March 2013

“Can We Just Get Rid of the Classroom?” Thinking Space, Relationally

Sophia Rodriguez

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/taboo>

Recommended Citation

Rodriguez, S. (2017). “Can We Just Get Rid of the Classroom?” Thinking Space, Relationally. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 13 (1). <https://doi.org/10.31390/taboo.13.1.08>

“Can We Just Get Rid of the Classroom?” Thinking Space, Relationally

Sophia Rodriguez

*From the moment there is genius, there is something that belongs to no school,
no period, something that achieves a breakthrough.*

—Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, The “Anti-Oedipus” from *A Thousand Plateaus*

*. . .to begin always anew, to make, to reconstruct, and to not spoil, to refuse to bu-
reaucratize the mind, to understand and to live life as a process—live to become.*

—Paulo Freire

While I was observing teacher candidates at a University in the Midwest U.S. a few months ago, I expected to hear questions and comments from the teacher candidates on the value of philosophy in education. But, as these future teachers considered the works of John Dewey, I listened intently to their interactions. At one point, the professor of the course said, “We need an intelligent theory of education which is different from an ideology.” Unexpectedly, a teacher candidate said, “Well, can’t we just get rid of the classroom?” There was a long pause and some nervous laughter that ensued. These teacher candidates were not suggesting that schools or classroom spaces be removed from being a central figure of an education system. Rather, these teacher candidates were raising the issue of how learning occurs and in what types of conditions, or spaces, these occurrences materialize. Reflecting on this moment in preparation for this article led me to think about the rules and norms that encode modern schooling practices—things so simple as a classroom with four walls, a space for formal learning. I wonder about the current ideologies that govern modern schooling practices in formal and informal spaces, and importantly, for this article, the ideologies that govern teaching preparations and teaching practices in contested, alternative spaces. What happens if we fail to see alternative spaces? I tend to believe that much happens beneath the surface when we are engaged in educational theory and research.

The argument of this article is primarily a theoretical one that engages with

conceptual ideas in critical geography scholarship and more recent theorizing in comparative education literature on globalization and education. I see continuity within the critical geography theorizing found in Edward Soja's work in *Seeking Spatial Justice* and more recent literature on “scale” by comparative education researchers (Roberston & Dale, 2008). Thus, I explore the relationship between critical geography and comparative education research on globalization theory. As Helfenbein (2010) notes, “Critical geographers are interested in space, place, power and identity” (p. 304). This article engages with these elements of spatial analysis but by drawing attention to the nuances of space as distinct from place. In addition, it argues that we need to theorize space as “relational” and fluid through poststructuralist theories of becoming offered by the work of Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, Hume Tomlinson, and Graham Burchell entitled, *What is philosophy?* and the individual work of Gilles Deleuze entitled *Bergsonism*.¹ Ultimately, in examining the critical geography literature from Edward Soja (2010), this article tests the limits of Edward Soja's conception of space. In addition, I discuss a teaching experience in Cuba to shed some light on how we might reconceptualize space as distinct from place. I will spend some time drawing out the distinction between space and place and am ultimately concerned with what and who constitutes space. Finally, I argue for a more nuanced theorization of space using Deleuzian (1988, 1994) concepts of becoming and multiplicity to understand space as fluid, contested, negotiated and emergent. Within this latter discussion of Deleuze's concepts I will define “becoming” and argue that it is a concept that can potentially capture the materiality of lived experiences in spaces of possibility. The call for a nuanced post-structuralist conceptualization of space draws attention to alternative spaces that are not governed by normative, positivistic ontologies, and thus merges the historical, the social and the spatial.

Critical Geography and Space

Recent understandings of space consider the ways in which social processes shape and are shaped by space simultaneously. This is an entry point for my understanding of how space is shaped by the lived, everyday experiences of those within a given space. Soja (2010) argues that within the last ten years, scholars have tended to space in their analyses, or what has been labeled the “spatial turn” seemingly in the fashion of the “linguistic turn” post-1968 in philosophy. This move in the realm of philosophy and social theory represents a shift away from a time when the spatial was “subordinate” to the historical (Soja, 2010, p. 15). The uprising of the spatial turn redefined space across disciplines and paved the way for scholars to articulate, problematize, and re-imagine definitions of space. For this present article, it is important to note the ways in which educational researchers and theorists considered space at theoretical level and the material level. For instance, Soja (2010) notes, “It [space] is more than just a physical quality of the

material world or an essential philosophical attribute having absolute, relative, or relational dimensions” (p. 17). In this line of thinking, Soja makes the case for space as something that is both a complex product of social processes and simultaneously something that is historically produced. Moreover, Soja described this “socialized lived space as constructed out of physical and natural spatial forms” (p. 18). In other words, recent understandings of space consider the ways in which social processes shape and are shaped by space simultaneously. While this is an important step in understanding space as something that is more than merely historical or political, I argue here that one can extend Soja’s conceptualization of space beyond this socio-spatial interaction. In particular, I am interested in ways that theorizing space as distinct from place—as the convergence of the spatial, the social, and the historical in Soja’s conception—can help us capture the ways in which actors (teachers and students alike) strategically construct and navigate space. In other words, instead of theorizing space through Soja’s conception of place, this article argues for a conception of space as relational—materializing in/through a set of relations. I will provide an example of this with my experience as a teacher trainer in Cuba in a later section.

To extend the argument for space, Helfenbein and Taylor (2009) aptly argue, “Critical Geography insists on the addition of spatial analysis beyond the merely discursive” (p. 236). The interest in space means more than the ways in which language—educational policies and historical narratives—construct space. Instead, this position (2009) desires a spatial analysis that sees space as “relational” and malleable over time. These authors conceive of space as a “rhizomatic interaction of space where power and identity emerge” and the dynamics within this space, whether contradictory and multiple, are brought into view (Helfenbein & Taylor, 2009, p. 237). The argument here seeks to add to the discussion begun in this characterization of space offered by Helfenbein and Taylor (2009), and continues in the tradition of Critical Geography insofar as it problematizes conceptions of space and place. Using concepts from post-structural theorists Gilles Deleuze and Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guatarri, I re-think space. Through this conception of space, we can understand the dynamic, interactive, multiplicitious attributes of space wherein lived subjects “become-” other than who or what they are in such dichotomous, positivist conceptions of space that often dominant theories of globalization in comparative education research. Indeed, the literature in Critical Geography connects with debates in comparative education regarding this issue of globalization. The next section examines the ways in which comparative education has dealt with and theorized globalization, and its implications for educational research. At times the discourse around globalization functions as a rhetoric of political inevitability (Massey, 2005). This relationship between globalization and space is complex and it is through Deleuzian conceptual tools that we can come to understand spaces in their dynamic, rhizomatically interactive fashion.

Globalization and Educational Spaces

Soja (2010) engages with globalization as it relates to justice in its most broad sense, as a political movement. He writes, “Globalization has also been associated with state restructuring and challenges to the political domination of the nation-state as the exclusive political space for defining citizenship, legal systems, and hence justice itself. Struggles for justice, more than ever before, stretch across political scales, from the global to the local” (p. 22). Indeed, the process of globalization—while marketed as inevitable—has been more complex with regard to schooling practices, globally. In order to transcend the boundaries of what is “global” or how things have become “globalized,” comparative education scholars in particular have engaged with various theoretical and methodological debates around what constitutes “the global” and “the local.” More specifically, I offer in the next section the debates around the global and the local with regard to spaces in which schooling, teaching and learning occur. This discussion provides an understanding of how scholars of comparative education more recently have conceptualized space and scale in new and complex ways that are complimentary in some cases to the work of early critical geographers.

Various scholarly works address “global forces” and local places (Anderson-Levitt, 2003; Tsing, 2004; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2009). These scholars engage in ethnographic study that is guided by social and critical theory. To this end, these scholars address how globalization processes penetrate local places. More importantly, within these studies, scholars address the local, material resistance to these global forces. In effect, there is a divide between those that see globalization as an inevitable force, and those who envision room for resistance at the local level. Additionally, multiple disciplines engage with theories of global spaces (e.g., anthropology and education, sociology of education, and historians of curriculum and education), and all of these find niches within comparative education research and theory.² My aim in this section is to give brief attention to the overarching theoretical paradigms in comparative education research on globalization. The point is to revisit debates around globalization, global spaces, and space more broadly by considering a theory that accounts for the “relationality” of space in a “globalized” world. This is a task that has yet to be achieved in comparative education research on globalization studies. In addition, this article is arguing from recent understandings of global spaces, and space as relational and scalar as opposed to global conditions influencing or governing local spaces—the common argument of “neoinstitutionalist” scholars (Robertson and Dale, 2008). Further, a theory of space that accounts for social relations that links social relations, material, lived experiences of human agents uncovers how space is transformative and not normative. This has not been the commonplace of globalization research.³ Previous conceptions of space-globalized spaces, or institutionalizations of modern schooling spaces have set up norms and stabilizes and essentializes features of a given cultural or

social practice or phenomena within a space without tending the multiple forces that interact in a given, lived space.

Comparative education scholars Dale and Robertson (2008) desire a shift away from this binary understanding of the global and the local in the process of globalization. These authors seek to include “space” as part of educational analysis. For instance, Robertson and Dale (2008) argue “There is broad agreement that it [globalization] is an historical process involving the uneven development and partial contingent transformation of political, economic, and cultural structures, practices, and social relations whose distinctive features involvement the denationalization and transformation of polices, capital, political subjectivities, urban spaces, temporal frameworks” (p. 2). It is important to note within this definition of the global and the process of globalization that new institutions and actors are partaking in social and class struggles in new, operative and emergent spaces beyond national and transnational boundaries. One of the implications for understanding globalization as an historical, unfolding process is that it occurs in fragments, and spaces that cannot be contained. Robertson and Dale suggest that educational policy and educational systems shift to a fragmented, “multiscalar and multisectoral” conceptualization of space. “Thinking through scale” is a moment of interaction between critical geography and globalization studies (Helfenbein, 2010; Dale & Robertson, 2008). This article extends this new multi-scalar space by theorizing space as multiplicity and sites of becomings. Moreover, in globalization research, space, as it is currently conceptualized in the dominant neo-institutionalist paradigm is not considered in analyses of schooling practices. Instead, in this neo-institutionalist paradigm, relations and networks that emerge in educative spaces are not considered because agency is secondary to the convergence of institutions.⁴ Space is conceived as “timeless and static” and immune to the possibility of change. We are not asking why space matters. Instead, in comparative education research, there is much attention on institutional isomorphism and the ways in which educational systems seek convergence (Meyer & Ramirez, 1997).

Before we can answer the question, “Why does space matter?” we need to conceptualize space in such a way that allows for transformation, nuance, and multiplicity. Lefebvre (1991) and Robertson and Dale (2008) argue that we must avoid the problem of fetishizing space by understanding space as integral to social process and simultaneously something that is produced from social relations (Robertson & Dale, 2008, p. 10). I will return to this theory of space as relational after discussing the context of Cuba.

Space Instead of Place

This article is not concerned with place in terms of a location per se, but rather it is concerned with “space” as constituted by and constitutive of a set of relations. This fluidity of space is connected to arguments in comparative educa-

tion about global forces penetrating local places. Yet this article challenges the paradigm of the “global” ruling the “local” place in order to transcend binary logic that governs globalization studies in comparative education and the binary logic that underlies Soja’s “socio-spatial dialectic” (Soja, 2010, p. 18). As stated earlier, this article resists the binary logic that underlies Soja’s conception of space—a logic even with the advancement of a “thirdspace”—which still relies on a fixed notion of place in which space is a part. And, while Helfenbein and Taylor (2009) note the challenge of understanding educational practices in the face of global forces, the argument here contributes to their position. These authors (2009) argue that educational theorizing and the spaces of education need to be opened up to the possibility of understanding the material experiences and multiple identities that occur in educative spaces. The question that lingers is: How can educational theory do this, and with which concepts? In an effort to substantiate their call, this article provides the post-structuralist—Deleuzian—conception of space as fluid, multiple and a site of becoming. To contribute to this, I explore a few questions related to a teacher training experience in Cuba and discuss the learning spaces of Cuban teachers in the context of scholarship on Cuba, and Cuban education. I share personal interactions with Cuban teachers in the context of scholarship in order to think about how Cubans generally occupy space, and how these spatial strategies they use within space can shed light on the importance of thinking of space relationally in educational research that cuts across areas of scholarship on critical geography, globalization theory and research in comparative education, and discourses on curriculum theory (Pinar, 1995; Popkewitz, 1997; Robertson & Dale, 2008; Soja, 1996, 2010).⁵

Cuba as a Potential Space of Possibility

It is my hope that reflecting upon the teacher training experiences in Cuba sheds light on the use of and need for spatial analysis—where space is conceptualized as a network of relations. Interactions with Cubans revealed two things: First, the social and cultural positioning of teachers was challenged by the youth cultures many young teachers were apart of in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Gonzalez & McCarthy, 2004). Along with this, educational projects of the Cuban government defined the professional, social, and cultural position of the Cuban pedagogue. On the level of policy discourse, we see a vision of the pedagogue projected as a “lifelong” trainee in their profession (Gasperini, 2000, p. 9). This fails to account for the ways in which Cubans navigate their social conditions and realities and subsequently *use* space. The second point of interest is relates to Cuban educational policy and teacher education programs there are challenged by the ways in which Cubans (teachers specifically) are more recently using social networks to navigate and negotiate space—both spaces of learning and lived spaces (Lutjens, 2006).

The social, cultural and professional position of teachers can be understood

through a report on the Cuban educational system (Gasperini, 2000). The report to the World Bank in 2000 highlights several features of Cuban teacher training within country and provides the context of teacher training in Cuba. Some of the features of the life of a teacher in Cuba according to the World Bank report 2000 include: “lifelong training, school-based teacher preparation, community of learning teachers, action research, evaluation, and professional status” (Gasperini, 2000, p. 9). It is noted, “Teacher training is a lifelong process including training on the job as well as formal and informal training. Its aim is to support teachers to improve classroom practice” (p. 9). It is further explained that teacher preparation for pre and in service teachers receive much coursework in basic knowledge, values, pedagogy and direct subject matter knowledge. Additionally, there is a built in “community of learning teachers” in which teachers are encouraged to have “exchanges of experience” (p. 9). The report to the World Bank goes on to highlight the ways that teachers are positioned as “community activists” and their work extends beyond the classroom because education is a “shared responsibility” between teachers, families and communities.

Recent scholarship points to the lack of attention paid to the social realities and spaces that constrain Cuban teachers (Lutjens, 2006). Since little educational research investigates Cuba beyond the level of policy discourse we do not know for sure the ways in which this vision of the Cuban pedagogue is disseminated into local spaces and evidence in the early 2000s of teachers leaving the profession suggest that conditions were not as “collaborative” as reports would indicate.⁶ Teachers are not prepared as intellectuals, instead, the training is just a focus on skills and vocation as it relates to a strong national agenda (Carnoy, Gove, & Marshall, 2007). The social context of schooling/teaching matters in Cuba, but the social is a direct result of the political. The Cuban Constitution mandates that education is “an activity in which all members of society participate”—national objective is ensured through educational policy that dictates social and cultural practice (Taylor, 2009, p. 88). Despite this “high professional status of teachers” as Gasperini notes, it is evidenced that Cuba’s educational spaces that have seen past success are not penetrated to include how teachers use space. Rather, a strong national agenda and community support for educational objectives contribute to the educational success of Cubans.

Research on alternative forms of teacher training is neither abundant nor recent. However, there is an established relationship between Cuba and various NGOs as they related to educational “rehabilitation” (Cruz-Taura, 2003). In this section I reflect on my experience as a trainer with an NGO project as a way to rethink concepts of space. The interactions with Cuban teachers reveals a few themes that are relevant if we are to think of space as something that is used, negotiated, and produced through social networks and academic exchange (Eckstein, 2010; Lutjens, 2006). I discuss my experience in Cuba in relation to recent scholarship research on academic exchange and social relations as a way of highlighting the importance of spatial relations and strategies in the lives of Cuban teachers. My

experience interacts and confirms key observations made in recent scholarship on the prominence of social networks and the negotiation of space in the Cuban context (Eckstein, 2010).

The first of two themes that surfaced during my experience in Cuba was the theme of academic exchange or academic knowledge production and consumption. The challenges faced in the area of academic exchange in Cuba have been noted in scholarship (Lutjens, 2006; Martinez, 2006). Lutjens (2006) emphasizes the “disruption of academic collaboration and exchange” between scholars in both the U.S. and Cuba. One can conjecture that these strained relations are related to differing ideologies and agendas for the academic circulation of knowledge. Interestingly, this scholarly work focuses on the ways in which strains on academic exchange impacted individual scholars, but Lutjens did not give an account of the impact of the spatial realities of Cuban teachers who would have had limited access to academic material related to the teaching profession. Part and parcel of this issue is the limited access to and cost of the internet as a major source for academic research related to the teaching profession.⁷ Yet the teachers that I interacted with had a desire to learn more academic knowledge that was related to their professional needs as teachers. Many of the teachers, following the report on the World Bank from 2000, had experience with action research projects, rudimentary understandings of academic disciplines and the ways in which knowledge circulates in academia. Despite the high cost and limited access to Internet resources and academic publications, “finding space within regulations is possible” (Lutjens, 2006, p. 73). Lutjens (2006) goes on to note the “informal terrain” and the use of “electronic networking, and social movement-like strategies and tactics” that are operating within the Cuban context in relation to academic knowledge circulation. It is suspected that much of the “space” is generated through networks of relations.

The second theme that has recently surfaced in scholarship relating to Cuba and as part of my reflection on the experience there is the use of social networks. In other words, teachers in Cuba use and create space out of a network of relations. Given that there is a strong desire to learn more about the teaching profession, I reflected upon the ways that Cuban teachers used spatial strategies to acquire more knowledge related to their profession. The use of networks across spaces and a culture of exchanging information through friends, colleagues, family, neighbors, non-governmental organizations, and tourism are prevalent in recent years (Eckstein, 2010). Teachers’ perceptions of school and learning about their profession are not associated with a fixed sense of place; instead, they increase knowledge about their profession through connections with friends and other teachers. Eckstein (2010) advances an argument about the importance of social capital and income sharing from families in the U.S. to their Cuban relatives on the island. Eckstein’s research “uncovers the small-scale informal, covert businesses that are built on people-to-people transnational ties and trust” (2010, p. 1659). This highlights the importance of networks of relations in a discussion on social capital, but it is important to

underscore the complexity and delicacy of these social relations. Other examples of Cubans using spatial strategies and networks of relations centered mostly on material gifts and objects, but also extend to knowledge of entrepreneurial strategies for informal businesses like selling flowers for funerals on the island. The point here is to offer up evidence that social networking and the use of relations within spaces is both present, and more importantly, it is strategic within the Cuban context. Interestingly, this use of social relations and networks across spaces has been applied to Cuba's "academic advantage" and teacher training (Carnoy, Gove, & Marshall, 2007). The importance of networks of relations for teachers to gain more academic knowledge related to their profession is evident, and it is within these moments of contact—with family, friends, colleagues, Churches, and non-governmental organizations—that can be captured through more inquiry into how space is used, and how space is shaped and shapes by these social relations.

Implications and Rethinking Space

After considering conceptions of space, and reflecting upon the Cuban teacher-training context as a space of possibility, it is argued that education researchers and theorists would benefit from a conception of space as a network of relations. Space, here, is not limited to a place, a single experience, or an embodied feeling within an "inhabited" place.⁸ Rather, space is negotiated through relations between multiple actors while space—simultaneously—shapes social action. The teachers that I interacted with used spatial strategies to "bypass" regulations on accessing information. As many Cubans do, these teachers "went elsewhere" to get information related to their professional needs. The current teacher-training context in Cuba moves beyond policy discourse at the national level and at the international level, and thus an analysis of space and spatial relations is critical. But, before this, a conceptualization of space that engenders relational, multiple experiences and becomings needs to be thought through. Here I rely on Doreen Massey's (2005) capturing of the "relationality" of space:

The lived reality of our daily lives is utterly dispersed, unlocalized in its sources and in its repercussions. The degree of dispersion, the stretching, may vary across social groups, but the point is that the geography will not be territorial. Where would you draw the line around the lived reality of your daily life? If we think space relationally, then it is the sum of all our connections, and in that sense utterly grounded, and those connections may go around the world. (pp. 184-85)

This conceptual journey of critical geography and globalization research in comparative education begins to inquire into a reconceptualization of space. Researchers in both critical geography and globalization research need to include a conception of space that considers social relations as "stretched out" from the individual, lived experiences of everyday life to the global (Massey, 2005; Robertson & Dale, 2008). In addition, this article argues that we see space as relational

and that it produces itself through networks of social and institutional relations. Intentionally, then, this article conceptualizes space as discursive and fluid—distinguishing space from place and other potential labels. If we fail to see space as a set of possibilities (Deleuze, 1988, 1994), then we fail to locate the imaginings of those subjects in processes of “becoming-other” than constrained by the governed space in which they live. And, if it is the task of critical geography to see the notions of space, identity, and power as the “critical” component of an analysis than a conceptualization of space as relational is necessary.

Future Theorization: Space as Relational Enables the Possible

Reconceptualizing space beyond the normative and the prescriptive governing rationalities of research and theory allow for study of such a complex systems within a unique socialist context, and potentially other urban spaces that often get overlooked in educational research. We can investigate the “daily lives” and “strategies” used within the context of social relations in such spaces (Robertson & Dale, 2008, p. 11).

Future theorizations of space that can extend the scholarly conversation on “spaces of possibility” offered initially in Helfenbein and Taylor (2009) ought to be viewed through the post-structuralist work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. These theorists’ concepts of becoming and multiplicity help understand space as the relational interactions of identity, power, and space. This is useful if we are to understand material, lived spaces of possibility. Both Deleuze and Guattari’s work understand space as systems of complex relations. These spaces—constituted by these complex relations and connective social processes—organize social life (Deleuze, 1994; Martson, Jones, & Woodward, 2005). In addition, the concepts of becoming and multiplicity are further useful in our efforts to, as Helfenbein and Taylor (2009) argue, “move beyond the merely discursive” (p. 237). That said, however, the point of theorizing space—which becomes about social relations and identity formation—with Deleuze’s notions of multiplicity and becoming is both a starting point in engaged research as well as an analytic to guide education researchers in the data collection process. In other words, understanding space as relational, multiplicitous, and in a process of becoming, guides researchers in education by drawing attention to power relations, networks of relations, and alternative or becoming identities that form. Further, the philosophy of Deleuze and the subsequent analytical tools move us beyond the values and meanings that are ascribed to educational places of learning (e.g., a classroom or a school building). With this post-structuralist approach, educational theorists and researchers can “destabilize the conventions of ‘reason’ that limit the consideration of alternatives” (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 131). To destabilize the normative frameworks that govern educational practices (schools, classrooms, or curriculum), is to shift our ontological position to see power relations, identity and space as a “becoming.”⁹ These becomings are

not always linear, logical, containable, or structured; however, instead we must think of them as conjured up, possible, emergent, and experimental, and interpreting these experiences requires researchers to be engaged and reflexive about their own position in the experience as well.

To recall the opening anecdote, a teacher remarks, “Can’t we just get rid of the classroom?” This is a question that exemplifies thinking beyond the normative frameworks that govern modern schooling practices. This utterance suggests that learning can and does occur in spaces and through networks of relations that we as theorists and researchers cannot always capture in conventional ways. That said, however, we need not “get rid of the classroom,” but certainly we can suggest it, ask if it is possible, or better, acknowledge that learning is not restricted to teacher-student interactions in school or classroom spaces. And, it also becomes our responsibility to inquire about these alternative spaces of possibility because it is in these spaces, these relations, that we potentially can observe resistance and transformation while learning of the daily lives of agents that navigate these spaces.

The work of Deleuze and Guattari and their concepts are underutilized in conversations about “relationality,” “spatiality,” or thinking of space as relational in comparative education research and critical geography despite some of the work already started by some of the scholars in these fields. However, to think of space as opposed to global forces and/or local places asks us to rethink issues of labeling, place, space, in the context of teaching and learning. Thinking of these “spaces of the possible” (Helfenbein & Taylor, 2009) moves us beyond Soja’s conception of space as tied to place, or a singular, directly lived place. It is argued here that space is neither a singular place, a period, nor a label to be known and inscribed with normative meaning. Rather, space, in this article is used, and contingent upon those acting within and upon the space—using and forming the spaces through networks of relations. At any given moment actors navigate these spaces and their identities become perhaps something more or something beyond what is governed through a fixed understanding of teaching and learning.

Notes

¹ These are foundational texts of the poststructuralist theories of Deleuze and Guattari. It is in these works one will find the concepts of multiplicity and becoming. It is of note, however, that the collected works of Deleuze interact with one another and for a broader understanding of Deleuze’s philosophy and the ways in which it developed with Felix Guattari, one might also reference their seminal text, *A Thousand Plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Additionally, Deleuze’s philosophical concepts have not been utilized much in educational theory and research. But for additional scholars utilizing Deleuze’s concepts in issues related to social science research see, Hickey-Moody, A., & Malins, P. (2007). *Deleuzian encounters: Studies in contemporary social issues*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan. This sixteen-article collection addresses social issues broadly with one essay focusing in on globalization, education, and classroom learning.

² Recent scholars address global/local spaces that through theoretical concepts such as “difference” (Marston, Woodward, & Jones, 2007, drawing on Derrida), “disjuncture, fragments, and flows” (Appadurai, 1996; Carney, 2009; Carney, Bista, & Agergaard, 2007), “multiplicity” and “becoming” (Deleuze, 1988, 1994; Deleuze & Guattari, 1994; Staheli, 2003; Stivale, 2008; “governmentality” (Gupta & Sharma, 2006; Ferguson & Gupta, 2002; Larner & Waters, 2004); cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2006; Popkewitz, 2008); multiple identities/traveling identities (Clifford, 1997). Of importance, and missing from these theorizations is the attention paid to the relationship—the multiple forces—between identity, space, and power; these are the markers of critical geography theorizing, but nonetheless have been absent from theorizing of globalization and educational policy and research thus far.

³ Instead the proliferation of writing on “global scripts” and “modernization” seems to have assisted in sustaining the authority of the global or processes of globalization. In other words, the conceptualization of globalization relates to a process by which all countries are moving toward “convergence” and isomorphism in with regard to institutions like schooling and other educative spaces (Lechner & Boli, 2005; Meyer, Boli, Thomas, & Ramirez, 1997; Meyer, Ramirez, & Soysal, 1992; Ramirez & Boli, 1987). Institutional theory and its parent discipline of educational sociology require critical attention if we are to reconceptualize space and understand space relationally.

⁴ This dominant neo-institutionalist paradigm that governs the study of education and schooling practices in comparative education research on globalization focuses on institutional convergence and lacks consideration of actors and their networks of relations that emerge in spaces. For examples of this work, see: LeTendre, Baker, Akiba, Goesling, & Wiseman, 2001; Meyer & Ramirez, 1997).

⁵ As mentioned, comparative education scholars Robertson and Dale (2008) advance the position that educational researchers ought to conceive of space as “multiscalar,” “vertical/horizontal” and “relational” in their attempt to resist the binary logic of the global and/or local debate in comparative education (See also, Robertson, 2012). Additionally, Popkewitz (1997) argues that curriculum—as one potential phenomenon—is governed by binary systems of reasoning. He argues for “an alternative conception of intellectual work and its relation to social change. It does this through viewing intellectual work as a strategy for destabilizing the conventions of ‘reason’ that limit the consideration of alternatives” (p. 131). This line of thinking in curriculum theory and curriculum history challenges the binary systems of logic that have been reproduced through educational research. Popkewitz’s poststructuralist approach advances the conversation around “alternative” uses of social theory concepts that transcend these binary systems of reasoning and value that is ascribed to what is deemed the norm, for instance, theories of space conceived through Deleuze as is argued for in this article.

⁶ For instance, the Cuban government created the Emergency Teacher Program of 2002 in order to quickly train inexperienced teachers at a low salary in order to place teachers in schools. The ministry is training 4000 specially recruited new teachers for this high level training in two year intensive training. This training program offered by the government was in response to the fact that there was a “teacher exodus” in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Carnoy, 2007; Torres, 1991).

⁷ The issue of internet access and cost of the internet in Cuba can be found here: U.S. Department of State. (2010.) Cuba. Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs.

⁸ This article, again, challenges the conception of space as something that is tied to place in Soja’s work. For instance, Soja’s *Thirdspace* argues that this thirdspace is, “the experience of place, in place; OR “directly lived, with all its intractability intact, a space that stretches

across the images and symbols that accompany it, the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’” (Taylor & Helfenbein, 2009, p. 322 citing Soja, 1996, p. 67). While the attention to space and materiality is important, the argument here is that space is relational and not bound to particular place or embodied feeling of a place.

⁹ For instance, comparative education scholars Marston *et al* (2007) explain that we need a “spatial ontology that recognizes a virtually infinite population of mobile, mutable, sites that [. . .] can self-organize” (p. 51). The key assumptions of this theoretical project are derived from Deleuzian (1988, 1994) philosophy on immanence, movement and fluidity, but this scholarly contribution has not been further explored in comparative education research despite efforts to think of space as relational in Roberston and Dale (2008). Their point is to bring spatial analyses to the fore much like the work of critical geography, but they also intend to see multiple, contested identities in spaces.

References

- Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2003). *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appiah, A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Carney, S., Bista, M. B., & Agergaard, J. (2007). ‘Empowering’ the ‘local’ through education?: Exploring community managed schooling in Nepal. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(5), 611-628.
- Carney, S. (February 01, 2009). Negotiating policy in an age of globalization: Exploring educational “policyscapes”; in Denmark, Nepal, and China. *Comparative Education Review*, 53(1), 63-88.
- Carnoy, M., Gove, A. K., & Marshall, J. H. (2007). *Cuba’s academic advantage: Why students in Cuba do better in school*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cruz-Taura, G. (2003). *Rehabilitating education in Cuba: Assessment of conditions and policy recommendations*. Coral Gables, FL: Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies, University of Miami.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Bergsonism*. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London, UK: Athlone Press.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., Tomlinson, H., & Burchell, G. (1994). *What is philosophy?*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Eckstein, S. (2010). Immigration, remittances, and transnational social capital formation: a Cuban case study. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33(9), 1648-1667.
- Ferguson, J., & Gupta, A. (November 01, 2002). Spatializing states: Toward an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality. *American Ethnologist*, 29(4), 981-1002.
- Gasparini, L. (2000). The Cuban education system: Lessons and dilemmas. *World Bank Country Studies Education Reform and Management Publication Series*, Vol. I. No. 5. Retrieved from <http://>

- siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099080026826/The_Cuban_education_system_lessonsEn00.pdf
- Gonzalez, E. & McCarthy, K. (2004). *Cuba after Castro: Legacies, challenges, and impediments*. Arlington, VA: Rand Corporation. Prepared for the National Defense Research Institute. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG111.pdf
- Gupta, A., & Sharma, A. (April 01, 2006). Globalization and postcolonial states. *Current Anthropology*, 47(2), 277-307.
- Helfenbein, R. (2010). Thinking through scale: Critical geography and curriculum spaces. In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (304-317). New York: Routledge.
- Helfenbein, R. J., & Taylor, L. H. (May 01, 2009). Critical geographies in/of education: Introduction. *Educational Studies*, 45(3).
- Hickey-Moody, A., & Malins, P. (2007). *Deleuzian encounters: Studies in contemporary social issues*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Larner, W., & Walters, W. (2004). *Global governmentality: Governing international spaces*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Lechner, F. J., & Boli, J. (2005). *World culture: Origins and consequences*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- LeTendre, G. K., Baker, D. P., Akiba, M., Goesling, B., & Wiseman, A. (September 01, 2001). Teachers' Work: Institutional Isomorphism and Cultural Variation in the U.S., Germany, and Japan. *Educational Researcher*, 30(6).
- Lutjens, S. (2006). National security, the state, and the politics of U.S.-Cuba educational exchange. *Latin American Perspectives*, 33(5), 58-80.
- Marston, S. A., Jones, J. P., & Woodward, K. (December 01, 2005). Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(4), 416-432.
- Marston, S. A., Woodward, K., & Jones, J. P. (2007). Flattening ontologies of globalization: The Nollywood case. *Globalizations*, 4(1), 45-63.
- Martinez, M. (January 01, 2006). Academic exchange between Cuba and the United States. *Latin American Perspectives*, 33(5), 29-42.
- Massey, D. B. (2005). *For space*. London, UK: Sage.
- Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M., & Ramirez, F. O. (1997) World society and the nation state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 144-181.
- Meyer, J. W., Ramirez, F. O., & Soysal, Y. N. (April 01, 1992). World expansion of mass education, 1870-1980. *Sociology of Education*, 65(2), 128-149.
- Pinar, W. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Popkewitz, T. (March 01, 1997). The production of reason and power: curriculum history and intellectual traditions. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(2), 131-164.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education, and making society by making the child*. New York: Routledge.
- Ramirez, F. O., & Boli, J. (January 01, 1987). The political construction of mass schooling: European origins and worldwide institutionalization. *Sociology of Education*, 60(1), 2-17.
- Robertson, S. (2012). Researching global education policy: Angles in/on/out. In A. Verger et al (Eds), *Global education policy and international development*. New York: Continuum.
- Robertson, S., & Dale, R. (2008). Researching education in a globalizing era. In J. Resnik (Ed.), *The production of educational knowledge in the global era*. Rotterdam, Neth-

- erlands: Sense Publishers.
- Soja, E. W. (2010). *Seeking spatial justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Stäheli, U. (2003). The outside of the global. *New Centennial Review*, 3(2), 1-22.
- Stivale, C. J. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze: Key concepts*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Taylor, H. L. (2009). *Inside el barrio: A bottom-up view of neighborhood life in Castro's Cuba*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Torres, C. A. (1991). The state, nonformal Education, and socialism in Cuba, Nicaragua, and Grenada. *Comparative Education Review*, 35(1), 110-130.
- Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An ethnography of global connection*. Princeton, NJ Princeton University Press.
- U.S. Department of State. (2010). *Cuba*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs.
- Vavrus, F. K., & Bartlett, L. (2009). *Critical approaches to comparative education: Vertical case studies from Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and the Americas*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sophia Rodriguez is pursuing a Ph.D. in cultural and educational policy studies at Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. Her e-mail address is srodriguez4@luc.edu