UNIVERSITÉ DU LUXEMBOURG

PhD-FLSHASE-2017-19

The Faculty of Language and Literature, Humanities, Arts and Education

DISSERTATION

Defence held on 21/06/2017 in Luxembourg

to obtain the degree of

DOCTEUR DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DU LUXEMBOURG

EN SCIENCES DE L'ÉDUCATION

Stephen Rizzo

Born on 9 March 1979 in Pietà, (Malta)

The politics of knowledge that govern the European Union lifelong learning policy space – A Foucauldian reading

Dissertation defence committee

Dr Karin Priem, dissertation supervisor

Professor, Université du Luxembourg

Dr Thomas S. Popkewitz

Professor, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Dr Robert Harmsen, Chairman

Professor, Université du Luxembourg

Dr Daniel Tröhler

Professor, Universität Wien

Dr Thomas Lenz, Vice Chairman

Research Associate, Université du Luxembourg

The politics of knowledge that govern the European Union lifelong learning policy space – A Foucauldian reading

Supervisors: Prof. Dr Thomas S. Popkewitz, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Prof. Dr Daniel Tröhler, Universität Wien, Prof. Dr Karin Priem, Université du Luxembourg

Doctoral School in Educational Sciences at the Faculty of Language and Literature, Humanities, Arts and Education at the Université du Luxembourg

(1130025720)

Declaration

This thesis is my own original work. It has not been submitted at another university. Some of the arguments contained in it may have appeared in previously published work and are referenced throughout.

The author has no conflicts of interest with respect to the research and authorship of this thesis.

Abbreviations

CEDEFOP	Centre européen pour le développement de la formation professionnelle (in French) / European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
DG-EAC	Directorate-General for Education and Culture
ECB	European Central Bank
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
EEC	European Economic Community
EES	European Employment Strategy
EMU	European Monetary Union
EQF	European Qualifications Framework
ESF	European Social Fund
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
ICTs	Information and Communication Technologies
IE	Institute for Education
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LLP	Lifelong Learning Programme
OMC	Open Method of Coordination
VET	Vocational education and training
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Abstract

This contemporary historical research calls into question the mentalities that construct the EU lifelong learning policy space in specific ways. By drawing on the Foucauldian concepts of governmentality and genealogy, this thesis analyses selected main EU lifelong learning policy literature by focusing on how this space has been articulated in governable forms. In line with a Foucauldian interpretation of power, the EU as a subject is decentred and considered as an epistemological form of assumption so that power and knowledge are analysed according to how they operate in this space. The governmentalist approach explores the technologies of the self and the technologies of government that construct and govern the conduct of conduct of the subject through the recurrent narratives in this space. In combination with this approach, the genealogical analysis of the episteme lifelong learning traces the different terminological interpretations which have been systematically reconfigured throughout the years to attain new connotations. These different connotations are problematised not only because the distinctiveness of the definition influenced the trajectory lifelong learning took throughout the years, but also because lifelong learning can, at one and the same time, control or liberate people. The distinctive contribution to academic literature that this thesis achieves is that it problematises the unquestionable truths that construct the EU lifelong learning policy space from a non-normative point of view. The overriding idea is for the actors in this space to make visible the taken-for granted principles and to create the possibility to challenge prevailing power relations and challenge what is uncritically taken as natural.

Keywords: lifelong learning, lifelong education, adult education, European Union, Foucault, politics of knowledge, policy construction, policy space.

Contents

Preface and acknowledgements

Lifelong learning crosses broad social, geographical and political arenas and has been a priority on the political agenda for the past twenty-five years. It is evoked as a modern panacea, with political discourse repeatedly highlighting multifarious potential benefits in socioeconomic spheres. Yet, similar to what is art, what constitutes a peaceful religion or what is democracy, what is lifelong learning and how should it be promoted is obviously a contested concept.

In Europe, numerous lifelong learning policies reiterate that we are living in a knowledgeable era, with knowledge-based economies and in knowledge societies. They repeatedly claim that knowledge has never been as accessible and as relevant as it is today, and many take this educational space for granted even though the quest for more knowledge is often used as a pretext to legitimise more lifelong learning policy reforms. In the light of this, this contemporary historical analysis of the EU lifelong learning policy space employs a Foucauldian framework to explore the construction of this space, since the normative lifelong learning narratives that run through it underscore the necessity for a critical exploration. If the actors in this space are to act as pedagogical facilitators, it is important to know more on the forces that shape their educational choices, how educational needs are constituted, whose interests do they serve, and in what ways they emerge in the context of their lives. Having a broader understanding of how this space is constructed as an element in the exercise of relations of power is necessary if one is to understand how taken-for-granted norms and truth claims are constructed and reconstructed. This is why it is important to understand how this lifelong learning policy space is constructed and what drives it from a non-normative point of view.

This research has brought forward new ideas which have challenged my professional values. Working on it has been a priceless learning experience, and although the messy Foucauldian nature of the research was very challenging, it was greatly rewarding once the pieces started joining together. As expected, during the years there were many unexpected twists and turns, and had it not been for the guidance of my supervisors I would have lost my way. Firstly, I would like to thank Prof. Dr Thomas S. Popkewitz and Prof. Dr Daniel Tröhler for posing challenging questions that made me think in new directions and for never imposing their own answers to these questions. I thank

them for their close reading of my texts, their valuable feedback and encouragement to dig deeper, and for the opportunity I was given to visit the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in spring of 2015 where I participated in seminars related to the theoretical approaches of this research.

I would also like to thank Dr Thomas Lenz from the Université du Luxembourg and Dr Daniel Friedrich from Teachers College at Columbia University for their insightful comments on some of my chapters. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr Karin Priem for taking over the supervisory duties during the last months of this study. Finally, I would also like to thank my colleagues at the interdisciplinary Doctoral School in Educational Sciences. Although researching and writing a thesis is mostly a lonesome journey, this seminar group provided a valuable academic learning experience because it offered a space for an exchange of ideas on historical, sociological and educational theories and methods. The professional educational environment at the Doctoral School, and the bi-weekly colloquiums also helped me to formulate challenging questions in order to analyse the construction of this space.

Stephen Rizzo

Université du Luxembourg

June 2017

1. Lifelong learning and the EU

The phrase lifelong learning is frequently articulated by ideologies from across the political spectrum, as if guaranteeing a lifelong learning space is a matter of ethical or philosophical commitment, an appeal that safeguards freedom, equality and progress. Perhaps it is. But the lifelong learning space as it has come to operate in Europe is not a free and open space where individuals opt to reach their goals according to how they deem fit (Milana, 2012). Rather, it is increasingly becoming the centre of international debates featuring different interests that are initiated and shaped through a multifaceted space of meaning, encompassing a range of governing tools to which actors[1] are drawn (Fejes & Nicoll, 2012; Walters & Haar, 2005). This study is interested in how the European Union (EU) lifelong learning policy space[2] is being constructed to be governed through the narratives[3] that inscribe it in specific ways and the technologies of the self[4] and the technologies of government[5] that govern it.

[1] Actors refers to those that are involved in this space, whether they are individuals, practitioners, policy makers or MS.
[2] Policy space refers to the multifaceted medium where policies are discussed, formed and enacted.
[3] Narratives structure the way subjects ascribe themselves to thoughts which are often linked to what is promoted as good or bad (Nicoll, 2006).
[4] In governmentality literature, technologies of the self are mentalities by which subjects constitute themselves through systems of power (Rose et al., 2006; Foucault, 2000) and come to accept, value and aspire to achieve congruence between their objectives and the objectives external to themselves (Foucault, 1988).
[5] In governmentality literature, technologies of government are mentalities in distant sites that generate and transmit knowledge from receding enclaves that link to the calculations at the centre of government (Miller & Rose, 2008).

This first chapter is divided in three. This first part starts by highlighting the EU's interpretation of lifelong learning which is leading the implementation of policies in Europe. The EU's inherent problem of normativity is explained, followed by the presentation of the research problem and its sub-questions. The second part delineates the theoretical (governmentality) and analytical (genealogy) frameworks. Governmentality relates to the different mentalities[6] of how governing constructs narratives, whereas genealogy refers to a specific way of viewing history, tracing the different historical modalities in the way models of power have functioned at different periods (Brookfield, 2001; Rose et al., 2006). A governmentality perspective on how the researcher is thinking about the problem is outlined, followed with the plan of a governmentality analysis of this space through four Foucauldian practices which will not act as operational concepts but as analytical lenses. A discussion on the relevance to genealogically analyse the episteme lifelong learning in order to learn more on its construction and reconstruction from the late sixties onwards, follows. The third and last part of this chapter tackles the methodology and the rationale behind the choice of the literature analysed. The reasons for choosing the period from the late sixties onwards are given followed by the structuring of the major themes that inform this thesis.

Although lifelong learning in not a new concept, there is a consensus that it attained status in diverse global imaginaries in the sixties and again in the nineties as a response to the educational and social crises that reinterpreted the relations between education, work and socioeconomic development (Rubenson, 2006; Jarvis, 2014). Transnational policies in Europe have enjoyed a degree of recognition since the 1993[7] and 1995[8] EU *White Papers* acted as a launching pad for the dissemination of guidelines (English & Mayo, 2012; Nóvoa & de Jong-Lambert, 2003). Most interpretations of lifelong learning found in contemporary EU lifelong learning policy literature promote it as a key instrument to increase employability and economic competitiveness as well as a policy of social cohesion (English & Mayo, 2012; Milana & Holford, 2014; Field, 2002). The *Memorandum on Lifelong Learning* (CEC, 2000) defined lifelong learning as an "all learning activity undertaken throughout life, with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competences within a personal, civic, social and/or employment-related perspective" (p. 9). In 2007, the Action Plan *It is always a good time*

[6] In governmentality literature, mentalities refer to organised practices that produce knowledge and narrate it (Gordon, 1991).
[7] *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment (CEC, 1993)*
[8] *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society (CEC, 1995)*

to learn (CEC, 2007) affirmed that "the need for a high quality and accessible adult learning system is no longer a point of discussion" (CEC, 2007, p. 3), and a year later, a resolution by the European Parliament on adult learning (EP, 2008) recognised that "adult learning is becoming a political priority" (idem, para. A), and urged EU Member States (MS) "to establish a lifelong learning culture, primarily focusing on education and training for adults" (idem, para. 3). This rationale is present in most lifelong learning policies. Personal development is also mentioned as one of the lifelong learning goals throughout this space, but the emphasis rests mainly on employability, adaptability and vocational mobility "which is important for the functioning of the internal market" (idem, p. 3).

The EU lifelong learning policy documents (*White Papers, Strategies, Resolutions, Communications, Conclusions, Reports, Memorandums, Joint-interim Reports, Programme Guides, Recommendations, Decisions, Action Plans and Guidelines*) discuss processes or provide data highlighting areas that need intervention. Yet, such literature carries an inherent problem of normativity since it refutes the normative grounds on which it rests by producing a partial subjective view of the history of discourse, making subjects unaware of the discourses that were excluded in the process. Advocates of the EU's lifelong learning policies argue that its policies offer a thorough analysis of this space that goes beyond traditional sovereign thinking. However, this understanding is based on the traditional political model of which the notion of sovereignty is at the core. This theoretical slip generates a blind spot due to the dominant dimension that arises from its exercise of post-sovereign[9] normative power (Merlingen, 2007) since its literature is generally concerned with the factors that led to their success or the misinterpretations that doomed them to fail.

A Foucauldian perspective sharply contrasts with normative studies. Walters & Haar (2005) argue that normative studies create a narrative in reaction to problems and measure the state of domains according to normative yardsticks. On the other hand, perceiving the EU lifelong learning policies from a Foucauldian perspective theorises that they are constantly arbitrary and modifiable and portray certain kinds of representations of the world as ideal, or more truthful than others. Foucault (1980, 2007) focused extensively on the knowledge which reflects the world rather than what signifies it. Amongst these, he identified

[9] The EU is a pooling of sovereignty where MS delegate part of their political power to the EU institutions: the European Commission represents the EU as a sovereign body, the Council of the EU represents the MS, and the European Parliament represents the EU citizens.

discourse and the principle of rarefaction of the author (Nicoll, 2006). Discourse identifies with the main narratives rooted along official policy lines, and the principle of rarefaction of the author, in this case the EU with its numerous publications, acts as the unifying principle at the origins of its significance and governs the representation of lifelong learning in this space. This is why, instead of focusing on the processes and tools of the EU lifelong learning policies, this thesis explores the relations between the EU's mentalities of power and the processes of subjectification[10] by problematising, or calling into question, how this space is constructed to be governed through the narratives that inscribe it in specific ways and the technologies of the self and the technologies of government that govern it. To explore however, is not to search for a concealed unity behind complex discourse, but to "reveal the historicity and the contingency of the truths that have come to define the limits of our contemporary ways" (Rose, 1999, p. 276). Such an exploration of the tacit fundamentals that frame the conduct of conduct[11] by making explicit the thoughts that are mostly tacit, consents the identification of the limits of what is promoted as meaningful and less meaningful and how and what is possible to think and do, i.e., a deconstructive exercise to open up the possibilities of thinking and acting differently (Foucault, 1985). By doing so, unquestionable truths are put under the microscope through lines of thought and critical thinking.

Aim of study

This study is deemed necessary because by asking different questions, it expands the terms of the political debate regarding the construction of the lifelong learning policies in this space. This new restructured and expanded space consents actors to think differently and broaden the space of legitimate contestation in relation to the norms and truth claims on behalf of which lifelong learning in general and lifelong learners in particular are governed. This is why this study calls into question the mentalities that construct the EU lifelong learning policy space through the technologies of the self and the technologies of government that govern it. By drawing on the Foucauldian concepts of governmentality and genealogy, this study analyses selected

[10] Subjectification invites subjects to maximise their learning potential by framing their options in a particular discourse which then becomes interiorised into their practices (Burchell et al., 1991; Rose, 2000). Subjectification targets the ethical substance of individuals; in other words, that aspect of the self that is to be worked upon in relation to moral conduct (Dean, 2010).

[11] Foucault defined conduct of conduct as "a form of activity aiming to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some person or persons" (Gordon, 1991. p. 2).

landmark EU lifelong learning policy literature and focuses on how this space has been articulated in governable forms. The main question to be answered is: How is the EU lifelong learning policy space constructed to be governed?

In answering this question, the following sub-questions are addressed: What aspirations does this space construct and which subjectivities[12] are brought forth? How do confessional practices[13] channel subjects' choices? How is data used to promote a certain kind of governance? What is the political rationality that pervades this space? And finally – how were different terminological interpretations (from recurrent to lifelong; and from education to learning) attributed to the phrase lifelong learning systematically reconfigured throughout the years and what values did these interpretations carry?

The main concern of this thesis is the discursive construction of the EU lifelong learning policy space and how it influences the way this space is understood, since what is taken-for-granted as truth is the result of a construction of thought that rests on power/knowledge relations (Foucault, 1980; MacLure, 2003; Howarth, 2010). The EU's lifelong learning literature which contains discursive practices aimed to persuade the addressees was created either as policy tools to redesign lifelong learning policies or as critical commentaries on such policies (Edwards & Nicoll, 2010). This is why it is normative. For Foucault (1980) such texts are "discursive artefacts" (p. 23) or "schemas of politicisation" (p. 190) since they are intertwined with power/knowledge relations and contain evidence of discontinuities to reconfigure the dominant discourses of the present (Berglund, 2008). For a Foucauldian researcher, such works are products of historic discontinuities and the discursive truths they promote must be critically deconstructed (Brookfield, 2000) from a non-normative point of view.

A non-normative approach is different than other approaches in the way that it does not follow traditional or well-trodden research paths. Whereas a normative approach on the EU lifelong learning policy space would look at exploring the current field with the aim of inscribing what should be done to have an economically, socially or politically stronger space, a non-normative approach instead focuses on the lifelong learner and perceives the individual not as an empirical fact but as a desire for who s/he is and expected

[12] Subjectivities are outcomes of discursive practices that influence the subject being governed by institutionalised forces that control and frame (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982).

[13] Confessional practices refer to expressing inner desires to the confessor (guidance) thus acknowledging the legitimacy of being positioned as a specific kind of learner (Fejes & Nicoll, 2012).

to become through policy in the future. In fact authors and researchers that carried out normative studies on this space used data to examine the successes or deficiencies of certain policies, and often put forward improved actions that seek to improve the initial results. This thesis, although it examines data, opts not to examine it in a normative way and foregoes any intentions to suggest better practices that seek to improve specific results. In line with a non-normative approach, if there is to be a transformation, it is important that the dominant thinking and practices in a particular space are first to be understood in order to be challenged. In fact, the data analysed in this study are used to highlight a specific reasoning which is key in constructing this space the way it is.

Therefore, to call into question the politics of knowledge[14] embedded in the construction of this space, the EU lifelong learning policy discourse was perceived as an irreducible medium of a constitutive dimension of reality by connecting it to the practices of governing through the realm of technologies of government and technologies of the self. During the analysis, the researcher "put aside previous notions of policy documents as realist or static descriptions" (Nicoll, 2006, p. 2) since policy literature, in line with a Foucauldian approach, must not be perceived as neutral reflections of reality. Viewing it this way "would be to treat language as a neutral technology and ignore the political and active work it does. Policy discourse acts rhetorically to work up the truth of what is described – it works to persuade" (idem, p. 2). This study, in fact, does not focus on the linguistic aspects of the policy literature "for it is not a matter of words, of concepts, of epistemologies" (Rose, 1999, p. 29). Instead it focuses on the mentalities immanent in the construction of this space that produce norms and truth-claims that traverse the narrative; such as how the EU speaks, according to which truths, and using what forms of persuasion.

Theoretical and analytical frameworks

Michel Foucault, a French critical historian of thought, has been influential in shaping different understandings of power, moving away from the analysis of power as a tool of coercion towards the idea that power is diffused rather than centralised, enacted rather than owned, discursive rather than forced, and constitutes agents rather than being deployed by them (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998).

[14] Politics of knowledge refers to how ideas are created, used and disseminated.

His work has been extensively used to critique power paradigms and the ways in which discourses are imbued with power. His alternative approach points to the need of an analysis of clusters of relations and reframes the ontological questions of power by asking how power is exercised, by what means, and what happens when this power is exercised. These questions bind subjects in searching for the essence and manifestation of power (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982).

Drawing on two of Foucault's notions, governmentality and genealogy, consent a specific focus to analyse how this space is constructed as an element in the exercise of relations of power. Governmentality relates to the different mentalities of how governing constructs narratives, whereas genealogy refers to a specific way of viewing history by tracing the different historical modalities in the way models of power have functioned at different periods (Brookfield, 2001; Rose et al., 2006). In order to question the mentalities that construct this space, this study considers the EU as an epistemological form of assumption (Hultqvist, 2004). Both notions centre on how power and knowledge operate in this policy space by focusing on the discourse in official lifelong learning policy literature. Discourse is important because it results from the constant struggle for ideas that the EU engages in when vying for control of the narrative. Once a final consensus on the narrative is reached, it is formally promoted in important EU fora and through the publication of several texts containing policy-specific guidelines. This reflects the outcome that the EU and its MS have reached an agreement on a certain state of the world – a set of intrinsically normative values that the actors involved are encouraged to adopt.

Governmentality as the theoretical framework

Interpreting the EU lifelong learning policy literature as stories of the present entails a deconstruction of the discursive constructions of norms[15] and truth claims[16] – what is taken-for-granted as normal or abnormal, desirable or undesirable – and explore how such norms and truth claims are established. Such

[15] Norms are shared expectations about appropriate behaviour held by a community of actors (Kleibrink, 2011).

[16] Foucault (1980) defined truth claims as "a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements" (p. 133). He argued that "Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned" (Foucault, 1980, p. 133).

discursive deconstructions shed light on how subjects are subjected by and subject themselves to the norms and truth claims of the narrative of this space of which they unknowingly form part. Foucault refers to such subjectification as governmentality (Rose 1999; Foucault, 2000; Dean, 2010), i.e., the mentalities surrounding the government of others and of the self (Foucault, 1988).

In order to have an organised governmentality analysis of how this space is constructed to be governed, the problematisation of the mentalities that construct this space will be presented through the following four practices: (i) the mentalities of government used to alter *aspirations* and *subjectivities* into conforming to specific ideals; (ii) the *confessional practices*' role in modifying the conduct of conduct through the *salvation stories* that pervade the narrative; (iii) the *data* of governing; and (iv) the *telos* (political rationality) of government.

The first two are technologies of the self because through them subjects self-discipline themselves as ideal subjects. The last two are technologies of government because through them a network of information and narratives in locales that are often distant, envisages and acts upon the conduct of conduct of subjects. These mentalities help governing at a distance through an array of interpretations that generate a network of configurations between the different actors present in this policy space.

(a) *Aspirations and subjectivities:* The mentalities of government used to alter aspirations and subjectivities into conforming to specific ideals were questioned to explore how the aspirations and subjectivities of the EU and those of subjects are linked. When the EU promotes the aspiration of the ideal subject who constantly improves his/her marketable skills in order to lead a better professional and personal life, it influences the conduct of conduct of subjects by enticing them to follow certain paths and self-actualise themselves. Yet such aspirations are subjectively constructed and in line with preconceived ideas. In this relationship, knowledge connects the aspirations of the EU with the personal objectives of subjects. Subjects who opt to avail themselves of lifelong learning do so against a cultural background constituted by a network of unseen subjectivities present in this space. Although these subjectivities are not exhaustive or even explicit, they are always present in the background and act as a series of expectations regarding conduct; i.e., how the subject is supposed to constitute himself as a subject of his own actions (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). Such modes of subjectification which Foucault (1985) described as "the way in which the individual establishes his relation to the rule and

acknowledges oneself to be a member of the group that accepts it" (p. 28) call for a problematisation to denaturalise the constructed subjective realities present in this space and contest the contingency of the arrangements within which subjects are assembled. How do subjects adjust their aspirations and what subjectivities are brought forth? How does the EU embed its mentalities in subjects' subjectivities and how do these subjectivities constitute the governable realms they appear to represent?

(b) *Confessional practices and salvation stories*: Foucault (1985) argued that "confession is a ritual of discourse in which the speaking subject is also the subject of the statement; it is also a ritual that unfolds within a power relationship, for one does not confess without the presences of a partner who is not simply the interlocutor but the authority who requires the confession" (p. 61). If this is the case then, the various practices (such as lifelong learning guidance, support, career management guidance and counselling) present in this space come under scrutiny. The Resolution of the Council (EC, 2008) on *Better integrating lifelong guidance into lifelong learning strategies,* for instance argues that "Citizens' lives are increasingly characterised by multiple transitions […]. Guidance plays a decisive role […]. In this respect, it can contribute to empowering individuals to manage their own career paths […] and to achieve a better balance between their personal and professional lives" (p. 4). The type of guidance suggested here, and in other EU lifelong learning literature is intended to help subjects navigate through the multiple transitions people go through life. Yet, when a subject seeks help by confessing (opening up) to someone (an expert in the field), s/he is seeking guidance, and by recommending particular routes as the ideal ways to improve employability, reduce poverty, increase social cohesion or reduce unemployment, guidance also becomes imbued with power relations (Bergmo Prvulovic, 2012, Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013). Very often, confessional practices work closely with salvation stories to entice subjects to take particular educational choices that promise to save them from their despair and put them back on track. However, salvation stories must not be considered as instinctive paths to redemption, but effects of power that must be questioned. The mentalities and unspoken assumptions that infuse salvation stories, and through which subjects are encouraged to identify themselves with, is deconstructed to shed more light on the forms of identity that governance of such space presumes and constructs and the power that salvation stories exert. Even though confessional practices carry no identity, political

discourses condense aspects of governance thinkable, and to move from the thinkable to the doable, thought is repositioned to adjust to the concepts that have been fabricated, and create new or adapted thoughts of how the governing in this space ought to be.

(c) *Data*: Data is a soft governance tool. Periodic evaluations and peer reviews converge EU goals through mechanisms that establish guidelines, quantitative and qualitative indicators. This technology of government carries more weight than the apparently soft nature of the governance implied because it generates and transmits data to the central calculations of governance. The EU's huge statistical project requires MS to continuously gather records which are then presented as if they laid claim to certain truths in that area. By translating social actions into numbers, and accumulating them across time and space, norms and truth claims are constructed, to which evaluations can then be compared and upon which interventions directed (Rose & Miller, 1992). This turns whatever data is gathered on (whether it is about the rate of unemployed, the calculations of the growth rates in the economy, the percentage of subjects that need specific training, the needs of the economy to improve or recover, the kind of education that provides more professional opportunities, the rate of inscription to particular courses, etc.) into calculable entities with a solidity and accuracy that appears to be all their own. Therefore it is important to explore how does data justify norms and truth claims by depoliticising policy and bring into being actors to be governed?

(d) *Telos*: The telos rests on the EU's intellectual interests of how it frames socioeconomic scenarios, the outcomes at which it aims, and the considerations taken into account when choosing on what to act, such as which problems or challenges, according to which criteria, how are questions framed, and which valid answers are sought. In this regard, the telos of EU lifelong learning governance carries a distinctive moral form that embodies notions of the nature and scope of legitimate educational and political authority; i.e., "an epistemological character articulated in relation to the understanding of the space to be governed" (Rose, 1999, p. 22). The aim of such questioning is to strip the political rule of its self-evident normalised character which is important for its operation (Merlingen, 2007; Manners, 2002).

Together with these four practices, a genealogical approach analysed the episteme lifelong learning.

Genealogy as the analytical framework

Genealogy is the study of family ancestries and histories and generally it is drawn in the form a family tree showing branches back in time that can be traced. The idea is to demonstrate that the past is present in present time. Genealogy as a Foucauldian notion however does not search for origin, instead it searches for disparity since it is concerned with the history of the episteme[17] that changed over time. Genealogy looks at history as containing irregularities and lines of descent, tracing the emergence through nonlinear trajectories by questioning the taken-for-granted ideas of the present (Dean, 2010). In fact, a genealogical study is also considered a study on the history of the present (Foucault, 1977). For Foucault, the "history of the present" (1977) refers to those truths which have come to be accepted as realities of the present (Rose et al., 2006). The intention of historicising the present is to introduce a critical attitude towards present perceptions as if they were natural and unquestionable: "to stand against the maxims of one's time, against the spirit of one's age, against the current of received wisdom" (Rose, 1999, p. 20).

Considering that an essential task that researchers in education need to engage in is to critically examine what is meant by keywords used in an educational space, this space is no short of indiscernible changes of keyword meanings which by time have been taken-for-granted (Jarvis, 2014). Genealogy was chosen as the analytical framework because it consents an intrinsic critique of this space and can provide the conceptual tools that recognise the changes in the episteme *lifelong learning*. The different terminological interpretations attributed to this phrase have been systematically reconfigured throughout the years to attain new connotations (Biesta, 2006; Tuschling & Engemann, 2006; Milana, 2012), and such new connotations need to be problematised not only because the distinctiveness of the definition heavily influenced the trajectory EU lifelong learning policies took throughout the years, but also because lifelong learning can, at one and the same time, control or liberate people (McLean, 2012).

[17] Foucault (1980) described episteme as systems of thought that define conceptual possibilities that govern the limitations in a given period.

In the sixties, the education of adults was known as adult education. Then, the first reports (by UNESCO) which put it on the international radar, called the education of adults lifelong education. It then changed once more to recurrent education, and then lifelong education and finally lifelong learning (English & Mayo, 2012; Biesta, 2006; Milana & Holford, 2014). These seemingly extraneous shifts in vocabulary call for a genealogical analysis interested in the grounds for these changes and in the values they carries since they signifies a shift in how subjects are constructed by limiting the practices that define their objectives (Wildemeersch & Salling Olesen, 2012). Looking at these terminological changes that occurred throughout the years reflects a conceptual departure from the notion of organised provision to a more individualised pursuit of learning (Barros, 2012; Milana, 2012). Lifelong learning's importance, compelled by the changes throughout the years seem to have changed from a more holistic perspective with a broader and more visionary concept (see for instance, Faure et al., 1972, and Delors et al., 1996) to which Edgar Faure, Paolo Freire, Jacques Delors and others made significant contributions based on the ideological origins of progressive and radical adult education, to a more vocationally oriented provision by implementing policies that are vocational and technocratic in nature (see for instance, the *Lisbon Strategy,* EC, 2000). But how did this happen over the years and what forms of telos did different international organisations privilege during different periods?

Methodology

Foucault never explained the methods on how an analysis ought to be. He wrote extensively to disrupt equilibrium and declared that he disliked prescribing: "I take care not to dictate how things should be" (Foucault, 1994, p. 288). The closest he came to suggesting a framework was via his rules for locating discursive formation (Foucault, 1972) where he spoke of ideological regularities located in language that produce discourse. As a result, it is difficult to construct a methodological framework based on Foucault's scholarship due to this lack of a clear delineation. Nevertheless, the different ways to do a discourse analysis are all informed by techniques that pursue the detection and definition of a range of realities and the dangerous nature of knowledge claims. In this regard, the most sensible approach was to draw on Foucault's toolbox and use his tools as they best suit the aim of this thesis, and in order to explore the mentalities of

government associated with how this space is constructed, the following five steps were followed:

1. Landmark EU lifelong learning policy literature (see list in Appendix 1) was selected from Eur-Lex (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=en) and EU Bookshop (https://bookshop.europa.eu/en/home/). These sites are the main sites for EU law and publications. The researcher searched for documents containing the keywords "lifelong learning", "lifelong education", "adult learning", and "adult education" published between 1/1/1965 and 31/12/2015. Since there were 2,101 documents[18] published during this period, the researcher selected the main documents according to their importance in the development of the agenda-setting role of the EU's lifelong learning policies. All EU White Papers, Memorandums, Actions Plans and Strategies that concerned lifelong learning and published during this time were selected since they are the most important kind of EU lifelong learning documents. Communications, Reports and Recommendations that were issued to support White Papers, Memorandums, Actions Plans and Strategies were also taken into account since they outline the implications, assumptions, and intended and unintended consequences of the directions that ought to be followed. UNESCO's report *Learning to be – The world of education today and tomorrow*, and the OECD's report *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning* were found on the internet.

2. A thorough reading from a governmentality perspective (i.e., asking the *what*, *why* and *how* questions that bind the essence and manifestation of power) of selected main EU lifelong learning policy literature was performed. The researcher approached the literature as a collection of "historically constructed ways of reasoning that are the effects of power" (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998, p. 9), hence, before reading and deconstructing policy texts as discursive stories of the present, the sociopolitical context at that point in time, the type of document and importance attributed to it were explored. Special attention was dedicated to the narratives that make the central concepts by focusing on passages containing power relations, subjectivity constructions and the problematisations of governance (Foucault, 1972), moving away from a textual analysis to a contextual analysis that make it possible to grasp insight into the political processes.

[18] As at 1.9.2015.

3. Key excerpts[19] were re-read to put together similar statements made in different contexts and question what makes such constructions possible. In questioning the mentalities present in the selected main EU lifelong learning policy literature the researcher continuously asked: How does this narrative constitute a technology of the self? Why are certain aspirations constructed and what subjectivities do they bring forth? What roles do guidance and risk-management play in this space? How are technologies of government able to create, sustain and promote knowledge as a mechanism of governing? What are the mentalities behind the works of Eurostat, Eurydice and the OMC? What is the telos embedded in this space? Such questions lead the researcher to identify four practices with which the EU subjects subjects to the normative truth-claims which govern the mentalities surrounding the government of others and of the self.

4. The documents which included key excerpts were re-read to double check whether there was something to be added, removed or reconsidered in the way the analysis was done.

5. After the governmentality perspective, attention turned to landmark first and second generation lifelong learning policy documents (see list in Appendix 2) in order to trace the shift in meanings of the episteme lifelong learning. To trace its shifts in interpretations from the mid-sixties onwards, the trajectory of lifelong learning was genealogically analysed by focusing on the determinants and the narratives it was encapsulated in during the different decades. What roles and expectations was this episteme assigned throughout the years? How were socioeconomic challenges interpreted and what kind of lifelong learning actions were put forward to address them? In other words, how is the notion of lifelong learning today different from when it was first espoused in international fora fifty years ago and how did this happen?

Selection of main EU lifelong learning literature

One of the most interesting and theoretically sophisticated debates centres on the claim that the EU acts as a normative power not just in the region but on the world stage (Merlingen, 2007). This thesis starts from the premise that an intergovernmental

[19] Key excerpts are passages that have been cited numerous times by the EU and play a central role in its narrative.

body of supranational institutions such as the EU needs to be seen in the light of its continuous search for articulations of modes of governance in the face of repeated interventions. The EU does not only promote human agency abroad through the promotion of fundamental civil, political and economic rights, but also, through its self-styled mission for social cohesion, it inscribes the very agency of those it seeks to empower in relations characterised by the technologisation of politics and administrative arbitrariness (Merlingen, 2007). This conceptual space for investigating this normative power where lifelong learning policy space is discursively constructed, reconstructed and co-constructed makes the case for an analysis of the EU's normative power in this space. Since the main force of the EU consists in the "ability to shape conceptions of normal in international relations in line with its unique normative basis, [...] rooted in its sui generis history and character" (p. 239) as a post-sovereign body, it plays an exclusive role in the normativising power of this space. This is done by promoting universal lifelong learning goals such as "fostering social cohesion, providing citizens with the skills required to find new jobs and helping Europe to better respond to the challenges of globalisation" (EC, 2008b, p. 11) as normal and ideal through a number of approaches backed by its intergovernmental presence and value-rational conduct in foreign policy (Merlingen, 2007). This is disguised as a form of personified ideal for the 'other' (Popkewitz, 2001), an expression of cross-border role-model grounded in normative convictions. When the EU normalises judgement through its lifelong learning policies, it creates a distinction between good and bad, between normal and abnormal, ideal and incorrect. These norms then provide the basis for actors to internally classify their aspirations by creating boundaries and exclusions. Besides being descriptive, norms also embody disciplinary power because they enable and constrain possibilities. Foucault (1979) argued that the "power of normalisation imposes homogeneity; [...] it individualises by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialities" (p. 184). This normalised judgement of the EU is then picked by actors and reflected in their aspirations as they reject other discourses which do not conform to the EU's norms and accept those which do.

In fact, the EU frames socioeconomic challenges in a way that reinforces and legitimises its policies and pressures underachieving actors to follow the salvation stories contained in policies that will lead towards paths of socio-economic redemption. Such an approach employs power in relation to others through various mentalities that expose new configurations of truth claims which the EU puts forward while acting as an expert in the field. Therefore, despite the fact that the EU's lifelong

learning policies focus on areas that need intervention, they nevertheless carry an inherent problem of normativity since they refute the normative grounds on which they rest.

With a population of just over 500 million and the world's largest market, the EU[20] is an international organisation representing an exclusive form of cooperation among 28 sovereign countries and has been the beacon for prosperity and peace in the region since the Second World War. In 2010, it accounted for 7.3% of the world's population and over one quarter of world's GDP (Eurostat, 2012, p. 17). It is governed by international treaties and memorandums signed not only by national governments of MS, but also, where necessary, by neighbouring governments (In education matters this responsibility falls on the ETF[21][22]). Although initially a political and an economic community, over time it attained legislative and executive authority over a much wider sphere of activities, including a considerable influence over lifelong learning. The EU formed in 1992 by the Maastricht Treaty represents a natural development of its predecessors; the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) established in 1951 by the Treaty of Paris, and the European Economic Community (EEC) established in 1957 by the Treaty of Rome. During the first years of the ESCS, education was considered a sensitive area where hard regulation was perceived to infringe national sovereignty. The signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 signalled a new era for Europe, and from then onwards, the policy fields of education, amongst many others, have been subject to greater harmonisation efforts by the European Commission (Dehmel, 2006; Lawn & Grek, 2012). It was this Treaty that first officially established education as a European activity: Articles 126 and 127 contain the aim of developing a European dimension in education, according the EU "partial jurisdiction over educational matters" (Murphy, 1997, p.

[20] Currently, more than half European nations are MS of the EU or EFTA (European Free Trade Association). The remaining countries are either candidate countries to join the EU (Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, Macedonia and Turkey), potential candidates (Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo), have special monetary agreements (Andorra, Monaco, San Marino and The Vatican) or close ties to it (The Ukraine). Only two countries in Europe (Belarus and Moldova) have a constrained rapport with the EU.

[21] The European Training Foundation (ETF) is an EU agency that helps developing countries to harness the potential of their human capital through the reform of education, training and labour market systems in the context of the EU's external relations policy.

[22] The EU has 3 agencies related to lifelong learning, namely the Centre Européen pour le Développement de la Formation Professionnelle (Cedefop) (named in French, translates to European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training), the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), and the ETF. Cedefop supports the development of vocational education and training policies and contributes to their implementation by working closely with the Commission, governments, employers' representatives, trade unions, researchers and practitioners with the intention to strengthen cooperation by sharing ideas and debating the best ways to improve policies. EACEA manages parts of the EU's programmes in education.

362). This Treaty (CEC, 1992b) broadened the original objectives of the EEC and introduced an economic and monetary union, a common foreign and security policy and the development of the EU's social dimension. During this time, lifelong learning became an explicit object of EU policy, and although the EU stated that it respects the responsibility of the MS for the content of teaching and organisation of education systems (CEC, 1992b), a new era in education cooperation was initiated, leading to a European education policy space (Lawn & Grek, 2012).

The third Delors Commission's 1993 White Paper[23] envisaged lifelong education and training as a major priority for addressing the Europe-wide employment issue, proposing lifelong learning as a key reform measure of education and vocational training systems (CEC, 1993). In 1995, another White Paper[24] was published in which three aims for education and training were postulated: social integration; enhancement of employability; and personal fulfilment (CEC, 1995). Taking into account the impact of the internationalisation, the information society, and scientific and technological knowledge, this paper was amongst the first to recognise that lifelong learning and training must play a central role in developing a learning society (Jarvis, 2007). This idea of a learning society was important to the lifelong learning movement's reconceptualization of lifelong learning. A European Year of Lifelong Learning (1996) followed and in 1997 a European Study Group on education and training concluded that there were four significant aims for education and training (CEC, 1997): constructing European citizenship through education and training; reinforcing European competitiveness and preserving employment through education and training; maintaining social cohesion through education and training; and, education and training in an information society.

In the Memorandum for Lifelong Learning (CEC, 2000), the EU set itself the oft-quoted strategic goal "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" by 2010 (EC, 2000, para. 5), and in 2001 established working groups to support and monitor the implementation of objectives at national level and develop indicators and benchmarks. In 2003 the Council decided on five benchmarks and fixed five goals for education and training to be reached by 2010. Amongst the numerous literature published during this time, some of the ones worth noting were a

[23] *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment (CEC, 1993)*
[24] *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society (CEC, 1995)*

Communication[25] (CEC, 2006b) and a complementary *Action Plan* in the following year (CEC 2007)[26], a *Recommendation* (EP & EC, 2006)[27], two Lifelong Learning surveys (Eurostat, 2006 and 2011) and the Lifelong Learning Programme 2007-2013 with an overall budget of 13.62 billion euros to bring together under one programme all education and training programmes. In 2010, the EU adopted a *strategic framework* (CEC, 2010b)[28] which replaced the Lisbon strategy with further long-term strategic goals.

The numerous lifelong learning policy literature the EU published every year during the past decades include booklets, recommendations, resolutions, statistics, programmes, White Papers, agendas, conclusions and action plans amongst many others. This plethora of policy documents is produced by its institutions ; the work of a civil service in the European Commission, but also the result of countless working groups, research projects, parliamentary debates, agencies and informal discussions on educational matters. Some are aimed at the general public whilst others are intended for lifelong learning practitioners, policy makers or government representatives. Instead of taking every single document into account, this thesis opted to focus on selected main EU lifelong learning policy literature since texts with high political significance represent a point of reference (Milana, 2012).

Period of study and thesis structure

Among lifelong learning scholars, there is a consensus that lifelong learning (or as formerly known adult education or popular education, amongst others) first attained status in global imaginaries in the sixties (Rubenson, 2006; Jarvis, 2014). Then, the fall of the Berlin Wall (November, 1989) and the democratisation of the Eastern Bloc (March 1989 to April 1992) severely influenced the direction Europe took in the years that followed since such territorial changes were not limited to just technical or political changes but brought with them a new sense of identity – a new Europe (Gustavsson, 2002). In the years following these events, Europe went from being a continent made up of different countries with separate economies, some of whom (12 countries out of 51) were members of a regional organisation called the EEC, to a continent made up of different countries with one major

[25] *Communication on Adult Learning: It is never too late to learn (CEC, 2006)*
[26] *Action Plan on Adult Learning: It is always a good time to learn (CEC, 2007)*
[27] *Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning (CEC, 2006)*
[28] *Education and Training 2020 (CEC, 2010)*

currency, most of which (28 out of 51) were members of a political-economic union with the world's largest market (Pépin, 2007) that includes the five largest European economies (Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Spain). In the early nineties, the European Commission adopted and promoted the language of lifelong learning and since then, lifelong learning policies gained a strong influence in national educational policy reforms (Dehmel, 2006) and gradually became a common European policy area (Jakobi, 2009; Dale & Robertson, 2009). In the beginning of this century, Europe and the EU also experienced the financial meltdown of 2008, mass immigration, a growing disillusionment in politics and the change in the cultural and financial centre of the world – from the west to the east; European nations sought to respond to these challenges through Europeanisation (Milana & Holford, 2014). This thesis focuses on the last fifty years (1965-2015) because lifelong learning attained international approval during this tumultuous period which gave rise to its expression in a new state of affairs where a very old set of problems were expected to carry new tasks.

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Chapter 2 deals with the EU's contribution in constructing a transnational dimension of the EU lifelong learning space as a collective space enabling it to become, over time, an element of policy coordination. Chapter 3 presents Foucault's notions on knowledge and power followed by an in-depth discussion of the methodological tools of governmentality and genealogy. Chapter 4 discusses the four practices (aspirations and subjectivities, confessional practices and salvation stories, data, and telos) that govern the construction of this space by exploring the norms and truth claims the EU puts forward while acting as an expert in the field. Chapter 5 delineates the genealogical approaches of how has the EU lifelong learning policy space been influenced from the mid-sixties onwards by exploring the dominant mentalities of government and the position of the subject therein in the construction of the episteme lifelong learning. This thesis will come to a close in Chapter 6 with concluding thoughts.

2. The construction of the EU lifelong learning space

Despite Europe being home to different cultures, languages, religions and histories, closer collaboration between European countries has consistently been sought to address national or international political, social and economic challenges (Jarvis, 2007). Increasingly, lifelong learning was also drawn into this shared European space (Borg & Mayo, 2005). In fact, the contemporary history of the EU lifelong learning space has constantly drawn on an increasing range of international experts, expanded on the role of the international markets and put forward a growing number of common frameworks, benchmarks and indicators (Jarvis, 2007). The networks created and the data produced in the construction of this space as a governable commensurate space (Lawn & Grek, 2012) lead to a one-dimensional narrative as if it were a single homogeneous European space. Through European policy networks and the EU (as the main policy actor), this space came to operate as a form of governance by creating a European-wide policy arena where the institutionalisation of education through discourse and networks takes place (Lawn, 2011). Nevertheless, this construction is concealed in the formal EU policy discourse. Therefore, to better understand how this policy space was constructed, enabling it to become, over time, an element of policy coordination, the wider context that led to cooperation in the fields of education and vocational training must be taken into account.

This chapter explores the historical formulation of the EU lifelong learning space through the various political, social and economic events that influenced the setting up of the first international lifelong learning structures first in Europe and then in the EU. Various channels and a communal European history were later framed by treaties and policy frameworks were mobilised to form a common ground to support the implementation of what started as a European lifelong learning space and is today the EU lifelong learning policy space. This will towards a homogenous agenda occurred first in parallel and then in a more integrated manner, and encompassed the first ideas on the role of education in the light of the social revolution of the sixties, Janne's report in the early seventies, economic liberalisation and the mass job outsourcing that followed, the fall of communism and the need for a stronger EU as a global player, the EU's cultural identity crisis and finally, the 2008 financial crisis. This chapter is divided in three: the cooperation stage, the negotiating stage, and the framing stage. The cooperation stage discusses the process of building a common ground for various actors to shape lifelong learning policy. The negotiating stage presents the process of negotiating ideas and information to project a viable future for lifelong learning. The framing stage addresses the structuring of a system that fits the governance of the main agenda.

Building a common ground (the cooperation stage)

The grounding principles of the European lifelong learning space can be found in post-1945 Europe when researchers and policymakers in education networked across borders, and European governments became more willing to support research in education believing that such studies would be valuable to their formulation of educational policy (Lawn & Grek, 2012). To reach out to the sociological, psychological and pedagogical problems young Germans faced after the war, in 1951 UNESCO created the Institute for Education (IE) (Milana, 2012). The IE opened its doors two years later, and quickly drew academics and researchers in comparative education together, facilitating international policy links and acting as an information centre on policy and research in education in Europe (Lawn & Grek, 2012). It later led to the formation of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (EEA), which became the most influential European association on education policy and research at the time (Lawn & Grek, 2012).

Notwithstanding the great hopes for action in favour of the reconciliation of the peoples of Europe during this time, when the Treaty of Rome was signed in March 1957, the prime objectives of the then six MS were agricultural policy and economic integration (Pépin, 2007). In spite of the omission of education, practical considerations and idealistic ambitions raised the profile of education, and it was eventually brought into the Community in the form of training mentioned under Article 128 which called for an establishment of a common vocational training policy to balance the concerns of the market on the labour force (Walters & Haahr, 2005). In the years that followed, the European lifelong learning space would evolve out of the need to satisfy basic freedoms declared in EEC Treaty such as the freedom of establishment and the freedom of movement (Pépin, 2007). A note worth mentioning is that this EEC Treaty established the European Social Fund (ESF) to strengthen economic and social cohesion and in the years that followed, this instrument would fund various education and training programmes (Brine, 2004).

The sixties brought about a revolution in social norms in most of the western world, including Europe (Field 2000). Social taboos, such as racism and civil disobedience broke free of the social constraints of the previous decades through deviation from the norm (Field 2000). The Berlin wall which was constructed during this decade divided Europe culturally and politically in two – the western democratic countries and the eastern Communist bloc. The growing unemployment and the liberal European democracies' inability to satisfy marginalised citizens challenged capitalist economies, and brewed political turmoil (Blackman et al., 2008). In France, civil unrest culminated in the May 1968 protests which were punctuated by demonstrations and large-scale general strikes together with the occupation of universities and factories bringing to a standstill an entire advanced capitalist economy (Breen, 2010; Singer, 2002). Some consider these protests as a cultural and social turning point, marking the end of the traditional collective action and the beginning of a new era (Singer, 2002). In interpreting this sociopolitical scenario, the OECD and UNESCO called for a greater action in lifelong learning as a field of mutual international cooperation.

In 1969, the importance of education was coyly raised at the The Hague summit (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002). This summit, often cited as the first summit where cultural issues were discussed at this level, offered a brief reference to educational concerns in the context of the Community's cultural objectives with a short note in Point 4 of the final communication recalling the need to safeguard "an exceptional source of development, progress and culture" (EC, 1974, p. 1) in Europe. Recognising that this final communication

could be broadly interpreted, the Council of the EU of Ministers for Education seized upon this humanistic message, and since then it has been cited in the preamble of almost every educational EU policy statement (Blitz, 2003). This summit gave rise to educational policies on the national stage since education was now expected to provide everyone with the opportunities for a general education and lifelong vocational training (Beukel, 1994).

During the early seventies, education was redefined to include the need to ensure a form of lifelong learning to keep knowledge up to date (Milana & Holford, 2014). This created an ideal out of the education of adults and paved the way for it to be perceived in terms of its humanistic ideals (Borg & Mayo, 2005). In fact, the Faure et al. (1972) report *Learning to be – The world of education today and tomorrow*, published by UNESCO during this time centred on a humanistic orientation (Boshier, 1998). The four assumptions that underpinned this report were: the existence of an international community with a fundamental solidarity; a shared belief in democracy; the aim of development as the complete fulfilment of man; and that only an overall lifelong education can produce the kind of complete man who is increasingly envisaged (Faure et al., 1972). For many, this report was remarkable due to its vision of a generalised role for education in the world and for its reflection of the optimism in the possibility of generalised progress. Biesta (2006) argues that although the authors of the Faure report were aware of the economic function of an educated workforce, this was subordinated to a democratic and to a lesser extent personal function. At the time, even the Council of the EU warned against viewing education just as a "component of economic life" (Neave, 1984, p. 7).

This decade also saw the first steps of modern globalisation with the growth in American and Japanese productivity, which led the European nations to question their position as global leaders (Jarvis, 2004). In 1973, the USA withdrew from the Bretton Woods Agreement (Cohen – Bretton Woods System) and the monies of all the industrial countries were set free to float independently, leading to the birth of the modern global capitalist market (Jarvis, 2014). During this time, education (which was perceived to include formal instruction that equipped participants with a qualification in a particular trade, skill or profession) was identified as a potential policy area that could provide a struggling Community with direction (Blitz, 2003). Earlier debates about the value of a skilled workforce that were enshrined in intergovernmental resolutions led to the idea of a shared European space institutionalised in cross-European programmes (Pépin, 2007). In the early years of the seventies, the European Court of Justice provided the European Commission with a stronger argument for

action. In a case brought in front of the Court, the Community was recognised as having the task to expand its competences in order to reach its goals, even if related policy areas had not been conferred upon in the previous Treaties (Hake, 1999). Thus, insofar as education related to the creation of a common market, the Court ruled that it was a formal area of Community concern (Aspin et al., 2012). Since this first ruling, the Court issued a number of decisions, and as a result of this, the European Commission acquired more powers (Blitz, 2003). Abetted by the European Court of Justice, the European Commission initiated educational programmes with the support of MS and although education never became a supranational policy, it elevated the European Commission's standing and reinforced claims that the Community was actively creating a people's Europe (Lawn & Grek, 2012).

Already in 1971, the Council of the EU stated that "A genuine awareness has emerged of the importance of the links between education and the economy and of the development of systems of further training and permanent or continuous education" (OJ C 81, 12.8.1971, p. 5). In that same year, the idea of cooperation in education on a Community level was stated when the six Ministers of Education first met (Lawn & Grek, 2012). During their regular meetings, they recognised that the actions developed so far regarding vocational training had to be complemented by cooperation in education (EC, 1970). The importance of education was gaining ground within the Community and, as a result of the 1973 enlargement, it resolved to find a way to insert education into its mandate under the banner of vocational training (Brine, 2004). In fact, in the following year, the European Commission acknowledged that its responsibility for developing Community policies also extended to the field of education and asked former Belgian Minister of Education Professor Henri Janne to formulate the first principles of an education policy at Community level (Field, 2001).

Janne's strategy paper (1973) entitled *For a Community Policy on Education* was a key turning point in institutionalising the exchanges of knowledge around a European education space (Pépin, 2007). Departing from the premise that "the irreversible recognition of an educational dimension of Europe and the irreversible initial movement towards an educational policy at European level" (Janne, 1973, p. 10) has begun, the strategy stressed for an increase in the possibilities around which a European dimension in education could be created and the need for more educational research on comparable data: "the setting up of a powerful information centre covering all aspects of this vast field" (Janne, 1973, p. 59). Janne (1973) argued that "Coherence in one

field calls for coherence in the other, and an operation of approximation or harmonisation of the policies – carried out with the necessary prudence – is indispensable" (p. 11). This report reflected the political position of many European countries prevalent at the time; that national structures and traditions had to be respected, and that there had to be a definition of what the Community intended to confer (Lawn & Grek, 2012; Ertl, 2006; Jones, 2005). Nevertheless, the report which was prepared after wide consultation with European experts in education was very clear: "In a society undergoing permanent change in the scientific, technical and social fields, there is no longer any good vocational training which does not comprise a sound general training at all levels, and there is no longer any good general training which is not linked with concrete practice and, in principle, with real work" (Janne, 1973, p. 18).

Janne's strategy paper significantly marked this period of development in the promotion of lifelong learning as a European concern (Milana & Holford, 2014) and, in the following year, the first outline which established two main pillars of the Community's educational policy discourse – cooperation and diversity – was brought before the Council of the EU (Pépin, 2007). Although MS were still allowed to follow their respective traditional educational systems, the Council of the EU established a system of progressive cooperation to compile data (Field, 2001). In 1975, CEDEFOP was created with a mission to collect and exchange information on national systems of vocational training that could contribute to the implementation of a common vocational training policy, and, three years later, Eurostat also started collecting data on education (Pépin, 2007). Eurydice[29] was then established in 1980 and tasked with the creation of an information network on general educational systems by gathering and circulating qualitative information on European education systems and policies (Lawn, 2011).

The same committee that set the ball rolling for the Janne Report, also set up the *Action Programme for Education* (EC, 1976), which entrusted the European Commission with the organisation of exchanges of experts in education, the creation of committees on education, and the launching of pilot projects to study ways that facilitate the transition from school to work (Panitsidou et al., 2012; Dehmel, 2006). The significance of this *Action Programme*

[29] Eurostat provides detailed statistics on the EU and candidate countries and Eurydice gathers, monitors, processes and circulates comparable qualitative data on education systems and policies in Europe to boost cooperation in education. Both aim to offer detailed descriptions and overviews of MS education systems and policies, and comparative thematic studies devoted to specific topics of EU interest.

however, lies in the fact that for the first time, education was legitimised as an area of policy by the Council of the EU, thus triggering an increasing number of related initiatives and projects that can be seen as the precursors of today's EU framework programmes in lifelong learning (Field, 1998). Driven by this new form of cooperation within the Community framework, it was shown that cooperation in education whilst respecting the diversity of national situations was possible (Field, 2000).

Information sharing for a viable future (the negotiating stage)

The EU's interpretation of the education of adults became the driving force for the implementation of new or improved policies strongly contributing to its adoption in national policies (Borg & Mayo, 2005; Rubenson, 2009). The groundwork for the adoption of new policies on a Community level began to be formally constructed through the formation of committees on education and cross-institutional collaboration (Field, 2000). Specific technologies that facilitate exchanges and diffuse information, more funding and research, circulation of documents and statistics, and recognising qualifications[30] obtained elsewhere in Europe helped in shaping this space (Milana & Holford, 2014). With a growing focus on the economy, goals became more ambitious and the European Commission used such goals (e.g., the common market and European unification) to rationalise its involvement in education and legitimise the educational initiatives put forth at European level (Pollack, 2000). This shift towards a Europe of Knowledge necessitated an intensification of the early work on networks and collaboration, and, most of all, on the categorisation of the collection of data on education (Pasias & Roussakis, 2012). To overcome the sensitivity towards different national policies and the obstacles to Europeanisation, data was a useful tool, especially in the light of the limited effects of the rule of subsidiarity, such as lack of harmonisation of objectives, systems of education, and technical, administrative and regulatory barriers (Pollack, 2000).

The 1980s saw a boom in action programmes launched by the European Commission: *Iris* promoted vocational training for women; *Comett* was aimed to strengthen cooperation in training relating to technology between companies and universities; *Petra*

[30] The European Qualifications Framework (EQF) is built upon closely intertwined national frameworks, and indirectly acts as a tool for standardisation by improving the portability and comparability of qualifications in the EU.

supported the vocational training of young people; *Force* supported policies and activities related to vocational training; *Eurotecnet* focused on the implementation of technologies in vocational training; *Erasmus* was introduced to promote cooperation between higher education institutions and foster staff and student mobility between European universities; and *Lingua* was established to help improve the foreign language skills of Europeans (Pépin, 2007). Bar for the last two, the other programmes focused on improving vocational training and despite reluctance from some MS, they were approved by the Council of the EU and funds were made available (Ertl, 2006; Dehmel, 2006). This development of action programmes with Community funding attracted a growing number of educators from different MS to collaborate within its framework (Radaelli, 2003). Bousquet (1999) called this "the most effective form of gentle restructuring or convergence at Community level" (p. 44). With the Single European Act[31] entering into force in 1987, the emphasis on the common market, which included the free movement of workers, was completed by strengthening the legal basis for cooperation in vocational training, giving the European Commission further political capital in education (López-Santana, 2006).

Following the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Berlin wall, the EU found itself searching for a fitting role in world politics – an economic giant that has to have the corresponding political muscle if it is to bring a modicum of balance to an increasingly unipolar world (Walters & Haahr, 2005). In this scenario, lifelong learning, yet again, was to play a fitting role, and was thus moved to the fore of the EU's agenda. During this time, the humanistic vision concerning equality and personal development started to be replaced by an economically stronger orientation focusing on evaluation and cost efficiency (Rubenson, 2004; Milana, 2012; Field, 2006; Blitz, 2003; Brine, 2004; Filander, 2012; Dehmel, 2006). Science and technology, and an investment in human capital were identified as important tools to increase productivity, and so a qualified workforce equipped with the necessary skills and competences increasingly became central arguments (English & Mayo, 2012; Fejes & Nicoll, 2008; Field, 2008).

The first years of the nineties were characterised by intensive debate on European identity, the role of education in an economically stronger Europe and networking across national borders (Grek et al., 2009; Dale & Robertson, 2009). Former Communist countries in eastern and central Europe had just

[31] The Single European Act revised the EEC Treaty to add new momentum to European integration and set an objective to establish the Single Market by 1992.

emerged from dictatorships and sought to consolidate their democracies by looking at the EU project as an ideal (Holford, 2008). By now, the importance of education was celebrated by the Community as an agent of political change, and the European Commission consolidated education resulting in important changes in the ways discourses and practices started being perceived (Radaelli, 2003; Dale & Robertson, 2009). A wide legislative process was initiated aiming at strengthening the complementarity of lifelong learning to other policy areas in order to improve the Community's standing as a politically and economically strong entity on the world stage (Pasias & Roussakis, 2009; Holford, 2008). Yet, the reactions of the European electorate towards European integration showed that there lacked an ideological and uniting European space within national societies. The EU's bureaucratic and centralised administration did not appear alluring enough; nor did the common agricultural policy or the competition policy appear sufficient to justify the European project.

In response to this, the early nineties saw the European Commission publish several policy documents aiming to create a new cultural identity by crafting a shared European imaginary – an ideological and uniting European space (Radaelli, 2003). This was sustained by *White Papers, Reports* and *Communications* tackling issues of European relevance such as European citizenship[32], social policy[33] and social solidarity[34]. Numerous projects, cross-institutional collaborations and networks emanating from the Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG-EAC) in programmes such as *Socrates* and *Leonardo* also facilitated the creation of notions such as European citizens and European governance (Pasias & Roussakis, 2009; Dale & Robertson, 2009). *Leonardo* included all actions concerning vocational training and *Socrates* was the new umbrella programme for education which included a specific programme on adult education called *Grundtvig* although only a small fraction of the budget was allocated. By making people more aware of their European identity, and promoting the European educational capital as a competitive advantage in its struggle against other strong economic international players (Pasias, 2006), lifelong learning started carving out an important space, and with this

[32] *Report on the Citizenship of the Union (CEC, 1993b); Report on Learning for Active Citizenship: a significant challenge in building a Europe of knowledge (CEC, 1998)*
[33] *European Social Policy - A Way Forward for the Union (CEC, 1994)*
[34] *Towards a Europe of solidarity. Intensifying the fight against social exclusion, fostering integration (CEC, 1992)*

came significant changes in how it was presented (Milana & Holford, 2014).

A legal basis formally establishing education as an area of cooperation was agreed in the Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992. Although the Maastricht Treaty does not mention the education of adults specifically, for the first time it established training and education as competences. The Articles about education and training are based on the subsidiarity principle, delegating the division of power to the MS and any attempt by the EU to interfere in national educational matters is to be closely associated the expansion of the common market (CEC, 1992b). Clearly, vocational education fitted this aim, and although Articles 126 and 127 of the Maastricht Treaty stated that no harmonisation of European education systems will be promoted, certain areas such as collaboration amongst educational institutions, language learning and youth exchanges received greater economic and policy significance (Lawn, 2011). In fact, the Maastricht Treaty gave the vital ingredient that had been missing so far – legitimacy for the European cause. In this regard, Lawn and Grek (2012) put forward that "if there was a need for a Commission, a Parliament, a Council, a Court of Justice and a Central Bank, surely there was a need to create a European demos, a transnational European public whose interests the Union would represent" (p. 44). This was a time when EU institutions gradually attempted to translate the new legal basis of the Maastricht Treaty into strategic action by aligning educational objectives to support the political, economic and social goals of the EU through convergence, integration and cohesion (Lawn, 2011).

The increasing pace of global trade characterised by rapid technological changes radically changed the relationship to knowledge, making it clear that guaranteeing a permanent update of skills and competences must be a priority on the agenda of education and training reforms if the EU was to remain competitive (Dale & Robertson, 2009; Holford, 2008). In a 1993 *White Paper*[35], the European Commission accentuated the importance of education and training for citizens as well as for economic growth: "lifelong education is the overall objective to which the national educational communities can make their own contributions" (CEC, 1993, p. 16). This put lifelong learning in the centre of EU policy which was consistent with the educational objectives of the Maastricht Treaty. A second *White Paper*[36], published by the European Commission in 1995, elaborated within this framework, and played a "crucial role in establishing lifelong

[35] *Growth, Competitiveness and Employment (CEC, 1993)*
[36] *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society (CEC, 1995)*

learning as a guiding strategy in EU policies" (Dehmel, 2006, p. 53). This *White Paper* (CEC, 1995) recommended increasing the general level of knowledge and addressed education and training as "one of the conditions for the development of a new model of more employment-intensive growth" (p. 1).

In the second half of the nineties, following the Employment Summit held in Luxembourg in 1997 which launched the European Employment Strategy (EES), the coordination of employment policies became a priority. The Amsterdam Treaty signed in that year included a specific provision on education in the preamble stating that MS were "to promote the development of the highest possible level of knowledge for their peoples through wide access to education and through its continuous updating" (CEC, 1997c, p. 24). As the education of adults kept gaining importance in policy circles, several institutions working in the field of education sought collaboration with the European Commission which practised an open door policy towards such stakeholders (Jakobi, 2009). Activities such as the Year of Lifelong Learning (in 1996) further highlighted lifelong learning at the international political level and triggered numerous debates adding to its growing consciousness, resulting in a multitude of projects, publications, and policies (Nicoll & Fejes, 2011). During this year, the OECD published *Lifelong Learning for All* (1996), and four years later, in the European Commission's *Communication* on *Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality* (CEC, 2001) lifelong learning was broadly defined as "all learning activity undertaken throughout life, with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competences within a personal, civic, social and/or employment related perspective" (OJ C 163, 9.7.2002, p. 1).

Constructing a structure that calls for more governance (the framing stage)

At the turn of the millennium, the quick pace by which economic success came along, followed by two subsequent enlargements have perhaps sown the seeds of a crisis further down the line (Pasias & Roussakis, 2009). Being an economically thriving period, EU leaders felt confident that this was a favourable time to embark on new initiatives for a new vision of the future, and aware of the accelerating pace of change, they argued that the EU had to "act now to harness the full benefits of the opportunities presented. Hence the need for the Union to set a clear strategic goal and agree a challenging programme for building knowledge infrastructures, enhancing innovation and economic reform and modernising

social welfare and education systems" (CE, 2000, p. 1). This was established in 2000 in Lisbon, when the Heads of State or Government of the MS (the Council of the EU) took position on the *Lisbon Strategy* – a 10-year economic and social strategy.

The *Lisbon Strategy* was a turning point in the EU lifelong learning space because it acted as the precondition for the EU to function as "a regulatory ideal" (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002, p. 133) in an area within the exclusive competence of MS by enabling it to influence national policies that go beyond national systems, thus circumventing the subsidiarity principle[37] (Hingel, 2001; Ertl, 2006). The *Lisbon Strategy* also institutionalised the OMC tool that helps the EU to leverage new governance mechanisms (Alexiadou et al., 2010). The subsidiarity principle remained important, but rather than hard legislation, the OMC was intended to act as a persuasive power by disseminating best practices and coordinating efforts towards previously agreed common objectives for national education systems (Bruno et al., 2006). These best practices underlined, amongst others, new goals, indicators and benchmarks, standards, peer reviews, monitoring and evaluation (CEC, 2000), thus consenting an increased EU intervention in MS' educational affairs. In fact, the DG-EAC, which was the main actor tasked with the coordination of the EU lifelong learning space, used the non-authoritarian approach of the OMC to introduce statistical categories of performance (Lawn, 2011). Statistical categories of performance were gradually developed by coordinating experts, practitioners and other professionals through the instrumentalisation of new forms of non-state power such as data, peer reviews, expert groups, monitoring, networking, evaluations, seminars, etc. – some close to policy making decisions and others acting at a distance (Lawn, 2011). Together they developed common policies built upon commensurability that position relations between political society (via the EU) and civil society (via subjects) through intermediaries in the form of standards; in other words governing without government because by setting targets and suggesting specific measures based on common identification of areas that need improvement, the social world comes into being and is therefore open to be shaped[38]. From now on, more and more EU lifelong learning guidelines were translated into national policies supported by mutual learning processes (Milana & Holford, 2014).

[37] *The subsidiarity principle is fundamental to the EU decision-making process since it determines when the EU is competent enough to legislate or not.*

[38] This is developed further in Chapter 4.

This was a period of structuring information and political objectives where the EU attempted to produce measureable changes at MS level (Milana & Holford, 2014). Although MS were free to develop measures of how to reach these objectives, they were obliged to publish reports to be compared with OMC indicators (de Ruiter, 2010). This new mode of governance however, did not replace the traditional pattern of decision-making and the production of legally binding instruments based on negotiations of common interests among MS (Panitsides & Anastasiadou, 2015). Rather, it covered policy areas where coordination by MS is necessary but little or no legal basis for action exists (Jones, 2005). Initially MS were hesitant towards this model, but as cooperation increased, more actors across borders started to draw policymakers and associate them directly with the Community experience (Alexiadou et al., 2010). This led to a sheer increase in lifelong learning policies to the extent that the arguments of the EU become aligned with and provide norms for its own actions (Dale & Robertson, 2009). When, for instance, it seemed legitimate and natural to speak of an EU benchmark with respect to the youth employment rate or the level of participation in lifelong learning, it was implied that these figures were meaningful as European figures – i.e., the percentage of youth employment and participation in lifelong learning were indeed a common European concern, and Europeans ought to be concerned about it.

Yet, despite all the efforts of the *Lisbon Strategy*, after three years it became clear that "The reforms undertaken are not up to the challenges and their current pace will not enable the Union to attain the objective set" (CEC, 2003, p. 4). In 2004, the High Level Group, appointed by the EU, put forward that Europe's "growth gap with North America and Asia" (Kok, 2004, p. 6) was widening and if the EU was to deliver the Lisbon goals, European institutions and MS ought to work harder through closer political commitment (Kok, 2004). Wim Kok's influential report[39] argued that the achievements of MS since 2000 in the area of lifelong learning were modest. The report claimed that in relation to the OMC, its leniency had led to a loose understanding of the importance of the benchmarks and indicators set in the previous years and suggested that national action programs and peer pressure should ensue by the following year. It recommended to closely relate lifelong learning to the labour market by increasing policies and programmes based on the production of a European knowledge economy (Kok, 2004). In the light of this report, instead of the broader objectives set in the past, the European Commission suggested that focus should be once again on growth

[39] *Facing the Challenge (2004)*

and employment objectives (CEC, 2005). Thus, from 2004 onwards, an increase in regular measurement and reporting of progress against Lisbon benchmarks can be observed, privileging mostly economically-related outcomes (English & Mayo, 2012; Fejes & Nicoll, 2008; Milana, 2012; Filander, 2012). During this time both the Council of the EU and the European Commission called for "the need to improve the quality and comparability of existing indicators" (OJ C 141, 10.6.2005, p. 7) because "lack of relevant and comparable data" (idem, p. 7) is causing difficulties and to remedy this situation, the European Commission announced an EU wide *Adult Education Survey* (AES) which was done by Eurostat in 2006.

During this decade, the two subsequent enlargements saw the EU increase from 15 MS to 27 MS in four years with a new population of over 500 million. Most of the new MS had high unemployment rates which the EU intended to tackle before it became a major issue (Pépin, 2007). So, debates changed focus – from the integration of the new MS' citizens in the EU to finding new financial responses to employment challenges (Holford, 2014). In 2006, the EU put forward a Treaty to establish a Constitution for Europe, intending to replace the existing EU treaties with a single text, expand qualified majority voting which was formerly decided by unanimity among MS, and give legal force to the Charter of Fundamental Rights. However, the French and the Dutch rejected this treaty in referenda, ending any hope that this ratification might take place. In preparation for the next generation of action programmes, the European Commission suggested to create a single integrated programme to plan education and learning activities from cradle to grave, which eventually became known as the Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP). The LLP was designed to enable people, at any stage of their life, to participate in courses, study visits, and networking activities. The first LLP ran from 2007 up to 2013, and the current LLP started in 2014 and will end in 2020.

In 2008, the financial recession hit, and in the context of an intensifying economic crisis, existing policies on lifelong learning seem to be becoming more and more tailored to respond to the challenges facing the governance of an economic powerhouse rather than the social and economic development of a stable geographical region (Barros, 2012; Elfert, 2015; Holford, 2014; Dale & Robertson, 2009). Fraught with shifting political scenarios, different ideological frameworks and an increasing capacity to exercise political and economic power, new EU lifelong learning programmes constantly came along and older ideas were rebranded by attaching themselves to economy-focused projects metamorphosing themselves into immutable elements in networks and policy areas (Milana, 2012; Dehmel, 2006; Fejes &

Nicoll, 2008). For instance, in the *Agenda for new skills and jobs* (CEC, 2010), the EU argues that by improving access to lifelong learning, subjects will be in a better position "to move to high-value added sectors and expanding occupations such as those emerging from 'sustainable growth' policies, equal opportunities policy and legislation, and 'white' jobs" (CEC, 2010, p. 5), thus accentuating that lifelong learning seems to apply only to the working population.

As societies continued to bear the brunt of the economic crisis, in 2010 the EU launched a new 10-year strategy to achieve the transformational change required in its economy, and besides calling for "more focus, clear goals and transparent benchmarks for assessing progress" (CEC, 2010b, p. 25), it included an initiative aiming to integrate work and education as a lifelong learning process. In addition to indicators and benchmarks, the *Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*, also suggested country reporting to help MS implement macroeconomic stability and return their economies to sustainable growth (CEC, 2010b). The underlying argument was that the recent economic crisis had no precedent and the only way to overcome it was through smart economic growth by developing an economy based on knowledge and innovation, sustainable growth through a greener economy, and inclusive growth by fostering an economy that delivers economic, social and territorial cohesion (Jakobi, 2009; Panitsides & Anastasiadou, 2015). Once again, the economic function of lifelong learning was promulgated by having intrinsic value for societies in general and subjects in particular through an emphasis on competition, employment and innovation (Biesta, 2006; Holford, 2014).

Conclusion

Considering that this space encompasses millions of people who speak different languages, work in different sectors, and live in different countries, it is important to understand the networks created in the construction of this one-dimensional space as if it was a single homogeneous European space.

This chapter traced the political, financial and social climates in Europe that produced a specific ontology of this space through three stages. The informality of these stages such as their organisation and complexity of knowledge relations and the hybridity of their institutional association, direct an overall interdependence that produces a distinctive form of construction,

enabling it to become, over time, an element of policy coordination. Although such a clear division of a complex phenomenon is simplistic, its analytical purpose helps to draw attention to how have the EU's political and governmental interpretations contributed to the construction and maintenance of this space through the cooperation stage, the networking stage and the framing stage. This governance cannot be perceived as simply transmitting or mediating policy because within its web of decentred and multifaceted forms, new meanings in education were continuously constructed. The aim is pedagogic – by defining, expanding and regulating the European lifelong learning space, an EU wide homogenous lifelong learning policy space can be constructed.

Policy in education was not anticipated in the EEC Treaty. In fact, although the first ideas were shared and promoted during this time (the cooperation stage), international interest in lifelong learning during the fifties and sixties was marginal (Delors, 1996). Yet, from the seventies onwards, this space experienced a growing consistency. A viable future which indirectly linked educational issues to economic progress (the negotiating stage) started to gain ground, and closer cooperation through information sharing and the creation of action programmes sought to increase the mobility of professionals across Europe. Although the first steps were taken in a vocational direction, the EU lifelong learning space was also associated with the intensive debate on European identity as it evolved into a wider Community concern during the first years of the nineties. The Maastricht Treaty can be identified as being the precursor of this, which was later followed by the *Lisbon Strategy*. The turn of the millennium then saw a rapid expansion of the formation of instruments that set standards in an attempt to produce tangible results in this space (the framing stage), thus turning a national space into a recognised EU space that compels further EU governance. Gradually, the EU's logic imbued this space and worked towards producing an enabling lifelong learning space of engagement with national and transnational agencies through organisational and network relations which can subsequently be measured as sites of European governance.

3. Foucault's notions of knowledge and power

Foucault's work is recognised as both generative and illustrative within educational and social theory and breaks with particular principles of critical traditions that have dominated Western thinking in the last decades (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). The pragmatism of his scholarship raises important questions about the emergence of the self that is to be worked upon as part of a process to fashion a productive self (Rose, 1993; Rose & Miller, 1992; Dean, 2010; Gordon, 1991). His concern with the construction of the subject through power relations, and perceiving change as ruptures has changed the conventions that underlie social and educational sciences (Dean, 2010; Rose, 1999). Theoretically and analytically, this thesis is inspired by his work.

This chapter presents Foucault's notions of knowledge/power through governmentality and genealogy. It starts by delineating the advantages of opting for a Foucauldian approach. A short discussion on power and what constitutes it follows, connecting discursive practices to the practices of government. Foucault's genealogy and the analytical template this study employs are then explained. The theoretical challenges of a Foucauldian reading are also presented, followed by Foucault's work in education policy studies in general and in the European lifelong learning policy space in particular. This chapter ends by presenting academic works in lifelong learning policy studies that have been carried out from a non-Foucauldian point of view.

Foucault is not the only voice that can provide useful insights in how this space is constructed to be governed, nor does his work provide a flawless complete answer to the main question of this

study. However, it does offer an ideal positioning to explore the discursive struggles because it consents to ask different kind of questions. First, Foucault's approach does not reduce political power to the actions of the authority that extends its power through laws (Rose, 1999). Instead, it draws attention to the technologies (of the self and of government) intended to govern the conduct of conduct (Gordon, 1991; Rose & Miller, 1992) through complex mentalities of numerical and discursive traits. Focusing on these technologies consents to explore the power that percolates in the construction of this space. In this regard, various practices are at play through which the EU seeks to render lifelong learning operable, and by means of which a multitude of connections are established between its telos and the aspirations and subjectivities of subjects.

Second, Walters & Haahr (2005) claim that working on EU studies through a Foucauldian perspective constitutes a mutually beneficial encounter because his work encourages the epistemological reflexivity that a consideration of the politics of a post-sovereign entity such as the EU demands. His scholarship enables the formulation of a critical position that does not fall into the pro- or anti- EU trap since the EU lifelong learning policy space is neither good nor bad. To paraphrase Foucault, it is something dangerous (Foucault, 1990) that calls for problematisation in terms of how power/knowledge operate through it and with what effects.

Third, Foucault argued that narratives of progress are not the most reliable tools of analytics because as a historical form of exploration, the analysis remains limited due to its insulation within the context of analytical activity (Gordon, 1991). Therefore, it is important to make a distinction between the history of the past and the history of the present. The history of the past is a work of the present grounded in current sociopolitical realm and produced as a way to understand what happened in the past, but since it is a work of the present, it runs the risk to project backwards present ontologies that such studies ultimately 'reveal' (Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). On the other hand, a history of the present explores the present by examining its values and discourses with recourse to the past as a resource of disrupting critical knowledge (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982; Rose, 1993; Dean 2010).

Fourth, Foucault's claim that knowledge and power play a central role in rendering fields amenable to intervention consents an analysis of the ethical conditions and modes of subjection that make it possible for certain ideals to become more reasonable than others since aspects that prompt policy are not self-evident. For

instance, the emergence of pathologised[40] subjects (Finger & Asún, 2001) is something to be analysed. This ability to discern rationality by analysing forms of governmentality starts from the notion that the central characteristics of a configuration of thought are made up of the same discourses which constitute it (Dean, 2010) since discourse is an integral part of its own functioning (Foucault, 2007). The governance of this space, therefore, only becomes possible through "discursive mechanisms that represent the domain to be governed as an intelligible field with its limits and characteristics whose component parts are linked together in some more or less systematic manner" (Miller & Rose, 1993, p. 80).

The classical administrative understanding of power that it can be held, lost, transferred, increased or decreased by certain individuals or institutions differs greatly from Foucault's interpretation of power. By examining power from a bottom-up approach through its relation of forces rather than from the top-down via a universal theory, Foucault (2003) argued that power's practices become more evident. Since power mobilises techniques of political administration, it conceals the contingency of social relations and naturalises relations of domination (Foucault, 1980). In fact, this thesis considers subjects as vehicles of power that are not separate from it or objectively standing in relation to it (Foucault, 1980). Power, in this regard, does not weigh as a force that restricts, rather, it traverses and produces discourse and forms knowledge (Foucault, 2003). The production, circulation and functioning of a discourse produces the productive effect of power helping it to establish itself through a "set of actions upon other actions" (Foucault, 2003, p. 221) that shape subjects' ways of acting and thinking.

Governmentality

In the seventies, Foucault introduced *gouvernamentalité* (governmentality in English) in one of his courses on the investigation of political power, and proposed a different approach to analyse the formulations of governing (Ciccarelli, 2008). By merging *gouverner* (governing) and *mentalité* (mentality) into the neologism *gouvernamentalité*, Foucault stressed the interdependence between the practices of the power structures that organise conduct and the mentalities that underpin these practices with the self-organising capacities of

[40] Pathologised here refers to subjects that do not conform to normative practices, and whom are often identified as the 'other'.

individuals (Gordon, 1991; Burchell et al., 1991). Foucault (1982) suggested that power be seen as a way with which certain actions modify others by acting upon the conduct of conduct. He defined governmentality as an "ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power" (Burchell et al., 1991, p. 102). To govern is "to structure the possible field of action of others" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. 221) which implies that power as a way to influence the conduct of conduct does not do away with freedom but rather presupposes it (Milana & Holford, 2014). Such a view encourages an analysis of power's different typologies and methods of action, and their effects on the lives of subjects.

When perceiving power from such a perspective, each formulation of government becomes an act that explicitly or implicitly embody an answer to who or what is being governed, and why, how and to what ends should it or they be governed[41] (Burchell et al., 1991; Gordon, 1991). Rose & Miller (1992) argued that "Government is a problematising activity. The ideals of government are intrinsically linked to the problems around which it circulates, the failings it seeks to rectify, the ills it seeks to cure. Indeed, the history of government might well be written as a history of problematisations" (p. 18). What is problematised in this space makes it clear as to which mentalities are promoted (Walters & Haahr, 2005), and it is when a collective or individual practice is identified as deficient that mentalities lend themselves most to a governmentality scrutiny.

The EU lifelong learning policy space is not short of such problematisations. From the dangers of rising unemployment, the threats posed by globalisation and the forecasts of the decline of the standard of living, through the problematisation of mass job outsourcing to Asia, multicultural tensions, the rise of extreme left and right ideologies, to economic concerns with international competitiveness, the articulation of governing this space has been bound to the constant identification and interpretation of deficiencies. It is around these deficiencies that the rhetoric in this space has evolved in a realm of designs put forward by the EU in the form of EU *communications, strategies, White Papers, recommendations, memorandums, resolutions* and *declarations* seeking to configure specific locales in ways thought desirable. This is why the relation between political rationales and

[41] In this study the governed alternately refers to the actors involved in this space, ranging from MS, subjects, policy makers, learning/education institutions and guidance practitioners, depending on the context. Irrespective of what is being referred to, the different formulations of government can be identified by focusing on its mentalities.

programmes of governance is not perceived as one of derivation or determination but of an expression of a particular concern in another modality (Merlingen, 2006).

To reconstruct governmentalities and explore the deficiencies and mentalities embedded in them requires an understanding of discourse as an irreducible medium (Walters & Haahr, 2005). This is perhaps why a governmentality analysis tends to focus on policy papers and official publications as its sources where the world is represented by data and reports rather than by popular discourse or the media (Rose & Miller, 1992). The discourse that characterises lifelong learning policies entices the reader to accept and internalise subjective truths portrayed as the only truthful representations of the world and plays a silent but hitherto neglected role in the construction of this space (Walters & Haahr, 2005). Such a discourse asserts control over the reader because it aims to ultimately influence the conduct of conduct by making explicit its thoughts that are mostly tacit. As Foucault (1988) put it, "political practices resemble scientific ones: it's not 'reason in general' that is implemented, but always a very specific type of rationality" (p. 73).

Discursive practices as tools

A Foucauldian notion of discourse holds that discourse is a culturally constructed representation of reality and must not merely be regarded as an epiphenomenon (Merlingen, 2006) but as a tool in knowledge construction that produces and reproduces power and knowledge at the same time (Miller & Rose, 1990). As Foucault (1981) asserts, "in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a [...] number of procedures" (p. 52). These procedures encompass a discrete realm of practices suggesting a play that designates inclusions and exclusions in which knowledge is shaped and produced, making it difficult to think beyond them (Rose, 2000). To think beyond them is, by definition, to be mad, to be beyond understanding and therefore reason (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982).

In the discursive field within which socioeconomic challenges are framed and accorded significance in this space, the EU's narrative emerges as an historically variable linguistic device that conceptualises and articulates ways of governing. The importance accorded to discourse arises from a concern with the performance it envisages, hence the exploration of this discourse explores its

politics of knowledge through which the EU constructs and reconstructs the problems for governance. Politics here, is a synonym for systemic and exclusive workings of power/knowledge since the aspirations of subjects get connected with the EU's political obligations of norms of conduct. Such an exploration of the tacit fundamentals that frame this space consents the identification of the limits of what is promoted as normal or abnormal in this space and how and what is possible to think and do.

Owing to its ontology which captures representation about the complex character of social relations with which subjects identify in this space, to analyse the EU lifelong learning policy discourse calls for a historical deconstruction of how mentalities in this space come to operate. To theorise the schemes related to the production of mentalities, the researcher explored the construction of key statements by focusing on the conditions where they operate. Foucault (1980) frequently used power/knowledge to suggest that power is constituted through accepted forms of truth and "produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint" (p. 131). Constraint, in this regard, refers to the limitations that the EU puts forward in order to justify a particular agenda. This is why this thesis explores mentalities of what this space promotes as normal and true in order to expose the historical limitations of their constraints through a modifiable and political form.

Being a political organisation, the EU's discourse is naturally inherently political even though it is presented to give the impression that it is purely a question of policies for the benefit of its citizens. Through its various publications, the EU positions lifelong learning as a central policy concept in the realisation of its strategies. Socioeconomic scenarios per se do not determine how they ought to be understood and responded to since perception is moulded according to the lens an actor looks through. Although socioeconomic scenarios in this space could be understood and addressed in different ways, the EU plays a significant role in formulating specific scenarios in specific ways.

Through a closer look at its policies, it is possible to deconstruct its telos, which carries a moral dimension by upholding ideals on the model paths to be followed (e.g., financial freedom, prosperity, professional flexibility, economic efficiency). Its epistemological character is articulated in relation to what is to be governed and embodies some accounts of the subjects over whom government is to be exercised, whether it is subjects or educational institutions to be managed, or lifelong learning per se to be exploited as a resource. In other words, discourse carries a special function

where words and notions intersect and become invested with power relations (Jakobi, 2009), enabling "rules or forms to become manifest" (Foucault, 1972, p. 99). In fact, this thesis does not consider the EU lifelong learning policies simply as creations of political or social aspirations, but as a part of a discursive field through which subjects are constructed to self-discipline themselves as members of the EU lifelong learning community. Through discursive claims, the policy space lays claim to certain expert knowledge of the area and depicts a picture that grasps the norms and truth claims it promotes and represents in a form that enters the sphere of conscious political calculation (Rose, 1993).

The Foucauldian discursive analytic locates statements that function with constitutive effects where one can "recognise and isolate an act of formulation" (Foucault, 1972, p. 93). In fact, this study explored various statements whose claims were in need of investigation by analysing the historical conditions around which they were shaped. In doing so, such statements and the "enunciative function of which they are the bearers" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. 56) are described by indicating how things said within policy discourse may call into being a recognizable object of discourse (Foucault, 1972). The operation of such discursive dividing practices in this space enables not just for that object to appear and be "placed in a field of exteriority" (Foucault, 1972, p. 50) but also lays the ground for the exclusionary "practices that derive from them" (Foucault, 1972, p. 139). This is approached in this thesis by opting for an open-minded consultation of the EU lifelong learning policy literature. An open-minded consultation denotes an approach which is open to all understandings, and even if some ideas or perceptions are subjectively thought to be better than others, the author excludes this and still explores all avenues and takes into account opposing or contradictory views, for Foucault (1980) argued that the more open the analytical consultation, the higher the probability to observe certain traits, thus making the analysis more ontologically comprehensive.

Drawing on Foucault's (1972) approach of discursive analysis also consented to look beyond the alibis of expertise, and separate the different origins of discourse which revealed functions of exclusion (Gordon, 1991; Dean 2010). Such an approach interrupts "what was previously considered immobile […], fragments what was thought unified, [and] shows the heterogeneity of what had been considered consistent" (Foucault, 1977, p. 147). In other words, the workings of the EU lifelong learning policy discourse were decentred by challenging their authority and contesting the rationality upon which norms and truth claims were based (Foucault, 1980). The objective of this decentring helped to understand how the subject is constituted within a space that

continuously relays knowledge and power. The decentring of the EU lifelong learning policy discourse also enabled the researcher to question the relation to present modes of reasoning by historically exploring how an autonomous subject is constituted; i.e., a historical specificity on the politics of knowledge (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). In Popkewitz & Brennan's (1998) words, such an approach consents to a difference which is similar to that of studying "blackness instead of blacks, femininity instead of women, homosexuality instead of homosexuals, and childhood instead of children" (p. 11).

Genealogy

During the last five decades, the EU politically operationalised the continuities and discontinuities that have surrounded the EU lifelong learning policy space according to its philosophies on education at the time (Jones, 2005; Tuschling & Engemann, 2006; Ertl, 2006; Dale & Robertson, 2009; Dehmel, 2006). What is understood today by the episteme *lifelong learning* is the latest meaning of an episteme that goes back decades and manifested itself differently in different times. During the years this episteme carried different meanings and by genealogically historicising it, this research takes into account the various different interpretations as elaborations of the same principle.

Genealogical critique is an anti-dialectical way of questioning values that are presently thought of as benign by offering a historical account (Bevir, 2010). By historicising the norms and truth claims that inform these values, a genealogical critique introduces discontinuity and questions the taken-for-granted norms by suggesting that they are only of a historically contingent value, and so it is possible that they could come to be disvalued (Foucault, 1972). Foucault (1977) defined genealogy as a "grey, meticulous, and patiently documentary" (p. 139) way of writing the history of the present by highlighting nominalism (any general idea is merely a name without any corresponding reality) and contestability (everything can be challenged since there is no unified portrayal of it) (Bevir, 2010). The focus of genealogy is on the discontinuities and reversals (Foucault, 1972), and the purpose of the genealogist is to "distinguish among events, to differentiate the networks and levels to which they belong, and to reconstitute the lines along which they are connected and engender one another" (Foucault, 1980, p. 114). Thus, as a mode of writing the history of the present, Foucault (1977) perceives genealogy as the genuine history which rejects the "metahistorical deployment of

ideal significations" (p. 140) and opposes the search of the origin of the event in favour of its emergence, construction and reconstruction by focusing on the transformations that it has gone through time (Tamboukou, 1999).

In this thesis, genealogy problematises the present understanding of lifelong learning through the past ideas (on lifelong learning) that formed the narratives of progress and the taken-for-granted ideas of the present by tracing these ideas to identify the factors that led to what carries value to today's understanding (Foucault, 1977). This approach explores the dominant mentalities that construct this episteme and the fabrication of the subject therein from the mid-sixties onwards. In exploring the different interpretations that UNESCO, the OECD and the EU attributed to the social world throughout the years, it becomes possible to gain purchase on how the mentalities that constrained different definitions have changed, not only over time and across the EU, but also within it too.

Theoretical Challenges of a Foucauldian reading

In a thesis, it is expected that the research process is described and evaluated in relation to its knowledge claims. Terms such as validity and reliability are used to confirm that the research is a true representation of the real world and that it has been conducted in a methodological way and is repeatable. It is important that the data collected makes it possible to generalise the results to a large population. Yet, one of the main ideas of this thesis is to challenge the norms and the taken-for-granted truth claims in this space. Hence, terms such as validity and reliability are not immediately applicable. Foucauldian scholarship rejects the idea of an absolute truth and therefore the knowledge construction that certain discourses hold to be the general truth. This is why the norms and truth claims that are taken-for-granted within this space are not taken to represent the reality, but are subjected to be understood as representations of what this space holds as normal and true within a discourse as a function of its power/knowledge relations. This is why in a research such as this the focus on validity and reliability ought to be replaced by questioning whether this research is relevant and trustworthy and whether the collection and analysis of data has been thoroughly performed. The judgement of whether this research is relevant and trustworthy should be performed using the same theoretical and philosophical lenses that have informed this study as using

other lenses that resemble other ontological and epistemological truths may lead to other conclusions.

There is also no single truth about the way a researcher makes sense regarding the experiences and lives of others. Everyone, including the researcher, is subsumed by truth claims embedded in discourses that are never objective or value-free. However, through a reflexive engagement, researcher subjectivity consents the best avenue to explore this space because it enables the researcher to work with and against personal discursively formed meanings. In fact, in a struggle to deconstruct personal 'truths', the author constantly questioned subjective positions on lifelong learning concepts in the EU so as to better understand the personal experiences which naturally unconsciously frame the interpretation of a Foucauldian reading. While questioning the mentalities that construct this space through the narratives that inscribe them and the mentalities that govern them, the researcher distanced personal bias and preconceived ideas in order to avoid the risk of giving just a personal observation swayed by personal assumptions, personal values and a worldview embodied in communal practice of western discourses. When considering that dominant knowledge about education and learning is constituted by mostly subtle discourses which are often out of the realm of consciousness (Dean, 2010), the importance to distance one's narrative becomes even more apparent, especially for the researcher to reduce to a minimum personal influence over the research. To become more cognisant of the discourses that unconsciously embody social interactions, which are in plain view but which people often fail to notice, Foucault (1977) suggested that the researcher must be stripped of the "creative role and analysed as a complex variable function of discourse" (p. 138). Sensitivity towards the researcher's power over the interpretation of the results could be an object of discourse analysis in its own right.

This thesis argues that the point is not to engage in "a battle 'on behalf' of the truth" (Foucault, 1972, p. 205) by discussing "the philosophical presuppositions that may lie within" (idem, p. 205) that truth, nor the "epistemological foundations that may legitimate it" (idem, p. 205). Indeed, Foucault maintains that to "tackle the ideological function of a science in order to reveal and modify it" (idem, p. 205), a researcher ought to "question it as a discursive formation" (idem, p. 205) which involves mapping the space by which particular objects are formed and the "types of enunciations" (idem, p. 205) implicated. When bearing in mind that power is embedded in discourse, historically and through textual production in narratives (Foucault, 2000), one might conclude that historical processes deny researchers the creativity

to understand and make sense of the world. Yet a Foucauldian approach aims "to free history from the grip of phenomenology" (Foucault, 1977, p. 185) and not to "free history of thought from all taint of subjectivity" (idem, p. 201).

Foucault's work in education policy studies

Education policy studies at the turn of last century coincided with a rapidly growing influence of Foucault's scholarship and some employed Foucault's theoretical approaches in their research (Ball, 1990, 1994; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998; Popkewitz, 2001; Fejes & Nicoll, 2008). Although there are many references to education and the school throughout Foucault's work, he never explicitly devoted a specific study to it such as he did for crime, sexuality, madness, health, identity or knowledge. The best-known discussion on education occurs in Part III of *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1979), although his analysis in this part is intermingled with parallel discussions of the economic, juridical, medical, military, monastic and of course penal manifestations of disciplinary techniques. Nevertheless, his work was picked by Anglo-American educational researchers who explored how it has conceptually or theoretically contributed for its relevance for education.

British Educational sociologist Stephen J. Ball was the first to edit a collection of essays explicitly engaging the work of Foucault in education. Published in 1990, *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*, draws on Foucault and analyses educational issues, arguing that schools, similar to prisons and asylums, act as institutions of social and moral regulation, and complex technologies of disciplinary control where knowledge and power are fundamental. The essays assess the relevance of Foucault's studies to educational practice, and show how the application of a Foucauldian analysis to education consents to see the politics of educational reform in a different light. In 1998, Thomas S. Popkewitz and Marie Brennan extended Ball's previous work and published *Foucault's Challenge; discourse, knowledge and power in education*. Bringing together various authors and drawing from a wide range of Foucault's work they focused on interpretations of Foucault's work to political science and literary criticism.

In the 1996 article *Continuing Education and the Postmodern Arts of Power*, Scott McLean argued that in postmodern societies, patterns of oppression are shifting from centralised and explicitly coercive projects of economic exploitation and political

domination to decentralised and subtle processes of constructing subjects with the ability and desire to govern themselves. To encourage a different perspective on oppression and power he suggested applying Foucauldian concepts, and argued that since political and economic changes subdue social activism, educators need to understand how systems of oppression change in order to build more effective and vigorous forms of social activism. In the same year, Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose edited *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, and Rationalities of Government* (Barry et al., 1996). This oeuvre on Foucault and political reason contains twelve essays that provide a critical introduction to Foucault's work on politics by exploring its relevance to past and current thinking about liberal and neoliberal forms of government focusing on the technical means with which liberal political rationalities have been put into practice in schools.

In another Foucauldian critical analysis, Popkewitz (2001) illustrate how educators, historians of education and educational theorists have interpreted education and schooling differently at different times. They contend that a century ago traditional historians saw the public school as an institution of democracy and progress, whereas revisionist historians in the sixties and seventies saw school as an enterprise of power and control through social regulation. Popkewitz (2001) concluded that schools, like other social institutions are sites of contradictory and conflicting goals where efforts of control are more implicit than explicit and may be resisted as much as they are embraced.

Michael A. Peters wrote several books on Foucault and education. In 2001, in *Foucault and governmentality: understanding the neoliberal paradigm of education policy,* Peters explained the neoliberal paradigm of education policy and the approach to this question premised on Foucault's notions of governmentality and recent work undertaken by Foucauldian scholars (e.g., Rose, 1993; Gordon, 1991). This book discussed Foucault's concept of governmentality as a means to map the history of the present and perceived the rationality of government as both consenting and requiring the practice of freedom of its subjects – a point where the relations between government and self-government coincide and coalesce. Following this, in 2003, in *Truth-telling as an educational practice of the self: Foucault, parrhesia and the ethics of subjectivity,* Peters examined Foucault's changing notion of truth in relation to the ever changing practice of education. He briefly examines the notion of truth as Foucault used it to investigate the sociopolitical sphere, and then delves into Foucault's meanings on the evolution of the classical Greek word 'parrhesia' as it exemplifies the changing practices of truth in

human relationships, and the techniques used in such relationships. Peter's examination is based on the importance of education and its relations to care of the self.

In their paper *The Learning Society and Governmentality: An introduction*, Simons & Masschelein (2006) present an overview of the elements which characterize a Foucauldian approach specifically focusing on governmentality in education. They focus on governmentality and its relation to the mapping of the learning society of the present, and argue that this mapping can help educators to liberate their view. Masschelein et al.'s (2007) collection of studies called *The Learning Society from the Perspective of Governmentality* detail Foucault's notion of governmentality, the growing secondary literature on studies of governmentality and its development in the field of education by focusing on the concept of the learning society. Through governance and governmentality, they argue that the learning society maps onto lifelong learning and refashions a new space in Europe. Drawing together the European scholarship on learning society and the interaction between power/knowledge and political power over the power over life from a governmentality perspective, the authors demonstrate how the discourse of the learning society is framed into a European lifelong learning space, and stress on the links between the political power exercised in European societies and the educational practices that play a constitutive role in the process of subjectification. This is a study of how educational practice and theory play a constitutive role in practices of subjectivity which are crucial to learning societies. The authors also investigate the intrinsic relationship between intellectual and practical educational technologies and take into account different educational ideas of enlightenment, learning, inclusion, participation and critique, while applying Foucault's theory on governmentality to current developments in society and education.

In the most recent comprehensive publication on the influence of Foucault on educational policy, *Foucault, Power, and Education* (2013), Stephen J. Ball focused on some of the ways Foucault has been articulated in relation to questions about education or educational questions. In his book, Ball discusses the interactions between Foucault's concepts and educational research and the application of Foucault's ideas in addressing contemporary educational issues and discusses the increasing marketisation of education by associating Foucault's governmentality with a neoliberal paradigm of education policy by questioning self-governance and the entrepreneurial self in education.

To varying degrees, most of these authors built upon Foucault's concepts of power/knowledge, discourse and governmentality, and discussed the significance of education in the light of governing subjects. This increasing number of studies mostly show the strong explanatory force of poststructuralism in general, and a Foucauldian perspective in particular. In this regard, although poststructuralist policy research is varied in its problematics, there is a major similarity in that all studies attempt to capture the complex history of the present (Gordon, 1991; Burchell et al., 1991; Dean, 2010) in an effort to understand how this specific form of the present has come into being and which conditions have accounted for specific mentalities to be prioritised over others.

Foucault's work in European lifelong learning policy studies

Despite some education policy studies employed Foucault's conceptual or theoretical approaches in their research, the mechanics on how the European lifelong learning policy space is constructed from a Foucauldian perspective remains a modest field of research. Research in this field has paid more attention to deregulation, decentralisation, and new modalities of marketisation, and focused on theoretically-driven macro-level analyses of policy foundations. As a result, the insight from a non-normative point of view on the processes through which lifelong learning policies are constructed to be governed as a co-production of different mentalities remains mostly unexplored bar, to a certain extent, for the following publications.

In 2001, Stephen Brookfield wrote *Unmasking Power: Foucault and Adult Learning* where he elaborated on Foucault's analysis of how sovereign power has been substituted by disciplinary power which subjects exercise on themselves and others. In this paper, Brookfield urges adult education practitioners to become more aware of what constitutes power, especially in the apparently beneficent and neutral participatory practices that adult education practitioners intend to be empowering for learners.

In 2004, Mark Olssen, John A. Codd and Ann Marie O'Neill published *Education Policy: Globalisation, Citizenship and Democracy* (Olssen et al., 2004) where they provided an international perspective on education policy, and of the role of education in the global economy. They contended with the big questions of citizenship and democracy in an age of globalisation.

Their work, anchored in the poststructuralist perspective of Foucault, traversed the whole territory of the politics of liberal education within a theoretical framework necessary for the critical analysis of the dominant political perspectives that influence neoliberal policies, social democracy, the markets, community, citizenship and democracy. The authors set out the analyses for understanding the restructuring in education affected by the resurgence of neoliberal political theory, and highlighted the importance of education in building strong democracies and communities based on cultural identity and inter-cultural awareness.

In their article *Recognition of prior learning as a technique for fabricating the adult learner: a genealogical analysis on Swedish adult education policy*, Per Andersson and Andreas Fejes (2005) traced the shift in assessment policy discourses from general knowledge and experiences to competences and performance by focusing on the construction of subjects in Sweden. They focused on the recognition of prior learning as a technique for governing the adult learner and a way of fabricating the subject in Swedish policy on adult education. By drawing on genealogy and governmentality, they traced this thought back in time to see how it has changed and stated that although this technique for governing and fabricating the adult subject was also present in the past, there is a difference in how the ideas of competence and knowledge are stressed today.

In his PhD thesis *Constructing the adult learner - a governmentality analysis*, Andreas Fejes (2006) problematised contemporary adult education narratives about the adult learner by contrasting them with other cultural and historical situations. In his thesis he explored how socioeconomic challenges are framed and how adult education and the adult learner are put forward as solutions to such challenges. In this work, Fejes also discussed the subjectification of the adult learner, the way that s/he is to be governed, and the practices of exclusion that are created.

In 2007, Maarten Simons published the article *To be informed: understanding the role of feedback information for Flemish/European policy*. In it he argued that the evident exchange of information on performance should be regarded as an indication of a governmental mentality with covert power relations. To describe this mentality, he used the educational policy in Flanders (Belgium), in particular the need for feedback information from the Flemish government. Drawing on a governmentality perspective, the article focused on the governmentalisation of Europe and the region of Flanders that

accompanied the need for continuous feedback information. He argued that the conduct of conduct takes the form of feedback on performance, meaning that the strategy of a governmental mentality is to secure an optimal performance for every entity involved by acting upon the need for feedback and will to learn of the actors. Simons' (2007) work used synoptical power, which Foucault (1991) called panoptical power, indicating the power arrangements when the majority (such as MS and policy-makers) watch over the minority (such as teachers, subjects and educational institutions) enabling the analysis of new modes of governance of MS by ensuring the ideal performance to grasp the exercise of power in feedback on performance.

In 2008, Andreas Fejes and Katherine Nicoll published *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject*, where they discussed the construction of governmentality and its application to learners, and educational policies and practices. Fejes and Nicoll (2008) interpreted governmentality as a biopower, where the population is managed according to the government's goals even though individuals are free to act according to how they think. In lifelong learning, Fejes and Nicoll (2008) argue that the state develops policies, frameworks and educational practices to govern learners, and once they are equipped with competences, they are given the freedom to become self-regulated and self-organising individuals. Hence, the state retains its power over its population.

Katherine Nicoll authored *Flexibility and Lifelong Learning: Policy, Discourse, Politics* (2006) in which she problematised how flexibility and lifelong learning are positioned within policy. Considering that flexibility and lifelong learning have become central aspects of education policy in MS of the EU and at the OECD in recent years, in this book Nicoll explored how both concepts have become central for the knowledge economy and social inclusion and that failure to adopt them becomes a failure at individual, organisational and national levels. Drawing on Foucault's work, she explores EU (amongst others) policy texts in the discourses of education, lifelong learning and flexibility that they construct, and provides insights into the strategies through which flexibility and lifelong learning become attainable as part of educational discourse.

In *Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education,* Roger Dale and Susan Robertson (2009) focus on the relationships between globalisation, Europeanisation and education. This edited volume is divided into two parts, of which only the first part examines Foucault's conceptual or theoretical understanding for education. In this part (*Governance and the Knowledge Economy*) the authors and their contributors focus on how the discourses of lifelong

learning and knowledge economy, together with an emerging division of educational governance became essential to the development of the European Education Space. They also discuss the *Lisbon Strategy*, the OMC and the *Bologna Process* in the construction of this space. A key theme that weaves through this volume and links Europeanisation to globalisation is the prominence given to the discourse of competitiveness, and the subsequent role allocated to education to enhance Europe's ability to compete with other economic powerhouses.

In *Europeanising the policy space of Education*, Martin Lawn & Sotiria Grek (2012b) describe the origins of the European education policy as it transformed from a cultural policy to a networking support and into a space of data and comparison. The authors explore the early development and growth of research networks and international collaborations in Europe. They argue that this European space of education has become a single commensurable space because it has been de-politicised by the use of standards and data, and governed through skills of persuasion of expert advice. They maintain that the construction of policy spaces by the EU makes this space governable through the mobilisation of actors and construction by comparative data, which for them is the result of the Europeanising effect of globalisation and international institutions.

In 2013, Andreas Fejes and Magnus Dahlstedt published *The Confessing Society: Foucault, confession and the practices of lifelong learning* (2013). In this governmentality study of educational guidance, drawing on Foucault's later work on governmentality and confession, Fejes and Dahlstedt analysed how confession operates within practices of lifelong learning as a way to shape responsible citizens as active and self-regulating individuals. This book takes a critical stance towards the modern relentless will to disclose the self and claims that society has become a confessing society.

In the volume *Adult Education Policy and the European Union: theoretical and methodological perspectives* edited by Marcella Milana and John Holford (2014), two chapters examined Foucault's conceptual and theoretical understanding for education. In Chapter 5, Romuald Normand & Ramón Pacheco (in Milana & Holford, 2014) delved into the grammars of justice in the politics of lifelong learning and the emergence of a new wave of capitalism through a governmentality perspective. In their study they explored how the politics of lifelong learning contributes to more governance through standards, and at the same time legitimises new principles of justice which redesign notions of the common good. Drawing on Foucault, they argue that subjects are

confronted by hardships through which they have to mobilise cognitive resources to justify their actions and to criticise those of others. Their research dealt with the arrangements and actions that define common good at a European level and the principles of justice that feed into the construction of a new moral subject. In Chapter 6, Andreas Fejes argued that Foucault's work plays an important role in research on the education and learning of adults. He illustrates which parts of Foucault's work have been taken up in adult education research, and promotes the value of a governmentality perspective. In this chapter, Fejes also argues that lifelong learning policies (of which adult education and adult learning are part thereof) shape particular kinds of citizens.

Non-Foucauldian works on European lifelong learning policy studies

There have also been many studies on European lifelong learning policies from a non-Foucauldian perspective. Through a range of different methodologies, numerous studies have explored lifelong learning policy and research implications, the emergence of lifelong learning as a chief strategy in EU training and education policy, the shifts in lifelong learning policy discourses by UNESCO, the OECD and the EU, lifelong learning reforms, the Europeanization of education, and the issues involved in research about lifelong learning policy, to name a few. The following are some of the latest studies which have been carried out in this field and inform this study.

In *Lifelong learning policies in the European Union: developments and issues* (1999), Barry J. Hake explored some of the policy and research implications of lifelong learning as the central strategy in the EU's education and training policies. He explored the incremental development of the EU's lifelong learning policies and the policy-making process up to the mid-nineties, focusing mainly on a critical analysis of the EU's understanding of lifelong learning as manifested in the 1995 White Paper.

In *Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality? Some critical reflections on the European Union's lifelong leaming policies* (2006), Alexandra Dehmel wrote on the increasing popularity of lifelong learning in EU policy circles. Embedded in a historical account of the lifelong learning discourse since the seventies, she describes the emergence of lifelong learning as a chief strategy in EU training and education policy, and provides a closer look at the EU's lifelong learning objectives. Dehmel's work

puts forward critical thoughts on the EU's use of the term lifelong learning and its principles, and explores the EU's lifelong learning policies in the broader light of the highly discussed EU convergence policy in education and training. In the same year Gert Biesta's article on *What's the Point of Lifelong Learning if Lifelong Learning Has No Point? On the Democratic Deficit of Policies for Lifelong Learning* (2006) provides an analysis of the shifts that have occurred in lifelong learning policy discourses by UNESCO, the OECD and the EU. He documented the shifts in these discourses (not in a genealogical way) and explored the intended and unintended consequences that followed from particular ways of thinking. Biesta (2006) documents a shift towards understanding lifelong learning primarily in economic terms and less in relation to its democratic function. Biesta (2006) argued that in the light of the contemporary conditions of the learning economy, lifelong learning is increasingly understood as an individual task rather than as a collective project. In this piece, important questions about who has the right to establish the agenda for lifelong learning and the diminishing democratic potential of lifelong learning are raised.

In his 2011 work entitled *The EU as a Norm Entrepreneur: the case of lifelong learning*, Alexander Kleibrink argued that lifelong learning reforms are part of a broader development in which economic policies diffuse transnationally. By focusing on the European dimension of this global development, he argued that to fully understand norm diffusion, researchers in education ought analyse how norms emerge and how their meanings have implications for their impact on policy change in places beyond the original community that internalised them. In this European lifelong learning policy space, Kleibrink (2011) argues that demands from multinationals urge the European Commission to develop a pan-European meta-framework for the recognition of lifelong learning attainments, whereby MS were assigned the task to strategically steer this reform.

Lawn's 2011 paper on *Standardizing the European Education Policy Space* follows on the same lines but from a different angle. In this piece, Lawn (2011) argues that MS are creating a new policy space in education through regulations, networking and harmonization, with statistics and the development of standards across the different fields of policy, thereby underpinning and extending the creation of these new policy spaces. Lawn (2011) posits that this Europeanisation in education has subtle and yet powerful features created through measurement and standardisation, and that although they may have a technical form, they are in reality knowledge based, policy driven and exclude politics.

Although many studies have focused on the Europeanization of education by exploring themes such as political integration or aspects of multilevel governance, Martin Lawn and Sotiria Grek's book on *Europeanizing Education - governing a new policy space* (2012) shifts the focus to another level of Europeanization, a Europeanization which contains "several explanatory elements reflecting the complexity of processes which include, first, transnational flows and networks of people, ideas and practices across European borders; second, direct effects of EU policy; and finally, the Europeanizing effects of international institutions and globalization" (2012, p. 8). In fact, this book opts to focus on "the intended and unintended consequences of European processes, and relational effects of disparate but powerful European agencies and actors" (2012, p. 8).

Methodologically, Lawn and Grek's (2012) work is based on the operational definitions of key terms because the definitions of these terms specifies the perspectives from which the story of the Europeanization of education is told in an amalgam of political and economic issues that form the Europe of today and its education. Their work tackles the political meaning of the first waves of international policies as a result of how education in Europe was governed by specific organisations and later the EU. The authors argue that challenging reforms and policies on the basis of research were called throughout history due to what they termed as the chaotic uniformity of education in Europe (Lawn & Grek, 2012). They highlighted the important shifts in governance of European and national education associations which helped to create the space and establish consistent fundamental policies for education on a European level (Lawn & Grek, 2012). Eurostat and Eurydice have created their ways of collecting data leading to a new governance about education since data and self-evaluation are seen as "the new political technologies, as is standardization, all part of a policy space in education now in Europe, built on governing knowledge and a new hidden politics of calculation" (Lawn & Grek, 2012, p. 153). This work further outlines the ample role of the EU in governing education from a distance; a role which led to standardising devices that account for the present paradigm of data-driven benchmarks and indicators which lead to an enhancement in the Europeanization process of education (Lawn & Grek, 2012).

Marcella Milana and John Holford's edited volume, *Adult Education Policy and the European Union: theoretical and methodological perspectives* (2014), explores some of the complex issues involved in research about lifelong learning policy. Divided in four parts, Part I deals with the evolution of EU policies which have influenced adult education practice by questioning how

adult education became an element of policy coordination at European level by focusing on the European Commission's contribution to constructing a transnational dimension in European adult education policy and the wider intellectual and policy background to its activities and thinking. Part II deals with theoretical perspectives on the workings of the EU and explores how these can shed light on how its political power is exerted. It examines how different institutions within the EU work together and how power relations changed over time. The contributors to this part perceive transnationalism and close interdependence as systems of governance at national and European levels. Part III deals with the complexity of the European socio-political landscape by examining the mechanisms of European lifelong learning regimes, and how they affect lifelong learners. The authors use sociological perspectives to explore the emergence of a new kind of governance through European lifelong learning politics by discussing conceptions of power. Finally Part IV, challenges disciplinary boundaries by addressing how adult education scholarship can borrow methodologies from other disciplines, and how this can contribute to methodological development in the field by drawing on the sociology of law, policy sociology and critical policy analysis.

Milana and Holford's (2014) volume, together with the other studies on European lifelong learning policies from a non-Foucauldian perspective mentioned earlier in this chapter inform this study. Yet, the distinctive contribution to academic literature that this thesis aims to provide is that it problematises the unquestionable truths that construct the EU lifelong learning policy space from a non-normative point of view. So far, even though research has been carried out on lifelong learning from a Foucauldian perspective (e.g. Brookfield, 2001; Olssen et al., 2004; Andersson & Fejes, 2005; Fejes, 2006; Fejes & Nicoll, 2008; Nicoll, 2006; Dale & Robertson, 2009; Milana & Holford, 2014) the discursive construction of norms and truth-claims present in the mentalities that construct the EU lifelong learning policies has not been explored.

4. The governmentality of this space

The configuration of discourse in this space consists of numerous heterogeneous elements that bear upon a range of different socioeconomic challenges, and points to discursive elements on learning and the moral motivations that come together to focus on subjects. This study considers subjects that engage in lifelong learning not only as the starting point for the exercise of power, but also as objects to be divided and analysed since the governing of this space encompasses the continuous creation of responsible subjects who take charge of their learning. This chapter takes Foucault's (1982) ethical substance as the starting point and posits that the governance of this space mobilises different forms of power to discipline subjects in particular ways. To expose how this space is constructed to be governed, the discursive construction of norms and truth-claims present in the mentalities that surround the government of subjects that engage in lifelong learning will be explored. Norms and truth-claims act as heterogeneous elements that bear upon a range of different socioeconomic challenges, and by problematising the mentalities that construct them, the constructivist nature of how this space is constructed to be governed is brought to the fore.

This chapter starts by discussing how different forms of power dispersed across this space work to align individual aspirations with the aspirations of the EU through techniques that constitute the self both as a subject of knowledge and also as a knowing subject. This chapter then discusses confessional practices (such as lifelong learning guidance, support, career management guidance and counselling) as mentalities that entice subjects that seek them to take particular educational choices, often through

salvation stories. In this regard, the forms of identity constructed are perceived as a normative mediator in the dialectic between the subject and the guidance practitioner (or trainer, career or study counsellor, etc.) who acts as an expert in the field. By framing risk in salvation stories, the 'other' – the actor who is discursively construed as different and undesirable and does not fit the criteria of the ideal – is constructed and attention is shifted from social structures that instigate or escalate failures to personal responsibility. This chapter will then focus on data, another mentality in disciplinary power which induces a specific subject. Data combines surveillance and examination, and normalises judgement by making subjects visible through a net which renders reality into a calculable form. The chapter will then come to an end by exploring the telos that underpins this space and the kind of society it envisages since it carries a distinctive moral form that embodies notions of the nature and scope of legitimate educational and political authority, or as Rose (1999) called it "an epistemological character articulated in relation to the understanding of the space to be governed" (p. 22). The unspoken assumptions that discursively infuse these four mentalities (aspirations, confessional practices, data and telos) are explored to expose the operations of power in this space, and thus, learn more on the forms of identity that governance of such space presumes and constructs and the power that these mentalities exert.

Aspirations and subjectivities

When policies promote someone who is seeking to constantly improve his/her "skills and competences" (CEC, 2007b, p. 5) to "fulfil his or her potential" (CEC, 2007b, p. 2) as the ideal, subjects are enticed to adjust their conduct of conduct and follow suit by self-actualising themselves according to the promoted ideal. After all, statements such as the above are backed by data and promoted as norms and truth-claims by a leading international organisation which invests a lot in education. Yet, upskilling oneself or increasing one's competences are subjectively constructed aspirations in line with political preconceived ideas. The previous chapter discussed subjectification[42] as the dialectical connection of the construction of the subject engaging in lifelong learning. It

[42] Foucault (1977) argues that subjectification refers to the dialectical connection between the mechanisms and exercise of power that construct a subject. Subjectification is highly political as it mediates and reconfigures the existing order of aspirations, with which subjects adopt the discourse used by stronger actors as if it was their own, and through it they become speaking subjects.

was argued that politics of knowledge can connect third party aspirations with personal objectives. To explore how the aspirations of the EU and the aspirations of the subject engaging in lifelong learning are linked, this part deconstructs the mentalities of government used to alter aspirations into conforming to specific ideals.

In this space, demands concerning the reconstruction of subjectivity are constructed around questions that focus on the governance of individual or collective deficiencies, mostly in the form of enhancing "social cohesion and higher productivity"[43] (CEC, 2010b, p. 18) by addressing unemployment[44], increasing competitiveness[45] or adapting to globalisation[46], and reducing poverty[47]. This can be seen, for instance, in the five important areas that lifelong learning interventions must focus upon highlighted in the *Action Plan on Adult Learning*: "i) To reduce labour shortages [...] by raising skill levels in the workforce [...]; ii) To address the problem of [...] early school leavers [...]; iii) To reduce the persistent problem of poverty and social exclusion among marginalised groups [...]; iv) To increase the integration of migrants in society and labour market; v) To increase participation in lifelong learning [...]" (CEC, 2007, p. 4). These deficiencies, which to varying degrees underscore all EU lifelong learning policies, call for a kind of governance that focuses on modifying the conduct of individuals by "overcoming these challenges" (CEC, 2010b, p. 26) or "existing constraints" (CEC, 1993, p. 102). Yet, when subjects opt to overcome such constraints, they are unknowingly subjected to the constitutive force of the discourse that underlies this narrative, and their subjectification results from normative claims on what is promoted as normal and ideal.

Pressures for a transformation in the conduct of conduct make way for opportunities to become a continuous process of "training and the retraining of workers" (CEC, 1993, p. 113) and "up-skilling and reintegration of people to the labour market" (CEC, 2010c, p. 14) designed to provide them with a feeling of "personal autonomy" (CEC, 1997, p. 3), fulfilment (CEC, 1997, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2006, 2007; EP & EC, 2006) and achievement (CEC, 1995,

[43] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000b, 2002; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.
[44] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EP & EC, 2006b.
[45] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000; EACEA, 1999.
[46] CEC, 1993, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2003b, 2007, 2007b, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006.
[47] CEC, 1993, 1997, 2006b, 2007b, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007; EP & EC, 2006b.

1997, 1997b, 2002, 2006, 2010; CEC & EC, 2004; EP & EC, 2006) consistent with the calculating desires of an ideal subject. This espouses individual employment and economic attainment into a single goal. When subjects are enticed to constantly learn "with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competences within a personal, civic, social and/or employment-related perspective"[48] (CEC, 2001, p. 33), however, they are not just self-actualising their aspirations, but also the EU's aspirations since such aspirations are subjectively constructed with a moral economy of enterprise by organising the mostly entrepreneurial conflicts they are summoned to solve. The ethos of the economy, generally coded in discourses of employability, quality and flexibility, re-shapes subjectivity through self-fashioning. This construction and mobilisation of subjectivities in this space matches Foucault's description of the way in which power shapes the subject through different educational practices. Against the background of what is promoted as educationally important, the main concepts that frame the subject for pedagogical intervention – such as learning (and not education)[49], employability[50] (including employable and jobseekers, the unemployed and long-term unemployed, and the early school leavers), quality[51] and flexibility[52] – become interiorised into individual practices even if they have little to do with lifelong learning in a substantive sense.

In fact, nothing is more subtle in constructing aspirations in a certain way than the shift from speaking about education to speaking about learning[53]. The language of learning, which from the early noughties onwards overrode that of education in this space (Aspin et al., 2012; Field, 2008; Lawn & Grek, 2012), unlike the interpersonal language of education, puts the obligation and responsibility for learning on the individual. Socioeconomic problems are translated into learning problems, such as learning for employability (CEC, 2006, 2007; EP & EC, 2006), learning for citizenship (CEC, 2006, 2007, 2007b, 2010c; EP & EC, 2006) and learning for social inclusion (CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002b; EP & EC,

[48] This is the EU's definition of lifelong learning found in the *Communication* on *Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality* (CEC, 2001).

[49] Including training providers, vocational education providers, adult learning providers, lifelong service providers, education providers, lifelong learning providers and learning providers (CEC, 1991, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2009, 2010; EP & EC, 2006; EC, 2007).

[50] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.

[51] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2002, 2007; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.

[52] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006.

[53] This is developed further in the next chapter on the historical problematisation of the episteme lifelong learning.

2006). These encumber subjects with a responsibility to tackle them even if in reality they have to be addressed on a sociopolitical level rather than on an individual level. This rapid increase in the use of learning over education, which Biesta (2010) called the "*learnification* of educational discourse and practice" (p. 5), introduced a wider language of learning – those who sought to engage in lifelong learning were referred to as adult learners (CEC, 2000, 2006, 2007), potential learners (CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002b), active learners (CEC, 2000) or VET learners (CEC, 2010c). Those who "help people learn in non-formal and informal environments" (CEC, 2001, p. 17) were identified as learning facilitators (CEC, 2001; 2002b; EP & EC, 2006b) or learning organisations (CEC, 2001), and MS were encouraged to create learning environments (CEC, 2001, 2002b, 2003), learning communities (CEC, 2001), learning regions (CEC, 2001) or a learning society (CEC, 1995, 1997, 2002b). The shift of the term itself – from lifelong (or adult) education to lifelong learning – manifests this rise of the new language of learning. Unlike education, the term learning is neutral with regard to content, direction and purpose. Saying that lifelong learning is "one of the guiding principles of education and training" (CEC, 2002, p. 2) or that it is "an overarching strategy of European cooperation" (CEC, 2002b, p. 4) does not mean anything until its contents, directions and purposes are clarified. The increase in the language of learning made it more difficult to question its purpose, to the extent that it is not only often taken-for-granted, but open to interpretation as anything can be part of lifelong learning.

This desertion of education as a social policy for the collective in favour of individual learning as a governmental strategy discloses a growing movement in this space which privileges the marketable empowerment of the subject over the general education of the common public. The argument for empowering the subject in fact, is a common trait in this space. The *Communication* on *Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society* (CEC, 2007b) starts with the following premise: "Empowering young people and creating favourable conditions for them to develop their skills, to work and to participate actively in society is essential for the sound economic and social development of the European Union, particularly in the context of globalisation, knowledge based economies and ageing societies where it is crucial that every young person is given the possibility to fulfil his or her potential" (idem, p. 1). However, framing the importance for more learning in empowering oneself, indirectly postulates that the empowerment of subjects requires an external intervention by someone who is not subjected to the power that needs to be overcome. In this regard, empowerment is portrayed as something that is achieved by a subject and relies on the

fundamental inequality between the one who empowers (in this case the EU) and the one to be empowered (the subject). This skewed logic of emancipatory learning works in favour of the one who empowers since its task is to identify the shortcomings, whereas the task of the one to be empowered rests on addressing the shortcomings identified.

The move away from education to the new concept of learning coincided with a change in direction in this policy space (Field, 2008; Milana, 2012). In the early nineties, the utopian soft-left politics that embraced earlier narratives of democratic concepts started to be replaced by a second generation wave of international policies shaped by an image of a Europe in ceaseless crisis (Brine, 2004). This feeling of a crisis after another (such as shrinking of the European economy from 4% to 2.5% a year, steady rise of unemployment, falling investment ratio and a worse competitive position vis-à-vis USA and Japan as regards to employment and shares of export markets (CEC, 1993) acted as a strategy that legitimised economic and managerial pedagogism over humanist concerns (Field, 2008; English & Mayo, 2012). In fact, in the years that followed, the new notion of employability (CEC, 2000, 2006, 2007, 2007b, 2010, 2010b, 2010c) emerged, and gradually replaced the ways of speaking about employment in general and lifelong learning in particular. For instance, until the nineties, employment was considered to be the responsibility of government, whose goal was to achieve full national employment (Fejes, 2006). In the years that followed though, to develop oneself through learning echoed a business logic that promoted lifelong learning mostly as a source of competitive advantage (Jakobi, 2009; Panitsides & Anastasiadou, 2015; Milana & Holford, 2014).

In the preamble of the first *White Paper* on lifelong learning, *Growth, competitiveness, employment* (CEC, 1993), the EU declared that "we are faced with the immense responsibility, while remaining faithful to the ideas which have come to characterize and represent Europe, of finding a new synthesis of the aims pursued by society (work as a factor of social integration, equality of opportunity) and the requirements of the economy (competitiveness and job creation)" (p. 3). Throughout the *White Paper*, which describes and analyses the perceived challenges for the EU in a dynamic international environment, the EU aims to reach an understanding with its MS on measures "based on the concept of developing, generalising and systematising lifelong learning and continuing training" (CEC, 1993, p. 120) to address sluggish growth, a lack of competitiveness, unemployment and the labour market's inflexibility. When comparing this *White Paper*'s rationale on tackling unemployment with the Council of the EU's conclusion in the *Strategy for Lifelong Learning* (CEC,

1996), published barely three years later, a significant discursive shift away from the social can be observed. This latter document adopted a neo-liberal approach stressing individual responsibility: "Existing attitudes to and structures for education and training are being challenged by many factors: the need to promote greater personal responsibility for acquiring new knowledge and skills; the need to promote individuals' personal development; the development of the information society; the evolution of knowledge and skills, especially the new qualifications needed for the future" (CEC, 1996, p. 2). From this document onwards, overcoming unemployment and improving employability became personal responsibility, and by promoting certain ideals, subjects were encouraged to keep themselves employable by learning the "right skills" (CEC & EC, 2004, p. 6) that are most in-demand in the labour market.

This ideological turn, from speaking about the importance of collective (national) education to speaking about the importance of individual education acted as an endeavour within the wider techniques of governing lifelong learning and turned it into a matter of government and self-government. Depaepe & Smeyers (2008), and Labaree (2008) call this the educationalisation of socioeconomic problems, where education is assigned the task to address socioeconomic problems by constructing the actors around a common set of experiences, processes, and language. Tröhler (2016) argued that understanding this phenomenon plays an important role in the construction of the modern subject as a self-actualising subject in the contemporary politics of knowledge that embody fears and hopes for redemption at the same time. In this space, the educationalisation of socioeconomic problems is fundamentally connected to the portrayal of the ideal image of the European subject which has "the freedom to adopt varied lifestyles, but equally the responsibility to shape their own lives" (CEC, 2000. p. 7), especially, in view of a "future dominated by change" (CEC, 2010c, p. 6). Portraying the free subject as an endangered subject turns lifelong learning from its ideological origins of progressive and radical adult education with an expansive and humanist concept into a kind of capital which ought to be managed, and for which subjects themselves are responsible. Similar to what happened in other areas (e.g., USA's reply to the Cold War, immigrant problems in Paris and Lyon)[54], this educationalisation of socioeconomic problems is the result of an increased expertise (Depaepe & Smeyers, 2008) that emerged as a result of the technocratic rationale of the EU's lifelong learning pedagogy through which actors are enticed to reach their

[54] See Tröhler (2016) for more on this.

goals through a technocratic rationale that introduces a subjective kind of discourse to govern in a particular way.

For instance, the importance of quality[55] (of lifelong learning, of indicators, of education, of human capital, of training, of qualifications, of teaching, and of provisions) is cited several times in this space. It is a notion that originated in the market driven economic paradigm and emphasises organisational planning. Quality in this space is linked with the introduction of a technocratic ideology that stimulates a human capital approach. The 1993 *White Paper* on *Growth, competitiveness and employment* argues that "national authorities should focus on the quality of training and the homogeneity of qualifications" (CEC, 1993, p. 18) and strive to "improv[e] the results and quality of training" (CEC, 1993, p. 118). In this space, it is often argued that "giving priority to quality in education and training has become vital to the EU's competitiveness" (CEC, 1995, p. 34). Quality, in this sense implies a sense of agency, defines success or status, and expresses failure or exclusion, and thus induces the construction of one's aspiration to succeed in a particular way, thereby acting as a political and ideological tool because what subjects aspire to learn is modified by a performative kind of knowledge that reflects instrumental elements and its potential to achieve certain prescribed results. It is also linked to the acquisition of new competences that correspond to the standards of production imposed by the knowledge economy. In this space, being competent, or having the right educational qualities entails the possession of a complex combination of skills and knowledge that leads to effective action in a particular domain. This line of thought runs parallel to an evaluative lifelong learning space through which subjects assimilate and measure their aspirations according to statistical categories of performance that evaluate and promote certain qualities (over others) as certified educational outcomes.

Another major thread running through this space is the argument for becoming more flexible and/or adaptable[56]. It is argued that to be more employable, subjects ought to aspire to "strengthen the development of key competences to ensure the[ir] adaptability and flexibility" (CEC, 2010c, p. 9) by continuously training to keep their marketable edge – "In a high technology knowledge society […] learners must become proactive and more autonomous, prepared to renew their knowledge continuously and to respond constructively to changing constellations of problems and

[55] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2002, 2007; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.
[56] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006.

contexts" (CEC, 1998, p. 9). The same rationale is put forward in the 2001 *Communication Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. This *Communication* argues that "In economic terms, the employability and adaptability of citizens is vital for Europe to maintain its commitment to becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based society in the world. Labour shortages and competence gaps risk limiting the capacity of the EU for further growth, at any point in the economic cycle" (CEC, 2001, p. 6). Yet, although flexibility and adaptability are portrayed as an empowerment tool that helps to free individuals from the constraints of outmoded work practices by giving them more control over their personal and professional lives, in reality, in the long term flexibility and adaptability create a permanent state of insecurity and forces subjects into submission.

Framed as a salvation tool out of social exclusion, flexibility and adaptability, together with VET systems, are portrayed as the most effective ways to overcome personal or professional hardships. For instance, the *Communication* on *A New impetus for European cooperation in VET to support the Europe 2020 Strategy* (2010c) frames the importance of lifelong learning in the following way: "Social exclusion of the low-skilled, learners from a migrant background, the unemployed and those with special educational needs is often the result of cumulating elements such as low formal qualification and the lack of basic skills and transversal competences. Education and training can be important forces to counter social exclusion; VET systems have a particularly important role to play." (CEC, 2010c, p. 9). This rationale is further developed in the *Communication* when it argues that "Developing the level of excellence in VET, opening pathways from VET to higher education and strengthening tertiary VET programmes can raise expectations for VET students and provide pathways for upward social mobility" (CEC, 2010c, p. 10). This narrative is not limited to this *Communication*; in point of fact, the whole narrative in this space is imbued with a constant redirection towards vocationally oriented provisions by suggesting practices that are clearly vocational and technocratic in nature. Arguments such as "Basic education, followed by initial vocational education and training, should equip all young people with the new basic skills required in a knowledge-based economy" (CEC, 2000, p. 7), or the "skills and aptitudes they need to succeed" (CEC, 2010, p. 10) create a normative relationship and frame the importance of education in a certain manner where subjectification acts as a codified instrumentation of technical knowledge-based on subjective modes of reasoning.

This normative power in the relationship between the EU and its subjects is conferred through the implicit consent in seeking to free them from unfitting restraints of the labour market, such as "improvement of hard professional/vocational skills" (CEC, 2010c, p. 7) which, as seen above, promise "pathways for upward social mobility" (CEC, 2010c, p. 10) by reaching for aspirations that are marked by a specific kind of freedom. In this space, the EU argues that individuals "*can* adjust their skills to the labour market needs of an environmentally sustainable economy founded on competence-based training concepts" (CEC, 2010, p. 3) (emphasis added on can). However, the right of the subjects to pursue personal educational choices without restraint and the power to do what one thinks is best, point to a natural act of liberation, a freeing of oneself from a controlling force, whereas in this space they are being governed in the name of freedom by being called to act to alter their subjectivities in order to be crafted through them. This kind of freedom that is put forward disregards the fact that the capacities of the subjects are motivated within a particular environment that reduces the potential for exploration, hence, the responsibility subjects carry is less a moral essence than an instrumental one because they have to be accountable and assessed for their choices. As such, the kind of freedom envisaged in this space has, ironically, come to represent a new form of rule, because in striving "to acquire a minimum set of competences in order to learn, work and achieve fulfilment in a knowledge-based society and economy" (CEC, 2003, p. 19), subjects become tied to a project of their own identity and bound to the pedagogies of expertise. The organisationally desirable subjects (such as those who are more productive, efficient, or flexible) become the personally desirable (to become self-fulfilled through performing excellently and being recognised as such).

Confessional practices and salvation stories

Although the explicit idea of lifelong learning guidance was first floated in the 1993 *White Paper* on *Growth, competitiveness, employment*, the first ideas that attempted to guide actors (in this case MS) towards certain approaches started gradually in the seventies[57], and later became a mainstay of this space through data collection and its subsequent dissemination in the form of statistical categories of performance. In the 1993 *White Paper* though, out of the eight measures to address "the inadequacy of present education and training systems in meeting the challenge

[57] This is discussed further in the next Chapter.

of long-term competitiveness" (CEC, 1993, p. 133), the fifth measure explicitly suggested that MS "improve the coordinated provision of guidance and placement services, notably at local level, to provide systematic advice to young people on career and job opportunities" (idem, p. 133). In the documents that followed[58], guidance (in the form of support, career management guidance and counselling) was identified as "necessary if individuals are to be able to exercise responsibility in building up their abilities" (CEC, 1995, p. 16). The *Resolution* on *Better integrating lifelong guidance into lifelong learning strategies* (EC, 2008) defined lifelong learning guidance as "a continuous process that enables citizens at any age and at any point in their lives to identify their capacities, competences and interests, to make educational, training and occupational decisions and to manage their individual life paths in learning, work and other settings in which those capacities and competences are learned and/or used" (idem, p. 2). Promoted as inherently good, and framed in an entrepreneurial approach, guidance practices, where subjects seek advice from an expert through confessing their doubts and insecurities, are nevertheless controlled spaces intrinsic to the exercise of power because they are part of a network of intelligibility of what is promoted as normal and desirable in this space. To shed more light on the forms of identity that confessional practices (which include guidance, support, career management guidance and counselling) presume and construct, and the power that salvation stories exert, this part problematises confessional practices as a technology of the self by decentring those that seek these practices and analysing them as being shaped in specific ways.

In this space, when an actor is interested to engage in lifelong learning, it is common practice that professional help is sought to discuss what kind of education is best to be pursued (Bergmo Prvulovic, 2012). Professional help might come from an educational guidance practitioner, a policy maker (in the case a MS or institution), a trainer, or a career or study counsellor. Irrespective of who is 'helping' the professional acts as an expert in the field. During this exchange, the subject shares individual and/or collective experiences with the expert, and the expert makes normalising judgements that measure deviant and oppositional attitudes according to the main narrative of this space (Foucault, 1980). When those seeking guidance internalize official policy narrative, whether it is about improving their "entry into the labour market" (CEC, 2010b, p. 13), "to improve skills and employability" (CEC, 2010, p. 6), "to help them develop and make

[58] CEC, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EACEA, 1999; EC, 2002, 2007; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.

the best use of competences in the work place" (CEC, 2010, p. 11), "to facilitate transitions from training to employment and between jobs" (CEC, 2010c, p. 5), or "to make choices relating to education and training programmes or employment opportunities" (CEC, 2006, p. 50), they self-discipline themselves through the regulating gaze of the EU by working through rather than against their subjectivities. When the expert indicates better options, s/he becomes part of the will to govern by mobilising productive power relations which subjects use to evaluate themselves. Shaping one's subjectivity as an object of learning is externally imposed, and gives way to self-discipline because the practice of telling one's story becomes a means to identify with and establish one's own location in a power/knowledge network. What is then promoted as normal or ideal becomes an imperative against which the subjects measure deviance. In this way, confessional practices become imbued with power relations because they act as a special space that elicits the self as an object of knowledge to follow specific subjective mentalities suggested by the expert. Although they carry no identity, confessional practices condense aspects of governance by repositioning thought to new or adapted thoughts of how governing one's life ought to be by inciting subjects to recognize their moral obligations "to raise productivity, competitiveness, economic growth and ultimately employment" (CEC, 2010, p. 2).

Often, confessional practices employ salvation stories as a lever to persuade subjects to take particular educational choices that promise to improve their personal or professional prospects. Salvation stories embody the assumption of human progress through rational means of control inscribed in discourses on the 'others' – those lacking subjects who are discursively construed as undesirable and do not fit the criteria of the ideal – as sites of a calculated progress. The European Commission's *Communication* on *Lifelong learning* (CEC, 2001), for instance, identified people "[…] at particular risk of exclusion such as people on low income, disabled people, ethnic minorities and immigrants, early school leavers, lone parents, unemployed people, parents returning to the labour market, workers with low levels of education and training, people outside the labour market, senior citizens (including older workers), and ex-offenders" (p. 13). For the EU, these 'others', such as the socially disadvantaged (those on low income, welfare dependent, the disabled and senior citizens)[59] and migrants[60] (including refugees and minority groups) carry

[59] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b; EC, 2002, 2007; EP & EC, 2006b.
[60] CEC, 1997, 2001, 2003b, 2006b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2002, 2007; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.

"considerable risks and uncertainties" (idem, p. 6) and are personified in a spectrum of valueless subjects, all of whom are discursively diagnosed and pathologised as lacking and in need of treatment. By embedding risk in the construction of the 'others', salvation stories reshape personal circumstances into stigma and personal irresponsibility where the 'other' is portrayed as facing "a precarious future in society and the modern labour market" (CEC, 2007b, p. 3), and "trapped in jobs with poor conditions or prospects" (idem, p. 6) because of "lack of skills" (CEC, 2010, p. 8), "transversal competences" (CEC, 2010c, p. 8), "drop-out from education and training courses" (CEC, 2000, p. 17), "demotivation" (CEC & EC, 2004, p. 19), or "poor results" (CEC, 2002b, p. 25).

EU lifelong learning policies consider that subjects are innately "motivated to take part in learning" (CEC, 2000, p. 8), and argue that those who do not engage in lifelong learning, do so, due to motivation problems that result from various dispositional, situational and structural impediments (CEC, 2002b, 2003, 2007, 2007b, 2010, 2010c) such as "lack[ing] the required skills, […] the required technical equipment to access certain opportunities (e.g., the Internet), […] lack of information or […] lack of financial support" (CEC, 2002b, p. 42), and that if such barriers[61] are removed, subjects will be naturally inclined to learn (CEC, 2003). Yet, motivation is a relational concept and does not reside within subjects. The motivation of whether one engages in lifelong learning or not, is best understood in relation to who is pathologising who. Therefore, in this space the motivation to engage in lifelong learning is a construct of the EU that sees it lacking in the 'others' who are stigmatised and held as unmotivated because they do not aspire to the subjective ideals it promotes. These 'others' are ascribed motivation problems, while taking for granted the basis upon which the stigma is formulated, thereby making the EU – the one that formulates the stigma – invisible. In this way, motivation, instead of a problem solver, becomes a euphemism for direction and control.

The *Lisbon Strategy* (EC, 2000) also aims to address these "most vulnerable members of society" (p. 3), and frames their vulnerability in the context of the labour market – "The number of people living below the poverty line and in social exclusion in the Union is unacceptable. […] The new knowledge-based society offers tremendous potential for reducing social exclusion, […] by creating the economic conditions for greater prosperity through higher levels of growth and employment, […]. At the same time, it brings a risk of an ever-widening gap […]. To avoid this risk and maximise this new potential, efforts must be made to improve

[61] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007.

skills, promote wider access to knowledge and opportunity and fight unemployment: the best safeguard against social exclusion is a job" (idem, point 32). This rationale – to focus on the pathologisation of the 'others' as a group-based deficit through employability and counselling (confessional practices) – is reflected in many documents in this space (e.g. CEC, 2001, 2002, 2002b, 2003b, 2006, 2007b, 2009, 2010). In fact, often, specific actors are enticed to work on "the promotion of the integration and retention of disadvantaged groups and individuals in the labour market" (OJ L 213, 13.8.1999, p. 5), overlooking altogether the fact that besides addressing certain subjects as disadvantaged groups stigmatises their personal circumstances, integrating these 'others' in the labour market is not necessarily an automatic ticket to an improved standard of living. Actually, enticing these 'others' to follow particular lifelong learning routes by framing the narrative in a discourse of risk and salvation restructures the narrative in a way that creates a normative discourse that focuses on medicalising the will of the 'others' to learn and shifts the attention from political, social or economic structures that instigate or escalate failures to personal stigma.

Data

The previous chapter highlighted Foucault's scholarship on the mentalities in distant sites that generate and transmit knowledge to the central calculations of governance through which subjects regulate their aspirations and subjectivities. It was argued that these mentalities, some of which carry numerical traits, depoliticize policy and bring into being actors to be governed. This part will explore how data, especially through the statistical categories of performance[62] (such as standards, norms, quality controls benchmarks, indicators and best practices), is transformed into an intellectual machinery which provides "a basic set of different kinds of reliable, readily comparable indicators on education systems" (CEC, 2000. p. 1) that helps to govern this space in particular ways.

Although used to describe socioeconomic realities, data embodies implicit choices on how and what is presented and interpreted. The objectivity that is naturally assigned to data disguises its

[62] Statistical categories of performance numerically describe a situation, quantify the objectives set, provide continuous updates on progress toward achieving them and give insights into which factors might contribute to achieving best results.

ability to act as an inscription device. The OMC[63] is the main mechanism of a style of policy formation in this space on which the EU lifelong learning policy papers base their framework (CEC, 2000, 2014). Designed to help MS to progressively develop their own policies, the OMC fixes guidelines with specific timetables to achieve specific goals in education, establishes, where appropriate, quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks as a means of comparing best practice, translates EU guidelines into national and regional policies, and entails periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review as mutual learning processes (EC, 2000). Formally initiated by the Council of the EU in Lisbon in 2000, the *Lisbon Strategy* defined it as a "means of spreading best practice and achieving greater convergence towards the main EU goals" (idem, Point 37).

To start with, in expressing the existence of a common European identity, the OMC embodies the idea of a shared community of destiny between MS. By portraying different socioeconomic realities across Europe as shared EU spaces such as the European cooperation in vocational education and training (CEC, 2010c), European Qualifications Framework (CEC, 2010c), European guidelines for validating non-formal and informal learning (Cedefop, 2009), European common reference tools (CEC, 2010c), European benchmarks in education and training (2002), European area of lifelong learning (2001), European Platform against Poverty (2010b), European Indicator of Language Competence (2007b), European average performance in education and training (CEC, 2003), and so on, certain subjectivities are constructed because they presuppose that it is natural to conceive of these spaces as such. The adoption of shared vocabularies throughout the years not only helps in forming this space as a shared space, but it also makes it appear that it is natural and self-evident for the EU to address a range of European problems, and seek solutions as a common approach.

In this space, data is collected on almost all educational aspects: educational background of participants in lifelong learning courses, length of learning activities, reasons for participating, obstacles to participation, access to information on learning possibilities, employer financing and costs of learning (CEC,

[63] The OMC is made up of four elements: formulation of common objectives, measurability, decentralised voluntary implementation and systematic monitoring. The formulation of objectives, agreed at Council meetings level, is a set of strategic objectives in conjunction with time schedules for their attainment at central level. Objectives are given in measured form through, for instance, indicators or benchmarks in order to measure their attainment and draw comparisons. They are then voluntarily implemented at MS level, and are frequently stated as a convergence in terms of results. This gradual convergence is followed and periodically reported to evaluate progress through systematic comparisons with other MS in the form of best practices.

2010d, 2014), and so on. To create the foundations for this calculative rationality, the EU brought together all the demands for data from within it (Eurostat) by triangulating MS data (collected by national authorities), consequently, reproducing and legitimising a technocratic rationale. The requirements imposed upon MS to "make their own statistics and indicator systems as comparable as possible" (CEC, 2001, p. 28) by keeping continuous records on lifelong learning through "VET statistics" (CEC, 2007b, p. 2), "qualifications and prior learning" (CEC, 2006, p. 7), "lifelong learning policy development" (CEC, 2006, p. 23), the "investment in education and training" (CEC, 2002, p. 1), makes the governance of this space dependent on a net of data which renders reality into a calculable form by translating these statistics into benchmarks, indicators and best practices. Norms and truth claims are then constructed upon which collective and individual evaluations are attached and interventions directed, thereby turning the actors involved into calculable entities with a solidity and accuracy that appears all their own. This form of governmentality controls and directs this space by establishing a complex panopticon where actors are induced in a state of conscious and permanent visibility.

In 2002, the *Communication* on *European benchmarks in education and training* (CEC, 2002) proposed the adoption of EU benchmarks in education and training and invited MS to establish national statistical categories of performance that contribute towards achieving the strategic goals set by the *Lisbon Strategy*. In the same year, an increase in skills and competences, access and participation, and resources for lifelong learning system parameters were among the objectives identified in the report on *European Report on Quality indicators of Lifelong Learning* (CEC, 2002). Three years later, the European Commission was asked to report on "progress made towards the establishment of a coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks for following-up the Lisbon objectives" (CEC, 2005, p. 7), and in the following year, it worked on vocational education within the coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks (CEC, 2006). Still, in 2010 the EU argued that there was a need for more data to support ventures that bring together business and lifelong learning institutions to address innovation skills gaps to match labour market needs (CEC, 2010). Thus, the European Commission was called to work "[…] To transform the open method of coordination on social exclusion and social protection into a platform for cooperation, peer-review and exchange of good practice, and into an instrument to foster commitment by public and private players to reduce social exclusion, and take concrete action, including through targeted support from the structural funds, notably the ESF" (CEC, 2010b, p. 20). In the *Agenda for New Skills and Jobs,* once again, new benchmarks on lifelong learning and

employability were put forward to stimulate a new focus on preparing young people for the transition to the labour market (CEC, 2010). Evidently, the underlying rationale that brings forth the need for further statistical categories of performance favours the principles of contemporary public management. Promoting the construction of a measurable lifelong learning space through a quantification and comparative assessment of outcomes leads to unquestioned compliance with common goals determined by mutually accepted indicators and practices. This signals a transition from knowledge-based education to a competence-based learning approach which prioritises the measurement and assessment of knowledge, and transforms this space into converting inputs to desirable outputs expected to add value to the knowledge economy.

Promoted as logical, normative, supportive and motivating, statistical categories of performance hide the subjectivities that go into constructing them as extensions of the EU's power by constructing comparable information on various issues such as employment and unemployment rates[64], dropout/non-completion (of courses) rates (EACEA, 1999; CEC, 2003, 2006, 2010c), poverty rates[65], poor health rates and rates of youth inactivity (CEC, 2007b), rates of enrolment (in courses)[66], literacy rates[67], percentage of academically low achievers[68], teacher/student ratios[69], counsellor training ratios[70], percentage of budget spent on training/education[71], percentage of population aged 25-64 who participate in education and training[72], etc. These issues act as a conceptualisation of government that constitutes practices of liberty which constantly presume, rest on and consent actors to open up to new possibilities while at the same time restrain them by subjecting them to a calculative and disciplinary mentality through the politics of surveillance. In this way, the capillary power of data works through the actors since they are considered as objects to be divided and analysed, and induces consciousness by the sheer presence of surveillance which measures the progress towards specific defined objectives. This

[64] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EP & EC, 2006b.
[65] CEC, 1993, 1997b, 2006b, 2007b, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007; EP & EC, 2006b.
[66] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997b, 2003, 2006; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; CEC & EC, 2004; EACEA, 1999.
[67] CEC, 1993, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2002b, 2003, 2007, 2007b, 2010, 2010b, 2010c; EP & EC, 2006; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; CEC & EC, 2004; EACEA, 1999; EC, 2000, 2007.
[68] CEC, 2002b, 2003; EP & EC, 2006; CEC & EC, 2004.
[69] CEC, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2010c; CEC & EC, 2004; EC, 2000, 2002, 2007; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999.
[70] CEC, 1995, 1997b, 2001, 2002; EP & EC, 2006b.
[71] CEC, 2006, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000.
[72] CEC, 1997b, 2001, 2002, 2002b, 2010, 2007; CEC & EC, 2004.

concurs with what Foucault, quoted in Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982), argued about the exercise of power – it "is a total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action (p. 220).

The politics of surveillance is sustained by a liberal grammar which mostly articulates job mobility[73], flexibility[74], employability[75], competition[76], the need for more qualifications[77], skills[78] and competences[79] by embedding a managerial rationality in its actors. This process of Europeanisation by data gradually replaces Community integration through a language of quantification, to the extent that the medium of statistical categories of performance enables actors to reach an agreement about commensurable expectations. This disciplinary technique that prescribes positive abstractions through data gives the impression that the primacy of the social has been untouched by disguising political power behind consensual numerical processes. In this regard, data becomes a technology of surveillance, because besides fixing performance requirements and consenting assessments to be defined, it justifies which categories ought to be analysed in order to monitor 'progress', 'standardisation' or 'development'. By circulating statistical categories of performance without any structural roots, policies become naturalised through a sense of inevitability, thus contributing to a greater convergence towards the main EU telos. The quantitative means of comparison penetrates the substantive domains of the subjects, which have been confronted with financial and managerial scrutiny by the spread of audit culture, and leads towards the expansion of further techno-economic rationalities.

[73] CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2002; EP & EC, 2006b.
[74] CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003b, 2006, 2007b, 2009, 2010; EC, 2007.
[75] CEC, 2000, 2006, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2007.
[76] CEC, 2000, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000.
[77] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2002, 2007; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999; EP & EC, 2006; 2006b.
[78] CEC, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; Cedefop & EACEA, 1991; EACEA, 1999; EC, 2002; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.
[79] CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2002, 2007; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.

Telos

The telos of EU governance carries a distinctive moral form that embodies notions of the epistemological character articulated in relation to the understanding of the space to be governed. The relation between the EU's conceptual ideas on lifelong learning and its political logics is a mutual manifestation of specific concerns in another modality. This part discusses the telos of EU governance in this space by exploring the context where lifelong learning is defined and what it is envisaged to solve and why. By identifying the presuppositions that underpin the lifelong learning narrative in this space, it becomes possible to explore the telos by analysing the validity of the claims embodying it, for it is upon them that all else that follows depends.

The narrative mobilised in this increasingly economically dominated space enjoins the aspirations of subjects with the telos of the EU in an uncritical manner, to an extent that over the years lifelong learning reforms have come to be imbued with interrelated discourses of competitiveness, marketisation and performance. Opting for such a context to promote learning points to a creation of subjective conditions for entrepreneurship[80] by assuring continuous availability of "skilled labour" (CEC, 1993, p. 92), making "certain tax advantages conditional upon the taking of action consistent with the objectives of active employment policies"[81] (idem, p. 140), and incite "to develop self-confidence, adaptability, a sense of responsibility [and] employability" (CEC, 2010c, p. 5). This rationale dominates the documents that encompass this space and acts as a catalyst that reshapes policies in ways that are attuned with the prevalent discourses of a "competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy" (CEC, 2000, para. 5) by "measuring progress" (CEC, 2007b, p. 1) and "observing and evaluating adult learning activities" (CEC, 2006b, p. 3), thereby prioritising certain actions and side-lining others.

The end of the 20th century was marked by two crises – a financial crisis due to MS facing reduced incomes while having to spend more on social security, and a bureaucratic crisis due to political disenfranchisement owing to the increasing perception that governments are inefficient and ineffective (Jakobi, 2009). In the light of these circumstances, the EU highlighted the importance of social cohesion even though it increasingly redefined it in terms of employability and placed an emphasis on individual

[80] CEC, 1997b, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2002; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.
[81] Such as social welfare.

responsibility. In fact, the EU's economic concerns that this space aims to tackle, continuously takes into account the social dimensions to economic growth and defines lifelong learning in the context of two broad goals, employability and social cohesion, of which the former is envisaged to solve or improve the latter. Thus, in this space, lifelong learning often plays a contingent role – its contribution is foreseen to lead to an increase in employability which in turn is expected to lead to an increase in social cohesion. Time and again (e.g., enlargement in 2004, enlargement in 2007, financial crisis in 2008), the EU argued that for Europe to become a competitive knowledge-based economy among the best in the world, there needs to be a strong commitment to social cohesion in the core of jobs creation[82].

In the *Memorandum on Lifelong Learning* (CEC, 2000), the EU declared that "The importance of lifelong learning for Europe's future has now been endorsed at the highest level. The Heads of the Member States agree that in the next decade, the European Union should set an example for the world. Europe can – and must – show that it is possible both to achieve dynamic economic growth and to strengthen social cohesion" (p. 6). This was corroborated two years later with the *Council Resolution on lifelong learning* (CEC, 2002) which declared that "Education and training are an indispensable means for promoting social cohesion, active citizenship, personal and professional fulfilment, adaptability and employability" (p. 1). Directly and indirectly, over the years the EU argued that overall reviews of public investment in education and training systems ought to be increased in a targeted way and re-direct existing investments to human resources development to ensure social cohesion and regional balance in terms of growth and employment (CEC & EC, 2004).

The human resources development discourse that makes up most of this space is used as a metanarrative that has a discursive force in that it aims to create the very effects it seeks to describe. It operates as an almost taken-for-granted discourse that the actors forget to remember, concealed beneath the concerns of economy and sovereignty. In this space, the relation between the EU and the subjects who engage in lifelong learning is not one of domination, but one of subjectification since the EU lifelong learning policies are constructed within a grid of politics of knowledge intending to construct specific locales in desirable ways. In this normative relationship (between the EU and subjects), power over acts as a kind of delegated power, and even though there are no or vague binding contracts formalising this

[82] CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2003b, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2009, 2010, 2010b; EC, 2000, 2007; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b.

delegation, normative power converts the circumstances of subjects into an improving direction through shared entrepreneurial goals. By time, the concerns of the economy became the concerns of the society to the extent that the concerns of employability, or lack thereof, are constantly the main challenges this policy space seeks to overcome. In many instances, the EU argues that "raising general skills levels in all Member States is important for the economy, as it helps to achieve the growth, employment and social cohesion objectives" (CEC, 2006b, p. 1). Another instance where the concerns of the economy seem to override those of the society can be found in the recent *Europe 2020 Strategy* which reiterates that "better educational levels help employability and progress in increasing the employment rate to reduce poverty" (CEC, 2010, p. 11). Over and over again, this policy space encourages "individuals to invest in their own learning, both for reasons of personal fulfilment and employability" (CEC, 2007, p. 8), and nowhere is this clearer than in the objective of the *Lifelong Learning Programme* which cites that "lifelong learning should support participants in training and further training activities in the acquisition and the use of knowledge, skills and qualifications to facilitate personal development, employability and participation in the European labour market" (CEC, 2006, p. 14).

Conclusion

During the last twenty five years, the perennial challenges of globalisation, unemployment and social cohesion were, to varying degrees, the driving forces behind turning this space into a site where subjects' individuality is fabricated to link with the EU agency of a political and market-driven international actor that seeks to capitalize itself through calculated acts of learning. These years though, were also punctuated by unprecedented socioeconomic and political challenges which heavily influenced, temporarily or otherwise, the rhythm of the construction of this space.

In the early nineties, the fall of communism, the war in the Balkans and the decline of heavy industry in the west as a result of international agreements for the liberalisation of trade (WTO/GATS) brought with them structural and social consequences in Europe (English & Mayo, 2012; Nóvoa & de Jong-Lambert, 2003; López-Santana, 2006), and thus a more complex reading of the critical problems of structural unemployment, globalisation and social cohesion, which the EU initially responded to with the *White Papers* on *Growth, Competitiveness,*

Employment (CEC, 1993), *Social Policy* (CEC, 1994) and *Education and Training* (CEC, 1995). An unparalleled wave of democratisation which passed over Europe during this time, was followed by a transformation of an old set of problems which now carried new signatures. Concerns regarding the challenges posed by the emergence of a new global economic order intensified the urgency for immediate action, leading the EU to take steps towards a cohesive Europe that converges common systems (Panitsidou et al., 2012). These transformations also led to a change in the EU's geopolitical dimension with the enlargements in 1995, 2004 and 2007, and in its economic dimension with the establishment of the EES and the EMU. The EES's aim was "to create more and better jobs throughout the EU" (CEC, 1997, p. 1) through common objectives and targets, whereas the EMU was tasked with coordinating economic and fiscal policies, a common monetary policy, and the euro.

The EU's political dimension also changed with the ambitious project towards making the EU "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" (CE, 2000, point 5), by 2010. At the time when the *Lisbon Strategy* was launched in 2000, the EU possessed a well-qualified workforce and social protection systems able to provide for the framework needed to manage the structural changes involved in moving towards a knowledge-based society (Milana & Holford, 2014; Panitsides & Anastasiadou, 2015), and it was in this context that lifelong learning was considered *conditio sine qua non* for the achievement of EU objectives (Dehmel, 2006; Jones, 2005; Nóvoa, & de Jong-Lambert, 2003). In fact, the lifelong learning policy initiatives put forward after the *Lisbon Strategy* can be seen in the light of a great awakening in Europe, an awakening that formed the groundwork of a new phase that legitimised fundamental changes that called for a pedagogic ideal where the self-actualising subject is continuously involved in a process of adoption (Pasias, 2006).

Yet, four years down the line, the EU felt the strategy needed a new impetus, and Wim Kok, a former Prime Minister of the Netherlands was chosen to preside over a High-Level Group and author a progress report. Besides criticising the *Lisbon Strategy* for neglecting the importance of the traditional industrial strengths of Europe, the Kok Report (Kok, 2004) addressed MS with a call to recast the strategy's balance of knowledge discourses in terms of growth and jobs. The report argued that there were serious inequalities in the achievement of the commonly agreed objectives between the older European core MS (e.g., England, France and Germany), the southern European region (e.g., Greece,

Spain and Portugal) and the new EU MS of central and eastern Europe (Nóvoa, & de Jong-Lambert, 2003), due to an overloaded agenda, poor coordination, conflicting priorities and the lack of determined political action (Kok, 2004). Following this, a new impetus led to a policy convergence via a mechanism of continuous monitoring, measurement and surveillance (Radaelli, 2013; Bruno et al., 2006; Pasias, 2006). On the surface, EU lifelong learning policies appeared to safeguard the quality of education for all, yet, the kind of lifelong learning policies put forward after the Kok Report used a utilitarian line of logic which defended a neoliberal ideology by converging towards a narrative that aims to instil enterprise and flexibility as desirable ways of being. Framing lifelong learning in such a narrative exposes its political objectives since it is vested with symbolic importance aimed at altering aspirations. This enterprising culture works by encouraging subjects to self-govern themselves by investing in their lifelong learning through a network of governing practices within specific discourses. When the EU argues for a consistent and systematic investment in lifelong learning, it is at the same time capitalising subjects through which they will constitute the identity of entrepreneurial selves. In this sense, entrepreneurial does not limit itself to an economic sense, but refers to a mode of self-government by reproducing one's human capital which integrates social and economic relations in entrepreneurship. Construed in terms of a pedagogy, "lifelong learning opportunities in both initial and continuing VET must be coupled with guidance and counselling services to facilitate transitions from training to employment and between jobs" (CEC, 2010c, p. 5), whereas concerns about inequality and poverty are shifted from the political to the individual sphere, and tamed by data.

Although the Kok report was used as a basis to propose a refocus of the strategy on actions that directly promote growth and jobs Kok, 2004), nothing could have prepared the EU's markets for what was to follow. In September 2008, the global financial crisis hit. A full-blown international banking crisis which led to some MS to bail out financial institutions. A crisis in the banking system of MS using the euro followed, with some MS (such as Greece, Portugal, Ireland, Spain and Cyprus) unable to repay or refinance their debt without the assistance of third parties (such as other MS who use the euro, the ECB or the IMF). The crisis had significant adverse socioeconomic effects in Europe, with "structural, chronically high unemployment rates represent[ing] an unacceptable loss of human capital" (CEC, 2010, p. 2). In this background, the EU kept advocating the educationalisation of social problems by putting forward mechanisms that express serious concern about socioeconomic problems and expect actors' lifelong learning paths to fix them. This particular politics of

knowledge is also found in the ideas and practices promulgated by other economically oriented international organisations such as the OECD, the World Bank and the IMF (Tröhler, 2016).

This educationalisation of social problems is a result of educational organisation building, society's need to find institutional expression of ideals and the faith in solving social problems through individual solutions (Labaree, 2008). Educationalisation integrates society around a common set of practices which stabilize and legitimize governance by providing a body to address such socioeconomic problems, and subsequently blaming it when these problems are not solved (Depaepe & Smeyers, 2008). Labaree (2008) added that the educationalisation of social problems provides a mechanism for expressing serious concern about socioeconomic problems without actually doing anything effective to solve them. In this space, socioeconomic problems are addressed through a kind of lifelong learning which institutionalises the EU's expression of that particular kind of lifelong learning, and even though this kind of lifelong learning does not solve these problems, it nevertheless creates a wave of reforms, such as new or different structures, processes, practices, and languages that shape this space in specific ways. Therefore, in educationalising social problems, although not much is done to solve these problems, a lot is done in constructing the EU lifelong learning policy space in specific ways.

Barely enough time had passed for the EU to adjust to this new, unprecedented scenario, when the Arab Spring ensued. The Arab Spring of 2010 brought a revolutionary wave of protests in the Arab world (including countries neighbouring the EU), some of which led to large-scale conflicts such as the Syrian civil war, the Egyptian crisis and the Libyan crisis. In a context of ongoing conflicts and a refugee crisis in the EU's backyard, rising numbers of immigrants (refugees and economic migrants) from areas hit by conflict sought refuge or political asylum in the EU. Although a new impetus on lifelong learning for immigrants has been in place since the early noughties, with the EU arguing for projects to "support migrants and refugees to attend courses to improve their English and to be able to write a proper c.v. to support their employability" (CEC, 2005, p. 8), it remains to be seen as to how will this space reaches out in addressing this human tragedy.

To recapitulate, this chapter started by exploring the relationship between the calculations of the EU and the aspirations of subjects who engage in lifelong learning. It was shown that subjects are continuously enticed to aspire to be free through self-work upon their aspirations. Freedom, as a governmental strategy in this

space is located in the evolution of liberal political developments that have taken hold of the EU lifelong learning polices from the *Lisbon Strategy* onwards, turning it from an abstracted ideal it is often theorised to a technical condition of rational government. Liberal practices promoted in this space facilitate freedom by empowering and activating forms of agency that, at the same time, discipline and constrain its exercise by setting common statistical categories of performance that render calculable the performance of actors. In fact, although the ideational message of lifelong learning communicates a vision of the knowledge-based society with overriding economic and political rationales, it is presented and regulated not as a matter of obligation or conformity to a moral norm, but as a free personal lifestyle decision.

Often, this will to knowledge is constituted by the subjects' concern of becoming cognitively, socially or economically disadvantaged, in other words of becoming the 'others'. The narrative of abnormality, of 'othering', plays a central role in this space because the subject as a pedagogical subject is constructed as an incomplete individual who is constantly encouraged to become mobile and engaging, and is coded with an identity imbued with hope concerning a successful personal and professional future. The EU report on *Accomplishing Europe through education and training* (1997b) called this continuing professional development, in many other EU reports it is referred to simply as lifelong learning, Drummond (2003) called it the "commodification of the self" (p. 61), and Popkewitz et al. (2006) referred to this as the unfinished cosmopolitan.

To avoid becoming undesirable, actors are encouraged to seek guidance or advice from experts in order to show them the best options out of their hardships. Yet, when they do, they position themselves as speaking and desiring actors and self-regulate themselves to sites for intervention by the expert through a discursive matrix of practices that bring forth their "learning needs" (CEC, 2007, p. 5) by describing their aspirations for self-development. Confessional practices, an integral component in this space, work in tandem with the mentalities that infuse salvation stories by acting on the personal conduct of subjects when new meanings and subjectivities are created. The pressures for a transformation in their educational choices make way for opportunities to become a continuous process of learning designed to provide them with a feeling of autonomy and self-achievement consistent with the calculating desires of the ideal actor.

Governing by data is another component in the construction of the audit culture of this space. By transforming this space into a

complex of incessant calculation, data normalises judgements from receding enclaves that link to the calculations of the EU, thereby linking the technologies of audit and the political aspirations with individual aspirations. This calculation brings forward a rationale with a kind of directionality in ways of thinking about learning where subjects are expected to organise their agency according to a technocratically predefined design, which, although backed by 'evidence' in the form of data, it nevertheless reflects the rational norms of the EU as a political organisation. In this way, instead of using data to explore or discuss lifelong learning, it is used to measure the quality of lifelong learning policy – a kind of information which focuses on outputs rather than inputs.

Although not backed by any EU legislation and without any authoritative action or juridical entity to reprimand corrective action, this policy by numbers approach acts as a discursive regulatory mechanism. It re-shapes reference points in this space with tables and graphs devoid of meaning and context, thereby naturalising policies by raising a sense of inevitability. At the same time, statistical categories of performance influence the conduct of conduct of the actors by subjecting the topic in question (e.g., age, level of education, enrolment vs completion, etc.) to an inanimate indicator. Becoming an ideal subject therefore, carries an epistemological character expressed in relation to the understanding of the EU's telos which transmits a distinctive moral form that embodies notions of the nature and scope of legitimate educational governance through which the EU continuously gathers and sorts data according to what it envisages to be normal or ideal, deviant or risky.

5. The genealogy of lifelong learning

As discussed in Chapter 3, Foucault links power with knowledge by arguing that discourse is an articulation of specific interpretations of the social world and constitutes certain phenomena into being aimed to conduct the conduct of subjects. Being a subject embodies normative values that define what is normal and what is not, and over the years these values have changed the different articulations that construct the episteme *lifelong learning* and the subject therein. These normative values act as pieces of evidence in the historical problematisation of this episteme and shed light on how the truth claims that emerged influenced the terminological shifts – from recurrent to lifelong and from education to learning. The mobilising of subjects in this space is part of the way in which power is exercised, where power enables, constrains, and circulates in the social rather than held by the EU. Its discreet and subtle operation through ostensibly freely adopted practices determines subjects' behaviour by controlling their decisions to behave. To explore how these values have changed the different articulations throughout the years, this study genealogically analysed the claims surrounding lifelong learning found in four landmark policy texts by three international organisations.

Foucault's developed genealogy in the later part (1972, 1977) of his work in opposition to the history of ideas. He (Foucault, 1977), argued that generally, history is seen as a process where order is created out of chaos, where a story is told with causality in the foreground as a way to explain the past and the present. Instead, in his scholarship, he (Foucault, 1977), put forward that history

ought to be seen as a continuous process of discontinuities, and its study should focus on re-establishing systems of subjection by tracing the emergence of particular events which arose in temporary plays of domination. Genealogy problematises the present through the past ideas that form the narratives of progress and the taken-for-granted ideas of the present. It traces these ideas in the present as a means to identify the factors that led to what carries value to today's society (Foucault, 1977). Genealogy perceives history as a process of discontinuities, and when studying it, the focus ought to rest on the re-establishment of systems of subjection by tracing the events that arose in temporary plays of domination (Fejes, 2006). Therefore, in order to explore the dominant mentalities that construct this episteme and the fabrication of the subject therein, this chapter traces the changing conceptualisations of the episteme lifelong learning that have taken place from the mid-sixties onwards. This thesis claims that the genealogy of this episteme can be recast in terms of the governmentalisation of this space.

This chapter discusses how international organisations' policy documents interpreted and constructed the socioeconomic world according to their historical variability and situational contingency of the idiom by which they expressed their concerns, consequently stripping their telos of its self-evident natural character (Merlingen, 2006). In exploring their interpretations of the socioeconomic world, it becomes possible to gain purchase on how the mentalities that constrained different definitions have changed, not only over time and across international organisations, but also within them too. The landmark policy texts analysed are:

1. *Learning to be – The world of education today and tomorrow*[83], authored by Faure et al. on behalf of UNESCO in 1972;
2. *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning*, authored by Dennis Kallen and Jarl Bengtsson on behalf of OECD in 1973;
3. *Teaching and learning: Towards the learning society*, authored by the European Commission in 1995;
4. *Lisbon Strategy*, authored by the Council of the EU in 2000.

This chapter starts by outlining the three international organisations that authored these reports, followed by their interpretations of significant socioeconomic and political shifts

[83] The Fauré report was originally written in French. In the English translation, éducation permanente was translated to lifelong education. This study consulted the English version of this report.

that influenced the changes in narrative that constructed this episteme from the mid-sixties onwards. Starting with the post-war boom, this chapter discusses the effects of the May 1968 protests, the oil crisis, the Thatcherite influence on education, the creation of the EU single market, the complex demands of the labour market and the EU's strong economic stance at the beginning of the century – all of which brought conflicting interpretations on the role of this episteme. The interpretation of these events by the three international organisations placed different political mandates on this episteme and shaped the mentalities in putting forward certain arguments and not others. This chapter also discusses the elasticity of this episteme, the changing roles of the state and the subject over the years, and the commodification and the resultant consequences of lifelong learning. To illustrate the institutional movement through time, this chapter adopts a temporal ordering to give a timeframe of what happened when. The institutional movement per se is not meant to be genealogical. What is genealogical are the conflicting interpretations on the role of this episteme and the changing values it carries.

The three main international organisations[84] that shaped the field of lifelong learning in Europe are UNESCO, the OECD and the EU. Together, they interpreted different socioeconomic scenarios in particular ways by promoting normative values that by time became internalised and diffused truths. UNESCO was the first, and in line with its educational mandate and role as an intellectual think tank, it authored *Learning to be – The world of education today and tomorrow* (Faure et al., 1972)[85]. This reflected on the future of education by questioning the validity of existing systems of education at the time of publication. Reflecting UNESCO's distinctive character as an intellectual organisation, this report is indebted to progress, values, freedom, emancipation, and carries a humanist[86] concept of individuals as masters of their own destiny (Elfert, 2015). Besides this report, during its history, UNESCO published other works with the intention to help national educational leaderships to offer quality education for all. Two that stand out are the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report*, and *The treasure within*. The *Education for All Global Monitoring Report* was published between 2002 and 2015 and was aimed to sustain commitment towards UNESCO's movement "Education for All". *The treasure within* was published in 1996, and

[84] Besides these three, throughout the years and to varying degrees, other international organisations such as the World Bank, UNICEF, the Council of Europe and ILO also engaged in the debate on the education of adults in Europe. Nevertheless, their engagement was either marginal or temporary and did not carry as much weight as those which this study focuses on.

[85] This was chaired by Edgar Faure, henceforth the Fauré Report.

[86] Humanism is a way of thinking that places importance on the human aspect of life by emphasising common human needs and stressing the value and goodness of humans (Rubenson, 2009).

built on Faure's report by sticking with UNESCO's integrated and holistic vision of education. Although this report did not ignite the same level of enthusiasm as its predecessor, it was a worthwhile endeavour as it tried to break away from the one-track narrative of other international organisations at the time. Initially this research started genealogically analysing this report too, but during the course of the study, it was decided to drop it and instead focus more in depth on the other UNESCO document, since when it was published, it put the education of adults on the international radar for the first time and hence carried more weight.

Although in academic circles this report is referred to as the Faure report, it was written by an international commission[87] on the development of education on behalf of UNESCO. In the aftermath of the May 1968 events, this commission was created and entrusted with the task to produce a report on the future of education intended to help nations formulate strategies for the development of their educational systems.

Following UNESCO, the OECD, an international organisation that coordinates economic policies of the world's wealthier (mostly western) nations entered the international lifelong learning scene. Although it has no direct power, the OECD is very influential on the international stage and most of its economic concerns take into account the social dimensions to economic growth by underpinning a gradual evolving awareness of the importance of human capital thinking. In its reports, education often plays a contingent role – its contribution leads to an increase in economic growth which in turn is expected to lead to an increase in the general well-being of society. Among the reports it has published on education, one that stands out is the very first major strategy which it published in 1973, *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning*. Similar to UNESCO, the OECD initiates and coordinates activities such as meetings, analytic work, surveys and workshops and even though its reports are not binding, much of its power in lifelong learning is normative. Besides this report, the OECD has published numerous other reports on the education of adults ranging from getting the right skills, to innovative learning environments, to reviews of resources to name just a few. The 1973 report was chosen because it was the first OECD report to focus

[87] The President of this commission was Former French Minister of National Education Edgar Faure. The other members of this commission were Felipe Herrera (ex-president of the Inter-American Development Bank), Arthur V. Petrovski (member of the Academy for scientific pedagogies in the former USSR), Abdul-Razzak Kaddoura (nuclear physicist), Majid Rahnema (ex-Iranian Minister for Higher Education), Henri Lopes (ex-Congolese Minister for National Education) and Frederick Champion Ward (consultant on international education at the Ford Foundation).

explicitly on education and similar to UNESCO's report in the previous year, it put this new concept on the map of international politics. This report was authored by Dennis Kallen and Jarl Bengtsson, both of whom were OECD officials at the time.

The EU, on the other hand, besides being influential and active in this field, it also finances its Community programmes, and thus it also promotes its policies through its budget. In contrast to the previous two, in the seventies the EU had limited presence in this area. Over time though, it acquired new power and contrary to other international organisations, it exerted it with increasing vigour, first during the late eighties when it pursued the creation of the Single Market (Field, 1998), and then again in the noughties when it aimed to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world. The EU exercises normative power through a refined governmentality not only on its MS but also worldwide, and unlike UNESCO and OECD, it carries a political mandate and thus exercises a stronger binding authority with its MS. The new drive that called on subjects to use their resources more efficiently to promote regional economic growth paved the way for the 1995 *White Paper*[88] which brought an invigorating interest in the education of adults, transforming the notion into policy statements and programmes and helping it enter mainstream political vocabulary in the form of lifelong learning. In 2000, it was furthermore chosen to be amongst the leading tools for the implementation of the *Lisbon Strategy*, acting as a guideline for policy formation and implementation. These reports were authored by the European Commission and European Parliament officials respectively in close collaboration with national stakeholders and policy makers.

In this genealogical analysis, the members of the UNESCO commission who wrote the Faure report, the OECD officials who authored the OECD report and the officials of the European Commission and European Parliament and the respective stakeholders and policy makers who worked with them will not be analysed for their authorship per se because in a genealogical analysis the author is decentred and instead of looking at his/her background, input or area of expertise, the analysis explores the mentalities put forward to govern subjects in the report as a whole. This focus on the 'how of governing' stems from the rejection of an a priori understanding of the distribution of power, and instead opts to focus on historically situated practices, mentalities and identities by which governing operates.

[88] *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society (CEC, 1995).*

The first years

After the Second World War, Europe experienced three decades of economic growth that were dominated by the assumption of continuous linear development (Blitz, 2003). During this time there were mass employment opportunities, growing national and individual incomes, increasing labour and social rights and the exponential growth of consumption (Elfert, 2015; Dale & Robertson, 2009). This was a period where public educational expenditure rose quicker than economic growth itself, and the pursuit of simultaneous diverse educational objectives was possible (Field, 1998). Discourses of political stability and economic growth were intertwined and the need to rebuild a strong European economic and trading base was linked with the need to maintain peace between formerly warring nations (Brine, 2004). In the course of these decades, access to education expanded, educational policies broadened the bases of reflection and searched for a balance between humanist concepts of education and an instrumental nature which contributed to socioeconomic growth (Dehmel, 2006; Finger & Asún, 2001).

It was during these years that UNESCO created a Commission with the aim to produce a report on the future of education that will help nations formulate strategies for the development of their educational systems (Faure et al., 1972). Given its distinctive character as an intellectual organisation and the economic growth that dominated this period, UNESCO called on national educational systems to develop from a humanist point of view. In fact, the report *Learning to Be – The world of education today and tomorrow*, coordinated by Edgar Faure et al. (1972) carried the spirit of the time – a cosmopolitan vision of justice that discussed the ontological problems of humankind and called for a new social contract that involved the responsibilities of everyone. It promulgated the promise of scientific humanism for the reform of education and society (idem, p. 1-159), addressed policy implications (idem, 160-234) and the policy principles of the education of adults which it framed as lifelong education.

This report argued that "We should no longer assiduously acquire knowledge once and for all, but learn how to build up a continually evolving body of knowledge all through life – 'learn to be'" (idem, p. vi); thereby shifting the emphasis from traditional compulsory schooling of the early years to the broader perspective of lifelong education. Its humanist approach was to achieve the fulfilment of man through a flexible organisation of the different

phases of education by suggesting a widening access to higher education, recognition of formal, informal and non-formal learning, and environmental, cultural and health education. This report articulated many of the concerns expressed in the May 1968[89] protests by configuring lifelong education in terms of solidarity and democracy. The report claimed that "most education systems do not help [people] to discover themselves, to understand the components of their conscious and unconscious personalities [...]. Education thus neglects its basic duty of teaching men the art of living, loving and working in a society which they must create as an embodiment of their ideal" (idem, p. 66). The underlying tenet was that education had to be at the centre of a learning society by focusing on the process of learning that will lead to the formation of the "complete man" who is an "agent of development and change", "promoter of democracy", "citizen of the world" and "author of his own fulfilment" (idem, p. 158).

Education, according to this report, had to contribute to political consciousness and reflection so that individuals understand the structures of the world they live in and commit to the struggle to reform them. The telos of UNESCO reduced the need to prioritise certain outcomes over others, and circumvented the need for comparisons between individuals or nations on who is most complete or developed. The political dimension of this interpretation of lifelong education represented its most important contribution in the light of a critical sociology of education by proposing a theoretical path and an action plan on how a new learning society ought to be. The authors of the report argued that "all that has to be learned must be continually reinvented and renewed and therefore, if learning involves all of one's life, in the sense of both time-span and diversity, and all of society, including its social and economic as well as its educational resources, then we must go even further than the necessary overhaul of 'educational systems' until we reach the stage of a learning society" (idem, p. xxxiii). The report identified four assumptions that underpin its tenet: the existence of an international community with a fundamental solidarity, a shared belief in democracy, the intention to develop the complete fulfilment of man, and that "only an overall, lifelong education can produce the kind of complete man the need for whom is increasing with the continually more stringent constraints" (idem, p. vi). Such assumptions portray a positive concept of progress and personal development and place the education of adults, or as this

[89] In France, civil unrest culminated in the May 1968 protests which were punctuated by demonstrations and large-scale general strikes together with the occupation of universities and factories bringing a country to a standstill (Singer, 2002).

report called it, lifelong education, as a means that would enable people to control and adapt to change. The ambiguity of the term lifelong education – which was not yet popular in 1972 – helped it to become a UNESCO ideal in the years that followed, creating the basis for an uncritical and evangelical zeal (Elfert, 2015).

For Faure (1972), this term presented a vision of democratisation, and grounded within the framework of being, it entailed a holistic methodology where the self cannot separate itself from the context and neither can the process separate itself from the content. The focus of learning as being rested on a fluid relationship (Bauman & Donskis, 2013) between the thoughts and actions of the subject towards more complex syntheses in response to the challenges of learning a truth. Perceiving lifelong education in a framework of being turned into a project of learning *to be* – a poetic praxis that consents to a practice where different thoughts and actions are allowed, rather than a project where learning is measured by predefined checklists of objectives regarding the possession of knowledge and skills.

The continuity of linear development in Europe was dramatically shaken by the 1973 oil crisis[90] which completely changed the political landscape in Europe (Field, 2000). The onset and deepening of the recession that followed caused labour unrest, increased social inequalities and slowed the international economy. European nations faced the complications that come with stagnation and inflation, to which they responded with imposing constraints on public resources. As ideas about an industrial democracy started to fade, the earlier debate on lifelong education as an agent of change and promoter of democracy started to be reconsidered, and international organisations were compelled to rethink[91] the role of education.

Unsurprisingly, the OECD interpreted this unstable political climate as a socioeconomic problem and blamed the traditional educational system for its inefficiency. In 1973, it published the report *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning* (1973), declaring that "Recurrent education is a comprehensive education strategy for all post-compulsory or post-basic education, the essential characteristic of which is the distribution of education over the total life-span of the individual in a recurring

[90] The oil crisis was an oil embargo on some western countries that had a major impact on international relations.

[91] The role, concept and values of education had to be rethought because the main theoretical concepts about education are based mainly on the theories of Dewey. Although his work was grounded in a different sociopolitical context, nearly a century ago Dewey (1916) argued that education is the enterprise of supplying the conditions which ensure growth, or adequacy of life, irrespective of age.

way, i.e., in alternation with other activities, principally with work, but also with leisure and retirement" (idem, 1973, p. 24). Most of what was put forward in this report was filtered through the human capital theory approach by promoting policies that contribute to economic expansion. Recurrent education became its educational agenda's leitmotif and its subordination of education to economic and managerial pedagogism in this report is based on the idea that by addressing economic problems, individuals' problems would be automatically addressed too.

The report claimed that the traditional compulsory scholastic set-up ought to be followed with an alternation between phases of work so that individuals have a role in a global strategy of recurrence. The report also spoke of the skills needed to improve individual and professional performances to "ensure a satisfactory interplay between the world of work and the education system" (idem, p. 41). This report also introduced the idea of paid education leave as a mechanism that allows employed individuals to engage in learning activities outside the workplace while preserving their job and income. This was in response to what was interpreted as the main problem of the educational system – a skills gap: the increasing gap between the knowledge promoted at school and at work. Intentionally interpreting unemployment as a skills crisis rather than a jobs crisis persistently called on the public and private education community to render their educational choices more relevant to the job market, thereby forcing public and private education institutions to redefine their educational priorities. Alternating education between phases of work revealed that humanistic education had to be the one to adjust to vocational education and not the other way round. Whereas Faure's report spoke of education and work as being equal, this report implicitly showed that this delicate balance needed adjusting if the sociopolitical climate of the time was to be overcome. Until this time, the problematisation of the education of adults, which the OECD called recurrent education, had not been so functionalistic.

However, despite the policy changes with long visions, mainly in view of the promises that a better educated society improves competitiveness and alleviates poverty, during this time their translation into action was marginal (Delors, 1996) not least because a free educational entitlement that went beyond compulsory education was an expensive idea to implement. By time, it became evident that the challenges to execute the concepts espoused by UNESCO and the OECD were remarkable, and needed extensive changes in national education systems and in the labour market (Jarvis, 2007). Moreover, the underlying tenets of lifelong education and recurrent education were rooted

in an economy of full employment and once the stable model of full employment started to give way to a more fragmented and turbulent labour market, the concepts lost much of their appeal (Field, 2001). Speaking about these first years, Paul Lengrand, a pioneer of the education of adults and one of its foremost advocates, argued that during the seventies "from the theoretical point of view the principle [of lifelong education] progressed considerably, but in practice the situation is less impressive [and] it does not appear that the set of traditional structures has in fact been substantially modified" (Lengrand, 1986, p. 9). This, however, gradually changed when the EU came onto the scene.

In 1973, the EU appointed former Belgian Minister of Education Professor Henri Janne to write a report on the principles of an education policy at Community level. Janne emphasised the interrelatedness between education and economic development in the provisions of the Treaty of Rome and the free movement of labour as a basis for moving towards an establishment of a common vocational training policy. He also noted that "there is no longer any good vocational training which does not comprise a sound general training at all levels, and there is no longer any good general training which is not linked with concrete practice, and, in principle, with real work" (Janne, 1973, p. 11). Janne suggested that it would be strategically smart if the EU embraced this field considering it was an emerging field "with few structures, little integration and, consequently, more open to combined action" (idem, p. 40). For Janne, the politicisation of the education of adults at EU level would find "a building site where little work has so far been done and which [...] would lead the Community to draw conclusions on educational policy in general" (idem, p. 42).

A few years later, in 1979, Margaret Thatcher became Prime Minister of Great Britain, one of the biggest economies in Europe at the time, and in conflict with the humanist path, she vehemently promoted privatisation and marketisation of governmental services (Nicoll & Salling Olesen, 2013). Characterised by an inclination to meet the needs of the labour market and the economy, Thatcher claimed that in the light of rising unemployment, upskilling the workforce was the only way forward if the nation was to compete in the global economy (Peters, 2001). In fact, humanist values of education in the late seventies and early eighties started to lose their appeal and a

neoliberal[92] rationale, which would pick up steam in the years that followed, started gaining ground (Holford, 2008).

In short, two longstanding positions related to education from the early seventies to the late eighties were radically transformed: the expectations from the education system and the role of the actors involved. The years of economic growth dominated by assumptions of continuous linear development were rocked first by the oil crisis, followed by the labour unrest and social inequalities that followed, and then with Thatcher's assertion on the markets and the economy. At first glance, the rationale put forward by the UNESCO and the OECD for a particular kind of education and the specific conditions for European cooperation appear not to be related. But upon further exploration, the challenges to which lifelong education and recurrent education were expected to respond called for a wider approach towards the field of education. In the years that followed, this approach gave birth to various technologies of government in distant sites that generated and transmitted knowledge. These technologies led to a new institutional framework which, without refuting the importance of a vision of democratisation grounded within the framework of being, consented the analysis of such scenarios from an instrumentalist perspective.

The second generation wave of international lifelong learning policies

The beginning of the nineties were marked by the end of the Cold War, an increasing globalisation of the economy, immigration towards Europe and a recession that brought record unemployment (including long-term unemployment, high unemployment amongst the youth, and low participation of women, older workers and ethnic minorities in the labour market) (Walters & Haahr, 2005). To address the globalisation concern and the record unemployment, the EU created the Single Market and the swiftness by which extensive knowledge dispersal of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), in particular the Internet, became central factors for educational development, brought an invigorating context for debate on the role of education in the future (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002; Boshier, 1998). Besides the Single Market, the EU looked eastwards for a

[92] Dale & Robertson (2009) defined neoliberalism as "harnessing the apparatuses of the state to its own purposes in place of the decommodifying and 'market-taming' role the state had under social democracy" (p. 29).

geopolitical dimension (with the membership of a number of Eastern countries in 2004) and worked to strengthen its political dimension (through an EU Constitutional Treaty which was later abandoned) (Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002; Milana & Holford, 2014). Nevertheless, in response to, or in defence of an increasingly unknown and multifaceted technological, economic, and sociopolitical scenario, the emerging educational order followed on the same steps of the previous decade – moving away from the primarily humanist ideals towards a more utilitarian view of education (Biesta, 2006, 2010; English & Mayo, 2012; Ertl, 2006; Milana & Holford, 2008).

Under Jacques Delors, President of the European Commission from 1985 to 1994, the EU became a major political actor in education and the first of a series of *White Papers* was published. As a member of the French Socialist Party, Delors had a longstanding interest in education, and during his presidency he advocated a new model that addressed the socioeconomic challenges of the time. Coming at the end of his presidency, the EU published the *White Paper* on *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society* (CEC, 1995) through which it proposed to align education and training along the requirements of the Single Market (such as the skills and training needed in the light of the global economy) whose operation had marked a breakthrough in the Europeanisation process.

This *White Paper* largely reflected the prevailing political discourse about continuous economic growth, scientific progress and technological innovation. This is reflected in the five objectives designed "to put Europe on the road to the learning society" (idem, p. 54). Among these five – (i) to encourage the acquisition of new knowledge, (ii) to bring schools and the businesses closer, (iii) to make capital investment in training[93], and (iv) to develop proficiency in three European languages to benefit from opportunities available in the border-free Single Market – only the fifth objective (v) to combat social exclusion, addressed a larger societal issue (although it only dealt with school drop-outs and did not address the social exclusion, such as ethnic minorities or older workers) (idem, 1995). This *White Paper* portrayed education as an investment that would help individuals to improve personal and national competitiveness and also combat social exclusion. Investing in one's education was not a new phenomenon, but by closely intertwining investment and

[93] The *White Paper* suggests that capital investment and investment in training should be treated equally, because if education and training are viewed as a cost, when businesses go through a rough patch they might be the first to be cut. So, to counter this possible scenario, the *White Paper* argues that expenditure on training should be viewed as belonging to the intangible assets of a company.

competitiveness denotes the telos of the EU in aiming to channel subjects towards an investment of monetary gain. Using the humanistic argument, the notion of education as a competitive investment epitomises economic and managerial pedagogism. By contrast, using the neoliberal argument, investment in education ought to be desirable since it pays off over a long period of time. However, the simplistic nature of this neoliberal tenet does not address the technical modelling on which it is based. Promoting education only as a competitive investment to improve personal and national competitiveness produces a partial subjective view of the history of discourse in this space because it eliminates other options that have been excluded in the process.

In accordance with the EU's telos, this *White Paper* uses economic freedom as a pretext for employability (a key word in this paper (see, for instance, the Forward of the *White Paper*)). Freedom is depicted as something that has to be achieved and constantly maintained through the flexible acquisition of certified key skills[94] and knowledge that enhance job mobility. The modifying of the concept of freedom mirrors the rearrangement of this space at the same time. From being a passive learner exposed to education, in order to be free of professional constraints, the subject is enticed to increase his marketable attributes. This kind of freedom is promoted through the argument that the individual has now more control on the kinds of education s/hew wants to pursue. In this sense, freedom is understood as a dissatisfied ethos of recurrent critique of the socioeconomic scenario (Miller & Rose, 2008), and acts as a prescription for rule, which becomes both the ethos and techne of government (Burchell et al., 1991) because the "responsibilisation" (Peters, 2001, p. 59) of the self is depicted as a choice for freedom.

Also, the practical measures (e.g., apprenticeships and vocational training) this *White Paper* puts forward are constructed on a market orientated platform and refrain from addressing the need for a more diverse provision of education in a learning society because they are rooted in the same narrative – the narrative of the market. This narrative acts as a form of governmentality because it constructs a circumscribed perception of the educational project in labour market relationships of future so-called knowledge societies and knowledge economies; in other words it constructs mentalities according to its subjective

[94] The *White Paper* defines key skills in terms of a broad knowledge base and proposes that key skills are identified in terms of well-defined areas of formal knowledge, so as to make it easier to devise validation systems that lead to a common accreditation system covering vocational and technical skills.

rationale whilst promoting them as being in the best interest of its subjects.

During the first years of the noughties the EU definition of lifelong learning changed, mainly because of the criticism of the narrow scope of the European Commission's definition, seen by many as too exclusively focused on labour market perspectives (English & Mayo, 2012). A survey about lifelong learning in the MS by Eurydice (2000) showed great variations and "ideas associated with the definition of the concept have been developed much further in some countries than in others" (p. 16). The greatest discrepancies in lifelong learning, the survey claimed, were not structural or instrumental but in the basic understanding of the concept and the role of the state (Eurydice, 2000) because by time, the role of the state was redefined. Instead of distributing educational resources, it is now expected to facilitate educational services that consent subjects to make choices, or as Rose (1999) argues, a shift from a social state to an enabling state. Through such practices, the state distances itself from governing through legislative measures since governing is now expected to happen via each subjects' 'free' choices. The individual is positioned as responsible or not depending on the opportunities s/he takes to transform into an ideal subject (i.e., employed and employable, and participates in lifelong learning).

Following the Council of the EU at Lisbon in March 2000, the *Lisbon Strategy* with its strongly economic target of making "the EU the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world" (EC, 2000, p. 5) within a decade was issued. This *Strategy* was a significant attempt at establishing a global policy consensus (Field, 2008) because it explained how the EU views the future of lifelong learning by setting common European objectives for education and training aimed at supporting MS to develop their own policies. The narrative put forward in this *Strategy* reflects a convergence of the contemporary international policy documents in this space and called for governance to focus on strategies of skills-based training intended to shape subjects via an increasingly mobile and cross-border intra-EU labour market.

Governance of this *Strategy* is framed as a technical problem-solving exercise characterised by conceptual and analytical language bound together by an overriding discourse on welfare development which promotes universal labour market participation. In parallel with employment and social inclusion policies becoming a priority at EU level, an international dimension about new concepts, problematisation of definitions, solutions and strategies emerged. This new discourse carried particular epistemic assumptions and normative values, and was

followed by procedural shifts that reflected new ways how these concepts ought to be understood and applied. This new discourse also reflected new knowledge about the ideal subjects, what their goals ought to be, and the appropriate ways of putting those goals into practice.

The main line of argument that weaves through the *Lisbon Strategy* is that if the EU is to compete on the global economy it must have knowledgeable and skilled workers who constantly update their skills. The *Strategy* emphasises a kind of knowledge that has certified outcomes (such as qualifications) indirectly implying that valuable knowledge is measurable knowledge. Such a pedagogical model in lifelong learning links to managerial assessment practices based on a categorisation process that represent a division between the domains of knowledge and actual know-how. Based on an instrumental rationality, qualifications make it possible to identify 'best' quality learning that ought to be transferable to other actors, and increasingly centres the validation of certain skills over others. This pedagogical model signifies that knowledge needs to be considered as something which is not simply applied, but as the product itself, a commodity in its own right that can be purchased or invested in.

Imbued with discourses of modernisation and change, this *Strategy* was based on the consistent premise that the future of Europe had to be closely intertwined with a knowledge economy (and other cognate terms such as knowledge society, knowledge-based economy and learning economy). This strategic intent was carried through specific policy concerns, such as training for the high knowledge-skilled and vocational retraining to increase employability for the low-knowledge skilled. In this regard, knowledge does not mean understanding or awareness. Rather, it refers to the mentalities that have become a central component of government, or in Rose & Miller's (1992) words, "the know-how that makes government possible" (p. 178). In the *Strategy*, the term knowledge is used synonymously with information and assigned objective and material qualities. Presenting it in such a way is based on two premises: the first is that it is objective (a stable truth and unchangeable), and therefore consents the measuring of the knowledge acquired with uniform tests and the issuing of qualifications; the second premise is the assumption of finality – knowledge has a beginning and an end. This conceals unchallenged belief in the right of pedagogical authority to define what's best to know. In fact, the widespread use of competency based training is conventional within this space as lifelong learning is aligned with the requirements of the industry by adopting specific skills that are measurable and behavioural in form. Such a neoliberal interpretation of knowledge reduces

education to a sub-sector of the economy which goes contrary to the pursuit of knowledge itself. This new set of educational obligations lead the subject to engage in a ceaseless cycle of work, training and retraining, skilling and reskilling, therefore turning one's life into a continuous economic capitalisation of the self, and shifting to what some commentators called the shift from welfare to workfare (Peters, 2011).

A major player in the *Lisbon Strategy* is the OMC. The OMC is a soft policy regulating mechanism that leads to the development of various technologies of government such as standardisation and common objectives, benchmarks, indicators and the EQF – all of which are regularly determined by mutually accepted indicators and frames of reference. It acts as a mentality that generates and transmits data linked to the central calculations of EU governance by promoting continuous assessment and covertly ordering a politics of surveillance and control of educational policies, literally establishing a panopticon of this space. The discursive interactions of the OMC act as conceptual debates and define problems, solutions and strategies that link everything together (Masschelein et al., 2007). The continuous monitoring and reporting of national progress against EU benchmarks and indicators reveals collective or individual failings or achievements, turning what in principle were national or individual matters into a key administrative tool of this space. Through this panopticon, the subject is placed under constant surveillance that directs self-reflection on the ideal lifelong learning path to follow, thereby aiming to create a behavioural modification. Surveillance makes this space knowable and governable as a space of sociopolitical and economic processes. It acts as the foundation of the application of the OMC itself by continuously gathering relevant information about subjects (such as their ways of functioning) and works on ideas on how to improve them through comparative evaluations and unchallenged compliance. In other words, it turns subjects into vehicles of power (Foucault, 1980).

This *Strategy* also reflects a mentality of government where power works in terms of how actors govern themselves (Walters & Haahr, 2005) within the range of freedom they are enticed to exercise – a certain kind of freedom which is concerned with reforming their conduct of conduct to make them more competitive and efficient. The appeal for governance in this *Strategy* calls for more governance through choices in the name of freedom, concealing an appeal to govern through the responsiblised, free and educated apprehensions and aspirations of subjects in terms of the values, discourses and techniques at their disposal. Freedom, in this case, becomes a prescription for control, and therefore the ethos and the techne of government at

the same time. Through it, social behaviour is covertly reconceptualised along the telos of the EU because the notion of enterprise entails a distinct conception of an entrepreneurial actor. Inadvertently, the choices made are shaped by acting upon external contingencies factored into the calculations of subjects. Subjects are then governed by making choices that will empower them in their quest for self-realisation. This *Strategy* advocates a broader devolution of responsibility that moves away from the construction of a democratic adult and towards an assimilation of the subject to the labour market. This self-regulating behaviour fits well with the discursive practices of neoliberal governmentality (Rose, 1999) and acts as moral regulation because through self-responsibility, subjects are expected to make themselves amenable to the economy or else risk being labelled as the 'other'[95].

Bearing in mind that the ever-changing world of late modernity (Bauman, & Donskis, 2013) advocates financial progress and also risk, since the late eighties the concept of education has been turned into a structural feature that pathologises the 'other' – the one that does not fit in the EU's template of the ideal subject. In fact, during this decade, lifelong learning become nearly synonymous with solving unemployment issues and improving the employability of this 'other' who needs to be familiar with entrepreneurial skills or else risk the dangers of exclusion. A pathologisation of the 'other' led to a theoretical and conceptual reconstruction of the mentality of governance on the social provision of lifelong learning and reconstructed the notions of education, learning and subject (Gustavsson, 2002). This new political paradigm presumed an understanding of the new socioeconomic scenario by which the EU self-appointed itself as an expert ascribed to forms of judgement on the basis that its claims possess the truth.

This problematic of governance (Foucault, 2007) reconfigures the power relations that modify the kind of desirable subject constructed and the kind of governance that is in action (Fejes & Nicoll, 2008) while obfuscating the exercise of power in this space. The emphasis of assigning more agency on the subject as opposed to structures and institutions reflects this conceptual departure from organised educational provision to an individualised pursuit of learning that works upon the soul of subjects to learn what suits

[95] The construct of the 'other' is prevalent in the discourse of this space where those at risk, generally identified as those who are unskilled in marketable knowledge such as the long term unemployed, social-security dependents, immigrants, older workers, etc., need to attain basic skills to participate in lifelong learning without which they are categorised as the 'other'. Very often these become the focus of policy where work on their will to learn is encouraged (Fejes, 2006).

their aspirations. This agency, however, is artificially fabricated because when subjects opt to avail themselves of lifelong learning, they do so against a cultural background constituted by a network of unseen subjectivities which are rarely challenged because they are buried in hegemonic policy discourse and act as discreet expectations regarding their conduct.

Conclusion

This chapter traced the changing conceptualisations of the episteme lifelong learning by exploring the dominant mentalities of three international organisations and the continuities and discontinuities that connect to the factors regarded as determinants. As was shown, throughout the years this episteme reflected the interpretation of international organisations' narrative of the socioeconomic scenario at the time and was used to legitimise and put forward certain kinds of mentalities and not others. This chapter documented a shift towards a narrowing down of the democratic potential of lifelong learning and a greater focus on its economic contribution.

To recapitulate, during the sixties and seventies, the discussion on lifelong education and recurrent education dominated the progressive educational debate in Europe and mostly supported educational policies of the welfare state. The problematisation adopted by UNESCO considered education as a public good which relied on collective responsibility, and thus anticipated the state to take a leading role as a provider and funder of equally distributed opportunities. The OECD's recurrent education policy, on the other hand, advocated that education was of shared responsibility structured to go with recurrent periods of work, and backed individuals to become actors of socioeconomic integration. Although lifelong education and recurrent education came from two distinct international organisations with contrasting telos, both agreed on three aspects: (a) criticism of the school model of formal education; (b) the need to ensure a system where individuals keep learning after compulsory education to keep up to date with technological developments; and (c) the promotion of equal educational opportunities irrespective of age, gender and social status. The underlying ideology was that the welfare state intervened so as to ensure economic and social stability. Both concepts brought together a range of interests and philosophies concerned with moral and political issues about the contribution of education towards society in terms of social, political, cultural and economic terms. The debate at the time was

tied to the idea of the good of society and how education could be part of its making. Problems were collectively defined and addressed by the state. Proponents of such a narrative highlighted the importance of an education that came from and contributed to the people's lives and was influenced by a humanist ideology concerned with individual growth in a growing consumer culture.

By time, the utopian soft-left politics that embraced these earlier narratives of democratic concepts started to lose ground. Instead, the second generation wave of international policies were shaped by an image of a Europe in ceaseless crises. This feeling of a crisis after another acted as a strategy that legitimised economic and managerial pedagogism over humanist concerns. At this time, the EU's educational policymakers took on a bolder and far-reaching role as a way to counteract this socioeconomic and political climate by going for the development of a so-called knowledge society and knowledge economy, with the logic of the latter increasingly becoming the litmus test to gauge educational policy effectiveness. As a consequence of the ascendency of neoliberal interpretations by international organisations, a new concept – lifelong learning – superseded lifelong education and recurrent education. This concept was borrowed by the EU and transformed according to its telos with individualised and technologically-mediated concepts of learning. In fact, lifelong learning benefited from the broadminded outline of its predecessors by becoming more acceptable to a wider audience. Sometimes lifelong education and lifelong learning were (and sometimes still are) used interchangeably notwithstanding important conceptual differences between the terms education and learning. The substitution of the relatively unambiguous concept of education by the somewhat arbitrary learning disguises a major shift in the development of this policy space. A major force that has driven education out and learning in, is the sense of the social and technological inevitability that most intergovernmental organisations' policies project – arguing that the only way to survive the markets is to adapt. This sense of inevitability of change is a central feature in the construction of this episteme.

The main difference between lifelong learning and its predecessors is the political mandate it carries. For many years, the political mandate of lifelong education and recurrent education was in essence a social transformation plan centring on a humanist ideology, and understood as a vision to build a learning society committed to safeguard social justice. On the other hand, lifelong learning's contemporary political mandate seems more and more to be a social adaptation policy – a vision to build a learning society that provides qualifications committed to safeguard market interests. Whether these are two opposite poles

of a continuum with contextual characteristics is debatable because there seems to be a deliberate and continuous substitution of the original ideals leading to a division rather than a continuity. When using the umbrella term lifelong learning, which as shown in this chapter can mean different things at different times, one must be historically conscious and make careful consideration to the contextual and discursive formations since the latest meaning that promotes lifelong learning as the panacea for economic development is only the last amongst a long list of developments.

6. Conclusion

The narrative of the EU lifelong learning policy space provides ways of moving towards social and economic development, both of which are highly valued in education to uphold and defend a more equitable world. Across a range of policy texts, this narrative is constructed around a number of norms and truth claims which predominantly argue that the global processes of economic reorganisation have reconfigured the relationship between global markets and the economies of MS, thereby refashioning the kinds of skills and knowledge perceived as essential for socioeconomic development. Using Foucault as the theoretical and analytical methodology of this study consented the exploration of this space through the discreet relations of power that "tie the subjectivity (conscience, identity, self-knowledge)" (Cruikshank, 1999, p. 21) of the subject to his/her subjection. The governmentalist approach employed in this study allowed an examination of the politics of knowledge by denaturalising the constructed subjective realities and contesting the contingency of the arrangements within which subjects are assembled.

Bearing in mind that Foucault argued that the subject is the result of forms of power that categorize him/her and force a law of truth over which "he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. 781), this thesis "grasp[ed] subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects" (Foucault, 1980, p. 97) by exploring the politics of knowledge that construct mentalities that subject subjects into disciplinary spaces. Besides a governmentalist approach, this thesis also employed a genealogical approach through which it analysed the emancipatory claims found in four landmark policy texts by three international organisations. These four landmark policy texts were interpreted as stories of the present in order to deconstruct the discursive constructions of norms and truth claims, and shed light on how subjects are subjected by, and subject themselves to the narrative of which they unknowingly form part. Since subjects are configured in a

way that traverses different spaces, their engagement in lifelong learning is not an engagement out of individual choices, but rather as part of a dialogic encounter. Popkewitz et al. (2006) argue that such a project is founded upon the unfinished cosmopolitan where the narratives embody new relations between the subject and socioeconomic challenges, which, together with the contingency and uncertainties in life, are tamed through numerical and discursive traits that position subjects as unfinished cosmopolitans expressed as universal human attributes of reason and progress.

The EU lifelong learning pedagogy in this space is implicit as a form of power/knowledge in the ethos of the economy, generally coded in discourses of flexibility, competence, freedom, employability, training, knowledge, quality, competitiveness, poverty and risk (among others) that re-shape aspirations and subjectivity through self-fashioning. These old concepts are ascribed subjective meanings which confer on them political importance that work on the aspirations of actors by framing the narrative in a specific way. As seen in the previous chapters, aspirations are constructed by shaping, promoting and attributing subjectivity – the truth axis which consists of techniques that constitute the self both as a subject of knowledge and also as a knowing subject (Foucault, 1988). In the process of mobilising lifelong learning, new arrangements for the conduct of conduct align subjects' aspirations and subjectivity with a moral economy of enterprise by framing and organising the conflicts they are summoned to solve. The mentalities of government that modify aspirations in this space represent an emergence of a lifelong learning discourse that consent a convergence towards the EU narrative which plays a persuasive role in subjecting subjects to aspirations that attempt to instil enterprise and flexibility as desirable ways of being.

Deconstructing this space through a governmentality approach consented to perceive lifelong learning as a technology of power which responds to the EU's construction of socioeconomic challenges by subjecting subjects to a flexible rationalisation of entrepreneurship, thereby reconstructing the context of education in its interests. In this way, lifelong learning becomes internalised by the EU's monopoly of norms and truth claims that it claims for itself. This disciplinarisation (Foucault, 2003) rests on the technologies of the self and the technologies of government for the production and validation of the statements that consent discourses to regenerate themselves from the inside through different methodological procedures without running the risk of failure. In fact, by instilling a certain ethos, the lifelong learning policy space becomes not only a location where the EU's telos is played out, but also a mechanism by which the collective and the individual are disciplined to this end.

In this space, the therapeutic ethos is predominant. Actors are enticed to reflect on their aspirations, successes and failures, routines and biographies, and expected to develop a confessional attitude that self-disciplines them to follow a certain path to behave in expected ways. Through different mobilisations of disciplinary power, confessional practices represent a model of governing in their relation to the collective by constituting a technology of control. In confessional practices, the surveillance apparatus merges into an integrated programme in the name of risk management which works on individual commitments and personal morality. Traditional notions of lifelong learning are replaced by salvation stories, the focus of which is often salvation from economic turmoil. Yet, advocating paths that promote economically healthier actors also produces that which it excludes – economically unhealthy actors. When being economically healthy is the norm, being economically unhealthy becomes a deviation, something that has to be diagnosed, treated and restored to a normal and healthy condition. Since in this space, being healthy is understood as being ready for professional and personal changes by "adapt[ing] their skills [and] remain ahead of foreseeable or necessary changes" (EC, 2008, p. 1), it becomes natural to define healthy subjects in terms of market related progress. This leads to a wave of risk-management discourse where the goals of self-realisation are modified and transmuted into support of the EU's legitimacy, even though an economically stronger EU does not necessarily mean a socially stronger Europe, or individually better or happier individuals.

These salvation stories are ordered through particular rules of individuality that intern and enfold freedom itself and embody the assumption of progress through a rational means of control inscribed in the discourses on the 'others' as sites of calculated progress. In fact, this space appeals to the freedom of subjects whilst limiting it in accordance with its own logic. In this case, it is not that Big Brother is watching you, but that subjects subjectively consent Big Brother to reside within their aspirations because they are convinced that with his help they will emancipate themselves from the limitations of their very human condition, thereby avoid being identified as the 'other'.

Yet, it is the narrative that makes the 'others' a problem since they are put in a position characterised by symbolic violence that defines them, and subsequently presented a solution to the problem they have become. The very act of categorising these 'others' portrays them as the reasons for and the solutions to socioeconomic problems. In this regard the EU (who formulates the problem) remains invisible because it represents normality, the ideology in power/knowledge that is taken-for-granted. Personified in a spectrum of (economically) valueless subjects such as migrants, the early school leavers, the jobseekers and the unemployed, and others, all of whom are discursively diagnosed

and pathologised as lacking and in need of treatment, risk is embedded in their construction and through which salvation stories reshape their personal and social circumstances into personal irresponsibility (such as lack of achievement, drop-out, lack of aspiration or poor skills). Stemming from a fear of becoming cognitively, economically or socially disadvantaged, pathologised 'others' are called to pursue a kind of learning which focuses mainly on employability framed by discourses of individualisation. They are incited to manage themselves in a way that their construction of the self forms the sediment of interiority – a self, which is constantly encouraged to focus on nothing more than survival, as tasks are performed from one episode of judgement to the next, the pressure and the upshot of which is to "be operational (i.e. commensurable) or disappear" (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxiv).

In fact, construed in terms of a pedagogy, although lifelong learning is proclaimed as the ideal mechanism to promote social cohesion, concerns about inequality and poverty are shifted from the political to the individual sphere, and tamed by data. Even though lifelong learning is not a matter of numbers, numbers have become an essential technology of government due to their way of constructing and legitimising policies. A powerful network built around reams of data that support its prescriptions constructs this space in particular ways by engaging in systematic efforts to introduce statistical categories of performance. Eurostat and Eurydice – two EU statistical platforms – have been constantly producing statistics and qualitative analysis respectively since the early eighties.

This 'avalanche' of numbers that is collected, compiled, extracted and mobilised to act across space and time is what Hacking (1991) calls political attempts at the calculated administration of life. By conceptualising a set of constrained processes and relations through the assembling of vast numerical mentalities with which this domain is understood, envisaged, tabulated, compared and turned it into the object and target of its telos, the EU governs this space by aiming to conduct the conduct of actors according to its rationale.

The EU's soft governance approach to lifelong learning (through the OMC) constructs statistical categories of performance that carry governing principles in implementing heterogeneous mechanisms and processes. Whether it is politicians, MS, policymakers, lifelong learning practitioners or subjects themselves that pick up this vortex of information on lifelong learning, it first runs through a filter that sorts out the normal from the abnormal, and then advises on the best practices to follow, thereby turning the actors involved into protagonists that support a particular ideological paradigm. Although not backed by any EU legislation and without any authoritative action or juridical entity to reprimand corrective action, this policy by

numbers approach acts as a discursive regulatory mechanism that redefines lifelong learning policy.

Its presentation as the ideal way to define what needs rectifying subjects the topic in question (e.g. unemployment, women in lifelong learning, regions with low lifelong learning enrolment, etc.) to an inanimate indicator by displacing political arguments through tables and graphs devoid of context. The problem with this is that such a reduction of reality cannot capture the multi-layered socioeconomic problems and contradictions of education practice and neither can it be ideologically or theoretically value-free since the social enters the statistical through the interests of the experts that assume this task (Gordon, 1991; McLean, 2012). The interlinked relations between governing by numbers (Rose, 2000) and the relations with the practical domains of their deployment in this space can be traced to the transformations of Eurostat's and Eurydice's statistics and qualitative analysis into statistical categories of performance which are then quoted in various documents to legitimise certain actions. These numbers do not just connect centres of calculation to other locales; they enable the EU to act as a centre by means of its own centrality in the flows of information that it represents what it seeks to programme.

This thesis, besides the governmentality approach, also employed a genealogical approach. This approach consented to view how this space is constructed to be governed by tracing the past ideas that form the present narratives of progress of the episteme lifelong learning. This was done by exploring the changing conceptualisations of this episteme that have taken place from the mid-sixties onwards. During the sixties and seventies, the discussion on lifelong education and recurrent education dominated the international educational debate in Europe and was mostly supported by the educational policies of the welfare state. The problematisation adopted by UNESCO in its Faure's report (1972) considered education as a public good whereas the OECD's recurrent education policy narrative advocated that education was of shared responsibility structured to go with recurrent periods of work, and backed individuals to become actors of socioeconomic integration. Although lifelong education and recurrent education came from two distinct international organisations with contrasting telos, both criticised the school model of formal education, highlighted the importance of a system where individuals keep learning after compulsory education to keep up to date with technological developments, and promoted equal educational opportunities irrespective of age, gender and social status. The underlying rationale during these years was that the welfare state intervened so as to ensure economic and social stability. Problems were collectively defined and addressed by the state, and proponents of such a narrative highlighted the importance of an education that came from and contributed to the people's lives. This rationale was influenced by a humanist ideology

which was concerned with individual growth in an ever more consumer culture. By time, this utopian soft-left politics that embraced this earlier narrative of democratic concepts became marginal as the second generation wave of international lifelong learning policies were instead shaped by an image of a Europe in ceaseless crises.

From the early noughties onwards, EU lifelong learning policies were characterised mainly by an economic-technocratic-instrumentalist perception connected with and controlled by the emergence of a new normative discourse (Panitsidou et al., 2012; Pasias & Roussakis, 2012) which advocated prioritisation of competence frameworks based on human capital theories aimed at adapting the European workforce to the requirements of the market (CEC, 2000, 2001, 2002b, 2003, 2006, 2006b, 2007b, 2010, 2010b, 2010c; EC, 2000, 2007; CEC & EC, 2004; EP & EC, 2006, 2006b). Driven by this normative discourse, this space increasingly adopted a homogenising rationale imbued with ideological masking and vocational concepts that hide political stagnation and social inequalities. Instead, it called for more individualising educational and training rights, thus compelling subjects to become more economically relevant by redefining their educational priorities according to the socioeconomic scenarios of the moment.

As a consequence of the ascendency of neoliberal interpretations by international organisations, the episteme lifelong learning changed according to a telos with individualised-mediated concepts of learning. A key difference between lifelong learning and its predecessors is the political mandate it carries. For many years, the political mandate of lifelong education and recurrent education was in essence a social transformation plan centring on a humanist ideology, and understood as a vision to build a learning society committed to safeguard social justice. Lifelong learning's contemporary political mandate, on the other hand, seems more and more to be a social adaptation policy – a vision to build a learning society that provides qualifications committed to safeguard private entrepreneurial interests. Whether these are two opposite poles of a continuum with contextual characteristics is debatable because there seems to be a deliberate and continuous substitution of the original ideals leading to a division rather than a continuity.

Concluding thoughts

The relevance of this study lies in it being a work on ethics, truth and limits. It carries an ethical aim because the disclosure of the ethical repertoire demonstrates that there are different ways of understanding lifelong learning. It is a work on truth because it underscores that subjects need to take a different attitude to the norms and truth claims

that make up this space and through which they are governed. It is also a work on limits because it discloses the limits of thought and perhaps empowers subjects to think beyond them (Miller & Rose, 2008). The original contribution to knowledge this thesis aims to provide is an understanding of how the EU lifelong learning policy space is constructed from a non-normative point of view. The overriding idea is to encourage actors in lifelong learning to recognise that they are themselves agents of power who possess the ability to challenge prevailing power relations and challenge what is uncritically taken as natural to normalise and reproduce the same power structures in a slightly different form (Foucault, 1980, 1982).

The vocational emphasis in this space represents a partial appropriation of lifelong learning as a whole, whose potential for social emancipation and transformation developed in the framework of a philosophical tradition with critical roots, seems to be intentionally confined to a state of latency – a narrow scope with technocratic and vocational roots. The increasing emphasis on knowledge related to instrumental action which is based on pragmatism privileging subjects for the sake of employment or vocational development rather than the broad-based social democratic lifelong learning project of the seventies and eighties is evidence of this. Although this neoliberal style of lifelong learning governance seems to promote fairer governance through decentralised decision-making processes, in effect it devolves responsibility to specific actors and undermines welfarist principles of collective responsibility and redistribution of education. This denotes a substantial shift in the relationship between politics and education, with education becoming an important instrument that supports and enhances specific policies endorsed to stimulate the EU's telos.

This market oriented narrative for education, with the discourse on control, evaluation and performativity of lifelong learning systems draws from, and aligns with, the neoliberal perceptions of the EU (and other international economic organisations such as the OECD, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund), as it foreshadows the future development of education and training systems in post-industrial societies. This though is not only occurring in this space. In his article on the global language on education policy and prospects of education research, Tröhler (2011) highlights the educational governance of the OECD through the collection of comparative data that shifts from input-steering to output-steering education policies. Tröhler (2011) argues that the specific language that developed along this particular way of thinking about the school (and society) reflects the historical process of the last 40 to 50 years through the lenses of the OECD's political rationality in that policy should not so much focus on curriculum development, teacher education, or school buildings, but should focus on results. Similar to this space, within this paradigm, the

experts are expected to define minimum achievement standards, and best practices ought to be compared and elicited to the portrayed ideal.

This educationalisation of social problems is not a new phenomenon. Depaepe & Smeyers (2008) found similar characteristics when they explored the tendency of contemporary administrations to overburden schools by pushing 'social' responsibilities on their agenda and expect them to come up with solutions to a growing diverse range of socioeconomic problems. Popkewitz (2008) also studied this contemporary neoliberal phenomenon when he explored the 'commonsense' approach through which the family and child are shaped by a form of expertise that steer children towards who they should be. Similar to Depaepe & Smeyers (2008), in Popkewitz's pedagogicalisation of social issues, the main actors of the expertise are the discursive sciences that overlap in forming the politics of knowledge in pedagogical practices. Popkewitz (2008) argued that discursive practices function as a cultural theses on how life ought to be lived through mentalities of government in which freedom and agency are enacted by turning life into a project of pedagogicalisation. Similar to the mentalities in this space, demand-led scenarios are constructed to give way to a supply-driven thinking, thereby translating factors linked to education into equations used for constructing and reconstructing discursive and numerical practices.

This educationalisation of the social is also characterised by a gap between *de jure* autonomy and *de facto* autonomy and signifies a disappearance of the realm of democratic politics itself. Its main contradiction lies in the growing gap between the conditions of subjects and their chances to make the choices they truly desire. As argued in Chapter 4, this gap emerges because governance of this space transfers socioeconomic challenges to individual problems despite the fact that they cannot be bridged by individual effort alone. In this light, the shift from "learning to be" (Faure et al., 1972) to "learning to be productive and employable" (Biesta, 2006, p. 170) has detrimental consequences to the personal and social potential of subjects because it turns lifelong learning into an instrument of adaptation instead of emancipation. This new impetus that encourages subjects to invest in their own learning signals the ushering in of a particular schemata, entrapping lifelong learning in a commodity role that prepares subjects to learn in order to become more flexible and employable at their own expense thereby translating social circumstances into personal irresponsibility and expect subjects to come up with solutions.

By using Foucault's nominalist engagement with traditional political concepts such as power and knowledge, studies like this provide a major and significant contribution to the ways in which policy studies are organised because they consent the research field to see policy construction in a different light. Foucault's scholarship paved the way

for a decentred form of lifelong learning policy analysis that asked how lifelong learning governs subjects and how is it governed. This focus on the 'how of governing' stems from the rejection of an a priori understanding of the distribution of power, and instead opts to focus on historically situated practices, mentalities and identities by which governing operates. Viewed in this manner, Foucault-inspired policy studies such as this, neither offer a substantive theory about the forces that shape public policy, nor do they convey what constitutes public policy (e.g. the structures, procedures). Instead they move into a new intellectual terrain by exploring the subjective constructions of the tacit fundamentals that frame a space by making explicit the thoughts that are mostly tacit. By restructuring and expanding the terms of the political debate related to this space, this thesis clears a space to think differently by allowing different questions to be posed and broadens the space of legitimate contestation in relation to the norms and truth claims on behalf of which lifelong learning is governed.

References

Alexiadou, N., Fink-Hafner, D., & Lange, B. (2010). Education Policy Convergence through the Open Method of Coordination: theoretical reflections and implementation in 'old' and 'new' national contexts. *European Educational Research Journal, 9*(3), 345-356.

Andersson, P., & Fejes, A. (2005). Recognition of Prior Learning as a Technique for Fabricating the Adult Learner: A Genealogical Analysis on Swedish Adult Education Policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*(5), 595-613.

Aspin, D. N., Chapman, J., Evans, K., Bagnall, R. (Eds.) (2012). *Second international handbook of lifelong learning.* Springer International Handbooks of Education.

Ball, S. J. (Ed.) (1990). *Foucault and education: Disciplines and Knowledge.* London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education reform, a critical and post-structural approach.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ball, S. J. (2013). *Foucault, Power and Education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Barros, B. (2012). From lifelong education to lifelong learning – Discussion of some effects of today's neoliberal policies. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, 3*(2), *119-134.*

Barry, A., Osborne, T., & Rose, N. (Eds.) (1996). *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* London: UCL Press.

Bauman, Z., & Donskis, L. (2013). *Moral Blindness: The Loss of Sensitivity in Liquid Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity.

Berglund, G. (2008). On Lifelong learning as stories of the present. *Doctor of Philosophy Thesis*, Department of Education, Umeå University, Sweden.

Bergmo Prvulovic, I. (2012). Subordinating careers to market forces? A critical analysis of European career guidance policy. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 3(2), *155-170.*

Beukel, E. (1994). Reconstructing Integration Theory: The Case of Educational Policy in the EC. *Cooperation and Conflict, 29*(1), *33-54.*

Bevir, M. (2010). Rethinking governmentality: Towards genealogies of governance. *European Journal of Social Theory 13*(4), 423-441.

Biesta, G. (2006). What's the Point of Lifelong Learning if Lifelong Learning Has No Point? On the Democratic Deficit of Policies for Lifelong Learning. *European Educational Research Journal, 5,* 160-186.

Biesta, G. (2010). Why 'What Works' Still Won't Work: From Evidence – Based Education to Value-Based Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 29*(5), 491-503.

Blackman, L., Cromby, J., Hook, D., Papadopoulos, D., & Walkerdine, V. (2008). Creating Subjectivities. *Subjectivity, 22*, 1-27.

Blitz, B. K. (2003). From Monnet to Delors: Educational Cooperation in the European Union. *Contemporary European History, 12*(2), 197-212.

Borg, C., & Mayo, P. (2005). The EU Memorandum on Lifelong Learning. Old Wine in New Bottles? *Globalisation, Societies and Education 3*(2), 203–225.

Boshier, R. (1998). Edgar Faure after 25 Years: Down but Not Out. In J. Holford, P. Jarvis & C. Griffin (Eds.), *International Perspectives on Lifelong Learning*, 3-20. London: Kogan Page.

Bousquet, A. (1999). *Éducation et formation dans l'Union européenne: Un espace de coopération.* Paris: La Documentation Française.

Breen, R. (2010). Educational Expansion and Social Mobility in the 20th Century. *Social Forces*, *89*(2), 365-388.

Brine, J. (2004). The European Social Fund: the Commission, the Member State and levels of governance. *European Educational Research Journal, 3*(4), *777-789.*

Brookfield, S. D. (2000). Transformative learning as ideology critique. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress,* 125-148. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brookfield, S. D. (2001). Unmasking power: Foucault and adult learning. *Political Perspectives,* 5(2), 8-32.

Bruno, I., Jacquot, S., & Mandin, L. (2006). Europeanization through its instrumentation: benchmarking, mainstreaming and the open method

of coordination ... toolbox or Pandora's box? *Journal of European Public Policy, 13*(4), 519-536.

Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds.) (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Commission of the European Communities. (1992b). *Treaty on European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Commission of the European Communities. (1997c). *The Treaty of Amsterdam*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Ciccarelli, R. (2008). Reframing Political Freedom: An Analysis of Governmentality. *European Journal of Legal Studies, 3*, 1-27.

Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The Will to Empower - Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Cornell University Press.

Dale, R., & Robertson, S. L. (2009). *Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education.* Symposium Books, Oxford.

Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality - Power and Rule in Modern Societies*. London, Sage.

Dehmel, A. (2006). Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality? Some critical reflections on the European Union's lifelong leaming policies. *Comparative Education, 42*(1), 49-62.

Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: the treasure within. Report to UNESCO of the international commission on education for the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO.

Depaepe, M. & Smeyers, P. (2008). Educationalization as an Ongoing Modernization Process. *Educational Theory 58*(4), 379-389.

De Ruiter, R. (2010). EU soft law and the functioning of representative democracy: The use of methods of open coordination by Dutch and British parliamentarians. *Journal of European Public Policy, 17*(6), 874-890.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.* New York: Macmillan.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault beyond structuralism and hermeneutics.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Drummond, J. (2003). Care of the Self in a Knowledge Economy: Higher Education, Vocation and the Ethics of Michel Foucault. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 35*(1), 57-69.

Edwards, R., & Nicoll, K. (2010). Researching the rhetoric of lifelong learning. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(2), 103–112.

Elfert, M. (2015). UNESCO, the Faure Report, the Delors Report, and the Political Utopia of Lifelong Learning *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 88-100.

English, L. M., & Mayo, P. (2012). Adult education and the State: Gramsci, the historical materialist tradition and relevant others. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults,* 3(1), 11-27.

Ertl, H. (2006). European Union policies in education and training: the Lisbon agenda as a turning point? *Comparative Education, 42,* 5-27.

Faure, E., Herrera, F., Kaddoura, A.R., Lopes, H., Petrovsky, A.V., Rahnema, M. & Champion Ward, F. (1972). *Learning to Be – The world of education today and tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.

Fejes, A. (2006). Constructing the adult Learner - a governmentality analysis. *Doctor of Philosophy.* Linköping Studies in Education and Psychology. Linköpings Universitet.

Fejes, A., & Dahlstedt, M. (2013). *The Confessing Society - Foucault, confession and practices of lifelong learning.* London and New York, Routledge.

Fejes, A., & Nicoll, K. (Eds.) (2008). *Foucault and Lifelong Learning: Governing the Subject*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Fejes, A., & Nicoll, K. (2011). Activating the worker in elderly care: a technique and tactics of invitation. *Studies in continuing education*, 32(2), 89-102.

Fejes, A., & Nicoll, K. (2012). Approaches to research in the education and learning of adults. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, 4*(1), 7-16.

Field, J. (1997). The European Union and the learning society: congested sovereignty in an age of globalization. In F. Coffield (Ed.), *A national strategy for lifelong learning,* 95-111. Newcastle upon Tyne, Department of Education, University of Newcastle.

Field, J. (1998). *European Dimensions: education, training and the European Union.* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Field, J. (2000). Governing the ungovernable: why lifelong learning policies promise so much yet deliver so little. *Educational Management and Administration*, *28*(3), 249-261.

Field, J. (2001). Lifelong education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20*(1), 3-15.

Field, J. (Ed.) (2002). Building a European dimension: a realistic response to globalisation? In *Promoting European dimensions in lifelong learning.* Leicester: NIACE.

Field, J. (2008) *Social Capital.* London: Routledge.

Filander, K. (2012). Discursive turns from 'Bildung' to managerialism - Memory-work of the Finnish adult education generations. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, 3*(2), 135-153.

Finger, M., & Asún, J. M. (2001). *Adult education at the crossroads: Learning our way out.* London and New York: ZED Books.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Sheridan Smith, Translated. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Nietzsche, Genealogy, history.* In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.) *Language, Counter-memory, practice.* Itahaca: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge.* Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1985). *The History of Sexuality: Volume 2: The use of pleasure*. Penguin: London.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *The Political Technology of Individuals,* (16-49). London: Travistock.

Foucault, M. (1994). The Subject and Power. In J. Faubion (Ed.) *Michel Foucault: Power: Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984, vol. 3*. London: Penguin.

Foucault M. (2000). *Interview with Michel Foucault. Power: the essential works of Foucault 1954-1984.* Penguin.

Foucault M. (2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the collège de France, 1975-1976.* Edited by M. Bertani, A. Fontana, F. Ewald & A. I. Davidson. Picador: New York.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France: 1977-1978.* Translated by G. Burchell. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: an introduction. The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Grek, S., Lawn, M., Lingard, B., Ozga, J., Rinne, R., Segerholm, C., & Simola, H. (2009). National policy brokering and the construction of the European Education Space in England, Sweden, Finland and Scotland. *Comparative Education*, *45,* 5-21.

Gustavsson, B. (2002). What do we mean by lifelong learning and knowledge? *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 21*(1), 13-23.

Hacking, I. (1991). How Should We Do the History of Statistics? The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hake, B. J. (1999). Lifelong learning policies in the European Union: developments and issues, *Compare*, *29,* 53-69.

Hingel, A. (2001). *Education policies and European governance.* Brussels: Directorate General for Education and Culture.

Holford, J. (2008). Hard Measures for Soft Stuff: citizenship indicators and educational policy under the Lisbon Strategy. *European Educational Research Journal, 7*(3), 331-343.

Howarth, D. (2010). Power, discourse, and policy: articulating a hegemony approach to critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies, 3*(3), 309-335.

Hultqvist, K. (2004). The traveling state: the nation, and the subject of education. In B. M. Baker & K. E. Heyrnng (Eds.), *Dangerous Coagulations? The Uses of Foucault in the Study of Education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Jakobi, A. P. (2009). *International Organisations and Lifelong learning: From Global Analysis to Policy Diffusion.* Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Janne, H. (1973). *For a Community policy on education. Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 10/73.* EU Commission - Working Document.

Jarvis, P. (2004). The meaning of lifelong learning for lifelong education. *Adult Education, 1,* 4-11.

Jarvis, P. (2007). Adult education - An ideal for modernity? *Twentieth Century Thinkers in Adult and Continuing Education.* Athens.

Jarvis, P. (2014). From adult education to lifelong learning and beyond. *Comparative Education*, 50(1) 45-57.

Jones, H. C. (2005). Lifelong learning in the European Union: whither the Lisbon Strategy? *European Journal of Education, 40*(3), 247-260.

Kleibrink. A. (2011). The EU as a Norm Entrepreneur: the case of lifelong learning. *European Journal of Education, 46*(1), 70-84.

Kok, W. (2004). *Facing the Challenge – The Lisbon Strategy for Growth and Employment.* Brussels: European Communities.

Labaree, D. F. (2008). Educational Formalism and the Language of Goals in American Education, Educational Reform, and the History of Education. *Educational Theory, 58*(4), 447-460.

Lawn, M. (Ed.) (2009). *Modelling the Future: exhibitions and the materiality of education*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Lawn, M. (2011). Standardizing the European Education Policy Space, *European Educational Research Journal, 10*(2), 259-272.

Lawn, M. & Grek, S. (2012). *Europeanizing education: Governing a new policy space.* Oxford Symposium Books.

Lawn, M. & Grek, S. (2012b). *In Europeanising the policy space of education.* Oxford Symposium Books.

Lengrand, P. (1986). *Areas of Learning Basic to Lifelong Education. Advances in Lifelong Education.* Pergamon Press.

López-Santana, M. (2006). The domestic implications of European soft law: Framing and transmitting change in employment policy. *Journal of European Public Policy, 13*(4), 481-499.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Translated by G. Bennington & B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in Educational and Social Research.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Manners, I. (2002). Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(2), 235-258.

Masschelein, J., Simons, M., Bröckling, U., & Pongratz, L. (Eds.) (2007). The Learning Society from the Perspective of Governmentality. Wiley-Blackwell.

McLean, S. (1996). Continuing Education and the Postmodern Arts of Power. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 22*(2), 7-26.

McLean, S. (2012). Government Education for Freedom? "Living Room Learning" and the Liberal Arts of government. *Adult Education Quarterly, 62,* 159-179.

Merlingen, M. (2007). Everything Is Dangerous: A Critique of Normative Power Europe. *Sage Publications, 38*(4), 435-453.

Milana, M. (2012). Political globalization and the shift from adult education to lifelong learning. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, 3*(2), 103-117.

Milana, M., & Holford, J. (2014). *Adult education policy and the European Union: Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives*. Sense Publishers.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1993). *Governing Economic Life.* In M. Gane & T. Johnson, *Foucault's New Domains.* London, Routledge.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the Present.* Cambridge: Polity.

Murphy, M. (1997). Capital, class and adult education: the international political economy of lifelong learning in the European Union. In P. Armstrong, N. Miller & M. Zukas (Eds.), *Crossing borders - Breaking boundaries: research in the education of adults, proceedings of the twenty-seventh annual Scutrea conference.* London, Birkbeck College.

Neave, G. (1984). *The EEC and Education.* Trentham Books.

Nicoll, K. (2006). *Flexibility and Lifelong Learning – Policy, discourse, politic*s. Abingdon: Routledge, Falmer.

Nicoll, K., & Fejes, A. (2011). Lifelong Learning: A Pacification of 'Know How'. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 30*(4), 403-417.

Nóvoa, A., & Lawn, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Fabricating Europe: The Formation of an Education Space.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Nóvoa, A., & de Jong-Lambert, W. (2003). The education of Europe: apprehending EU educational policies. In D. Phillips & H. Ertl (Eds.), *Implementing European Union education and training policy*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.

Olssen, M., Codd, J. A., & O'Neill, A. M. (2004). *Education Policy - Globalisation, Citizenship and Democracy*. Sage Publications.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (1973). *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning.* Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.

Panitsides, E. A., & Anastasiadou, S. (2015). Lifelong Learning Policy Agenda in the European Union: A bi-level analysis. *Open Review of Educational Research, 2*(1), 128-142.

Panitsidou, E., Griva, E., Chostelidou, D. (2012). European Union policies on lifelong learning: in-between competitiveness enhancement and social stability reinforcement. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46,* 548-553.

Pasias, G. (2006). *European Union and education. Vol. II: Educational discourses and policies (2000– 2006)*. Athens: Gutenberg.

Pasias, G., & Roussakis, Y. (2012). Towards the European Panopticon: EU discourses and policies in education and training 1992–2007. In R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education.* Springer International Handbook of Education.

Peters, M. A. (2001). Foucault and governmentality: understanding the neoliberal paradigm of education policy. *The School Field, XII,* 5-6, 61-72.

Peters M. A. (2003). *Truth-telling as an educational practice of the self: Foucault, parrhesia and the ethics of subjectivity*. Oxford Review of Education.

Pollack, M. A. (2000). The end of creeping competence? EU policy-making since Maastricht. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *38*(3), 519-538.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Brennan, M. (Eds.) (1998). *Foucault's challenge: discourse, knowledge and power in education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2001). Rethinking the political: Reconstituting national imaginaries and producing difference in the practices of schooling. *International Journal of Inclusion,* 5(2-3), 179-207.

Popkewitz, T. S., Olsson, U., & Petersson, K. (2006). The Learning Society, the Unfinished Cosmopolitan, and Governing Education, Public Health and Crime Prevention at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(4), 431-449.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2008). The Social, Psychological, and Education Sciences: From Educationalization to Pedagogicalization of the Family and the Child. In M. Depaepe & P. Smeyers, *Educationalization as an Ongoing Modernization Process*. Educational Research 3.

Pépin, L. (2007). *The History of European Cooperation in Education and Training: Europe in the making*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Radaelli, C. M. (2003). *The Open Method of Coordination: A new governance architecture for the European Union.* Stockholm: Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies.

Rose, N. (1993). Government, Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism. *Economy and Society, 22*(3), 283-299.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. (2000). Governmentality and control. *British Journal of Criminology, 40,* 321-339.

Rose, N., O'Malley, P. & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 6,* 83-104.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *43*(2), 173-205.

Rubenson, K. (2004). Lifelong learning: a critical assessment of the political project. In P. Alheit, R. Becker-Schmidt, T. Gitz-Johansen, L. Ploug, H. Salling Olesen & K. Rubenson (Eds.). *Shaping an Emerging Reality – Researching Lifelong Learning.* Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.

Rubenson, K. (2006). The Nordic model of lifelong learning. *Compare, 36*(3), 327-341.

Rubenson, K. (2009). Lifelong learning. Between humanism and global capitalism. In: P. Jarvis, *International Handbook on Lifelong Learning* (411–422). London & New York, Routledge.

Simons, M. (2007). To be informed: understanding the role of feedback information for Flemish/European policy. *Journal of Education Policy, 22*(5), 531-548.

Simons, M., & Masschelein, J. (2006). The Learning society and governmentality: An introduction. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(4), 417-430.

Singer, D. (2002). *Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968*. Cambridge. MA: South End Press.

Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing Genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 20*(2), 101-217.

Tröhler, D. (2011). The Global language on education policy and prospects of education research. In *Daniel Tröhler, Ragnhild Barbu (Eds.),* Education systems in historical, cultural, and sociological perspectives. Sense publishers, Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei, 55-73.

Tröhler, D. (2016). Educationalization of Social Problems and the Educationalization of the Modern World. *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 1-6.

Tuschling, A., & Engemann, C. (2006). From Education to Lifelong Learning: The emerging regime of learning in the EU. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(4), 451-469.

Walters, W., & Haahr, J. H. (2005). *Governing Europe - Discourse, governmentality and European integration.* London and New York: Routledge.

Wildemeersch, D., & Salling Olesen, H. (2012). The effects of policies for the education and learning of adults - from 'adult education' to 'lifelong learning', from 'emancipation' to 'empowerment'. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, 3*(2), 97-101.

European Union Source Documents

Commission of the European Communities (CEC)

CEC. (1992). *Communication* on *Towards a Europe of Solidarity – Intensifying the fight against social exclusion, fostering integration.* COM (92) 542/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (1993). *White Paper* on *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment - The challenges and ways forward into the 21st century*. COM (93) 700. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (1993b). *Report* on *Citizenship of the Union*. COM (93) 702/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (1994) *Green Paper* on *European Social Policy – A Way forward for the Union.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC. (1995). *White Paper* on *Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society*. COM (95) 590/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (1997). *Communication* on *Towards a Europe of Knowledge.* COM (97) 563/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (1997b). *Accomplishing Europe through Education and Training*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC. (1998). *Report* on *Learning for Active Citizenship: a significant challenge in building a Europe of knowledge*. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2000). *Memorandum* on *Lifelong Learning.* SEC (2000) 1832. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2001). *Communication* on *Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality*. COM (2001) 678/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2002). *European Report on Quality indicators of Lifelong Learning.* Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2002b). *Communication* on *European Benchmarks in education and training.* COM (2002) 629/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2003). *Communication* on *Investing efficiently in education and training: an imperative for Europe.* COM (2002) 779 final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC & EC. (2004). *Education and Training 2010: The success of the Lisbon Strategy hinges on urgent reforms.* 6905/04. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2004). *Work Programme* on *Implementation of Education and Training 2010 – Competences for Lifelong Learning - A European Reference Framework.* Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2005). *Communication* on *Working together for growth and jobs – A new start for the Lisbon Strategy.* COM (2005) 24/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2006). *Youth in Action Programme Guide.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC. (2006b). *Communication* on *Adult learning: It is never too late to learn.* COM (2006) 614/final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2007). *Communication* on *Action plan on Adult learning: It is always a good time to learn.* COM (2007) 558 final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2007b). *Communication* on *Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society*. COM (2007) 498 final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2010). *Communication* on *An agenda for new skills and jobs: A European contribution towards full employment*. COM (2010) 682 final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2010b). *Communication* on *Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.* COM (2010) 2020 final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2010c). *Communication* on *A new impetus for European cooperation in vocational education and training to support the Europe 2020 strategy.* COM (2010) 296 final. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2010d). *Commission Regulation (EU) No 823/2010 of 17 September 2010 implementing Regulation (EC) No 452/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the production and*

development of statistics on education and lifelong learning. Brussels: European Communities.

CEC. (2014). *Commission Regulation (EU) No 1175/2014 of 30 October 2014 implementing Regulation (EC) No 452/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the production and development of statistics on education and lifelong learning.* Brussels: European Communities.

European Council (EC)

EC. (1970). *Communiqué, The Hague, Bulletin of the European Communities, point 4*. EC 1/1970. Brussels: European Communities.

EC. (1974). *Council Resolution of the Ministers of Education, meeting within the Council, of 6 June 1974 on cooperation in the field of education.* Brussels: European Communities.

EC. (1976). *Council Resolution of 13 December 1976 concerning measures to be taken to improve the preparation of young people for work and to facilitate their transition from education to working life.* Brussels: European Communities.

EC. (2000). *Presidency Conclusions. Lisbon Strategy. Lisbon European Council 23-24 March, Lisbon Strategy.* Brussels: European Communities.

EC. (2002). *Council Resolution of 27 June 2002 on lifelong learning.* (2002/C 163/01).

EC. (2007). *Council Conclusions on a Coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks for monitoring progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training.* Brussels: European Communities.

EC. (2008). *Council Resolution on better integrating lifelong guidance into lifelong learning strategies.* Brussels: European Communities.

EC. (2008b) *Council Conclusions on the priorities for enhanced European cooperation in vocational education and training for the period 2011-2020.* Brussels: European Communities.

European Parliament (EP)

EP & EC. (2006). *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning.* Brussels: European Communities.

EP & EC. (2006b). *Decision No 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning.* Brussels: European Communities.

EP. (2008). *Resolution of the European Parliament of 16 January 2008 on Adult learning: it is never too late to learn.* Brussels: European Communities.

European Union Agencies

Cedefop & EACEA. (1991). *Structures of the education and initial training systems in the Member States of the European Community.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

EACEA. (1999). *Forward planning in education in the Member States of the European Union.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

EURYDICE. (2000). *Lifelong learning: the contribution of education systems in the member states of the European Union*. Brussels: EURYDICE.

Cedefop. (2009). *European guidelines for validating non-formal and informal learning.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Official Journal

Official Journal of the European Union, C 81, 12.8.1971.

Official Journal of the European Union, L 213, 13.8.1999.

Official Journal of the European Union, C 163, 9.7.2002.

Official Journal of the European Union, C 141, 10.6.2005.

Appendix 1

European Union documents[96]

Author & Year	Document Name	Document Type
Cedefop & EACEA, 1991	Structures of the education and initial training systems in the Member States of the European Community	Document
CEC, 1993	Growth, competitiveness, employment - the challenges and ways forward into the 21st century	White Paper
CEC, 1995	Teaching and learning: towards the learning society	White Paper
CEC, 1997	Towards a Europe of Knowledge	Communication
CEC, 1997b	Accomplishing Europe through education and training	Report
EACEA, 1999	Forward planning in education in the Member States of the European Union	Working Document
CEC, 2000	Memorandum on Lifelong Learning	Memorandum
EC, 2000	Lisbon Strategy	Strategy
CEC, 2001	Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality	Communication
EC, 2002	Lifelong learning	Resolution
CEC, 2002	European Report on Quality Indicators of lifelong learning	Report
CEC, 2002b	European Benchmarks in Education and Training	Communication

[96] Last accessed on 31.12.2016.

CEC, 2003	Investing efficiently in education and training: an imperative for Europe	Communication
CEC & EC, 2004	Education and Training 2010: The success of the Lisbon Strategy hinges on urgent reforms	Joint-interim report
Kok, 2004	Facing the Challenge – The Lisbon Strategy for Growth and Employment	Report
CEC, 2006	Youth in action programme guide	Programme Guide
CEC, 2006b	Adult Learning: It is never too late to learn	Communication
EP & EC, 2006	Key Competences for Lifelong Learning	Recommendation
EP & EC, 2006b	An action programme in the field of lifelong learning	Decision
EC, 2007	Coherent framework of indicators and benchmarks for monitoring progress towards the Lisbon objectives in education and training	Council Conclusions
CEC, 2007	Action Plan on Adult Learning: It is always a good time to learn	Action Plan
CEC, 2007b	Promoting young people's full participation in education, employment and society	Communication
CEC, 2010	An agenda for new skills and jobs: A European contribution towards full employment	Communication
CEC, 2010b	Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth	Communication
CEC, 2010c	A new impetus for European cooperation in vocational education and training to support the Europe 2020 strategy	Communication

Appendix 2

First and second generation documents on lifelong learning [97]

Year	Document Name	Document Type
Faure et al., 1972	Learning to be – the world of education today and tomorrow	Report
OECD, 1973	Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning	Report
CEC, 1995	Teaching and learning: towards the learning society	White Paper
EC, 2000	Lisbon Strategy	Strategy

[97] Last accessed on 31.12.2016.