CEPaLS Paper 01: More Leadership?

Preface
On 1st March 2005 I gave an inaugural lecture as Professor of Education Policy at the University of Manchester. I had taken up my appointment on 1st October 2004, where I began to work on developing research projects and outputs that have filled the past 15 years. In re-reading this lecture I can recognise not only the research, teaching and supervision that had led me to come home to this great civic University, but also the agenda that I set for myself. This agenda has been very exciting and has included a range of people who have joined and contributed to the Critical Education Policy network.

The lecture has not been published as an article. I am reissuing the lecture because it continues to speak to the issues that we are facing in the provision of educational services and the identities of educational professionals within them. The solutions to educational problems continue to be located in a form of modernisation that has its antecedence in medieval monarchy combined with scientific claims that are more about exhortation than evidence. A series of systemic crises regarding such solutions (e.g. markets and school closures; admissions and exclusions; privatisation of decision-making without public accountability; performance management etc) combined with incompetent governing (e.g. austerity; Covid-19 pandemic) continues to demonstrate the need for an agenda that speaks to different values and a rethinking of what it means to be a professional as political and activist.

I intend producing a range of papers in this series for the field of Critical Education Policy and Leadership Studies (CEPaLs), and in doing so I intend returning to this lecture as a source of inspiration for considering knowledge production in the field.

Helen M. Gunter
1st September 2020.

More Leadership?
Helen M Gunter

Introduction

I intend to give an account of an intellectual journey within the field of educational leadership in the past, the present, and suggest an agenda for ongoing work. It is a journey that is both personal and shared. It is personal because it is the work that has engulfed me for nearly twenty-five years as both a researching professional in a school and a professional researcher in a university. It is shared because I have not travelled alone, but have worked with students and colleagues in ways that have enriched my life and work. I thank those people for their challenges, their humour, and most of all their patience! The work I am going to talk about this evening has its origins in a number of projects and activity: first, work that has focused on knowledge production (Gunter 1997, 2001) which has its origins in my PhD on the history of the field (Gunter 1999), has been developed through my work with Professor Peter Ribbins (Gunter and Ribbins 2002, 2003a, b; Ribbins and Gunter 2002), and through the ESRC seminar series on *Challenging the Orthodoxies of School Leadership* with Professor Alma Harris and Dr Michael Fielding (Fitzgerald and Gunter 2005, Gunter et al. 2003, Harris 2003). Second, work that has focused

on the modernising context in which practitioners engage with and develop their practice, which has its origins in my Master's work on the impact of site based performance management (Gunter 1990), and has been developed through work on appraisal (Bennett et al. 1996, Gunter 1996), teacher workload and remodelling (Gunter 2004, 2005b, Thomas et al. 2004), and educational leadership (Gunter 2005a, Gunter and Thomson 2004, Hollins et al 2005, Tomlinson et al. 1999).

This work identifies the field of educational leadership as a vibrant and busy territory that respects the characterisation of the field through the membership and aims of the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society (Belmas), and presented by Professor Sir George Baron (1969) that "viewed in its widest sense, as all that makes possible the educative process, the administration of education embraces the activities of Parliament at one end of the scale and the activities of any home with children or students at the other" (6). Within the Baron and Taylor (1969) tradition I would argue for a field of knowledge that draws from the social sciences, and I intend to argue that the field as we might currently describe it is facing certain predicaments regarding a narrow definition focused on schools with a highly technicist form of knowledge focused on measurement and prescription. This is located within a wider framework of the relationship between the state, public policy and knowledge, and the contribution I wish to make in this paper is to ask a series of questions about the leader centric nature of our culture and belief system, knowledge claims regarding what constitutes the truth of what we know about leaders, leading and leadership, and how we as a field can position ourselves and work politically regarding knowledge production. In intend to begin this process by telling three stories which will serve two main purposes: first, to illuminate and develop the issues raised, and second, to act as a metaphor regarding how we describe and come to understand our working and lived lives through stories.

Thomas More

Thomas More died at 9am on the 6th July 1535. He was 58 years of age. He seemed to have retained his humour to the end. When a barber was sent to cut his beard and hair, it is reported that he refused: "the king has taken out a suit on my head and until the matter is resolved I shall spend no further cost upon it" (Ackroyd 1998: 391). We see him here in the portrait (Figure 1) by Hans Holbein the Younger painted in 1527. The painting hangs in the Frick collection in New York, and a copy hangs on the staircase in the Gunter household. In this portrait we see him as successful and powerful. It is two years

before he was appointed Lord Chancellor of England, but he has already achieved much: elected to Parliament (1504) and speaker of the House of Commons (1523), governor and treasurer of Lincoln's Inn (1512), he joined the service of the King, ultimately became the keeper of the king's conscience (1518) and was knighted in 1521. While he had considered the church as a vocation he realised he might become "an impure priest" (Ackroyd 1998: 100). He married twice and fathered four children.

Figure 1: Thomas More

The painting can be accessed:

https://collections.frick.org/objects/100/sir-thomas-more

Holbein's painting has been the subject of much debate, not least the half open curtain with the glimpse of a possible future ahead of him: do we see a person who is cheery or anxious? Ackroyd (1998: 261) tells us that the portrait,

> "… is a study in ambiguity and detachment, with the inscrutability of More's expression as a direct representation of his reticence and impenetrability. Holbein did not know that under the gold chain and velvet doublet More wore a hair shirt which chafed and broke his skin. But once it has been imagined there, the true value of the painting emerges. This is the portrait of a private self dressed as a public image, with the contrast between a secret inner life and rhetorical public role creating this enigmatic and inscrutable figure".

More was found guilty of treason on the 1st July 1535. He embodied the laws of God and had inherited and practised the rhetoric of reason through which knowledge was to be known and agreed. He had argued at his trial that a statute that offends God cannot be imposed on a Christian, and indeed this was a matter of conscience that could only be judged by God. His legal training both enabled him to defend his position in court but it had also led him there. Richard Rich reported a conversation that had taken place in the prison cell where he alleged that More had denied the supremacy of Henry VIII as head of the church. While the form of words can be debated what seems to help us better understand is that More had been invited by one lawyer to another to engage in a legal drama where the 'case is put' in an abstract and often rhetorical way. Central to their training as lawyers is the ability to frame an argument and engage in oration in ways that formed a reasoned case:

> "It would be inconceivable to More that anything he said should be taken to express his individual convictions. He had abided by the rules of law all his life and still could not imagine a world in which they might be distorted or abrogated. In this, perhaps, he was naïve" (Ackroyd 1998: 380).

It seems that More had learned that knowledge production was by debate and rhetoric within the framework of an absolute truth: the tightly drawn boundaries and procedures of God and the Church. Yet from 1517 when Luther's 95 Theses were proclaimed, it became increasingly clear that those boundaries were being challenged.

More was born, brought up and worked within a feudal state buttressed by an all encompassing authoritarian religion. He had learned to follow: to be loyal and to do his duty. What was known was written in sacred texts and what was to be known could be learned by heart in such a way that the established order was maintained. As a humanist social reform would take place within this established structure of knowledge. Translation and disputation would not "add to knowledge" but "reveal it" (Ackroyd 1998: 40) in ways that were practical for the world, and so More regarded Luther's arguments as "newefangylness" which would lead to disorder (Ackroyd 1998: 65). As such More was, in Ackroyd's (1998) terms, "one of the last great exemplars of the medieval imagination" (43). He accepted burning at the stake for heretics who challenged the established order through books and opinions. Yet he joined the heretics in this modern world through the use of the printing press to make claims and counter claims regarding the church and pope. While in *Utopia* (More 1976) his writing is full of wit and irony, his replies to Luther are vitriolic as he fights for order. As such Luther is described as "an ape, an arse, a drunkard, a lousy little friar, a piece of scurf, a pestilential buffoon, a dishonest liar" (Ackroyd 1998: 226). While More was fighting for tradition and obedience, the world was changing fast with the rise of the state, vibrant commerce, and of the individual conscience exemplified through private prayer.

Isaac Newton

Isaac Newton died in the early hours of Sunday morning of the 19th March 1727. He was 84 years of age. He had suffered from gout, but it was a long and painful struggle with kidney stones that led to his death. He had held the Lucasian professorship at Cambridge, had been Master of the Royal Mint, a Justice of the Peace, and was knighted by Queen Anne in 1705. It is reported that he was celibate and he handled this through work and reading. We see him here (Figure 2) in the 1702 painting by Godfrey Kneller, who was one of the many people who over time sought to capture the image and the meaning of Newton's work.

Figure 2: Isaac Newton

The painting can be accessed:

https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw04660/Sir-Isaac-Newton

The picture illuminates both the power of the intellect and the status of his achievements presented to us in *Principia* (*Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematics*) and *Opticks*. And yet there remains modesty, otherworldliness, and simplicity in his clothes and demeanour. Such an ambiguity is manifest in the statement he used to describe himself and we can read it when we look at the milled edges of a £2 coin: "standing on the shoulders of giants". Within these few startling words he is locating his achievements within the context of knowledge that he has engaged with and had taken inspiration from. Gleick (2003) opens his biography as follows:

> "Isaac Newton said he had seen further by standing on the shoulders of giants, but he did not believe it. He was born into a world of darkness, obscurity and magic; led a strangely pure and obsessive life, lacking parents, lovers and friends; quarrelled bitterly with great men who crossed his path; veered at least once to the brink of madness; cloaked his work in secrecy; and yet discovered more of the essential core of human knowledge than anyone before or after. He was chief architect of the modern world. He answered the ancient philosophical riddles of light and motion, and he effectively discovered gravity. He showed how to predict the courses of heavenly bodies and so establish our place in the cosmos. He made knowledge a thing of substance; quantitative and exact. He established principles, and they are called his laws" (3).

He lived and worked within a world of alchemy, Christianity, and developed an approach to the truth that has become known as Newtonian institutionalised science. Through alchemy he explored the relationship of humans to the cosmos, and as such he was interested in life and death. God was not far away because he "breathed life into matter and inspired its many textures and processes" (Gleick 2003: 106). While Newton's work on gravity, time, motion and space left a hugely important legacy for what we now know and experience as the modern world, it is also the case that God inhabited that world as well: "he believed in God, not as a matter of obligation but in the warp and weft of his understanding of nature… Newton's God had established the rules by which the universe operates, a handiwork that humans must strive to know" (Gleick 2003: 110). Yet his thinking did mean he strayed into heresy, particularly in regard to the Trinity, and as such he gave recognition to powerful knowledge. He tried to reveal how knowledge and knowing had been lost over time and his task was to restore this to the modern world. He denied the divinity of Jesus and the Holy Ghost because there is no reference to the Trinity in the New Testament, and indeed he argued that the texts had been misrepresented:

> "In theology as in alchemy, he felt himself to be questing for ancient truths that had been perverted in the dark history of past centuries. Knowledge had been lost, veiled in secret codes to hide it from the vulgar, distorted by blasphemers, priests and kings. He believed this to be true of mathematics, too, the language of God. In all these realms, he tried to recover words and laws once known and then lost. He had a mission. He believed he was doing God's work" (Gleick 2003: 113).

As Master of the Royal Mint he ruthlessly pursued any counterfeiter, and as a JP he could follow these cases through and ensure that a capital crime was rewarded with capital punishment.

So while we must acknowledge his achievements that have helped to shape our modern Newtonian world, he was the product of a pre-Newtonian world. Understanding the knowledge claims of Newton's world helps us to embrace his own description of his achievements just before he died:

> "I don't know what I may seem to the world… but, as to myself, I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst a great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me" (Quote in Gleick 2003: 4).

He had been schooled in the scholastic tradition rooted in Aristotle, and he not only read and noted such thinking but he also set it aside so that he could describe what he knew and raise questions for thinking and working through. His method of questioning, problem solving and calculating meant that he knew there was more truth out there than he had had time for, even in his solitary and obsessive world of work: "I keep the subject constantly before me and wait 'till the first dawnings open slowly, by little and little, into a full and clear light" (Quoted by Gleick 2003: 39). While he presented his ideas in, for example, *Philosophical Transactions*, he found the debate with Hooke to be very challenging, because as Gleick (2003: 91) describes:

> "He had discovered a great truth of nature. He had proved it and been disputed. He had tried to show how science is grounded in concrete practice rather than grand theories. In chasing a shadow, he felt, he had sacrificed his tranquillity".

Such debates continued after his death, and while Newton had put his achievements into the larger scheme of things, it is the case that what became known as Newtonian needs to be charted and understood. When we examine knowledge claims we need to engage with how particular individuals and successive generations have sought to understand and use ideas, and to ask why? How is the use of ideas related to elite structures and elite interests? Knowledge workers can be written out of the script and as such we can ask, for example, where are the women? Such has been the influence of Newtonianism that we can understand what Gleick (2003: 193) meant when he argues: "what Newton

learned entered the marrow of what we know without knowing how we know it". So many of the assumptions that underpin what we do and why we do it are located in how Newton's rules and approach to knowledge production have been interpreted and through this become a part of our practice and our judgements about other's practice. Newtonianism developed in context by particular people showing interest and using his ideas:

> "… Newton's posthumous reputation was fashioned not only by scholarly university men, but also by the poets, journalists, preachers and instrument makers of Enlightenment England for whom economic survival was a strong a motivation as academic legitimacy" (Fara 2002: 72).

Hence Newton's legacy is not so much what he did, said and wrote but what others drawing on the resources he left chose to make of it. Furthermore, it is those with social, economic and political legitimacy who are most able to generate a distinctive approach to particular forms of knowledge, and what counts as worthwhile knowledge. Challenges in the twentieth century came from Einstein, and John Maynard Keynes, and such positioning enables revisionism to flourish. Indeed, Bertrand Russell argues that Newton "was not a strict Newtonian" (Fara 2003: 259). Certainly as time rolls on our engagement with the world of Newton and his work fades as we know less about what he actually did and said, and may or may not know about the myths of his work. When we are asked he may be known by us as a genius but we might not know why. Fara (2003: 255-256) uses Salvador Dalí's *Homage to Newton* (Figure 3) to illuminate these matters:

> "Like others who have passed into mythical realms, there can be no end to the Newtonian image-making process. Dalí's sculpture… illustrates this point. At one level, it is immediately astonishing that a Spanish surrealist should choose to make several statues of Newton. More symbolically, Dalí's hollow figure forcefully conveys that Newton has become an emblematic hero, leaving admirers who know nothing about his actual life or science free to provide their own interpretations. New rituals are constantly developing to commemorate versions of Newton that never existed in reality, but which evoke conflicting visions of Britain's heritage and of scientific genius".

Figure 3: Homage to Newton

A photograph of the statue can be accessed here:

https://www.daliparis.com/en/gallery-item/homage-to-newton/

Hannah Arendt

Hannah Arendt died of a heart attack on the 4th December 1975. She was 69 years of age. She left an impressive intellectual legacy: *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951), *The Human Condition* (1958), and

On Revolution (1963). Her writings have inspired our thinking and action, but she remains controversial for some. Figure 4 shows visually the different perspectives on her as a metaphor for her life.

She was born in Hanover in 1906 into a Jewish family, but from the age of seven, following the death of her father, her mother raised her. Hannah was born into a well-educated left wing home, and while verbal attacks on their Jewishness were not condoned, and Hannah was brought up to defend herself, they did not directly engage with Zionism until the Nazi's made it an issue for all Jews. She grew up strongly independent and relished intellectual work. She was a student of both Heidegger and Jaspers, she was lover with the former for four years, and after she married Günther Stern in 1929 she moved to Berlin. The 1930s were a period of great turmoil, and after the Reichstag Fire she became increasingly involved in the resistance. After being arrested, interrogated and released, she left Germany for Prague, then Geneva and finally Paris where she met her second husband, Heinrich Blücher. They were interned as enemy aliens in France, and in 1941 they fled to the USA where they lived together until her husband died in 1970.

Figure 4: Hannah Arendt

The photograph can be accessed here:

https://memory.loc.gov/ammem/arendthtml/arendthome.html

Her intellectual legacy enables us to raise some important questions about knowledge production particularly through how a lived life is full of predicaments that require both philosophical argument and political action. As a refugee herself she had learned that our preoccupation with human rights is based on universalism in such a way that excluded the excluded. A human without a polity means that you do not have the "right to have the right to life (and) liberty" (Baehr 2000: xiv), and so the state should be about securing such fundamentals. Exclusion through totalitarianism is not so much based using dogma for answers to tough questions but on cynical pragmatism of action, action, action. It was in her study of the Eichmann trial (1977 *Eichmann in Jerusalem: a report on the banality of evil*) that she argued that his actions were not based on an ideology as such but on a "deficit of thought" or what she labelled his "banality":

> "The longer one listened to him, the more obvious it became that his inability to speak was closely connected to his inability to *think*, namely, to think from the standpoint of somebody else. No communication was possible with him, not because he lied but because he was surrounded by

> the most reliable of all safeguards against the world and the presence of others, and hence against reality as such" (Arendt 1977: 287-288).

Therefore evil came from a man who it seems "never realised what he was doing" (Baehr 2000: xxvi).

The Origins of Totalitarianism afforded Arendt the opportunity to diagnose totalitarianism and while she recognised that such a regime could be defeated from external forces such as the use of military action to end the Third Reich in Germany, she struggled with the possibility that internal conditions could enable change. While she showed optimism about human capacity to do the unpredictable, and in order to have some hope we would want humans to demonstrate this in their political action, it was change within the Soviet Union following the death of Stalin that led her to argue that regimes can be internally transformed:

> "Without action, without the capacity to start something new and thus articulate the new beginning that comes into the world with the birth of each human being, the life of man, spent between birth and death, would indeed be doomed beyond salvation" (Arendt 2000a: 181).

What is core to Arendt's work is an attempt to understand political life, and she had experienced attempts to eclipse such activity and sought to return some dignity to the purposes and practice of the political. In *The Human Condition* she examines labour, work and action. Labour is necessary to produce the goods we need to survive, and this consumption means that they are "the least durable of tangible things" (Arendt 2000a: 171). Work produces goods that are more durable and hence stabilise the social. Humans produce and their product can outlast the process that produced it and the objective for which it was produced. Humans therefore live amongst and with each other, and action with others requires the presentation and understanding of who we are:

> "Wherever men live together, there exists a web of human relationships which is, at it were, woven by the deeds and words of innumerable persons, by the living as well as by the dead. Every deed and every new beginning falls into an already existing web, where it nevertheless somehow starts a new process that will affect many others even beyond those with whom the agent comes into direct contact. It is because of this already existing web of human relationships with its conflicting wills and intentions, that action almost never achieves its purpose. And it is also because of this medium and the attending quality of unpredictability that action always produces stories, with or without intention, as naturally as fabrication produces tangible things. These stories may then be recorded in documents and monuments, they may be told in poetry and historiography, and worked into all kinds of material. They themselves, however, are of an entirely different nature than these reifications. They tell us more about their subjects, the 'hero' in each story, than any product of human hands ever tells us about the master who produced it, and yet they are not products properly speaking. Although everybody starts his own story, at least his own life-story, nobody is the author or producer of it. And yet, it is precisely in these stories that the actual meaning of a human life finally reveals itself. That every individual life between birth and death can eventually be told as a story with beginning and end is the prepolitical and prehistorical condition of history, the great story without beginning and end. But

> the reason why each human life tells its story and why history ultimately becomes the storybook of mankind, with many actors and speakers and yet without any recognizable author, is that both are the outcome of action. The real story in which we are engaged as long as we live has no visible or invisible maker because it is not *made*" (Arendt 2000a: 179-180).

If the world is not made then we cannot unmake our errors, and Arendt handles this pessimism by arguing that we can forgive, and while we cannot necessarily determine it does not mean that we cannot make promises. This exercise of agency is essential to political life based on the capacity to do new things.

For Arendt action is political and is public. Politics is a space, it is where we describe ourselves, where we discuss and where the new can be initiated. The "common world" is what "we enter when we are born and what we leave when we die. It transcends our life-span into past and future alike; it was there before we came and will outlast our brief sojourn in it", and what matters is the public and what we decide we want to "save from the natural ruin of time" (Arendt 2000b: 202-203). We are helped in this process by institutions as a legitimising, durable, and stabilising framework through which the initiative and accommodation of the plural person can happen. What is of concern for Arendt is how entry into the public realm is no longer based on immortality were they "wanted something of their own or something they had in common with others to be more permanent than their earthly lives", but that spaces have been filled by "public admiration and monetary reward" (Arendt 2000b: 203). What we need to hold the common together are places where we can be separate but at the same time connected, like sitting at a table. Compassion removes distance, and Baehr (2000: xii) articulates this as meaning that "the opposite of compassion is not cynical indifference to the plight of those who suffer, but rather solidarity and respect, principles that may be occasioned by an emotion, but which in their generalized concern for human dignity (of the fortunate and of the unfortunate alike), their rejection of condescension and self-righteousness, their realism and sense of perspective offer superior resources for dealing with oppression and exploitation than the passions and sentiments of the heart". The danger in the lack of a common world based on "solidarity and respect" is all too clear:

> "The public realm, as the common world, gathers us together and yet prevents our falling over each other, so to speak. What makes mass society so difficult to bear is not the number of people involved, or at least not primarily, but the fact that the world between them has lost its power to gather them together, to relate and to separate them. The weirdness of this situation resembles a spiritualistic séance where a number of people gathered around a table might suddenly, through some magic trick, see the table vanish from their midst, so that two persons sitting opposite each other were no longer separated but also would be entirely unrelated to each other by anything tangible" (Arendt 2002b: 201).

Knowledge, knowing and knowers: stories to illuminate the field

What I take from the three vignettes are examples of knowledge production, located in time and context. For More knowledge was the word of God and the primacy of the Church to deliver the word of God, knowing the word of God better was through rhetoric and obligation, and the knowers were the feudal elite based on a complex legitimacy of military might and sanguinity. For Newton God was behind the rules by which the universe operates, and in the case of the Trinity the Church had distorted the word of God. Knowing was through observation, description and experimentation, he knew and was a knower through method. Arendt argued that knowledge is located in the philosophical questions of humanity, and the dignity of a lived life combined with the contribution that life could make to humanity. Knowing is through the stories of how we present ourselves and through the validity of political action. Hence humans know and while we are located in the history that we are born into and we will leave a legacy for others, we can through political action do new things.

Each of these three vignettes has something to say to us about knowledge production or how we come to make claims about the truth: what is known, what is worth knowing, how and why we know, and who the knowers are. Most strikingly these three stories illuminate that knowledge, knowing and knowers is a power structure, and what constitutes the truth is contested (we agree, we disagree, we don't know) and contradictory (what we say may not be what we do). What is core to knowledge production is practice: what we do, and do repeatedly, and what we do that is habitual and what we do that is new. We think, we talk, we listen, we care, we hate, and we laugh. Such practice can be understood as a complex interplay of belief, evidence, and politics: we do things based on belief as faith, and we do things because the data convinces us it is true, and we do things to work for our goals (or to stop others achieving theirs). We may continue to believe even if the evidence tells us otherwise. It is difficult to disentangle 'faith', 'facts', and 'fights' as they are inter-related and are multi-layered within a complex process of what Holland and Lave (2001: 5) describe as "history in person": "a constellation of relations between subjects' intimate self-making and their participation in contentious local practice".

We also need to acknowledge that all three are products of the power structures in which they were located. They were also victims of such power structures. Medieval monarchy was strengthened

through the Reformation and as such More was branded a heretic for beliefs that previously were legitimised by that very monarchy. A particular form of scientific knowledge was strengthened more by how Newton's work was interpreted and used than the challenges he made to the established thinking that was often discarded by contemporaries. Arendt was rejected by her homeland because of her race, and her work has been condemned by her race. Yet she has made a significant contribution to how we can and should live in the world, and how we create dignity in our political encounters. Within context, all three have been labelled 'heretics', and yet all three continue to speak to us today about issues of knowledge and knowing in our everyday world, and how we might appreciate who knows and who might be recognised as a knower.

What is the challenge of this analysis for the field of educational leadership? What have More, Newton and Arendt got to do with the way schools, colleges and universities are led in today's world? I want to use the analysis I have built so far to construct an argument regarding the current predicaments in the field. I want to argue that knowledge is narrow and technicist, knowing is limited to prescribed behaviours, and knowers are an elite network distant from practice, and underlying this argument is a direct concern regarding the relationship between the state, public policy and research within education. The form of leadership that is being officially presented to us is labelled as transformational leadership, and I want to argue that this is based on the power structures of Medieval Monarchy where increasingly our job in schools, colleges and universities seems to be to reveal the essential truths through rhetoric but not to question it otherwise we are branded as heretics. This is being given a Newtonian modernist gloss through the drive to collect evidence of the impact of the transformational leader on outcomes, and I intend to argue that this has more in common with alchemy than with science. Other forms of transformational leadership exist in practice, theory and research, and I intend using Arendt's analysis as inspiration to argue that knowledge, knowers and knowing in our field are pluralistic, public and political.

Knowledge, knowing and knowers: the field of educational leadership

The form of transformational leadership that currently permeates education in England and the western world has its origins in non-educational settings (Bennis and Nanus 1985, Burns 1978). The importation of transformational leadership into education put the emphasis on the role incumbent (headteacher,

chief executive, vice chancellor) as the leader, who behaves according to four "I's" to lead others as followers:

- *Inspiration:* motivating the subordinate through charisma
- *Individualism:* focusing on the individual needs of subordinates
- *Intellectual stimulation:* influencing thinking and imagination of subordinates
- *Idealised influence:* the communication and building of an emotional commitment to the vision (Gronn 1996).

This model has permeated government education policy for the last 25 years, and has enabled the haphazard building of site based performance management from 1988 to be rationalised and sustained. What was presented as enabling the reform of the bureaucratic state through the decentralisation of decision making regarding strategy, staffing and structures has become centralised managerialism based on new types of work (e.g. target setting), new appointments (e.g. marketing) and a reworking of power relationships (e.g. line management). The fabric of public institutions has been fragmented into units or organisations where "relationships have tended to shift towards the contractual, competitive and calculative" (Clarke et al. 2001: 9). Policy texts and auditing systems put the responsibility on the headteacher as leader to deliver political goals through standards that are buttressed by control mechanisms such as quangos. As such the headteacher becomes the leader of: first, *systems* or the installation and oversight of tasks and structures to enable the control and external accountability requirements; second, *consumers* by controlling the external environment of the school through the use of contract compliance; and, third, *performance* by controlling the embodied identities and approaches to work so that what is visible in tasks, behaviours, and interactions is about achieving the total integration of the school in the delivery of external policy agendas. Most recently the remodelling agenda has reaffirmed the headteacher's right to manage as this transformational leader:

> "Our determination is to ensure that every Head is able to do more than run a stable school. Transformation requires leadership which:
>
> - Can frame a clear vision that engages the school community;
> - Can motivate and inspire;
> - Pursues change in a consistent and disciplined way; and
> - Understands and leads the professional business of teaching.
>
> To achieve their full potential, teachers need to work in a school that is creative, enabling and flexible. And the biggest influence is the Head. Every teacher is a leader in the classroom. Every Head must be a leader of these leaders. And the Head's greatest task is the motivation and deployment of their key resource: staff" (DfES 2002: 26).

The link with Medieval monarchy based on immutable obligation and duty is evident here, with a unified structure and culture were there is a place for everyone and everyone is in their place. The only difference being that the monarch ascended the throne based on birthright and military might, whereas a headteacher now undergoes what Gronn (2003) has characterised as "designer leadership" training and so is licensed to lead. However, just as the monarch needed others to help run the country, so do organisational leaders, and hence we have witnessed a hybrid model being developed known as distributed leadership. The heroic charismatic leader needs others to help deliver government policy, and so there is an emphasis on the role of the middle leader, and the teacher as leader. The structural privileging of heads as leaders is based on historical legitimacy, widespread cultural assumptions, and is consistent with centralised constitutional monarchy, and is being made over as modern through the Newtonian approach to effectiveness. The current emphasis is on measuring the impact of the headteacher on student outcomes, and Leithwood and Levin (2004) have recently reviewed the literature and shown that while "school leadership effects explain three to five percent variation in student achievement across schools" it is the case that these effects are difficult to detect because they are "small (but significant), and "they are mostly indirect" (4). Their advice to the DfES is not to have one major project that is complex, open to contestation and could produce only tentative results (25). However, alternative positions exist in the field and indeed Bates (1989) argues that the knowledge claims underpinning the cause and effect connections between postholders and learning outcomes is "a parody of natural science" (133) because of the attempt to exercise leadership as if it is in laboratory conditions so that if we create the right context then leadership practice can be replicated to good effect.

Important work is being done in the UK and internationally to critique this form of transformational leadership, and to chart other ways in which we might move forward. You will recall that in 1997 I argued that vision and mission presented as new management is based on old hierarchies, and that collaboration with this was undermining the knowledge production process within the field (Gunter 1995, 1997). I called this *Jurassic Management* where education was being turned into a theme park based on a systems model of input-process-output, where educational professionals were being trained in the view that as long as the right process was adopted based on instrumental strategies outlined in glossy ringbinders, the inputs would be correctly processed into outputs. More recently I have argued that policy and the strategies for delivering policy have resorted to the over use of bullet points in ways that

deny access to authentic intellectual stimulation (Gunter and Willmott 2002). It seems to me that bullet points are the embalming fluid of education: the text you present can on the surface look good but there is little intellectual work being done.

The social world cannot be controlled in this way, and if we are to understand organisations then we need to begin with how people live and work together. In 2001 I located Jurassic Management within the wider field terrain and asked serious questions about knowledge claims within practice and research that seem to be 'othered' (Gunter 2001). In other words, the performing school, headteacher, teacher, underpinned by transformational leadership, was just one model, albeit a privileged one, within a vibrant and dynamic field. We know from research that practitioners do not necessarily conform to the official model of headship as transformational leaders, and even headteachers who fall into line find it difficult to ensure that 'others' comply as followers. We know that headteachers work in difficult situations where the answer cannot be taken from a ring binder. For example, Yvonne Bates (1999) talks about taking over Lilian Baylis school that had been publicly named and shamed, and she went out into the local community to introduce herself:

> "Teachers had been told they were failing and pupils had internalised this message of failure and many pupils had developed poor self-images and low aspirations. The strength of feeling in the community about the school took me by surprise. They wanted it closed. Few believed that anything could be done to improve the school. Local people told gruesome stories of violence, pensioners afraid to walk the streets, gang robbery and intimidation. On my first excursion into the local community shortly after taking up my new post I met a number of the local traders in Lambeth Walk. I introduced myself cheerfully as the new headteacher at Lilian Baylis. Several looked horrified, others looked doubtful, one looked sad, took my hand and said pityingly, 'you poor cow'." (87).

We have a range of thinking and theorising about this that has taken inspiration from the realities of practice to problematise the transformational leader. Such a model of leadership is regarded as a "top-dog theory" where the needs of management to be technically accountable dominate, and where the leader is identified as the causal entity of the goals of work and the organisation (Gronn 1996). Gronn (1996) talks about the "barren models of followership" (12) where the experience is "an anodyne instilling in them of a disposition of learned helplessness" (11) because:

> "…leadership is seen as something performed by superior, better individuals (invariably, ageing white males), rather than by groups, located in top positions, and as something done *to* or *for* other inferior, lesser people" (12).

The development of distributed leadership has not resolved these matters, and in *Leading Teachers* (2005a) I argue that this is a hybrid model that essentially maintains the status quo. It does not, as might be suggested in the label, connect leadership with issues around diversity, and instead retains its integrity as a white, masculine, middle class model. The headteacher remains the transformational leader, with the supporting cast having the spotlight turned onto them. The division of labour remains essentially hierarchical where distribution is about line management delegation based on role definition, or is about empowerment where we are licensed to make decisions but within the established structures and roles. It is based on control, and more importantly on fear: the fear of not being in control – whether you are a leader or a follower.

Illustrative of this argument is the issue of transformational leaders as providing intellectual stimulation as a feature of organisational effectiveness through reflection on work and performance. Leithwood et al. (1999) describe this as follows:

> Leadership initiatives potentially having this effect might take many forms. Such initiatives can be quite informal and modest, for example, asking a teacher why he or she continues to use a routine that has become an unthinking, but not very useful, part of his or her repertoire. An example of a somewhat more extensive but still informal initiative aimed at intellectual stimulation would be attempting to persuade a teacher that he or she has the capacity and support to attempt new grouping practices or to take on new professional challenges, such as leading a school team, providing some professional development to colleagues or mentoring a novice teacher. A more formal and extensive example of intellectual stimulation would be engaging staff in the planning and implementation of a several-year professional development programme co-ordinated with the school improvement plan (75).

This intellectual activity is about production and is achieved through actions which structure controlled ideas and emotions. It is what Ball (2003) describes as teachers having to "calculate about themselves, 'add value' to themselves, improve their productivity, strive for excellence and live an existence of calculation" (217). It is also the type of leadership that Blackmore (1999) argues is a barrier to equity. An alternative way of being and doing in the world is how we engage in intellectual work which "must always be subversive of authority in its own domain" (Connell 1983: 250) and so it is about respecting experiential knowledge, questioning existing practice, and having the courage to exercise judgement. As Smyth (2001) puts it:

> If teachers are to challenge and ultimately supplant… (the) …dominant technocratic view of schooling, then it is necessary that they be articulate about the nature of their work, and where they are located historically and pedagogically in it, while also being conscious of its social and political purposes. It means teachers going beyond the roles of technicians, managers, or efficient clerks imposed upon them by others, and being unwilling to continue to accept the way things are in schools. Even where these externally contrived agenda appear to be rational,

> sensible, and humane, the inability of management pedagogies to adequately understand, let alone grapple with, the complexities in classrooms creates a situation of opposition for teachers. What must not be overlooked is that unequal power relations in schools (between individuals and groups) are established and constructed through the lived experiences of people in schools. As such, they can be "disestablished" and "deconstructed" in the way people choose to live, work, and ultimately penetrate the object of their struggles. What is needed is faith in the power of teachers to reflect upon, resist, and change the oppressive circumstances in which they find themselves (203).

Underlying this body of work in regard to the impoverished nature of the officially preferred models of leadership has been an agenda based on: first, giving recognition to other models of leadership that are alive and well in the field; second, examining ways of knowing about leadership that may not be officially measurable; and, third, including knowers who have traditionally been excluded as knowers, including headteachers. I would like to begin exploring this by presenting the work I have been doing in collaboration with Professor Peter Ribbins on mapping, maps and mappers within the field. We began working on this through the production of a joint paper for a seminar in Reading when along with other colleagues in the field we were invited by Professor Geoff Southworth to develop the mapping process (See: Ribbins and Gunter 2002). Figure 5 shows were we have reached in our work on mapping based on our reading of field outputs and participation in the field.

Figure 5 (Gunter 2005a)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Activity</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Challenge</td><td>Understanding meanings

Conceptual:

❑ What does it mean to be and to do leaders, leading and leadership?

Descriptive:

❑ What do we see when we witness leaders, leading and leadership?</td><td>Understanding experiences

Humanistic:

❑ What experiences do those involved in educational institutions have of leaders, leading and leadership?

Aesthetic:

❑ What can the arts do to illuminate the practice of leaders, leading and leadership?</td><td rowspan="2">Provision</td></tr>
<tr><td>Working for change

Critical:

❑ What happens when power is exercised as leaders, leading and leadership?

Axiological:

❑ What does it mean for leaders, leading and leadership to support what is right and good?</td><td>Delivering change

Evaluative:

❑ What impact do leaders, leading and leadership have on organisational outcomes?

Instrumental:

❑ What type of leaders, leading and leadership are needed to secure organisational effectiveness?</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Actions</td></tr>
</table>

This conceptual framework is an example of what we regard as a “loose” typology designed “to aid thought rather than replace it” (Gunter and Ribbins 2003b: 260), because it is a “good working beginning for anyone trying to understand what characterises and distinguishes the modes of enquiry in the field and what watersheds of assumption and world-views divide them” (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993: 179). While each quadrant has distinctive features that make it useful to how we understand our work about

knowledge production, as the unfolding analysis will show, there are underlying complexities that need to be respected.

The vertical axis represents how we position ourselves in relation to thinking in abstraction and in ways that are distant, and thinking in action in ways that are proximate to the here and now. The horizontal axis represents the purposes of activity and action, and how we seek to problematise through challenge and provide through delivery. We engage with this framework in the present to construct what is and this is supported by our knowledge of the past and our speculations of and strategies for what might be. We can examine first, who and what are leaders in relation to organisational, professional, social and personal identities; second, what does it mean to do leading and what do we experience and witness what is and what might be done; and, third, how do we characterise leadership in regard to both formal leaders and leading, and to leadership within social practice?

Understanding meanings is *philosophical*, where conceptual and descriptive approaches are located in the concern to understand knowledge and knowing. This problematises knowledge claims and is cognitive and affective as an activity distant from taking the actions that the knowledge claims may propose. We could ask: what does leadership mean? What does leadership look like? Understanding experiences is similarly about distance but with a view to improving practice, hence the focus is on accounts of practice by practitioners and how the arts can illuminate this and enable us to be *artful*. We could ask: what experiences have teachers had of leadership? What representations do we have (e.g. stories, artefacts) that can illuminate knowing about leadership? Working for change and delivering change are both closer to action, are ideological, and require a political commitment. The former is where critical and axiological approaches are located, and as such they seek to problematise with a view to *working for* change. We could ask: how might power structures act as a barrier to leadership? How do we work for leadership as a right and a good in our society? Delivering change is where evaluative and instrumental approaches are located, and the emphasis is on *securing outcomes*. We could ask: what do we know about the impact of leadership on organisational outcomes? What do teachers need to do in order to be and do leadership?

When we are concerned with understanding meanings we think, we engage in dialogue, we seek clarification, we problem pose more than problem solve. Playing with and developing ideas is an activity but it does not necessarily determine or influence here and now actions. Similarly when we work for change we do all of this, plus make a conscious political commitment through our actions to put the meanings into action. When we seek to understand experiences we want to listen to others' experiences and we can use the arts to provide ways of improving practice. When we need to deliver change we make a conscious political commitment to undertake the strategies for effective action. We problem solve more than problem pose.

The binaries that can be used to divide can be eliminated. First, our agency to do what we do and think what we think is not artificially separated from the social, political and economic structures (both systemic and organisational) that impact upon and are shaped by that agency. Those who focus on action (working for change and delivering change) may amplify structures that they want to reinforce or over come, but their exercise of agency is implicated within those structures. Those who focus on activity (understanding meanings and understanding experiences) may promote their own and other's agency but their understandings are structured by the systems and organisations they inhabit over time. Second, theory and theorising are integral to practice, and *vice versa*. Taking action to work for change and to deliver change is based on theory and is theoretical. As Inglis (1985) has stated:

> "… those who refuse all theory, who speak of themselves as plain, practical people, and virtuous in virtue of having no theory, are in the grip of theories which manacle them and keep them immobile, because they have no way of thinking about them and therefore of taking them off. They aren't theory-free; they are stupid theorists" (40).

As we are concerned with understanding meanings or we seek to understand experiences we may theorise as an activity that lacks immediate proximity to the doing but the very nature of thinking, talking, and breathing is itself made up of actions. Connected with this is the third point in which we do not separate out or privilege either intellectual or operational work. The activity of challenging is more intellectual than operational but it still requires the doing and the evidencing of the doing through writing and talking. Conversely the action of delivering change could be more operational than intellectual but it does require cognitive and affective processes as well as the public expressions through writing plans, and chairing meetings. Fourth, all academics are practitioners because they do practice that is about the goals of an organisation, and all practitioners are academics because they think about and are committed to goals that exceed and extend those of the organisation.

What does this tell us? We are located in a very vibrant and challenging territory, that is not only my life's work but also the passionate interest of others. It allows us to reveal another form of transformational leadership that exists in the literature and research shows us exists in practice. It is a form of transformational educational leadership and is located in teaching and learning: it is about education, it is located within education, and through its practice it is educational. Educational leadership is underpinned by a richness of research and theory located in the social sciences, and based on valuing dialogue and differences of views. Hence knowledge claims are concerned with the interplay between the realities of activity and action with working for social and socialised learning. Educational leadership is a social practice and is less about the *must* of being a leader and more *about* the meaning and activity of doing leading and experiencing leadership. Foster (1989) argues, leadership is 'a shared and communal concept' (57):

> Leadership, then, is not a function of position but rather represents a conjunction of ideas where leadership is transferred between leaders and followers, each only a temporary designation. Indeed, history will identify an individual as the leader, but in reality the job is one in which various members of the community contribute. Leaders and followers become interchangeable (49).

So educational leadership is concerned with productive social and socialising relationships where the approach is not so much about controlling relationships through team processes but is about how the agent is connected with others in their own and other's learning. Hence it is inclusive of all, and integrated within teaching and learning. While there are formal organisational leaders who have a role and a job description they are not the only leaders. Students are leaders of their own and others' learning, teachers are leaders of learning both inside and outside the organisation. We are able to make our experiences and aspirations for our own and others learning visible. The organisation of the school is a public space where democratic structures and cultures, and the necessary practices associated with this, can be developed and used. Hence educational leadership is not just the must of delivering efficient and effective organisations but is about challenging the power structures and cultures that we inherit and that can act as barriers to democratic development.

Learning and using that learning through association is compelling for us because it enables us to acknowledge the embodied nature of much professional knowledge and the evidence we have about our experiences and how the reality of change happens. Furthermore, we can recognise that we are

not the empty followers in receipt of a supposedly more superior narrative but we can engage with the social that we inherit and make a difference to, and leave this world the better for having been political. It is our task as teachers to "remake, and if necessary re-order, the world in which they and their students live" (Smyth 2001: 53). Such commitment gives us access to a whole range of resources that enable the field to handle teaching and learning in more interesting and productive ways than as a unit cost and a target to be measured. Kevin Hollins the headteacher of Knutsford High School in Cheshire invited Professor Pat Thomson and myself to work in the school as researchers, and we have undertaken a baseline project (Hollins et al. 2005). We are now working with a group of students as researchers, particularly in developing an agenda for enquiry regarding student experience of learning, and how this work can contribute to the school's developmental agenda (Thomson and Gunter 2005). I do not have the time this evening to talk in detail about this but to note how this work is located within research and theorising about students and teachers as leaders, doing leading and engaging in leadership (e.g. Fielding 2001, Lingard et al. 2003, Noddings 2003, Smyth 2001). I would like to take inspiration from John Smyth's (2001: 171-172) argument that "teacher learning, which is becoming increasingly coupled with teacher leadership, is about teachers not being fearful of 'confronting strangeness'…", through which teachers refuse "to accept customs, rituals, and the familiar world unquestioningly", and so, "teacher leadership is, therefore, about teachers understanding the broader forces shaping their work and resisting domestication and not being dominated by outside authorities". It is also about recognising that while teachers work in an organisation called a school, it is first and foremost an institution created to enable schooling as a community orientated and inclusive activity that is political, and requires educationalists to work for socially just change.

What we need to do is to embrace *strangeness* where we have a theory of learning inspired by Arendt's articulation of the public and politics. Transformational leadership based on an organisational vision and mission, of leader and followers, has the language and practice of totalitarianism about it. In Sennett's (1999) terms the disconnection between decisions about work and the delivery of outcomes corrodes our characters. The strong drive to know all through futuring and to control through cognitive and affective compliance is a breeding ground of banality and fear. In the midst of a modernising agenda in education we must remember that the Reformation, Nazi Germany, and Stalinist Russia all made claims to be modern, and we know the price humanity paid for this. Yet why do we comply? Again

Sennett (2002: 337-338) encapsulates how we are seduced by “intimate tyrannies” where “it is not the forcing, but the arousing of a belief in one standard of truth to measure the complexities of social reality”. As such there is no need to think, talk, negotiate, challenge, work and rework things through because it is all settled in the emptiness of the vision statement. Those who do not agree are *the* problem and are purged.

Bates (2003: 1) helps the field to handle this by arguing that there are two sets of questions:

> “The first set are *ethical* questions about how we are to respect each other’s differences and the second set are *organisational* questions about how we can construct and operate institutions that will allow us to work together cooperatively to redress current inequities and advance a common good while respecting each other’s differences”.

In order to do this we need to focus on the place of the student within the civic, and so our task is with issues of how we conceptualise communication. In this way our purpose in educational institutions is the education of citizens rather than just the production of workers, and this provides the meaning for teaching and research, and supports our identity and commitment. Learning is through cognitive conflict, where we are given opportunities to engage with problem posing and the possible ways in which we might or might not be able to resolve this. Hence leader training and preparation needs to be primarily about learning (theories, research), and we need to seriously work on the inter-play between the organisation and learning. In doing this we can use knowledge we have and through the process we produce new knowledge. In support of this we need to create organisational arrangements that enable students to live in a world of strangers “without holding their strangeness against them and without pressing them to surrender it or to renounce some or all of the traits that have made them strangers in the first place” (Bauman 2000: 104-105). We therefore need to revitalise the public domain in ways where unity is it not based on sameness but on “a kind of unity… which is *achieved*, and achieved daily anew, by confrontation, debate, negotiation and compromise between values, preferences and chosen ways of life and self-identifications of many and different, but always self-determining, members of the *polis*” (Bauman 2000: 178). Hence the school, college, university does not exist outside of our practice, and it is within that practice that we have the possibilities for authentic change. If we are serious about democratic rights and way of life, then we need to create the conditions in schools where students and teachers can practice this through the decisions and choices to be made about what is learned and how it is to be learned. We cannot expect students to leave school with a

sense of trust in others if their teachers are not trusted to use their professional skills, knowledge, judgement and courage to design learning and support student pathways through that learning. As a field we need a way of describing, understanding and explaining both the study and practise of practice. We need to be able to have a theory of knowledge production that addresses these challenges within the field, I propose that this is located in the epistemology, fieldwork and thinking tools of Pierre Bourdieu.

Knowledge, knowing and knowers: thinking theory in educational leadership

Pierre Bourdieu died of cancer on the 23rd January 2002. He was 71 years of age. Born into a rural peasant region in the south of France in 1930 he rose to be Professor of Sociology at the Collège de France. He left an important legacy of work (over 25 influential books, and many articles) that is practical in purpose and in action. See Figure 6.

Figure 6: Pierre Bourdieu

His photograph can be accessed here:

https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=d_lp40IAAAAJ&hl=en

He engaged with huge political issues of the time from the Algerian crisis of the 1950s to the impact of neo-liberalism on the social fabric of France in the 1990s, through to museums, culture, and the media. For him sociology was a "combat sport" (Jeffries 2002) where he used scientific method to reveal the truth of people's lives, and he challenged the scientist to seek to understand their place in the practice of those very scientific methods. He not only wrote about practice but also sought to participate in practice, and as such he revitalised sociology:

> "Bourdieu conceived of a unified social science as a 'public service' whose mission is to 'denaturalize and defatalize' the social world and to 'necessitate conducts' by disclosing the objective causes and subjective reasons that make people do what they do, be what they are, and feel the way they feel. And to give them thereby the instruments to master the social unconscious that governs their thoughts and limits their actions, as he relentlessly tried to do his own" (Wacquant 2002: 556).

By "denaturalise" Wacquant means that Bourdieu sought to uncover and so reveal the power structures controlling what on the surface seems to be the established and normal way in which lives are being led. Integral to this was the aim to "defatalize" where we can exercise agency and make a difference

through intellectual work and practice. While we may view our lives in a globalised neo-liberal economy as beyond our control, we can open up our lives to scrutiny and so identify causes outside of ourselves, and as such "what the social world has done, it can, armed with this knowledge, undo" (Bourdieu 1999: 629).

At that point I will stop because Bourdieu (1998) alerted us to the sociology of the obituary as a means by which we are legitimised through classification, and as such we need to be aware of "scholastic illusion" of granting "the canonical texts the false eternization of ritual embalming" (2000: 48). We can only really understand Bourdieu through empirical work and dialogue about that work, and so I will put his thinking tools to work. The three vignettes I have constructed illuminates knowledge production as both a practice and being about practice: More's life and death shows that what he knew was in what he did in ways that were embodied, and when what was legitimate knowledge was declared illegitimate then he was left as an agent in a hostile context. While Newtonianism is regarded as an external rational structure of knowledge and the means to know, we know that this is a product of engagement and interpretation in context and over time. Both More and Newton's lives illustrate the politics of knowing, but it is Arendt's life and work that articulates this and shows us not only how and why we do what we do, but also the capacity to create the new through what we do. As field members we need a theory of practice that can interconnect embodied, structured, and relational knowledge. Bourdieu's theory of practice is helpful here because his work provides us with the thinking tools to create a way of describing, understanding and explaining knowledge, knowers and knowing.

In order to illustrate what Bourdieu can do, and how this might enable the field I intend to draw on some empirical work. There are a range of projects I have been involved in during the last decade in schools, local authorities, prisons, universities, colleges, and Whitehall, and I intend here to draw on a Project that dominated my life for a good two years or so, the *Transforming the School Workforce Pathfinder Evaluation Project* (Butt and Gunter 2005). The DfES undertook a pilot study in 32 schools in England to trial the use of ICT, the role of support staff, and change management processes, to examine and change the workload of teachers. The aim was to free teachers to teach, and to remove (relocate) work that they had traditionally done. The findings and analysis of this work are being put in the public domain through the report (Thomas et al. 2004) and papers at conferences and learned journals (See

Educational Review 57, 2, 2005), and here I do not have the space to examine the wider implications of this work through the government strategy of Remodelling (see Gunter 2004, 2005b). Nevertheless, the data is illuminating about the practice of being a teacher and doing teacherly work, for example:

> "I now leave at 4 pm and collect my own children. I use to leave at 6 pm. I collect, feed and bath them and by 8 pm I can use my laptop. This has not reduced my workload but it has reorganised it, and it has remodelled my life. I have my life back with my children. I am a workaholic but I am leaving school earlier (Senior Manager Meadow School).
>
> "The job is still hard because of what is expected of us, such as league tables. The Project has not removed the demands, there is still the issue of accountability. I still feel frustrated about having to comply. The Project has not removed the people related issues, and how we cause stress…" (Diary debriefing meeting Meadow School).
>
> "Irrespective of the funding, the Project brought opportunities into reality. As long as we deliver the national curriculum, then it is up to us how we do it. We can do things differently without it all falling about our ears. We now have an early start to the day and it all didn't come crashing down" (Senior Manager Meadow School).
>
> "Special Needs Assistant reorganisation has led to my being involved in class more. Since the start of the Project I've been more involved with the children" (Support Staff 2 Park Vale School).
>
> "Without any disrespect to the SNAs, and although I know that some SNA's could do it, it's not a question of managing behaviour it's a question of subject knowledge. We haven't been to training college for nothing" (Middle Manager Park Vale School).
>
> "It was a shock to have the change plan proposal to re-structure the school year accepted in July and then rejected. This gap between the instruction to think 'blue sky', then face a 'grey mass of rain' was very disappointing. To some extent, this was made worse by the DfES pushing for regular reports of progress, making it seem as if we were being asked to 'dig up the seed every week to check for growth'. There was an obvious need for trust and a little show of belief in the school. Above all, the pace and time frame of the Project meant we were often pushing against the grain" (Senior Manager Park Vale School).
>
> "I feel we need less initiatives and a clearly defined period of consolidation. There is also a desperate need for more trust to be shown in the professional's judgement – an acceptance that the teacher is well placed to know what is appropriate for the needs of pupils – and much less rhetoric and 'spin'. (Middle manager Park Vale School).
>
> "As a teaching head the job is potentially unmanageable, now its manageable. This is a massive change. OfSTED is coming, and we have the staff to handle this (Senior Manager: Small Schools Cluster).
>
> "I go back to part time working from April. I knew this but it is still a shock, I knew the money wouldn't be there. There is a drawback to the Project because the money isn't there anymore. (name) and I are losing our hours, and so we are going back to what we use to do. There is no security for Teaching Assistants, so you don't know where you are… the Head will have to do more (Support Staff 1 Small Schools Cluster).
>
> "I think that this is a school that expects and embraces change" (Teacher Beacon Hall School).
>
> "The change management teams were the most significant part of the Project. For the first time the school could pull together all of its employees. The six teams cam up with some fantastic ideas, with high levels of thinking and ownership of the particular projects. This was an excellent part of the initiative and showed an interesting way of managing change in schools. It needed to involve all of the staff (Senior Manager Beacon Hall School).

> "I have enjoyed being part of the Project and got loads of ideas from other schools. The sharing of good practice is the way ahead – not re-inventing the wheel (Teacher Lakeside High School).
>
> "It has made me realise how many different tasks I do. It has confirmed that teachers have a huge workload and that change in teachers' tasks will not come quickly" (Teacher Lakeside High School).

How do we understand these glimpses into the lived lives of educational professionals? We can see from these few words out of the many thousands we collected that there is evidence of the workforce knowing about education, teaching and learning, and how that knowledge is embodied: it is known, it has been learned over time and through interventions such as training. There is also evidence of others knowing about education and how this is presented to the workforce through the Project, but also through wider structures of policy such as funding regimes. In other words, we can witness the exercise of agency in decisions and choices about working lives, but also the structures that either enable or limit those choices. Bourdieu enables us to theorise this through his thinking tools of habitus and field, and most notably how we deploy capital.

Bourdieu bridges the subject-object divide by the use of habitus, which for him has been "invented" as a means of explaining the "paradox" of the individual being directed towards ends but not driven by them. Habitus is described as a system of:

> "… durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively 'regulated' without being in anyway the product of obedience to rules, they can collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor" (Bourdieu 1989: 53).

Habitus is embodied: it is internal, but witnessed in practice through a "feel for the game" (Bourdieu 1990: 9), which is "the social game embodied":

> "Nothing is simultaneously freer and more constrained than the action of the good player. He quite naturally materializes at just the place the ball is about to fall, as if the ball were in command of him – but by the very fact, he is in command of the ball. The habitus, as society written into the body, into the biological individual, enables the infinite number of acts of the game – written into the game as possibilities and objective demands – to be produced" (Bourdieu 1990: 63).

The data show how embodied the work of a teacher is, and how practice is about manageability and the better integration of life and work rather than ceasing work. Habitus is about representing action, and can only be understood through the agent's interactions with others, it is "that presence of the past in the present which makes possible the presence in the present of the forth-coming" (Bourdieu 2000:

210). It is ways of talking, moving and making things, which is not about abstracted rules but about regularities in social actions. Dispositions are not the product of rational action or self-interest, but a socio-historical conditioning that are regarded as “reasonable” by those who occupy the same social space (Bourdieu 1990: 109). While quick wins can be identified in the schools authentic change will take time, the main issue being how the agent engages with external structures such as the project and wider policies. The project has revealed the structured structures of how agents have experienced and learned to operate in regard to centralised policymaking about all aspects of the school. Even though the project is aiming to structure structures through using resources to drive task, personnel, and cultural change, there is evidence of how teachers are resisting this by showing a disposition to be trusted rather than directed, and to be autonomous rather than compliant.

While habitus developed from Bourdieu’s (1965) work with the Kabyle in the 1960s, the concept of field is a product of later work on cultural reproduction and the sociology of art (1993). The link between habitus and field is within the question: what effect does habitus have? If habitus is a system of dispositions in which agents engage in certain behaviours within context, then the social spaces in which this takes place need to be known. For Bourdieu, actions are the product of “an encounter between an habitus and a field, that is between two or more-or less completely adjusted histories” (1990: 91). Through field Bourdieu theorises about practice that enables the lives of agents to be revealed as practice rather than determined by structure or driven by unreflective cognition. The social world is complex and Bourdieu engages with theory that will enable this to be understood rather than obscured through the simplification of externally constructed models. Social processes are structured by a hierarchy of fields: political, economic, cultural, and education. Each field is a structured system of social positions held by people and institutions. The nature of social positions defines the situation for people, and the field is structured internally as a set of power relations.

So as Jenkins (1992: 84) describes a field is a “social arena within which struggles or manoeuvres take place over specific resources or stakes and access to them. Fields are defined by the stakes which are at stake”. What brings people together is a “social magic” (Bourdieu 1990: 88) in which there are people with similar dispositions developed under similar social conditions who have specific stakes and interests, for example, lifestyle, education, politics and prestige, and can be summed up by the struggle

for and rival claims to the truth. Central to understanding the individual – collective dynamic interactions is that of *position*. Agents do occupy a range of positions and can create new ones. Positions are about domination, subordination, or equivalence. A field is a competitive arena in which position is achieved by the access allowed to *capital* or goods/resources: economic, social, cultural and symbolic. Struggles are not just about material gain but also symbolic capital or authority, prestige and celebrity status. This is linked to who is accepted as having legitimate views, who is listened to, who is published, who is read, and who is talked with and about (Bourdieu 1990). Books, papers, articles, inaugural lectures, seminars are all part of a field in which position and social relationships sustain or condemn. Citing, quoting, acknowledging, giving reference to, and reviewing enables us to see the meaning and importance attached within a field. Distinction is about taste, and perception is linked to position in social space (Bourdieu 1984), and so "one person's pedigree can be another's mark of infamy" (1988: 11). The change management teams were places in which capital was staked, and challenges were made to the legitimacy of support staff capital, not least within the classroom regarding their place in the teaching and learning process. The data shows struggles over positioning, and how cultural capital of credentials combine with symbolic capital of status are being staked in the process of determining the nature of work and who does it.

Change is concerned with the complex interrelationship between external and internal struggles within fields, and this leads to questions about access. This seems to be linked to two factors: first, what are the specifics interests of the field? Second, what are the strategies of capital accumulation used by agents? This is neatly described by Johnson (1993)

> "To enter a field, to play the game, one must possess the habitus which predisposes one to enter the field, the game, and not another. One must also possess at least the minimum amount of knowledge, or skill, or 'talent' to be accepted as a legitimate player. Entering the game, furthermore, means attempting to use that knowledge, or skills, or 'talent' in the most advantageous way possible. It means, in short, 'investing' one's (academic, cultural, symbolic) capital in such a way as to derive maximum benefit or 'profit' from participation. Under normal circumstances, no one enters a game to lose. By the same token, no one enters the literary field – no one writes a novel, for example – to receive bad reviews (8).

Fields have boundaries that are set by the point(s) at which the field no longer has an impact on practice. A field is a "field of struggles" where agents want to preserve or improve positions in relation to how the capital is defined. Agents do have strategies but they are unconscious dispositions leading to practice rather than the product of rational calculation. Furthermore, the agent can have trajectories in which

there are a “series of positions successively occupied by the same writer in the successive states of the literary field, being understood that it is only in the structure of the field that the meaning of these successive positions can be defined” (Bourdieu 1993: x). This relationship between the agent’s position, for example, through the symbolic form of a book or a conference paper is a means by which the link between the agent and the field is objectified. In other words, the award of credentials imposes “the universally approved perspective” within a field, and is good currency in the market place. The holder no longer has to engage in a “symbolic struggle” about position (Bourdieu 1990: 135). Marking student’s work and being in charge of a class are examples of symbolic capital, and this is being staked in current debates about pay and contractual status of teaching assistants (Gunter 2005b).

Knowledge, knowing and knowers: more leadership?

Thank you for sharing this intellectual journey this evening, and to use Bourdieu’s metaphor I have packed and unpacked my intellectual suitcase. This is a necessary feature of our work because otherwise our suitcases are empty and not worth transporting. In developing this analysis of the work of the field I have taken inspiration from two main sources: first, Alan Bennett (1997) who has very creatively stated: “A writer does not always know what he or she knows, and writing is a way of finding out” (539-540), and now that I have reached the end I think I know where to continue my journey; and second, Fred Inglis (2003) who has very helpfully stated: “intellectual method cannot promise genius, but it should at least forestall stupidity” (131), and as such I present these ideas about educational leadership not as an absolute truth but as challenges to the mediocre.

I have argued that the form of leadership that is being imported, refined and developed within education, and in particular, for schools is located in the power structures of Medieval monarchy with a modernistic gloss drawn from the use (or abuse) of Newtonian science. As such we have an impoverished and banal model that does not authentically connect with debates about how we as a society want to live and work together, or with issues of teaching and learning (except as targets and unit costs). Do we want more of this leadership? Even the promoters of this model will soon have to admit its limits even on utilitarian grounds because as we shift from controlling the workers and outcomes of separate organisations to a focus on children’s services then some new thinking will be needed. However, it is

deeper than this and we do need to engage with issues of knowledge production otherwise the field will face another make over as transformational leadership is relabelled but possibly not reconceptualised.

The process of mapping the field and creating maps such as this lecture enables field members to engage with the range of knowledge claims underpinning work, and how boundaries are drawn and struggled over. There are approaches to educational leadership in our field that are not as structurally privileged as transformational leadership but exist in practice and have been captured in research. The challenge for the conceptualisation (for both production and use) of research is twofold: first, it is to ask questions about what field members know and need to know, what is worth knowing, how they know and practice that knowing, and who does the knowing; and second, it is to recognise as Bauman (2000: 216) states:

> "There is no choice between 'engaged' and 'neutral' ways of doing sociology. A non-committal sociology is an impossibility… Sociologists may deny or forget the 'world-view' effects of their work, and the impact of that view on human singular or joint actions, only at the expense of forfeiting that responsibility of choice which every other human being faces daily. The job of sociology is to see to it that the choices are genuinely free, and that they remain so, increasingly so, for the duration of humanity"

We can engage with this approach to knowledge, knowing and knowers as multi-level: first, *technical* where field members log the actuality of practice regarding what activity and actions are taking place, but while it enables the field member to enquire what the situation is, on its own it is not enough. Second, *illuminative* where field members interpret the meaning of practice regarding how and why activity and actions take place, and while it enables movement beyond description to emerging understanding, this cannot necessarily explain. Third, *critical* where field members ask questions about power relationships within and external to activity and actions, and while this enables an engagement with the interplay between agency and structure, it could be pessimistic because it can tell us the situation we are in but may not interconnect with emancipation. Fourth, *practical* where field members research and devise strategies to secure improvements in activity and actions, but this cannot of itself open up the analysis to explanations regarding the epistemic communities that support such prescriptive ways of knowing. Fifth, *positional* where field members align their research with particular knowledge claims about activity and actions, and the networks (epistemic communities; political parties; pressure groups) that sustain them. Conceptualisation does not float free of field positions and positioning regarding knowledge

claims and so field members must always ask: who is doing the conceptualisation, why, and to what effect, and what impact is it having?

This multi-level approach enables the field member to design projects and read reports in ways that can describe, analyse, explain, and improve practice, and ensure such enquiry is located within wider state and policy structures. It means that our approach to knowledge production needs to be located within conceptually informed practice. We need to spend less time training people in prescribed skills and behaviours, and instead enable field members to have access to the knowledge, ways of knowing and who the knowers are that create those prescriptions, and give access to the wider field terrain. I would want to argue for conceptually informed practice where our prime focus is on enabling practitioners to develop their intellectual engagement with knowledge and knowers. None of this is irrelevant, as the practice of leading and the relational nature of leadership is such that it is the tough questions of humanity that we face everyday in our schools, colleges and universities. However, it is very easy to ridicule this, and as Stephen Ball (1994: 44) has so graphically stated that to try to present alternatives means we are demonised as "irrational… destructive and mad". Yet this is the job of the University, and it is why the field was originally located in higher education, so that research, theory, and professional development could go hand in hand, and work with practitioners from a range of educational institutions in understanding, and developing their knowledge about their practice. Our job is to work with practitioners in thinking differently about their work, and to know the intellectual resources that they can draw on and use to produce new insights into that practice. Not least because knowledge workers in universities are practitioners. As Bourdieu (2003: 24) has stated:

> "Today's researchers must innovate an improbable but indispensable combination: scholarship with commitment, that is, a collective politics of intervention in the political field that follows, as much as possible, the rules that govern the scientific field".

Practitioners need access to the social sciences through postgraduate study where we can interplay their theorising with theories, their experience with data, and as such enable them to position themselves within a vibrant and dynamic field. We gain much from this, not least the prime focus on learners and learning, and I remain optimistic that there are spaces to be found and created where we engage in dialogue regarding the agenda for educational achievement. As Bourdieu (1990: 16) states: "I think that enlightenment is on the side of those who turn their spotlight on our blinkers".

If you wish to reference this lecture, please do so as follows:

Gunter, H.M. (2005) *More Leadership?* Inaugural Professorial Lecture, School of Education, University of Manchester, March 2005.

References

Ackroyd, P. (1999) *The Life of Thomas More*. London: Vintage.

Arendt, H. (1951) *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1963) *On Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Arendt, H. (1977) *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Arendt, H. (2000a) "Labor, Work, Action" in: Baehr, P. (ed) (2000) *The Portable Hannah Arendt*. London: Penguin Books. pp: 167-181.

Arendt, H. (2000b) "The Public and the Private Realm" in: Baehr, P. (ed) (2000) *The Portable Hannah Arendt*. London: Penguin Books. pp: 182-230.

Baehr, P. (2000) "The Editor's Introduction" in: Baehr, P. (ed) (2000) *The Portable Hannah Arendt*. London: Penguin Books. pp: vii-liv.

Ball, S.J. (1994) *Educational Reform, A Critical and Post-Structuralist Approach* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ball, S.J. (2003) "The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity" *Journal of Education Policy,* 18, (2), 215-228.

Baron, G. (1969) "The study of educational administration in England" in: Baron, G. and Taylor, W. (eds) (1969) *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences*. London: The Athlone Press. pp:3-17.

Baron, G. and Taylor, W. (eds) (1969) *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences*. London: The Athlone Press.

Bates, R. (1989) "Leadership and the Rationalization of Society" in: Smyth, J. (ed.) (1989) *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership* London: The Falmer Press.

Bates, R. (2003) *Can we live together? The ethics of leadership in the learning community*. Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society, Milton Keynes, October 2003.

Bates, Y. (1999) "A vision for Lilian Baylis" in: Tomlinson, H., Gunter, H., and Smith, P. (eds.) (1999) *Living Headship: voices, values and vision* London: Paul Chapman.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bennett, A. (1997) *Writing Home* London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Bennett, H., Gunter, H., and Reid, S. (1996) "Through a Glass Darkly: Images of Appraisal" *Journal of Teacher Development,* 5 (3). pp: 39-46.

Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985) *Leaders* New York: Harper and Row.

Blackmore, J. (1999) *Troubling Women: Feminism, Leadership and Educational Change* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1965) "The sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society" in J. G. Peristiany (ed.) *Honour and Shame* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction* London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1989) *The Logic of Practice* Translated by R. Nice, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990) *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology* Translated by Matthew Adamson, Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field Of Cultural Production* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Acts of Resistance* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1999) "Postscript" in: Bourdieu, P. et al. (1999) *The Weight of the World* Cambridge: Polity Press, in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Pascalian Meditations*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2003) *Firing Back, Against the Tyranny of the Market 2*. London: Verso.

Burns, J. M. (1978) *Leadership* New York: Harper and Row.

Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (2005) "Challenging modernisation: remodelling the education workforce", *Educational Review*. 57 (2) pp: in press.

Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S. and McLaughlin, E. (2000) "Reinventing the Welfare State" in: Clarke, J., Gewirtz, S. and McLaughlin, E. (eds) *New Managerialism, New Welfare?* London: OUP and Sage.

Connell, R.W. (1983) *Which Way Is Up? Essays on sex, class and culture* Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

DfES (2003) *Time for standards: reforming the school workforce*, London: DfES.

Fara, P. (2003) *Newton, The Making of a Genius*. London: Picador.

Fielding, M. (2001) "Students as radical agents of change", *Journal of Educational Change*, 2, (2), 123-141.

Fitzgerald, T. and Gunter, H. (2005) "Trends in the administration and history of education: what counts? A reply to Roy Lowe" *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. In press.

Foster, W. (1989) "Towards a Critical Practice of Leadership" in Smyth, J. (ed.) (1989) *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership* London: The Falmer Press.

Gleick, J. (2003) *Isaac Newton*. London: Fourth Estate.

Greenfield, T. and Ribbins, P. (eds.) (1993) *Greenfield on Educational Administration* London: Routledge.

Gronn, P. (1996) "From Transactions to Transformations" *Educational Management and Administration*, 24, pp7-30.

Gronn, P. (2003) *The New Work of Educational Leaders*, London: Sage.

Gunter, H.M. (1990) *The changing relationship between central government – LEA – School*. Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, CNAA.

Gunter, H.M. (1995) "Jurassic Management: Chaos Theory and Management Development in Educational Institutions" *Journal of Educational Administration,* 33 (4) pp: 5-20.

Gunter, H. (1996) "Appraisal and the School as a learning organisation" *School Organisation*, 16, (1). pp: 89-100.

Gunter, H.M. (1997) *Rethinking Education: the consequences of Jurassic management*. London: Cassell.

Gunter, H.M. (1999) *An intellectual history of the field of education management from 1960,* Unpublished PhD thesis, Keele University.

Gunter, H.M. (2001) *Leaders and Leadership in Education*, London: Paul Chapman.

Gunter, H.M. (2004) *Remodelling the School Workforce*. Paper presented to the Society for Educational Studies Special Interest Group on Social Justice. Institute of Physics, London. November 2004.

Gunter, H.M. (2005a) *Leading Teachers* London: Continuum.

Gunter, H.M. (2005b) *Remodelling the School Workforce: challenges in the formation and fracturing of identities*. Paper presented to the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme, Kings College, London. January 2005.

Gunter, H.M., Brodie, D., Carter, D., Close, T., Farrar, M., Haynes, S., Henry, J., Hollins, K., Nicholson, L., Nicholson, S. and Walker, G. (2003) "Talking Leadership" *School Leadership and Management*, 23 (3). pp: 291-312.

Gunter, H.M. and Ribbins, P. (2002) "Leadership studies in education: towards a map of the field" *Educational Management and Administration,* 30, (4), 387-416.

Gunter, H.M. and Ribbins, P. (2003a) "Challenging orthodoxy in school leadership studies: knowers, knowing and knowledge?" *School Leadership and Management*, 23, (2), 129-146.

Gunter, H.M. and Ribbins, P. (2003b) "The field of educational leadership: studying maps and mapping studies" *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51, (3), 254-281.

Gunter, H.M. and Thomson, P. (2004) *Knutsford High School: baseline report 2004*. Report to the DfES Innovation Unit, London.

Gunter, H. M. and Willmott, R. (2002) "Biting the bullet" *Management in Education*, 15, (5), 35-37.

Harris, A. (2003) *Challenging the Orthodoxy of School Leadership: towards alternative theoretical perspectives*. Report to the ESRC, University of Warwick.

Holland, D. and Lave, J. (2001) "History in person, an introduction" in: Holland, D. and Lave, J. (eds) *History in Person*, Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press. pp. 3-33.

Hollins, K., Gunter, H. and Thomson, P. (2005) *The Innovative School*. Paper presented at the International Congress for School Improvement and Effectiveness, Barcelona, January 2005.

Inglis, F. (1985) *The Management of Ignorance* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Inglis, F. (2003) "Method and morality: practical politics and the science of human affairs" Sikes, P., Nixon, J., and Carr, W. (eds) *The Moral Foundations of Educational Research*, Maidenhead: Open University Press. pp: 118-133.

Jeffries, S. (2002) "Obituary: Pierre Bourdieu" *The Guardian* 28/01/2002. www.guardian.co.uk. Accessed 22/06/2004.

Jenkins, R. (1992*) Pierre Bourdieu* Routledge, London.

Johnson, R. (1993) "Pierre Bourdieu on Art, Literature and Culture" Editor's Introduction in P. Bourdieu *The Field Of Cultural Production* Polity Press, Cambridge.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., and Steinbach, R. (1999) *Changing Leadership for Changing Times* Buckingham: OUP.

Leithwood, K. and Levin, B. (2004) *Approaches to the Evaluation of Leadership Programs and Leadership Effects*. Paper prepared for England's Department for Education and Skills, February 2004.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., Mills, M. and Christie, P. (2003) *Leading Learning*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.

More, T. (1976) *Utopia*. Translated by Paul Turner. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

Noddings, N. (2003) "Is teaching a practice?" *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 37, (2), 241-251.
Ribbins, P. and Gunter, H. (2002) "Mapping leadership studies in education: towards a typology of knowledge domains" *Educational Management and Administration*, 30, (4), 359-386.

Sennett, R. (1999) The Corrosion of Character New York: Norton.

Sennett, R. (2002) *The Fall of Public Man* London: Penguin Books.

Smyth, J. (2001) *Critical Politics of Teachers" Work*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Thomas, H., Butt, G., Fielding, A., Foster, J., Gunter, H., Lance, A., Pilkington, R., Potts, E., Powers, S., Rayner, S., Rutherford, D., Selwood, I., and Szwed, C. (2004) *The Evaluation of the Transforming the School Workforce Pathfinder Project*. London: DfES, Research Report 541. www.dfespublications.gov.uk

Thomson, P. and Gunter, H. (2005) *Researching students: voices and processes in school evaluations*. Paper to be presented in the *Speaking up and speaking out: international perspectives on the democratic possibilities of student voice* at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, Canada, April 2005.

Tomlinson, H., Gunter, H. and Smith, P. eds. (1999) *Living Headship: voices, values and vision* Paul Chapman/Sage in association with the British Educational Management and Administration Society.

Wacquant, L. (2002) "The sociological life of Pierre Bourdieu" *International Sociology* 17 (4) 549-556.