This article was downloaded by: [Statsbiblioteket Tidsskriftafdeling]

On: 10 June 2015, At: 06:50

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Globalisation, Societies and Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cgse20>

Global polity in adult education and UNESCO: landmarking, brokering and framing policy

Marcella Milana^a

^a Department of Education, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark

Published online: 10 Jun 2015.

[Click for updates](#)

To cite this article: Marcella Milana (2015): Global polity in adult education and UNESCO: landmarking, brokering and framing policy, Globalisation, Societies and Education

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2015.1010437>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms &

Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Global polity in adult education and UNESCO: landmarking, brokering and framing policy

Marcella Milana*

Department of Education, Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark

(Received 16 July 2014; accepted 17 January 2015)

Aknowledging the complexity of local–global interconnections, the author argues for the adoption of a global polity perspective in adult education, here applied to study mobilisation processes that occur through UNESCO. The findings point to three processes that cross geopolitical borders and professional interests: ‘landmarking’, by which a shared sense of a common past is created; ‘brokering’, which helps shape a common future direction; and ‘framing’, which is used to convert ideational landscapes into material government-led actions. The theoretical perspectives and analytical insights presented could be used in analogous studies in other areas of education or with a focus on different political actors.

Keywords: adult education; UNESCO; global polity; networks; brokering; framing

Introduction

The education of adults as a matter of public concern has prompted the first conceptualisations of lifelong education and learning, at the same time as contemporary discourses on lifelong learning have revitalised interest in the education of adults as a policy issue that is neither below nor above, but includes governmental attention (Griffin 1999a, 1999b). This phenomenon can be captured under the concept of ‘global polity’, which acknowledges the mobilisation of different stakeholders towards the governance of a distinct yet malleable policy object (Corry 2010). In the field of adult education such mobilisation is made possible by the explicit intention of interstate organisations, governments and non-governmental organisations to redefine the contours of adult education practice. It results in coordinated and interdependent modes of political action around the education of adults, understood as a policy object that is separate from education at the primary, secondary or tertiary level (Milana 2012a).

*Email: mami@dpu.dk

Some of the ideas exposed in this article are drawn from previously published work (Milana 2014).

A renewed focus on the education of adults as a public concern is turning policy studies from a niche into a more visible area in adult education scholarship, as testified by a slow but steady growth in the number of publications dealing with policy development at regional or international levels and their impact on national contexts (see Desjardins and Gordon 2013; Milana and Holford 2014; Nesbit and Welton 2013, among others). This phenomenon has, at least in Europe, been paralleled and supported by the establishment of a scholarly research network on Policy Studies in Adult Education, with the explicit aim:

to develop a core forum of select experts [...] which will commit to ongoing dialogue and development around two specific areas, namely the development and impact of policies on adult education; and the development and impact of research of policy. (ESREA 2010, November 10, Objectives of the proposed network, par. 2)

These trends reflect the growth and expansion of governance mechanisms that include but are not reducible to political action by national governments. Still, policy studies in adult education, with only few exceptions, continue to prioritise national governments as their main unit of analysis, and thus, as Ball (2012, xii) puts it, tend to be locked in a 'policy-as-government paradigm'. I argue that overcoming such analytical limitations requires not only a purposeful research agenda but also better conceptual and methodological tools than those traditionally applied to researching adult education policy. A purposeful agenda calls for attention to the relations between transnational policy-making and state policy, and their development and reciprocal influences. Better conceptual and methodological tools should essentially draw on a range of disciplines (e.g., political sociology, political anthropology and comparative and international education) to comprehend (theoretically) and observe (empirically) *who* and *what* contribute to policy-making across material, ideational, social and political territories and thus *how* policy is made and the ways it affects educational praxis.

Following this line of argument, I engage in this contribution with an analysis of mobilising processes that occur across or through UNESCO, drawing on a methodology purposely advanced to study how and where global polity takes place. Following the literature review, I present the methodology that frames the study and describes the data used for the analysis before presenting the findings. The findings bring to light three modes of mobilisation processes at play, neither within nor outside, but across geopolitical borders and professional interests: one is *landmarking* events and publications, through which a shared sense of the past is created; a second is *brokering* values and ideas, which helps shape a common future direction; and a third is *framing* information and political intentions, in order to convert ideational landscapes into material actions. These modes of mobilisation might be

equated to ‘techniques’ or tools of power used to govern adult education. However, I intentionally refrain from using this terminology as its widespread (ab)use sometimes leads to researchers subsuming some kind of a-priori intentionality by governments, interstate organisations, etc. (as is that case when statistics or rating and ranking are used as tools to govern education); I make no such claims when speaking of modes of mobilisation here. Differently is the case with specific monitoring, evaluation and reporting activities or international meetings and conferences, to which I intentionally refer as governing ‘technologies’.

Literature review

Education policy work, or the process ‘through which values are authoritatively allocated’ (Easton 1965, 21) to education, as the vast literature on governance shows, is no longer under the sole influence of the nation state and its arena of power. Different theoretical traditions construe governance as constituted by policy networks of people and organisations (see Enroth 2011 for a discussion). Policy networks are mutually resource-dependent (Rhodes 1997); necessitate coordination through strategic or communicative/discursive action (Maynts 2003); and are characterised by pluralism of steering and regulative capacities among network actors (Enroth 2011). However, for networks to have ‘any real influence on policy’, they must connect to governments (Pierre and Peters 2005), the only political institutions with legislative and regulatory power within their own territories. Generalising these observations, governance seems to occur not as an alternative to but rather ‘in the shadow of hierarchy’ (Scharpf 1994, 40).

Governance mechanisms, nonetheless, are not limited to structures and practices that result from the pluralist coordination of interdependent network actors (governance in its strict sense). They also include the overall coordination of these very structures and practices (meta-governance; Jessop 2011, 106, see also Meuleman 2008). For the present purpose governance is equated to network governance, which occurs when a series of social actors gather around a mutually beneficial project, which is jointly pursued under frequently unsettled conditions, thanks to the organisation of the material, social and temporal resources deemed necessary to accomplish the project objectives and the monitoring of the progress made in this respect (Jessop 2011, 113). In line with this argument, meta-governance represents a response to the failure of network governance, which calls for changes in the composition of networks and re-articulations of the networks of networks, in order to restore and secure the negotiated consent deemed necessary for network governance to succeed (Jessop 2011, 114). From this perspective, education policy work is the result of complex dynamics or ‘nodes of interactions’ of individuals and organisations with their own policy volition,

which occur at multiple levels and scales and across time and space (Cerny 2001; Robertson 2012).

Conceptual and empirical understandings of such dynamics and their implications necessitate a full-bodied interpretation of a ‘global’ dimension in education policy work or a “meta-narrative” that needs to be picked apart’ (Robertson 2012, 5), which finds expression in the ontological changes derived from the legitimization of ideational and discursive practices that reach out at different scales. It should be a central scope for adult education policy studies to unveil the concreteness in any one context of such a ‘global’ dimension.

Several sociopolitical and ethnographic studies have contributed differently to this aim by disclosing how policy work that occurs across material and ideational sites contributes to shaping global imaginaries; imaginaries that homogenise values, beliefs and ideas about education (Rizvi and Bob Lingard 2010) but also open up new spaces for re-imagining local characterisations (Carney 2009, 2012).

Specifically, sociopolitical studies have brought to light ways in which a social concern turns into a political issue on a global level thanks to the mobilities of people, ideas and economic resources (Rizvi 2009), and hence the reach of policy processes that impinge on a ‘global education’ agenda (Rizvi and Bob Lingard 2010) through the exertion of political power at different sites (Ozga 2000, Ball 2012). Yet, it is the empirical depth of ethnographic studies that have made it possible to further examine these assumptions and gain better understandings of the ‘frictions’ (Tsing 2005) of global connectivity; namely, the processes of resistance and local (re)articulation of a ‘global education’ agenda that occur in national and local contexts. As a result, some contend that global interconnectivity has produced a ‘policyscape’ in education, or a flow of ideas that crosses and goes beyond local and national contexts, yet does not prevent forms of resistance and contestation that lead to re-imagining such ideas locally (Carney 2009, 2012).

Anthropological studies have shed additional light on the multiplicity of actors who have policy will, beyond the purview of governments, who support, resist or reinvent specific ideas about education. On the one hand, these studies have highlighted the viewpoints of people who negotiate global understandings and ideas in specific localities (Levinson, Sutton, and Winstead 2009; Levinson, Sutton, and Winstead 2009). On the other hand, they have moved beyond narrower perspectives on the human materiality through which a policy gets enacted, by questioning how a policy is conceived through global processes. In doing so, anthropological studies reinterpret a policy as both a tool of the government and a tool for examining the system of governance the government creates (Shore and Wright 1997). From this perspective, at least on a theoretical level, a policy is assigned agency at the same time as the concept of a ‘field’ of study is stretched to incorporate,

beyond physical sites, also those socio and political issues that constitute a policy matter (Shore, Wright, and Però 1997). Consequently, empirical attention is paid to the exploration of ‘policy worlds’ or the interactions of agents, concepts and technologies that play a role across sites; interactions that produce, reinforce or resist specific governance mechanisms (Shore, Wright, and Però 1997).

Thus far, a few unsolved issues have emerged. One is the tension between mobilities and flows that de-territorialise values, beliefs and ideas on and about education, and the processes of fixity and re-bordering they trigger (Robertson 2012). Another issue is the tension between a conceptual comprehension of the interactions that occur at different levels and scales, and between human and non-human agents, and the processes of grasping empirically the depth and breadth of such interactions to an extent that can adequately document their significance. In other words, how can we explain both de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation processes that occur via the authoritative allocation of values to adult education? And how can we empirically grasp interactions between human and non-human agency that elucidate such processes?

Multi-sited ethnographies have faced similar methodological challenges when paying attention, simultaneously, to horizontal and vertical interactions (Vavrus and Bartlett 2009), and hence freeing empirical explorations from a single place and time. In doing so, they have enquired external forces that are either resisted or accommodated by people (Burawoy et al. 2000), while treating artefacts as ‘actants’ rather than just ‘symbolic projections’ of human agency (Latour 2005, 10).

Horizontal and vertical ethnographies (Vavrus and Bartlett 2009) are doubtless epistemologically rich methodologies, yet the ‘sites’ they explore are scarcely ‘made up of actors with combinations of local *and* global horizons of action’ (Robertson 2012, 10, emphasis in original). In other words, such ethnographies do not resolve the ontological question of what constitutes the ‘global’ they claim to be studying. Global ethnographies (Burawoy et al. 2000) seem to better engage with ontological concerns when the global is understood as constituted by ‘global forces’ that are created at a distance but avoided, resisted and negotiated locally and produced by contingent ‘global connections’ of people, things and ideas. Further, they acknowledge that global forces and global connections are themselves constituted imaginatively. Expanding understandings of the ‘global’ dimension in education requires, however, paying more attention to non-human actants as well (Latour 2005). This direction is deployed in, for instance, the study of global education networks (Resnik 2008), and is promising for the further exploration of the relations between global forces, global connections and global imaginaries on and about adult education.

Methodology

Drawing on the above literature, yet departing from it in order to think afresh about adult education as a matter of public policy concern, neither within nor outside, but across geopolitical borders and professional interests, I propose adopting a global polity perspective on adult education. Such a proposal builds on a few assumptions. First, a global polity exists in adult education to the same extent as it does in other areas of public concern and governance. Yet, it is distinct from other forms of global polity in its intentionality to govern the education of adults (and those youngsters unable to show a normative educational record) rather than primary, secondary or tertiary education. Second, while the term ‘global polity’ grasps the gestalt of a social phenomenon, its empirical investigation is dependent on observations of the ‘global polity structure’ or the organisation of and relations between the elements that compose such a *gestalt*.

Accordingly, a global polity structure can be reduced to four constitutive categories that make reference to either the organisation of or relations between its elements, as shown in Table 1.

Each category (qualities, scales, environments and agencies) is relational in nature, in the sense that it incorporates a distinctive attribute as well as its

Table 1. Constituent categories, attributes and elements of a global polity structure.

Categories	Attributes	Elements
Qualities	Homogeneity	Shared basic understanding of one world, based on a minimum of common beliefs, guiding norms, values and ideas about adult education.
	Heterogeneity	Contextual reinforcement or resistance and contestation of the shared basic understanding of one world.
Scales	Monoscalarity	Mobilisation of agents that occurs horizontally, across local, national, regional and international environments.
	Multiscalarity	Mobilisation of agents that occurs vertically, within local, national, regional and international environments.
Environments	Physical	Concrete environments such as organisational structures, meeting rooms, virtual working spaces, and so on.
	Non-physical	Ideational environments such as words, concepts, imaginaries, and so on.
Agencies	Human	Political volition mobilised by human agents at either individual or organisational levels.
	Non-human	Political volition mobilised by non-human actants (events or artefacts) that make human agents act.

opposite. Such a relational nature points to the complexity of the local–global nexus or how the ‘global’ and the ‘local’ interact within a global polity structure. Traditionally, norms and ideas about education were thought of as linked to specific geographical and/or social territories and their cultures; whereas de-territorialisation has subjected these links to serious critique (Tomlinson 2007). However, as culture is created through people’s interactions, but the same people belong to (and interact within) multiple geographical and/or social territories, sense-making, although locally produced, is potentially global (Anderson-Levitt 2012). As a consequence, homogeneous and heterogeneous views about the world, and the place of adult education in it, coexist and are in a continuous dialogue. In the same line of thought, the global potential of local meanings produced within a global polity structure may diffuse within, as much as across, geographical and/or social territories. This is also due to the mobilisation of people, which is not restricted to a certain local, regional or national scale as much as linked across such scales. Thus, there is also a dialogical relation between mono- and multi-scalarity. At all scales, time and again, people meet and interact (more or less regularly) in a variety of environments, so that both the physical locations in which this happens and the words, concepts and imaginaries that inform these encounters are also in constant dialogue. This calls attention to the fact that what makes people (and the organisations they represent) contribute to the co-creation of meanings in adult education is not only the actions of other people and organisations but also the events and artefacts that result from their actions. This is why human agency and non-human agency are also in an active, dialogical relation.

Consequently, a global polity structure exists when a given set of actors shares a basic understanding of one world that incorporates both global and local horizons of political action, which expand vertically and horizontally. Its orientation results from the interactions between agents, concepts and technologies that take place in local, national, regional and international environments, and is often objectified in events such as conferences, official meetings or artefacts such as written texts, videos or still images. A global polity structure is kept alive by interactions between human and non-human agencies that are not bound to either vertical or horizontal perspectives or to either single or multiple environments. It should be noted, however, that human agents may have obligations, capacities or preferences to interact primarily in single or multiple environments, with either vertical or horizontal perspectives, while events and artefacts may simply carry crystallised meanings or contribute to their transformation, distortion or modification.

As a framework guiding empirical analysis, a global polity perspective calls for a coherent methodology with adequate heuristic tools. One such tool that is particularly apt to this scope is situational analysis (Clarke 2005), which uses elements derived from grounded theory, such as word by word or sentence by sentence open coding and labelling, and theoretical coding via constant

comparisons. However, it also incorporates elements from actor-network theory and discourse analysis, such as attention to non-human actants and discursive elements, in order to examine processes that occur at not only individual but also collective levels. Situational analysis also proposes synthesising and visualising both coded and ‘somewhat digested data’ (Clarke 2005) through maps that can prompt further analytical insights and interpretations. These heuristic tools were applied to the present study and helped theorise political mobilisation that occurs through UNESCO; yet theorising using situational analysis is a work in progress that can always be further extended.

Analytical focus and data sources

From a global polity perspective, UNESCO, an intergovernmental organisation representing, as of 2011, a total of 195 member states and 8 associate members across five world regions represents a visible collective agent with policy volition in adult education. Besides its headquarters, UNESCO operates through a number of specialised institutes, centres and field offices located in diverse member states. Hence, due to its institutional nature, UNESCO has the capacity to interact in multiple environments, yet with an obligation towards horizontal horizons (e.g., across its member states), as well as vertical horizons comprised within international environments (e.g., in relation to other interstate entities and non-governmental organisations). While its work tends towards the homogenisation of beliefs, guiding norms, values and ideas, in doing so it creates heterogeneity, for instance by resisting or contesting alternative world views promoted by others (Milana 2012a, 2012b; Wain 2001). Accordingly, this collective agent was selected, for the purpose of the present study, as an ‘entry point’ to explore how mobilisation processes towards the governance of adult education work.

I used different data sources gathered within the framework of an ongoing project (GLOBE-A), which investigates how globalisation processes (re)define the nature and scope of adult education worldwide and pays special attention to the dialogical relations between international and national levels.

In particular, during a period of stay at the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL) in January 2013, I participated in a video conference with UNESCO Headquarters, had informal conversations with several staff members, and interviewed six of them and one ex-member of the UNESCO National Commission for Germany to gain better knowledge of how the institute functions, its historical development and its current strategy and work on adult education. Also, I conducted a review of the literature on policy and advocacy work by UNESCO in the field of adult education, which helped me identify the most frequently referred to publications and events under the auspices of UNESCO, as well as the main journals with a broad coverage of these events and related activities and publications. This in turn led to the

identification of individuals and collectivities that have been writing and publishing about these issues. Finally, I gathered the 1976 *Recommendation on the development of adult education* and selected policy documents that make reference to it as well as the entries to the 2013 online consultation on its revision by 35 individuals from non-governmental organisations, universities, national governments, interstate entities, schools and private institutions based in Europe and North America (47%), Latin America (32%) and Africa (21%). This helped to disclose the discursive elements of the 1976 *Recommendation* and the debate that surrounds it, as well as its life as a legal instrument subject to monitoring activity. I complemented the above data-set with additional interviews and informal conversations with representatives from the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE) and the European Association for the Education of Adults (EAEA). Although all interviews and informal conversations during the study provided sensitising data that are used in the analysis, I do not include references in the text to either the audio recording of interviews or my notes on informal conversations, as the information contained in these is highly sensitive.

Findings

UNESCO shares institutional responsibilities for adult education between its headquarters (e.g., United Nations Literacy Decade), the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (e.g., Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Programme), the International Bureau of Education (e.g., Education for All, EFA) and the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (e.g., supporting EFA goals). Yet, since its establishment in 1951, institutional responsibility for adult education has mostly been a prerogative of the UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE). Established as a foundation under German civil law and heavily financed by the German Government, UIE turned into a fully-fledged UNESCO Institute in 2007, under the name of UIL. The new legal status has led to an alignment of the institute with UNESCO's overall strategy and greater dependence in economic, administrative and ideational terms, also due to dramatic budgetary fluctuations that affect both UNESCO and UIE in terms of line of financing, overall revenues and expenditure.

UNESCO's main activities in the field of adult education include the organisation of an international conference held every 12 years since 1949, which is funded by the member states but organised by UIE/UIL, according to specific protocols for agenda setting, access and the right to speak. Further, since 1972, UNESCO has foreseen the incorporation of adult education committees set up by member states for consulting and coordinating with UNESCO, within the UNESCO National Commissions. Additionally, In 1976 UNESCO adopted a *Recommendation on the development of adult education*, the only international legal instrument in this field to date. Last but not least, over the decades UNESCO has come to coordinate several development goals

and initiatives that cover, among other things, basic education and literacy programmes for adults. None of these activities would have occurred without interactions between non-human and human agents, either individuals or collectives, which occurred in a variety of physical and non-physical environments and across member scales. While it is not possible to capture the totality of these interactions (and their effects) in just one study, the analysis presented here produces useful insights into mobilisation processes that occur through UNESCO and in particular, UIL.

Three modes of mobilisation that are entangled in textual artefacts or events and intertwined with the development of standard-setting instruments emerged from the data: *landmarking*, *brokering* and *framing* (see Table 2).

Table 2. Modes of mobilisation by selected characteristics.

	Landmarking	Brokering	Framing
Processes	Co-constructing a shared past for a broad set of actors who have policy will in adult education.	Supporting the transaction of values, ideas and information to envision a viable future for adult education.	Structuring information and intentions to produce material changes at the governmental level in the field of adult education.
Incidents	Events and publications that mark turning points or new stages of development.	Technologies that facilitate the exchange and diffusion of meanings.	Governance mechanisms that set standards and institutional responsibilities and describe processes and practices.
Visible marks	<i>Learning to Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow</i> (1972) <i>Learning: The Treasure Within</i> (1996) CONFINTEA V, and its outcome document, the <i>Hamburg Declaration</i> (1997)	World Conference on Adult Education International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA) Preparatory meetings Follow-up meetings Background/working documents Post-conference publications	<i>Recommendation on the development of adult education</i> (1976) <i>Belém Framework for Action</i> (2009) <i>Global Report on Adult Learning and Education</i> (2009, 2013).

Landmarking

In everyday language, a landmark is something (like a building) that helps people orient themselves in space or has historical significance, but a landmark can also represent something (like an event) that marks an important stage of some sort. In either case for this ‘something’ to acquire the status of a landmark there must be an attribution of meaning (by someone). As such, landmarks in adult education could be many things, including books and international conferences that individuals and groups recognise as marking a stage of development in adult education policy and, metaphorically speaking, as helping people (and organisations) know where they are. Building on this generic definition, I use the verb *landmarking* here to denote the active and dynamic process through which something is made into a landmark not through the independent work of isolated individuals but rather through the work of collectivities.

The incidences of such a process are concrete things like an event or a publication that individuals and organisations across geographical and social territories recognise as having historical importance, as it marks a stage of development in adult education policy worldwide.

A visible mark of *landmarking* activity, in this study, is found in *Learning to be* (1972), a report by the former Prime Minister and Minister of Education of France and Commission Chair, Edgar Faure. This report epitomises the work that had been carried out around the concept of ‘lifelong education’ under the auspicious of the UIE at a time of active leadership in establishing the organising principle for educational development (Tuijnman and Boström, 2002). It was fully embraced by the ‘lifelong education movement’ (Wain 2001, 184) for its radical approach, which also fit in with de-schooling, and de-institutionalisation stands (Moosung and Friedrich, 2011). In short, the report addresses the need to create new and diverse education and learning opportunities to transcend ‘the limits of institutions, programmes and methods imposed on it down the centuries’ (Faure, Edgar and International Commission on the Development of Education 1972, 145). This project was grounded in social-democratic liberal ideas that saw individual growth as entangled with social development (Milana 2012a). On this background, the expansion of adult education, educational innovation, democratisation processes and adult education as a worldwide policy matter were discussed at the Third International Conference on Adult Education (Tokyo 1972), thereby setting the scene for the authorisation of UNESCO’s Directorate General to do policy work in support of its member states. This led to the adoption of the 1976 *Recommendation*.

A second visible mark is represented by *Learning: The Treasure Within* (1996). This report summarises the work of a commission chaired by the former president of the European Commission, Jacques Delors, with the explicit aim of repositioning education at the top of the political agenda while

advancing lifelong learning in response to globalisation. Although not immune to neoliberal ideas like skills updating, the report represents an attempt to preserve a social-democratic liberal approach to education that reconciles economic growth with equity issues and respect for the human condition and the environment. It reaffirms the central role of the welfare state at a time when it was put into serious question by the expansion of neoliberal thinking in education (Milana 2012a; Moosung and Friedrich 2011). This report represents the basis on which the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (Hamburg 1997, hereafter CONFINTEA V) took off.

CONFINTEA V represents a third visible mark. The conference was organised under the auspices of the Director of UIE, Paul Bélanger (1989–1999), former Director-General of the Canadian Institute for Adult Education (1972–1985), who had been a key figure in urging that non-governmental organisations take part in the international conferences on adult education as a separate category from appointed national delegations. The conference outcome documents: the *Hamburg Declaration* and the *Agenda for the Future*, address adult education as the primary condition for full societal participation and put special emphasis on democratic participation, access, literacy skills, the right to work and health and environmental care. They received much attention, not just from the conference delegates, among other things for their compatibility with development goals and initiatives that have flourished ever since under the auspices of UNESCO.

Such visible marks, no matter how radical, innovative or visionary the ideas they crystallise are, are not landmarks per se. They assume this status over time, thanks to their potential as non-human actants in intermediating ideas in interaction with individuals and collectivities. Such potential finds expression when individuals and collectivities for instance make explicit reference to these texts or events, and in so doing assign them specific values. References can be made by those responsible for a publication or for organising an event (self-referencing) or by others, who in many cases have contributed to their creation (cross-referencing).

Self- and cross-referencing are done for purposes as diverse as, for example, reaffirming a joint positioning within competing discourses, anchoring critique to shifts in global views and perspectives or gaining consensus to advocate for alternatives to mainstream discourses on adult education.

An example of a reaffirmation of a collective positioning is found in *Towards an Open Learning World* (UNESCO 2002), celebrating the UIE/UIIL's 50th anniversary, which includes a picture of the *Learning to be* (1972) report on its cover and again on page 39. Further, *Learning to be* (1972) is referenced by several people connected to varying degrees with UIE/UIIL (i.e., an ex-UIE interpreter, an ex-member of the UNESCO National Commission for Germany and an ex-UIE Director) with the goal of positioning UNESCO as a worldwide leader in conceptual advancement and school reforms.

Self- and cross-referencing are at times ambiguous in their aims, as is the case of the editorial in the special issue of the *International Review of Education* on the follow-up of the Sixth International Conference on Adult Education held in Brazil in 2009 (CONFINTEA VI) (Vol. 57: 1–2, 2011). The editorial was co-signed by Carolyn Medel-Añonuevo, current UIL Deputy Director, and two academics who were involved in the preparation of the conference. It criticises the neoliberal obsession with evidence-based policies and governing by numbers approaches by referring to *Learning to be* (1972) and *Learning: The Treasure Within* (1996) as ‘authoritative for their adherence to common and shared values such as helping to build a substantive world with just societies that value knowledge, promote peace, celebrate diversity and defend human rights’ (5). However, this claim lives side by side with an ambiguous prescriptive argument on how adult education scholarship could better serve UIL’s mandate to produce a triennial *Global Report on Adult Learning and Education*, a recent monitoring tool, which aspires to become a standard-setting technology as powerful as the *Global Monitoring Report* by the World Bank or *Education at a Glance* by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Diverse cases for self- and cross-referencing appear in, for instance, the special issue on CONFINTEA VI of *Adult Education and Development* (Vol. 75, 2010). This issue reproduces speeches held at the conference by ‘colleagues who were of special importance for us [the German Adult Education Association, DVV, n/a]’ (5), like the President of DVV, and ‘longstanding partners’, such as the former Director of UIE, Paul Bélanger, at that time President of the ICAE. ICAE is a professional institution based in Paraguay that was established shortly after the Third International Conference on Adult Education (Tokyo 1972). It has been an associate member of UNESCO since 2012, thanks to the official reclassification of non-governmental organisations within UNESCO. Self- and cross-referencing in this case are mostly aimed at creating (or renewing, as perceived by some) a collective consensus at the crossroads of professional organisations and among their members, such as adult education practitioners and academics.

Brokering

Social network analysis has devoted much attention to the ways in which information is shared among people belonging to different social groupings that are connected in different ways to one another. In this context ‘brokerage’ has been advanced as the action of bridging and connecting groups that some people (brokers) do, thanks to multiple group affiliations and/or interactions (Burt, Kilduff, and Tasselli 2013). Building on the assumption that beliefs and ideas that determine people’s conduct within a group tend towards homogenisation and are hardly accessible to other groups, between-group brokers

are the only ones to gain access to diverse beliefs, ideas and ways of conduct (Burt 2004) and to diffuse them across groups.

Similarly, in adult education, different groups like intergovernmental organisations, non-governmental organisations, academics and adult education practitioners (and sub-groupings of these) have their own beliefs, ideas and information about what constitutes a viable future for adult education and what determines their respective conduct. Here as well, brokerage helps bridge and connect groups; however, while social network analysis focuses on individual brokers and their advantages, I employ the term 'brokering' to denote the transaction of values, ideas and information across groups; it is active (it occurs through things that are being done) and processual (in the sense that it is dynamic, evolving work), but it directs attention primarily towards collectivities rather than individuals.

Incidences of *brokering* as a process are found in specific technologies that can facilitate the exchange and diffusion of meanings across groups, such as those orchestrated by UIE/UIIL (as one collectivity), or under the responsibility of non-governmental organisations (as another collectivity).

A visible mark of *brokering* can be found in, for instance, a number of international conferences and meetings sponsored by and/or organised under the auspices of UNESCO. It is also thanks to these technologies that exchanging and diffusing meanings between UNESCO and non-governmental organisations occur. Since CONFINTEA V, non-governmental organisations have not only had their own delegations, but have also actively participated in preparing and running international conferences, by proposing and organising workshops, or advocating for a higher level of governmental participation in the international conferences and related regional preparatory and follow-up meetings. Some of these collective entities have been created soon after or just before the international conferences on adult education, like ICAE (see above) or the Action Platform for Adult Education, which was created in 2008 during the preparation of CONFINTEA VI.

Another technology that facilitates the exchange and diffusion of meanings across-groups is media ownership. Visible marks include, but are not limited to, three journals edited by UIE/UIIL, the International Cooperation of the German Adult Education Association (DVV International) and ICAE, respectively, in collaboration with other non-governmental organisations active at national or regional levels, such as the National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE), based in the UK, and the EAEA, whose secretariat is in Brussels.

When we adopt a socio-material approach, these journals can be seen as brokers in the sense that they connect different social groupings through their written words. Specifically, it is through these journals that values, ideas and information are brokered across and beyond restricted groups (e.g., advisory boards, consultative groups, drafting committees or delegations appointed by

national governments) and larger collectivities excluded by them, such as the academics and professionals who constitute their readership.

The *International Review of Education*, founded in 1931 by a German educationalist and originally published by the University of Cologne, has been published under the auspices of UIE/UIIL since 1955 (UNESCO 2002). It is a peer-reviewed journal that, thanks to its distribution by Springer, is included in citation tracking and bibliographic databases worldwide. Originally intended to support scholarship in comparative education, it has had a longstanding relation with the World Council of Comparative Education Societies, whose triennial congresses have served as a platform for the publication of guest-edited issues. The journal has also had an important role in fostering lifelong learning (Tuijnman and Boström 2002) and in brokering values, ideas and data specific to the field of adult education, as, for instance, in the special issue on the follow-up on CONFINTEA VI already mentioned. Shifts in the institutional legal status and directorship of UIE/UIIL, coupled with the appointment of a new executive director of the journal, have recently led to an explicit redirection of the journal to better support UIL's overall strategy and commitments to lifelong learning, specifically adult education, thus strengthening the journal's brokering potential in these matters.

Adult Education and Development has been published since 1973 by DVV International. Available in three languages, English, Spanish and French, the journal is distributed to libraries specialising in education worldwide and has since 2000 also been available for free download on the Internet. The international conferences on adult education, as well as preparatory and follow-up activities, have been covered by the journal since its foundation with 'A short review of the most important decisions of the Third World Conference on Adult Education, Tokyo 1972'.¹

Over the years a growing number of issues have been devoted, partly if not exclusively, to the international conferences on adult education and related events,² paralleling a growing commitment of DVV International and its Director (Heribert Hinzen, 1978–2010) to the organisation of such events. These issues, for instance, make available to a broader audience background and output documents prepared in connection with CONFINTEA V and CONFINTEA VI, the mid-term review conference of CONFINTEA V (Bangkok 2003), and the Second Bonn Conference on Adult Education (2009), run in collaboration between DVV, ICAE, EAEA and the Asian South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education, with the support of UIL and the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. Originally planned as a follow-up to CONFINTEA VI, due to a change of dates, the Second Bonn Conference came first; hence the work developed there fed into the International Civil Society Forum, convened by non-governmental organisations back-to-back with CONFINTEA VI, as well as into the workshops organised by DVV International at the conference. The

journal has recently undergone a major restyling; with a new advisory board including, among others, a UNESCO chair and representatives from ICAE and EAEA, it is now published once a year and distributed free of charge in over 120 countries. Issue 80/2013 is centred on the post-2015 agenda, and advocates the more explicit incorporation of an adult education perspective in future global development goals and activities.

Convergence, an international peer-reviewed journal launched 1968, become the official journal of ICAE, and was published on its behalf by NIACE over the last eight years of its existence before being discontinued in 2011. The journal accepted and published manuscripts in French, Spanish, and to a major extent English, and was and is still indexed and abstracted by online digital libraries such as ERIC, EBSCO and ProQuest. Among the internationally recognised journals specialising in adult education, *Convergence* was one of the few focusing on issues of concern for comparative and international adult education (Mulenga, Al-Harhi, and Carr-Chellman 2006). From 2001, at least one issue per year included articles that made explicit reference to the international conferences on adult education.³ Thanks to close collaboration with DVV International, the journal devoted a special edition in 2007 to CONFINTEA VI, which was translated into Portuguese in 2009 with the support of DVV International, Ação Educativa, a Brazilian non-governmental organisation, and the UNESCO office in Brasília.

It should be noted here that a closer look at the authorship of editorials and articles in the above-mentioned journals that report, comment on or debate international conferences and meetings held under the auspices of UNESCO/UIL also brings to light individual brokers (in social network analytic terms) such as Carolyn Medel-Añonuevo, Paul Bélanger and Heribert Hinzen, just to mention a few that have already appeared in this analytic account. Brokering potentials are enhanced by representational power shifts, which result from a limited number of individuals moving in and out of official positions not just within but also across institutions, like intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations; institutions that have differential policy volition and legitimate reach.

Finally, both collectivities and individuals that have actively contributed to the realisation of past events such as international conferences and meetings, still carry with them a memory of these events, and write about them, can act as ‘historians’ and facilitate bridging and connecting not only between groups but also between processes like landmarking and brokering.

Framing

Framing is a familiar concept in the social sciences. In network and governance studies, framing usually refers to a mode of meta-governance that captures the definition of policy-relevant goals by a given network, the material conditions necessary to achieve these goals and the discursive/

narrative rationale linking both together (Van Bortel and Mullins 2009). It also refers to one of the principles of network management, and thus also includes the legal basis and fiscal conditions that goals, conditions and discursive/narrative rationales depend on (Sørensen and Torfing 2009).

A governance network, such as the one under consideration in this study, may, however, well be an expression of what Torfing et al. (2012, 3) see as one mode of interactive governance, namely a 'complex process through which a plurality of social and political actors with diverging interests interact in order to formulate, promote, and achieve common objectives by means of mobilizing, exchanging, and deploying a range of ideas, rules, and resources'. But given the relative weight that non-governmental organisations have in the network under consideration, and their lobbying and advocating position, the network bears some resemblance to social movements, at least in terms of its purposeful action aimed at carrying out a social reform of certain aspects of society, in this case, through adult education. Accordingly, framing in this context also builds on the way it is understood in social movement research, where, similarly to governance studies, it refers to political goals, resources and discursive/narrative storylines, albeit with an emphasis on mobilisation as an active and evolving way of producing negotiated action frames for diagnostic, prognostic and motivational purposes (Benford and Snow 2000). Accordingly, I use 'framing' to denote the process of structuring information and intentions to bring to light certain (and not other) political goals, resources and discursive/narrative storylines that diagnose the status of adult education worldwide, and project its potential development in an attempt to motivate in this case, a given social actor, namely national governments, to contribute to social change in this policy area.

Incidences of the process of *framing* in this study are governance mechanisms under UNESCO and/or UIL.

One visible mark is the 1976 *Recommendation on the development of adult education*. Among UNESCO's legal instruments recommendations are the 'softest' ones, as they encourage governments to adopt certain approaches or undertake a course of action but are not legally binding. The 1976 *Recommendation* crystallised beliefs, guiding norms and values about adult education while paving the way for a gradual transformation of this ideational landscape into a standard-setting instrument at the global level.

A close-text analysis highlights three core elements in its discursive structure: the first refers to the characterisation of adult education in relation to national education systems, the second, to the governance of adult education within and across nations, and the third, to the values and orientations that inform its characterisation as well as its governance.

AE is characterised as being an integral part of lifelong education, which contributes to the development of educational systems, social and economic progress and development and world peace. Accordingly, it is not an entity in

itself or a sub-division of a national education system, but one of its components, albeit with no theoretical boundaries of its own, and no limitations to knowledge with short-term applicability.

AE governance requires both policy and system coordination. Policy coordination should ensure that AE objectives and goals are defined in relation to the overall national development plans and take into consideration the general objectives of education as well as social, cultural and economic policies. Systemic coordination implies that AE, schooling, tertiary education and vocational training are conceived as equally essential components of a differentiated but coordinated national education system.

Finally, among identifiable values and orientations are the right to education, context adaptation and interaction, critical understanding and judgement, democracy and freedom, equity and social justice, human progression, living together, learner-centeredness, needs specificity, transferability, together with collective and community orientations, cultural orientations, holistic orientations and global orientations.

Monitoring activities on the impact of the 1976 *Recommendation* on national contexts has been sporadic.

The first monitoring was conducted in 1993. On the recommendation emerging from the Fourth International Conference on Adult Education (Paris 1985), a questionnaire was sent to governments and returned by approximately 33% of UNESCO's member states. A new monitoring was initiated in 2011, following UNESCO's decision in 2007 to adopt new means to monitor the implementation of all its standard-setting instruments, among which is the 1976 *Recommendation*. The monitoring was based on the *Global Report on Adult Learning and Education* (2009) prepared by UIL in view of CONFINTEA VI. The *Global Report*, first commissioned to external experts and then rewritten in house, was based on national reports received upon request by almost 80% of UNESCO's member states and regional reports produced by individual consultants.

The *Global Report*, now produced on a triennial bases, represents the main tool to monitor national progress in the field of adult education as a result of a decision of the Directorate General of UNESCO, together with the decision, also made by the Directorate General, to revise and update the 1976 *Recommendation*. Both decisions were ratified by UNESCO member states at CONFINTEA VI, as reported in its outcome document, the *Belém Framework for Action* (2009).

Accordingly, UIL has been responsible not only for the production of the *Global Report*, whose second edition (2013) has been entirely written in house, and only reviewed by external consultants, but also for a preliminary study of the technical and legal aspects relating to the revision of the 1976 *Recommendation*. This process (up until 2013) has seen the production of a preliminary report by an expert group composed of five representatives of

governmental and non-governmental bodies from the five UNESCO regions; a two-week online consultation to which more than 300 people were invited or granted permission to join, but only 11% made an active contribution, mostly from the perspective of non-governmental organisations and academia; and internal meetings and exchanges with personnel from UNESCO Headquarters.

The preliminary report by the expert group acknowledges that the 1976 *Recommendation* is a 'visionary document' with a 'clear rights-based approach' to adult education, which is 'emancipatory' and 'unique'; however, the group also confirms UNESCO's viewpoint that it is 'outdated' and difficult to implement on a practical basis.⁴

The contributions to the online consultation also deal with the updating of content. However, they also question the normative power of the document and suggest a convention or a legally binding technology to advocate for stronger commitment by national governments to worldwide progress in adult education. Further, the online consultation brings to light conflicting views on how to best frame adult education as a global reality while giving full recognition to national heterogeneity in terms of visions, values and organisational principles and questions how governing technologies such as monitoring, evaluation and reporting activities can become 'a collaborative and cooperative endeavour at local, national and international levels'.⁵

A preliminary study of the technical and legal aspects relating to the revision of the 1976 *Recommendation* by UIL was examined at the 191st session of the UNESCO Executive Board (April 2013) and approved at the 37th session of the UNESCO General Conference (November 2013). The preliminary study reiterates the uniqueness of the 1976 *Recommendation* as a normative instrument (par. 1), mentions the online consultation (par. 5) and some of the arguments that emerged from it, such as the need for conceptual elaboration and political support for adult education (par. 8), and stresses the use of a more politically correct and gender-sensitive terminology (par. 12) brought forward by the expert group. Finally, the ongoing process of revising the text of the 1976 *Recommendation* is in the institutional hands of UIL but it must be carried out in accordance with UNESCO's protocols and approved by individual governments that adhere to UNESCO.

Conclusions

In this contribution I have argued for the adoption of a global polity perspective as a theoretical framework to comprehend and guide investigations of *who* and *what* contribute to policy-making across material, ideational, social and political territories and thus *how* policy is made. In a nutshell, it recognises that multiple stakeholders mobilise towards the governance of a joint policy object they concur in shaping. However, a 'global polity' denotes the whole of a phenomenon, whereas it is the organisation of and relations between the elements that constitute it that guide its investigation. Building on

existing knowledge on policy work and governance in education, and taking into account the complexity and multidimensionality of local–global inter-connections, I have presented a global polity structure composed of four relational categories (qualities, scales, environments and agencies), linked in different ways to each other. Specifically, the category of ‘qualities’ refers to homogeneous and heterogeneous views on the world that coexist and are in a continuous dialogue; ‘scales’ denotes that people’s mobilisation is not restricted to a certain local, regional or national scale but is linked across such scales; ‘environments’ points at both the physical or concrete locations in which people meet and the words, concepts and imaginaries that inform these encounters. Finally, ‘agencies’ recognises that sense-making occurs not only through people’s actions but also thanks to the events and artefacts they produce. Accordingly, a global polity structure embeds the tensions between simultaneous flows and fixations of meanings that bring about de-territorialisation just as much as re-territorialisation of views about the world, and the place education holds.

In this vein, analytical attention has been paid here to the workings of one among many observable global polity structures, which has UNESCO as one of its agents. Moreover, the focus has been limited to how political mobilisation occurs via interactions through and across UNESCO. From the data under consideration, three modes of mobilisation have emerged, each of which represents an active, processual phenomenon: *landmarking* or co-constructing a shared past for adult education; *brokering* or supporting the transaction of values, ideas and information to envision its viable future; and *framing* or structuring information and intentions to produce material changes at the governmental level. Serving multiple individual and collective purposes, *landmarking* is often normative and prescriptive in its wording, and is facilitated by a limited number of individuals and collectivities that act as ‘historians’. Historians are those who have either actively contributed to the production of landmarked texts and events or have at least had privileged access to them. Historians also play a key role in *brokering* activities that are facilitated by ownership of or privileged access to means of communication such as professional and scientific journals. *Framing*, in contrast, relies less on historians and their policy volition, as this type of mobilisation process is more dependent on the organisational and administrative workings of intergovernmental organisations like UNESCO and the way in which representational powers are exerted in them.

When we look back at the constituent categories, attributes and elements of a global polity structure, *landmarking*, *brokering* and *framing* processes tend towards homogenisation in the sense that they construct a shared basic understanding of adult education as an important field of public policy concern. However, they also contextually reinforce or resist the idea of a one-size-fits-all policy solution (qualities). Further, they mobilise collective agents

like governmental structures, non-governmental organisations, professional organisations and research organisations, or their individual representatives, both across and within local, national, regional and international environments (scales). Additionally, they create new or expand access to existing physical and non-physical places (environments) in which these agents can meet and interact. In doing so, these processes rely on political volition by individuals, collectivities or events and artefacts that make people act (agencies). Exploring each of these processes in more depth, together with additional political mobilisation processes, should be the object of further research.

Moreover, *landmarking*, *brokering* and *framing* can be seen as interdependent processes that result in a sort of political ‘euphony’, as reflected in the identification of adult education as a human right, and in joint policy directions and monitoring efforts. This apparently contrasts what would otherwise be a discordant and meaningless mix or ‘cacophony’ of political discourses and actions by intergovernmental organisations, governments, non-governmental organisations and other stakeholders. But it is important to highlight that hypothetically, such global euphony would resonate differently at local, regional and national scales and among different social groupings. Enquiring whether and how it does so should also be the object of further research.

To conclude, although this study focused on adult education and UNESCO, it is reasonable to assume that the theoretical framework and analytical insights presented here could inspire studies in other areas of education or with a focus on different collective agents than UNESCO. Such studies should take into account similarities and differences, for instance, in terms of the legal status and function of collective agents, the official and unofficial inter-institutional relations between different stakeholders, and the specific technologies that these legitimate.

Acknowledgements

The author was a Visiting Scholar at the University of California, Los Angeles at the time of the study. However, she is solely responsible for the views expressed here. Special thanks go to the Director and staff of UIL and representatives from ICAE and EAEA with whom the author has had face-to-face interaction, as well as to all participants to the online consultation whose entries provided additional research data.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This research has been supported by a Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowship (IOF) under contract number 297727.

Notes

1. See *Adult Education and Development* Vol. 1/1972.
2. See *Adult Education and Development* Vol. 62/2004, Vol. 69/2007, Vol. 72/2009, Vol. 73/2009, Vol. 75/2010, Vol. 77/2011, Vol. 78/2012.
3. See *Convergence* Vol. 34/4 2001, Vol. 35: 4/2002, Vol. 35: 2–3/2002, Vol. 36: 1/2003, Vol. 37: 3/2004, Vol. 38: 3/2005, Vol. 38: 4/2005, Vol. 39: 2–3/2006, Vol. 39: 4/2006, Vol. 41: 2–3/2008, Vol. 42: 2–4/2009.
4. Expert meeting: Review of the 1976 Recommendation on the Development of Adult Education, Synthesis of Main Results and Proposals UIL, 10–11 July 2012, page 3.
5. Entry by a representative of academia, dated 10 October 2012.

References

- Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn M. 2012. "Complicating the Concept of Culture." *Comparative Education* 48 (4): 441–445.
- Ball, Stephen J. 2012. *Global Education Inc. New Policy Networks and the Neo-liberal Imaginary*. New York: Routledge.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (1): 611–639. doi:[10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611).
- Burawoy, Michael, Sean O. Riain, Joseph A. Blum, Sheba George, Zsuzsa Gille, Teresa Gowan, Lynne Haney, Maren Klawiter, Steven H. Lopez, and Millie Thayer. 2000. *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burt, Ronald S. 2004. "Structural Holes and Good Ideas." *American Journal of Sociology* 110 (2): 349–399.
- Burt, Ronald S., Martin Kilduff, and Stefano Tasselli. 2013. "Social Network Analysis: Foundations and Frontiers on Advantage." *Annual Review of Psychology* 64 (1): 527–547. doi:[10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143828](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143828).
- Carney, Stephen. 2009. "Negotiating Policy in an Age of Globalization: Exploring Educational 'Policyscapes' in Denmark, Nepal, and China." *Comparative Education Review* 53 (1): 63–88. doi:[10.1086/593152](https://doi.org/10.1086/593152).
- Carney, Stephen. 2012. "Imagining Globalization: Educational Policyscapes." In *World Yearbook of Education*, edited by E. G. Steiner-Khamisi and F. Waldow, 339–353. London/New York: Routledge.
- Cerny, Philip G. 2001. "From 'Iron Triangles' to 'Golden Pentangles'? Globalizing the Policy Process." *Global Governance* 7 (4): 397–410.
- Clarke, Adele E. 2005. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern Turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Corry, Olaf. 2010. "What is a (Global) Polity?" *Review of International Studies* 36 (S1): 157–180. doi:[10.1017/S0260210510000975](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210510000975).
- Desjardins, Richard, and Jean Gordon, eds. 2013. "Adult Learning Systems in a Comparative Perspective." [Special Issue]. *European Journal of Education* 48: 2.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A System Analysis of Political Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Enroth, Henrik. 2011. "Policy-network Theory." In *The Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by M. Bevir, 19–35. London: Sage.
- ESREA. 2010. *Policy Studies in Adult Education*. Accessed May 7, 2013. http://www.esrea.org/policy_studies.

- Faure, Edgar and International Commission on the Development of Education. 1972. *Learning to Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Griffin, Colin M. 1999a. "Lifelong Learning and Social Democracy." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 18 (5): 329–342. doi:[10.1080/026013799293586](https://doi.org/10.1080/026013799293586).
- Griffin, Colin M. 1999b. "Lifelong Learning and Welfare Reform." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 18 (6): 431–452. doi:[10.1080/026013799293504](https://doi.org/10.1080/026013799293504).
- Jessop, Bob. 2011. "Meta-governance." In *The Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by M. Bevir, 106–123. London: Sage.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, Bradley. 2005. "Programs for Democratic Citizenship in Mexico's Ministry of Education: Local Appropriations of Global Cultural Flows." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 12 (1): 251–284. doi:[10.2979/GLS.2005.12.1.251](https://doi.org/10.2979/GLS.2005.12.1.251).
- Levinson, Bradley A. U., Margaret Sutton, and Teresa Winstead. 2009. "Education Policy as a Practice of Power: Theoretical Tools, Ethnographic Methods, Democratic Options." *Educational Policy* 23 (6): 767–795. doi:[10.1177/0895904808320676](https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808320676).
- Maynts, Renate. 2003. "New Challenges to Governance Theory." In *Governance as Social and Political Communication*, edited by Henrik P. Bang, 27–40. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Meuleman, Louis. 2008. *Public Management and the Metagovernance of Hierarchies, Networks and Markests: The Feasibility of Designing and Managing Governance Style Combinations*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Milana, Marcella. 2012a. "Political Globalization and the Shift from Adult Education to Lifelong Learning." *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults* 3 (2): 103–117. doi:[10.3384/rela.2000-7426.rela0070](https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.rela0070).
- Milana, Marcella. 2012b. "Globalisation, Transnational Policies and Adult Education." *International Review of Education* 58 (6): 777–797. doi:[10.1007/s11159-012-9313-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-012-9313-5).
- Milana, Marcella. 2014. "UNESCO, Adult Education and Political Mobilization." *CONFERO* 2 (1): 73–107. doi:[10.3384/confero.2001-4562.140604a](https://doi.org/10.3384/confero.2001-4562.140604a).
- Milana, Marcella, and John Holford, eds. 2014. *Adult Education Policy and the European Union*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Moosung, Lee, and Tom Friedrich. 2011. "Continuously Reaffirmed, Subtly Accommodated, Obviously Missing and Fallaciously Critiqued: Ideologies in UNESCO's Lifelong Learning Policy." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 30 (2): 151–169. doi:[10.1080/02601370.2010.547619](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2010.547619).
- Mulenga, Derek, A. S. Al-Harhi, and D. J Carr-Chellman. 2006. "Comparative and International Adult Education: A Content Analysis of Some Major Adult Education Journals." *Convergence* 39 (1): 77–89.
- Nesbit, Tom, and Michael Welton, eds. 2013. *Adult Education and Learning in a Precarious Age: The Hamburg Declaration Revisited*. (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education No. 138). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ozga, Jenny. 2000. *Policy Research in Educational Settings Contested Terrain*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Pierre, Jon, and Peters B. Guy. 2005. *Governing Complex Societies: Trajectories and Scenarios*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Resnik, Julia, ed. (2008). "Understanding Educational Policies in the Global Era: A New-Weberian Perspective and Knowledge Producers as Status Group." In *The Production of Educational Knowledge in the Global Era*, edited by Julia Resnik, 33–52. Rotterdam: Sense.

- Rhodes, Rod A. W. 1997. *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rizvi, Fazal. 2009. "Mobile minds." In *Globalizing the Research Imagination*, edited by J. Kenway and J. Fahey, 101–114. Anningdon: Routledge.
- Rizvi, Fazal. 2010. "Mobilities Paradigm and Its Challenges for Comparative Education." Keynote address to the XXIV conference of the Comparative Education Society of Europe, Uppsala, August 16–19.
- Rizvi, Fazal, and Bob Lingard. 2010. *Globalizing Education Policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Robertson, Susan. 2012. "Signposts in 'Doing' Critical Transnational Education Policy Analysis." Keynote address to the inaugural conference of the ESREA Network on Policy Studies in Adult Education, University of Nottingham, February 10–12.
- Sharpf, Fritz W. 1994. "Games Real Actors Could Play: Positive and Negative Coordination in Embedded Negotiations." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 6 (1): 27–53. doi:[10.1177/0951692894006001002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0951692894006001002).
- Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright, eds. 1997. *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Shore, Cris, Susan Wright, and Davide Però, eds. 1997. *Policy Worlds: Anthropology and Analysis of Contemporary Power*. London: Routledge.
- Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing. 2009. "Making Governance Network Effective and Democratic through Metagovernance." *Public Administration* 87 (2): 234–258.
- Tomlinson, John. 2007. "Cultural Globalization." In *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization*, edited by George Ritzer, 352–366. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Torfing, Jacob, B. Guy Peters, Jon Pierres, and Eva Sørensen. 2012. *Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsing, Anna L. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tuijnman, Albert C., and Ann Kristin Boström. 2002. "Changing Notions of Lifelong Education and Lifelong Learning." *International Review of Education* 48 (1/2): 93–110. doi:[10.1023/A:1015601909731](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015601909731).
- UNESCO. 2002. *Towards an Open Learning World*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.
- Van Bortel, Gerard, and David Mullins. 2009. "Critical Perspectives on Network Governance in Urban Regeneration, Community Involvement and Integration." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 24 (2): 203–219. doi:[10.1007/s10901-009-9140-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-009-9140-6).
- Vavrus, Frances, and Lesley Bartlett. 2006. "Comparatively Knowing: Making a Case for a Vertical Case Study." *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 8 (2): 95–103.
- Vavrus, Frances, and Lesley Bartlett, eds. 2009. *Critical Approaches to Comparative Education. Vertical Case Studies from Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and the Americas*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wain, Kenneth. 2001. "Lifelong Learning: Small Adjustments or Paradigmatic Shift?" In *International Handbook of Lifelong Learning*, edited by D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M. Hatton, and Y. Sawano, Vol. I, 183–198. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.