taken for granted understanding of participation.

References

Andersen, L.B., Danholt, P., Halskov, K., Hansen, N.B. and Lauritsen, P. (2015) *Participation as a Matter of Concern in Participatory Design*, in "CoDesign", 11(3-4), pp. 250-261.

Barney, D., Coleman, G., Ross, C., Sterne, J. and Tembeck, T. (2016) *The Participatory Condition in the Digital Age*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Lengwiler, M. (2008) *Participatory Approaches in Science and Technology: Historical Origins and Current Practices in Critical Perspective*, in "Science, Technology, & Human Values", 33(2), pp. 186-200.

Lezaun, J., Marres, N. and Tironi, M. (2016) *Experiments in Participat*ion, in C.A. Miller, E. Smith-Doerr, U. Felt and F. Rayvon (eds.), *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press, pp. 195-222.

Marres, N. (2012) *Material Participation: Technology, the Environment and Everyday Publics*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

* * *

Paolo Landri

Digital Governance of Education: Technology, Standards and Europeanization of Education, London, Bloomsbury, 2018, pp. 192

Michael Schlauch *Free University of Bozen-Bolzano*

Since the upsurge of remote schooling due to the current COVID-19 pandemic, research about the digitalization and the digital governance of education systems has gained significant importance. In this context, Paolo Landri's monography *Digital Governance of Education – Technology, Standards and Europeanization of Education* appears both as a valuable guide and as a precursor for methodological concerns that researchers increasingly have to respond to. This is especially the case if one shares Landri's intent to not produce a static rendering of education policy and practice as "matters of fact", but rather to retrace the shifting power relations and risks regarding digital governance. What makes this book unique is that it provides a sophisticated account of the state of affairs regarding the digital governance and digitalization within the European and Italian educational landscape shortly before the acceleration towards digital schooling we are witnessing during the ongoing pandemic. The research

questions Landri aims to investigate concern the sociomaterialities of digital governance, the relationship between standardization and digitalization and their potential impact on schools as we have known them in the past, which he refers to as the "classical morphology of schooling" (p. 106). The book illustrates not only how digital technologies contribute to the standardization of education systems. Moreover, it demonstrates how digitalization reshapes the conditions of educational practice itself. In other words, it gives insight into how some aspects of schooling that once remained tacit and implicit are now susceptible of being either codified or hidden within a new regime of visibility.

As it has been acknowledged in many other STS studies, social research at the intersection between social phenomena and technology presents considerable methodological challenges due to the necessity to acknowledge the entanglement of human and nonhuman actors and the need to uncover the concealed workings of algorithms and digital infrastructure. In an effort to bridge STS, sociology of education and a digital sociology of school, Landri responds to those challenges with a "composite approach" consisting of historical analysis, semiotic analysis and multisited ethnographies. He uses these methods in order to develop complex cartographies of the digital governance of education. Here, Landri embraces the concept of "cartography" introduced by Rosi Braidotti (2011, p. 4), considering it as a "theoretically based and politically informed reading of the process of power relations". In writing these critical cartographies, Landri makes use of Actor-Network Theory (ANT). However, as he explains, ANT is used as a sensibility rather than as a systematic and complete theorization. This is consistent with the problematization that the word "theory", present in the acronym ANT, that we find in previous discussions about "after-ANT". As educational contexts are often characterized by volatile configurations and assemblages of learning, this non-reductive perspective of ANT as sensibility has enriched a number of studies in the past. Thus, Landri draws from a strand of studies that have been adapting ANT to issues of learning and education since the '90s, featuring, among others, researches such as those of Jan Nespor, Helen Verran, Estrid Sørensen, Radikha Gorur, Tara Fenwick and Richard Edwards (2010; Fenwick et al. 2011). Recently, the concept of sociomateriality has been used to refer to the co-constitutive entanglement of humans and nonhumans in practices. With the addition of a sociomaterial vocabulary in recent studies, it is possible to discern how this book advances an emerging research field related to the study of sociomateriality in education.

The book is structured into seven chapters. While the first, second and the last chapter respectively represent the introduction, the theoretical frame and the conclusion of the overall book, chapters 3-6 approach the digital governance of education from different directions. Chapter 3 consists of a historical analysis of European cooperation that brings us back to the apparent paradox between current developments and the avoidance of

cooperation in the domain of education in the original Treaty of Rome of 1957. Landri retraces how different education systems have gradually been made commensurable, leading to the current emergence of a "supranational space of European Education" (p. 33). In chapter 4, the author shifts to the national Italian context and discusses emerging forms of digital governance. The analysis focuses on the case of a national database of school profiles ("Scuole in Chiaro") and the fabrication of a school data infrastructure of self-evaluation. In chapter 5 we get an additional view on these issues by means of data from a multi-sited ethnography in different primary and secondary schools. Interestingly, head-teachers are supposed to insert reports for self-evaluation and self-improvement in a national web interface. The authorship of these reports, however, is not entirely independent, as automated compliance checks and notifications encourage the integration of performance items that are linked to certified national data and benchmarks already registered in the system. Landri shows how schools, in relation to their socio-economic status and pedagogical culture, find different strategies of compliance or non-compliance with the system, which he classifies as "alignment", "muddling through", "fabrication" and "opting out". In chapter 6, we learn more about the new emerging morphology of the "digitally supportive school" in the Italian context. Landri connects the new identities of "digitally confident and supportive" teachers, students and schools framed in EU policy documents and surveys (European Commission 2013, 143-151) with the evolution of policymaking that has recently led to the second National Plan Digital School (MIUR 2015). In an effort to account for the complexities of organizational change, this is complemented by another ethnographic case study of an Italian school that is recognized on a national level as a digitally supportive school.

Under the influence of COVID-related school closures and limited reopenings, one could easily be inclined to think that digital technologies disrupt educational practices in ways that either reflect hopes for a deschooled society (Illich 1971) or elicit skeptical voices about the potential failure of public education (Postman 1995). Landri, however, illustrates how digital governance is performing "change without rupture" and describes how schooling experiences "a deformation of its space while retaining its basic properties" (p. 106). Arguably, in light of recent emergency remote teaching experiences during the pandemic, one may determine that digital means can be used to perform continuity. Strikingly, Landri shows how the conformity of digital governance with traditional regimes of standardization may also interfere with the enactment of a digitally supportive school. In the case described in the book, the digitally supportive school is characterized by distributed educational leadership, an orientation to knowledge-in-action rather than highly standardized skills and a reflexive enactment and shaping of digital technologies, e.g. by choosing not to follow the national trend and opting to acquire video projectors rather than

the more expensive smartboards. Today, these considerations help generate further hypotheses about the reactions of schools in the shift towards emergency remote teaching and after, with either the temporary absence or consolidation of digital forms of governance. At the same time, they may also indicate directions to consider for future configurations of digital schooling.

A recurrent theme throughout the book is the "myth" or the "paradox" of transparency. Landri demonstrates that dominant forms of digital governance add additional layers of opacity and obscurity and do not necessarily ensure more accountability. Consequently, an apparently well-intended pursuit of transparency can result in unintended effects, suspicions, uncertainties and ambiguities along with tendencies of surveillance and control. This makes it all the more urgent for researchers to follow the path outlined by Landri in order to critically engage with the ongoing changes in education systems.

Whereas in the book we get to know some of the possible tensions that arise from the introduction of new forms of digital governance in educational practices, we now face a situation that exhibits an unprecedented scale of shifts towards global platforms, transformations of teachers' digital labor practices and digital inequalities (Selwyn and Jandrić 2020). Landri acknowledges that the cartography he has produced is necessarily incomplete, as unreachable actors remain impossible to account for. Yet, I argue that in the future it will be possible to look at this book as a work that marks and documents a "pre-pandemic" digital governance of education in Italy and Europe. At the same time, such a retrospective view will provoke questions about further aspects of educational practice that may have appeared as too mundane in the past to justify extended exploration. In fact, as the topology of schooling now reaches beyond the classroom into home environments through the integration of digital devices, new challenges for a digital sociology of school arise that extend the original scope of Landri's book. For example, it would have been compelling to know more about the extent to which the described forms of digital governance have affected or have not affected yet the everyday lives of students from their own perspectives. In spite of that, I consider the theoretically and empirically grounded cartographies presented in *Digital Governance of Education* as a valuable landmark in the challenge of critical, STS-informed education research that should not be ignored by anyone investigating contemporary education policy.

References

Braidotti, R. (2011) *Nomadic Theory: The Portable Rosi Braidotti*, New York, Columbia University Press.

European Commission (2013) *Survey of schools: ICT in education. Benchmarking*

access, use and attitudes to technology in Europe's schools, Brussels, European Union.

Fenwick, T. and Edwards, R. (2010) *Actor-network Theory in Education*, London, Routledge.

Fenwick, T., Edwards, R. and Sawchuk, P. (2011) *Emerging Approaches to Educational Research: Tracing the Socio-Material*, London, Routledge.

Illich, I. (1971) *Deschooling Society*, New York, Harper and Row.

MIUR (2015) *Piano Nazionale Scuola Digitale*, URL http://www.istruzione.it/scuola_digitale/allegati/Materiali/pnsd-layout-30.10-WEB.pdf, [Accessed 2019-04-30].

Postman, N. (1995) *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*, New York, Vintage.

Selwyn, N. and Jandrić, P. (2020) *Postdigital Living in the Age of Covid-19: Unsettling What We See as Possible*, in "Postdigital Science and Education", 2(3), pp. 989-1005.

* * *

David Neyland, Vera Ehrenstein and Sveta Milyaeva

Can Markets Solve Problems? An Empirical Inquiry into Neoliberalism in Action, Cambridge, MA, the MIT Press, 2019, pp. 336

Chris Ivory *Anglia Ruskin University*

Neyland, Ehrenstein and Milyaeva's monograph poses the question of whether or not markets solve problems. Although ultimately the authors leave the reader to answer this question for themselves, they do provide more than enough empirical detail to allow them to do so. After a grounding in the fundaments of neoliberalism (e.g. Harvey 2005) and the issues associated with markets being introduced to areas from which the public sector wishes to withdraw, the reader is introduced to the sensibilities of social Studies of Science and Technology through the work of Callon (1998; 2007) and others. Through these works, the reader is alerted to the fact that markets are created – through disentangling relations between actors before re-entangling them into new configurations. Such work, drawing as it does on ANT, also draws attention both to important non-human actors – non-human actors form the network linkages the make possible these new configurations - and to the fact that markets are performative, the result of the work done by the many public and private organizations who undertake to create them. This introductory chapter is clear to note