

**Paper for the *Educators and Planners: Symphony or Discord* Conference  
AAIR Conference 1 – 3 December 1999**

**POWER/KNOWLEDGE CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE IN EDUCATION  
OR *POLITICS IN EDUCATION***

**Patricia FRENCH,  
Academic Manager  
The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand**

**ABSTRACT**

This paper seeks to raise the awareness of educators to the principles underpinning the competitive education environment in order to provide tools to debate improvements or alternatives. Using a historical methodology this paper identifies the framework for the reforms and as a result identifies why it sometimes seems impossible to argue against the logic of them. Stepping outside the square and challenging the underpinning ideology is the way to be able to do so. The paper also considers specific policy developments such as quality assurance and considers the impact of these issues on educators and on concepts such as collegiality and professionalism. Raising awareness and reminding educators of the underpinning ideologies driving the competitive model in tertiary education is important as living with the current system without question can result in an osmotic enculturation of its principles. A result not necessarily in the best interests of education.

## **POWER/KNOWLEDGE CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE IN EDUCATION OR POLITICS IN EDUCATION**

In a time when the principles of deregulation and minimal intervention are the professed position of the government, it may seem contradictory to talk about politics and education in terms of power and control. This paper suggests however, that politics is more than ever in control of education, and that all the change of the past ten years has resulted merely in a remodelling of that power and control, not the removal of it.

We are all aware that the past ten years have seen a radical change to the New Zealand education sector as part of the public sector reforms. This paper gives an overview of those public sector changes and the way they have influenced and controlled tertiary education in particular. I use the concepts of power/knowledge, control and surveillance as proposed by Michel Foucault to critique these developments and consider the associated dominant discourse. Foucault considered power/knowledge to be a device for studying the social and scientific practices that underlie and condition the formation of beliefs within society, and, he considered control and surveillance concepts to be linked to the exercise of power/knowledge through three main techniques: observation, examination and judgement. In this paper I suggest these techniques are exemplified through quality assurance mechanisms.

### **THE BASIS FOR REFORM**

According to Whitwell (1990), the 1980s saw the triumph of economic rationalism, which meant efficiency become a sacred goal with increased competition and the unlocking of market forces the key means to obtaining it. The market based ideology provided, and continues to provide, the environment for the restructuring of the public sector which largely arose out of the Treasury briefing paper presented to the incoming 1987 Labour government. This Treasury paper, *Government Management*, proposed a fundamental review of the way the public service (including the education service) operated and a review of the premises upon which government made decisions. This publication suggested that:

People do not have rights like they have noses. Rights are relative, they are grounded on the need for mutual observance and accommodation. Rights are things we give to each other. Given the essential role of the state as enforcer of rights and the inability to establish any natural rights, it is clear that rights definitions are a matter of public choice and ultimately of politics (pp.25-26).

This publication raised the possibility of changing the belief that New Zealanders had a right of lifelong access to a publicly funded education, health and social security system: that this right was, in fact, a political choice that would not necessarily continue to receive political support. It also raised the prospect of change to the structures and policies that had been associated with supporting that right. Once promulgated, these changes were undertaken with much the same speed as previous reforms in the economic arena. Speed was seen as an essential tool to achieve the desired outcomes. Its importance to the reforms is captured in the following advice given to an Australian Education Council Conference by Roger Douglas in 1990<sup>1</sup>.

Implement reform by quantum leaps. Moving step by step lets vested interests mobilise. Big packages neutralise them. Speed is essential. It is impossible to move too fast. Delay will drag you down before you can achieve your success. Once you start the momentum rolling never let it stop. Set your own goals and deadlines. Within that framework consult in the community to improve detailed implementation (quoted in Neyland, 1998, p.64).

Thus we saw a rapid and fundamental review of what had been the generally accepted basis of the education, health and social security system. Schick (1996) in reviewing the reforms suggested *Government Management* drew on ideas from the frontiers of economics, including Public Choice Theory and Agency Theory to which was added an emphasis on outputs. In addition the literature on management contributed the managerial doctrine of giving freedom to the managers to manage, which was adopted in the reforms and became known as New Public Management (NPM).

Overall state sector reform laid out in *Government Management* was based on these three conceptions of the truth and according to Boston, Martin, Pallot, Walsh (1991), suggested the following:

- the separation of policy, service and regulatory functions within government departments in order to overcome what Treasury saw as policy capture by service providers;
- the remodelling of the public sector more on the private sector;
- the surrender of public sector activities in areas which were already been undertaken by the private sector;
- the application of private sector principles of management to the public sector;
- the operation of market forces (competition) within the public sector as these market forces were seen to discipline decision makers in the private sector and ensure better management practices.

Easton (1997) suggests that at that stage Treasury was operating from first principles. This meant that, rather than checking its conclusions against the collective memory of senior officials and files, Treasury checked them against an analytical framework based on economics. This analytical approach to policy making involved a major difference from previous precedent-set bureaucratic processes in that it squeezed out debate and dissent. Even questions about whether the implementation of policy had been successful needed to overcome the convenient distancing of policy from operations. This distancing meant that the operational failure of concepts or ideology could be explained by environmental constraints, lack of efficiency or lack of commitment to the identified policy goals. This left the principles sounding rational and defensible and kept them inviolate from arguments supporting other ideas such as those based on experience or other economic models. Easton (1997) suggests the methodology adopted by Treasury was one almost invulnerable to challenge by empirical evidence because auxiliary hypotheses were added to the core theory to protect it from any anomalies or inconsistencies. The result was an approach that was an extreme version of economics which also needed to be narrow in order to achieve consistency of policy decisions.

This new model of control was structured to be compatible with the economic and political dominant discourse. Foucault (1977) suggested that the exercise of power can occur via two main forms of control which operate simultaneously. According to Foucault:

Power isn't localised in the State apparatus and nothing in society will be changed if the mechanisms of power that function outside, below and alongside the State apparatuses are not changed (quoted in Gordon, 1980, p.60).

Foucault studied the way that the power/knowledge of experts could be captured in a discipline and shape individuals and their activities and how both the law and disciplines work to create a situation which is gradually accepted as the 'norm':

...these discourses, to which the disciplines give rise invade the area of right so that the procedures of normalisation come to be ever more constantly engaged in the colonisation of those of law. I believe that all this can explain the global functioning of what I would call a society of normalisation (quoted in Gordon, 1980, p.106).

Foucault wrote this in relation to the human sciences and in particular referred to medicine as the discipline of normalisation. But times change and previous hegemonic groups have been displaced by others. For the purposes of this paper, if Foucault's ideas are applied to the discipline of economics, and normalisation is interpreted as the creation of behaviour patterns consistent with required principles, then the statement can be seen to apply readily to the restructuring of the New Zealand public sector. Within this restructuring, sovereignty or 'laws' were created to facilitate a mode of operation or behaviours consistent with the discipline's discourse. As a result we found the discourse becoming entrenched via changes in legislation, and the commitment to new policies consistent with a market-driven model of the economy entered the operations of the public sector. As previously indicated, it is generally agreed these policies, articulated in *Government Management*, were founded on the combination of Public Choice Theory, Agency Theory and New Public Management.<sup>2</sup>

### **THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY, AGENCY THEORY, NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

Public Choice Theory is based on the assumption that all human behaviour is dominated by self interest. This assumption gives rise to distrust of politicians, bureaucrats and the political process and leads to limitations being placed on the role of the state and a reduction in discretionary power of political decision makers. It also leads to the belief that powerful interest groups capture a disproportionate share of influence and income and, as a consequence, individual liberty is undermined and economic growth disrupted. As a result, according to Easton, (1997), Boston et al (1991), recommendations from public choice theorists are right wing and aim to minimise the role of the state and limit discretionary power of politicians, reduce public monopolies, curb the functions of government agencies and increase individual liberty. The government's role is reduced as a consequence to one that allows the free market system to operate efficiently.

The government introduced the Education Amendment Act 1990 and the Industry Training Act 1992 to allow the free market system to operate in education and ironically created controls and accountabilities that were previously captured in professional expectations and associated actions but which have now been formally imposed on educators and education. Public Choice Theory underpinned the Education Department's restructuring into a Ministry. This resulted in some of the functions of the old Education Department being relocated in agencies, while others ceased, e.g., gathering statistical data and manpower planning. Still others were uncoupled such as regulatory, evaluation and advisory functions. This was thought to avoid capture by service providers. Policy advice was also obtained from outside the Ministry in the spirit of contestability. Public Choice Theory was also the basis for restructuring the tertiary education sector into more autonomous operating units and for the appointment of Chief Executives rather than Principals or Vice-Chancellors, thus using language to divorce academia from the management role.

Agency Theory rests on the notion that social and political life is a series of contracts (or agreed relationships) where one party is the principal and the other the agent. The agent performs tasks on behalf of the principal for an agreed reward. Agency Theory also rests on the premise that individuals are self-interested and opportunistic, and that the relationship between a principal and an agent is one of equals, in which either party may seek to implement the bargain in ways that disadvantage the other. *Government Management* was particularly concerned about the capture of policy making apparatus by service providers. Agency Theory is also linked to an emphasis on outcomes. Outcomes are specified as performance criteria, inserted into contracts and measured in service and performance agreements. In consequence, Agency Theory probably underpinned the separation of funding from provision of services, so the Ministry of Education funds or Skill New Zealand is used as a funding agency, and delivery was controlled by the providers. This is thought to reduce the likelihood of control of funding by vested interests. Agency Theory also accounted for competitive tendering for services with industry training

organisations (ITOs), and finally for the encouragement of private training organisations, in other words, privatisation. This is consistent with the tenet that where public sector activities are done in the private sector then the public sector should surrender such activities. Agency Theory is the basis for contracts with students and contracts with Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ), contracts with the Ministry of Education, contracts with ITOs and, perhaps the area that impacts most directly on educators, employment contracts between education professionals and their employing institution.

The other area of great influence came from the literature on management. New Public Management (NPM), is essentially about how to remove controls on public sector employment relations so as to let the managers manage. According to Shick (1996) it entails some centralised control and top-down implementation. It includes increasing the discretion of managers to recruit, retain, train and motivate staff in order to achieve their organisation's objectives. It stresses responsiveness to customers. The rationale for this is that it is impossible in principle and in practice to specify all future contingencies in a contract and that, therefore, the executives must necessarily be given powers in order that they can fulfil the performance required in their relational contract. New public management concepts were integrated into the new structure after the Education Amendment Act 1990 and resulted in greater autonomy for Chief Executives, changes to the accountability mechanisms and performance based salary packages. A formal review of the changes in the state sector including the education area revealed a perception that "75 percent of the benefits had arisen through the application of NPM" (Shick, 1996, p.23).

However a striking aspect of the reforms has been the connections made between Agency Theory, measurement of outcomes and New Public Management. Managerial reform is dependent on the behaviour of managers. To overcome opportunistic behaviour on the part of the managers, Agency Theory and measurement of outcomes ensured that muscle was added to the accountability arrangements. This muscle included requirements for the explicit specification of outputs, a clear chain of accountability and measurable outcomes. It has been these particular connections which has made it possible to operationalise the reforms completely throughout the public system. As a result a whole series of political and economic changes have transformed our organisations.

This transformation began with the shift from professional collegial control to governance by NPM apostles. This has been accompanied by a change in terminology. Principals of polytechnics were renamed Chief Executives, and at least one Vice-Chancellors has recently sought to be also referred to in this way (Michael Irving at Victoria University of Wellington). Management continues to be presented as an objective technically neutral mechanism dedicated only to greater efficiency. Managers continue to operate within the framework of Agency Theory, which assumes that all workers have vested interests and are opportunistic. The idea of public servant goodwill and a desire to do a good job for people, the notion of an holistic education and professional ethics as an underpinning assurance of quality, were displaced by the framework of Agency Theory. Educators have found themselves as a party within the Agency Theory process, controlled by the techniques of management and market competition. Educators are currently tightly controlled by the processes of efficiency, cost effectiveness and accountability.

Agency Theory and Public Choice Theory which underpin market competition have been accompanied by the need for externally visible accountability. This has been apparent via the surveillance, examination and judgement inherent in both the document approval and auditing processes associated with the cumbersome external approval requirements that have accompanied the industry of quality assurance. External monitoring and reporting, while ostensibly making quality visible, imply that the preexisting professional standards and practices were insufficient. The creation of the external standards measured by performance criteria based on the economic model have swept through education.

The major players in quality assurance for polytechnics has been New Zealand Polytechnics Programmes Committee (NZPPC) and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). NZQA was created as a

result of the passage of the Education Amendment Act 1990.<sup>3</sup> NZQA was given wide and encompassing powers in relation to approval of programmes, courses and accreditation of institutions (some of these powers were subsequently devolved to NZPPC).

The power/knowledge base for the development of NZQA was consistent with the dominant discourse of reducing interest group capture, improving accountability to the consumer and incorporating Agency Theory into the newly competitive education environment. One way this occurred was by opening up to input from wider membership the approval panels for programmes. NZQA also, of course, developed the National Qualifications Framework, based on unit standards which measures competencies. This national framework and the Industry Training Act 1992 have empowered industry to determine for education a much more task focused, learning outcome based framework with detailed performance criteria. It has, in effect, wrested the building blocks of curricula away from the teaching institutions and academics, who are now required to deliver unit standards based education if they wish to offer a 'national' qualification. In this regard the Education and Industry Training Acts may be interpreted as reducing academic interest group capture and objectifying the knowledge required to a national level. By improving consumer accountability via industry training organisations and by creating competition among providers the concepts of Agency Theory have been integrated into the Acts. The White Paper, *Tertiary Education in New Zealand: Policy Directions for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century 1999*, continues to promote a tertiary education system consistent with the principles espoused in *Government Management*.

A Foucauldian perspective would suggest that the changes which have occurred are dressed up and purported to be in the consumer interest but actually have been made because they are consistent with an ideological position. In reality the only control consumer have, is what course they undertake and in which institution they enrol. This has not changed as a result of the reforms. What has changed is market competition that determines which courses are available and how much they will cost. In relation to consumer choice, I have observed during my employment with the Open Polytechnic of New Zealand, that the impact of market forces means courses which do not attract sufficient enrolments to make a profit are often not offered and this area of knowledge is no longer part of the educational options available. Perhaps in the future market forces will see even less access choice for students as institutions close. It is possible that the dominant discourse is controlling knowledge covertly by creating an environment where ultimately only courses which can make a profit are available.

Another area of change is the emphasis on outcomes-driven education which determine what courses will contain. The emphasis on learning outcomes is expected to be further cemented by the recent White Paper, *The National Qualifications Framework of the Future 1999* which requires that: "all qualifications on the NQF will be described in terms of their learning outcomes, level and credit values and detailed field" (Ministry of Education 1999, p.21). Hopefully the detailed performance criteria for learning outcomes lower down the framework will not be expected at level eight as this would be antithetical to the pursuit of truth.

## **THE IMPACT ON EDUCATORS**

The costs for educators in achieving greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, at least those who have survived in the new market model, include intensification of tasks, loss of autonomy, closer monitoring and appraisal, non participation in decision making and lack of personal promotion through recognition of teaching skills. Movement into management is often the only way of attaining promotion and the prerequisite for such promotion (and certainly the basis for staff being overtly valued) is their ability to cope with change, willingness to adapt to new goals, take on the competitive orientation of the marketplace rather than for their subject knowledge or teaching expertise.

As effectiveness measures become geared to such values, human beings are steered into compliant

patterns of behaviour. Staff who have opposed or resisted the reforms, or the methods of efficiency have probably been treated with the discourse of derision. The problems are seen to be in the person rather than the system and collective interests apart from those of the system are deconstructed. Typically such individuals are referred to as inflexible or dead wood, or dinosaurs, implying they are living with outdated ideas that can no longer be sustained, and the collective voice of a union is labelled as holding vested interests in the old system. The language of survival is not the language of education: it is management speak. The rhetoric from politicians and business leaders has been aimed at painting the education profession as self-serving, incompetent and misdirected and placing the previous system under the suspicion of being inefficient, ineffective and lacking standards. This discourse of derision enjoys its success by first defining the problem, and then presenting a solution of competition and visible accountability. The doubt over standards is played upon right through education. For example, we have been told that despite national resistance to the concept, the government is proceeding with a pilot national system of assessment at the primary school level on the premise that the government needs more evidence of schools' effectiveness (again effectiveness measured against very narrow assessment terms).

So as a result we have professional educators measured against outputs such as research and sometimes outcomes such as number of course completions, by their managers who are in turn measured against their outputs such as business objectives and sometimes outcomes such as specific targets. Effectiveness and accountability are defined in terms of the possibilities of measurement. The norm is established, the norm is given a value. It then becomes a constraint of conformity that must be achieved. Unfortunately, although we presumably value everything we measure, not everything we value can be measured by criteria based on an economic model. Sometimes it is possible to recognise a standard but not define it precisely because the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

Two other lynchpins of current management practice are short term contracts (up to two years wherein uncertainty or instability of employment becomes seen as the norm), and a preference for loose networks which are more open to reinvention than pyramidal hierarchies. While pyramidal hierarchies can stultify, they also offer a myriad of informal networks built over long periods which affect productivity, morale and the general climate in an organisation. How many restructures, re-engineering and downsizings has your organisation been through? How many new team networks have you worked within over the last ten years? These all create a climate of no long term focus which disorients and loosens bonds of trust and commitment. Sennett (1998) suggests this emphasis on flexibility, no long term focus and lack of commitment to individuals and careers reduces the meaningfulness of working lives. As we become interchangeable resources our sense of being needed is removed, our individual contribution less recognised and so satisfaction is reduced. The so called resolution of the recent Ansett pilots strike is a case in point.

In this climate of efficiency and effectiveness there is also much reduced collegiality. In the past there was an opportunity to discuss with colleagues across institutions the research and discipline developments that could benefit education. Nowadays it is a competitive environment and ideas are seen not only as intellectual property but increasingly property only to be shared via contract. The language of competition has become normalised and has infused itself so deeply into the psyche that requests for assistance are viewed in terms of 'Will this affect our competitive advantage?' 'What is in it for us?' Requests for joint ventures are viewed primarily as revenue opportunities and assessed against risks to accreditation, rather than opportunities to share knowledge, teaching and learning strategies or to improve the overall knowledge base of a qualification. The outcome is certainly not better development of knowledge. The pursuit of truth, which should be a concern of educators, is constrained.

## **THE LANGUAGE OF CONTROL**

According to Foucault (1980) the dominant discourse is

an approach and viewpoint consisting of a particular conception of truth about the condition of the world which happens to prevail over competing versions because of the peculiarities of time, space and social conditions that provide the rules and specify truth and the economic and political role it plays (quoted in Knight, Smith, Sachs 1990, p.133).

The dominant discourse embodying the principles previously identified has played, and is playing, a key role in educational changes. Foucault suggests that the effect of dominant discourses is to disempower other discursive practices that might equally explain or be used to structure operations should they reach transcendence. So it is important to hear what, identify how and consider why something is said or left unsaid. According to Knight, et al (1990), discourses use scientific methodologies and social science theory in order to create a reality that is rational, objective, seamless and taps into the sensibilities of national popular consciousness. A Foucauldian perspective suggests the official state policies need to be viewed with this in mind as such policies attempt to represent the world in factual terms so that certain kinds of practices appear to flow naturally from them.

According to Grace (1991) exposure to this discourse results in a subtle manipulation of perceptions.

An ideological position makes constant use of a particular form of language which it attempts to naturalise in a common sense way. If that language is accepted, taken up and used without question an important part of that ideological position is already assimilated. The language of inputs, outputs and production functions in education is being introduced to us as an analytically more robust way of thinking about education (pp.265-275).

As educators we need to ask ourselves how readily we accept terms like providing educational products and services, customer focus, consumer, human resources, user pays, outputs, outcomes, efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. While there is nothing intrinsically wrong with these words, a problem exists when they are seen as the preferred, best or only way to describe the situation: in other words when the process of normalisation occurs. Then the words take on the meanings of the discourse. This is consistent with the suggestion from Kenway (1990), that the very organisation of the discourse can be an exercise of power, controlling and restraining what can be said as well as the right to speak. Foucault asserts that the statements and claims of a discourse pronounced as 'truth' are constructed through the interplay of power and knowledge by systems of administration and classification which fix people within their gaze (surveillance). According to Papps (1995), discourses involve the subjugation of some truths to others and in this process individuals are defined according to the needs of the dominant regime. These words and concepts are generic management terms, they objectify the topics discussed and their constant use and acceptance by educators removes control about the way key areas of work are expressed. In this way, education is subjugated to another discourse. We are in danger of losing control over the very language which describes the culture of education. We see business plans full of words like products and services. Personnel are now described as human 'resources' implying they are an item to be used, moved and replaced, a little like a white board. There seems to be a diminishing of importance on the process of education involving teaching and learning in favour of emphasis on assessment, so that lecturers become more like technicians. Discourses constrain the possibilities of thought and order and combine words in particular ways excluding or displacing other combinations. We need to be aware of the connection between speaking the language of that dominant discourse and the implicit acceptance of the power and control of that discourse.

The first step in assisting educators to evaluate such control mechanisms is to ensure those involved have access to the information and are aware of who exercises power and control and who speaks the language of power and control, and thus who demonstrates acceptance of the discourse. This can range from

themselves, and their managers to those accorded expert status, e.g. management consultants. Shumway (1989) suggests that experts

all command our attention and respect and thus have power over us because they claim some kind of exclusive expertise. We listen and are likely to accept their advice on the grounds of specialised expertise. But in each case a form of disciplinary power is being exercised over us that we cannot resist unless we recognise that it is power and not truth that is spoken in each case (p.162).

Educators need to be aware of the constraints which accompany the dominant discourse and how these constraints are operating on themselves and their environment and how they are impacting on education. Educators also need to know how to resist the impact of the dominant discourse and what responses to expect when promoting alternative views. Hoy (1986) suggests that change in Foucauldian terms can only come about by individual actions:

For Foucault neither comprehending the work nor changing it depends on grasping the concept of totality. Rather his microphysics of power depend on comprehending power by first studying the everyday practices where individuals continually experience micropowers and the particular confrontations with and resistances to impositions of power. Change does not occur by transforming the whole at once but only by resisting injustices at the particular points where they manifest themselves.... The battle can only be won by the continued efforts of the individual combatants (pp142-143).

## **CONCLUSION**

The moves toward so called deregulation and minimal intervention have not flowed down to individual educators for whom there has been a change to the model of control, perhaps even more evident control, but certainly not a reduction of control. Rather than set educators free, the alternative structures which accompanied the power/knowledge basis of the education reforms have increased the experience of surveillance and control for educators. The language employed has begun its insidious tapping into not only the national consciousness but the understanding of educators. As educators we need to ensure we take back control of the language of education by exerting the power/knowledge of the discipline of education. In this way we can begin the process of reversing the control and restraint over education practice and over what can be said as well as the right to speak about and within education.

The review of the Education Act, the creation of NZQA and the principles in the white papers fit within state sector reform and are all in keeping with Public Choice Theory, Agency Theory and New Public Management. In essence this means they have common threads of apparently improving individual consumer welfare and choice and consequently involving less state intervention and more market responsiveness. Educators need to be aware of the basis for power/knowledge that is being exercised over education. This will enable us to achieve better control of the language used to describe and control the culture of education. It may also keep alive the real goal of education, that is, the pursuit of truth.

## REFERENCES

Boston J, Martin J., Pallot J, Walsh P. (eds) (1991) *Reshaping the State New Zealand's Bureaucratic Revolution*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Easton B, (1997) *The Commercialisation of New Zealand*. Auckland, University Press.

Foucault M. (1975) *Discipline and Punish* Editions Gallimard Transl by A.M. Sheridan, (1977) New York: Pantheon Books.

Grace G. (1991), *The New Right and the Challenge to Educational Research* Cambridge Journal of Education 21(3) : 265-275.

Gordon C,(ed) (1980) *Michel Foucault. Power Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* transl. Gordon C., Marshal L. Mepham J. Soper K. Sussex, The Harvester Press.

Hoy D.C, (1986) *Foucault A Critical Reader*: Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Kenway J, (1990) *Education and the Right's discursive politics: private versus state schooling*. In Stephen Ball (ed) *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*. London, Routledge:167-206.

Knight J, Smith R & Sachs J, (1990) *Deconstructing Hegemony: multicultural policy and a populist response* in Stephen Ball (ed), *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and knowledge*. London, Routledge:133-152

Ministry of Education (1998) *Tertiary Education in New Zealand: Policy Directions for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education (1999) *The National Qualifications Framework of the Future* Wellington, Ministry of Education.

Neyland J. *Outcomes Based Mathematics Education* in Nerida Ellerton (ed) (1998) *Issues in Mathematics Education; A contemporary perspective*. Perth, Mastec Edith Cowan University.

Papps E, (1995) *The Passivity of Nursing: Deconstructing the Docile Body*. Paper presented at The Social Force of Nursing and Midwifery. Wellington 22-23 May.

Sennett R, (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York, W.W. Norton & Co.

Shick A, (1996) *The Spirit of Reform: Managing the New Zealand State Sector in a Time of Change*. A Report prepared for the State Services Commission and the Treasury New Zealand: State Services Commission. August. Wellington, State Services Commission.

Shumway D, (1989) *Michel Foucault*. Boston, Twayne Publishers.

The Treasury, (1987) *Government Management :a briefing paper to incoming Labour government*. Wellington: The Treasury.

Whitwell G, (1990) *The triumph of economic rationalism :The Treasury and the Market Economy*. Australian Journal of Public Administration 49(2) :124-143.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Roger Douglas was the Minister of Finance when the New Zealand Labour Government introduced the New Right economic reforms in the mid 1980's. Roger Douglas was seen as the architect of these reforms, the operation of which were subsequently referred to as Rogernomics.

<sup>2</sup> This point is covered by a variety of sources including Whitwell, 1990; Easton, 1997; Shick, 1996., Jonathon Boston, John Martin, June Pallot, Pat Walsh, *Reshaping the State New Zealand's Bureaucratic Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

<sup>3</sup> NZQA was known as the National Education Qualifications Authority prior to this Amendment to the Education Act.