



1-22-2016

## Gated Globalization: Regionalism and Regional Trading Agreements: Educational Diplomacy in an Epoch of the Post- bureaucratic State

Tavis D. Jules  
*Loyola University Chicago*, [tjules@luc.edu](mailto:tjules@luc.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/education\\_facpubs](https://ecommons.luc.edu/education_facpubs)

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

### Author Manuscript

This is a pre-publication author manuscript of the final, published article.

### Recommended Citation

Jules, Tavis D.. Gated Globalization: Regionalism and Regional Trading Agreements: Educational Diplomacy in an Epoch of the Post-bureaucratic State. *Perspectives in Transnational Higher Education*, , : 23-37, 2016. Retrieved from Loyola eCommons, School of Education: Faculty Publications and Other Works,

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education: Faculty Publications and Other Works by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
© Sense Publishers, 2016.

## Chapter Proposal for PERSPECTIVES ON TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION

By Tavis D. Jules  
Assistant Professor, Cultural & Educational Policy Studies  
Loyola University Chicago  
820 N. Michigan Avenue Chicago,  
Illinois 60611  
Email: tjules@luc.edu

Tavis D. Jules is an Assistant Professor of Cultural and Educational Policy Studies and Comparative and International Education at Loyola University Chicago. He earned a Doctorate of Education in International Education Development with a specialization in International Educational Policy Studies from Teachers College, Columbia University. His research focuses on educational policy formation and development—particularly, but not exclusively, within the Caribbean. More recently, his research has focused on analyzing the impact of regionalization upon small (and micro) states as well as education in transitory space with a geographic focus on the Maghreb Region. He is the Book Reviews Editor for the *Caribbean Journal of International Relations and Diplomacy*. His recent publication includes *Neither world polity nor local or national societies: Regionalization in the Global South—the Caribbean Community* (Peter Lang Press, 2012)

Chapter Title: ‘Gated globalization’, Regionalism and Regional Trading Agreements:  
Educational Diplomacy in an epoch of the Post-bureaucratic State.

Depending on who is speaking educational diplomacy means different things to different people. However, educational diplomacy is part of ‘new diplomacy’ or ‘public diplomacy,’ which “describes the arrival of new actors and new topics on the diplomatic playing field” (Hone, 2014, p. 1). On the one hand, educational diplomacy is about cultural exchanges and technical knowledge transfer. On the other hand, educational diplomacy centers on collaboration and cooperation to facilitate technical assistance. At the intersection of these two trajectories is norm-setting within international educational politics in the form of government-to-government and government-to-non-governmental exchanges. Given the importance of education at the global level as typified by the second Millennium Development Goal and the proposed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), this chapter suggests that in today’s changing global environment educational diplomacy is more than cultural exchanges between governments. In fact, it is suggested here that as programs go global, that educational diplomacy is now about locating power within the fog of globalization through cooperation and collaboration between governments to understand what can be learned. There is a growing consensus now that globalization is rescinding and countries are reiterating towards region trading agreements (RTAs), as protectionism is becoming the new orthodoxy. As countries retreat towards the perceived fortification of regionalism and bilateralism, national educational systems are beginning to transition to accommodate this move. This chapter does not suggest that the retreat to regionalism will be a permanent feature of the higher educational landscape, instead it advances that we will see “mechanisms of ‘parallel organization,’ operating on the basis of multilevel consensus, often functioning side-by-side with traditional [educational] bureaucracy” (Heckscher and Applegate, 1994, p. 2). Educational diplomacy is but one such mechanism. The shift from government to governance has brought about an epoch engendering the post-bureaucratic – the amalgamation of an organic structure and the modalities of indirect and co-opted form of control – premised upon discourse and agreement rather than authority and domination (Heckscher, 1994; Josserand, Teo, and Clegg, 2006; Iedema, 2006). From a post-bureaucratic perspective, “trans-regional regimes” (Jules, 2008) such as the Caribbean Community (hereinafter CARICOM) are seen as horizontal networks rather than hierarchical entities since they are open at their boundaries. Decision-making in CARICOM is becoming horizontal and emphasizes meta-decision-making rules to encourage participation and empowerment. For the post-bureaucratic regime or organization, binding decisions are made at the level of strategy—that which unifies all parts of the system—producing binding pronouncements through this mechanism by demonstrating active collaboration with others (Heckscher & Charles, et al., 1994). In today’s technological intensified world, “formalized organizational structures and control mechanisms are regarded as less suitable in the current era in which there has been a transition from standardization to diversity” (Parker and Bradley, 2004 p. 198). However, in CARICOM, the transition towards post-bureaucratic governance mechanisms in education implies the recognition that the Weberian legal-rational model that advocates formal organizational structures and mechanism is declining and there is a tendency towards regional institutional mechanism steeped in the functional relations of collaboration,

cooperation, diplomacy and implementation. This chapter will examine how the rise of regional post-bureaucratic regional regimes are altering the national educational landscape and ensuing consequences for higher educational governance activities—the funding, provision, ownership, and regulation (see Dale 2005).<sup>i</sup>

In what proceeds, several aspects of policy as discourse are deconstructed to understand how the post-bureaucratic era gives rise to a new form of ‘educational diplomacy’ at the regional level that is driven by the functional processes of economic integration. As Peterson (2014) suggests, in an era of “accelerated global engagement, country-to-country educational diplomacy is being overtaken by institution-to-institution relationships and a broad array of actors” (p. 3). It is these institutions and actors that this chapter seeks to highlight. This chapter, therefore, offers a theoretical perspective on transnational education by building upon and applying Robertson’s (2010) theory of ‘regulatory regionalism’—(a) the presence, significance and effect of new higher education governance mechanisms in constituting [the Caribbean] as a competitive region and knowledge-based economy; and (b) the role of domestic political economies in this process” (p. 25) to the Caribbean to suggest that in an era of enhanced regionalism educational diplomacy is a new pluri-scalar order of things. Central to this conceptualization is the ideas that regionalization (the process) and the regionalism (political project) is driven and calculatedly fashioned from within and it is not solely internally energized, it is based on domestic political maneuvering and regionalism does not have an ideal-type module (Robertson, 2010; Jayasuriya, 2003; Jules, 2014). Such a conceptualization is warranted given the changing landscape of regionalism within Latin America and the Caribbean variety from longstanding trading blocs that have reinvented themselves, commencing with the CARICOM (Caribbean Community) and UNASUR (Union of South American Nations)—which combined two existing customs unions, MERCOSUR (the Southern Common Market) and CAN (the Andean Community of Nations)—to new arrangements such as ALBA (the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America); CAIS (Central American Integration System); CELAC (Community of Latin American and Caribbean States); and SELA (Sistema Económico Latin-Americano y del Caribe [Latin American and the Caribbean Economic System]). As regional assemblages and amalgamations changes, the education architecture of transnational higher education is also changing and driven by governance mechanism.

Educational diplomacy has its own politico-legal framework that ensures that governments benefit from commitments made, thus strengthening transnationalism. In making such an assumption, this chapter draws attention to the changing nature of diplomacy through education by using the regional level as an example. First, soft power and diplomacy in education are discussed and it is advanced that the regional governance projects give rise to educational diplomacy are geostrategic aspects of the “constellations of power and interests—a framework that has the virtue of locating the dynamics of regional governance within the broader context of domestic political projects” (Jayasuriya, 2003, p. 201; Jules, 2014). Second, this chapter provides an historical overview of educational transnationalism, a facet of educational diplomacy, to reflect the current state of how comparative and international education has discussed transnationalism. It does so by providing an historical account of the different waves of educational transnationalism in the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) by examining the new role of education in an era defined by the ascension of regionalism. Next, with the aid of existent literature on regionalism (the construction of political projects), I will suggest that trans-

regionalism provides one way of explaining the efficacy of “gated globalization” (Economist, 2013) upon the nation state. In this context, the gated global is used as a generic term to capture the tarrying of globalization, the retreat by nation states towards RTAs and rise of protectionism. The second half of the chapter will consider how the ensuring processes or greater regionalism has affected the regional landscape. The chapter concludes by arguing that the twin forces of the rise of post-bureaucratic regimes at the regional level and the pausing of globalization and ensuing demands of nation state upon its workforce changes has given rise to educational diplomacy. In fact, this chapter suggests that we are witnessing the movement from transnational educational policy making towards educational diplomacy, and the discourse around regionalism is one way of understanding this new agenda-setting attitude that uses the regional level as it point of reference to engender national performances. In making such an argument, this chapter recognizes that from the perspective of actualization that “political resistance [due to] national circumstances and interests, absence of supranationality in governance, administrative and institutional deficiencies at the national level” (Bishop et al. 2011, p. 20) is the greatest hindrance to institutional reforms; however, this conceptual chapter focuses on how economic regionalization has led to reshaping of transnational discursive patterns.

### **Educational Soft Power and Educational Diplomacy**

Soft power (see Nye, 2004) in education is the “nexus of influence in world affairs that relate to culture, science, technology, and other subtle forces” (Altbach & Peterson, 2008, p. 37). In higher education, soft power has materialized through education and academic exchanges as a form of ‘public diplomacy’ that extends national diplomacy through education (see Bayat 2014; Peterson, 2014). Educational diplomacy, suggested by the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) in 2009, is viewed as “the cross-disciplinary, transnational sharing of theories, ideas, and concepts that advance the landscape of education and, thereby, enhance human development” (Association for Childhood Education International, n.d.). At its core, educational diplomacy is a “multi-level, multi-actor negotiation processes,” that engages in cultivating “trust and negotiation of mutual benefit in the context of global [education] goals,” and as “the chosen method of interaction between stakeholders engaged in public [education] and politics for the purpose of representation, cooperation, resolving disputes, improving [education] systems, and securing the right to [education] for vulnerable populations” (Hone, 2014, p.1). Hone (2014) suggests that educational diplomacy entails three broad aspects:

- the normative aspect of education diplomacy;
- education diplomacy as an activity spanning various issue areas, policy fields and types of diplomatic engagement; and,
- education diplomacy as a multi-level activity. (p.1).

From a normative perspective, educational diplomacy focuses on improving access, quality, equity, and contributes to sustainability while promoting social and economic development across a broad spectrum. In other words, education is core to achieving sustainable development. As an activity spanning various issues, educational diplomacy is cross-cutting in that it is “a key ingredient in developing so-called citizen diplomacy” (Hone, 2014, p. 2). As a multi-level activity education diplomacy is a bilateral, multilateral and transnational activity that directly connects citizens to their country (Hone, 2014). Thus, educational diplomacy is seen as being

relevant to the global education agenda, by drawing attention to ways policies are shaped, through the use of hard or soft diplomacy. Therefore, education diplomacy may involve actors, agents, and institutions working towards specific local, national, regional or global targets through diplomatic channels or activities that seeks build trust and respect.

As Bayat (2014) suggests, educational diplomacy provides an avenue for actors involved in “high-quality education for all children” (p. 273) through which they can disseminate and discuss their ideas. In other words, global educational diplomacy is based upon “broader advocacy and interactions to influence and shape policies that impact education” (Bayat 2014, p. 273). In an era of educational soft power, the core attributes of educational diplomacy are advocacy and collaboration “that covers the actions of a wide-array of actors and activities intended to promote favourable relations among nations” (Peterson, 2014, p. 2) or what has been called “public diplomacy.” With the rise of educational soft power, we are also seeing the rise and intensification of national interest through education as a way to influence actors, agents and interests. However, today, educational diplomacy is not only about cultural exchanges, instead it is about the spread and dissemination of norms, standards, benchmarks and practices from one actor to another. In other words, as economic interactions intensify, it is about the attractiveness of markets and the ability to establish new alliances while courting old ones (Hartmann, 2008). Educational diplomacy has emerged as a form of global engagement, particularly in higher education, that seeks to capture the interconnectedness and activities that define the new ways of working in world that increasingly operates across sovereign borders. In other words, it is no longer individuals who are involved in global engagements in the form of student mobility, but institutions too are developing, testing, marketing and branding their own type of ‘foreign relations’ policies as they seek to build educational relationships (Peterson and Helms, 2013). Moreover, as higher institutions seek to internationalize, they are becoming public diplomats and their public diplomacy is expanding to include governmental officials and offices. As such, long-term engagement is now the new normalcy in global higher education expansionism.

The relationship between soft power and educational diplomacy has existed since the birth of the modern university. In fact, during colonial time, educational diplomacy was at its zenith with the Jesuit missions spreading the faith through education and the British and French selecting students to study abroad in order to return home to take up administrative positions. In other words, higher education has been used extensively during colonial time as part of the official colonial policy (Altbach and Peterson, 2008). In the post-World War II and cold-war years, educational soft power was used as a way to spread ideology, culture and political ideas through exchanges, scholarships, and research projects. When *education diplomacy* is added to the *soft power* spectrum; it changes from simply describing a type of cultural exchange to defining the very instruments (cooperation and collaboration) themselves. Education diplomacy has remained a central component of academic influence given that soft power “.... provides analysts and policy-makers alike with an abundance of understanding of interpretations of power, diplomacy, state behaviour and foreign policy” (Hadfield, 2015, p. 3). At the heart of education diplomacy is soft power in the form of the “ability of a given political entity—a state or non-state actor—to induce other actors and entities in the international system to desire similar goals and outcomes to the initiating actor” (Hadfield, 2015, p. 3). Thus, education diplomacy is based upon the sheer attractiveness of perceived influence upon a wider array of ideas, preferences and behaviors between actors, institutions and governments. Soft power

attractiveness, when utilized in education diplomacy, thus lies in its ability to create an environment that consequently produces a shift of mind-set rather than a violent change via intimidation (see Cini & Perez-Solorzano Borragan, 2009; Hadfield, 2015).

While there has been a rising tide of interest in international education, attention is often paid to programs and activities that facilitate exchanges and cooperation between countries (Abuza, 1996). This posits that educational diplomacy *is* “what’ can be learned from about international perspectives to education and how these perspectives can be applied to national contexts. In *Comparative and International Education*, the notion of what can be learned or borrowed or transferred from one context and applied in another context is not a new idea (Beech, 2012; Jules, 2015; Rappelye, 2006; Phillips & Ochs, 2004; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004). Unlike educational borrowing and lending, educational diplomacy is based upon how local populations can be influenced and the advancement of national influence through soft power (Peterson, 2014). In other words, at the heart of educational diplomacy is soft power in the form of exchanging ideas, fostering cultural awareness, and advocacy and interactions. Typical examples of these types of relationships are the Fulbright program – sponsored by the US Department of State, the British Council – United Kingdom, Alliance Française – France and Confucius Institutes – and the Peoples Republic of China. However, in today’s changing global environment driven by technological disruption, educational diplomacy is evolving to include transnationalism and not just educational opportunities and cultural relations designed to promote national interests abroad. In other words, governments are no longer the sole actors involved in educational diplomacy, educational cooperation and educational collaboration. Thus, educational diplomacy has moved away from being a venue for the strengthening of cultural and educational exchange programs to an arena that fosters transnational learning—that is learning by seeing what works in similar contexts and what aspects can be copied and transplanted into another context. At the heart of transnational learning is cooperation and collaboration, or what has been called “cooperative educational transfer” (Jules, 2015).

South-south cooperation, cooperative endeavors between two or more emerging markets, in education is but one engagement strategy that has been historically used to describe cross-border activities. South-South transfer in education is viewed as the transfer among equals (Chisholm, 2009). As Chisholm (2009) suggests, such cooperation is:

...often facilitated through technical assistance by consultants, regional meetings and joint planning among policy-makers, and educational exchanges. Professionals in multilateral agencies, governments, transnational corporations, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) might also promote cooperation around ‘solutions’ to problems of access of quality in education that include elite or low-cost models of schooling. (p. 2)

Historically, particularly during the cold war, south-south cooperation emerged as a form of cultural exchanges between core and periphery countries (see Morais de Sa e Silva, 2009). However, Peterson (2014) suggests that while building relationships is at the heart of south-south cooperation, those wishing to undertake this form of soft power should be mindful of the consequences that comes with it, namely the binding of human capacity to external funding. From this perspective, the institutional character of south-south cooperation can be dated back to pre-independence movement and the “revamping of international cooperation by governments in

general, as reflection of an overall attitude of rejection of conflict and cooperative predisposition to maintain peace in the aftermath of World War II” (Morais de Sa e Silva, 2009, p.42; see also UNESCO, 2006). In drawing attention to the three phase of south-south cooperation in education Morais de Sa e Silva, (2009) suggests that the first wave of cooperative endeavors were stimulated by Truman’s conceptualization of underdevelopment and the common bond that post-colonial countries shared; the second wave commenced extensive borrowing of petrodollars in the 1970s that ultimately led to debt problems; and the third or present wave is began with the structural adjustment programs of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund or the so called ‘knowledge banks’. The point here is that in locating the history of south-south cooperation we can also see evidence of soft power and educational diplomacy at work in that although “South-South cooperation [has] evolved in different phases ...in the current phase, it keeps the traditional meanings of political strengthening and self-reliance, but also has come to mean South-South transfer” (Morais de Sa e Silva, 2009, p.57)

Giving the trajectory of education diplomacy and the use of soft power and south-south cooperation to engender it, we now return to the concept of ‘regulatory regionalism’ within higher education to discuss how these models affect national educational systems that are part of regional entities. Regulatory regionalism is the study of the political projects that “allows us to look at regions not as abstract identities but more or less as coherent projects of regional governance” (Jayasuriya 2003, p. 201). Thus, in adopting a ‘political project’ viewpoint of regionalism, which is both multifaceted and multidimensional, we are able to see the different scales (local, regional, global) that educational diplomacy asserts within and across regions. These scalar dynamics allows us to locate the:

... social forces with the discursive power and material capability to propose and mobilise, institutionalise and govern territorial, political and market-making claims that are able to secure new regional frontiers, in turn enabling and making possible new strategic relational forms, including state organisation and political rule. (Robertson, 2010 p. 24)

Therefore, this kind of analysis suggests that scalar orders are continuously disputed social constructions and at the heat of these forces within education is soft power that give rise to education diplomacy. In other words, we are also seeing the accelerated global engagement that is now moving from simple country-to-country diplomacy towards institution-to-institution diplomacy within education, which implies that governments are no longer the prime actors involved in educational diplomacy (Peterson, 2014). As more and more institutions seek to build global education relationships and sign academic cooperation agreements, soft power diplomacy becomes solidify as the new orthodoxy.

### **An historical overview of Educational Transnationalism**

With the fall of the communism in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the opening of the post-socialist economies, transnational organization or “international Knowledge Banks” (Jones, 2004) such as the World Bank/IMF (International Monetary Fund), the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), and the WTO (World Trade Organization) have become the dominant actors in education (see Robertson, 2009; Robertson, Bonal, & Dale, 2002; Verger, 2009). Their work, agenda setting attitudes and policy



prescriptions have become to be captured in catch phrases such as “educational fundamentalism” –the drastic increase in funding for education from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (Jones, 2007) and “educational multilateralism” – ascendancy of ‘embedded liberalism’ as core attributes and mandates multilateralism institutions (Mundy, 1998; 1999; 2007) given the way that these organizations have come to decisively structure current directions and developments in national education systems (see Moutsios, 2009). However, with the states retreating towards regional trading agreements, the architecture of transnationalism is being reshaped and the reform privileges and prestigious are now being passed to regional organization or “trans-regional regimes” (Jules, 2012) who are now responsible for educational governance activities. This horizontal move, a core attribute of the post-bureaucratic state and a distinctive feature of new regionalism has also given rise to new set of institutional mechanisms, structural dynamics and soft regulatory features that are controlled and designed by the nation states, but executed at the supranational level as in the European Union or at the trans-regional level as within CARICOM. In other words, the movement towards regionalism is giving rise towards new forms of post-bureaucratic governance models and regulation of the international education market or transnational education (TNE). The measures will ultimately impact and influence the cross border exchange of students, institutions (onshore and offshore) who have collaborative arrangements while at the same time question transnational delivery options document verification and institutional recognition. However, the biggest change that the retreat towards regionalism presents is that educational institutions are now being asked to create regionally minded citizens who possess the qualities of global citizenship since the labor market for talent recruitment is now regional in scope. The movement from the transnational modules of governance in the era of post-bureaucratic regulatory governance suggest that states now “defines objectives and oversees maintenance of the system management...[and] no longer wants to be seen as the sole provider of legitimate instruction (Maroy, 2009, p. 78). Additionally, the internationalization of education and trade in educational services, one of twelve services, under the General Agreement of Trade in Services (GATS) has created new promises and challenges for education diplomacy.

### **Trans-regionalism and coordination of higher education in an era of Transnationalism**

This section used the concept of “trans-regionalism” (Betts, 2011; Dent, 2003; Kim, 2003; Song, 2007) to explain governance, coordination, and regulation in educational institutions at the regional level. Within this context, “trans-regionalism implies the establishment of common ‘spaces’ between and across regions in which constituent agents (e.g. individuals, communities, organisations) operate and have close associative ties with each other” (Dent, 2003 p. 224). When trans-regionalism is applied to education diplomacy, we see that educational diplomacy today moves away from the historical orthodoxy of cultural exchanges and now account for temporal space, actors and institutions. In other words, education diplomacy is now an ideational governance mechanism that is responsible for the coordination of higher education governance activities. This development is driven by the “shift from a bipolar international structure based on geo-political competition between capitalist and communist systems to that of a relatively less adversarial multipolar world was conducive to new patterns and paradigms of international relationships to flourish” (Dent, 2003, p. 224). Thus, state relations are no longer bipolar or multipolar but trans-regional (between regional trading blocs) in nature, and therefore education diplomacy must adapt to these changing dynamics. Today’s global environment of soft

power and education diplomacy must now function in an interconnected global era that is driven by cooperation and competition. From the perspective of cooperation, most countries are part of one regional trade agreement thus making education diplomacy one facet of their soft power. From a competition view point, emerging and frontier market economies are fighting for the same pot of donor aid and industrial economies are focusing on spotlighting their uniqueness as the BRICs<sup>ii</sup> (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) economies continue to grow.

In an era besieged by a multi-tiered system with vertical and horizontal differentiation of regimes across different scales, institutional complementarity, cooperation and coordination are essential. Trans-regionalism has emerged as a second type of interaction that institutions are constantly engaged with, for example ASEAN-EU dialogue, ASEAN-Mercosur relations, EU-Mercosur, and CARICOM-US meeting. As such, education diplomacy is no longer about government-to-government relations by more regime-to-regime relations. In education, these regional entities that operate about the level of the nation state or at the supranational level, such as the Caribbean Community CARICOM, have been designated as “trans-regional regimes” (Jules, 2008; 2012). CARICOM is viewed as a “trans-regional regime” (Jules, 2008; 2013) because it is comprised of a group of sovereign states that share a common geographical space that are committed to implementing a collective choice around which its members’ expectations converge, given their common heredity. Thus, trans-regimes, with their focus on actors and their principles, norms, rules, and procedures (a core tenant of coordination) and the anticipated outcome of convergence around actor’s expectations (this will ultimately lead to some form of spillover), presents a unique analytical framework for us to study education diplomacy. In other words, the growing complexity of the dynamic international architecture with a multiplicity of actors and institutions at different scales requires a new approach to understand the ‘epistemo’-logic of comparative enquiry (Schriewer, 2014).

Educational diplomacy by its very nature is problematic and difficult to define since it means different things to different regions. Classic diplomacy (government-to-government) is being replaced in an era of economic globalization as citizens become more global minded. In some instances, as in CARICOM, cooperation and collaboration has fashioned the “neo-Caribbean citizen” (Jules, 2014b) in the form of the “vision of the ideal Caribbean citizen” (CARICOM, 1997) that emphasizes Caribbean citizens being prepared to participate in the Caribbean Single Market by: respecting human life as the foundation on which all of the other desired values must rest; is psychologically secure; values differences based on gender, ethnicity, religion and other forms of diversity as sources of strength and richness; is environmentally astute; is responsible and accountable to family and community; has a strong work ethic; is ingenious and entrepreneurial; has a conversant respect for the cultural heritage; exhibits multiple literacies, independent and critical thinking to the application of science and technology to problem solving; and embraces differences and similarities between females and males. In other instances, as people, educators, researchers, and practitioners continue to travel abroad, overcome language barriers, negotiate with foreign educators and schools systems and ultimately borrow and import forging modules they are utilizing educational diplomacy to its fullest potential (Allison, 2014).

**Transnationalism or Regionalism: post-bureaucratic educational governance models in an era of educational diplomacy**

Regionalism (the political project) and regionalization (the functional process) has been the corner stone of Caribbean diplomacy dating back to the Windward Island Federation from 1833 to 1958, the Leeward Islands Federation 1671 to 1956, the West Indian Federation from 1958 to 1961, and the Free Trade Area Accord (CARIFTA) from 1965 to 1973. CARIFTA (CARICOM, 1965) was transformed into CARICOM under the Original Treaty of Chaguaramas (CARICOM, 1973). At the core of Caribbean regionalism are fiscal (economic integration), non-fiscal (functional cooperation), international (foreign policy coordination), and risk and threat (security) technocratic apparatuses that depend on regional cooperation and collaboration given the small size of Caribbean countries. However, education and its ensuing transnational processes have been historically regulated to the functional realm, and education is often viewed as being one of more successful components of the process of regionalization given that it is perceived as being less political and ideological. Further, everyone seems to be on board with better standards, quality and access to education. Functional cooperation has always been conceptualized as the: efficient operation of common services and activities for the benefit of the Caribbean people; accelerates the promotion of greater understanding among the people; advances social, cultural, and technological development; and intensifies activities in areas such as health, education, transportation, and telecommunications (CARICOM, 2007). However, with the implementation of the Caribbean Single Market in 2006, this calls for: (i) the ability of Caribbean nationals to move goods, services, capital and labor—creating a ‘fabricated policy space’ (Nóvoa and Lawn 2002); (ii) the creation of common trade and external tariff policies and harmonization of laws; and (iii) the right to establishment—i.e., the ability to set up a business in any territory (Jules, 2014) means that education is now more multidimensional and multifaceted across different scales (national, sub-regional and regional) and is being controlled and regulated by different actors with similar projected outcomes. Therefore, educational diplomacy, driven by the non-economic processes of ‘educational regionalization’—the coordination of external and internal mechanisms and governance activities—has arisen as exogenous and endogenous actors become intertwined in the regulation and coordination of education, thus creating a multilevel or “pluri-scalar governance of education” (Robertson, Bonal & Dale, 2002). The notion of ‘governance’ has entered the comparative and international as a way to explain the changing and rescaling of “social relations rising as education is mobilized upward to different scalar locations to play a more direct and functional role in capital accumulation” (Robertson & Dale, 2006, p. 221). In other words, the process of “upscaling and the governance of education to supra-regional (in this case the European Union) and global scales (for instance through the World Trade Organisation) can be understood as a new functional, institutional and scalar division of the labour of education systems” (Robertson and Dale, 2006, pp. 221-222). However, since the principal of proportionality—“...institutional arrangements devised for, Community action [that] shall not exceed what is necessary to achieve—” (CARICOM, 2006, p. 5) is retained among member states, CARICOM does not exhibit the kind of supra-regional upscaling that Robertson and Dale (2006) conceptualized. Instead, CARICOM represents the upscaling of trans-regionalism through intergovernmental networks (Council of Human and Social Development) and regional scales (Caribbean Vocation Qualification) that have become part of coordination of the functional spaces that have emerged to engender the movement of labor within the Caribbean Single Market. In other words, the proportionality means that CARICOM does not use the ‘Monnet method’ of integration, as within the European Union, that preferences supranational formulation based on binding community law. Therefore, governance in CARICOM, primarily within the functional areas, has become conjoined with cooperation. In extrapolating external

governance to the regional level, network governance is seen “as a process-oriented mode of policy-making, amounts to a more structural mode of exerting influence since it allows in principle for the simultaneous extension of regulatory and organizational boundaries” (Rhodes, 1997, p. 15). Therefore, when enforcement problems exist, or policy paralyzes, the concept of network governance could be seen as a horizontal mode of partnership-orientation. This chapter will suggest that the rise of the post-bureaucratic coupled with deeper RTAs is reshaping notions of transnational education. In essence, the retreat from global norms of globalization simply means that within the “pluri-scalar nature of the governance of education...education is now being asked to do different things in different ways, rather than the same things in different ways” (Dale, 2005, p. 117) and the same can be said of transnational higher education. Across CARICOM countries, transnational higher education is no longer about global mindedness and global citizenship or cosmopolitanism. However, in an era of RTAs, and the changing nature of regionalism, transnational education now seeks to develop regional norms, minds and work force or the “neo-Caribbean citizen” (Jules, 2014) in the form of the “vision of the ideal Caribbean citizen” (CARICOM, 1997).

### **Governing educational diplomacy**

At the end of the day, educational diplomacy is a type of meta-governance whereby “mutual recognition regime” (Hartmann, 2008) facilitates technical cooperation and collaboration between governments, institutions, and actors. As Kjellén (2008) suggests, “we have entered a new era of international cooperation and that the boundaries of traditional diplomacy – concentrated on national security and economic and commercial matters – are being extended to a much broader concern for global sustainability” (p. 2). Education diplomacy has a rich history in south-south cooperation and when soft power is added to the spectrum it allows us to focus on the instruments (cooperation and collaboration) that are utilized in the diplomatic process. As we see for the CARICOM, education diplomacy has now moved from the realm of government-to-government cultural exchanges towards regional-to-regional or transnational partnership. In some instances, as in the vision of the ideal Caribbean person, education diplomacy has now evolved into a region specific project with benchmarks, outcomes, and goals. However, at its core, educational diplomacy is an uneven process and necessary measures are not in place to adjudicate the issues associated with internationalization. While the benefits of educational diplomacy currently outweigh the determinants of cooperation and collaboration on a global scale between actors, institutions and governments there still exists room for greater consensus around the pillars that should motivate deep engagement. Thus, transnational interactions are aimed at building relationships and furthering education priorities within the global education arena.



## References

- Abuza, Z. (1996). The politics of educational diplomacy in Vietnam: educational exchanges under Doi Moi. *Asian Survey*, 618-631.
- Allison, J. (2014). R. Freeman Butts: Educational Foundations and Educational Diplomacy. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 62(1), 1-17.
- Association for Childhood Education International, (n.d). What is education diplomacy? Retrieved from <http://www.educationdiplomacy.org/overview/>
- Bayat, M. (2014). Global Education Diplomacy and Inclusion in Developing Countries: Lessons From West Africa. *Childhood Education*, 90(4), 272-280. DOI:10.1080/00094056.2014.936192
- Beech, J. (2012) *Education Policy Transfer in an Era of Globalization: theory-history-comparison*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang
- Beets, A. (2011). The global governance of migration and the role of trans-regionalism. In R. Kunz, S. Lavenex & M. Paniz (Eds.), *Multilayered migration governance: The promise of partnership*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bishop, M. L., N. Girvan, T. M. Shaw, S. Mike, R. M. Kirton, M. Socbie, D., Mohammed, and M. Anatol. (2011). Caribbean Regional Integration. Waterloo, ON: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- CARICOM. (2007). Needham Point declaration. Retrieved from [http://www.caricom.org/jsp/communications/meetings\\_statements/declaration\\_on\\_functional\\_cooperation.jsp](http://www.caricom.org/jsp/communications/meetings_statements/declaration_on_functional_cooperation.jsp)
- Cini, M. and Perez-Solorzano Borraran, N. (Eds.) (2009) *European Union Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dale, R. (2003). Globalisation and the rescaling of educational governance: a case of sociological ectopia. International Studies Association Conference Lisbon, Portugal, September.
- Dale, R. (2005). Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 117–149. doi:10.1080/03050060500150906.
- Dent, C. M. (2003). From inter-regionalism to trans-regionalism? Future challenges for ASEM. *Asia Europe Journal*, 1(2), 223–235. doi:10.1007/s103080300017.
- Economist. 2013. "The world economy: The gated globe." Economist, October 12.
- Hartmann, E. (2008). Bologna goes global: a new imperialism in the making?. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6(3), 207-220.
- Hadfield, A. (2015): Commune Consensus: A Soft Power Comparison of the Commonwealth and the European Union, *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, DOI: 10.1080/00358533.2015.1063845
- Heckscher C. & Applegate L. M. (1994). Introduction (pp 1-13). In Donnellon, A., & Heckscher, C. C. (Eds.), *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hone, K. (2014). Education Diplomacy – Towards a Common Understanding. Retrieved from <https://norrag.wordpress.com/2014/11/27/education-diplomacy-towards-a-common-understanding/>

- Iedema, R. (2003). *Discourses of post-bureaucratic organization*. In *Discourses of post-bureaucratic organization* (pp. 1–40). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jayasuriya, K. (2003b). Introduction: Governing the Asia Pacific: Beyond the ‘New Regionalism.’ *Third World Quarterly* 24 (2): 199–215.
- Jones, Phillip W. 2004. “Taking the Credit: Financing and Policy Linkages in the Education Portfolio of the World Bank.” In *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*, ed. G. Steiner-Khamsi. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jones, P. W. (2007). *World Bank financing of education: lending, learning and development*. Routledge.
- Josserand, E., Teo, S., & Clegg, S. (2006). From bureaucratic to post-bureaucratic: The difficulties of transition. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 19(1), 54–64.
- Jules, T. D. (2012). *Neither world polity nor local or national societies: Regionalization in the Global South – the Caribbean Community*. Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Jules, T. D. (2014). The political economy of “open regionalism” and education in small (and micro) states: The construction of the Caribbean Educational Policy Space in CARICOM. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 00(00), 1–24.  
doi:10.1080/14767724.2013.861708.
- Jules, T. D. (2014b). “Trans-regional Regimes and Globalization in Education: Constructing the Neo-Caribbean Citizen.” In *Globalizing Minds: Rhetoric and Realities in International Schools*, edited by I. Silova and D. Hobson, 249–275. Chapel Hill, NC: Information Age.
- Jules, T. D. (2015). Educational exceptionalism in small (and micro) states: Cooperative educational transfer and TVET. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 10(2), 202–222. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745499915571706>
- Kim, J. (2003). Sub-regionalism, regionalism, trans-regionalism. Implications for economic integration, *Asia Europe Journal* 1, 183–196.
- Kjellén, B. (2008). *A New Diplomacy for Sustainable Development. The Challenge of Global Change*. London: Routledge
- Lavenex, S. 2004. EU external governance in ‘wider Europe’. *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(4), 688–708.
- Lavenex, S. (2008). A governance perspective on the European neighbourhood policy: Integration beyond conditionality. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(6), 938–955.
- Lavenex, S. & Wichmann, N. (2009). The external governance of EU internal security. *European Integration*, 31(1), 83–102.
- Moutsios, S. (2009). International organisations and transnational education policy. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative & International Education*, 39, 4.
- Mundy, K. (1998). Educational multilateralism and world (dis)order. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4), 448–478.
- Mundy, K. (1999). UNESCO and the limits of the possible, *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(1), 27–52.
- McGill Peterson, P. (2014). Diplomacy and Education: A Changing Global Landscape. *International Higher Education*, (75), 2-3.
- Nye, J.S. (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Nòvoa, A., & M. Lawn. (Eds.). (2002). *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Parker, R., & Bradley, L. (2004). Bureaucracy or Post-Bureaucracy? Public Sector Organisations in a Changing Context. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 26(2), 197-215.
- Peterson, T, Ginsburg, A., Garcia, L, and Lemke, M (2000). Educational Diplomacy: Using the Untapped Opportunities of International Education. *Education Week* November 22, 48.
- Peterson, P. M., & Helms, R. M. (2013). *Challenges and Opportunities for the Global Engagement of Higher Education*. American Council on Education and Center for Internationalization and global engagement. Paper presented at Beijing Forum conference on November 1, 2013 Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/CIGE-Insights-2014-Challenges-Opps-Global-Engagement.pdf>
- Phillips, D. & Ochs, K. (2004) Researching Policy Borrowing: some methodological problems in comparative education, *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(6), 773-784.
- Rappleye, J. (2006) Theorizing Educational Transfer: toward a conceptual map of the context of cross-national attraction, *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1(3), 223-240.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Robertson, S. L. (2009). Globalization, Education Governance, and Citizenship Regimes - New democratic deficits and social injustices. In W. Ayers, T. M. Quinn, & D. Stoval (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 542–553). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Robertson, S. L., & Dale, R. (2006). Changing Geographies of Power in Education : The Politics of Rescaling and its Contradictions (pp. 221-232. In K. Derek *Education Studies: Issues and Critical Perspectives*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Robertson, S. L., Bonal, X., & Dale, R. (2002). GATS and the Education Service Industry: The Politics of Scale and Global Reterritorialization. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(4), 472–495. <http://doi.org/10.1086/343122>
- Schriewer, J. (2014). Neither orthodoxy nor randomness: differing logics of conducting comparative and international studies in education. *Comparative Education*, 50(1), 84–101. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2014.883745>
- Song, W. (2007). Regionalisation, inter-regional cooperation and global governance. *Asia Europe Journal*, 5, 67–82. doi:10.1007/s10308-006-0094-y.
- Verger, Antoni. 2009. The Merchants of Education: Global Politics and the Uneven Education Liberalization Process within the WTO. *Comparative Education Review* 53 (3): 379–401.

---

<sup>i</sup> Following Dale (2005) I use “educational governance activities” as a generic term to encompasses the funding, provision, ownership, and regulation of education that may be carried out independently by different actors that are endogenous or exogenous to the nation state.

<sup>ii</sup> Here I refer to the historical BRIC countries. However, it should be noted that some scholars have added South Africa as a BRIC country.