

International Organizations and the Global Education Governance

A case of the OECD's PISA through critical discourse
analysis

Word count: 10 035



Abstract

In the last thirty years, the field of education and educational policymaking has become increasingly internationalized. Consequently, more actors, especially actors beyond the national level have become interested and involved in educational policymaking. International Organizations (IOs) in particular have become prominent in the educational sphere and their role in affecting and defining educational practices and policies has been growing. Through discourses and ideas, these IOs have become influential actors within educational policymaking. The key purpose of this thesis is to examine what kind of ideas these IOs disseminate and promote as well as how they affect the governance and policymaking of education. With the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and its Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) as the case, this thesis aims to discover what kind of discourse about education and therefore about educational policymaking the organization promotes through PISA. Furthermore, this thesis aims to discover whether there has been a change in the OECD's discourse considering the recent developments within the organization which have extended the influence and role of PISA and the OECD to a global reach. By using a critical discourse analysis (CDA) to analyze how and what kind of conceptualization the OECD promotes regarding education, this thesis aims to contribute to the understanding of how IOs, through their ideas and discourses, affect the governance of education and educational policymaking.

Keywords: *Education policy, International Organizations, governance, PISA, The OECD, critical discourse analysis*

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Purpose and aim	2
1.2	Research questions	3
2	Previous literature	4
2.1	The significance of IOs in education policy.....	4
2.2	The discursive practices about education in IOs.....	5
2.2.1	The general role and power of ideas within IOs.....	5
2.2.2	The discursive practices about education in IOs.....	6
3	Background and case selection	8
3.1	The OECD’s role in global education governance.....	8
3.2	The rise of PISA.....	9
3.3	PISA for Development.....	10
4	Theoretical framework.....	12
4.1	Constructivism	12
4.2	Competing discourses	13
4.2.1	Economistic utilitarian discourse.....	13
4.2.2	Humanitarian turn	13
4.2.3	Hypothesis	14
5	Methodology.....	15
5.1	Critical discourse analysis.....	15
5.2	Sources and data sampling	16
5.3	Data management.....	17
5.4	Limitations	17
5.5	Ethical considerations	18
6	Analysis.....	19
6.1	The OECD’s original conceptualization of education	19
6.1.1	Lifelong learning, skills, knowledge, and competencies	19
6.1.2	Human capital	21
6.1.3	The concept of literacy and the domains assessed.....	23
6.2	The changes in the OECD’s discourse.....	24
6.2.1	Changing context of PISA	24
6.2.2	Economic growth and human capital.....	25
6.2.3	Skills, knowledge, and domains for assessment.....	26
7	Discussion and conclusion.....	29
8	References.....	32
9	Appendices.....	36

9.1.1	Coding framework	36
9.1.2	Reports and official documents used for analysis.....	37

1 Introduction

The field of education and policymaking within it has traditionally been connected to decision-making and governance at the national level. Policy formulation regarding education practices has occurred in the national context with very little influence from the supranational level. Unlike other fields where international cooperation has been necessary to reach better common outcomes, such as trade or security, education has not required a similar level of cooperation or coordination to reach optimal outcomes (Nagel et al. 2010: 3). However, in the last thirty years, governance structures have been changing and the role of the state in various fields has been diminishing while the impact and influence of International Organizations (IOs) and other non-state actors has been growing (Pease 2019: 1-15; Buduru & Pal 2010).

Globalization, particularly its neoliberal form since the 1990s, has been changing the field of education into a more internationalized field where policymaking no longer takes place solely in the national realm (Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 2,117). The emerging knowledge economy, as well as the increased worldwide competitiveness and interconnectedness of the world economy, has put more importance on creating competitive human capital within countries. Moreover, comparisons of human capital levels between countries have also become more important (Morgan & Volante 2016). All of this has had consequences on education in national contexts. As the field of education has become more internationalized, IOs have become more important actors within the governance and policymaking of education (Niemann & Martens 2018). Consequently, discourses that are framing education policy at the national level have been emanating increasingly from the international level and these discourses and ideas about how education should be organized and governed have been formulated largely by IOs (Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 14, 118; Windzio & Martens 2022 Niemann & Martens 2018; Nagel et al. 2010: 3-6).

IOs have been using different strategies of becoming influential in the field of education. In the case of The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) as an IO with very little influence in educational matters before, its norm diffusion and soft governance through the international large scale assessment survey that it created in 1997 has become

significant (Sellar & Lingard 2012; Xiomin & Auld 2020; Piro 2019: 1-4). The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) was created to measure the levels of human capital comparatively and holistically for the first time (OECD 1999). Its role and influence in global education governance and in shaping the desired outcomes and values of what education ought to deliver has been only growing since the launch of PISA in 2000 (Piro 2019: 2-4). PISA has provided the OECD an influential tool and, as a result, the OECD's role in the global education governance field has been strengthened and its influence in shaping the concept of 'good education' has become more prominent (Addey & Sellar 2012: 97; Niemann & Martens 2018).

1.1 Purpose and aim

Education as well as educational policies are central factors for development. However, education plays a crucial role for society's functions and development not only from a human capital growth perspective but also especially in today's world from perspectives of sustainability, equality, social cohesion, and citizenship. Therefore, to examine what kind of ideas IOs are producing about the role of education in society is crucial considering the potential for IOs to shape education policies that in turn will affect what kind of future societies are being built. Especially considering the case of the OECD and the recent developments within the organization that extends the influence of PISA and the OECD globally (Addey & Gorur 2020; Addey 2017; Auld et al. 2019; Xiaomin & Auld 2019), critically examining the ideas that underpin the OECD's education discourse is imperative. By using a critical discourse analysis (CDA) to analyze the official documents of the OECD, this thesis aims to uncover the educational ideas and discourse that the OECD promotes and how these have changed in the light of the organization's latest developments. Thus, this thesis attempts to also examine critically the growing role and importance of the OECD as the 'global governor' of education and education policy.

The purpose and aim of this thesis are to contribute to the understanding of how IOs produce ideas about the role of education through their discourses, and how these ideas are shaping education policies and governance. By closely examining the case of the OECD's role in education and education policy through PISA, this thesis is able to provide a deeper

understanding of how and why international organizations are discursively producing ideas about education that affect different countries globally.

As the content of this thesis focuses largely on IOs role in education policy, it contributes to the fields of development studies and political science. Because of the importance of education and education policies for development - economic, social, and political - as well as the explicit focus on IOs role in shaping the global governance of education, this thesis is relevant for both of the aforementioned fields of social science.

1.2 Research questions

Considering its aims and purposes, this thesis tries to answer the following research questions:

1. What kind of ideas are international organizations producing about education and how are they shaping global education governance?
2. How has the discourse and conceptualization of the role of education changed within the OECD since 1999 to 2019?

The first question guides the theoretical contribution of the thesis and the choice of previous literature. The second research question in turn guides the empirical analysis and connects the theoretical grounds of the thesis to the changes in the political and economic contexts in the real world.

2 Previous literature

2.1 The significance of IOs in education policy

In the last thirty years, education governance and education policymaking have been increasingly changing (Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 2, 117). As a result of intensifying globalization and the changes in governance and policy formulation, education policy has become increasingly an internationalized field. Thus, IOs have become more and more studied in the light of education policymaking – how they affect the national education sphere and what kind of ideas they are distributing regarding education (Nagel et al. 2010: 5; Niemann 2022: 127). Certain authors even claim that education IOs are the cause, rather than the effect of internationalization of the field of education (Niemann & Martens 2021:165-171).

Previous studies interested in the influence of IOs in education and education policymaking have recognized certain IOs as the most influential players for the discourses in education and education policy (Niemann 2022: 135; Akkari & Lauwerier 2015). These include UNESCO, UNICEF, The World Bank and the OECD (Akkari & Lauwerier 2015). These IOs have been directly involved in the matters of education in their work, some having a longer history in the area, while others have subsequently become more prominent and influential in the field (Niemann & Martens 2021:169; Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 117-125; Spring 2008).

According to recent studies by Niemann & Martens (2021) and Niemann (2022), within the previous literature on education IOs, the discourses that the IOs emanate can be roughly divided into two overarching categories that incorporate key topics of educational goals. The first one - utilitarian leitmotif - focuses on the economic effects of education, incorporating the importance of human capital for economic growth while advocating for the standardization of curricula and increased measurement of competencies (Niemann & Martens 2021: 171- 176; Niemann 2022:132-133). The second one - humanitarian or citizenship leitmotif - on the other hand views education as essential for the emergence of social capital and thus, for the social and political integration of a society (Niemann 2022: 132). The World Bank and the OECD

who have been mainly concerned about education's role for economic growth and the economic benefits it has for society and individuals, have been placed as the promoters of the utilitarian perspective on education (ibid.) On the other hand, especially UNESCO and UNICEF, out of the global education IOs have been more connected to the humanitarian citizenship leitmotif as they have been emphasizing the rights to education (Akkari & Lauwerier 2015). Yet, interestingly, studies have demonstrated that the discourses and dominant concepts and ideas within these different IOs have been converging in the last ten to fifteen years and today, most of the education IOs share similar concepts in their ideational base, such as quality, good governance, accountability, privatization, benchmarking and the measurement of learning outcomes (Akkari & Lauwerier 2015; Niemann & Martens 2021: 165).

2.2 The discursive practices about education in IOs

2.2.1 The general role and power of ideas within IOs

Ideas are an important element of policy discourse and can thus influence policy outcomes (Niemann 2022: 131). Furthermore, ideas are important governance instruments for IOs as through them, IOs can acquire power and capacity to define and interpret issues at stake (Niemann 2022: 131-135). Yet, to acquire this capacity and power for governance through ideas, IOs need to have authority to define the issue at stake (Niemann 2022: 131-135; Broome & Seabrooke 2012). According to Broome and Seabrooke (2012), the question of how authority is constructed within IOs is closely linked to debates within global governance and political economy of IOs. These debates continue to center around issues of how IOs influence their member states and whether IOs are actors in their own right or hostages to the interests of their member states (Broome & Seabrooke 2012). Similarly, Barnett and Finnemore (2004) state that while IOs can be seen as passive structures through which action takes place, they can also be seen as autonomous actors with power to influence world events (Barnett & Finnemore 2004: 162).

According to Barnett & Finnemore (2004), the authority and autonomy of IOs is connected to their bureaucratic structure (Barnett & Finnemore 2004: 162-165). They draw from Weber's concept of bureaucracy as a uniquely authoritative and powerful unit and view the authority of IOs emerging from their social relations and the bureaucratic nature of IOs (Barnett &

Finnermore 2004:162-169). Moreover, the power of authority within modern IOs is based on the different sources of authority that IOs have – delegated, moral and expert authority – which together create an appearance of depoliticization and objectivity (Barnett & Finnemore 2004: 173).

Consequently, the role of ideas within IOs should not be underestimated as they are the core influence for the policy discourse that the IO disseminates. Yet, even more important is to understand through what mechanisms and practices do these ideas of certain IOs become disseminated and adopted at the national level.

2.2.2 The discursive practices about education in IOs

According to Nagel et al. (2010), the ways in which IOs influence national education policy and disseminate their ideas can be categorized to different governance instruments. The first category concerns normative activities, including the norm setting as well as opinion formation by IOs. Through these activities, IOs establish the grounds for national rules and provisions as well as stimulate national education policy debates by disseminating their own ideas, concepts and models into national decision-making. This way, they also set standards for national policy evaluation (Nagel et al. 2010: 10-15). Standard setting is closely tied with benchmarking which in turn is connected to the phenomenon of international assessments. International assessments and surveys that standardize and compare education systems, practices and policies have been a growing phenomenon which has been mainly initiated and promoted by education IOs (Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 44-50). Kamens and McNeely (2009) argue that IOs and nongovernmental organizations alike have been important drivers of international testing and assessment culture in the world and through them they have been diffusing important educational innovations (Kamens & McNeely 2009). A manifestation of this educational governance by comparison are International Large Scale Assessments (ILSAs) which have been administered and promoted by education IOs (Addey et al. 2017). In the context of globalization and increased competition amongst states, comparative performance data of education systems have become more relevant for national policymakers to improve and make changes to their education system. ILSAs have filled this need of providing data but while simultaneously giving IOs important influence in governing the global education field (Addey et al. 2017).

Another category for IOs to be powerful to disseminate their own ideas and discourses is financial means that IOs possess and can use to induce countries to join in on practices and programs promoted by IOs (Nagel et al. 2010: 11). For example, Addey et al. (2017) as well as Kamens and McNeely (2009) find that low- and middle-income country participation in ILSAs has been largely driven by donor encouragement and support or has been set out as a precondition for aid or loans (Addely et al. 2017; Kamens & McNeely 2009). Furthermore, participation has been rationalized in terms of evidence for better policies and technical capacity building for national assessments (Addey et al. 2017). As in any other policy context, when resources are given by IOs to promote and support certain practices within countries, this can motivate countries to live up to the IOs standards and implement the IOs ideas on the local, regional, and national levels (Nagel et al. 2010: 14).

Finally, coordination activities of IOs have been also identified as a means for IOs to act in the governance functions of education (Nagel et al. 2010: 11). With coordination activities Nagel et al. (2010) refer to the capacity of IOs to organize and promote initiatives by bringing different actors, such as policymakers and experts together (Nagel et al. 2010: 11). This way IOs can indirectly influence the direction and management of a program or project through their expert authority and coordination. Lastly, the consulting activities done by IOs are also a way for IOs to disseminate their own ideas (Nagel et al. 2010: 15). This is closely connected to the above-mentioned benchmarking and ILSAs since advice for improving the ranking in the international assessments is often sought from experts that are in the IOs. The reforms that experts then advise national policymakers to embark on will be likely guided by the ideas dominant within the IO (Nagel et al. 2010: 15).

Altogether, through these practices, education IOs encompass power and authority for autonomous action and have become influential actors concerning education policy. As a result, the ideas they disseminate, and produce have become important for policymaking at the national level. Yet, while this importance of ideas emanating from IOs and the supranational level to the national level has been recognized, the kind and extent to which IOs develop and spread ideas about education and education policy on a global scale has not been examined sufficiently (Windzio & Martens 2022). Considering this, this thesis will now turn to the examination of the case of the OECD and its education discourse promoted through PISA, perhaps the most well-known ILSA administered by the OECD.

3 Background and case selection

3.1 The OECD's role in global education governance

Originally the OECD was established to stimulate and promote economic progress and world trade (Piro 2019: 40-43). In the original charter of the OECD, education had an inferred role and there was no independent structural location for education as the organization was primarily concerned about economic policy (Rivzi & Lingard 2006; Sellar & Lingard 2013: 190). Yet, at the end of the Cold War and at the emergence of the global economy, the OECD found itself contemplating its relevance and role as an IO (Sellar & Lingard 2013: 189).

The rise of neoliberalism as a dominant ideology as well as the intensified globalization during the middle of 1990s-provided the OECD an impetus to deepen its importance in education. Rivzi and Lingard (2006) argue that the growing influence of the OECD in education is connected to how the organization utilized the ideology of globalization and advocated for the need to reformulate educational purposes and governance in line with the requirements of the global economy (Rivzi & Lingard 2006). The emerging global knowledge economy and the role of skills and knowledge for it were essential and this perspective of education, the human capital perspective, was precisely what the OECD was emphasizing when it was consolidating its role in its educational work (Niemann & Martens 2018). The role of human capital for national competitiveness in the global knowledge economy was emphasized by the OECD making it seem essential for nation-states to understand their levels of national human capital and this way also their level of economic competitiveness (ibid.). This 'comparative turn' in the OECD's work that placed more emphasis on creation of comparative technical data was becoming the new *raison d'être* of the organization and this was manifested in the development of PISA (Xiomin & Auld 2020; Wiseman & Waluyo 2017: 49-54). Thus, the OECD was becoming an important IO for the creation of statistical comparative data which is arguably at the heart of its global education governance and leadership through PISA.

3.2 The rise of PISA

Since its first launch in 2000, interest in PISA has grown significantly in terms of the number of participating countries: from thirty-two in 2000 to seventy-nine in 2018 (Piro 2019: 4). The OECD estimates that by 2030, the number of participating countries in PISA will double, marking 80 per cent coverage of the globe (Piro 2019: 5). PISA is perhaps the most well-known and most influential ILSA today and as discussed above, the dependency on comparative performance data has increased the influence and role of ILSAs and thus, they have become an important element of the global governance of education (Addey et al. 2017).

Addey et al. (2017) and Addey & Sellar (2012) connect the influence of ILSAs, especially PISA, to the “new modes of global governance in education”. These include the epistemological governance and infrastructural governance. Epistemological governance - essentially the importance of ideas and shaping of what is valued within education through establishing a common way of thinking what is desirable - has been connected related to PISA as an important soft power element because PISA influences the common way of thinking what is desirable within education (Addey et al. 2017; Addey & Sellar 2012: 98-100). Moreover, infrastructural governance, also understood as technocratic governance, refers to the extension of global infrastructure and technocratic governance means in order to generate, manage and analyze the commensurate data across different systems (Addey et al. 2017). PISA has been an important part of creating and strengthening the epistemological and technocratic governance of education through the construction of a commensurate space for educational measurement globally (Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 128-133). While the OECD has championed PISA to be the most accurate and legitimate measure of comparative international educational performance, it has also strengthened the influence of PISA and thus, simultaneously the significance of the OECD as an education IO (Rivzi & Lingard 2010: 135). Given this, the power that the OECD has through PISA to shape education and education policies, the discourse, and ideas that it really promotes are important to examine.

3.3 PISA for Development

The OECD membership originally mainly consisted of nations from the Global North and therefore it has been often termed as “The Rich Man’s Club” (Mahon & McBride 2009). While the organization has partner countries which it works closely with and has also extended the membership recently to certain middle-income countries, the membership base of the organization still consists predominantly of industrialized wealthy nations (OECD 2022). Consequently, PISA has also been developed to be used in industrialized countries with relatively high education levels (Addey 2016).

However, in the last ten to fifteen years, the OECD has been contemplating the relevance of PISA and thus, the relevance of the OECD as an education IO for other than high-income countries. Consequently, the OECD has found itself thus in the need of branding itself as an organization with global relevance (Addey 2016). Indeed, after five rounds of PISA implementations, the OECD publicly recognized that PISA had poor policy value for the lower and middle-income countries that had been using PISA to evaluate their educational outcomes and systems (Addey 2016). As a result, the OECD took steps to adjust and create a better fitting assessment survey for low-income and middle-income countries and the pilot project - PISA for Development (PISA-D) - was instituted and launched in 2014 (Addey & Gorur 2020; Rutkowski & Rutkowski 2021).

PISA’s and the OECD’s influence in the global education governance have been studied within various academic fields increasingly since the inception of PISA in 2000 (Pons 2017). However, considering the recent developments within the OECD and PISA, relatively little attention has been directed to the potential discourses through which the organization frames the role of education and thus, influences education policies at the national level. While a small amount of critical literature regarding PISA-D and the OECD’s involvement in developing countries has been emerging, this literature does not include perspectives from a discourse analytical point of view (Addey, 2017; Rutkowski & Rutkowski 2021; Xiomin & Auld 2020; Auld et al. 2019). While certain studies have been conducted about the motivations for PISA-D and the OECD has been studied extensively in the context of its education work, specifically the discourse of the OECD

in the changing circumstances for its role as an education IO and in the light of the humanitarian turn have not been studied.

Windzio & Martens (2022) state that the kind and extent to which IOs develop and spread ideas about education and education policy on a global scale has not been examined sufficiently (Windzio & Martens 2022). According to Xiomin & Auld (2020), the OECD has been taking, what they call ‘a humanitarian turn’ in its education work (Xiomin & Auld 2020). To this humanitarian turn, PISA-D and the establishing of relevance beyond the wealthy OECD member states has been central. From development studies perspective, this changing role of the OECD and extension to developing countries is a crucial matter for further research of what kind of role for education is the organization promoting through PISA.

4 Theoretical framework

4.1 Constructivism

The overall theoretical, ontological, and epistemological starting point for this thesis is social constructivism as it recognizes the importance of ideas for policies and practices (Biebler 2001). Within the study of international relations and politics, constructivism has made important contributions especially about how international norms influence state behavior and how socialization of actors internationally occurs through the activities of IOs (Pease 2019: 101-102). Furthermore, constructivism offers insights into how norms, values and identities are diffused within the international system and how behavior is affected by them (Pease 2019: 102). The OECD operates as an important site for the construction and dissemination of transnational research and policy ideas and the organization holds an extensive expertise power through its research capacity and conduct (Mahon & McBride 2009). Thus, constructivism offers a useful starting point for the examination of how the OECD as an international organization affects and shapes the education policies and ideas through PISA.

Most IOs lack coercive power to exercise governance functions and therefore their governance is largely based on governing with soft power which also grants them legitimacy and, to a large extent, authority as governing actors (Niemann & Martens 2008). In the light of social constructivism, IOs govern precisely by promoting the normative value of a certain norm as legitimate. This can be done through framing and promoting a certain norm with discursive means as prestigious or stigmatizing and shaming other behaviors as unacceptable and undesirable (Niemann & Martenes 2008). Therefore, IOs are central in shaping international discourses which is the essence of soft governance for many IOs (ibid.).

4.2 Competing discourses

4.2.1 Economistic utilitarian discourse

Since the comparative turn in the OECD that positioned PISA as the main component of the organization's education work, the human capital perspective and emphasis on education's role for economic growth have been dominant (Niemann & Martens 2021:166-167). Social wellbeing has been seen to increase as a result of economic growth and development (Morgan & Volante 2016). Morgan & Volante (2016) and several other authors (see for example Niemann 2022; Niemann & Martens 2021; Windzio & Martens 2022) embrace the theoretical grounds of the OECD's education work that connects the discourse of the OECD still today to the human capital discourse that emphasizes and embraces mainly the positive economistic influence that education can have on individual level as well as on a country level. Moreover, for these authors, the standardization model that the OECD supports through PISA results in convergence of education systems and policies around the world (Morgan & Volante 2016). Inherent to this human capital discourse or utilitarian economistic discourse about education is emphasis on numbers and measures of educational successes, emphasis on employability and skills to ensure labor market productivity within the knowledge economy, for example in relation to Information Technology (ICT) skills as well as mentions about lifelong learning in connection to the knowledge economy (Spring 2008; Morgan & Volante 2016). Moreover, international surveys or assessments are emphasized to find "solutions" to build the best skills for the human capital in the knowledge economy of today and thus, while there may not be direct recommendations to align policies with those skills that are measured in international surveys, it can be expected there to be an implicit inclination towards that (Morgan & Volante 2016).

4.2.2 Humanitarian turn

Another theoretical standpoint on the OECD's educational work has been recently formulated by Xiomin & Auld (2020) who argue that the discourse and nature of the

OECD's education work has been taking a humanitarian turn (Xiomin & Auld 2020). This humanitarian turn has taken place especially in the light of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the initiative PISA-D. The authors connect PISA-D to the expanding influence of the OECD in the field of education as PISA-D extends PISA's metric to developing countries (Xiomin & Auld 2020). Moreover, the authors emphasize The Learning Framework 2030 developed by the OECD to encompass and measure competencies that are not only relevant for the economic growth and human capital development but rather for individual and collective wellbeing. Assessments and surveys are thus also branded more in a humanitarian manner rather than solely encompassing an economic aspect through which countries and individuals could achieve levels of human capital and economic growth. Furthermore, this humanitarian turn in the OECD's education work is seen to be connected to the post-2015 agenda and the organization's changing role and position in this new order (Xiomin & Auld 2020).

4.2.3 Hypothesis

The analysis shall be built around these two competing theoretical grounds on the discourse of the OECD's education work. Both theories have been recently supported and therefore there is no validity of dismissing either or on the basis of being outdated. By using a critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a method, it will be tested whether the discourse in the official OECD documents still follows the utilitarian economic discourse or whether the discourse has changed into a humanitarian discourse about education. Overall, the hypothesis here is that there has been a change to some extent towards the humanitarian discourse, but the conceptualization of education and education policy in terms of human capital utilitarian economic discourse still prevails because it is the cornerstone of the OECD's education work and influence which has given it its power and authority as an IO.

5 Methodology

This thesis follows a qualitative research design and the methodology for analyzing the empirical material is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Using CDA as a method for analysis indicates a close inspection of language used in the material while critically interpreting the representations and meanings that are constructed through language (Punch 2014: 91; Dunn & Neumann 2016: 2-6). CDA, especially the socio-political approach to CDA more frequently used in social sciences, is sensitive to the context in which the studied texts have been produced as well as to the constructs of power and hierarchies through the power of knowledge production in discourses (Dunn & Neumann 2016: 3; Fairclough 2013; Halperin & Heath 2012: 326). Furthermore, this means that criticism, both explanatory and normative criticism are inherent to CDA (Fairclough 2013). As the ontological and epistemological starting point of this thesis is based on constructivism, CDA as a method for analysis is particularly suitable to uncover how and what kind of understanding of education's role and education policy the OECD promotes and supports through PISA. Thus, the CDA approach adopted here is concerned especially about the official discourses of education and education policy that the OECD supports and promotes through PISA. To analyze this, ten PISA-related documents were chosen for CDA analysis of how language is used in these documents to construct meaning and representations of education's role in society.

5.1 Critical discourse analysis

Discourse is said to "...encompass ideas, statements, or knowledge that are dominant at a particular time..." (Punch 2014: 191). CDA is a part of discourse analysis (DA) and thus, shares most of the core components of DA. While DA does not have a unified theory, method nor practice, a common character of DA, especially of CDA is its interdisciplinary nature as the construct of social realities that CDA examines requires looking at the meanings that constructs objects and subjects through various disciplinary lenses (Fairclough 2013; Punch 2014: 191-192). Thus, at the core of CDA is the

production of meanings and representations through language used and how these meanings shape the social reality, identities, power, and hierarchies (Fairclough 2013; Dunn & Neumann 2016: 3). As a result, CDA is highly suited for answering “how” and “how possible” research questions (Dunn & Neumann 2016: 12).

While there is no unified theory nor a highly structured and defined single method for conducting CDA, Dunn & Neumann (2016) discuss that usually three steps are taken when conducting DA: identifying discourses, delimiting the discourse to manageable timeframes and sources, and identifying representations that comprise the discourse (Dunn & Neumann 2016: 8). Moreover, they state that discourse analysts conventionally focus on change, rupture or continuity within the discourses (Dunn & Neumann 2016: 104). In this thesis, the focus will be on the possible change that has been occurring in the OECD’s official discourses about education and education policy.

5.2 Sources and data sampling

The material that has been used in the analysis of this thesis comprises the OECD's official PISA-related documents between 1999-2019. The selected documents for analysis are listed in the appendix with details. The timeframe for analysis starts from 1999 as this is the year when PISA’s first assessment framework for PISA 2000 was published and the end is 2019 because this is when the learning frameworks of 2030 (incorporated as core components of PISA) have been published. The selection of these documents was done by reviewing the OECD’s PISA documents and education related documents whilst identifying junctures where change within discourse could be detected. It is expected that change in discourses through the language used in these documents can be detected when analyzed comparatively.

5.3 Data management

The chosen texts for analysis were put into a matrix where reasoning and details for each document were listed which facilitated the management of data rising from the data. Starting to map out and layer the discourses emerging, the texts were submitted to close reading while using thematic coding and a framework for coding developed based on the theoretical framework (see appendix 9.1.1). Double reading was employed to read the texts which means carefully reading the text descriptively and dialogically (Dunn & Neumann 2016: 110) and while doing this, notes were taken carefully of the concepts and themes that started recurring. At all times, a specific focus was paid on the use of language, which meant focusing the rhetoric employed, choice and sequence of words, and importantly what was missing. After this, to create an overview, a visual representation with different thematic areas was done. This facilitated the categorical understanding of the different discourses that started to be identified as well as the overlap between them.

5.4 Limitations

Firstly, the limitations regarding the methodological choices of this thesis are important to acknowledge. DA and CDA have been criticized for not fulfilling the scientific criteria of repeatability and objective validity because of the interpretative nature of the method (Phillips & Hardy 2002: 80-85). Therefore, the generalizability and definite unambiguous drawing of conclusions of CDA research is limited. Further, a common critique of DA and CDA is tied to the interpretative nature of the method. While the examination of language is expected to reveal meanings, it is critiqued that the meaning can be interpreted based on the researcher's own use and understanding of language and thus, the close inspection of language as a strength of DA & CDA also presents a weakness (Tenorio 2011). The claim of biased research that is too much based on the researcher's presence and interpretations is a considerable limitation of CDA. However, the countercriticism to this from the proponents of CDA is that no research is free from biases and the readers

should remain critical of the context of each study (Hussain et a. 2015). Furthermore, Tenorio (2011) reminds of the importance of CDA analysts for having a critical attitude towards their own practices, purposes, and methods to reduce biases and diminish the limitations of CDA (Tenorio 2011).

Acknowledging these limitations and taking measures to minimize the adverse effects from the limitations is important. Thus, when conducting the research and analysis for this thesis, these above-mentioned points will be held in mind at all times while trying to provide as transparent research as possible, given the time and expertise limits.

5.5 Ethical considerations

In every research, there are ethical considerations. In this thesis, the first one is about the ownership of data sources. While this thesis focuses on the official documents of the OECD, all these documents analyzed are publicly available online and there are no limits stated of using them for analytical purposes. However, remaining aware of the potential limitations arising from sources is important. The second ethical concern connects to the claims of CDA as a moralistic pursuit (Graham 2018), and thus to the and the possible criticism of the OECD's actions and role in the field of education. CDA encompasses inherently a criticism towards social construction, structures, power, and ideology (Fairclough 2016; Graham 2018) and thus, CDA is especially suited for revealing injustices. However, this also means, moral criticism towards dominating power structures and thus, in CDA research like this one, it is important to remain ethical when exposing these injustices. Moreover, it is important to state that the critique and conclusions that may arise are a subject of this thesis alone and others may reach different conclusions. Again, this connects with the overall limitations of this study, the lack of generalizability from the findings.

6 Analysis

The following section contains the analysis, which is divided into two different sections. The first section presents the findings from the analysis of education and education policy from the OECD's PISA related documents from the first years of PISA (between 1999-2010). The second section will then discuss and present the findings from the later PISA related documents, especially from documents published post 2010 as this timeframe is expected to be a turning point for the discourse in relation to education that the OECD supports and promotes.

6.1 The OECD's original conceptualization of education

6.1.1 Lifelong learning, skills, knowledge, and competencies

From the beginning of PISA in 2000, the OECD has been conceptualizing education's role as preparing students to become lifelong learners in society and to create an understanding of the knowledge and skills the youth in different countries must have to fully participate in society:

“The assessment will focus on 15-year-olds, and the indicators are designed to contribute to an understanding of the extent to which education systems in participating countries are preparing their students to become lifelong learners and to play constructive roles as citizens in society.” (OECD 1999:7).

The OECD has committed to Lifelong learning for All Act in 1996 (OECD 2001), but the discourse of lifelong learning that the OECD employs in relation to education and PISA can be also considered from a perspective of utility and productivity. Lifelong learning and the ‘usefulness’ in terms of skills and knowledge that can be applied to situations outside of the school environment formed the cornerstone of the discourse The OECD started to promote when it first launched PISA in 2000 (OECD 1999). Moreover, lifelong

learning is connected repeatedly to competencies, that is knowledge and skills beyond curricula and singular subjects, that education should foster. Competencies in the different domains that are assessed in PISA can be viewed as the foundation of the discourse that the OECD promotes as the purpose of what education should bring about. In the Definition and Selection of Key Competencies, it is stated that transversal competencies, competencies that are applicable in multiple areas of life, are the key competencies that should be the cornerstone of assessment (OECD 2005; OECD 1999). Thus, assessing knowledge and skills beyond curricula and subjects can be seen to form the basis of the OECD's discourse of education which supports education's role in bringing about these applicable competencies within students that can be useful beyond the traditional school subjects and curricula.

Furthermore, lifelong learning is frequently connected to the future and adaptation to changing circumstances (OECD 1999; OECD 2005; OECD 2018). Globalization and changing circumstances that it has brought about for education, such as the need for broader technological capabilities and skills that require adaptation are discussed already in the first PISA framework and periodically stated in the subsequent documents (OECD 1999; OECD 2005; OECD 2018). Hence, it can be interpreted that the discourse of education through PISA is also futuristic. Additionally, lifelong learning is also connected to 'successful' outcomes of education as it prepares students to act in the uncertainty of the future. While PISA and the OECD claim to not make any direct policy recommendations for countries, connecting adjectives such as 'success', 'successful' and 'best practice' to the discussion of PISA and the definitions of the assessment domains generates indirectly a connotation to the domains being assessed as generating successful educational outcomes for individuals and countries. Therefore, by connecting adjectives such as those mentioned above, the OECD generates a discourse of successful education achieved through PISA.

6.1.2 Human capital

The framing of education through the competencies approach to knowledge and skills that the OECD employs is also found in the human capital definition of the first PISA assessment framework:

“This emphasis on testing in terms of mastery of broad concepts is particularly significant in light of the concern among nations to develop human capital, which the OECD defines as:

“The knowledge, skills, competencies and other attributes embodied in individuals that are relevant to personal, social and economic well-being.” (OECD 1999:11)

Interestingly and surprisingly, this definition of human capital that the OECD uses in the PISA assessment framework is not only centered around economic concerns as could have been expected. While this definition emphasizes that these concepts and competencies that PISA assesses are important because of countries’ concern to develop human capital in their nations, the definition itself also embodies the role of human capital, brought about from education, for personal and social well-being which are mentioned prior to economic well-being. Moreover, it is also surprising that human capital is not directly mentioned in relation to the assessment domains but only in the definition of how the OECD views human capital and its relation to PISA.

While the human capital discourse of education that the OECD uses may not be as economic as expected, it is still certainly used as the basis for PISA’s relevance and usefulness:

“Estimates of the stock of human capital or human skill base have tended, at best, to be derived using proxies such as level of education completed. When the interest in human capital is extended to include attributes that permit full social and democratic participation in adult life and that equip people to become “lifelong learners”, the inadequacy of these proxies becomes even clearer.” (OECD 1999:11).

This quote demonstrates how through the inclusion of lifelong learning assessment and measuring of skills and knowledge useful and necessary to fully participate in society are promoted as the advantages and ultimately the strength of PISA. Moreover, it is evident that this measurement and assessment of human capital in an innovative manner is the justification of the need for PISA as well as the basis for its usefulness for countries. Therefore, it can be interpreted that PISA was established for the purposes of measuring and assessing human capital of countries, fully for the first time ever. Yet, surprisingly unlike expected, this human capital measurement and discourse that the OECD originally promoted in the PISA framework incorporated a much broader perspective and understanding of human capital than just human capital for economic purposes.

However, when analyzing the OECD's annual report of 2001, human capital, and education's role of generating it are repeatedly connected to growth and productivity of countries in terms of increases in ICT skills and coping in a knowledge-based society with changing demands:

“The new economic environment will also demand new skills, competencies and ways of organizing work which will require changes in policies towards education, training and labour relations. Policy will also need to ensure that new technologies continue to emerge in the future and that innovation and technology diffusion continue to make a contribution to growth” (OECD, 2001: 27).

“One clear result that has emerged from the growth project is the need to place still more emphasis on human capital in the increasingly knowledge-based global economy. Countries can be awash with technology, but it takes human skills and talent both to operate it and to undertake the reorganisation of work and commercial relationships that can improve productivity and lift growth potential.” (OECD 2001: 5)

Interestingly this similar mention to growth and productivity via education and human capital is not mentioned throughout the PISA documents or assessment frameworks but in the annual report, this connection is made evident. Thus, there seems to be a difference in how the OECD as an organization defines and views human capital and its role for society and especially purposes of economic growth than what the OECD uses in PISA related documents.

Moreover, skills that are essential to be acquired from education are recurrently connected to the skills needed in the labor market and coping as a worker in the changing knowledge-based economy (OECD 2001; OECD 1999; OECD 2005). This emphasis on employability and productivity through skills acquisition from education is even stated to be a solution for the growing inequalities and gaps between rich and poor:

“In the social sphere, attention turned to the growing gap between rich and poor in many OECD countries, how to avoid social exclusion and how to reverse it when it does occur. Evidence so far suggests that jobs are a key to re-integrating people into society, bringing the debate back to the problem of education and the skills needed to cope in a knowledge-based society.” (OECD 2001:24)

Essentially, it seems that skills form the foundation of the human capital definition and discourse that the OECD promotes. Yet, these skills are continuously connected to employability, productivity and the usefulness of skills from education for these purposes. Consequently, this creates and contributes to the understanding of education’s role and conceptualization from a utilitarian and mainly economic point of view.

6.1.3 The concept of literacy and the domains assessed

In the original framework of PISA assessment, the competencies of each domain are chosen to be assessed in terms of literacy in relation to each domain (OECD 1999). Furthermore, this concept of literacy has continued to be the basis for the assessment of the domains in the later rounds of PISA as well (OECD 2017). Literacy of each domain is emphasized as it incorporates the ability to apply and use the knowledge and skills in a broader manner than just reproducing this knowledge and skills of a certain subject or a domain (OECD 2017; OECD 1999). This is closely connected to PISA’s intention of being real-life applicable and measurement of the knowledge, skills, and human capital as well in terms of participation in society. The use of the concept of literacy is also considered as an ‘innovative’ tool for measurement (OECD 2017).

The original domains that PISA was created to assess are reading, mathematics and science (OECD 1999). The reasoning for choosing these domains is also provided in close connection to what kind of a function does the knowledge and skills of these domains, especially in terms of broad concepts and ideas, play in society's functions (OECD 1999). There is no doubt that these domains are in many ways important for functioning in society and being able to fully participate in society as a citizen, but what is important and interesting is to note what is missing or which domains are not assessed. In the framework for assessment (1999), there is no room given in assessment for creativity or for aspects such as emotional intelligence or social and interpersonal skills (OECD 1999). The choosing of those above-mentioned domains for assessment may be done because they provide the best proxy of the knowledge and skills for participation in society, but these domains are also measurable quantitatively for the creation of scales and indicators. The OECD is known for its sophisticated data analysis and statistics so another way of viewing the choosing of these indicators, however not mentioned, is the transferability of the measurements of these domains into comparable data.

6.2 The changes in the OECD's discourse

6.2.1 Changing context of PISA

While the original PISA framework was developed to be applicable for partner countries wishing to join in on PISA, there was a clear emphasis that PISA was an instrument primarily directed at the OECD countries. Indeed, this connection is made very clear in the initial assessment framework for PISA where the language used in relation to PISA is referred to as 'OECD/PISA' (OECD 1999). Emphasizing PISA's role for the OECD countries contributes to the discourse that PISA's relevance is mainly useful for the OECD countries. In the later frameworks and reports, however, PISA is no longer referred to as 'OECD/PISA' and in fact, it is highlighted how PISA is the best measurement to measure educational progress and learning outcomes on the global scale (OECD 2012). Presenting PISA as the 'most successful' educational instrument that will best measure not only countries' progress in terms of off- or on-track, the OECD is

extending the relevance of PISA beyond its own membership base (OECD 2012). The need to extend the role of the organization to a more global scale is also evident from the OECD's 50th Anniversary Vision Statement (2011) which sets forth a vision for the organization, amongst other things, to have a greater emphasis on partnerships in the New Paradigm for Development (OECD 2011). Thus, through the difference in language of how the OECD's and PISA's role on the global scale is discussed, it is evident that the OECD is readjusting its role within the field of education in the changing global atmosphere to retain itself relevant as well as retaining the instrument of PISA relevant for a larger base of countries.

6.2.2 Economic growth and human capital

The OECD's original mission is stated to be the promotion of economic growth (OECD 2011). Moreover, as discussed earlier, the connection of education's role to the original mission of the OECD has been clear in terms of emphasis on human capital's role in generating growth and in the emphasis on employability through the acquisition of skills and knowledge from education (OECD, 2005; OECD 2001; OECD 1999). Economic growth is still stated to be the cornerstone of the organization:

“The organization's essential mission is to promote stronger, cleaner, fairer economic growth and to raise employment and living standards” (OECD 2011: 2)

However, the language used in relation to economic growth in the reports is much more centered around words such as 'inclusive', 'sustainable' and 'equitable' growth (OECD 2011; OECD 2012):

“We will actively pursue strategies for growth and jobs by making the best use of OECD expertise in multidisciplinary analysis and structural reforms. Sustainable economic growth is a critical objective and future OECD strategies will promote green growth.” (OECD 2011: 2).

Furthermore, the role of education is explicitly emphasized to ought to be more than just for the purposes of employability and growth:

“Education needs to aim to do more than prepare young people for the world of work; it needs to equip students with the skills they need to become active, responsible and engaged citizens” (OECD 2018: 4).

“Their motivation will be more than getting a good job and a high income; they will also need to care about the well-being of their friends and families, their communities and the planet.” (OECD 2018: 2).

While there is similarity in the statement above with how human capital is defined in the earlier PISA documents, there is never an *explicit* mention that education *needs* to prepare young people beyond labor force participation and thus, the discourse has created an understanding that the preparation for workforce and employability through the acquisition of skills and knowledge is enough from education. Moreover, from the second quote on what the students of the future will value and need to value, it is clear that the aspect of sustainability and recognition of the need to acquire skills in relation to other aspects than just employability is essential.

6.2.3 Skills, knowledge, and domains for assessment

6.2.3.1 Domains

In the post 2010 OECD reports and documents, the core domains of mathematics, reading and science are still present and emphasized as being the bare minimum standards of skills that education should foster (OECD 2017). Furthermore, those same domains that were assessed in the first PISA are still the core for assessment in later PISA rounds as well as in the PISA-D assessment framework (OECD 2017). Yet, there is a new domain for assessment, financial literacy, although optional, which has been incorporated in the framework since 2012 (OECD 2017). The context of globalization and the futuristic approach is still very much present and especially in relation to inclusion of financial literacy, the importance of this domain is discussed because of the volatility of the global financial system especially considering the recent economic crisis which has shown the lack of financial skills:

“A lack of financial literacy contributes to ill-informed financial decisions, and these decisions could, in turn, have tremendous adverse effects on both personal and, ultimately, global finance” (OECD 2017: 82)

“In addition to the benefits identified for individuals, large-scale financial literacy can be expected to improve economic and financial stability for a number of reasons” (OECD 2017: 83)

While this addition of financial literacy as a domain for assessment mainly focuses on economic efficiency benefits that financial literacy can generate at individual and country level, there is also a more humanitarian based justification in terms of reducing inequalities that financial literacy can bring about:

“Schools are well-positioned to advance financial literacy among all demographic groups and reduce gaps and inequalities in financial literacy, including across generations.” (OECD 2017: 85).

6.2.3.2 Skills and Knowledge

The skills that are maintained as important in the frameworks and reports are connected to competitiveness as a worker in an increasingly competitive and demanding economy:

“...to remain competitive, workers will need to acquire new skills continually, which requires flexibility, a positive attitude towards lifelong learning and curiosity” (OECD 2019: 2)

Lifelong learning and especially learning to learn are also the core components of what education should bring about in order to remain competitive in the labor market (OECD 2019). These components of skills and lifelong learning are similarly discussed as in previous PISA reports and frameworks. However, what has been absent before and what has gained importance is the focus on and importance of social and emotional skills that education should promote which as well has not been present before (OECD 2018). Previously, there has not been a mention of the importance of including and focusing on

these ‘non-measurable’ skills but now in the Future of Education framework and Skills and Knowledge for 2030 frameworks, these skills are recurrently mentioned as important (OECD 2018; OECD 2019; OECD 2019). While the importance of these skills is discussed mainly in relation to employability and labor market functions, there is an explicit mention of these skills being important for the wellbeing of society and valuing of others:

“Valuing the contributions that people make to society is necessary not only for individual and societal well-being, but also for the health and relevance of institutions” (OECD 2019: 4)

This is very much a novelty in how skills and education’s role have been presented in the OECD’s documents and this can be seen to be connected to a shift to more humanitarian values regarding what education should foster. However, there is also a reoccurring mention of artificial intelligence’s role in diminishing job opportunities for those possessing ‘traditional’ skill sets and thus, emotional, and social skills will be more important in the future as jobs that require these skills are less likely to abolish (OECD 2019). Hence, while there is clearly a move towards inclusion of skills that have a more humanitarian based value, the importance and relevance of these skills is also highlighted in terms of employability and labor market functions. Thus, the core components are still the same for the frameworks, but new inclusions of skills and other non-measurable components are added such as focus on curiosity, resilience, and self-regulation that have previously not been present.

7 Discussion and conclusion

The influential role of PISA as an instrument for countries to measure the levels of educational attainment amongst their youth gives PISA, and thus the OECD, an important position in defining through the discourse they promote and through ideas embedded within the discourse, a power to define and construe what is educationally valuable. For example, the choice of the domains being assessed, and competencies and skills measured does not directly tell any country to align their curricula with these domains and measured aspects. However, as partaking in ILSAs, such as PISA, is often connected as a requirement for especially low- and middle-income countries to receive for example aid allocations, the pressure to participate and do well in these ILSAs indirectly causes countries to align their curricula with the assessment criteria. Moreover, in the context of high-income countries as well as low- and middle-income countries, no country wants to place last in these international rankings and measurements. As the global knowledge economy is increasingly competitive, the educational rankings and measurements such as PISA can have implications on other aspects within international relations so often participating in ILSAs is seen as a better alternative than not participating at all (Piro 2019: 10-13). Consequently, while PISA nor the OECD directly do not make policy recommendations, the conceptualization of education and the official discourse they promote has implications on national education policies.

Based on the analysis presented in this thesis, it is evident that lifelong learning - the focus on measuring skills and knowledge that are useful for the successful participation in society - remains the cornerstone of the OECD's conceptualization of education. Essentially, education's role can be tied to the provision of the functions of lifelong learning: acquisition of skills and knowledge that, in the best possible way, enable an individual to become a productive, useful, and valuable part of society while generating productivity and usefulness at a larger level in terms of growth and social wellbeing. The concepts of usefulness, success, and competitiveness as an indication of 'best practices' as well as the focus on measuring learning and focus on performance outcomes that are embedded within this discourse point to the utilitarian economic discourse concerning education. This discourse that incorporates the ideas of human capital needed for mainly

economic reasons, is inevitably still today the foundation that the OECD bases its conceptualization of education on. As the use of these adjectives and concepts is also present in the later PISA documents, this suggests and implies that this economic utilitarian discourse is still present within the OECD's conceptualization of education.

Furthermore, the measuring of learning and focus on performance outcomes as the successful indicators of educational outcomes and quality have been present since the beginning of PISA and continue to be so in the later documents. This quantitative measurement of quality and provision of indicators and scales within education is the core of what PISA was created for. This ultimately reflects what the OECD as an organization has capacity and strength to do. While the first assessment domains that were chosen for PISA assessment are arguably core elements and domains of what skills education should generally bring about, these domains are also easily quantifiable with scales and indicators.

In the later rounds of PISA, especially considering the humanitarian turn in relation to the 2030 frameworks, more weight has been given more to non-measurable, less directly economically productive, and useful skills. While this is arguably an indication of a shift towards a humanitarian turn in the PISA assessments and overall, within the OECD's conceptualization of education, the importance of these domains is also done in relation to the employability and labor market purposes as the skills needed for future workers are changing. Moreover, the quantitative measuring and the creation of scales and indicators prevails while these new skills that are included are skills that do not seem to be a fit for measuring this way. Arguably, this questions a real change within the OECD toward a true humanitarian turn or change in its education work. Thus, while there may have been a shift in the domains that are assessed and an inclusion of more humanitarian value-based skills and knowledge, the justification that is used for the inclusion of these as well as the way of measuring these skills indicates that the core focus within the discourse remains on utility, efficiency, and performance.

The ideas that are embedded in the OECD's discourse through PISA still promotes an economically centered view of what education ought to deliver. What are valuable outcomes of education are defined in terms of real-life applicability mainly in terms of skills and knowledge needed in the changing labor market. While there are also mentions

about education's role in creating citizens that can participate fully in society, ultimately what can be stated based on the analysis is that the discourse about education's role and education policy is predominantly utilitarian economic. However, it is also clear that within the discourse that the OECD promotes through PISA, there has been a change towards a more humanitarian based discourse. The context where the OECD now develops and produces ideas about education has been changing because of global developments. PISA-D and other recent changes within the organization's educational work must be viewed in terms of these global developments and shifts. Perhaps the changes in the education discourse have been inevitable for the OECD to align itself better with what it as a *global* organization should promote. Yet, this shift to more humanitarian-based discourse within education seems to be rather superficial and the original mission of the OECD as an IO within education and elsewhere is still visible in its educational work in relation to PISA: the promotion of economic development and growth, yet now with a more global reach.

This thesis has attempted to answer the question of what kind of ideas are IOs producing about education and what is the role of these ideas in shaping global governance of education. The extent of this thesis was not enough to exhaustively answer these questions but by closely examining the changes in the OECD's discourse through PISA, this thesis has attempted to make a contribution to see what kind of ideas the OECD as an influential education IO is promoting. In future research, it is important to continue discovering and examining how IOs are shaping the national education policies through their discourses. In particular, more focus should be given to the OECD's and PISA's extension as a global metric for measurement of educational success while critically examining the context and voices that are taken into account when defining what is educationally valuable and successful.

8 References

- Addey, C. (2016). PISA for Development and the Sacrifice of Policy-Relevant Data. *Educ. Soc., Campinas*, 37(136), pp.685–706. doi:10.1590/ES0101-73302016166001.
- Addey, C. and Gorur, R. (2020). Translating PISA, translating the world. *Comparative Education*, 56(4), pp.1–18. doi:10.1080/03050068.2020.1771873.
- Addey, C. and Sellar, S. (2012). Why Do Countries Participate in PISA? Understanding the Role of International Large-Scale Assessments in Global Education Polic. In: A. Verger, M. Novelli and H.K. Altinyelken, eds., *Global Education Policy and International Development New Agendas, Issues and Policies*. Bloomsbury.
- Addey, C., Sellar, S., Steiner-Khamsi, G., Lingard, B. and Verger, A. (2017). The rise of international large-scale assessments and rationales for participation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 47(3), pp.434–452. doi:10.1080/03057925.2017.1301399.
- Akkari, A. and Lauwerier, T. (2014). The education policies of international organizations: Specific differences and convergences. *PROSPECTS*, 45(1), pp.141–157. doi:10.1007/s11125-014-9332-z.
- Auld, E., Rappleye, J. and Morris, P. (2019). PISA for Development: how the OECD and World Bank shaped education governance post-2015. *Comparative Education*, 55(2), pp.197–219. doi:10.1080/03050068.2018.1538635.
- Barnett, M.N. and Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the world: international organizations in global politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Broome, A. and Seabrooke, L. (2012). Seeing like an International Organisation. *New Political Economy*, 17(1), pp.1–16. doi:10.1080/13563467.2011.569019.
- Buduru, B. and Pal, L.A. (2010). The globalized state: Measuring and monitoring governance. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(4), pp.511–530. doi:10.1177/1367549410377144.
- Dunn, K.C. and Neumann, I.B. (2016). *Undertaking discourse analysis for social research*. Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, 7(2), pp.177–197. doi:10.1080/19460171.2013.798239.
- Goldstein, J. and Keohane, R.O. (1993). Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Analytical Framework. In: J. Goldstein and R.O. Keohane, eds., *Ideas and Foreign Policy, Beliefs, Institutions and political change*. New York: Cornell University Press, pp.3–31.
- Graham, P. (2018). Ethics in critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 15(2), pp.186–203. doi:10.1080/17405904.2017.1421243.
- Halperin, S. and Heath, O. (2012). *Political research : methods and practical skills*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Hidalgo Tenorio, E. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis, An overview. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), p.183. doi:10.35360/njes.247.

Hussain, S., Jote, A. and Sajid, S. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis: Demystifying the Fuzziness. *The International Journal Of Humanities & Social Studies*, 3(10), pp.242–249.

Kamens, David H. and McNeely, Connie L. (2009). Globalization and the Growth of International Educational Testing and National Assessment. *Comparative Education Review*, 54(1), pp.5–25. doi:10.1086/648471.

Keith Francis Punch (2014). *Introduction to Social Research : Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles Etc.: Sage.

Mahon, R. and McBride, S. (2009). Standardizing and disseminating knowledge: the role of the OECD in global governance. *European Political Science Review*, [online] 1(1), pp.83–101. doi:10.1017/s1755773909000058.

Meyer, H.-D. and Benavot, A. (2013). PISA and the Globalization of Education Governance: some puzzles and problems. In: H.-D. Meyer and A. Benavot, eds., *PISA, Power and Policy: The Emergence of Global Educational Governance*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books, pp.7–27.

Morgan, C. and Volante, L. (2016). A review of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's international education surveys: Governance, human capital discourses, and policy debates. *Policy Futures in Education*, 14(6), pp.775–792. doi:10.1177/1478210316652024.

Nagel, A. - K., Martens, K. and Windzio, M. (2010). Introduction—Education Policy in Transformation. In: K. Martens, A.-K. Nagel, M. Windzio and A. Weymann, eds., *Transformation of Education Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp.3–50.

Niemann, D. (2022). International Organizations in Education: New Takes on Old Paradigms. In: K. Martens and M. Windzio, eds., *Global Pathways to Education, Cultural Spheres, Networks, and International Organizations*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp.127–161.

Niemann, D. and Martens, K. (2018). Soft governance by hard fact? The OECD as a knowledge broker in education policy. *Global Social Policy*, 18(3), pp.267–283. doi:10.1177/1468018118794076.

OECD (1999). *Measuring Student Knowledge and Skills - A New Framework for Assessment*. OECD. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/measuring-student-knowledge-and-skills_9789264173125-en.

OECD (2001). *OECD Annual Report 2001*. OECD. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/oecd-annual-report-2001_annrep-2001-en.

OECD (2005). *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies*. OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/definitionandselectionofcompetenciesdeseco.htm>.

OECD (2011). *OECD 50th Anniversary Vision Statement*. OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/mcm/48064973.pdf>.

OECD (2017a). *PISA for Development Brief 2 - PISA for Development: Benefits for participating countries*. OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/PISA-for-Development-Benefits-for-participating-countries-PISA-D-Brief2.pdf>.

OECD (2017b). *PISA for Development Brief 17 - PISA for Development and the Sustainable Development Goals*. OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-for-development/17-PISA-D-and-SDG4.pdf>.

OECD (2017c). *PISA for Development Brief 19 - Mainstreaming PISA for Development into PISA*. OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/19-Mainstreaming-PISA-D-into-PISA.pdf>.

OECD (2018). *The future of education and skills Education 2030*. OECD. Available at: [https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20\(05.04.2018\).pdf](https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf).

OECD (2019). *OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030 Conceptual learning framework, Concept note: Skills for 2030*. OECD. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/teaching-and-learning/learning/skills/Skills_for_2030_concept_note.pdf.

OECD (2022). *Our global reach - OECD*. Oecd.org. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/about/members-and-partners/>.

OECD (2019). *Future of Education and Skills 2030: Conceptual learning framework, Knowledge for 2030*. OECD.

Pease, K.-K.S. (2019). *International organizations : perspectives on global governance*. New York, Ny: Routledge.

Phillips, N. and Hardy, C. (2002). The Challenges of Discourse Analysis. In: N. Phillips and C. Hardy, eds., *Discourse Analysis*. pp.60–81. doi:10.4135/9781412983921.n4.

Piro, J.M. (2019). *The primacy of PISA : How the world's most important test is changing education globally*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Pons, X. (2017). Fifteen years of research on PISA effects on education governance: A critical review. *European Journal of Education*, 52(2), pp.131–144. doi:10.1111/ejed.12213.

Rivzi, F. and Lingard, B. (2006). Globalization and the changing nature of the OECD's educational work. In: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J.-A. Dillabough and A.H. Halsey, eds., *Education, globalization, and social change*. Oxford, U.K: Oxford University Press, pp.247–260.

Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London ; New York, Ny: Routledge.

Rutkowski, D. and Rutkowski, L. (2021). Running the Wrong Race? The Case of PISA for Development. *Comparative Education Review*, 65(1), pp.147–165. doi:10.1086/712409.

Sellar, S. and Lingard, B. (2013). PISA and the Expanding Role of the OECD in Global Educational Governance. In: H.-D. Meyer and A. Benavot, eds., *PISA, Power, and Policy the emergence of global educational governance*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Symposium Books, pp.185–207.

Spring, J. (2008). Research on Globalization and Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), pp.330–363. doi:10.3102/0034654308317846.

Windzio, M. and Martens, K. (2022). The Global Development, Diffusion, and Transformation of Education Systems: Transnational Isomorphism and 'Cultural Spheres'. In: K. Martens and M. Windzio, eds., *Global Pathways to Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp.1–35.

Wiseman, A.W. and Waluyo, B. (2019). The Dialectical Impact of PISA on International Educational Discourse and National Education Reform. In: L. Volante, ed., *The PISA Effect on Global Educational Governance*. Routledge.

Xiaomin, L. and Auld, E. (2020). A historical perspective on the OECD's 'humanitarian turn': PISA for Development and the Learning Framework 2030. *Comparative Education*, 56(4), pp.503–521. doi:10.1080/03050068.2020.1781397.

9 Appendices

9.1.1 Coding framework

	Human capital/economic utilitarian	Humanitarian
Codes and themes	<p>Economic growth, economic development , skills, knowledge economy, lifelong learning, human capital, competition, best practices, success, skills for employability, references to workers, competition, competitive,</p> <p>Focus on measurement with numbers, communication with numbers, perspectives of OECD member countries incorporated only, performance centered,</p>	<p>Wellbeing, equality, sustainability, inclusion, inclusivity, inclusion of competencies not directly relevant for economic purposes only (eg. emotional intelligence), assessment as human right that belongs to all, communication and measurement less only with numbers, perspectives of non-OECD members countries (especially those participating in the PISA-D initiative) included</p>

9.1.2 Reports and official documents used for analysis

Document	Year published	Why was it chosen ?	Publisher	Length
Measuring student knowledge and skills- a new framework for assessment	1999	Provides the basis for the PISA assessment as it is the first framework for PISA. Basis of OECD's conceptualization of education through PISA	OECD	85 pp
The definition and selection of key competencies, executive summary	2005	Competencies are a central theme in PISA survey and thus a central theme in conceptualization of education within OECD	OECD & DeSeCo Project	20 pp
OECD's Annual Report	2001	First round of PISA assessment was done in 2000. This document was chosen because it was expected to have a focus on education and thus provide information how OECD conceptualizes education and what kind of education policies it promotes	OECD	135 pp
OECD's 50 th anniversary vision statement	2011	This is not directly linked to education discourse but this document has been identified as a turning point for OECD's mission and purpose in other sources. Therefore, this document was expected to provide information of the upcoming changes with	OECD	4 pp

		regards to conceptualization of education within OECD.		
OECD's contribution on education to the post 2015 framework: PISA for development	2012	Provides justification for the PISA-D project and for PISA to be a measurement tool for SDG 4.	OECD	8 pp
PISA for Development brief 2, 17 & 19	2017	These provide justification and motivation for PISA-D but also information about the discourse that OECD is promoting of education and education policy through PISA-D	OECD	2,2,2 pp
PISA 2015 Assessment and analytical framework	2017	This document provides a comparison of the changing conceptualization of education through PISA with the first assessment framework of PISA 2000. This framework is also the same used for assessing PISA-D.	OECD	262 pp
OECD Future & Skills learning framework 2030	2018	Information on the changing discourse that OECD wants to promote. Giving direction whether or not it is more humanitarian or similar to what it has been before	OECD	23 pp
Conceptual learning framework – skills for 2030	2019	This provides a direction of whether or not the skills emphasized for future learning are any different than those emphasized before in PISA documents. To	OECD	15 pp

		find out whether there has been any change at all.		
Conceptual learning framework – knowledge for 2030	2019	This document is expected to provide an answer to whether the knowledge needed through education in the future is discussed in any different manner than in previous PISA documents.	OECD	13 pp