



University of Chester

This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester's
online research repository

<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>

Author(s): Robert Ian Hulme

Title: The international movement of ideas and practices in education and social
policy

Date: August 2011

Originally published as: University of Chester PhD by Publication

Example citation: Hulme, R. I. (2011). *The international movement of ideas and
practices in education and social policy*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
University of Chester, United Kingdom.

Version of item: Submitted version with published items removed

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/276045>

**The international movement of ideas and practices in education and social policy:
crossing boundaries between policy and practice**

Robert Ian Hulme

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (by
Publication)**

August 2011

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Theoretical Perspectives on International Policy Making	6
3. Policy into Practice for Integrated Working	17
4. Method	19
5. Reflections on the Limitations of the Work Presented in this Thesis	21
6. Publications Submitted with this Thesis	23
7. Conclusion	28
8. References	30
Appendix 1	36
Appendix 2	58
Appendix 3	68
Appendix 4	86
Appendix 5	110
Appendix 6	125
Appendix 7	149
Appendix 8	165

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the colleagues and scholars with whom I have collaborated in the construction of this body of work. In particular, I would like to thank Dr Moira Hulme of the University of Glasgow. I would also like to thank Professor Neville Ford for his advice and guidance throughout my time at the University of Chester.

Abstract

This thesis comprises eight publications produced between 2000 and 2009 in addition to a critical review of that work. The review considers the contribution made by the author to the perspectives on policy making offered by the framework of policy transfer and its subsequent applications within global social policy and related sub disciplines. It develops to explore the author's use of critical policy sociology and methodological work in social policy, education and political science in order to enhance existing perspectives on policy transfer. In contrast to rational linear models of decision making, alternative recursive deliberative approaches are suggested throughout this work. The review also considers aspects of the author's work on integrated working or trans-professionalism in the public services. Those aspects of his work on policy theory which illuminate professional learning are critically assessed. The publications are presented as they were published, in chronological order.

1. Introduction

The publications which make up this body of work represent two distinct elements of my research activity for the past 14 years. The theory of policy making in the development of the framework of policy transfer and its application to education policy is the most substantial area. There is a related secondary theme about the application of policy to practice in the development of professional knowledge in the public services. What is presented here does not represent a complete record, my initial work on policy transfer is omitted, as are more recent publications but they reflect my interest in the ways in which agendas in education and social policy travel, or are transferred around the globe. The publications submitted were selected on the basis that a coherent theme would be presented from initial theory building to application in examples of policy and practice. Some are indicative of academic standing and others reflect membership of academic networks in social policy and education.

The work presented may appear to represent two distinct or even unrelated areas of social science. It is certainly true that they represent an act of boundary spanning in the sense of academic disciplines from politics and public policy to social policy and education. Perspectives on policy transfer and global social policy have continued to develop but as yet, no-one else has spanned the disciplines to offer a focus on education policy. Throughout there is a quest to theorise the origins of ideas that inform change in policy and practice in education and social policy. All the work submitted is connected with the prefix 'trans' – meaning crossing or between. This critical review will address why and how my focus has crossed boundaries and the original contribution my work has made to these emerging fields.

2. Theoretical Perspectives on International Policy Making:

a. Developing a multi-level framework for international policy analysis

All the pieces submitted begin from the fundamental premise that policy change had been under theorised in policy studies. Prior to the late 1990s policy theory had drawn on the rational synoptic notions of policy established in the works of Downs and critiqued in the work of Lindblom during 1960s and 1970s. The first contribution of the original book, *Policy Transfer and British Social Policy*, (submission 1) in offering an analytical framework, was to broaden the focus of policy studies and in doing so to capture the reality of policy making which is not about rational actors who were fully in control of policy environments. Rather, policy is messy, serial and in particular, it is international in scope. At the time of writing, the structures and language of social and education policy were being replicated across the world but policies which featured similar language did not necessarily carry the same meaning or content in every context. Social scientists from a number of disciplines developed concepts and metaphors in an attempt to characterise the international movement of policies. My work made a contribution first, in helping to develop the original concept of policy transfer in political science but also in linking this to sociological perspectives used in educational policy sociology (travelling and embedded) and in furthering the emerging perspective of global social policy. Policy transfer helps to explain the use of knowledge from elsewhere in decision making processes. Travelling and embedded policy sheds light on the complex relationships between supranational, cross-national, regional and sectoral influences on policy making. Examples from education policy (both domestic and international) were used for the first time to illustrate how

aspects of global policy agendas (for global social policy) are mediated or negotiated by policy communities and networks in producing 'local' policy settlements.

In developing an understanding of global social policy (submissions 4 and 6) it is necessary to have a perspective on the international movement of ideas, structures and practices in the making of social policy. By 2006, the date of publication for submission 4, I had been working on policy transfer to develop a framework intended to do just this, for 9 years. Bob Deacon, who originated the global social policy perspective, has referred to a system of 'emerging global governance' (2007 p15) in which national governments interact with transnational corporations, international coalitions of policy advocates or policy experts and a variety of other policy actors. The process of making social policy has become 'global' in that certain agendas quality assurance in health and education have 'travelled' around the globe. For policy makers, the 'transfer' of 'generic' policy goals such as these can be a valuable instrument in the new 'global governance'. However, in the late nineties and early noughties, the conceptual tools available to policy analysts and academics remained largely rooted in the domestic policy making. The exception to this had been work produced by political scientists such as David Dolowitz and David Marsh and on education policy myself, who focused on policy transfer and diffusion and sociologists seeking to explain how certain agendas, particularly in education policy travel between nations. My original example of the use of American structures in the reform of Higher Education (submission 1) in England and Wales under the Conservative government in the early-mid nineties proved to be seminal in advancing understanding of the partiality of policy transfer and the propensity of transferred policy to fail.

A substantial literature on the international movement of ideas and practices in policy making has developed over the last fifteen years. Within the literature a range of concepts related to (and in my many ways complimentary to) policy transfer are employed in considering the influence of ideas from other contexts in policy development. Our contribution in developing the concepts of ‘policy transfer’ sat alongside ‘policy diffusion’, ‘cross-national attraction’, ‘policy borrowing’ and ‘policy convergence’. ‘Policy learning’ or ‘lesson drawing’ (Rose, 1991), however, involves more than policy borrowing in education, (Raffe et al, 1999) and my contribution helped to make a link with how epistemic communities (Haas, 1990) and advocacy coalitions (Sabatier, 1993) support learning. The small group of academics who developed the early policy transfer at a small conference on policy transfer at the University of Birmingham in 1996 and later through an ESRC funded seminar series Governance at the Universities of Birmingham, York and Manchester, sought to produce a framework which could be applied to broader analyses of international policy analysis. The significant early publications from this were Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000; Dolowitz, Hulme Nellis and O’Neill, 2000; Evans and Davies, 1999.

Policy Transfer and British Social Policy set down this analytical framework. It was to be developed and discussed further in submissions 2 and 4 both of which describes the process of policy transfer and provides a framework for exploring the international movement of policy.

A process in which knowledge about policies, institutions and ideas developed in one time or place is used in the development of policies, institutions etc. in another time or place (Dolowitz et al., 2000: 3)

This framework made an original contribution but also complemented contemporary perspectives on international policy across the disciplines. The political science and social policy literature on ‘diffusion’ (Mintrom 1997; Mintrom and Vegari 1998; Elkins and Simmons, 2005) had a broader focus on the international causes of policy ‘adoption’ of institutional forms within welfare systems but again the focus is upon structures and programmes. The earlier literature on ‘lesson drawing’ (Rose 1991) similarly drew on a linear, rational understanding of the policy process and offers a focus on the tendency of policy elites to look for ‘lessons’ in how to deliver policy outcomes from other contexts, both domestic and international. These studies offer frameworks rather than models or complete theoretical perspectives and accordingly have been criticised as case studies in search of an international theory of policy change (Wolman and Page, 2002).

Other frameworks for examining the international movement of ideas and practices have developed within the field of education policy studies. ‘Cross national attraction’ (Phillips and Ochs, 2003, 2004) examines the tendency for ‘northern’ and ‘western’ nations in particular to replicate structures; the work focuses on the historical and political links in education between England and Germany. A further education perspective is offered in ‘policy borrowing’ (Halpin and Troyna, 1995) which focuses on the movement of policy between the USA and the UK. Borrowing however, did not capture the manner in which the search for policy knowledge and evidence had become embedded in international education policy networks.

Submissions 1, 2, 4 5 and 6 offered a perspective on this for the first time. Policy ‘convergence’ (Raffe *et al*, 1999; Menter *et al*, 2006) examines cross-national influence but emphasises the importance of the policy community and national cultural traditions in

shaping the direction of domestic policy. Home international comparisons bring into sharp focus how ‘the shaping myths and traditions’ of the host nation, and the composition of the policy community influence the specific character of policy making. This holds true for all trans-national analysis and was the basis of submission 6 and was the first contribution of this nature to the global social policy field.

The literature on policy transfer offers what can be interpreted as a multi-level framework for exploring the movement of policy ideas and practices. What we developed was a flexible tool which had not before been applied to education policy. There are three levels within the framework although these levels should be seen as fluid and the boundaries between levels can be blurred. The framework identifies: (1) the rise of generic agendas and policy platforms that are *global* in reach (for example, contained within ‘modernizing’ discourse supported by the global language of ‘effectiveness’, ‘quality’, ‘diversity’ and ‘choice’ (submissions 1, 2, 4 ,5 ,6 and 8); (2) the transfer of *inter-national* policy ideas (between nation states submissions 1, 2 and 4) and (3) transfer of ideas at the *inter-organisational* level (for example, developed from links between individual policy entrepreneurs and knowledge networks). This latter level has been useful in outlining the link between cross sectoral policy transfer (submission 3) and the emergence of new communities of practice (international and domestic in submission 5 and 7. This framework provides a useful heuristic device for comparing studies of policy development between regions, states and sectors anywhere in the world.

b. Connecting theories of policy making in politics, social policy and educational policy sociology

In contrast to the rational model of policy development which was still sometimes assumed within these frames, my work submissions 6 and 8 attempted to connect to alternative ‘sociology’ based perspectives. By drawing on the theoretical resources of policy sociology, (Ball, 1990, 1994; Bowe and Ball, 1992; Gale, 2001; Grace, 1995; 2001; Ozga, 1987, Whitty, 2002); closer attention is afforded to processes of mediation, contestation and deliberation. Submissions 6 and 8 in particular, attempted to draw together notions of ‘travelling’ and ‘embedded policy’ with policy transfer (Jones and Alexiadou, 2001; Ozga and Jones, 2006) to consider how supranational influences interact with specific local circumstances. This attention to the agency of ‘local’ policy actors directs attention to the continuing significance to national (and regional) policy communities in contesting and mediating global agendas. In contrast with technical models of policy making, I argued for concepts which highlight the political nature of the making of social policy. Through the work that had preceded these later outputs, the limits of policy science had become increasingly apparent. Social and education policy-making is an inherently *political* process, not simply a technicist matter of problem solving. Politics always enters into the policy process; outcomes are influenced by decision maker’s engagement with often unintended consequences. Ball (1994:18-19) stresses that ‘solutions to the problems posed by policy texts will be localised and should be expected to display ad hocery and messiness’.

Policy sociology, whilst not focussed on the mechanics of policy making, marks a departure from the narrower focus of ‘policy science’. Within some of the international

and comparative work referenced above, including some of the work on policy transfer, the focus is on the machinery, rather than on what powers it, or how and where it is directed. Within policy science, policy formation and implementation is often seen as essentially a technical process involving the diagnosis and prescription of solutions to policy problems. The intention in attempting to fuse policy transfer with policy sociology perspectives was to go beyond understanding the mechanics of global and international policy making and to move towards a *problematizing* of the policy process as complex and uncertain and dependent upon a search for knowledge and precedent to justify policy platforms.

The impact of cultural factors upon the interpretation and mediation of policy are highlighted in very different ways in submission 5 and 7. Submission 5 examines the impact of a three year European Union funded TEMPUS project, to develop a Centre for Social Policy in the Republic of Udmurtia (Russian Federation). The article explores the impact of travelling policy in that policy makers and professionals were made aware of 'generic' European Union policy platforms such as quality assurance and anti-discriminatory practice in social welfare. As such, it provides much needed case study material for the global social policy perspective above. Such policies though, are not simply transferred into practice; they carry discourses which reflect the culture and politics of the transferring agency. This output represents the first attempt to look at the cultural mediation of practice in social policy in a Russian context. The chapter outlines the significance of Russian cultures of informal dialogue in the interpretation, mediation and subversion of travelling agendas.

Submission 7 examines the mediation of a generic policy agenda i.e. the requirement within the UK government's *Every Child Matters* (2003) for practitioners to work together across professional boundaries within the same or neighbouring local authorities in England. It emphasises the importance of spaces for practitioners to develop a common language and shared understandings of the requirements of policy which has very different applications in the organisational contexts and cultures of education, social work, the health service and the criminal justice system. Submissions 5 and 7 raise important questions about the emergence of new professional learning communities (Wenger et al 2002) in very different settings. The links between professional learning and policy learning is a theme is an unexplored area and a focus for my current work.

c. Policy transfer from the past: theorising change in times of crisis

One of the original contributions within my use of policy transfer has been to examine the use of policy precedent or policy knowledge from the past. I was the first of those involved in an essentially contemporary international theoretical area to do so. This is evident in submissions 1, 2, 3 and 6 where I have looked at the influence of epistemic communities (based on older work by international relations academic Ernst Haas) as knowledge based policy networks. After 2008, I began to explore the use of older policy responses to develop contemporary social and education policy in the wake of the economic crisis of 2008. This is explored in output 8.

Previous work on policy had begun with the notion that major policy shifts occur in response to systemic crises (Archer, 2009, Schmidt 2002,). This has been based on the simple equation that in the midst of a major economic crisis, current policy responses are

not working. My policy transfer work in outputs 2, 3, 4 and 6 identified the need for perspectives on policy that highlighted the motivation of policy makers for seeking policy knowledge from other places, including the re-invention of older forms. This work was influenced by Hay's 1996 work on the state in crisis. For Hay, fundamental change in politics and social policy is premised on a sense of 'systemic crisis' which challenges the political economic and social parameters of policy making. The platform of neo-liberal market reforms pursued by Conservative governments during the 1980s and 1990s, remoulded and continued by New Labour, had its origins in the challenges to the British state presented by the movements in the global economy, precipitated by the oil crisis of the mid-1970s. A similarly fundamental shift can be argued to be taking place in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis. Submission 8 is one of a series of recent and on-going pieces of work I have produced to address this proposition.

In attempting to extend the framework of policy transfer beyond the bounds of a kind of extended technical rationality, I drew on the concept of 'policy learning' or, '*the penetration of political objectives and programmes by new knowledge*' (Haas, 1990: 316). Policy-oriented learning is primarily about the use of evidence and policy knowledge to define political interests and to refine the strategic direction of change. Knowledge provided by epistemic communities can act as a 'trigger' for learning and a catalyst for change by helping to break policy makers' habits, including a tendency to look for continuity in policy (Duncan, 2009 Dwyer and Ellison, 2009). Haas (1990:41) defines epistemic communities as groups of professionals 'usually recruited from several disciplines', linked by specialist knowledge and acting as a conduit for that knowledge in the service of policy makers. After 2008, given the crisis facing policy makers at national, international and global levels, along with systemic disruption to financial markets and the

social and political markets that maintain public services, I attempted to add the notion of ‘unlearning’ or selective ‘policy amnesia’ to the policy heuristic. The notion of amnesia is useful in that it highlights the complexity of institutional memory in policy development.

d. Transfer, knowledge and evidence

The work on crisis grew out of my use of the evidence movement in outputs 4 and 6. The global agendas which have travelled most readily have strongly reflected the language of the movement for ‘evidence- informed’ policy and practice. This has been an illustrative example in my use of policy transfer theory in submissions 3, 6, and 7. These outputs, in varying degrees explored the political nature of putting ‘evidence’ into policy. This is a key aspect of policy learning and therefore the transfer of policy ideas, structures and language. In discussing this global movement for policy development, the example of the UK government’s ‘evidence-based’ movement is used in all of them.

The evidence movement draws on the rationalist synoptic ideal of policy making established and critiqued by Lindblom and Simon in the 1960s and Hecllo in the 1970s. For those seeking to develop theories of the knowledge base of policy it offered an ideal opportunity to develop collaborative work. It represents a form of instrumental answerism advanced by confidence in ‘techno-scientific research’ (Ozga and Lingard, 2007). The evidence movement is underpinned by a particular view of knowledge. Lomas et al (2005:3) suggest, ‘*Evidence is knowledge that is explicit (codified and propositional), systemic (uses transparent and explicit methods for codifying) and replicable (using the same methods with the same samples will lead to the same results)*’. Evidence is positioned as a commodity, a product to deal with the endemic problem of risk in policy. Processes of

research commissioning increasingly steer research towards, *'the applied, the commodifiable and the profitable'* (Luke, 2007:87). Most of the work on the evidence movement had been in the health field. Through the outputs listed above, I endeavoured to demonstrate the power of the transfer model to illuminate the impact of this global economised discourse on the policy and knowledge networks of UK public policy in the 1990s.

The evidence movement can be seen to represent an aspect of a 'global market' for policy knowledge. It was therefore ideal for exploring notions of Global Social Policy in outputs 4 and 6 and responses to global economic crisis output 8. This global market includes the developing influence of policy think tanks (Stone 2004), international non-governmental organisations and international research centres. Education systems attached increasing influence to data analyses from transnational organisations such as UNESCO and the OECD's Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI); and pay attention to international comparisons based on standardised assessment of pupil progress (Ozga and Lingard, 2007). In one sense there is nothing new in this modernist project which has been a central concern of academics in 'policy science' since the 1960s. The emergence of 'policy as numbers' (Rose, 1999) as a transnational policy norm is a more recent development. What is newer and is explored in all of this work is the increasingly selective and partial use of evidence to justify the premises of policy. A further contribution of this collaborative work was to explore the impact on education policy in England and Scotland referred to in outputs 6 and 8.

3. Policy into Practice for Integrated Working

Of the articles and book chapter which comprise this thesis, one stands out as ostensibly different in content and method. Submission 7, Learning Across Boundaries: Developing Trans-professional understanding through Practitioner Enquiry, in Campbell, A. and Groundwater-Smith, S. (2009) (ed.s) *Connecting Inquiry and Professional Learning in Education: International Perspectives and Practical Solutions*, is within an edited collection about teacher education with invited contributions from world leading authors in these fields. The focus of the book is upon teacher identity and the practitioner enquiry. The area of trans-professionalism or integrated/multi professionalism though, has been utilised as a policy example in submissions, 6, 7 and 8 and has become a strong focus for my work over the past two years. This submission represents an original contribution to the field in that it provides a ‘bottom up’, practitioner focus on what was in 2008-9 a new area of policy development in education and health. It marks a departure from mainstream policy analysis in that it is based on data set of interviews and focus groups with policy makers managers and practitioners in the field, exploring the perceptions of each about working across professional boundaries.

The integration of services for young people in education, social work, health and the criminal justice system in England, with its attendant requirement for closer and more systematic inter-agency working and the development of a more holistic ‘trans-professional’ knowledge base, offered challenges for policy theorists (Forbes 2006). Relating policy to practice in this area is problematic at each level – local, national and trans-national/global but I began this in submission 7 and other related outputs (Hulme, Cracknell and Owens 2009). My on-going work in this field has led me to look at policy

precedent in the USA, Canada, Finland and Australia. The work that I have produced in this area (beginning with submission 7) has led to invitations to give a keynote address to the Special Interest Group for Health and Human Services Linkages at the American Education Research Association in 2010. I act as the International Officer for this SIG and have established the Research Unit for Trans-professionalism at the University of Chester.

Though, in some ways a departure from my policy theory work, there are continuities with earlier perspectives and another original contribution through this work. My analysis has highlighted that reform has challenged policy makers at national and regional levels who lack an institutional memory for how to translate policy into practice. International examples from the USA (Lawson 2004, 2008) and Scandinavian particularly Finnish notions of social pedagogy and even examples local to the UK such as Scotland (Edwards et al 2009, Forbes 2006) have been ignored in an attempt to 'drive through' change from the top.

In framing analysis of *Every Child Matters* (2003) as it impacted on practice, I drew upon perspectives in international policy. Conceiving of a global movement to integrate education with broader human services and perceiving the lack of outcomes in the context of practice as a classic implementation problem. A rhetorical analysis (Jones and Thomson 2008, Freedman and Medway 1994) of the policy agendas in all our countries reveals an iteration of the language of integration going back to the *UN Rights of the Child* and beyond. There is a very clear and simple policy agenda. Professionals must work more closely together in order to improve outcomes for all children. Yet examples and case studies of successfully integrated delivery are few and isolated (outside some remarkable exceptions).

4. Method

The published work within this submission is almost exclusively based on theoretical exposition. The connection of disparate theoretical traditions is a significant aspect of the claim to originality within this thesis and this is integrated into the analysis within the previous two sections. Two of the submissions are distinct in this regard, submission 5 and more particularly, submission 7. The original policy transfer work drew upon the tradition of public administration and public policy theory (Dunleavy, 1991, Parsons 1996, Marsh and Stoker 1995), the extension of this work into travelling and embedded policy in submission 6 drew on the theoretical resources of policy sociology as outlined above (Ball, 1990, 1994; Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992; Gale, 2001; Grace, 1995; Ozga 1987). Analysis of travelling policy agendas for submissions 2-6 and 8 were based on analysis of travelling rhetoric and metaphor. This was informed in part by work in rhetorical analysis, (Jones and Thomson 2008, Freedman and Medway 1994) and partly by the theoretical work on political discourse analysis (Schmidt 2002, Fairclough 2000, Wetherell, Taylor and Yates 2001, Chilton, 2004).

Output 7 draws upon a data base of qualitative evidence from an action research project focused on developing trans-professional working in response to *Every Child Matters:* (2003). The focus for this work is a partnership established between the University of Chester and eight local authorities in the North West of England.

The data base comprises data from semi structured interviews with Directors of Children's Services, academic researchers and focus groups with professionals in the broad fields of education and social care (from teachers and social workers to health visitors and those

involved in the criminal justice system). The research design arose from developmental work to establish networks of learning between professional groups involved in the provision of children's services. Action research was employed to encourage inter and intra-professional dialogue and debate through seminars intended to generate shared understandings and a shared language across the different knowledge bases informing professional practice (medical, social, psychological and educational) and the diverse settings, communities and cultures in which professionals work. This methodological position was premised on the assumption that the significant challenges of inter-agency working are best met through a deliberative process that is participative and inclusive in addressing the politics of practice.

The primary source of data is based on a series of semi-structured interviews with 8 key decision makers involved in the formation of local policy; including the Director of Children and Learners for a Government Office for a region of 6.9 million people charged with the regional coordination of *Every Child Matters* across all the local authorities in the region. The interviewees include 4 of the 22 Directors of Children's Services in the North West region. The practitioner perspective was sought through interviews with a range of teachers, social workers and health workers participating in the collaborative action research partnership. This work also draws on rhetorical analysis of the official policy texts that frame the national agenda on the integration of children's services in Scotland and England with a focus on one English region. A further perspective which assisted in forming a link between policy discourse and practitioner voice was 'loose coupling' (Cuban 1988) to characterise the forms of connection, disconnection and translation that mediate policy into embedded practices, taking these to involve complicated mediations that involve resistance as well as promotion. The data gathered from interviews was

analysed using thematic network analysis (Attride-Stirling 2001). This method of data analysis was also deployed on the data base of Russian practitioners and decision makers in submission 5.

5. Reflections on the Limitations of the Work Presented in this Thesis

It has been stated earlier that the work presented here was written over a period of 9 years. The analysis of the international movement of ideas and practices in the making of social and education policy within them has shifted and developed over this period of time. In part, this reflects the changing role of the author in moving from institutional and academic platforms in political science, through social policy to education. It also reflects a developing awareness of the limitations of the work presented here.

The thesis presents what is essentially a series of essays on the on the use of the conceptual framework of policy transfer in developing theories of policy making. From submission 1, published in 2000, there is an implicit (explicit in submission 4 and 6), recognition of the limitations of policy transfer as a framework. Earlier in this critical review, reference was made to the originality of policy transfer in offering a perspective on policy change rather than continuity and in offering a theoretical tool to connect broader and deeper theoretical perspectives. Whilst this is essentially still true, the limitations of the framework are ever more apparent. The essential weakness of the framework is still the one referred to in submission 2, 4 and 6. Its academic antecedent lay in the 1960s models of policy processes still dominant within policy sciences and public policy the 1990s. Transfer as it was originally constructed is carried out within policy formulation; or inside the 'black box.' Our understanding of the manner in which policy is made and enacted has moved on great deal since then. It has been enriched by policy sociologists who have allowed us to see that

policy is not linear and programmed but messy and serial involving mediation and contestation within policy communities at national, regional and local levels.

It is important to acknowledge in this critical review that there are methodological limitations to policy transfer. It is very difficult to demonstrate policy transfer at the level of elite policy making since the process of borrowing evidence or language is not normally conducted within public view. No such claim is made in any of the submissions presented within this thesis. One of the claims to originality made earlier in this critical review was that I had adapted the framework to examine the process of transferring ideas and practices across sectors (submission 9) and professional groupings (submission 8). Both of these pieces of work were submitted as examples of the application of policy theory. Submission 8 though, offers perspectives from practice in the form of qualitative data drawn from focus groups and interviews conducted after a series of collaborative pieces of action research were conducted. Data gathered from action research is very rarely (if ever) used in the analysis of policy making. Bob Lingard makes this point in an earlier chapter of the edited book from which submission 8 is drawn (Campbell and Groundwater-Smith 2009). I believe that research gathered from the intervention of practitioners can offer a powerful means of interrogating the professional mediation and contestation of policy regimes. It might also represent a means of connecting perspectives from policy theory on policy learning with work in more applied professional fields on professional learning. This is though, underdeveloped in policy theory and would represent a difficult task for an empirical study of policy enactment. Submission 8 attempts neither of these things. The data offered from practitioners and managers within this submission is offered as a very limited reflection on action and the specific experience of developing inter-

professional dialogue in response to a particular policy initiative. It does not and cannot offer evidence of policy transfer across sectors or professions.

6. Publications Submitted with this Thesis

- 1. *Policy Transfer and British Social Policy* Dolowitz, D. Hulme, R. Nellis, M and O'Neill, F. (2000) Open University Press, Public Policy and Management Series. ISBN 0-335-19991-7 pp146**

This joint authored book is of course outside the period of registration but is worthy of reference because it was the first book to be published on the subject of policy transfer. It established transfer studies the area of politics and social policy. It established for the first time a focus on policy development which highlighted the origins of ideas and help to capture the growing international movement of policy.

The book grew out of small conference at University of Birmingham in 1996 and two ESRC seminar series on Governance. The framework on which the work is based provided a view of the mechanics of global policy making.

The contribution to this book that I would wish to be considered is the chapter on post compulsory education in England and Wales. This work originated from a semester long sabbatical in Virginia in 1999 and offered an original perspective on the reasons for trans-Atlantic policy transfer in higher education in 1990s. The impact of the book led to two ESRC seminar series on Governance in 2000-2001. It is still regularly cited in political science and social policy articles.

- 2. Hulme, R. (2005) Policy Transfer and the Internationalisation of Social Policy, *Social Policy and Society* vol 4, issue 4, pp 417- 425 ISSN 1474-7464**

Social Policy and Society is one of the three journals sponsored by the UK Social Policy Association. Cambridge University Press annual publishing reports indicate that it has been in the top twenty viewed articles for the journal since 2005. During the 2010 -11 publishing year it remains 20 most cited articles in the journal since 2001. The article's main contribution was to develop the notion of policy transfer as an analytical tool beyond that set down in the original book for application to social policy analysis. For the first time in the discipline it draws upon a range of examples in education policy. It offers a series of utilities for policy transfer as a perspective on policy analysis.

- 3. Hulme, R. & Hulme, M. (2005) New Labour's education policy: innovation or re-invention? in Powell, M. & Bauld, L. (Eds) (2005) *Social Policy Review 2005*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 33-50. ISBN 1-86134-669-7.**

Social Policy Review is an annual review of leading research in the field by invitation only. This paper reviews New Labour's education policy during 2004-5, applying the policy transfer perspective at the level of domestic policy making, namely the capacity of policy makers to re-invent much older policy ideas. It was cited by Professor Stephen Ball in his book *The Education Debate* on Policy Press in 2008.

- 4. Hulme, R. (2006) The Role of Policy Transfer in Assessing Impact of American Ideas on British Education Policy, *Global Social Policy* 6.2 173-195)DOI: 10.1177/1468018106065365**

This article was based on a paper presented the Global Social Policy (GASSP) conference at McMaster University Canada in 2004. It offers the first detailed treatment of policy transfer within the global social policy perspective and the first to deal with education policy. This article connects an analysis of Anglo- American policy transfer to the development of trans-Atlantic think tanks and importantly for future work to the development of the evidence movement in education and health.

- 5. Hulme , R. and Luchinskaya, E. (2007) Developing Social Policy as an Academic Discipline in a Russian University' in *Transitions in Russian and Eastern European Higher Education*, Frankfurt, Peter Lang ISBN 978-3-631-57135-4**

This work in a European-wide edited collection (published by Peter Lang in German since a small majority of authors were based in German universities) is based on work developed on a three year European Union funded project to develop a centre for Social Policy in the Republic of Udmurtia (Russian Federation). It examines the political and cultural issues involved in transferring western policy ideas and practices to Russian contexts. In particular, there is a focus on the cultural mediation of western policy structures and professional practices. The collection was contributed to by some of the most significant scholars of higher education policy in Europe. It is regularly cited in European Journals. The production of the original research led to the establishment of a number of Russian political scientists and an invited paper at the British Slavonic and Eastern European Studies Association Conference in Oxford in 2007.

- 6. Hulme R. & Hulme, M, (2008) The Global Transfer of Policy, in *Understanding Global Social Policy*. Yeates, N (Ed) Bristol, Policy Press ISBN 978 1 86134 943 9**

This book defines the perspective of global social policy. Whilst it is a critical text book, the contributors comprise all of those who have contributed to the development of global social policy as a sub-discipline of Social Policy. The late Professor Peter Townsend of London School of Economics said of the book:

Understanding Global Social Policy is of the first importance in setting out what global policy analysis entails and how the structural changes determining the conditions under which the world's population now live and can be addressed.

The chapter on the global transfer of policy draws out all of the literature on the movement of education policy from a variety of disciplines and contrasts policy transfer with the more sociologically informed perspective of travelling and embedded policy. It offers case studies on international organisations UNESCO and the World Bank and highlights international agendas on interagency working and teacher education. It offers a perspective on transfer within the constituent nations of the UK.

- 7. Hulme, R & Cracknell, D. (2009) Learning Across Boundaries: Developing Trans-professional understanding through Practitioner Enquiry, in Campbell, A. and Groundwater-Smith, S. (Ed.s) *Connecting Inquiry and Professional Learning in Education: International Perspectives and Practical Solutions*. Abingdon, Routledge ISBN 10:0-415-47813-8**

This chapter is in an edited collection featuring contribution from some of the foremost international scholars on teacher education including Ian Menter and Bob Lingard. It is based on data gathered from a research project at the University of Chester on the gaps between policy and practice on interagency working and the development of trans-professional knowledge. This work was first presented at the American Education Research Association in San Diego in 2009. I went on to develop this work for a publication in the *Journal of Education on Action Research* about Trans-professional Learning in Third Spaces with Allan Owens and David Cracknell in 2009. The perspectives offered in this work informed a successful bid to the ESRC Higher Education Innovation Fund which facilitated a conference at the University of Chester on Policy into Practice for Inter-agency working featuring contributions from the Children's Commissioner for England and Professor Helen Gunter from the University of Manchester.

8. **Hulme, R and Hulme, M. (2009) The 're-imagining' of evidence under New Labour: policy and practice in education in uncertain times, *Effective Education* vol 1 no 2 ISSN 1941-5532**

This article explores the changing relationship between evidence and policy making under the New Labour government. It offers an outline of the development of Evidence Based Policy and Practice by evaluating the changing political uses of the evidence to inform policy in education. It was invited by Professor Paul Connolly who leads the Centre for Effective Education at Queens's University in Belfast.

7. Conclusion

As I have argued above, there are consistent and distinct themes in the contribution of all of this work. Throughout there is a focus on change. Much of the work submitted seeks to explain why policies change by focussing on the motivations for seeking new policy when the most fashionable policy theories of the 1990s, notably policy networks and policy communities, could explain only policy continuities. In the later pieces, perspective is offered on changes in professional practice and professional identity brought about by attempts to develop new communities of practice. There is a connecting theme about learning. Whether this is ‘policy-oriented learning’ within policy communities or ‘professional learning’ within communities of practice. There is a focus on the sources of knowledge to effect change for both policy makers and practitioners. In both cases, a perspective is developed on precedents and the origins of knowledge. There is an emphasis on the importance of memory, whether this is institutional in the case of policy transfer or professional in the case of multi- or trans- professionalism.

The strongest contribution of this work has been to the development of internationally recognised work on policy transfer and global social policy. My work in this field has examined the impact of ideas from the USA on policy development in the UK on higher education reform, the development of the evidence movement in education and the reform of professional education in Russia. My original policy transfer example- the Americanisation of higher education in the UK in the 1990s proved to be prescient both in the sense that it illustrated the limitations of selective policy transfer and that transfer tends to be serial: the proposed reform of higher education in England and Wales in 2012 calls for further analysis of the use of policy ideas from America. These are themes that

currently resonate in 2011. They provide very good reasons for revisiting and renewing this work for the purpose of adapting the framework into a model of global policy making. The impact of the financial crisis and the political crisis which had succeeded it highlights the need for more nuanced understandings of how policy ideas travel around the globe and indeed how global responses can be made to generic crises.

A key aspect of my work has been to explore the search for policy oriented knowledge to underpin decision making in education and social policy. This has led me to explore the origins and development of the evidence based practice in education and social policy and also in the later work to examine the relationship between the policy shaping the practice of teachers and social workers and professional practice. Since May 2010, there has been an increasingly unsystematic use of evidence deployed by the incoming Coalition government. This has often comprised the use of very narrow international examples in education policy such as Swedish free schools and Finnish teacher education in *The Importance of Teaching*, Department of Education 2010. A critique of the partial and selective use of evidence might present a useful basis for critical policy analysis in these unsettled times.

Another original contribution has been to highlight the global movement of ideas and practices in inter and multi-agency work. This work has been shaped by my experience in building research capacities with teacher educators and social work educators at Manchester Metropolitan University and the University of Chester. My work in this field has focused on the importance of practitioner enquiry in interpreting generic policy agendas to build new professional knowledge and to facilitate meaningful collaborative

work across professional boundaries. This work has had significant impact on academic work in this developing field of enquiry both in the UK and the USA.

8. References

- Archer, C.C. (2009) Responses to Financial Crises: An Evolutionary Perspective. *Global Society*, 23(2), 105-127.
- Attride-Stirling. J. (2001) Thematic networks: an analytic framework for qualitative research, *Qualitative Research* 1 (3) 385-404.
- Ball, S. J. (1990). *Politics & Policy Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology*. London, Routledge.
- Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education Reform: A Critical & Post-Structural Approach*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Ball, S, J. (1998) Big Policies/Small World: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education* 34 (2) 119-130.
- Ball, S. J. (2008) *The Education Debate*, Bristol, Policy Press.
- Bowe, R., Ball, S.J. et al. (1992). *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology*. London, Routledge.
- Campbell, A. and Groundwater-Smith, S. (eds) (2009) *Connecting Inquiry and Professional Learning in Education: international perspectives and practical solutions*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. (2004) *Analysing Political Discourse: theory and Practice*, Oxon, Routledge
- Cuban, L (1988) *Constancy and Change in Schools* Teachers College Press, New York
- Deacon, B. (2007) *Global Social Policy and Governance*, London: Sage
- Department of Education (2010) *The Importance of Teaching*, Stationery Office.

- Department for Education and Skills (2003) *Every Child Matters*. London, Stationery Office.
- Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (1996) 'Who Learns What From Whom? A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature', *Political Studies* 44(2): 343-357.
- Dolowitz, D. with Hulme, R., Nellis, M., and O'Neal, F. (2000) *Policy Transfer and British Social Policy*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Downs, A. (1957) "An Economic Theory of Democracy." Harper New York.
- Duncan, S. (2009) Policy Transfer: theory, rhetoric and reality. *Policy and Politics*, 37(3): 453-458.
- Dunleavy, P. (1991) *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice: Economic Models in Political Science*. London: Pearson.
- Dwyer, P. & Ellison, N. (2009) 'We nicked stuff from all over the place': policy transfer or muddling through? *Policy and Politics*, 37(3): 389-407.
- Edwards, A., Daniels, H., Gallagher, T., Leadbetter, J. and Warmington, P. (2009) *Improving Inter-professional Collaborations: multi-agency working for children's wellbeing*. London: Routledge.
- Elkins, Z. and Simmons, B. (2005) On Waves, Clusters, and Diffusion: A Conceptual Framework, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* March 598:33-51.
- Evans, M. and Davies, J. (1999) 'Understanding Policy Transfer: A Multi-Level, Multi-Disciplinary Perspective', *Public Administration* 77(2): 361-385.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language*, London Routledge
- Gale, T. (2001). Critical Policy Sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(5), 379-393.

- Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership beyond educational management: An essay in policy scholarship*. London, Falmer.
- Forbes, J. (2006) Types of social capital: tools to explore service integration? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-16.
- Freedman, A. and Medway, P. (1994) *Genre and the new rhetoric* London. Taylor Francis
- Haas, E. (1990) *When Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organisations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Haas, E. (1992) 'Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination', *International Organisation* 46 (1): 1-35.
- Haas, P. (2004). "When does power listen to truth? A constructivist approach to the policy process." *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(4): 569-592.
- Halpin, D. and B. Troyna (1995). "The politics of education policy borrowing." *Comparative Education* 31: 303-310.
- Hay, C. (1996) *Re-stating Social and Political Change*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Hulme, R. Cracknell, D and Owens, A. (2009) Learning in Third Spaces, Developing Trans-professional Understanding Through Practitioner Enquiry, *Journal of Education Action Research* 17: 4, 537-550
- Jones, K. & Thomson, P. (2008). Policy rhetoric and the renovation of English schooling: the case of Creative Partnerships. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(6), 715-727.
- Jones, K. & Alexiadou, N. (2001) *Travelling Policy: Local Spaces*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational research, Lille.
- Lindblom, C. and D. Cohen (1979) *Usable Knowledge: Social Sciences & Social Problem Solving*, Yale University Press.

- Lomas, J., T. Culyer, et al. (2005). *Conceptualising and Combining Evidence for Health System Guidance*. Ottawa, Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (CHSRF).
- Luke, A. (2007) After the marketplace: evidence, social science and educational research. In Lingard, B. and Ozga, J. *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Education Policy and Politics*. London, Routledge (pp.85-100).
- Marsh, D. and Stoker, G. (1995) *Theory and Method in Political Science*, London, Palgrave.
- Menter, I. Brisard, E. et al. (2006) *Convergence or Divergence? Initial Teacher Education in Scotland and England*. Edinburgh, Dunedin.
- Mintrom, M. (1997). Policy entrepreneurs and the diffusion of innovation. *American Journal of Political Science* 41:738-770.
- Mintrom, M. and S. Vergari (1996) "Advocacy coalitions, policy entrepreneurs and policy change." *Policy Studies Journal* 24(3): 429-434.
- Ozga, J. (1987) 'Studying educational policy through the lives of policy makers: an attempt to close the macro-micro gap'. *Changing Policies, Changing Teachers*. S. Walker and L. Barton. Milton Keynes, Open University Press: 138-150.
- Ozga, J. and R. Jones (2006). "Travelling and embedded policy: the case of knowledge transfer." *Journal of Education Policy* 21(1): 1-17.
- Ozga, J. and Lingard, B. (2007) Globalisation, education policy and politics. In Lingard, B. and Ozga, J. *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Education Policy and Politics*. London, Routledge (pp.65-82).
- Parsons, W. (1996) *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*, London, Edward Elgar

- Phillips, D. and K. Ochs (2003) "Processes of policy borrowing in education: some explanatory and analytical devices." *Comparative Education* 39(4): 451-461.
- Phillips, D. and K. Ochs, Eds. (2004) *Educational Policy Borrowing: Historical Perspectives*. Oxford, Symposium Books.
- Raffe, D. (2005) Devolution and divergence in education policy. *Devolution in Practice: Public Policy Differences within the UK*. Newcastle upon Tyne, IPPR North: 52-69.
- Raffe, D., K. Brannen, et al. (1999) "Comparing England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland: the case for 'home internationals' in comparative research." *Comparative Education* 95(1): 9-25.
- Rose, N. (1999) *Governing The Soul: The Shaping Of The Private Self*. London, Free Association (Second edition).
- Rose, R. (1991) 'What is Lesson Drawing', *Journal of Public Policy* 11(1): 1-22.
- Sabatier, P and Jenkins-Smith H. (Eds.) (1993) *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalitions Approach* Boulder: Westview Press
- Schmidt, V. A. (2002) *The Futures of European Capitalism*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Stone, D. (2004) Better Knowledge, Better Policy, Better World: The Grand Ambitions of a Global Research Institution, *Global Social Policy*, 4(1): 5-9.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. (2002) *Cultivating communities of practice : a guide to managing knowledge*. Harvard; Harvard Business Press
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. J., (2001) *Discourse as Data*, London, Sage
- Whitty, G. (2002) *Making Sense of Education Policy: Studies in the Sociology and Politics of Education*. London, Paul Chapman

Wolman, H and Page, E. (2002) Policy Transfer among Local Governments: An Information-Theory Approach, *Governance* 15(4): 477-501.