

MULTI-GOVERNANCE IN AN AGE OF 'EDUCATIONAL TRANS-REGIONALISM': REVISITING THE FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF CARICOM'S EDUCATIONAL PROJECT

GOBERNANZA MÚLTIPLE EN LA ERA DEL "TRANSREGIONALISMO EDUCATIVO": REVISIÓN DE LOS ASPECTOS FUNCIONALES DEL PROYECTO EDUCATIVO DE LA CARICOM

Tavis D. Jules

ABSTRACT

The ascendancy of new governance has had a drastic impact on all levels of policy reforms. I apply regime theory to the modes of governance that drive the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) by illuminating how the changing role of governance, at the regional level, is impacting national educational developments. The primary purposes, structures, and processes of trans-regional governances, focusing on inter-sector spillover, are then studied to illuminate the role of non-economic spaces within CARICOM. This paper suggests that the non-economic pillar of Caribbean integration – functional cooperation – influences national educational systems by giving rise to what I call *educational trans-regionalism*: a multi-layered process of 'networks' and 'interactions' in which new institutions and mechanisms proliferate as they seek to coordinate, regulate, disseminate, and translate educational policy discourse from the regional governing panopticon.

Key words: CARICOM, functional cooperation, trans-regional regime, functional spaces, educational trans-regionalism

RESUMEN

El ascenso de la nueva gobernanza ha tenido un impacto drástico en todos los niveles de reformas políticas. Aplicando la teoría del régimen a los modos de gobernanza que impulsan a la Comunidad del Caribe (CARICOM) se enfatiza cómo el papel cambiante de la gobernanza, a nivel regional, está impactando los desarrollos educativos nacionales. Posteriormente, se estudian los propósitos, las estructuras y los procesos principales de las gobernabilidades transregionales, centrándonos en los efectos indirectos intersectoriales, para iluminar el papel de los espacios no económicos dentro de CARICOM. Este artículo sugiere que el pilar no económico de la integración caribeña –la cooperación funcional– influye en los sistemas educativos nacionales al dar lugar a lo que podemos denominar transregionalismo educativo: un proceso de múltiples niveles de 'redes' e 'interacciones' en las que nuevas instituciones y proliferan los mecanismos que buscan coordinar, regular, difundir y traducir el discurso de política educativa desde el panóptico de gobierno regional.

Palabras clave: CARICOM, cooperación funcional, régimen transregional, espacios funcionales, transregionalismo educativo

Fecha de recepción: 4 de junio de 2020.

Fecha de aceptación: 29 de diciembre de 2020.

INTRODUCTION

The rise of 'new governance' has profoundly impacted national education systems in the Global South. New Governance is cauterized by the "movement from government to governance" (Pierre, 2000) and has also been called "governing without government" (Rhodes, 1996). The governance literature suggests that nation states need to tackle numerous governance challenges in an era of heightened economic transnationalism and economic globalization while reforming social systems, such as education (Pierre & Peters, 2000; Pierre, 2000; Pierre, 2009; Rhodes, 1997; Stoker, 1998). Economic integration in the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) is based upon two modes of multi-level governance: (i) inter-governmentalism¹ where national governments regulate the level and speed of economic integration based upon agreement on policy responses that do not undermine national sovereignty (Moravcsik, 1983), and (ii) neo-functionalism in which economic integration is predicated upon the removal of trade barriers in order for one sector to lead others toward integration (Hass, 1958). The non-economic spaces of integration are those driven by the process of functional cooperation² – one of four coequal pillars of CARICOM with the other three being, economic integration, foreign policy coordination, and security (added in 2007). Here, the distinction is made between regionalism (the political project) and regionalization (the political process). The spaces in which functional cooperation inhibit as detailed in the Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas (CARICOM, 2001) as

...(a) more efficient operation of common services and activities for the benefit of its peoples; (b) accelerated promotion of greater understanding among its peoples and the advancement of their social, cultural and technological development; (c) intensified activities in areas such as health, education, transportation, telecommunications. (p. 7)

Focusing, first, on integrating a particular functional space, such as education, allows international aid donors, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the European Union, to influence several aspects of the nation's educational development agendas. Consequently, policy paralysis occurs at the national level since numerous policy objectives and obligations are either poorly executed or never implemented in the first place (Pollard, 2012).

Few studies outside of the European Union have concentrated on how the shift from government to governance at the regional level has affected the functional spaces in which educational policymaking is embedded. This paper differs from the extant literature on regionalism in the Caribbean (Brewster, 2003; Bishop & Pain, 2010; Bishop et al., 2011; Girvan, 2006) in that it emphasizes *how* the combined and coordinated uses of regional governance (inter-governmentalism and neo-functionalism), within and across CARICOM's member states, has given rise to a very distinctive set of governance mechanisms within and across national education systems. Rather than focusing on the global/local nexus divide that has dominated research in Comparative and International Education and heeding the call to move beyond "methodological nationalism" (Robertson & Dale, 2008), this paper uses the regional level as the unit of analysis to explore the influence of Caribbean regional governance upon the national educational system. Unlike previous research on European integration that has focused on 'why' the rescaling of regional governance spaces in higher education institutions has been driven by "regulatory state regionalism" – the

1 The creation of the Caribbean Court of Justice has the potential to change the inter-governmental nature of CARICOM given its jurisdiction and its ability to create community laws. The movement away from inter-governmentalism was recommended by the West Indian Commission (CARICOM, 1992) and reaffirmed in the Rose Hall Declaration (CARICOM, 2003) and by the Technical Working Group on Governance (CARICOM, 2006).

2 Article 4 (c) (iii) and 18 of the Treaty of Chaguaramas which established the Caribbean Community on 4 July 1973 list the areas of functional cooperation as "shipping, air transport, meteorological services and hurricane insurance, health, intra-regional technical assistance, intra-regional public service arrangements, education and training, broadcasting and information, culture, harmonisation of the law and legal systems of Member States, position of women in Caribbean society, travel within the region, labour administration and industrial relations, technological and scientific research, social security other common services and areas of functional cooperation as may from time to time be determined by the Conference" (as cited in Task Force on Functional Cooperation [2007], p. 14).

regulation of education governance mechanisms within the border political project of statehood – (Robertson, 2010; Verger & Hermo, 2010), the emphasis here is on how the mode of regional governance influences the non-economic or 'functional spaces' of national development. In other words, the article seeks to understand *how modes of regionalism influence national educational priorities and policies*.

While this article is theoretical in nature, previous accounts and policy narratives were used in a "complementary fashion" to comprehend "basic concepts" (Hanberger, 2003, p. 273) as they relate to educational discourse that emerges and the political context surrounding it. Methodologically, this article uses the analytical tool of a "historical-comparative or comparative-historical approach" (Cowen, 2000; Larsen, 2010; Schriewer, 2002), grounded in historical policy analysis (HPA) (Hanberger, 2003; Jules, 2013a; Jules, 2013b; Jules & Barton, 2014; Schram, 1993; Torgerson, 1996) of the discourses of national educational policies to illuminate how regional discourses on deeper economic integration shape national educational policy priorities. Following Mahoney and Rueschemeyer (2003), the comparative-historical inquiry used has three features: (i) explains causal configurations; (ii) focuses on the explanation of temporal processes over time; and (iii) describes sequels within delimited historical contexts. The comparative-historical inquiry focuses on "develop[ing], test[ing], and refin[ing] causal and explanatory hypotheses about events or structures integral to macro-units such as nation-states" (Skocpol, 1979, p. 36). In explaining the outcomes of geopolitical and geostrategic transformations transpiring across the inter-state system and sub-systems and its impacts upon national educational systems, the techniques of "*explaining-outcome process tracing*" (Beach & Pedersen, 2013) – outlining the trajectory of a phenomenon over time by tracing a causal mechanism "to locate the intermediate factors lying between some structural cause and its purported effect" (Gerring, 2007, p. 45) and *path dependence* (a sequence of changes that influences the eventual outcome) were employed to "uncover the link between cause and effect ... through the 'reconstruction of the origin of a certain event'" (Ritter, 2014, p. 99). In this way, the aim was to "trace the complex conglomerate of systematic and case-specific causal mechanisms that produced the outcome in question" (Beach & Pedersen, 2013, p. 19). This paper explains how regionalism's structural and institutional environment shape educational policy development at the national level.

I first suggest that international regime theory offers a foundational analytical framework for examining how regional governance modes shape educational policy developments across the national level. Then, I apply regime theory to CARICOM to analyze the institutional responses to the challenges of regional governance modes. The main purposes, structures, and processes of trans-regional governances, focusing on inter-sector spillover, are then explained to illuminate the role of non-economic spaces within CARICOM. I then argue that while the existent literature has focused on theorizing the traditional areas (such as political and economic integration), attention must be given to the 'functional spaces' or non-economic spaces within political projects. I conclude by arguing that we are seeing the rise of the non-economic pillar of Caribbean integration – functional cooperation – which influences national educational systems by giving rise to what I call *educational trans-regionalism*. This paper does not go into a detailed discussion of educational trans-regionalism, but merely argues that it results from the restructuring of functional spaces through various modes of regional governance.

1. A CONNUBIALISM OF REGIONAL MODES OF GOVERNANCE: INTER-GOVERNMENTALISM AND NEO-FUNCTIONALISM

It has been said that economic transnationalism, frequently referred to as economic globalization, involves fragmentation and integration that are both driven by interdependency and interconnectivity. Over time, scholars have shown the influence of the global on the local.

Globalization has: (i) impacted spatial organizations and social relations through the use of copious conceptual operations, themes, wide transactional networks, and interrelations – be it through extensity, intensity, or velocity (Held et al., 1999); (ii) undermined the role of the state through the use of transnational actors (Beck, 2000); (iii) intensified social relations (Giddens, 1990); (iv) respatialized and reconfigured social geography and people (Scholte, 2005); and (v) given rise to fragmentation (Rosenau, 2003). Outside of the European Union, few studies have surveyed how the regional level, in an era of heightened supranationalism influences national educational systems with or without globalization. As such, I suggest that the focus on regional governance's functional spaces is warranted, given globalization's changing complexity.

In CARICOM states, the transference from state-controlled Keynesianism to market fundamentalism guided neoliberalism has given rise to a discussion of an emerging new regional order. Therefore, the containment of changing dynamics and rules of regionalism requires new conceptual tools. This is evident in CARICOM, where less emphasis is now placed on open regionalism – the *widening* of economic relations – and greater attention is paid to the strengthening of the governance mechanisms of economic integration in the form of mature regionalism – the *deepening* of economic relations (Girvan, 2006; Jules, 2014; Odle, 2006; Pollard, 2012). In light of the implementation deficit that exists in enacting regional decisions into national legislatures, mature regionalism has emerged as the regional governance mechanism through which “critical policy decisions of the Community taken by Heads of Government, or by other Organs of the Community, will have the force of law throughout the Region” (CARICOM, 2003, p. 1). In essence, a shift is occurring from the ‘geo-political dynamics’ that emerged at the end of the Cold War towards ‘geo-regional dynamics’ under conditions of openness, policy interdependence, and intra-regional cooperation. In the small economies of CARICOM, there is a need to think not only in terms of cooperation and collaboration but also to consider the conditions of “soft power” – power not exercised over, but within, to achieve desired policy outcomes (Nye, 2011).

Most interpretations, there are five tiers of economic integration: (i) the most-favored national arrangement, which reduces tariff on products; (ii) free trade areas with zero tariff on goods and services; (iii) custom unions, which uses a common external tariff; (iv) common market, which combines attributes of a customs union while permitting the free movement of goods and services; and (v) economic and political unions. As a result, several theoretical approaches, ranging from functionalism/neo-functionalism (Haas, 1958; Nye, 1965; Schmitter, 1969); liberal inter-governmentalism (Moravcsik, 1993); institutionalism (Armstrong & Bulmer, 1998); network analysis (Bomberg, 1998; Peterson, 1995); and transactional analysis (Deutsch, 1957) have been used to study integrative projects. However, since its inauguration, CARICOM's integration project has been influenced by a hybrid mode of governance, which departs from other political projects' orthodoxy. CARICOM's rhetorical approach to economic integration and its other three pillars are constructed along:

...elements of ‘inter-governmentalism’, (which recognises the continuing importance of individual Member States in determining the path of the integration process), and elements of neo-functionalism, (which is premised on the principle of shared sovereignty or the collective exercise of such sovereignty in specified areas). (CARICOM, 2006, p. 14)

CARICOM's connubialism of inter-governmentalism, neo-functionalism, and modes of regional governance stems from the fact that its members still view themselves, first and foremost, as a group of sovereign states that do not need to cede power to a supranational entity, such as the European Union. Moreover, CARICOM is seen as an example of “positive integration,” owing to the creation of a common market and economic union since “... they usually require institutional edification and policy coordination” (Babarinde, 1998, p. 100). This is in stark contrast to economic integration schemes that are driven by “most-favored nation, free trade area, and customs union,

which involve the elimination of trade barriers, [and] are manifestations of ‘negative integration’” (Babarinde, 1998, p. 100).

Inter-governmentalism does not allow for the sharing of sovereignty, and each member state in the integrative project is entitled to one vote. Emphasis is placed on national coordination from the regional level, resulting in a lack of enforcing decisions or implementation paralysis. The supranational approach recognizes that joint sovereignty is essential, particularly in areas where the region is competent to legislate over national issues. Much of the inter-governmental literature focuses on isolated events within integrative projects, such as treaty negotiations (Niemann & Schmitter, 2009).

Under the Original Treaty of Chaguaramas, inter-governmentalism is manifested in CARICOM's institutional structures and modes of governance, particularly in the decision-making process where the Conference of Heads of Government, the highest decision making body, and the Council of Ministers ensure that each nation-state had a single vote. CARICOM's original founding Treaty was based upon the core tenants of inter-governmentalism. The Revised Treaty of Chaguaramas of 2001 is based upon nine protocols – (i) institutional arrangements for CARICOM, such as organs, councils, bodies and associate institutions of the community; (ii) establishment, services, capital and movement of community nationals; (iii) industrial policy; (iv) trade policy; (v) agricultural policy; (vi) transport policy; (vii) disadvantaged countries, regions and sectors; (viii) competition policy, consumer protection, dumping and subsidies; and (ix) disputes settlement. The Revised Treaty reaffirms inter-governmentalism and recognizes that CARICOM is an associate of a sovereign state. Thus, within these protocols, we first see the establishment of governance mechanisms responsible for the regulation of national educational developments.

Several scholars have been critical of the application of a pure neo-functional theory as an analytical frame to understand CARICOM's integrative project given the region's experiences with “Caribbeansclerosis” – the perceived stagnation of the Caribbean integration (Jules, 2008; see also Benn, 2012; Vandkey, 2011). Their apprehension stems primarily from the fact that scholars view neo-functionalism as an important dynamic of European integration that has historically paid particular attention to transactional costs (Deutsch et al., 1957; Haas, 1958; Nye, 1971; 1988). Pure neo-functionalism is often seen as problematic in its application to CARICOM since its core tenants of combining functionalist, federalist, and commination theories generally focus on functional mechanisms and functional goals (Niemann & Schmitter, 2009). This is tricky since the Caribbean experience is such that any allusion to federalism ideas at the regional level would inevitably lead to a scatter effect (Springer, 1963; Whearas, 1940). As such, it is the mechanisms of neo-functionalism, “technocratic decision-making, incremental change and learning processes” (Niemann & Schmitter, 2009, p. 2) that have been integrated into the CARICOM project.

In sum, CARICOM's modes of governance are a hybridity of inter-governmentalism and neo-functionalism, which has given rise to a distinctive regional regime regulating national educational developments. Therefore, given the current modes of regional governance, national education systems cannot be studied in isolation from the cultural, economic, and political structures and mechanisms that regulate, coordinate, and govern them. Therefore, we cannot study national educational systems, either vertically or horizontally, without recognizing and acknowledging the geopolitical and geostrategic transformations transpiring across the inter-state system and sub-systems and their subsequent consequences. In the next part of this paper, I suggest that the hybrid theoretical approach that CARICOM's members have utilized to position CARICOM in the global environment has created a unique module of educational governance and regulation that can be conceptualized by using regime theory.

2. 'REGIMES THEORY' AS AN APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING TRANS-REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE AND REGULATION

In order to understand the impact of regional governance in education, it is first crucial to comprehend the procedures around which trans-regional actors' expectations converge. Regime theory offers an invaluable conceptual framework for illustrating the different processes in educational developments that are taking place at the trans-national level and propelled by economic transnationalism. Krasner (1983) initially conceptualized a regime as a set of "principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given issue area" (p. 1). In this manner:

Principles are beliefs of fact, causation, and rectitude. Norms are standards of behavior defined in terms of rights and obligations. Rules are specific prescriptions or proscriptions for actions. Decision-making procedures are prevailing practices for making and implementing collective choice. (Krasner, 1983, p. 2)

Krasner (1981), recognizing the sustained discrepancies that exist amid large and small states, submits that economic well-being and political control in the emerging and frontier capital markets can be changed by modifying the "...principles, norms, rules, and procedures that affect the movement of goods and factors in the world economy," (p. 119). Krasner (2011) further implies that four conditions have driven Third World states to transform international regimes:

...the international weakness of virtually all developing countries; the domestic weakness of virtually all developing countries; the systemic opportunities offered by the international institutions which were created by a hegemonic power now in decline; and the pervasive acceptance of a belief system embodying a dependency orientation. (p. 120)

Studies to date (Haas, 1993; Krasner, 1983; Puchala & Hopkins, 1983; Stein, 1983; Young, 1983) have conceptualized regimes as social institutions that display the "conjunction of convergent expectations and patterns of behavior and practice" (p. 94). These two components, behavior and practice, ought not to manifest at the same time for regimes to arise; "the occurrence of behavioral regularities sometimes gives rise to [a] convergence of expectations, and vice versa" (Young, 1993, p. 94). In other words, all regimes incorporate arrays of social conventions, and as such, they highlight that they are human artifacts, having no presence or meaning apart from the conduct of individuals or groups of human beings (Young, 1983). As social institutions, regimes represent behavioral conventions that correspond to a response to coordinated problems and situations, in which the pursuit of interest leads to socially describable outcomes. Regimes occur once "patterned state behavior results from joint rather than independent decision-making" (Stein, 1983, p. 117). Thus, regimes evolve because actors renounce autonomous decision making in dealing with shared interests and common aversions.

Keohane (1983) differentiates between agreements and regimes, implying that agreements are *ad hoc* "one-shot" arrangements, while regimes' rationale is to enable agreements. Likewise, Jervis (1993) notes that regimes "[imply] not only norms and expectations that facilitate cooperation, but a form of cooperation that is more than the following of short-run self-interest" (p. 173). However, given CARICOM's geographical propensity during this regime formation phase, it adopted a life of its own, based upon its members' aspirations. Since regimes do not arise of their own accord, they can be envisaged as "intervening variables standing between basic and causal variable and outcomes of behavior" (Krasner, 1983, p. 5). In this way, regimes transcend agreements.

Keohane (1983) notes that regimes are similar to contracts since they "involve actors with long-term objectives who seek to structure their relationships in stable and mutually beneficial ways" (p. 146). Thus, regimes create frameworks (reducing transactional costs), and coordinate actors' expectations (improving quality and quantity of information available to states) as issues occur within any given policy space. Keohane (1983) notes that the "denser the policy space, the more

highly interdependent are different issues, and therefore the agreements made about them” (pp. 155-56). Concerning transactional costs, the optimal size of regimes will grow if the yields are high. In other words, if the cost is higher to make separate agreements in dense policy spaces, then belonging to a regime becomes cost-effective for the states. In this way, regimes are intended to mitigate the impacts of the international environment upon individual states.

According to Stein (1993), regimes are based upon shared interests or collaborations. Thus, regimes are “arrangements peculiar to substantive issue-areas in international relations that are characterized by the condition of complex interdependence: neither hierarchy nor anarchy prevails, and states really practice self-help” (Hass, 1993, p. 27). As such, regimes evolve, as in CARICOM's case, when states recognize that the anticipated supply of “public goods” cannot happen by way of autonomous action. Therefore, “interdependence, far from being a wholesale mutual need, is thus recognized as a regrettable condition” (Haas, 1983, p. 28). In grasping the interest and structural principles of regimes, consideration is given to negotiating agreements that deliver collective or private goods to member states. In this way, regimes can be distinguished based upon their function along a continuum ranging from specific and single-issue to diffuse and multi-issue (Puchala & Hopkins, 1983).

Regime theory recognizes that the dynamism that occurs at the international level, given various amounts of ambiguity, will compel nations – big and small – to be more conducive to policy coordination or cooperation (Patnaik, 1996). As Keohane (2005) notes, international regimes are regulators of the global systems seeking to reduce transactions cost. While international regime theory is often identified with “hegemonic stability theory” (Patnaik, 1996), this paper departs from this orthodoxy and recommends that regime theory elucidate the negotiation, coordination, and governance of education from an international political-economic perspective. As such, regime theory offers a structure for us to survey the institutional space in which regional governance materializes, and the resultant scales of educational governance and educational regulation across the national level are both multifaceted and multidimensional. CARICOM is legislated by the Conference of Heads of Government of the Caribbean Community (CHGCCs), maintained through councils, congresses, and other bodies, and monitored by the Bureau of Heads. Regimes establish hierarchies of values, accentuating some and disregarding others. This is exemplified in the Grand Anse Declaration (CARICOM, 1989), which stressed the Caribbean Single Market and Economy (CSME), the economic pillar of regionalism, while neglecting the two non-economic pillars of foreign policy coordination and functional cooperation (recognized as an essential part of the integration project in the Declaration on Functional Cooperation in 2007). Regimes could also dispense incentives to the benefit of others and the detriment of some. In doing so, they “buttress, legitimize, and sometimes institutionalize international patterns of dominance, subordination, accumulation, and exploitation” (Puchala & Hopkins, 1983, p. 66) for their members. Thus, a regime's authenticity hinges on the perimeters that members negotiate or impose upon themselves. Therefore, regime theory as a conceptual framework allows us to understand CARICOM as a trans-regional regime and the trans-regional spaces that it occupies and governs within. Regimes are, therefore, the way in which modes of regionalism function and exert influence on national educational priorities and policies.

3. GOVERNING TRANS-REGIONAL SPACES

During the pre-Cold War period, CARICOM was viewed as just another customs union premised upon inter and intra-regional trade amongst 12 of its now 15 members. The Caribbean custom union spanning from 1973-1989 featured merchandise trade, minimal provision of core service and capital, an intensive harmonization policy, industrial allocation, and joint development of agricultural resources (Girvan, 2012). CARICOM's trans-regional space began to emerge in the

immediate post-Cold War period and is linked to the twin forces of the collapse of ideological pluralism (competing models of development) and the rise of a unipolar homorganic power, along with the restructuring of the regional project under the Grand Anse Declaration (CARICOM, 1989). Arguably, the implosion of the socialist experiments in Grenada, Guyana, and Jamaica (Jules, 2013) that occurred at the end of the Cold War also gave way to the death of ideological pluralism across the Caribbean, along with the accession of 12 CARICOM countries to the Grand Anse Declaration and the reporting of the West Indian Commission. These historical events created a Caribbean transitological space that restructured education governance and regulated education functions – moving them from the regional level to the national space. Cowen (2002) notes that 'transitologies' are defined by the:

...collapse and reconstruction of (a) state apparatuses; (b) social and economic stratification systems; and (c) political visions of the future; in which (d) education is given a major symbolic and reconstructionist role in these social processes of destroying the past and redefining the future. (p. 338)

Following Cowen's (2002) ideas of transitologies, the Caribbean Educational Policy Space (CEPS) has sought to read the forces of "history and the interplay of the domestic [regional], and the international in the construction of educational patterns" (p. 339). In applying transitologies to CARICOM countries, the period of educational reconstruction (1998-1997) was driven by institutional reforms (the movement from the Standing Committee of Ministers Responsible for Education [SCME] to the Council of Human and Social Development [COSHOD]) in the post-socialist period. The reshuffling of the post-Cold War architecture has led to regional entities restructuring themselves to respond to economic globalization's current challenges. During the Cold War era, CARICOM, with its 15 members and five associate member states, were pigeonholed by ideological pluralism and policy insularity that stagnated regionalism. CARICOM is the oldest regional integration project in the emerging markets. Such a distinction is indispensable as it draws attention to the prevailing complications of economic and political nationalism that has beleaguered the discourse around whether the Caribbean integrative political project ought to focus on "widening" – a purely market approach based on open regionalism and meaningful development through production integration – or "deepening" – based on mature regionalism – economic relations (Baquero-Herrera, 2006; Girvan, 2006; Girvan et al., 1994; Jules, 2014).

These semantic shifts around the perceived development path led to the creation of different modes of educational governance and educational regulation since national educational systems in CARICOM states are "...now being asked to do different things in different ways, rather than the same things in different ways...[while the education] 'system' ...it is suggested that the constitution of education sectors may be in the process of changing, with a development of parallel sectors at different scales with different responsibilities" (Dale, 2005, p. 117). While governance has become a catchword in Comparative and International Education research, the definition of governance is often observed through normative or analytical frameworks that are viewed as using neo-liberalism and its ascendant policy perceptions across multiple scales to restructure the state (Robertson, 2002). Thus, state reorganization in the shifting interstate system is indebted to different forms of governance ranging from "interactive governance" – the use of civil, public and private actors to solve social problems while creating social opportunities – (Kooiman et al., 2008; Torfing et al., 2012) to "networked governance" – diverse functional networks that are categorized by "routinized, purposive interaction between diverse actors that share a common sphere of expertise" (Fenwick et al., 2014, p. 3; see also Castels et al., 1974; Raustiala, 2002; Slaughter, 2004; Meek & Thurmaier, 2012; Sørensen & Torfing, 2007).

The spaces that regionalism occupy are seen as a set of multifaceted and multidimensional processes ebbed within the "political projects" (Jayasuriya, 2003; Robertson, 2010) 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). The political project of regionalism and its congruent processes within CARICOM are driven by the cooperation and coordination of transactional costs. Therefore, governance now exists within numerous spaces at the regional level. Trans-regionalism “implies the establishment of common ‘spaces’ between and across regions in which constituent agents (e.g., individuals, communities, organizations) operate and have close associative ties with each other” (Dent, 2003, p. 323).

An additional trans-regional space exists in CARICOM, and it can be observed as a ‘functional space.’ In this paper, in taking up the notion of functional space, it indicates a space grounded on the coordination of educational governance, funding, provision, and regulation of the functional areas of regionalism, such as education and health. From this perspective, a distinction is made “between the de facto, market driven nature of the evolution of ‘regionalization’ and the de jure, state-driven nature of ‘regionalism’” (Breslin & Higgott, 2003, p. 1).

4. CONCLUSION: GOVERNING TRANS-REGIONAL EDUCATION

The post-1989 CARICOM development agenda places production integration in the form of open regionalism at the heart of developing the Caribbean Single Market and Economic (CSME). The focus on the CSME has had an unintentional trickledown effect on national educational systems that were broadly outlined in the Future of Education in the Region (CARICOM, 1993) and then clearly captured in the vision of the “Ideal Caribbean Citizen” (CARICOM, 1997). An analysis of vertical and horizontal dimensions of the modes of governance at the regional level shows that we are seeing the rise of *educational trans-regionalism* with its spillover effects (neo-functional attributes) and the unanimity of decision making by member states (intergovernmental traits) that are ebbed within the “...pluri-scalar nature of educational governance, that education policy can no longer be seen as the exclusive preserve of individual nation-states ...” (Dale, 2005, p. 113). In Ronald Sanders’ terms, CARICOM is now a “half-way house,” that is forged around a “community of sovereign independent states, while at the same time it is in the process of creating an institutional design, which can accommodate the demands of the global political economy” (as cited in Grenade, 2006, p. 16). In other words, the new mobility based “structural diversification with competitive efficiency” (Girvan et al., 1994) has given rise to educational trans-regionalism that is driven by market regionalism, policy coordination and regulation, institutional harmonization, and eventually monetary union.

Educational trans-regionalism and its functional and cross-border integration processes are driven multi-level and multinational interaction of institutions and states at the regional level, which are governed within trans-regional spaces created as the boundaries nation states metaphorically recede. Therefore, educational developments within trans-regional spaces are organized as transitologies that are: (i) conditions of the world (labeling educational problems); (ii) discourse (semantic constructions of educational problems); (iii) projects (framing educational problems); (iv) scales (actors involved in educational problems); and (v) means of identifying the reach of particular actors (level of educational problems) (Robertson, 2012). Within the context of conceptualizing regional spaces, I have extrapolated the notion of trans-regionalism to explain what I see as the emergence of a regional education governance mechanism in the form of ‘educational trans-regionalism’ that is “exclusive rather than inclusive (in the sense that they involve a limited group of states and are based on closed membership)” (Dent, 2011, p. 25). Further, trans-regionalism has been the driving force behind the market-led production integration process: the coordination of the factors of production and production inputs. In other words, regional educational governance mechanisms reinvigorate the orthodox forms of governance that have become a common derivative of the move from government to governing. Therefore, the space

within which these new governance mechanisms operate gives rise to educational trans-regionalism: the data-driven transformation, commodification, and credentialization of employment services based on labor market information systems.

Educational trans-regionalism is different from “educational fundamentalism” – the severe upsurge in funding for education from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Jones, 1992; 2007) and “educational multilateralism” – the preeminence of ‘embedded liberalism’ as fundamental characteristics and mandated multilateralism institutions (Mundy, 1998; 1999; 2007) – in that it speaks to the rise of new governance mechanisms at the regional level. Whereas educational fundamentalism and educational multilateralism focused on the role of non-state actors – international organizations, donors agencies, hemispherical organizations, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, public private partnership programs, and international financial institutions as they continue to finance, regulate, and negotiate global and transnational educational policies and politics (Dale, 2003; Mundy, 2006, 2007; Robertson & Dale, 2006). Educational regionalism considers the coordination of resources at the regional level by supranational organizations, “trans-regional regimes” (Jules, 2012). In other words, educational trans-regionalism has manifested as exogenous and endogenous actors, which become interlinked with the regulation and coordination of education, thus creating a multi-level or “pluri-scalar governance of education” (Dale, 2005; Robertson & Dale, 2002). The notion of ‘governance’ has entered the field of Comparative and International Education as an explanation of the fluctuating “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). Therefore, 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 Organization) can be understood as a new functional, institutional and scalar division of the labor of education systems” (Robertson & Dale, 2006, p. 222). However, since the principle of proportionality – “...institutional arrangements devised for, Community action [that] shall not exceed what is necessary to achieve the Revised Treaty – ” (CARICOM, 2006, p. 5) is retained among members 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 inter-governmental networks (Council of Human and Social Development) and regional scales (Caribbean Vocation Qualification) that have become part of the coordination of the functional spaces that have arisen to stimulate the movement of labor within the Caribbean Single Market. This 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. Hence, governance in CARICOM, principally within the functional areas, has become adjoined with cooperation. In extrapolating external governance to the regional level, network governance is seen “as a process-oriented model of policymaking, 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). Hence, when implementation problems occur or policy paralysis happens, the concept of network governance could be a horizontal mode of partnership orientation.

Thus, educational trans-regionalism can be defined by a distinctive set of functional and cross-border integration processes that are multi-level and multinational interactions of institutions and states at the regional level. Educational trans-regionalism attends to the fact that states no longer are the sole curators that provide educational activities since functional processes (such as education, health, and transportation) are embedded within multiple links and interactions across state borders. Therefore, the regional level serves as a filter that captures the discursive patterns of international and national levels and then filters them through the regional Optique. This lens

allows us to see the prevailing discourses in national education systems as well as the divergent strategies deployed.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, K. A., & Bulmer, S. (1998). *The governance of the single European market*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Babarinde, O. (1998). A neo-functional examination of the African economic community: Lessons from the experience of the European Union. *African Development Review*, 10(2), 90-120. doi: 10.1111/14678268199800112
- Beach, D., & Pedersen, R. B. (2019). *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines*. University of Michigan Press.
- Beck, U. (2000). *What is globalization?* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- 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* (pp. 23-46). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Benn, D. (2012). Strategic positioning of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) in the changing global environment. In K. Hall & M. Chuck-A-Sang (Eds.), *Caribbean community: The struggle for survival* (pp. 20-35). Trafford Publishing: New York.
- Benn, D. (2013). The strategic positioning of the Caribbean Community in the changing global environment. In K. O. Hall & M. Chuck-A-Sang (Eds.), *Coping with the collapse of the old order: CARICOM* (pp.18-31). Bloomington, IN: Trafford Publishing.
- Bishop, M. L., Girvan, N., Shaw, T. M., Mike, S., Kirton, R. M., Soobie, M., Mohammed, D., & Anatol, M. (2011). *Caribbean regional integration*. Waterloo, ON: The Centre for International Governance Innovation.
- Bishop, M. L., & Payne, A. (2010). *Caribbean regional governance and the sovereignty/statehood problem*. Retrieved from http://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/Caribbean_Paper_8.pdf.
- Bomberg, E. (1998). Issue networks and the environment: Explaining European Union environmental policy. *Comparing Policy Networks*, 167-184.
- Brewster, H. (2003, October). *Mature regionalism and the Rose Hall Declaration on regional governance*. Paper presented at CARICOM 30th Anniversary Conference on regional governance and integrated development, University of the West Indies.
- CARICOM. (2006). *Report of the technical working group on the governance of the Caribbean community*. Republic of Trinidad and Tobago: CARICOM.
- Cowen, R. (2000). Comparing futures or comparing past? *Comparative Education*, 36(3): 333–42.
- Crossley, M., & Sprague, T. (2012). Learning from small states for post-2015 educational and international development. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 15(1), 26–40.
- Dale, R. (2003, September). *Globalisation and the rescaling of educational governance: A case of sociological Ectopia*. Paper presented at the International Studies Association Conference, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Dale, R. (2005). Globalisation, knowledge economy and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 41(2), 117-149. doi:10.1080/03050060500150906
- Deutsch, K. W., Burrell, S. A., Kann, R. A., Lee, M., Jr., Lichterman, M., Lindgren, R. E., Lowenheim, F. L., & Van Wagenen, R. W. (1957). *Political community and the North Atlantic area: International organization in the light of historical experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Fenwick, M., Uytsel, S., & Wrbka, S. (Eds.) (2014). *Networked governance, transnational business and the law*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

- Frieden, J. A. (1991). Invested interests: The politics of national economic policies in a world of global finance. *International Organization*, 45(4), 425-451. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.flagship.luc.edu/10.1017/S0020818300033178>
- Gamble, A., & Payne, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Regionalism and world order*. London, United Kingdom: Macmillan.
- Gerring, J. (2005). Causation: A unified framework for the social sciences. *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17 (2), 163– 98.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Girvan, N. (2001). Rally Round the West Indies. In K. O. Hall (Ed.), *Remarks at the launch of the Caribbean community: Beyond survival* (pp. 189-197). Kingston: Ian Randle Publications.
- Girvan, N. (2006). Production integration: A critical perspective. In K. Hall & D. Benn (Eds.), *Production integration in CARICOM: From theory to action* (pp. 8–29). Kingston: Ian Randle Publications. Retrieved from <http://www.normangirvan.info/wp-content/uploads/2007/09/production-integration-a-critical-perspective-jan-06.pdf>
- Girvan, N. (2012). Caribbean community: The elusive quest for economic integration. In K. Hall & M. Chuck-a-sang (Eds.), *Regional integration: Key to Caribbean survival and prosperity* (pp. 34–67). New York: Trafford Publishing. Retrieved from <http://www.normangirvan.info/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/girvan-cdb-final-apr252010.pdf>
- Girvan, N., Samuel, W., Boxill, I., & Whitehead, J. (1994). *Market, state, and Caribbean integration: Towards a new paradigm*. Georgetown: CARICOM. Retrieved from <http://www.normangirvan.info/wp-content/uploads/2007/09/market-state-and-caribbean-integration-1994.pdf>
- Grenade, W. (2006). Exploring the emerging CARICOM model: Any resemblance to the EU. *Jean Monnet/Robert Schuman Paper Series*, 6(9). Retrieved from http://www6.miami.edu/eucenter/Grenade_CARICOMEUMay06.pdf
- Haas, E. (1958). *The uniting of Europe: Political, social and economic forces, 1950-1957*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hanberger, A. (2003). Public policy and legitimacy: A historical policy analysis of the interplay of public policy and legitimacy. *Policy Sciences*, 36 (3), 257–78.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations*. London, United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Herrera, M. (2006). Open regionalism in the Andean countries: Existing and divergent treaty arrangements and approaches and it's consequences for the trade in financial services. (Centro Argentino de Estudios Internacionales Working Paper). Retrieved from <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/cisintegr/016.htm>
- Hettne, B., Inotai, A., & Sunkel, O. (Eds.). (2001). *Comparing regionalisms: Implications for global development*. London, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jules, T. D. (2008). "Re/thinking Harmonization in the Commonwealth Caribbean: Audiences, Actors, Interests, and Educational Policy Formation." Ed.D diss., New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- 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. (2013a). Ideological pluralism and revisionism in small (and micro) states: The erection of the Caribbean education policy space. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 11(2), 258–75.
- Jules, T. D. (2013b). Going trilingual: Post-revolutionary socialist education reform in Grenada. *The Round Table*, 102(5), 459–70.
-

- 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*, 12(4), 474-497. doi:10.1080/14767724.2013.861708
- Jules, T., & Barton, T. (2014). Educational governance activities and the rise of educational contagion in the Islamic Maghreb. The case of Tunisia. *InterDisciplines. Journal of History and Sociology*, 2, 1–29. <http://doi.org/DOI>: <http://doi.org/10.2390/indi-v5-i2-121>
- Keohane, R., & Nye, J. S. (1974). Trans governmental relations and international organizations. *World Polity*, 27. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2009925>
- Kooiman, J., Bavinck, M., Chuenpagdee, R., Mahon, R., & Pullin, R. (2008). Interactive governance and governability: An introduction. *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies*, 7(1). Retrieved from <http://dare.uva.nl/record/288400>
- Larsen, M. A. (2010). New thinking in comparative education: Honouring Robert Cowen. Rotterdam.
- Lavenex, S. (2004). EU external governance in ‘wider Europe.’ *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(4), 688-708. doi: 10.1080/1350176042000248098
- Lavenex, S. (2008). A governance perspective on the European neighbourhood policy: Integration beyond conditionality. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(6), 938-955. doi: 10.1080/13501760802196879
- Lavenex, S., & Wichmann, N. (2009). The external governance of EU internal security. *European Integration*, 31(1), 83-102. doi: 10.1080/07036330802503932
- Lindberg, L. N. (1963). *The political dynamics of European economic integration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mansfield, E., & Milner, H. (1999). The new wave of regionalism. *International Organization*, 53(3), 589-627. doi: <http://dx.doi.org.flagship.luc.edu/10.1162/002081899551002>
- Mahoney, J. & Rueschemeyer, D. (2003) Comparative historical analysis – Achievements and agendas. In Mahoney, J. & Rueschemeyer, D. (Eds.) *Comparative historical analysis in the Social Sciences*, (pp. 3–38). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Meek, J. W., & Thurmaier K. M. (Eds.) (2012). *Networked governance: The future of intergovernmental management*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Moravcsik, A. (1993). Preferences and power in the European community: A liberal intergovernmentalist approach. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, 473-524. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5965.1993.tb00477.x
- Moravcsik, A. (1998). *The choice for Europe: Social purpose and state power from Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mundy, K. (1998). Educational multilateralism and world (dis)order. *Comparative Education Review*, 42(4). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1188855>
- Mundy, K. (1999). Education multilateralism in a changing world order: UNESCO and the limits of the possible. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(1), 27-52. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(98\)00054-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(98)00054-6)
- Mundy, K. (2007). Global governance, educational change. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), 339–357. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03050060701556281>
- Mundy, K. (2006). The evolution of educational multilateralism from 1945 to 2005. In E. Fuchs, (Ed.), *Education international: Historical perspectives and current developments*, (pp. 181-199).
- Würz-Castle: Ergon, S. Niemann, A. & Schmitter, P. (2009). Neo-functionalism. In A. Wiener and T. Diez (Eds.), *Theories of European integration* (2nd ed.) (pp. 45-66). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Nye, J. S. (1965). Patterns and catalysts in regional integration. *International Organization*, 19(4). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2705647>
-

- Nye, J. S., Jr. (1971). *Peace in parts: Integration and conflict in regional organization*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Nye, J. S., Jr. (1988). Neorealism and neoliberalism. *World Politics*, 40(2), 235-251. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2010363>
- Nye, J. S., Jr. (2011). *The future of power*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.
- Odle, M. (2006). Production integration in the CSME: A business perspective. In D. Benn & K. O. Hall (Eds.), *Production integration in CARICOM: From theory to action* (pp. 30–55). Kingston: Ian Randle Publications.
- Peterson, J. (1995). Decision-making in the European Union: Towards a framework for analysis. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2(1), 69-93. doi: 10.1080/13501769508406975
- Pierre, J. (2000). Introduction: Understanding governance. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Debating governance. Authority, steering, and democracy* (pp. 1-10). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pierre, J. (2009). New governance, new democracy (Working Paper Series 4).
- Pierre, J., & Peters, G. P. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Pollard, D. D. (2012). Interrelationships between community and national competition rules. In K. Hall & M. Chuck-A-Sang, (Eds.), *Managing Mature Regionalism* (pp-75-94). Georgetown, Guyana: Trafford Publishing.
- Raustiala, K. (2002). The architecture of international cooperation: Trans-governmental networks and the future of international law. *Journal of International Law*, 43, 1-92. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.333381>
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44, 652-667.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ritter, D. P. (2014). Comparative Historical Analysis, In D. della Porta (Ed.). *Methodological practices in social movement research* (pp. 97-116). United Kingdom, Oxford University Press.
- Robertson, S., & Dale, R. (2002). Local states of emergency: The contradictions of neo-liberal governance in education in New Zealand. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(3), 463-482. doi:10.1080/0142569022000015472
- Robertson, S. & Dale, R. (2006). Changing geographies of power in education: The politics of rescaling and its contradictions. In D. Kassem, E. Mufti & J. Robinson (Eds.), *Education studies: Issues and critical perspectives* (pp. 221-232). Buckinghamshire, United Kingdom: Open University Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (2003). *Distant proximities: Dynamics beyond globalization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sandholtz, W., & Zysman, J. (1989). 1992: Recasting the European bargain. *World Politics*, 42(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2010572>
- Schmitter, P. C. (1969). Three neo-functional hypotheses about international integration. *International Organization*, 23(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2705772>
- Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. London, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schram, S. F. (1993). Postmodern policy analysis: Discourse and identity in welfare policy. *Policy Sciences*, 26, 249–70.
- Schriewer, J. (2002). Educación Comparada: Un gran programa ante nuevos desafíos. In Formación del discurso en la educación comparada, edited by J. Schriewer, 13–40. Barcelona.
- Slaughter, A. M. (2004). *A new world order: Government networks and the disaggregated state*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
-

- Springer, H. W. (1962). *Reflections on the failure of the first West Indian Federation*. (No 4). Cambridge, MA: Center for International Affairs.
- Stallings, B. (Ed). (1995). *Global change, regional response: The new international context of development*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 155, 17-28.
- Sweet, A. S., & Sandholtz, W. (1997). European integration and supranational governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 4(4), 297-314. doi: 10.1093/0198294646.001.0001
- Torfinn, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J. Sørensen, E. (2012). *Interactive governance: Advancing the paradigm*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Torgerson, D. (1996). Power and insight in policy discourse: Post-positivism and problem definition. In H. M. Dobuzinskis, & D. Laycock, (Eds.), *Policy Studies in Canada: The State of the Art* (pp. 266–98). Toronto.
- Vandyke, B. L. (2011). *Caribbean integration: Theoretical challenges* (Master's Thesis). The University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica. Retrieved from <http://uwispace.sta.uwi.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2139/15831/BarbaraVandyke.pdf?sequence=1>
- Verger, A., & Hermo, J. P. (2010). The governance of higher education regionalisation: Comparative analysis of the Bologna Process and MERCOSUR-Educativo. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 8(1), 105-120. doi:10.1080/14767720903574116
- Wheare, K. C. (1940). *What federal government is?* Retrieved from <http://www.federalunion.org.uk/archives/wheare.shtml>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Tavis D. Jules

Tavis D. Jules is Associate Professor of Cultural and Educational Policy Studies at Loyola University Chicago, specifically focusing on Comparative and International Education and International Higher Education. His vast professional and academic experiences have led to research and publications across the Caribbean and North Africa. He is President of the Caribbean Studies Association, Book and Media Review Editor for the Comparative Education Review and an International Institute of Islamic Thought Fellow. His most recent books include: *The Educational Intelligent Economy: Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and the Internet of Things in Education* (with Florin D. Salajan, Emerald 2019); *Educational Transitions in Post-Revolutionary Spaces: Islam, Security and Social Movements in Tunisia* (with Teresa Barton, Bloomsbury 2018); *Re-Reading Education Policy and Practice in Small States: Issues of Size and Scale in the Emerging Intelligent Society and Economy* (with Patrick Ressler, Peter Lang 2017); and *The New Global Educational Policy Environment in the Fourth Industrial Revolution: Gated, Regulated and Governed* (Emerald 2016).