An intellectual history of the field of education management from 1960

Helen M Gunter B.A., MSc., PGCE

Submittted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. at Keele University

March 1999

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction to the study

1.1 Introduction

The research reported on in this study seeks to explore the history of the development and definition of a major area of professional study and practice. The approach taken is to focus on how an individual field member in higher education describes and understands the location of their professional practice within a field, and how this inter-connects with the education policy context. This type of investigation enables a range of issues to be explored: what is a field and how do individuals come to locate and position themselves within a particular field? How does membership of the field affect the nature of professional practice and how do field members understand and shape their professional identity through this practice? How does membership of the field create and resolve debates about theory, practice and research? Very little work has been done on the development of the field of education management in England and Wales or on its antecedents by field members, and this research both investigates the process of development, and the factors that have contributed to the particular form of its development and current configuration.

In order to explore these issues this study uses both oral and written texts, and presents an analysis of the professional biographies of sixteen people who are or have been located in an HEI, and have or currently seek to position their work within the field of education management in England and Wales. These people are significant in their contribution to establishing and developing the field as a legitimate area of study and practice for members of an HEI. This intellectual history of the field of education management aims to present and understand knowledge claims by investigating how and why field members have created and shaped ideas and activities through their professional practice as members of HEIs. The situated context in which field members have been and continue to be located is analysed as a means of understanding the structuring impact of education policy. Attention will be given to the relationship

between the policy context and the formation and development of the field, with a particular focus on the understanding and experience of key participants. The policy context is not presented as determining field member professional practice, but as defining the setting in which that practice has been constructed and reshaped. A central purpose of such a study is to explore ways in which knowledge is produced because this field sits between the area of professional 'practice' and the 'academy'. Underpinning this is an exploration of the strategies and processes through which a new area inserts and secures itself within the academic culture and structures in HEIs.

This chapter introduces the study by presenting the research questions. The chapter then moves on to explore the origins of these questions within my own research biography, and then considers the issue of values in the research design. The chapter goes on to present a rationale for the study, and concludes with a synopsis of the structure and notes the intellectual resources used.

1.2 The field of education management

A field is a metaphor that is used to describe and understand intellectual work. It suggests that there is a particular territory or space with boundaries, activity is structured, and entry is controlled. The field of education management is a "field of study and practice concerned with the operation of educational organizations" (Bush 1995), and so like other academic fields its activity is concerned with struggles over theory and method (Ladwig 1996), and like other applied fields the importance of policy interventions means that it seeks to be connected with practitioner interests and problem-solving (Halpin 1994). Membership is heterogeneous, and Fitz (1997) argues that there are three types of knowledge worker who position themselves within the field: the academic in HEIs, the practitioner in a wide range of educational institutions, and the entrepreneur who generates income through the provision of courses and consultancy. Membership is not located within one type of organisation such as the school or the university. Furthermore, the field is concerned with both practice and the

study of practice, and hence there is a complex network of participants who both 'do' it and study it at the same time. For example, a teacher may be a practising manager but at the same time undertaking a postgraduate course in education management; or a consultant may have previously been a Headteacher and is currently promoting good management practice through working with practising managers in educational settings; or a lecturer in an HEI is undertaking OFSTED inspections as a part of his/her income generation role at the same time as undertaking a piece of scholarly research. The balance within an individual's portfolio of activities may be a product of personal discretion and/or the product of employer determination through contract compliance and the legal context in which education professionals work. Furthermore, the broader setting in which professional practice is located is significant, particularly since field members in HEIs have faced challenges to intellectual work from policy interventions that structure research projects which "support rather than interrogate policy" (Halpin 1994 p201). Hartley (1998) argues that intellectual work in general is being affected by current cultural and economic changes as they challenge the validity and coherence of knowledge. This study does not claim to be able to map this complex field, rather it focuses on a significant and particular aspect of it through concentrating on those located within HEIs who position themselves within the field.

This study is an intellectual history and the professional practice of field members is concerned with knowledge production. This can be explored by raising questions at two inter-connecting levels: the micro or individual level, and the macro or policy context. At the level of the individual field member appropriate research questions can be raised: what is the relationship between being a field member in a practitioner context of school and moving into an HEI? What networks do field members belong to and how are boundaries constructed? How are debates about research questions and theory conducted and resolved within a field? Is professional employment within an HEI significant for the type of practice engaged in? Is the type of HEI (polytechnic/new

university or older university) significant for the type of professional practice? What brings professional recognition and rewards?

In focusing on the individual field member within an HEI the relationship with the policy context raises a complementary series of questions: how do legislative and policy changes in schools and colleges affect the type of professional practice of members of HEIs? How has the restructuring of central government with the establishment of agencies such as the TTA, had an effect? How do funding arrangements for inservice training impact on the structure and focus of provision by HEIs? How does a contractual relationship with an outside agency such as an LEA or the TTA have an impact on work?

The documentation of changes in higher education and the work of field members is under researched, and Smyth (1995a) observes that academics in general do not normally and naturally engage in reflexive processes about their work and the context in which it is taking place. However, as Deem (1996a) argues "personal accounts which provide situated knowledge" are an important method for an investigation and understanding of change "if we are not to lose sight of the histories of the disciplines in which academics work" (p6). Furthermore, Seddon (1996) uses Ozga's work (1994) on policy to show the importance of being explicit not just about what has been read and which research tool has been deployed but also to reveal the "conceptual lacework" (p211) of meanings and choices within the processes of the intellectual project being undertaken.

1.3 The individual as a 'case' of the problematic

The original interest in this area is rooted in a combination of personal experience and academic discourse. Both as a student and lecturer in education management I have both observed and I am a part of the growth in the field from the mid 1980s. My

involvement within the field has gone through four interconnected, and often parallel, phases:

- Practitioner-teacher: as a school teacher from 1980-1991 my professional practice was directly concerned with the curriculum and its management.
- Practitioner-scholar: in 1987 I began a part time M.Sc. in Education Management in which I read and researched into the theory and practice of effective management in educational institutions.
- Practitioner-trainer: in 1991 I was appointed Senior Lecturer in Education Management at Leeds Polytechnic (later Leeds Metropolitan University) in which I worked on the M.Sc. in Education Management, undertook inservice training and consultancy work, and was promoted to an income generation role within the Programme Area of Teacher Education.
- Practitioner-researcher: in 1993 I took a demotion to move to Keele to develop my research and publications combined with continuing to work on Master's level teaching, and consultancy. During 1993-1995 I undertook OFSTED inspections, and during 1997-1998 I became an NPQH trainer.

This experience of positioning my professional practice and interests within the field of education management, and securing employment within an HEI, has raised a number of questions about how my own professional identity has been challenged and reshaped. Perhaps the central question is: how do I come to be professionally located where I am today? Exploring this foregrounds the importance of lived experience and how I understand my professional practice and make sense of my situated context. This can be revealed through stories in which choices and decisions, to work here or there, to teach this or that, to write on this topic or that, can enable an understanding of how clusters of people can come together to create and develop an area of activity. Underlying this is an understanding of what it means to be a member of a field in which professional practice is shaped through association with others, and what happens when particular questions are asked, research issues are focused on, and debates about theory take place. Furthermore, there is a potential gender issue of what it means to enter a male dominated field, in which research and theory has been identified as being gendered (Adler *et al.* 1993). More specific questions can be asked on two inter-connected levels:

How and why have I as an individual:

- come to label practitioner work as management?
- sought legitimacy through my credentials as a practitioner?
- sought employment in a HEI, rather than an LEA, or as a private consultant?
- joined clusters of other field members within the HEI?
- networked with field members outside of the HEI either formally through BEMAS or informally, and both nationally and internationally?
- used needs based pedagogy through management diaries, intray exercises, and simulations?
- see my purpose as working with practitioners to seek solutions to management problems?
- used theory as a tool to describe and determine action?
- used theory developed in a non-educational setting?
- undertaken research within a practitioner context?
- had work published within the field?
- presented myself and my work as politically neutral?

How and why has the Policy Context shaped my work as a field member by:

- training field members to provide government agency services such as OFSTED inspections, and training for the NPQH?
- funding and contracting the training of practitioners as managers?
- designing and accrediting the training of practitioners as managers?
- inspecting the provision of training for practitioners as managers?
- funding research into effective management practice?
- promoting and structuring continuous professional development in which management skills and knowledge are a priority?
- directing changes to the professional practice of teachers through legislation in which management functions are mandatory?
- promoting a particular type of theory and research?

These are interesting and challenging questions, that have the potential to make the intellectual and professional dilemmas of field members visible. On the one hand, the

emphasis within the field on practice means that I have experienced training practitioners as managers, and this is supported by the HEI context of income generation, and is taking place within a policy context that has legislated site-based management for schools. On the other hand, a location in an HEI means I have experienced the researching of management practice, and the income generation is in the form of grants rather than fees, and is taking place within an academic context in which theory development, knowledge claims and scholarship are expected. I recognise that this dichotomy has the potential to distort, but it does serve to illuminate the tensions, especially of having worked within a former polytechnic in which the CNAA seemed to have a central role in the formation and development of accredited courses in education management. Furthermore, the ending of the binary divide and the growth in the management imperative in all HEIs raises some interesting questions about the ability of individual academics to control and shape their own work, and the extent to which it is being determined by internal performance measures and external contract compliance (Ozga 1998).

Since becoming a student, and then a researcher and teacher, I have developed a sense of being within a field of study, and how I see my position and how others seek to position my work. This may appear, with hindsight, to be neat and tidy. Undertaking the interviews for this study has enabled me to both seek and be given access to the professional, and sometimes personal, lived experiences of senior members of the field both past and present. In doing this my understanding of the complexity and richness of academic networks has increased, and has facilitated my reflection on how I have both sought entrance and been co-opted into the field. My membership of a recent seminar series *Redefining Education Management* has enabled me to engage in debates about theory and research, and how field members are reviewing their position. Like Deem (1996a) I inhabit border territory, I simultaneously do and do not belong within the field. Much of my professional practice is the same as other field members in HEIs but my research and theoretical interests have focused away from

the immediate problem solving agenda of practitioners to the historical setting and development of the field. The creativity of being on the margins is evident in my aim to chronicle and analyse the growth of the field, but I have also experienced the drawing of boundaries that aim to exclude this type of work (*ibid.*).

This type of reflexive biography has enabled me to see the direct link between the dynamic and ongoing development of the field I am studying and changes within my professional identity. As Bourdieu (1988) argues, any attempt to try to be anonymous and to be neutral or to hide behind method "is doomed in advance to failure" (p25). This ongoing reflexive approach is what makes study exciting and worthwhile, and it is recognised that understanding the lived experience of field members centres around this process.

1.4 Researching the professional lives of field members

Asking questions that engage with lived experiences and an investment in a professional location is challenging. As Bourdieu (1988 pxv) argues what is spoken or written about "is bound to be read differently by readers who are part of this world as opposed to those who are outsiders". Bourdieu goes on to say:

> "It is well known that no groups love an 'informer', especially perhaps when the transgressor or traitor can claim to share in their own highest values. The same people who would not hesitate to acclaim the work of objectification as 'courageous' or 'lucid' if it is applied to alien, hostile groups will be likely to question the credentials of the special lucidity claimed by anyone who seeks to analyse his own group. The sorcerer's apprentice who takes the risk of looking into native sorcery and its fetishes, instead of departing to seek in tropical climes the comforting charms of exotic magic, must expect to see turned against him the violence he has unleashed" (*ibid.* p5).

For example, Greenfield talks about his shift away from positivist behavioural science and "number crunching" (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993 p232) and how he challenged the systemic-empiricist approach, and put the self into the organisation. In conversation with Peter Ribbins he talks about his intellectual journey:

> "PR: I am trying to understand the way your thinking has developed, as opposed to where you are now. Can we consider this in three questions: first, 'what can I know?' Secondly, 'how can I achieve such knowledge?' and thirdly, 'who can help me to know?' An considering each of those questions, can you also say something about the sequence in which your ideas have developed? What came first, what next and what last?
>
> TG: Initially, I was seduced by a methodology that, collapses the first two questions. The first becomes irrelevant and the second all-important. The argument I've been making is that logical positivism offers us a shrunken view of the world. It offers a methodology for manipulating reality so as to control it, a methodology that promises more than it actually delivers. It ends up hiding more than it reveals. In terms of the nature of knowledge, I've turned my back on the people who were my mentors in educational administration. I have found myself going back to ways of knowing and bodies of knowledge that I had encountered much earlier. On coming to educational administration I concluded that my earlier knowledge was useless, or more exactly, valueless. This paper recognises that those other bodies of knowledge are relevant and are powerful. That they are not just supplements to what social science lets us understand, but are truly unique insights in their own right. Partly because they are not paralysed by the only way of knowing recognised in positivistic social science" (*ibid.* p256).

Greenfield sees his work and writing as representing "a groping towards understanding, not a uniform and logical line of extrapolation" (*ibid.* p269). This has considerable resonance with me as it supports my argument that this study is a snapshot of my current place in the "groping towards understanding" and my return to my disciplinary origins as an historian. This re-engagement with history has enabled me to move away from what had become habitual and understand the moral judgements that have led me to gain an understanding of change and stability in my own intellectual identity during the last twenty years. Making the self visible means that the "assumptive choices" (McPherson and Raab, 1989) I have made in the design and development of this study are open to debate. This study does not dichotomise the individual as separate from the collective or from structures, but is more about seeing individuals and their professional choices as a part of the bigger picture, and clearly there is a tension between the simplicity of attempting to describe and analyse the world, and the obvious complexity of the way relationships and networks develop. Taking this forward opens up possibilities for this study in which the value systems need to be opened and explored, and this is the purpose of the next two parts of this section of the chapter.

1.4.1 Problematising historical methodology

The approach taken in this study is that historical research is more than following a method in order to reveal the facts. An example of this type of work is Callahan's study (1962) that is concerned with exploring "the origin and development of the adoption of business values and practices in educational administration" in the USA between 1900 and 1930. In identifying a "cult of efficiency" in the USA education system, Callahan charts what he calls "An American Tragedy in Education" in which:

> "Efficiency and economy - important as they are - must be considered in the light of the quality of education that is being provided. Equally important is the inefficiency and false economy of forcing educators to devote their time and energy to cost accounting. We must learn that saving money through imposing an impossible teaching load on teachers is, in terms of the future of our free society, a very costly practice" (*ibid.* p263).

Callahan studies the connection between the growth in the scientific and rational business ethic and changes in school administration by looking at documentary sources to show how Taylorist ideas gained currency. What he is able to demonstrate is a shift in the self image of the school administrator and how the performance of pupils, the efficiency of the curriculum and school organisation was conceptualised as a business function and product. Callahan describes and analyses the changes and asks the question: why? However, unlike Callahan this study has to engage with charting the history of a field in which I am professionally located and my identity has been significantly shaped by. This raises questions about associated but different values, and issues about validity, and knowledge claims. For example, Callahan's study is not politically neutral but he does not foreground this by using a theoretical framework to explain the dominance of Taylorism within USA society in general, and education in particular.

Williams and May (1996) argue that searching for cause and effect is like the "alchemist's search for gold" (p62), and so any attempt to construct an historical protocol that purports to be neutral is inappropriate for a study which is "concerned with the way individuals interpreted the situations they were in as well as with the circumstances themselves" (Shipman 1988 p109). Jenkins (1991) argues that there is

a difference between the past and history: the past has happened and can never be experienced again, but it can be reconstructed and repackaged. History is both within the historian's mind but also within the situated context in which s/he works, and Jenkins argues that history is not about absolute truths but a contested discourse in which we should not ask, what is history? but instead ask: who is history for? The approach taken in this study is to begin by asking these types of questions in Chapter 2 through presenting and using an historical framework based on the work of Dale (1989) in which education policy is charted and analysed. This is built on in Chapter 3 where the professional practice of field members contained in published texts is mapped against the Dale framework to illustrate the continuities and discontinuities in the development of the field. This approach enables an historical chronology to be developed and used, but I go on to argue in Chapters 4-7 that theorising the positions and positioning of field members within the field and over time requires a series of sociological questions to be asked. This suggests that historical method within the context of this study is about foregrounding values and the power structures underpinning them, and the next part of this section of the chapter will explore this rationale.

1.4.2 Problematising intellectual work

The main challenge engaged with from Chapter 4 onwards is in how to investigate a very complex social process that underpins education management as a field of study and practice. Understanding social processes is central to the task of the social sciences, and students of History, Politics, Economics, Sociology etc., are all concerned with describing, evaluating, and explaining aspects of the human condition and the relationship with structures. Debates occur about the focus and relevance of a particular social science, and in particular whether the relationship between the individual and the collective is one of balance and accommodation, or one of critique and emancipation. Central to these concerns are the research traditions that are integral to the growth and dynamics of the social science academy. A dominant

tradition is rooted in the natural sciences in which the world is a well ordered and predictable machine: things can be taken apart, analysed and put back together again without damage. By separating out knowledge into disciplines in places of learning, or organisations into departments and roles, there is an assumption that the whole can be understood by investigating the part. Turbulence and disturbance to the system is negative, and a problem. In this world the emphasis is on either rising above the practical and being characterised as thinkers, or for the practitioner keeping the machine running smoothly, and solving problems. You either do or do not get your hands dirty. However, there are alternative ways of conceptualising the world that has some interesting things to say, and as Sungaila (1990) argues we are alive and we should conceptualise the universe accordingly:

> "Machines are not natural. They are not alive. Our world is both. Our students, our schools, our school systems, are alive. So are our language, our culture, our society. Our systems of thought, including our discipline of educational administration, are living systems to. And science has at last begun to grasp the basic principles on which living systems operate. They are self-renewing and self-organizing" (p6).

Understanding people and networks of relationships become the focus of study, and it is these interconnections that shape activity. Understanding knowledge work as a field enables an investigation that looks beyond the visible:

> "...(there) are unseen structures, occupying space and becoming known to us through their effects... Fields encourage us to think of a universe that more closely resembles an ocean, filled with interpenetrating influences and invisible structures that connect. This is a much richer portrait of the universe; in the field world, there are potentials for action everywhere, anywhere two fields meet" (Wheatley, 1994 p49 and p51).

What is interesting is the 'meeting' or the 'collision' of and within fields. Within the social sciences there are collisions at conferences, within journals, book reviews, and other academic activities over issues to do with struggles for power, status, and knowledge. In particular who has the legitimacy to speak, and to speak with authority, to be listened to, and Wiley (1979) argues that while ideas have a life of their own they are rooted within the social contexts that develop, promote, and support them:

> "To achieve domination, a theory must... have intellectual merit; it must be backed by a well-organized group; and the group must gain control of a large and balanced share of the means of intellectual production. An idea or theory

> that is unsuccessful is not necessarily less true or less meritorious than the successful ones. The key theorists may not have formed a group, or it may have been poorly organized and led, or it may have been unable to gain enough of the means of production to grow" (*ibid.* p48).

This perspective allows knowledge production to be further problematised and connected with structures of power in which knowledge is controlled through the HEI as a site of knowledge production. In this sense the study will seek to ask sociological questions about the professional practice of field members in HEIs so that field activity can be investigated through theoretical concepts.

Silver (1990) argues that: "History is inevitably...theoretical" (p7), and in an earlier work he gives an explanation for this:

> "Without the historical test, theory may be beautiful but may be beyond validation and understanding. Without the theoretical test, history may be busy but blind" (Silver, 1983 p245).

Theory is important to the historian in enabling understanding and explanation. This suggests that historians not only have to give meaning but also have to understand meaning associated at different times with different concepts such as bureaucracy, class, state, and capitalism. Theory can enable the historian to construct frameworks in which to understand actions and choices by people, and there can be a recognition of alternative pasts. Any interpretation and understanding of current social science issues such as power, markets, social injustice need an historical perspective to understand both the current situation and its antecedence. Mills (1959) asserts that historical investigations should be more than identifying trends and discontinuities: we should not ask, "has something persisted from the past" but "why has it persisted?" (p171).

Field members in England and Wales have to look abroad for this type of historical work. Theorising change within the field of educational administration in the USA has been undertaken by Culbertson (1988), and more recently Burlingame and Harris (1998) have used work from anthropology to argue that "revitalisation movements...provide a more powerful and fruitful explanatory framework" (p21). The framework within revitalisation movements is of a series of five stages in which there is

identifiable cultural change from stability through turmoil and into either the death of a culture or revitalisation leading to a new stability. This provides an interesting way in which the interaction of knowledge workers within the field and situated within a cultural setting can be explained. Burlingame and Harris go on to use the chronology of the field developed by Culbertson (1988) to show two consequences of revitalisation movements: firstly, the mapping of groups who cluster around knowledge claims, and engage in struggles for recognition in forums such as the American Research Association; and, secondly, political gains are made because claims about change, often labelled a paradigm shift, eradicates contradictions for groups of knowledge workers through claims of having achieved a "satisfying culture" (*ibid.* p32). The strength of this analysis lies in the focus on understanding knowledge claims as dynamic and located in the often contradictory and stressful professional lives and work of those who promote and challenge them. However, the relationship between the agent of cultural change and culture as structural change remains one dimensional in an insistence of the latter on imposing behaviours and attitudes on the former.

Understanding intellectual work seems to require a sociological interrogation of practice in order to describe and understand the complex motivations of individuals and the structures they inhabit. This requires a multi-layered approach and the study moves forward in Chapter 4 with an analysis of knowledge production and the interconnections with knowledge and power. This is problematised by focusing on the location and purpose of intellectual work and the HEI as a site of knowledge production. This chapter concludes with a series of questions which inform the design and implementation of an empirical study based on the gathering and analysis of oral and written texts. The research design is presented in Chapter 5 in which the rationale for the gathering of the oral texts through professional biographies and the written texts from the BEAS/BEMAS papers is explained. This is followed in Chapter 6 with a thematic presentation and analysis of the voices of field members and supported by references to the written texts. The approach taken is to put more emphasis on how

professional practice such as publication is illustrative of positioning within the field than a detailed analysis of those publications. The study then moves on to Chapter 7 in which Bourdieu's (1990) theory of practice, and his ongoing development of Habitus and Field, provides a theoretical lens through which to view, describe and explain the positioning and professional practice of field members located in HEIs. In locating and engaging with Bourdieu's thinking tools in Chapter 7 I am working within both the spirit and method of his sociology. I am also learning from the mistakes of others who have regretted how the use of more traditional and masculine approaches to their work has both distorted Bourdieu's ideas and hindered their own intellectual development (Brubaker 1993).

Bourdieu's theory of practice is developed through and within his work (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), and he has much to say about the role of the academic and university department and how this relates to power and culture. This is particularly relevant as my role as a field member needs to be a reflexive thread throughout the study. Bourdieu is concerned with social relations and a central aim is to remove the dichotomy between the individual and society, and between subjectivism and objectivism. His model of practice and of human behaviour is based on a rejection of structuralism; and a realisation of a false choice between objectivism and subjectivism. His move away from structuralism is a shift from "an approach based on analytical models constructed from the cultural rules supposedly governing behaviour to an emphasis upon the generation and pursuit by agents of strategies..." (Jenkins, 1992 p45). In this sense while I intend to raise sociological questions in Chapter 4 to sensitise the gathering and analysis of the oral and written texts in Chapters 5 and 6, the approach taken is not to see complex social relations through the determinism and organizational efficiency of externally generated theory. I am taking seriously Bourdieu's arguments that theory and data are in relationship to one another, and to sit at a desk hunting for theoretical definitions has led Bourdieu to be critical of such

approaches: "they cross borders with empty suitcases - they have nothing to declare" (quoted in Harker *et al.* 1990 px). Bourdieu illuminates as follows:

> "There is no doubt a theory in my work, or, better, a set of *thinking tools* visible through the results they yield, but it is not built as such...It is a *temporary construct which takes shape for and by empirical work*" (Wacquant 1989 p.50).

This is taken up by Jenkins (1992) who confirms that Bourdieu is "good to think with" (p12) and that his "work is a constant incitement or encouragement to criticism and further reflection on the reader's part" (p176). Bourdieu openly engages in reflection and development rather than pretends that he has all the answers:

> "When you want to escape from the world as it is, you can be a musician, or a philosopher, or a mathematician. But how can you escape it as a sociologist? Some people manage to. You just have to write some mathematical formulae, go through a few game-theory exercises, a bit of computer simulation. To be able to see and describe the world as it is, you have to be ready to be always dealing with things that are complicated, confused, impure, uncertain, all of which runs counter to the usual idea of intellectual rigour" (Bourdieu *et al.* 1991 p259).

This raises issues about the power of the academic and why the individual researcher, lecturer, or professor does what s/he does and in the way that s/he does it. Brubaker (1993) argues:

> "A purely theoretical reading of Bourdieu...mistakes the point and purpose of his texts. Their point is not simply to interpret the world; it is to change the world, by changing the way in which we - in the first instance, other social scientists - see it" (p217).

If I treated theory in a theoretical way then I could identify that Bourdieu's work is flawed and has internal contradictions, but in treating his theory as being sociological then the contradictions and changes can be a strength as he openly engages in reflection and development rather than pretends that he has all the answers. This complexity is a strength of this study, and both the analysis in Chapter 7 and the Conclusion presented in Chapter 8 will put more emphasis on the dilemmas and contradictions facing field members in HEIs than on listing a definitive set of findings. The "possibilities" for the development of the field combined with what will be described as "traps" are presented along with an agenda for further research.

Within the study footnotes are used to provide additional information to underpin the analysis, and to extend the discussion into connected areas. In Chapter 6 footnotes are used in a creative way as a means of enabling the analysis of the written texts to support and illuminate the oral texts located in the main body of the study. In privileging the voices of the sixteen field members I am deliberately giving more weight to the primary evidence. This is consistent with the value system underpinning the research questions explained within this introductory chapter, and is connected with ongoing reflexive practice within my own intellectual work as made visible throughout the study.

1.5 Summary

This study seeks to explore some interesting and relevant questions regarding the location and positioning of professional educationalists within the field of education management. I have argued so far that these questions cluster around two points: firstly, the individual, the choices and decisions regarding professional practice within a HEI, and the types of pedagogy used and knowledge claims made. This is made more complex by recognising the formal and informal networks in which individuals and clusters form, and through which professional practice and areas of enquiry can be constructed; and, secondly, the policy context that has promoted management activity and roles through funding, designing and accrediting training, funding research, and the introduction of site-based management.

The study operates at different levels and begins in the next three Chapters with presenting an analysis of what is objectively known about the field of education management. Chapter 2 is a library based literature search and examines the policy context in which field members in HEIs work and presents an account of the growing management imperative within the public sector as a whole, and the work of the public sector worker in particular. Chapter 3 is also a library based literature search, but acknowledges how my own involvement within the field and the process of collecting the professional biographies extended my knowledge of field publications and activities.

The chapter presents a description of the development of the field of education management from the 1960s by looking at the purposes of the field, professional practice by field members in HEIs, and forms of controversy which help support claims for significance. This chapter will analyse the work of the individual field member situated within an HEI, and will seek to understand what it means to be a member of a field.

The exploration of questions regarding the development of the field from the perspective of the policy context, the organisation, and the individual, leads on to Chapter 4 which draws the analysis together by focusing on the knowledge claims of the field, and what it means to be a field member located in a HEI. The intellectual resources on which this chapter is based come from a library study, but engage with a different type of literature than that found within the field itself. The analysis presented in the first three chapters enables interesting aspects of the development of the field to be made visible, but it is argued that significant questions regarding the professional practice of field members in HEIs cannot be investigated without seeking a subjective understanding of what it means to locate the self within the field. Chapter 5 draws on the literature as well as my own experience as a researcher to present a research design in which the construction of oral and written texts is described and the process of data collection analysed. Chapter 6 makes visible the subjective understanding of selected field members in HEIs through presenting the similarities and differences in their professional biographies, and the analysis is taken a stage further in Chapter 7 by using Bourdieu's theory of practice to describe and understand the professional practice of field members.

Chapter 2

The policy context and the field of education management

2.1 Introduction

The professional practice of the field member in an HEI takes place within the policy context, and the questions raised in Chapter 1 point to a number of pertinent issues: firstly, the funding, and accreditation of the training of practitioners as managers; secondly, the funding of research into effective management practice; thirdly, the promotion of continuous professional development in which management skills and knowledge are a priority; and, fourthly, directing changes to professional practice through legislation in which management functions have become mandatory. This chapter will begin by investigating these issues through a presentation of policy changes and legislation, before going on to a second section that will discuss the relationship between these changes and the restructuring of the public sector. The chapter will end by considering the implications for field members in HEIs and look at the possibilities for understanding the relationship between the policy process and their professional practice. The description and analysis within the chapter is based on an extensive library based literature search.

2.2 Education Policy

The policy context has both created the problem solving context for practitioners and legislated for the employment of management strategies [1]. This section of the chapter will describe and analyse the restructuring of state education from the administration of education through to the site-based management of education. Dale (1989) provides a useful chronological framework for understanding the shifts in the role of different groups who have been involved in the changing structure of education. This chronology is presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1 [2]
Changing roles in the structure of education in England 1944-1988 (*ibid*. p115)

	1944-74	**1974-88**	**1988-**
National	Oversees. (Chair)	Limited Assertiveness.	Minister's instrument.
Political Party in power	Reserve power.	Electorally opportunist.	Dominant.
LEA	Active partners. (Managing Director)	Squeezed.	'Eunuchs'.
Teachers	Active partners. (Executive Director)	Problems.	Proletarianized.
Parents	Who?	Constructed as 'natural experts'/ moral guardians.	Consumers.
Industry	Indifferent. (full employment)	Concerned. (increasing unemployment)	Consultants.

Dale argues that the post-war settlement established education policy-making based on a framework of central and local interaction with very little demand from parents and industry. The breakdown in this settlement in the mid-1970s, is directly connected to an increase in group demands and pressures on education from parents and industry to be responsive their needs. At a time of economic dislocation these demands were linked to challenges to existing elite groups in government, combined with concerns about the relevance and quality of education. The period 1974-1987 is dominated according to Dale by "three themes of standards, accountability and economic responsiveness" (*ibid.* p107), in which high profile cases such as the William Tyndale affair generated questions about the control of education. A central feature of this period is an increase in central intervention or "assertiveness" through changes in resource management as illustrated in the "bid and contract" system of TVEI. Dale argues that by the late 1980s the implementation and operation of the market enabled the potential of a new settlement to be established through the dominance of central agencies combined with parental choice, and the private sector as the location of best practice for the delivery of public sector services. The traditional power structures in

Whitehall and County Hall have been restructured and their inhabitants have either retired or are now performance managed. Practitioners have become technicians of the curriculum and discourses of professionalism now centre around new skills in development planning and whole school review.

Dale highlights that the construction of boundaries to "periods" of historical change enables the argument to be made, but he also regrets that it may make invisible the threads and complexities of continuity. A way of revealing this is to identify themes that the groups recognised by Dale have been involved in as they have struggled or settled for their particular role. These themes are related to debates about how we understand the location of power within the politics of decentralisation and centralisation, and Lauglo (1996) argues that decentralisation is more problematic than centralisation as the levels and forms of power dispersal are complex. He goes on to provide a typology of decentralisation in which the particular form can be identified according to alternative values and claims about legitimacy. Decentralisation can be determined by structural and systemic arrangements in which authority is dispersed through democratic channels such as devolution, and federalism; alternatively, there are economic reasons such as the quality and efficient use of resources that can be achieved through different channels such as professionalism, management by objectives, and markets. This is illustrated in Table 2, and builds on Dale's model:

Table 2
Centralisation and Decentralisation in the structure of education in England and Wales from 1944.

	1944-74	**1974-88**	**1988-onwards**
Structure and System	Central-LEA partnership.	Central-LEA power-dependency.	Centre dominant.
Quality and Efficiency	Professional self-regulation.	Stakeholder interests. Increased school management.	Central regulation. Strong school management. Strong stakeholder interests.
Culture and Practice	Educational administration.	Curriculum management.	Site-based management.

From the end of world war two to the present day, the groups who are involved directly in the process and outcomes of education policy have taken up positions and repositions over the location of power (both structural and resource) in the control of education. Decision-making in education was firmly rooted in the tradition and practice of the unitary state, but as Tomlinson (1986 p220) argues the nature of central government intervention in education changed from the "promotion of policies" during the twenty years after 1945 to a more interventionist approach in the post 1988 period. Judgements about the quality of education and the efficient use of resources were no longer located with practitioners and their monitoring and evaluation through notions and practices of professional standards and peer review, but with the consumers of the educational process.

The chronology presented by Dale (1989) in Table 1 has enabled the signposts of policy change to be established, and in Table 2 the underlying debates and struggles that have and continue to take place about the location of decisions and the measurement of the outcomes have been revealed. A further dimension to Table 2 is how the culture and practice of problem resolution has been structured and understood in the development and implementation of education policy. The chronology enables the shift away from the administration of a system of education to market management to be contextualised by focusing on changes in power relations and challenges to values inherent in the growth of management systems and structures.

The growth of the management imperative within public sector organisations is based on the adoption of business management techniques that have their roots in different traditions. Taylorism has its origins in the work of Taylor (1911) and scientific management, in which the emphasis is on control through external regulation, and the supervision of the work process. Management is a technique or function and is concerned with planning, budgeting, goal setting, and performance; the design of the work is separate from the actual performance of the work tasks. Assumptions are

made that the worker needs to be directed to complete tasks, and incentives can be used such as PRP. Secondly, new wave management is evident in the work of Peters (1988) and Peters and Waterman (1982), and has its roots in the human relations movement from the 1930s, in which the role of the manager is to enable and facilitate workers through teams and problem solving tasks. Control comes from building a sense of corporate mission through valufacturing consensus driven goal achievement (de Bono 1993). This is an optimistic view of management processes, it is humanistic, integrative, and promotes the unitary organisation.

The legitimacy of management practice has been through the establishment of *a right to manage*. If managers are to be able to manage, to be innovatory, make changes, and respond to the customer, then the public sector based on trade unions and political accountability needs to be restructured. This is illustrated by changes to the location of the power over hiring and firing; working conditions; restructuring and downsizing; contracts; the end of national bargaining and the introduction of locally determined pay and conditions of service. The interaction of private sector values with the public sector is a fertile area for research and comment, especially so when the management function being installed within the public sector is rooted in private sector values. Stewart and Walsh (1992) argue that what is interesting here is that management cannot simply be implemented but there is an interaction between the values base of professionals within the public sector, and the values assumed by management models developed in the private sector.

Public sector values have traditionally differed from the private sector in a number of ways: firstly, the emphasis is on welfarism in which needs are met disconnected from personal resources, and the common good is a realisable goal in which benefits for the individual are directly related to the collective and vice versa; secondly, the resolution of issues and questions takes place through systems that are not allied to a particular interest, and there is a close link with the development of a liberal democratic political

culture in which deliberation, negotiation and co-operation are actively encouraged; thirdly, expertise and professional knowledge is trusted and valued for its own sake as well as the outcomes it affords, and there is a strong sense of a vocation in which public service and dedication may transcend job descriptions and contracts.

Table 2 shows three signposts in how we might understand the changes to the culture and practice of how problems and crises have been resolved within the policy context. Educational administration is associated with the post war period in which bureaucratic structures supported an elite who maintained the 1944 settlement (Gewirtz and Ozga 1990). Public sector values are evident in the rhetoric of their claims to retain their status and power, and the overlaying of private sector values from the 1970s created strain and contradictions for those still in post. Challenges to educational administration from the late 1960s and more clearly evident from 1974 are linked to both economic decline and the growth in democratic participation. Concerns related to educational standards increasingly focused on the methods in the internal and external management of the curriculum. Management in this context went through a transition from professionally based notions of collegiality to the importation of North American scientific management in the Taylorist tradition. This latter aspect remained in the culture and practice of education with the introduction and ongoing development of site-based management from 1988. Taylorism is evident in the form of teacher appraisal, PRP, and OFSTED inspections, and this has combined with new wave management in the form of charismatic leadership and team processes. This restructuring in the public sector system and the values underpinning it requires a more detailed description of the shift from the power structures of educational administration to the site-based management of a school, and it will be charted and analysed in the next three parts of this section of the chapter.

2.2.1 Educational administration 1944-1974

Kogan (1975) divides the post war period up to the reorganisation of local government in 1974 into four: firstly, from 1946, but more notably from 1955 to 1964, was a period of growth and consolidation; secondly, from 1964 to 1968 was a period of expansion based on egalitarian notions underpinning the growth in higher education and the reorganisation of the tripartite system into comprehensive schools; thirdly, from 1968 to 1970 was a period of increasing pessimism; and, fourthly, by 1974 the period of optimism in education ended with severe economic crises.

The 1944 Education Act located the responsibility for the provision of primary and secondary education with LEAs, but the relationship between Whitehall and County Hall lacked clear boundaries, and is generally regarded as being encapsulated in the phrase: 'national policy locally administered'. Kogan (1971) argues that traditionally control has been "regulatory and quasi-judicial" (p27), but as Buxton (1973) argues "the 1944 Act does not provide any effective means of coercing the local authority to do what the government requires, the crucial controlling factor, here as elsewhere, being financial rather than legal" (p100). In the post war period education was administered by an elite who had a stake in the 1944 settlement, and their structural and cultural domination continued in spite of the 1968 Fulton Report (Lawrence 1992). The Whitehall elite was characterised by a limited social and educational background (public school and Oxbridge), dominated by the ethos and practice of the 'cult of the generalist' in which members of the administrative class could apply their generalist mind and knowledge of the processes of government (Kellner and Crowther-Hunt 1980). It seems that the same ethos and type of person inhabited local administration, and so there was no need for the centre to hold or use interventionist powers as there was a coincidence of interests. Weaver (1979) in reflecting on his professional life in educational administration describes the importance of partnership and "mutual trust" that he learned in the 1930s, and is best understood by his own words in describing the challenges of the late 1970s:

> "But a worry remains which brings me back full circle to my opening theme, the spirit of partnership and mutual trust that I claimed to characterise our educational system. I have tried, among other things, to show how this has enabled individual threads of concern and inventiveness continuously to be woven into the texture of the system to enliven the pattern of educational change. This spirit, and with it the freedom of action and sense of fellowship it confers on the partners, is under severe test. How far it can survive the impact of exacerbated political partisanship, central and local; the clumsy application of corporate management; the centripetal pressures towards uniformity; the growing replacement of reason and persuasion by force as an acceptable method of resolving difference; the corrosion of what were thought to be professional imperatives by the acids of militancy; the frustrations of financial retrenchment: all this hangs in the balance" (*ibid.* p16).

Bogdanor (1979) describes educational administration, as lived by Weaver and his contemporaries, as a strong network who sought to secure a balance in the name of the public interest. This worked as long as there was a deferral to this elite to "act sensibly" through their professional community (*ibid.* p161), but as Fincher (1975) shows this mystique was being questioned.

Challenges to the post war settlement took place from the mid 1960s, with trends towards more participation, and a pluralism of interests, often conflicting. Higher education expanded and polytechnics were created. For schools the most significant change was the introduction of comprehensive education, and the role of the centre in this development was through administrative memorandums, significantly, Circulars 10/65 and 10/70. Circular 10/65 requested LEAs to draw up plans to reorganise schools, and as Buxton (1973) shows it was a statement of policy without the strategies to achieve it. Williams (1995a) describes this as follows:

> "until the late 1960s, strategies for educational change and development were formulated, negotiated and implemented in an enduring culture of mutual regard, trust and commitment within a policy formulation troika of providers - the minister and the government department, the LEA associations and the teachers' unions" (p4).

The move towards comprehensive education has a number of roots (Baron 1965, Feinwick 1976). Firstly, research work in the sociology of education, and the psychology of learning challenged the segregation of children through the 11 plus examination (Lowe 1988); and, secondly, a strong impetus came from local level in which the ideological arguments about equity and structural injustice were not as strong

as the administrative goal of "providing a viable secondary education for children who would otherwise be dispersed to schools then thought to be too small to provide an adequate range of subjects" (Kogan 1975 p219).

At school level the creation of comprehensive schools had implications for the internal administration of teaching and learning. Grace (1995) identifies the dominance of the Headmaster tradition in which leadership is characterised as the generation of religious and spiritual morality. Up to the 1930s management was very much about strong control and discipline through Taylorist mechanisms such as payment by results, and "the capacity of headteachers to keep other teachers and the pupils in a state of subordination" (*ibid.* p29). In post war Britain, Grace argues that there was a moral energy for change and a belief in the connection between education and democratic culture. Within schools the emphasis was on professional relationships and decision making was based on collegiate processes. In this period, which Grace calls the "modern professional", administration was given low status and the relationship between headteacher and staff was based on educational values and the ethical issues of working with children. Administration was about supporting educational objectives, and status within the profession came from pedagogy. However, the comprehensive school made the internal arrangements for the organisation of teaching and learning more complex: children were increasingly organised in mixed ability classes, the pastoral role of the practitioner was enhanced, and schools grew in size:

> "As one of the consequences of comprehensive education reform was the creation of large schools (in excess of 1,000 pupils) and the creation of schools on split sites, the relevance of modern management practice to the efficient operation of these new institutions could hardly be denied. The co-ordination of the activities of large numbers of pupils and teachers; the scheduling of curricula programmes and options; the pastoral care of pupils and the maintenance of good human relations in schooling constituted an imperative for the introduction of managerial systems and a managerial discourse in English secondary schooling. This discourse began to normalize and legitimize concepts such as 'the senior management team', 'middle management', 'management by objectives', 'the management of human relations', etc" (*ibid*. p35).

Grace argues that this led to a period of "social democratic management" in which activities were rooted in the values of professional collegiality, with an emphasis on

participation in decision making dependent on the management style of the headteacher. Work by the Schools Council in funding and directing research and development projects is seen as significant both for the promotion of curriculum change but at the same time it perpetuated institutional autonomy through the significant involvement of practitioner associations (Kogan 1975).

Challenges to educational administration were connected to social changes, and economic decline. There seemed to be a need to explain and justify roles and systems (Birley 1970), and demands for a modernised system of government underpinned changes within local government such as the introduction of corporate management in the wake of the Bains Report in 1972. The mystique of the administrative elite was challenged in Whitehall through reviews of the cost effectiveness of procedures and the deployment of staff, and the Fulton Report (1968) had challenged the mandarin domination of policy-making without direct accountability. From the mid 1970s education policy not only continued to focus on structural matters that eventually resulted in site-based management from 1988, but the centre became more interventionist in the what, why, and how of teaching and the curriculum.

2.2.2 Curriculum management 1974-1988

Grace (1995) sees the growth of the management imperative brought about by comprehensivisation as crossing the 1974 boundary and lasting until the mid 1980s when site-based management was introduced. Challenges to social democratic management based on professional collegiality were already appearing as Headteachers faced the internal management consequences of contraction through falling rolls. Dale (1989) argues that what is distinctive about the shift in education policy in the mid 1970s is increased central intervention in the curriculum, and in 1975 the DES set up the APU which focused on developing the national monitoring and assessment of the curriculum (Williams 1995a). Led and symbolised by Callaghan's Ruskin College Speech in 1976 the agenda was clearly focused on what was taught, to

what standard, and what accountability mechanisms were to be used. Increased central control over education was exercised through strict controls over local authority spending, and the introduction of rate-capping combined with penalties. Sir Keith Joseph at the DES from 1981 challenged professional discretion by the used of specific grants and introduced priority areas for inservice training, one of which was management. Williams describes this approach as follows:

> "From 1981 to 1996, he (Joseph) launched a raft of centralizing policies for the reform of the system with a 'market rationale' and objectives for specific change. Innovative policies included the introduction of a vocational strand in secondary school curricula through the introduction of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI); direct intervention in the initial and post-experience training of teacher; and, most significantly, had oversight of radical new policies for a reformed curriculum and its delivery in schools. The government's declared policy objectives were to raise standards for all levels of ability in schools and to secure efficient and effective returns on resources provided for education. Strategies to secure these objectives moved in two broad directions: education that was relevant and appropriate to achieve national policies and a determination to secure implementation of those policies in explicit centrally controlled ways" (*ibid.* pp9-10).

This trend in the external management of the curriculum, which led to the introduction of the National Curriculum from 1988, increased the management imperatives in school to evidence standards and to begin to 'market' their purpose to parents and children. The voice of parents had increased with the 1980 Education Act which required schools to publish more information about their work, and enabled them to exercise a preference in the choice of school. Furthermore, parental entitlement to alternative education in the private sector was supported by the introduction of the Assisted Places scheme in which fees were subsidised by central government for able children.

The efficient and effective deployment of practitioners combined with accountability mechanisms strengthened the external and internal management of the curriculum. In 1987 the Teachers' Pay and Conditions of Service Act ended national negotiating rights, the Burnham Committee was abolished, and in 1991 the School Teachers' Review Body was set up. Strain (1995) describes the changes as follows:

> "The new conditions of employment define professional duties as specific activities which teachers must carry out over a prescribed number of hours. These activities are wide ranging and, in addition, cover the provision of

> guidance, information and records, including assessment reports. School discipline, staff meetings, assemblies, co-operation and participation in school management, administration, school and public examinations are all now included amongst the duties a teacher 'may be required to perform'" (p45).

In the pre-1986 period before appraisal was made a legal requirement, the White Paper *Teaching Quality* (DES 1983) emphasised practitioner assessment and this was made even more salient by the speech by Sir Keith Joseph (1984) at the North of England conference. Again the emphasis was put on the assessment of practitioners and he made it clear that the LEA should take more direct action against practitioners who were under performing. In response to the union threat to boycott appraisal the language of removing practitioners was toned down, but in the White Paper *Better Schools* (DES, 1985) the government's position was clear:

> "...the regular and formal appraisal of the performance of all teachers is necessary if LEAs are to have the reliable, comprehensive and up-to-date information necessary for the systematic and effective provision of professional support and development and the deployment of staff to best advantage. Only if this information relates to performance in post can LEA management make decisions affecting the career development of its teachers fairly and consistently" (Para 180 page 55).

Appraisal was part of a package of measures including changes in the conditions of service and the salary structure. The tensions between business models of performance appraisal and educational values rooted in practitioner development is illustrated by the report from the 1985 *Better Schools, Evaluation and Appraisal Conference* (DES, 1986). A paper by the DES "Techniques for Appraising Teacher Performance" Presentation 2, is about installing management procedures and tasks into the classroom through the use of job specifications, measurable competences, and line management appraisal.

As the management imperative grew for schools, very significant changes were taking place in national and local government systems. In the early 1980s Bush and Kogan (1982) note how their interviews with *Directors of Education* illustrate the paradoxical and often contradictory context in which they were working. By the late 1980s LEAs had become, according to Brighouse (1988), "eunuchs" (p102), in which the innovative role of past local educational administrators such as Newsom, Morris, and Clegg, had

been lost. In Whitehall, reform initiatives focused on tasks performed within the state machinery through to a complete restructuring, and this is illustrated by a review of administrative processes in the early 1980s by the Efficiency Unit or what became known as 'Rayner's Raiders'. Lord Rayner was imported from Marks and Spencer to bring about a shift in the management functions within the civil service. The administrative culture was under pressure to change as FMI and MINIS were introduced into Whitehall departments in order make the system better managed (Hennessy 1989). FMI was designed to lead to objective identification with an emphasis on costing, clear responsibility for the target identified, and measurement of performance. MINIS was designed to provide ministers with the right information at the right time to support decision making. This public sector restructuring towards a strong managerialist centre combined with the decentralisation of resources to schools is evident in the experiments with LFM in the 1980s (Downes 1988). This is illustrative of a dramatic shift away from the elitism of career administrators to new centres of power in the work and role of headteachers in site-based management from 1988 (Brighouse 1988, Williams 1995b).

2.2.3 Site-based management from 1988 onwards

The centre has increased its intervention regarding educational standards, and has done this through management agencies rather than LEA administrative structures. The centre has undergone organisational restructuring through the Ibbs Report or 'Next Steps' in which there is a separation of the policy making function of a Whitehall Department, from the service delivery through an agency such as the TTA, and OFSTED. The majority of civil servants who are involved in service delivery (as distinct from giving policy advice to ministers) have been restructured into agencies that have devolved powers over budgets, personnel, pay, and recruitment. The aim is also to enable the constitutional requirement that a minister is responsible for all things done in his/her name to be changed, and operational control by agencies has brought direct (and often public) responsibility and accountability for civil servants.

In the post 1988 period LEAs have faced ongoing restructuring as their traditional role has been changed, and according to the Audit Commission (1989) they were in a transition of *Losing an Empire, Gaining a Role*. The nature of this role remains uncertain, and as Wragg *et al.* (1994) show LEAs were given the responsibility for teacher appraisal in 1991 at a time when other responsibilities were being delegated to schools or to central agencies. More recently, the continued emphasis on standards has created a role for the LEA over literacy and numeracy, and a complex process of Education Development Planning has been introduced to ensure that performance can be monitored and measured.

The restructuring of education in England and Wales in the last thirty years remains controversial through the intervention of the state in both simultaneously promoting decentralisation and centralisation. Decentralisation has been in the form of increased powers of school Governing Bodies and the diversity of school provision with LMS, GMS, and CTCs. Centralisation has been through increased intervention by government agencies with the introduction of a National Curriculum, OFSTED inspections, and the TTA control of professional development. Lawton (1992) describes the paradox in the following way:

> "After restructuring, the central authority may retain control of the ends of education, but individuals at the school site are primarily responsible for the means of education and for demonstrating success at achieving goals set both locally and nationally. Restructuring, then, refers to a decentralised form of educational management and, often, governance within a set of agreed parameters" (p139).

The challenge for practitioners has been in how accountability seems to have been reshaped around the achievement and measurement of performance and standards, and this is directly connected to the centralising trends. At the same time accountability is also a decentralisation process through a diversity in the type of schools available, parental choice, and the working of has become known as a quasi-market [3]. Site-based management is evident within educational provision across western style

democracies, and is seen by some commentators as a permanent feature and the basis around which a new settlement will be formed (Caldwell 1997) [4].

The 1988 Education Reform Act is seen as a watershed in the structure of state education in England and Wales, though many trends can been seen in the years prior to this (Feintuck 1994). Important changes were made to the governance of schools in 1986 (Education (No.2) Act) in which parental (through a ballot) and community (through co-option) representation was increased and practitioner representation decreased (Deem *et al.* 1995). Mechanisms and processes to secure increased accountability to parents was introduced through the requirement from 1986 for a governing body to publish an annual report to parents and to hold a parental meeting at least once a year. The nature of governance and the role of governors has been changed by successive legislation in which a governing body has substantial responsibilities for setting the strategic direction of the school, and for the quality and standards of educational provision.

The 1988 Education Reform Act illustrates this policy direction through some significant changes in the restructuring of LEA provision: the abolition of ILEA; the provision for a parental ballot to enable a school to be 'opted out' of local authority control to that of GMS; the introduction of CTCs; the introduction of open enrolment that aimed to enable parental choice; LMS through formula funding and delegated budgets; and the national curriculum. The 1992 Further and Higher Education Act took technical and sixth form colleges out of LEA control and placed them under a new national funding council.

LMS created a form of site-based management in England and Wales in which there were new responsibilities for financial, human and physical resources. The introduction of formula funding meant that schools would receive their budget according to student numbers, and when combined with open enrolment this put the provision of education by the school within a quasi-market. The ability to hire, fire, promote and demote staff

enables the school to determine the amount and type of staffing, and the nature of contracts. The delegation of budgetary control to the school was designed to enable the culture and practice of identifying site-based resource priorities, the planning and implementation of a budget, and the monitoring and evaluation of provision. Increasingly other policy changes have impacted on this with a growing shift in the 1990s towards income generation in which formula funding remains the most significant financial input, but schools are encouraged and directed to seek funding from other sources such as bidding for National Lottery funds and Technology College Status.

Legislation has also put in place external levers to improve educational standards and to generate data on the performance of educational institutions. The 1988 Education Act introduced a National Curriculum for children aged 5-16 and national testing was introduced at ages 7, 11 and 14. These SATs together with GCSEs, and post 16 qualifications were intended to provide evidence of the school's impact on a child's learning, and enable judgements on efficiency and effectiveness to be made. The 1992 Education Act established OFSTED and introduced regular inspections of schools by privatised inspection teams. The OFSTED Framework of Inspection and the inspection process requires schools to produce documentation on the management systems, and learning processes and policies prior to an inspection visit to the school. As a result of on-site observation and documentary analysis the inspection report identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the educational provision. The school must produce an Action Plan in response to the Key Issues for Action, and send copies of this and the Report to parents. From September 1997 schools began the second cycle of inspection in which the emphasis was on validating their improvement and effectiveness since the first inspection. Schools that have been found to have serious weaknesses follow a special process called Special Measures in which there is closer monitoring of the implementation of the Action Plan to improve standards. In 1992 the first League Tables for schools were published in which examination results and statistical

measures on attendance and exclusions are presented. Comparisons between schools have been further facilitated by each school being given its PANDA data in which the context of the school and statistical information about its performance can be measured against local and national indicators. This is meant to improve target setting for each school and enable it to meet LEA and National targets for literacy and numeracy. The 1997 Education Act made the setting of targets for pupil performance by the governing body a legal responsibility.

Site-based management has changed the structure and practice of employment within schools and colleges. Grace (1995) argues that management is about enabling schools to operate, compete, survive and develop within a market context, and the secularisation of leadership and management in schools has shifted the goals and priorities of educationalists. Grace argues:

> " ...new managerialism involves a much more sophisticated and specialized approach to the management of educational institutions as corporations or businesses...the new managerialism in the schools has involved more expert attention to budgeting control and forecasting; public relations and market research; performance indicators and quality control; and staffing and personnel relations" (*ibid.* p44).

The changes outlined are part of a shift towards HRM in which employees are a resource to be efficiently and effectively deployed in order to meet targets. Commitment to the organisation is achieved through management processes such as recruitment processes, appraisal schemes, PRP, training, and communication. Emphasis is given to the line manager who takes prime responsibility for the employee's commitment and performance. Communication is with the individual rather than through collective systems such as the trade union. HRM aims to ensure that employees are an integrated part of the organisation through consensus value systems and performing according to clearly defined targets (Ironside and Seifert 1995).

The growth of the management function mandated in legislation and regulations is now governing the life and work of the public sector practitioner. For example, the 1993

Education Act required the Secretary of State to issue a Code of Practice for the provision of special needs education. The *Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs* was published in 1994 in which the management role of a SENCO in the gathering and reporting of evidence about the special needs of children was emphasised.

The *School Teachers' Review Body Reports* provide considerable evidence to show the promotion of HRM methods in education. While there is recognition that the professional commitment of teachers is what has enabled reforms to be implemented within schools, the emphasis in recent reports (1994 and 1995) has been on the use of affordable pay and conditions of service in the recruitment, retention and commitment of teachers. Two particular issues have been given attention: firstly, school and teacher performance and the importance of benchmarking, in which evidence from OFSTED is utilised to support PRP (STRB 1994); and, secondly, the increase in teacher workload is recognised but the STRB in 1995 concluded against any changes in conditions of service and "meanwhile we hope that the effective managing of teachers' workloads will be treated as a priority by headteachers and governing bodies" (STRB 1995).

The research into, and the promotion of, management within schools has been led by the DES (later DfE, and DfEE) through the funding of projects. The SMTF (1990) reports that management is the means to school improvement and advocated management development: "...which focuses attention on the support which should be available in and near to the school and places less emphasis on off-site training" (*ibid.* para 3 p1). In other words the right to manage must be extended to the internal determination and meeting of development needs:

> "The school, especially the head and governors, has the first line responsibility for developing its capacity to manage itself, and to develop its managers" (*ibid.* para 42. p15).

Management development is very much about enabling the individual teacher to be a part of a corporate and consensus driven organisation, the teacher is a "human

resource" and a "principal asset" who needs to understand and participate in "corporate goals". Bolam *et al.* (1992) report on a project that was funded by DfE and argues that "successful schools do not just happen" (p2). While their findings are not presented as recommendations for "good management" the outcomes are stressed as being consistent with "informed experience and the findings from earlier research" (*ibid.* p118). The emphasis is on vision, leadership, team development, proactive strategic thinking and policy development, process indicators such as good communication so that "the school is under control" (*ibid.* p120).

The emphasis in the 1991 *Education (School Teachers Appraisal) Regulations* (DES 1991a) and Circular 12/91 (DES 1991b) is on performance, and appraisal is about enabling teachers "to realised their full potential and to carry out their duties more effectively" (Regulation 4(2)). Appraisal is part of teachers' "professional duties" and their performance is directly linked to firstly, professional development and career planning, and secondly, the management of that performance by "those responsible for taking decisions about the management of school teachers". The intention of appraisal is managerial and is focused on the effective and efficient deployment of teachers in both their current and future role, and while the appraisal process cannot be used for disciplining or dismissing a teacher, the appraisal statement may be used by "those responsible for taking decisions on the promotion, dismissal or discipline of school teachers or on the use of any discretion in relation to pay" (Regulation 14 (1)). The emphasis on performance management as grown, and in particular the developmental schemes set up by LEAs from 1991 have been criticised. The OFSTED (1996) report made the following evaluative judgements on the performance of teacher appraisal: firstly, teacher performance has not been well supported through appraisal. The impact on teaching and learning "has not been substantial" and the link between appraisal and improvement is minimal; and, secondly, the connection between effective management and appraisal is still under developed. The Report in particular raises a concern that PRP and the link with appraisal needs review. OFSTED note that while Circular 12/91

identified that such a link was "legitimate and desirable" schools tended to follow the appraising body's (LEA, or the Governors for a school with GMS) recommendation not to make any link between appraisal, pay and promotion. The Report concludes that appraisal is "functioning below its full potential" and justifies its call for a review on the basis of a different context in 1996 compared with 1991. In June 1996 OFSTED and the TTA produced a Report (TTA/OFSTED 1996) that reiterates the improvements required in a more effectively designed and operationalised system, but it goes on to emphasise the importance of how it is managed. This is not just the link between targets and development planning, but how appraisal is integral to the self managing school. The change of government in May 1997 has continued the policy trend and teacher development has been defined by Morris (1998) as performance driven rather than a morally committed process.

Teacher performance has been further promoted through inservice training and the preparation of headteachers. In the pre-1988 period there was an emphasis on voluntary and pluralistic provision: firstly, from 1967 HMI ran COSMOS courses on the management of teaching and learning; secondly, OTTO courses began in 1984 in which headteachers were given a secondment, and links with non-educational settings were encouraged. From 1986 these courses were overseen by the NDC that had been set up at Bristol University after a competitive tendering processes between a partnership of HEIs and business. The NDC was succeeded by the SMTF in 1989 which was located at the DES, and this undertook research into the provision of training and the needs of practitioners (Bolam 1998). In September 1994 the TTA was established with responsibilities for the funding and accreditation of ITT and inservice training. The TTA has created an integrated framework of continuous professional development encompassing ITT, the identification of expert teachers, subject leadership, the role of the SENCO, and headteacher leadership. National Standards have been published for practitioners at each of these stages, and for aspiring headteachers a professional qualification, the NPQH, was introduced in 1997 (Ouston

1998a). For newly appointed headteachers the HEADLAMP scheme was introduced in 1995 with vouchers for purchasing training from licensed providers. In September 1998 the LPSH was introduced in which headteachers are meant to have a business mentor (Bush 1998).

The funding of inservice training has been through the LEA (for GM schools there is a grant), with a range of schemes (GRIST and LEATGS) in which a central feature is the identification of "management training (not just for heads and deputies)... funded at £4 million in 1987-88 rising to £10 million in 1990-91" (Creissen and Ellison 1998 p29). GEST replaced this:

> "...again with management training as a priority category and with the requirement on LEAs to contribute a higher percentage of the resourcing than previously. With both these initiatives, the earmarking of funding meant that the training actually did take place with the more enlightened LEAs and schools supplementing the funding from other sources. Alterations to the GEST funding system provided for a category of 'school effectiveness' which allowed for a more varied range of activities" (*ibid.* p29).

What this analysis of the introduction of site-based HRM illustrates is that there have been three inter-related levels of change: firstly, the growth in management functions leading to either the relabeling of the practitioner's work as management and/or the appointment of people to management functions; secondly, the adoption of private sector management techniques and language such as strategic planning, and performance indicators; and, thirdly, a more fundamental ideological transformation through the reshaping of relationships, values, and the redistribution of power. It seems that formal approaches to problem identification and resolution has shifted from the workings of political processes to management systems based on quality and efficiency.

2.4 Summary

Site-based HRM has introduced changes to professional practice and there has been a shift away from the administration of the school in which matters such as timetabling and record keeping have been overlain with new tasks, new roles, and underpinned by

alternative value systems expressed with a different tone and language. Emphasis is now on the tasks of auditing, planning, monitoring and evaluating performance according to goals and values developed through a combination of site-based and externally determined processes. Roles have been relabelled as middle or senior management, and new roles have been developed in marketing, and responsibilities for whole school review. Site-based management has elevated these tasks and roles above that of pedagogy, and has reshaped welfare matters around notions of the customer and their needs. This link between changes in professional practice and the policy context is seen through the mediation of official guidance combined with implementation checks during OFSTED inspections.

The description and analysis of changes to the work and structural location of the practitioner has enabled the presentation of some interesting issues relating to the professional practice of the field member within an HEI. These issues are complex and override any simplistic notions of cause and effect connections. Researching the professional practice of field members in HEIs does provide for some interesting possibilities to be explored in relation to how they construct their work, and perhaps revealing what Ozga (1994) describes as her "personal baggage" (p231), could enable a very rich area of activity to be investigated and understood. For example, reflection and analysis amongst policy scholars within educational studies shows a conscious engagement with a project: what is and should be studied, the orientation towards that project, and the perspective taken (Ozga 1994, Seddon 1996).

Undertaking such a study within the field of education management is very challenging, not least because it relies on access to the working lives of field members in HEIs as well as their visible outputs through publications and research projects. Nevertheless, how the work of field members in HEIs interconnects with practitioners is of interest since it seems to have been very recent. For example, Poster (1976) notes how the 1956 Burnham Report "provided opportunity for the introduction into the structure (in a

school) of middle management", but he also argues that changes in schools were taking place "in the absence of any significant thinking or writing about education management" (p20). The growth since the 1970s in the logic and practice of the management imperative through public sector restructuring and HRM processes has implications for practitioners in schools and colleges in the tasks they perform and the value systems in which they operate. The rapid growth in the field of education management suggests that field members have responded to the needs of practitioners, and it is the nature and type of this response which is a central theme within this study. If practitioners have problems and concerns in how to meet the challenges of the reforms outlined in this chapter, how have field members in HEIs responded? Does the privileging of rational and masculine management systems within recent educational reforms have an impact on the type and orientation of field members located in HEIs?

The pertinence of these questions is illustrated by Hartley (1997) who argues that management theory is "situated in time and space" (p48) and is influenced by structures and culture at the time. If practitioners have welcomed the reforms and benefited from them, how have field members responded? If the funding for inservice training and courses has been available have field members bid for it? If so, what does this mean in relation to their work and the mechanisms of accountability? What happens when that funding is withdrawn or the mechanism on which it is allocated is changed? What type of pedagogy have field members used in training? How has theory been defined and used? What research projects have taken place and where have funds come from? What types of publications have field members produced? This is further complicated by the situational location of field members in HEIs: firstly, there are the requirements to engage in scholarly research and to publish, and the academy has been a stronger cultural tradition in the older universities than the polytechnics and more recent new universities; secondly, the professional practice of members of HEIs is itself a part of the restructuring of the public sector, and is itself increasingly

subjected to the demands of the management imperative (Ozga 1998). The next chapter will begin to explore these issues by presenting and investigating what we know about the way in which field members in HEIs have responded to practitioner needs from the 1960s.

Chapter 3

The development of the field of education management in England and Wales from 1960

3.1 Introduction

The research questions underpinning this study are concerned with the professional practice of the field member in an HEI within the policy context. Chapter 2 has presented a chronology of the changes in education policy from the dominance of educational administration in the post war period, through to site-based management from 1988. Change in the culture and practice of educational problem solving has brought about a different type of work for the practitioner. This is the setting in which the professional practice of the field member in an HEI can be described and explored, and it provides the context in which the field of education management has both grown and claimed its intellectual territory within higher education.

Table 3 extends the chronology established in Chapter 2 by signposting the main trends and developments in the field of education management over the three phases of change.

Table 3
Stages in the development of the field of education management in England and Wales 1944 onwards

	1944-74	1974-88	1988-onwards
Policy Context	Educational administration.	Curriculum management.	Site-based management.
Training	Experimental provision.	Pluralistic provision.	Contract provision.
Theoretical Focus	Social sciences.	Management theory.	Conceptual pluralism.
Theoretical Orientation	Seeking theory.	Experimenting and describing with theory.	Normative.
Research Focus	Policy development.	Policy evaluation.	Site-based improvement.

This framework will provide a structure for the presentation and analysis of the evidence about the growth of the field of education management as outlined in the next section of this chapter.

The intellectual resources that I have drawn on within this chapter are threefold: firstly, an extensive library based literature search; secondly, as a participant within the field of education management I am a member of BEMAS and so I am in receipt of the journal, I publish within the field, and I have recently been a member of the ESRC Seminar Series *Redefining Education Management*; thirdly, as I visited and met with the sixteen people who are a part of this study (see section 5.3.1 for a full list) they drew my attention to textbooks and research which they regarded as important, and some gave me copies of particular books or articles which illustrated their contribution to the field. This chapter is not concerned to undertake a content analysis of these texts as illustrating individual contributions to the intellectual history of the field, but to present and analyse what these texts illustrate about positions and positioning within the field.

3.2 Phases in the development of the field of education management in England and Wales

Bush (1995) provides the following definition of the purpose of the field of education management:

> "(it) is a field of study and practice concerned with the operation of educational organizations. There is no single generally accepted definition of the subject because its development has drawn heavily on several more firmly established disciplines including sociology, political science, economics and general management." (p1)

Education management focuses on what does and/or what ought to happen when management in an educational institution takes place. Practitioner training and professional development is about improving capability (Glatter 1979) in which the practitioner can use a range of concepts and models. The credibility of field members in HEIs is related to their professional craft knowledge as much as their research and theoretical interests.

The period 1944-1974 is concerned with the early development of the field in which people like George Baron and William Taylor brought interested colleagues together and connected this embryonic network with the international field. 1974 is a significant turning point for the field as it signposts the growth in the management imperative, and at the same time field members where increasingly being located in HEIs. Site-based management from 1988 has not diminished the field's interest in theory and research, but it has been marginalised with a growing entrepreneurial normative approach.

3.2.1 Educational administration 1944-1974

The origins of education management lie within what was known in England and Wales (and is still known internationally) as educational administration. The purpose of education management as a field of study and practice, and its development out of educational administration, is located in networks that began abroad through the IIP, the CCEA (later CCEAM), and at home the formation of BEAS (later BEMAS). Bell (1996) in his inaugural lecture notes the inter-relationships between field members, and especially the co-option of the next generation. Those who actively led the development of the field in England and Wales such as George Baron, William Taylor, along with Tom Bone, Ron Glatter, Eric Hoyle, Meredydd Hughes, and Len Watson, did so within a broader international network. This networking provided theorising and research opportunities to support a changing practitioner training imperative to deal with the implementation of externally driven change.

The IIP has been held every four years since 1966, and its first meeting was at various universities in the USA and Canada, and was sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation and the UCEA [1]. While international connections had been facilitated by private visits and the creation in 1963 of the *Journal of Educational Administration*, the real initiative for the IIP was William Walker of the University of New England in Australia (Culbertson 1969) [2]. The participants came from Australia, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand, and the USA, and those from England and Wales who networked

internationally in the 1960s set up BEAS in 1971, and the first chair was Eric Briault from the ILEA. In 1973 BEAS was incorporated and the original Executive Committee was replaced by a Council of Management. During the 1970s and into the 1980s the Council of Management had representatives from LEAs, Schools, and FE, but the major grouping was from HEIs and included leading names: Baron at the London Institute, Taylor in Bristol, with Bolam at Bristol, Bone at Jordanhill College of HE in Glasgow, Glatter at the London Institute, Hughes in Cardiff, and Watson at Sheffield Polytechnic. The aim of BEAS was to promote, conduct, and disseminate research into educational administration in order to support the preparation and development of those in or aspiring to administrative roles. This was done through networking at home and abroad, the production of a journal (originally known as the *Educational Administration Bulletin*, and from 1976 it was called *Educational Administration*), and an annual conference. The membership of BEAS was meant to reflect the broad appeal of the field to include teachers, headteachers, LEA officers, civil servants, as well as academics in colleges and universities.

The initial motivation for early field members to contact each other at home and then to go abroad and network with North American and Australian field leaders was intellectual. They were clearly interested in ideas and theory, and Baron and Howell's (1974) report on *The Governance and Management of Schools* is explicit about the lack of theory to underpin their study. George Baron at the London Institute, and William Taylor, at Oxford and later in Bristol, were concerned to establish and debate the meaning of educational administration. A significant text that established and describes the concerns of educational administration in the late 1960s and dominated thinking and practice through the 1970s, was Baron and Taylor's *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences* (1969). The theme of this edited collection is to explore theory and its connection to the meaning and practice of educational administration. Baron (1980) also argues that the writing of this book is also connected to claims for recognition:

> "I sought to show how the latter (i.e. *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences*) could contribute to our field of study. My thinking was very much influenced by my contacts with American and Canadian scholars and with the work of Professor William Walker in Australia; and it was motivated by the political need to legitimate the study of educational administration in the university world in this country" (p18).

The book is the product of contact with the more mature educational administration field in North America and its relevance to understanding what was required in England and Wales. Baron (1969) characterises educational administration as:

> "Viewed in the 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. Indeed, for its effective functioning an educational system must and does rely on parents performing both legally prescribed and generally understood functions. It is important to make this point, as otherwise there is a danger that 'administration' may be interpreted solely as the concern of officials of the Department of Education and Science and of officers of local education authorities. Indeed, the use of the term in England has been so limited that in popular usage it refers only to the latter category and is not applied to heads and others who are responsible for the organisation and running of the schools. Nevertheless, there is general recognition of the administrative nature of the headmaster's position, if still some unease at his being described as an administrator" (p6).

While the administrative imperative is identified (Stenhouse 1969), there is a strong link with policy processes through debates about democratic values and the cultural/traditional context in which schools and practitioners are located.

There is a clear attempt to see educational administration as a field of study and application which embraces all participants within the structure, tasks, and systems of the educational process. This manifested itself in the following trends: firstly, education is seen as an important part of the government and social process in England and Wales, and as Baron (1969) argues, "there will thus be an increasingly urgent need to review the relationships between teachers, administrators, elected representatives, parents and the general public. Policy-making, administration and teaching are tending to become ever more closely linked..." (p4); secondly, the growth of larger schools and colleges meant that there were issues to do with internal and external organisation and communication, and Baron stresses "the variety of links that they (schools and colleges) must establish with industry and other educational institutions, and their need

to explain their purposes to the wider public all underline the scope for the challenges they have to face" (*ibid.* p4); thirdly, changes in all aspects of the education world means that the administrator can no longer rely on trial and error but there is an education and training imperative, "...the necessity increasingly emerges for practice to be studied, assessed, and ultimately reduced to a form in which it can be taught to those outside the immediate situation" (*ibid.* p4); and, fourthly, developments in the social sciences means that academics from economics, political science and sociology are both interested in and are undertaking interesting research in the application of relevant concepts and methodologies.

Baron and other writers acknowledged the debt to the USA for a number of reasons, and in particular, the high status of educational administration both in the universities and in schools and colleges meant that as a field of study it had legitimacy which supported the efforts of those in England and Wales. The debt also lies with the ability to tap into the wealth of material from the USA that could be imported and utilised in the early development of the domestic field, and the main activists had an international stage on which to celebrate achievement. However, Baron is mindful of the complexity of the inter-relationship as illustrated by the theory-practice divide as an issue of relevance, purpose, and culture when he states:

> "In England much American writing on educational administration is of absorbing interest to the social scientist who is seeking avenues of approach to the study of school organisation and policy formation in this country. At its best it is charged with imaginative insights that throw new light on problems of leadership, structure and innovation. To the practitioner in England, however, writing of this kind can appear highly remote from his concerns, since the urgent needs at the moment are to translate into teachable form the managerial aspect of the headmaster's role, and to develop the mastery of administrative techniques that characterised the first stages in educational administration as a field of study in the United States. It is, therefore, of the first importance that there should be full and rapid development of short practical courses... But it is important also that awareness will develop of the wider issues that face those who are concerned with the shaping of the educational system and its institutions at a time when accepted custom has ceased to be a useful guide" (*ibid.* p12-13).

What the Baron and Taylor description and presentation of the agenda to support field development illustrates is that educational administration is seen as being: firstly, a

unified continuum in embracing national, local and school involvement in the policy process; secondly, something more than technical tools and procedures concerned with 'how to do it' but it is firmly rooted in the social sciences; and, thirdly, theory and practice must be directly connected through case study research, and effective teaching and learning through both short and long courses for practitioners. Furthermore, other writings illustrate the importance of educational administration as a field that has a sense of itself and how it is located in the ongoing policy construction and development of the education system. For example, the publication from the first IIP in 1966 (Baron *et al.* 1969) puts emphasis on developing an understanding of the historical, cultural, and structural aspects to education and educational administration in particular.

Taylor (1968) endorses the maturity in the field in North America and that the lack of interest at home in training and the preparation of headteachers was related to a number of factors: firstly, the class system in English society meant that those who held high office didn't need to be trained as they were born into it, and non-elite members who led and managed, undertook training, and experienced socialisation processes, into acceptable behaviours; secondly, the generalist approach to administration meant that specialist expertise was not allowed to develop and so administration lacked status; and, thirdly, status in education comes from being an academic rather than an administrator, and the culture prevents someone from expressing an interest in administrative matters for fear of being labelled a "power seeker". Taylor goes on to argue that changes in society meant that practitioners were working in a more complex set of relationships in which their role was being challenged and opened up to public scrutiny. Baron (1968) describes changes in schools with a shift "away from the concept of the Headmaster as possessing authority by virtue of his personal qualities, towards the Head deriving authority from professional competence and a lively understanding of the environment of which his school forms part" (p3). Interest in the

preparation of headteachers is connected to these changes, and Taylor (1968) makes a strong connection with the importance of theory:

> "When schools were relatively small, and the role of the teacher limited to providing fairly well defined competencies within an accepted framework of authority and expectation, then the possibilities for the development of specific skills and knowledge appropriate to school administration and management were minimal. The possibility of professionalising an activity is dependent upon the existence of a recognised body of knowledge and a set of skills and processes in connection with which appropriate training and induction procedures can be devised. It is a misnomer to refer, as is often done, to an individual as an 'amateur' because he has to function in an area of activity in which such knowledge and skills are undeveloped or unarticulated" (p142).

The main educational change in the 1960s and 1970s that led practitioners to seek support was comprehensivisation. Taylor (1973) argues that a larger sized school had implications for people and structure, in particular the need for more specialised departments and different types of communication systems. While educational administration had been developed as an inclusive concept, it is increasingly recognised that headteachers were uneasy at being called administrators (Baron and Taylor 1969). These changes meant that headteachers needed training, and Taylor worked with headteachers to develop in-tray exercises and simulations in which to investigate management issues and, in particular, planned change. A worry expressed at the time was the danger of too much pragmatism, and the possibility that practitioners would not see the relevance of theory (*ibid.*) [3].

In addition to establishing an administrative training imperative, field members sought entry into the HEI academy, and is clearly expressed by Bone (1992) who in reminiscing about the early days of the field describes:

> "It is a long time ago now, but I refer to it because what we wanted then, more than anything else, was to see the establishment of full length, degree level courses in educational administration all over the country. We admired and envied the position in the United States and Canada, and looked forward to the day when we would have masters' degree courses in most of our universities, and perhaps too in some of the new polytechnics which were just appearing. And we assumed, or at least I think we assumed, that when these courses had been in existence for a while, and had been taken by a fairly large number of students, a marked improvement in the practice of educational administration would follow throughout the country" (p2).

Courses were set up in the 1960s and this furthered the debate about training and the process by which practitioners are prepared for their administrative role (Glatter, 1972). Taylor (1969) is central in the development of curriculum materials for inservice programmes at Bristol, Oxford, Reading, and Sheffield. Glatter's (1972) work complemented this development and he raises the issue of the impact on the professional practice of the lecturer in an HEI, and in particular the intellectual and practical demands of drawing on a range of theory from different settings and integrating this in a meaningful way for the practitioner. It seems that the field member in an HEI was being simultaneously created and conceptualised as a generalist in drawing on the range of social sciences, and also as a trainer in the sense of working with and valuing the experience of the course member.

From the mid 1970s the traditions of educational administration became overlain with new trends in which the work of practitioners became increasingly defined and labelled as management. The field gained in status as legitimate area of activity for field members in HEIs, but this was based more on the adoption and use of management theory from outside of education than from the tradition of the social sciences. This will be explored in the next section.

3.2.2 Curriculum management 1974-1988

The period from the mid 1970s to the late 1980s is dominated by an ongoing process to establish the legitimacy of educational administration. Central to this was the establishment of postgraduate courses, the winning of research grants, and the creation of chairs, for example, 1977 Meredydd Hughes (Birmingham). The OU E321 Course *Management in Education* had by 1980 been studied by 2000 students, and 2000 copies of the unit was sold in 1980 to non-OU students (Squire 1987), and is seen as a landmark in the development of the field through the linkage made between "management theory and educational practice" (Bell 1996 p2). In 1982 Birmingham University (Hughes *et al.* 1982) reported on a survey of management training

opportunities for senior managers in schools and colleges, and identified that 58 HEIs were providing award bearing courses in educational administration and management. It went on to report that by 1980, 1600 senior teachers in schools and FE had obtained a qualification with some management within it. The growth in award bearing courses was facilitated by the identification of management training as a priority area for Heads and Senior Teachers in 1983, and the largest growth was outside the traditional university sector: 650 teachers had a qualification from university, and 420 from polytechnics and 530 from colleges. CNAA validated postgraduate courses had an emphasis on part time study for practitioners in which management projects focused on problem solving [4]. In 1983 the NDC was established at Bristol University with an emphasis on short courses [5], and research was still taking place not just to map provision but also to justify the need for training (Buckley 1985).

These developments in the professional practice of field members in HEIs were increasingly being shaped by a focus on the needs of the practitioner. The description of professional practice as a 'field' rather than a discipline is significant for field members in HEIs (Glatter 1972). As Harries-Jenkins (1984) states:

> "we are looking at a field of management studies characterised by a considerable flexibility of discipline boundaries. A major feature of this has always been the exceptional permeability of these boundaries, so that the development of research and theory in this context has long relied on the work of scholars in such established disciplines as economics, political studies, psychology, and sociology" (p215).

This echoes the writings of Baron and Taylor (1969), Bone (1982), Glatter (1972, 1979), and Hughes (1978), and gives perspective to the tensions in the development of education management as a field of application. Hughes (1978) argues that a field of application is concerned with "showing awareness and sensitivity in relation to the problems and concerns of the practitioners who provide the justification of the whole enterprise" (p10). At the same time acceptance with the academy required the field to be associated with more established and respected areas of practice, and Hughes

went on to argue that the best way to understand a field of application is by the use of an analogy with medicine:

> "Medical Science is a body of knowledge, the elements of which are drawn selectively from a number of sources on the basis of their relevance to clinical practical. These elements are derived from sub-disciplines of the natural sciences, Physics, Chemistry and Biology and also from clinical experience; the knowledge is organised about problems of practice...From such a viewpoint an understanding, co-operative relationship between a clinician and the analyst i.e. between the practitioner and the academic, is seen in all-important" (*ibid.* p10).

Within this framework the practitioner or clinician communicates with the analyst or academic on what is needed, and the analyst/academic can provide an overview and direction to the clinician/practitioner's work. In this way practitioner demand and the articulation of problems led to a response from academics in the form of courses and evaluation research.

The tension in seeking legitimacy with the academic establishment and with the practitioner in schools and colleges was played out in the 1970s in the debate over identity and labelling. While Lord Morris (1974), the Hon. President of BEAS, argues that the growth in democracy endorsed the immediacy of a creative administration, this was soon overtaken by the modernism of management. Bolam (1981) illustrates this:

> "The 1980 Annual Conference brought about a highly significant change for the Society: it has been re-named The British Educational Management and Administration Society, or BEMAS for short. The decision to change was an almost unanimous one and the reasons given were convincing. The term 'Administrator' is a reasonably familiar one to academics and to anyone with experience of North American educational systems but in a UK context it undoubtedly conjures up images of Education Department Offices, County Hall and Elizabeth House. Yet, as was argued in the Editorial in the last issue, the majority of the Society's members work in schools and for them the term management, I believe, conveys much more quickly and accurately the kinds of concerns which they hope to see stressed in the Society and in the Journal" (pi).

Early field leaders favoured the term 'administration' and Baron (1969) argues that educational administration is a function of all from Parliament to parent, and that the headteacher is an *administrator*. This is very much in line with the views of his international colleague, William Walker (1969), and both would agree with Taylor (1969) who describes the work of the educational administrator as being:

> "concerned with the acquisition, control and distribution within a social system of scarce educational resources, a term that includes status and rewards as well as buildings and books. The processes involved - decision-making, communicating, evaluating, supervising, and so on - are characteristic of administrative behaviour in organizations of all kinds and at all levels; and as such they require description, analysis, and conceptual refinement in terms of the formal and informal structures within which they operate, the procedures that they utilize, and, not least, the extent to which they are congruent with system values and goals" (p207).

Taylor argues that administrative work is undertaken by headteachers, deans and heads of department in universities and colleges, and by HMI, local authority advisers and inspectors, but there is a reluctance to be called administrators. Field leaders had been professionally socialised into seeing management as an activity which historically was connected to the lay governance of Board Schools and then primary schools (Baron and Howell 1974) [6]. However, by the early 1970s the term management was increasingly accepted as more applicable to the practitioner in England and Wales, with educational administration reserved for international networking. Management was seen as a distinct activity (Bennett, 1974), and increasingly a superior form of activity (Morgan 1979), and this was a significant break with the earlier generation. For example, Taylor (1973) argues that while a headteacher must learn to delegate and to develop management skills this should not dominate educational objectives and the primacy of children. Within a plenary session at a BEAS conference McHugh (1979) describes Baron's answer to a question on the issue:

> "In answer Professor Baron referred to the development of two traditions. Historically the term 'administration' had been used in the university sphere and the local education authorities and followed closely the patterns developed in the United States of America, Canada, and Australia. The term 'management' was much more the tradition of the British Polytechnics and Management Centres and was increasingly being used in the schools sector, particularly in relation to the role of headteachers and deputy heads. Although he felt it was important to clearly define the concepts used he saw no real benefits to be gained from trying to differentiate 'educational administration' from 'educational management' in any absolute sense. In his view there was a great degree of overlap between the two terms and the only benefits he saw for preferring the use of the term 'administration', particularly in publications, was to facilitate communication at an international level" (p44).

What these debates seem to suggest is that there was a trend for field members within HEIs to have their professional practice labelled and shaped by other field members located in schools and colleges. Headteachers were describing their professional

practice in management terms (Barry and Tye 1975, Peters 1976, Poster 1976), and the emphasis was on developing a more conscious approach to what might be done better (Richardson 1973). At a time when the purposes, standards and performance of practitioner field members in schools and colleges was coming under scrutiny and increasing central direction, these same practitioners were asking similar questions of those who were seeking to train and develop their professional skills. Within this setting 1974 is a significant year for field members in HEIs because the challenge by Greenfield provided alternative possibilities for their engagement with theoretical issues.

Greenfield's challenge began in 1974 and continued until his death in 1992, and is presented in a series of papers that were brought together with Peter Ribbins (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993). The collection achieved international acclaim and presents Greenfield's unfolding critique and his engagement with other writers such as Hodgkinson (1978) and Evers and Lakomski (1991a, 1991b). In 1974, at the Bristol session of the IIP, Greenfield gave a paper in which he put people into organisations, and challenged the reality and independence of the organisation as being both true and a truth. Greenfield raised serious questions about the value-free management of Simon (1945), and he went on to question the legitimacy of the Theory Movement in North America [7]. Greenfield's thesis is that organisations exist in the subjective phenomenology of the individual and are invented social reality:

> "The error most theorists make in thinking about organisations is to conceive them as somehow separate from life, love, sex, growth, self, conflict, accomplishment, decay, death, and chance. If we seek to understand the world as people experience it, we come to see that they take the world very much as they find it. Each lives in his own world, but he must deal in that world with others and with the worlds they live in. Organisations come into existence when we talk and act with others. We strive to communicate with these others, to touch them, to understand them and often to control them. Generalisations and metaphysical justifications that tell why things are as they are or how they might be different and better are totally irrelevant to them... People do what they have to do, what they can do, and what they want to do. They have opportunities to act, to remain silent, to maximise their pleasure or to forswear it, to prevail upon others or to submit to them. Concrete specific action is the stuff organisations are made of. In both their doing and their not doing, people make themselves and they make the social realities we call organisations" (1993 p53).

Greenfield questions the epistemological assumptions upon which North American social science was based at the time, he acknowledges the work of Hodgkinson (1978) and the importance of values in which administration is seen as a philosophical engagement rather than scientific practice. Greenfield was concerned about the technicist approach of management science within North America and its impact on the preparation of administrators, and he argues that such an approach failed to enable the professional to engage with issues to do with power, moral responsibility, and legitimacy. For Greenfield the power of the arts provides both a spiritual and humane engagement with issues which have dominated human thinking and activity for centuries:

> "I have proposed that leaders require a period of withdrawal and contemplation, that is what I would see as the role for training. Certainly there is a role in training for the provision of information, concepts and theories. But I think the most valuable form of training begins in a setting of practice, where one has to balance values against constraints - in which one has to take action within a political context. I think only somebody who has acted in that way is ready for true training in leadership. In that context I would be Platonic, not striving to make philosophers kings, but kings philosophers, or artists maybe. To make them more humane in any case, more thoughtful of their power, more aware of the values it serves or denies" (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993 p257).

The impact of Greenfield's critique of educational administration continues to resonate today (Rizvi, 1994). Within the context of North America there were some highly contentious and deeply personal attacks on Greenfield, and as Gronn (1985) shows he was on an "intellectual pilgrimage" in which he knew that he had come from the very academy that he was criticising, but he was uncertain about where he was going.

The problem that the North American field had with reflection and debate about theory and research is noted by Greenfield (1978) and in replying to a symposium of papers written in response to his 1974 IIP paper in Bristol he argues that reflection and reflexivity within the field was difficult. He recounts the response by the field as follows:

> "I have watched with surprise and fascination the furore which began with the presentation of my paper at the IIP in 1974. A Thursday, I think it was, in Bristol. People ask me if the reaction bothers me. No it doesn't. The slings and arrows of academic warfare are not unpleasant. Somewhat like St. Sebastian, I suppose, I'd rather be in pain as long as the crowd understands what the ceremony is about. But it is hard just to be written off, ignored or buried" (pp86-87).

In a more recent interview with Ribbins (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993) he recounts that in giving the paper he did not anticipate the need to engage in intellectual combat and his only aim was to engage in an intellectual debate about ideas which for him were not clearly formed or set in concrete. Furthermore, he admits his naiveté in not realising that in attempting to engage in intellectual debate he was not only attacking ideas but also the careers and reputations of those who had supported those ideas. However, he was not prepared for the inability of the field to rise above personal attacks and innuendo:

> "The paper began to be talked about in unscholarly ways. I discovered something about my field: its pettiness, its calcified and limited vision, its conventionality, its hostility to dissenting opinion, its vituperativeness" (*ibid.* p247).

Greenfield (1978) argues that his lack of an invitation to the 1978 IIP is connected to the inability of the field to engage in real debate about theory, and while there is a genuine desire to talk they do not want to be involved in "an unfortunate battle in rather poor taste which somehow demeans theory and the past glory of the field of study" (p83). He shows exasperation in being unable to get his colleagues to ask different questions, and four years on from the 1974 IIP he reveals that what he said was not new but it was to him and to his audience, and "the real value then of the IIP paper and of the symposium may be the debate itself" (*ibid.* p98).

The embryonic field within England and Wales debated Greenfield's ideas and in a symposium in the BEAS journal *Educational Administration* in 1976 (from 1981 known as *Educational Management and Administration*) writers engaged in this by exploring philosophical issues. For Harrison (1976), as a CEO, Greenfield provides a reflexive opportunity in which to challenge the corporatism located in the growth of the management imperative as illustrated in the Bains Report. Hoyle (1976) argues that Greenfield was right to foreground phenomenology but he is critical of the dismissal of systems theory because we need to also see that organisations have things in common. Within the symposium other concerns focus on the purpose of schools and

education, and Pat and John White (1976) from the London Institute of Education argue that a school must have a purpose, and a central one is to "change its pupils". This issue is taken up by Russell (1976) from Coombe Lodge who argues that understanding the world is not enough and changing it assumes ideological struggles and hence organisations are real.

This focus on the purpose of education provided potential for the field to raise some fundamental philosophical and political questions about policy direction and the identity of the educational professional. However, within the Symposium political neutrality was promoted and preferred by Bone (1976) who argues that raising questions about education without a constructive way forward just provides "ammunition for those who, in times of financial stringency, simply want to cut expenditure on education (p 13). Greenfield (1978) in his reply to the Symposium is concerned about the consequences of "the tidy minded" (p90) and the impact on the field's engagement with some very complex questions. The Greenfield debate set the tone and agenda for the 1970s and 1980s in the encouragement it gave to the field in England and Wales to develop its own intellectual agenda, but it seems to indicate a problematic role for the field member in an HEI in which debates about theory may not rest easily between the professional demands from practitioners and the drive for accountability and improved standards from Whitehall. Baron (1980) illustrates the potential impact of Greenfield on the professional practice of field members in HEIs:

> "To me, Greenfield's paper made its impact, not so much because it put forward a 'phenomenological perspective' as an alternative to 'systems theory', but rather because it was a first frontal attack on the latter and particularly on 'the emphasis which much of social science places upon quantification, more complex mathematical models, and bigger number crunchers in the shape of better and faster computers'. This explains, to me at least, why Greenfield incurred the wrath of the 'establishment' of research in educational administration within which, at Stanford, Chicago and Alberta hypothesis formulation has been a prevailing orthodoxy; it also explains the welcome accorded to his argument in Britain by academics uneasy with the formidable research apparatus of the North Americans and reluctant to acknowledge its achievements; and by practitioners happy to seize on any vindication of intuitive judgement" (pp17-18).

Interesting issues emerge here about how the field member in an HEI makes connections between Greenfield's work and their own practice. Field members at the 1974 IIP conference and afterwards witnessed at first hand what happens when a field member raises questions and what it means to be a member of a field which resolves intellectual debates through exclusion. At the same time the drive to establish the legitimacy of the field with practitioners working in a challenging policy context gave support to the development of an indigenous literature.

OU course textbooks illustrate the richness of the social sciences in describing and understanding educational organisations, but at the same time the increasing use of management theories and models transferred from non-educational settings (Houghton *et.al.* 1975, Westoby 1988). Field members continued the tradition of seeking to understand the nature of professional practice in educational institutions by using the social sciences to ask questions about roles, decision-making and the nature of organisations. Research and theorising about organisations within educational settings was growing with considerable interest in complexity and uncertainty such as the work on "organized anarchies" (Cohen and March 1989), and "loosely coupled systems" (Weick 1989). Hoyle (1982) followed in the Greenfield tradition by focusing on the relationship of people to the formal organisational structure. Hoyle argues that while we may talk the language of rationality, there is a much more interesting "darker side" to organisational life that he identifies as micropolitical activity. He argues that there is a gap between the organisation as presented in theory and research, and the organisation as we experience it, and so the implications for the field are: firstly, we must investigate our epistemological assumptions about knowledge creation and the claims that we can know through objective methodologies; and secondly, if we accept that our knowledge claims about social networks in organisations should be based on case studies of how actors see themselves and attach meaning to their context, then the emphasis is more on "theory for understanding" than "theory for improvement". This is a significant challenge for the professional practice of field members in HEIs because

while teaching about micropolitics in a Master's course might help understanding, there are ethical issues about whether this can be translated into observable skills which could be trained. Hoyle is clearly working within the Greenfield tradition of asking questions about the relationship between theory and practice, and he is quite explicit about how theory enables understanding but cannot be clearly linked to problem solving.

Bailey's (1982) reply to Hoyle is illustrative of the dilemma facing the field and he sees the intellectual debate as a problem that can be solved by promoting consensus driven processes in schools, in which informal relationships can be supportive, and the unacceptable destabilising behaviour of the "darker side" be marginalised. As the field grew in the 1980s this problem solving imperative grew, and discussions about epistemology and knowledge claims increasingly became the province of a minority of field members in HEIs. Field members drew boundaries around their work with the practitioner, and Tipton (1982) argues that while a trend towards skills training was not as advanced in the UK in the early 1980s compared with North America, she states that the field was failing to engage with the educational implications of social improvement and reform.

Bailey's (1982) reply to Hoyle (1982) raises other issues within the field in which the complexities of the social sciences are recognised as hindering the field's engagement with the practitioner (King 1984). This can be illustrated further by an examination of the publication in 1985 of *Managing Education: The system and the institution* coedited by Hughes, Ribbins, and Thomas in which there is a clear aim to intellectualise the practitioner and the study of practice within the field. The book follows the tradition of Baron and Taylor (1969), and has four sections focused on theory, policy, practice. The authors argue in favour of drawing on a range of intellectual traditions, the importance of the social sciences, and endorse Greenfield's argument about the importance of philosophy. Hinds (1986) provides a critique from the standpoint of a senior LEA officer

and he shows concern that in spite of the intended audience the book is more for students of education management than practitioners, that is, "it has little place for 'getting better as a manager by practice and by risk'.". Hinds' requests a few models "which would be potent enough to apply to all sectors and activities of the education service, (and) be simple enough for the 'manager in action' to remember...", and in reply Hughes, Ribbins, and Thomas (1986) declare that they are unable to do this by echoing the failure of the Theory Movement to provide a unified theory of organisations. The consequences of this for the field member in an HEI are that controversies about theory were being settled in discussion with practitioners in relation to their utility in a problem solving agenda. Theory was increasingly action orientated and about the skills and competences for improving performance and "the development of capability" (Glatter, 1979).

Debates about research within the field and the establishment of an agenda is presented by Baron (1979) who describes four approaches: firstly, research for understanding, which is identified as the territory of the historian and anthropologist in seeking to explain the present by reference to the past or different cultures. Baron argues that the audience for such research is regarded as other historians, anthropologists and others with a related interest who might understand and use "highly technical and esoteric language" (*ibid.* p18); secondly, policy-related research, is that which promotes a better knowledge base for policy formulation, implementation and evaluation. Baron raises concerns that this type of research is expensive, time consuming, needs a change in attitudes by academics and administrators, and the audience is relatively small; thirdly, evaluative research, which enables those engaged in policy making and administration to view what they do from different political, social, and cultural positions, especially comparative research with other countries; and, fourthly, research into administrative structure and process:

> "research concerned with the performance of administrative functions and roles, whether these be in relation to running the school, a college, a department, or a supporting service; or with the setting up and maintenance of structures for

> governing institutions and regulating their relationships with their environments" (*ibid.* p19).

While Baron acknowledges the difficulties in distinguishing between 'policy' and 'administration' he does advocate that this focus for research is the one which must be given the highest profile.

In summary, as practitioners increasingly found themselves in different organisational settings such as a comprehensive school, and within an education system that was under pressure to demonstrate its effectiveness, they sought to establish their legitimacy and competency through taking on the language and practice of management. Field members in HEIs retained the professional practice that is expected of an academic, their numbers increased, and legitimacy was increased by the award of chairs. However, as the school curriculum increasingly had to be managed, then the curriculum for inservice was also being managed by the definition of practitioner needs as management by central government policy interventions and the steering of funding. This enabled field members to work productively with practitioners in developing an understanding of organisations and their roles within them, and is characterised by Grace (1995) as "social democratic" management which "attempted to realize the notions of professional collegiality, consultative management and shared decisionmaking" (p38). Theory could be used to both problematise and increase the status of the practitioner such as Hughes (1976, 1985) analysis of the headteacher as both "leading professional" and "chief executive". Intellectual debate and a sense of being a member of a field in which there are forms of controversy had been stimulated by the Greenfield challenge to the Theory Movement of North America. Field members in HEIs in England and Wales had the opportunity to develop and build on the variety of traditions within the social sciences (Hoyle 1982, Hughes *et al.* 1985, Bush 1986), but also field members had learned that academic life and controversy could be unpleasant, and began to develop professional practice that would support problem solving for the practitioner rather than to challenge the knowledge claims underpinning those solutions. It is the latter trend that has come to dominate the field in the post

1988 period, but while those interested in debates about knowledge claims have been marginalised they have not been silenced. As Hodgkinson (1993) argues "Greenfield remains a stimulating irritant to the ranks of the professoriate. For some a burr under their saddles, for others a continuing inspiration" (pxiv).

3.2.3 Site-based management 1988-onwards

Many of those who had gathered in London in 1971 to create BEAS were no longer in the field by the time of the 1988 Education Reform Act, and a new generation of field members entered HEIs such as Bell at Liverpool John Moores, Bolam in Bristol, later at Cardiff, Bush at the Open University and later at Leicester, and, Ribbins and Thomas at Birmingham. Nevertheless there were field members who had been involved in the 1960s and 1970s and remained in post: Glatter at the London Institute and later at the Open University, Hoyle at Bristol, Hughes at Birmingham, and, Watson at Sheffield Polytechnic (later Sheffield Hallam University). The field remains male dominated, with only a few women, such as Hall and McMahon at Bristol and Ouston at the London Institute, making important contributions. Research by Lawrence (1994) shows that by the mid-1990s there were 49 universities and 4 colleges offering masters courses in education management, and a survey by the *Times Educational Supplement* (Doe 1997) reports that "more than 4,000 senior managers are spending £7 million and large amounts of their spare time on part-time degrees" in education management.

More recent leaders of the field such as Bush (1986, 1995), and Ribbins (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993) continued to be inspired by Greenfield, and debates about theory. The BEMAS journal *Educational Management and Administration* under Ribbins editorship is a place where field members are able to debate knowledge claims regarding issues of epistemology and research methodology. It is also a place where field members seek to chart and reflect on the development of the field at different intervals and anniversaries connected with BEMAS (Hughes 1997, Strain 1997). However, it is still the case that intellectual debate is more a feature of international

rather than national networking through connections with, for example, the field of educational administration in Australia as illustrated by the work of Evers and Lakomski (1991a), and Gronn (1996) [8].

The books produced to support the OU module E818 *Management in Education* (Bush 1989a, Glatter 1989, Levacic 1989, Preedy 1989, Riches and Morgan 1989) illustrate the connections with Baron and Taylor (1969) through an engagement with the social sciences (Bush 1989a), but also the increasing use of management theories in economics (Levacic 1989) and HRM (Riches and Morgan 1989). The emphasis is on the function or tasks of management in which the curriculum is to be managed (Preedy 1989). Ten years on a recent collection of four OU texts for the *Effective Leadership and Management in Education* course (within the MA Programme) (Crawford *et al.* 1997, Harris *et al.* 1997, Kydd *et al.* 1997, and Preedy *et al.* 1997) show important continuities in the development of the field through the relationship between the social sciences and management theories, and the functions of management in tension with processes. What is interesting is how this series of books is able to represent the increased specialisation within the field in which members of HEIs have positioned themselves in particular areas of interest and activity such as headship (Southworth 1997, Hall 1996, Hall 1997, Hall and Southworth 1997); and, finance and budgeting (Levacic *et al.* 1997). Furthermore, the field continues not only to draw on national and international writers, practitioners and academics, research and practice from both inside and external to education, but also from those who have located their work in connecting but alternative networks such as change, effectiveness and improvement (Harris *et al.* 1997), and policy sociology (Grace 1997). On balance field members seem to be more comfortable in associating with the ideas and strategies from those who focus on improvement and effectiveness, than with those who seek to challenge underlying knowledge claims such as gender (Hall 1996, 1997) and the policy imperatives supporting transformational leadership (Grace 1995).

Bush (1989a, 1989b, 1995) has pioneered work in the development of theory, and presents a typology of models for describing and evaluating educational management in educational institutions: Formal, Collegial, Political, Subjective, Ambiguity, and Cultural. (The latter being an addition to the original typology in 1986). What distinguishes the models are the different perspectives on: goals, organisational structure, the external environment, and leadership. Bush (1995) does not conceptualise the models as rivals but does identify that:

> "The six models presented in this book represent different ways of looking at educational institutions. They are analogous to windows, offering a view of life in schools or colleges Each screen offers valuable insights into the nature of management in education but none provides a complete picture. The six approaches are all valid analyses but their relevance varies according to the context. Each event, situation or problem may be best understood by suing one or more of these models but no organisation can be explained by using only one approach. In certain circumstances a particular model may appear to be applicable while another theory may seem more appropriate in a different setting. There is no single perspective capable of presenting a total framework for our understanding of educational institutions..." (p143).

However, the legacy of the Theory Movement is strong within the field and Bush initially reports on the work of Davis and Morgan (1983) who integrate political, collegial, formal, and ambiguity perspectives into a systemic framework in which institutional policy formulation. Bush (1995) raises the issue of context and argues that there are five "over-lapping considerations" when trying to understand the validity of the six models: size of the institution; organisational structure; time available for management; availability of resources; and the external environment. For Bush this makes a contingency approach to synthesising the six models an imperative, and rather than there being a rigid structure imposed on managers whereby they go through a sequence of processes, the focus is on the manager and their development of "conceptual pluralism" in which:

> "leaders should choose the theory most appropriate for the organisation and for the particular situation under consideration. Appreciation of the various approaches is the starting point for effective action. It provides a 'conceptual tool kit' for the manager to deploy as appropriate in addressing problems and developing strategy..." (*ibid.* p154).

This has been subjected to critique within the field (Wallace and Hall 1994, Wallace 1997) in which a single theory, or multiple use, is seen as limited compared with a "dual

metaphor" in which Wallace and Hall (1994 p23) seek an integration between political and cultural models. However, in spite of this work on the relevance of theory to practice, there is a growing entrepreneurial tradition in the professional practice of field members in some HEIs. In this sense the choosing of theory is the right not to choose it at all, or not to make it explicit. This can be linked to typologies of knowledge that separate "propositional knowledge" as being external to the practitioner from the "personal" or skills based knowledge which is developed through experience (Eraut 1998).

Grace (1995) argues that the post 1988 period is about the secularisation of management in which educational institutions are operating within the market system. Within this context education management became fully established with a strong modernising imperative through the adoption and promotion of business models, and entryism by private sector consultants disconnected from HEIs. This can be illustrated by a range of work such as Everard and Morris (1990) who define management as functional processes based on goals and the control of the individual in meeting those goals, and managing the culture is presented as the means of enabling effective change to take place (Hargreaves and Hopkins 1991). Leadership is presented as transformational (Caldwell and Spinks 1988, 1992) in which a leader re-engineers, envisions and secures the future. The emphasis has shifted from the pre-1988 period where there was an interest in describing and understanding organisations through the use of social science theories such as the work of Cohen and March (1989) and Weick (1989) to the normative prescription of process collegiality such as teams and leadership. Field members in HEIs have seen their work as being shaped by the policy context in which they present normative solutions:

> "We should make no mistake about the political nature of these developments, but a horrified throwing in of the towel is no response on the part of those who would manage the service in the interests of the pupils" (Osborne 1990 p3).

The emphasis is on how can we effectively manage within an increasingly turbulent environment, or as Osborne says later in a discussion about curriculum change:

> "It is in the quality of the management of these initiatives that success or failure lies - not in the ideas themselves" (*ibid.* p5).

Within this rapidly growing field there is a large industry providing managers with recipes for the solution to problems. Handbooks can be generic or sector specific (Aylett 1991, Barker 1991, Craig 1989, Davies *et al.* 1990, Davies and Ellison 1994, Green 1993, 1994, 1995, Marland 1986, McMahon and Bolam 1990, and Playfoot *et al.* 1989); or be more specialised: appraisal (Bollington and Bradley 1991, Mathias and Jones 1989), budgets (Davies and Ellison 1990), inspection (Ormston and Shaw 1993, 1994), the law (Adams 1993), marketing (Davies and Ellison 1991, Marland and Rogers 1991), planning (Davies and Ellison 1992, Purfitt *et al.* 1992), self management (Trotter 1993), senior management (Smith 1992), special needs (Walters 1994), teams (Bell 1992), and time (Knight 1989).

This growth in "management by ringbinder" (Halpin 1990), or "management by ticklist" (Davies 1990), presents the work of the field member in HEIs as being primarily about problem solving, and researching the policy context is "a luxury which fewer people will have had time, or perhaps the inclination, to undertake" (Osborne 1990 p1). Courses, books, and packages about management knowledge and competences present the practitioner as a better professional with open and measurable skills delivering measurable outcomes in a responsive and consumer driven way. Within these type of texts field members describe the policy context as providing a management imperative in which educational professionals are exhorted to adopt processes such as working in teams. There is very little evidence of field members discussing the knowledge claims on which these types of texts are based, or that there are controversies which remain unsettled. The long established debate about values within educational administration has been raised within the field of education management and Glatter (1987) calls "for those involved in the management of education to reassert their competence not only in implementation (essential though that is) but also to contribute, together with many other groups, to the debate about values, basic assumptions, goals and policies" (p11).

Often values seem to be treated as measurable facts to be used to test a postholder's suitability and Everard (1995) goes so far as to advocate competency statements, measurement, and accreditation for educational professionals. The fundamental issues raised by Greenfield (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993), and Hodgkinson (1978), are being discussed by field members in England and Wales (Bottery 1992, 1994, Bush 1995, Ouston 1998b), but this remains a minority interest.

This approach to knowledge production is central to understanding the research agenda in the post-1988 period, and the proceedings of the Third BEMAS Research Conference from 1988 (Saran and Trafford, 1990) shows more of an emphasis on the applicability of research than on the values debate. The collection contains reports of evaluation studies funded by the DES and MSC, but the bulk are scholarly essays focused on specific areas that survey what has been done in the area and what the agenda for further research might be. Debate about the purposes of research within the field is very limited, but what is presented is significant as it is within the tradition of debating the tension between seeking to understand and informing action. Bolam (1990) presents an overview of funded project research in staff development, management development, and appraisal, and he concludes that there is a strong government agency involvement in determining and funding projects which tend to be "aimed at providing solutions to problems rather than at theory testing" (p40). The underlying problem for the field is contained in a debate which concludes the collection between Delamont and Locke. Delamont (1990) argues that the collection of articles, although focusing on an important area of study, are limited in a number of ways: firstly, there is a lack of reflexivity in the choice and use of methods by the researchers; secondly, there is a lack of explicit method in the accounts presented; and, thirdly, there is a narrow use of methods used with surveys and questionnaires being the accepted data collection techniques. Locke's (1990) reply is to denigrate the case for what he labels as "exotic description" (p211), and to repeat an earlier argument (Pratt and Locke 1979), in favour of problem-solving. Delamont's advantage is that she is

standing outside of the field and is observing that while the field problematises management practice it is not problematising management. This is further illustrated by Saran and Trafford's (1990) conclusion in which the contributions are legitimised according to their contribution to the work and/or training of practitioners and they go onto note how the frustrations of the school effectiveness field could be solved by identifying the "practical management lessons" from the work presented. The research approach presented by Delamont is not prevalent within the field, and in England and Wales the main writer and advocate of ethnographic studies such as biography is Ribbins (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993), and abroad the work of Gronn (1996) is significant.

The field of education management has grown rapidly and in the post 1988 period the field has become more specialised. Members of HEIs can be interested in the same area of practitioner work but approach research and the role of theory in different ways (Wallace and Weindling 1997). The analysis so far shows that while field members in HEIs have similar employment contexts, and even the same professional title, they construct their professional practice in different ways. For example, for some field members debate about theory which raises controversies about power in the way that Hoyle's work did, or Greenfield's contribution to values, is essential to how they understand their work and why they seek to associate with other field members through research, debate and publication. However, there is a strong entrepreneurial trend in which field members in HEIs are presenting prescriptive strategies to enable site-based management to work. This latter trend is reinforced by the changes in the funding of inservice training in which field members in HEIs must decide whether to enter consortia with other providers to offer, for example, NPQH training or assessment. Field members have had to bid and enter contractual arrangements with the TTA to receive funding for short and long term courses, and this work will be inspected. Some HEI providers have been removed altogether from professional development through the changes in the funding arrangements (Ouston 1998a), while those who remain are

less involved in the preparation of practitioners for a management role, and instead are in receipt of practitioners who are now conceptualised as candidates for training (Ribbins 1998). The professional practice of field members is currently under pressure both from within, regarding concerns about the entrepreneurial trends, and from without, as field member location and professional practice is being disciplined by external contractual arrangements.

In 1997 an ESRC seminar series *Redefining Education Management* began and there have been four seminars led by Professors Bell, Bolam, Bush, Glatter, and Ribbins. The motivation for the commissioning of papers and key note addresses has been to investigate the current position of the field in relation to theory, practice, and training, since the 1988 Act and the growth of agencies such as the TTA [9]. In summing up the seminar series Bolam (1998), building on the work of Dale (1989) and Hoyle (1986), categorises the work of field members as falling into three "projects": firstly, a *knowledge for understanding project* using theory and research to question and to challenge; secondly, a *knowledge for action project* in which evaluation research can be used to inform practice; and, thirdly, the *interventionist project* which seeks to improve practice through training and consultancy, and while this project does not necessarily use research it can be the focus of research. The balance between these three projects and the work of field members in HEIs is complex and located in the changing professional profiles of individuals. Glatter (1997) is interested in how field members position themselves at a time when the TTA has centralised the provision of training, preparation, and the accreditation of practitioner professional development, and Bell's (1997) paper on markets and primary school management is concerned with policy questions and effective management. A paper by Cordingley (1998) presents the field member with little option other than to locate their work within the interventionist project, while papers from Power *et al.* (1997) and Fitz (1997) encourage field members to problematise the professional practice that encompasses all three projects. While the trend for the field member could be interventionist, the Seminar Series was

interested in retaining the conceptual and empirical links with the ongoing themes within the field described by Bolam's (1998) first two projects. Papers in the seminar series by Busher (1998), and Wallace (1997) were in the tradition of Baron and Taylor (1969) and Hughes *et al.* (1985); and papers by Hall (1998), and, McMahon (1998), focused on the issues of pedagogy in the tradition of Taylor (1968, 1969). A significant contribution is Simkins (1998) who argues that rather than see theory as a range of conceptual possibilities for the practitioner, we should see theory as a contested domain which field members take positions on: descriptive or normative, bureaucratic or collegiality. For Simkins trying to make sense of the burgeoning literature produced within the field over the last thirty years is about identifying the ongoing themes of power (in the tradition of Hoyle 1982) and values (in the tradition of Greenfield in Greenfield and Ribbins 1993) which structure the positions taken by field members.

Bush (1997) began the series by asking if the field is in crisis or at a crossroads, and Bolam's (1998) typology enables us to see that the professional practice of field members in HEIs can be described and understood, and the crossroads is related to the direction the field will go in. The vast array of work produced by field members, of which a small sample has been presented in this chapter, means that there are patterns which have emerged within it. The typology presented in Table 3 is underpinned by ongoing struggles over the meaning of: firstly, values: what are we doing, what ought we to be doing, and why should we be doing it? and, secondly, power: what are the formal and informal structural factors which support and challenge what we do and how we understand what we do? Increasingly field members in the 1990s are focusing on leadership and the same issues of values and power are being played out in the debates about whether the field is educational management and/or educational leadership [10]. Understanding the historical location of the continuities and shifts in these debates requires a thematic approach and this is the focus on the next section on the historiography of the field.

3.3 The field of education management and historiography

The three periods of change within the field enables shifts in the professional practice of field members to be signposted, but following on from Dale's (1989) concerns about the framework which I have reproduced in Table 1, this type of analysis can mask the ongoing themes and continuities. This section of the chapter will present a historiography of the field as a way of underpinning the framework in Table 3 with a deeper and richer analysis of how field members see and develop their professional purposes and practices.

Historiography by those involved in the field of education management remains a marginal activity; but its central theme is that of the growth of the management imperative. It can be identified as being of the following types:

- **Celebratory**;
- **Review**;
- **Agenda setting**, and
- **Positional**.

While these types of historiography are not mutually exclusive (agenda setting seems to pervade the professional practice of field members) there are examples that show the particular nature and type of approach.

3.3.1 Celebratory

The early field leaders regard that they were "late arrivals" (Hughes 1978) to a field which in North America and Australia was more established, and so there is a tendency, at different stages, to focus on achievements. For example, Bush (1995):

> "As the subject became established as an academic discipline in its own right, its theorists and practitioners began to develop alternative models based on their observation of, and experience in, schools and colleges. By the mid-1990s the main theories, featured in this book, have either been developed in the educational context or have been adapted from industrial models to meet the specific requirements of schools and colleges. Education management has progressed from being a new field dependent upon ideas developed in other settings to become an established discipline with its own theories and some empirical data testing their validity in education" (p6).

Celebration is through the telling of stories of the early pioneers of the first courses for educational administrators, the establishment of BEAS in 1971, and those who went out and made connections abroad (Bone 1982, 1992, Hughes 1974, 1978). The management imperative is celebrated as being established as an essential professional competence, and evidence of this achievement in the status of education management is the support of the Government (Hughes 1974), the growth of practitioner demand and support for courses, and the increased networking via national and international conferences and support groups (Bone, 1982, Hughes, 1974, 1978, Watson and Garrett, 1994).

3.3.2 Review

Review approaches tend to be the opportunity for those working and writing in the field of education management to engage in stocktaking, and try to put a rationale or framework on the developments. Such historiography tends to be in the form of articles that preface bibliographies in an attempt to understand what education management is and what it is becoming, for example, Howell (1978). In reviewing the field, Harris-Jenkins (1985) presents 473 references to education management writings (1985), which he (1984) classifies as falling into one of four categories:

- The Comparative Approach in which management in educational institutions is compared for similarities and relevance with industrial and commercial practice.
- The Organisational Approach in which models and concepts from organisation theory such as structure, leadership, and roles are discussed in relation to educational institutions.
- The Managerial Approach in which managerial approaches and techniques are identified as being increasingly separate from policy studies, but recognises the potential for reintegration through the common aim of organisational effectiveness.
- The Environmental Approach in which education management sees the educational institution within a social and economic environment through the application of systems theory.

This categorisation also contains commentary in which Harris-Jenkins (1984) argues that traditionally the Comparative and Organisational approaches have dominated the

literature, but increasingly Management is dominating research, and in the future he identifies the Environmental approach as the growth area. This type of scholarly research into the field with analysis through the creation of stocktaking taxonomies is rare, and is part of the field's concern about how it engages the practitioner with the future without having a sense of its own past. This is particularly evident in the dominance of **Agenda setting** in which there is an obligation on education management writers to extrapolate what it is that education managers need to be thinking about as a part of their management and personal development agenda (Bell 1991, Dennison 1988, Glatter 1987, Hughes and Ribbins 1980).

3.3.3 Positional

Positional approaches are where writers and researchers in the field focus on purpose and by doing this they draw boundaries around their work and make associations with other like-minded people. It is within this context that observations can be made about how field members make claims for significance, decide what is and is not controversial, and work within networks to debate knowledge claims. There are three areas that illustrate the positions taken by field members: firstly, an orientation towards practitioner issues and concerns; secondly, how theory developed in non-educational settings is understood; and, thirdly, how field members relate their work to that of other networks such as education policy sociology.

(i) Practitioner orientation

A stable feature of the purpose of the field is the importance of the practitioner in educational institutions. Increasingly, that focus has become sharper on the practitioner in the school, and the earlier considerations of field members within central and local administration has become a minority interest.

A brief overview of the literature on teacher appraisal shows two trends for field members in HEIs: firstly, working with practitioners in reviewing practice and policy implementation. This can either be directly involved within the project (Copley and

Thomas 1995, Elliott 1991, Hopkins *et al.* 1991, Montgomery 1985) through to being respondents in case studies and surveys (Barber *et al.* 1995, Hattersley 1995, Hellawell 1990a, 1990b, 1993, James and Newman 1985, James and McKenzie 1986, Metcalfe 1994, Kyriacou 1995, Turner and Clift 1988, Wragg *et al.* 1996). A second trend is where field members in higher education have presented analysis and commentary on an aspect of appraisal (Day 1988, 1989, Fidler 1994, 1995a, 1995b, Stenning and Stenning 1984). The role of the practitioner is central to the thoughts and aims of the writer in either considering the relevance of theory to practice (Bollington *et al.* 1990) or about the distillation of experience of working with practitioners by presenting the most appropriate strategies for the effective implementation of appraisal (Jones 1993).

The complexity of these networks is further understood by the fluidity in the professional location of many of the writers and researchers. Some practitioners work not only in a professional context within a school, but also work simultaneously in higher education and inservice training (Bunnell 1987). In addition to this there are numerous examples of teachers and senior managers in all sectors who have moved into higher education (Bennett *et al.* 1992). The nature of appraisal is such that it facilitates and encourages an integrated network of support and development with teachers working with LEA advisers and trainers. The growth of CPD through short courses and postgraduate accreditation opportunities in the 1980s and into the 1990s has forged links between practitioners and higher education lecturers and dissertation supervisors. The closeness of the higher education lecturer to the practitioner enables legitimacy in which the practitioner gains status by the external agent (for example, postgraduate accreditation), and the external agent retains his/her recent and relevant experience connected with the 'real world' of practice.

Field members in HEIs have supported the management imperative through appraisal systems (Routledge and Dennison 1990), and have taken up positions on how

appraisal can and should be made to work [11]. What is significant about all the writing by field members in HEIs is that the direct connection with the classroom is tenuous. While writers are clear that a purpose of appraisal ought to be an improvement in learning outcomes (Fidler and Cooper 1988, Jones 1993), the connection between the introduction of a management process and pedagogy remains at the level of rhetoric. Research evidence (Power *et al.* 1997, Whitty *et al.* 1997) is showing that operating in the market place "personalizes the responsibility" (Whitty *et al.* 1997 p63) for educational outcomes, and this suggests that field members in HEIs will face continued pressures from practitioners to provide even more management prescriptions. The dilemma for field members is that the opportunities to practice their professional interests through training and research has grow rapidly with the policy emphasis on the institution (Simkins 1998), but in trying to position themselves as distinct from policy scholars, field members are claiming that the focus on improvement has more validity than critical evaluation (Glatter 1998). However, Whitty *et al.* (1997) show that studies about the impact of site-based management may have found practitioner support for management activities and roles, but there is growing evidence of practitioners being "differentially privileged" (p57) in which there is a growing gap between those who have power and those who are managed (Smyth 1995b). Using theory in a normative way to inform practitioners about what they ought to do means that field members cannot critically evaluate these changes, and as Bush (1997) argues the current preference for collegiality may not be helpful for practitioners as it does not enable them to describe and understand the realities of practice.

(ii) Alternative management settings

Field members in HEIs have focused on debates about educational institutions and their similarity or difference to other organisations, and the transferability and application of theory developed in alternative settings. It is interesting that in surveying the literature it is those external to education who make the strongest case for 'similarity' or 'convergence' between education management and other settings. Squire

(1987) from the location of a business school provides a critique of how education is responding to the development of the management imperative. His argument is based on a critique of the growing field and its misinterpretation of management theory, for example, MBO, and how educational institutions could and should benefit from the authentic and accurate management theory. Squire (1987) takes a deficit view of education in which the practitioner is seen as engaging in resistance based on ignorance of the true potential of management theory:

> "Having listened carefully to a plain statement of MBO theory, an experienced grammar school deputy head responded, in 1980, 'I was appalled'. Appalled, she explained, not by the theory per se but by the grossness of the proposition that it could and should be applied to education. There was, she continued, too startling an incongruity between the overt positiveness of MBO and the occult uncertainties of the learning process. Most of this very able lady's apprehensions yielded in the event to the 10 hours of argument, explanations, discussion, demonstration and reflection which appear to represent the learning time for MBO in the education service, but her reservations are entitled to examination" (p10).

Squire critiques Glatter's (1972) concerns about MBO as failing to be aware of how education needs to develop through the use of management theory. The position taken by field members before the 1988 Education Reform Act, tended to argue that "education institutions are different" (Glatter 1972) or "a special case" (Howell 1978). Field members are concerned about claims for generalisability between different types of organisations (Al-Khalifa 1986), and Harris-Jenkins (1984) identifies variables that make educational institutions different: such as the uniqueness of educational goals, and the difficulties in measuring outputs. Al-Khalifa (1986) raises serious questions about the research and motives upon which the case for generalisability is made, and she sees a connection between Mintzberg (1973) developing generic management roles as a means of standardising training. Al-Khalifa (1986) goes on to raise doubts because "what is missing from these comparisons is an account of the organizational life of the school and the significance of this for managerial work." (p231)

Before 1988 writers like Glatter (1972), Howell (1978), Harries-Jenkins (1984), and Al-Khalifa (1988) present arguments that educational institutions have significant

differences. Baron and Howell (1974) argue that: "there is no easy way out. It seems to me that we cannot construct the study of educational administration from 'borrowings' and that there is no substitute for the painstaking study of how educational systems and institutions work" (p6). Debating the relationship between the field and theory developed within other settings has traditionally been endemic within the field, and it needs to be seen in relation to the strong fight to establish the validity of education management. As Bone (1982) recalls:

> "The view that education was different from industry and commerce was one that was held quite naturally by those whose main experience had been in teaching, and it was to play a vital part in the development of educational administration studies in Britain, for in the formative period of the late 1960s it would have been perfectly possible for the education profession, which knew little about management training, to have turned to the schools of business and industrial management which did. It could have been accepted that the process of management was much the same no matter where it occurred, and so educational administrators could have been trained alongside managers in industry, commerce, and other public services, drawing on the same theory and research findings, with only some variations according to different established practices. But this did not happen" (p35).

More recently Bottery (1992) shows how business management has been used, and his central thesis is that transferability must recognise and not compromise teacher professionalism. In this context, Bush (1998) is concerned about the direct policy intervention by the TTA in promoting "best practice" from the private sector in the preparation and professional development of aspiring and serving headteachers. However, in spite of this field members in England and Wales have sought legitimacy in their work either through citing or using business models such as Peters and Waterman (1982), or by using models of school management that have been developed elsewhere but are primary based on business concepts and values such as *Collaborative School Management* developed by Caldwell and Spinks (1988, 1992, 1998). It could be that conceptual pluralism not only makes the choice of which theory an optional issue but also the choice of whether to use or make explicit theoretical concepts.

(iii) Field Boundaries

A third area within Positional approaches is to consider how field members in HEIs see their professional practice compared with other field networks in educational studies. Glatter (1979) analysed the relationship between management studies and policy studies, and he argues that the distinction between policy and management studies could be seen as: firstly, policy studies is, "the relationships of power, influence and control between the various bodies and groups of participants within the education system, and the way in which these relationships affect the policy process in the many areas of policy with which education is concerned" (p27); secondly, management studies is, "the internal operation of educational institutions, and also with their relationships with their environments, that is, the communities in which they are set, and with the governing structures to which they are formally responsible" (*ibid.* p27). For Glatter both are concerned with a pattern of relationships but the division is one of convenience rather than conceptual: the macro focus on the education system as a whole is the concern of policy studies, and the micro focus of the particular school/institution(s) is the concern of management studies. Glatter goes on to argue that both policy and management studies draw from the same disciplines, and the social science concepts used in macro level studies can also be used in micro studies, and vice versa. Viewed from the 1990s this continuum seems to have fractured with reflections about the purpose and practice of field members being analysed and critically evaluated by those outside of the field. The main location of this type of work is in the education policy sociology network. As Ozga (1992) argues:

> "Most striking, and most significant, is the absence of any reflection within these texts on the origins and dimensions of the field of study they seek to expound. The impression that this is an area of teaching, research and publication without a sense of itself, of its intellectual origins and characteristics, is very strong. An this is a very significant absence, as self-consciousness in the subject area might generate self-criticism" (p279).

Ball's (1995) response has been to locate these trends within the broader field of educational studies in order to enhance the identity of education policy sociology: firstly, *Policy Scholarship* in which practice and policy implementation are set within a

theoretical context which make such study an intellectual experience rather than just a technical event. Secondly, *Policy Science* or engineering, which is defined as a "set of procedures which enables one to determine the technically best course of action to adopt in order to implement a decision or achieve a goal" and the job of the policy scientist is to look at the options, and identify the best one in order to achieve an effective and efficient way forward; the role of the social sciences is to provide the technical answers to the identified problems. Thirdly, *Policy Entrepreneurship* in which the intention is:

> "not to research practices, but to change them into the image of policy. It rests on the proselytising and, in some cases, the sale of 'technically correct answers'. The entrepreneur's interests, in terms of identity and career, are bound up directly and immediately, rather than once removed, as in the case of policy science and critical social science, with the success of their dissemination" (p265).

The challenge from education policy sociology is focused around knowledge claims, and ultimately the location of the field of education management within higher education. Ball argues that the flourishing of policy science, and policy entrepreneurship means that the "academy is tamed" (*ibid.* p259) in which there has been a repositioning in the relationship between the teaching, and research, within higher education and the state. Ball's thesis is that educational studies has a problem in that "they are both too open to other discourses and not open enough" (*ibid.* p256). The 'closed' nature of education management is in its focus on an attempted merger between management and organisation theory to describe and evaluate the impact of educational change on practitioners and schools, but it can be seen as drawing boundaries which limit questions about the effect of those changes on practitioners.

There has been a struggle for recognition between the macro and micro perspectives as identified by Glatter (1979), and he is concerned that the struggle for legitimacy is about ensuring that education management should not be the poor relation. Equally policy sociologists have declared the vulnerability of their work within the current policy context (Ozga 1987), and the issue has been raised about whether it is just a branch of

education sociology (Halpin, 1994). Raab (1994) argues that those who take political science seriously gain more recognition from the study of economic and foreign policy than they do from education policy. Moreover, the importance of practitioner interest which is central to education management is endorsed by Angus (1994) and in replying to Ozga's (1992) critique of the field of education management he argues:

> "I cannot stress too strongly that, despite the general dismissal of such texts by sociologists of education, their influence in the arena of educational practice is profound. Social critics need to understand and appreciate that these books address very real problems as experienced by school administrators, their staffs and their school communities. That is why the texts are popular and publishers are happy to produce a stream of them. To the extent that they engage with and offer solutions to what participants perceive to be practical problems, they cannot be dismissed out of hand. Indeed, they are likely to be seen as more relevant to practice than sociological analysis. That is why it is important for people working in the sociology of education to continue to apply their analyses in ways that engage with the day-to-day work of practitioners. Recent work in policy sociology... has been able to take this direction without sacrificing theoretical cogency" (pp80-81).

Education policy sociology has its roots in the response of social scientists to the new policy context brought about by Thatcherite education policies in the 1980s and 1990s.

Ball (1992) argues for the need to "promote theoretical debate and development in relation to policy analysis" (p493) and such an approach has been described by Ozga (1987) as being "rooted in the social science tradition, historically informed and drawing on qualitative and illuminative techniques" (p14). As a network those who would position themselves within policy sociology not only engage in a project but also debate the nature and purpose of that project through papers and publications. Writing, theory, and argument are challenged, and this field has engaged in lively debates about the relationship between the state and policy development with conflicting views between pluralist and neo-marxist interpretations and theoretical analysis (Bowe *et al.* 1992, Dale 1989, Gewirtz and Ozga 1990). Within this debate is the ongoing development and attempts to define what the field is about, its location and identity within educational studies (Hatcher and Troyna, 1994, Ball 1994a). It seems that research must enable the specific context or phenomenon to be seen within the broad context of the state and the macro perspective. If not then the research is criticised in the way that

managerialist studies are, such as Ozga's (1990) "Comment" to the article by Halpin and Fitz (1990) on their research into grant maintained schools. It seems that intellectual identity is about how different clusters of members of HEIs discuss and debate theory, and Fitz (1997) argues that the problem for the field of education management is that it doesn't have an "ology" in which it is underpinned by social theory. Equal opportunities is an interesting example to illustrate the point, as the field of education management has only recently engaged in issues of gender (Ouston 1993, Hall 1996); it remains a minority interest and the field seems to be gender blind. Engaging with social theory or an "ology" would open up the focus on practitioner problem solving and organisational improvement to a different set of questions regarding power and the relationship between the organisation and social injustice (Smyth 1993). However, the problem for policy sociology is that its members do not seek to establish their credentials through having a practitioner background, and so have difficulties with debates about relevance and the responsibilities associated with taking action.

It seems that boundaries are drawn both by field members and by members of alternative fields which denote the prime focus of activity. For the field of education management the work of the policy sociologists demonstrates an unwillingness to deal with the realities of practice and a desire not to get their hands dirty. For the policy sociologists, the field of education management is too concerned with making the realities of government directed practice work without a broader understanding of the historical and policy structures. Exploring these claims would be an interesting but alternative study, suffice to note that perhaps the fracture in Glatter's (1979) continuum in the form of different groups is about struggles over identity and labelling. There is a complex networking of educational professionals beneath the staking of a claim for affiliation and recognition, and there is evidence of crossing borders in relation to theory and the place of publication (Bottery 1994, Simkins 1998). Greenfield (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993) has a message for all involved, and central to his own reflexive

biography is that "thinking yourself out of a paradigm" is painful as ideas evolve over time and identity is transformed.

3.4 Summary

This chapter has been concerned with presenting a chronological account of the development of the field of education management from the post war period, but mainly focusing on the work of Baron and Taylor from the 1960s onwards. Table 4 presents a summary of how we might best understand the purpose of the field as it has grown and developed from the 1960s:

Table 4
The purpose of the field of education management in England and Wales 1944 onwards

	1944-74	1974-88	1988-onwards
Policy Context	Educational administration.	Curriculum management.	Site-based management.
Purpose	System development.	Problem solving.	Improvement.
Practitioner	Administrator.	Manager.	Leader.
Boundaries	Continuum.	Fractured continuum.	Networking.

It is evident from the analysis presented in this chapter that a consistent focus for the field has been the practitioner. In the period prior to 1974 the professional practice of field members was to establish practitioner understanding of their administrative role in order to support their work within an increasingly complex and changing context. Leading field members sought to establish the legitimacy of the field within HEIs but saw their work as a part of a continuum which embraced macro and micro concerns. Field members were inspired by the theoretical maturity of the North American field, but aimed to locate practice within the social sciences to enable a pluralistic approach rather than a single theory. The period from the mid 1970s to the mid 1980s was one of growth and development in which field members in HEIs continued to work with practitioners in which experimentation with social science theory was a feature, but increasingly management theory was being used to support prescription. The increasing demands on the practitioner reshaped the education management

curriculum, in which a problem solving approach remains as a significant feature within the field in the post 1988 period. Historical analysis suggests that the policy focus on the organisation, that ultimately led to site-based management, fractured the continuum between those who sought to work with practitioners in the development of institutional policy, and those who positioned their work to critically evaluate the restructuring of the state. In the post-1988 period members of the field of education management have continued to focus on the practitioner and the organisation in which the person and the process has shifted from that of manager-management to leader-leadership.

Field members network with other fields and there is some cross border traffic in the use the literature, which journals a field member publishes in, and conference attendance. However, members of the field of education management have a central interest in conceptualising the practitioner in relation to organisational development, and this makes them more likely to associate with improvement, and effectiveness networks than with policy sociology. It seems that current debates about the connection between the management of adults with teaching and learning, central intervention in professional development and training, and what 'best practice' is for educational development, will more likely be debated and resolved with those who seek to label their work as improvement and/or effectiveness. Boundaries are drawn and the importance of the recent seminar series *Redefining Educational Management* has been in enabling the field to see the intellectual territory it occupies through what Bolam (1998) has described as the three projects: to seek understanding through research and theory; to enable action informed by research; to bring about improvement through interventions. It seems from the analysis so far that those who locate their professional practice within the field have created and have taken up positions in one or more of these projects. These positions may have been stable over time or may have shifted, these positions may have been more about exploring work and activity that interests the individual or clusters, or may be the result of responding to policy interventions in the work of practitioners and increasingly in the work of field members in HEIs.

Investigating the research questions which this study is focused on has revealed some interesting and important aspects in the development of the field, and the use of a chronology has structured a description and analysis of the inter-relationship between the individual field member in an HEI and the policy context in which their professional practice is shaped and reshaped. However, while the analysis so far has shown that the field inhabits a particular territory, what has not yet been explored are questions about how knowledge is produced and used within a field. This is the focus of Chapter 4 and this type of sociological analysis seeks to provide a conceptual framework for furthering understanding about how field members locate their professional practice between the policy context and the practitioner. This is will lead on in Chapter 5 to the presentation of a research design which will enable the study to move from reporting on the work of field members to enabling their voices to be heard in Chapter 6. The gathering of professional life stories from sixteen members of the field will enable a connection to be made between the outcomes of their work in the form of publications and provision as presented in this chapter, with their stories about professional positioning which underpins this work.

Chapter 4

An intellectual history of the field of education management

4.1 Introduction

In the previous two chapters I have used an educational policy framework to structure a chronology of the development of the field of education management. The professional practice of field members in HEIs shows both change and continuity in the post-1988 period compared with those who initiated the study and practice of educational administration from the 1960s. Amongst the changes is the rise in the number of field members in HEIs, the current field member is overtly working with management theory, their work has become more specialised, and their work has become more structured by the market demands of practitioners, and central government agencies. However, there are some important themes which early field members would recognise and they remain central to the identity of field members. These are concerned with: firstly, the prime focus on the work of the practitioner and the problem solving imperative; secondly, an emphasis on the relevance of theory to practice and the practitioner; thirdly, the transferability of theory from non-educational settings; fourthly, the process and purpose of pedagogy, and how the HE lecturer is conceptualised.

These themes raise questions about what it means to be a member of a field and how controversies arise, are debated and resolved. For example, why has management theory come to be used and accepted? Why have the social sciences been marginalised in the professional practice of many field members? Why have postgraduate courses in education management been designed and validated within HEIs? Why have field members devised bids in collaboration with people in private sector institutions to run training programmes for practitioners? These types of questions extend the possibilities for understanding the development of the field because they locate the themes within broader debates about knowledge, power, and production: how is knowledge constructed? How is knowledge organised? What purpose is attributed to knowledge? What does it mean to be involved in knowledge

production? Why is certain knowledge located in HEIs and how do alternative knowledge claims come to be accepted within this structure? The purpose of this chapter is to explore these questions by firstly engaging with the sociology of knowledge before going to explore knowledge production as intellectual work.

4.2 Developing a sociology of knowledge

The development of this study from a chronological account and analysis into a sociological investigation enables the production of knowledge to be foregrounded. The emphasis is not so much on the product of knowledge in the form of a fact or a theory, as the process of production that is "a selection and organization from the available knowledge at a particular time which involves conscious or unconscious choices", and Young (1971b) goes on to argue the purpose of a sociology of education is:

> "to relate these principles of selection and organization that underly curricula to their institutional and interactional setting in schools and classrooms and to wider social structure" (p24).

This problematises knowledge rather than accepts it as a given, and it sees knowledge production as connected to structural factors such as class, and to construction factors such as pedagogic processes. It enables the connection between facts and values to be made visible, and establishes that "the political positions of knowers are significant factors in the construction of knowledge" (Griffiths 1998 p52). In this sense seeking to understand the production of knowledge requires a description of structural power and dominant elite groups, combined with an analysis of the processes of transmission and learning. Lukes's (1974) work is important here in its critique of pluralist or liberal definitions of knowledge in which observable conflicts within decision-making systems are seen as privileging behaviourist explanations without due accord to the how and why of an "exercise of power" (p55). For the purposes of this study, this approach opens up the possibility of exploring the relationship between the professional practice of a field member in an HEI with the power structures within their organisational location.

A useful starting point is to focus on how knowledge is organised. Knowledge is defined and controlled through disciplines which Bernstein (1971) argues "means accepting a given selection, organization, pacing and timing of knowledge realized in the pedagogic frame" (p57). Young (1991b) argues that we are socialised into a specialised subject discipline in which learning is a "private property" for the individual to achieve and be rewarded for. Individuals are presented with what is "high-status knowledge" which is defined as:

> "literacy, or an emphasis on written as opposed to oral presentation; individualism (or avoidance of group work or co-operativeness, which focuses on how academic work is assessed and is a characteristic of both the 'process' of knowing and the way the 'product' is presented; abstractness of the knowledge and its structuring and compartmentalizing independently of the knowledge of the learner; finally and linked to the former is what I have called the unrelatedness of academic curricula, which refers to the extent to which they are 'at odds' with daily life and common experience" (p38).

Alternative knowledge that puts emphasis on the relevance of theory to practice, and on learning through talk and group activity is low status (Young 1998). Young (1971a) argues that there is an explicit relationship between elite groups and how knowledge is organised; knowledge is stratified in the sense that the value of knowing one thing rather than another is linked to power structures which determine what is to be known, and what it is worthwhile knowing. The transmission of this knowledge is controlled through access to learning in a particular institution, the structure of the curriculum within that institution, and the power relations which structure pedagogy. The purpose of knowledge is to control what is known and when it is to be known, and the rewards for knowing are limited to an elite.

Curriculum change and the entry of an alternative way of knowing into the school or the HEI is linked to power relationships, and change will or will not happen dependent on how elite groups perceive the type and level of challenge to their values and power base (Young 1971a, 1971b, 1998). For example, Bernstein (1971) observes an ongoing shift from what he terms "collection codes" where knowledge is highly organised through strong subject boundaries and hierarchies, and "integrated codes"

where boundaries are open, and the emphasis is on "ways of knowing" through group learning. Changes in the school curriculum and post-compulsory education which grew from the 1970s and 1980s are illustrative of an integrationist trend, and Bernstein goes on to argue that this is not only related to technological changes and the perceived requirement for different types of skills within the economy, but also a more deeper crisis within the power structures which had hitherto maintained control. Challenges to the social structure in the post war period are connected with the demands to destratify knowledge hierarchies, and the drive towards equity through systemic changes such as comprehensivisation from the 1960s and ROSLA in 1973 put pressures on the curriculum and raised issues of relevance to children and to the economy. Central to this debate are philosophical questions and Hirst (1974) makes a distinction between "forms" of knowledge and "fields" of knowledge. Forms of knowledge or disciplines are concerned with knowing the world, compared with fields of knowledge that are action orientated. Forms of knowledge have central concepts forming a logical structure, with techniques and skills, and "distinctive expressions which are testable against experience" (p44). In contrast a field or "organisations" of knowledge:

> "are not concerned, as the disciplines are, to validate any one logically distinct form of expression. They are not concerned with developing a particular structuring of experience. They are held together simply by their subject matter, drawing on all forms of knowledge that can contribute to them" (*ibid*. p46).

Engineering and medicine as fields are dependent on foundation knowledge from the natural sciences; and, education is a field based on the social sciences. What this type of debate about knowledge illustrates is a challenge to the stratification of knowledge, but at the same time it is illustrative of the context in which it was located. As Young (1998) argues any attempt to destratify knowledge, that is, question current knowledge production, and to restratify, that is, to accept alternative understandings of knowledge, is very complex. While the Hirstian argument that knowledge organised as a field drawing on the disciplines is very attractive to integrationist and action orientated pedagogy, it should not be based on simplistic cause and effect connections between power structures and education. On the one hand working within traditional hierarchical

knowledge structures does give access to a discipline that provides theory to explain. On the other hand, as education is essentially a practical activity there is the potential to theorise from practice. Both can contribute to new knowledge and understandings about the world through the interrelationship between theory and practice (Young 1998).

Any changes to what is regarded as knowledge which is worth knowing is related to the economic and power structures in society. Bourdieu (1971) argues that the contextual setting in which questions, issues and solutions are raised and worked through is historically located:

> "what is a 'topical question' largely depends on what is socially considered as such; there is, at every period in every society, a hierarchy of legitimate objects for study, all the more compelling for there being no need to define it explicitly, since it is, as it were, lodged in the instruments of thought that individuals receive during their intellectual training" (p195).

This perspective enables the connection with power and social structures to be made, and how a dominant elite enables knowing to be a power process. However, while the connection between power structures and knowledge production is central to marxist interpretations (Poulantzas 1978), the post-structuralist writer Foucault (1972) argues that historical change is a product of a more complex process or discourse [1]. Discourse is presented as being about what can be said and thought, and who can speak, when, and with what authority. Meaning comes from power relations, there are exclusions and inclusions, claims are made, and positions taken. Finally, discourse is complex and dense, and is about how the world is seen and understood, and the assumptions that structure what can and cannot be said. There are sites in which a right to speak is known and understood, and education can be identified as a site of discourse development. In this sense a teacher or lecturer does not create, develop, communicate, and transmit knowledge separate from context, and practice is linked to issues of power, status, recognition, and value judgements about worth and validity.

Gramsci's (1973) contribution to the development of marxist thought is to connect domination by the state (political society) with hegemonic control through culture (civil society). Gramsci sees knowledge production as more than a link between an economic base and a social infrastructure, and his work gives recognition to the importance of culture in which struggle is about classes using different ideas. This is clearly illustrated by feminist critiques and interpretations of knowledge production, and Gramsci's work has informed post-positivist research methodologies as aiming not just to understand what is known, but also to challenge and to transform (Lather 1986). In this sense it is argued that emancipatory knowledge is 'not a thing' but a very powerful notion in which:

> "...it does no more than give form to a particular kind of democratic aspiration to engage in changing the world as well as interpreting it. It offers an embryonic, local form of connecting research with social, educational and political action in complex practical circumstances. In this, it is similar to the aspiration sloganised by the environmental movement in the words 'think globally, act locally'" (Kemmis 1991 pp60-61).

This is a different type of change process which is based on a fundamental challenge to the certainty of progress and the dominance of rational method and scientific logic. Feminist critiques have challenged modernity and the binary nature of knowledge, for example, rational/irrational, subject/object, nature/culture etc. In the dichotomies presented the male is associated with what is seen as superior and is privileged as being rational, subject, and culture, while the female is located at the antithesis and is subordinated (Skeggs 1997, Stanley and Wise 1993).

This debate about knowledge enables the knowledge claims of field members to be investigated from a critical and sociologically informed perspective [2]. A sociology of knowledge makes visible the endurance of power structures through "steering at a distance" (Ball 1993). If knowledge is connected to power in the arguments presented, for example, by Foucault and Gramsci, then this has implications for understanding the professional practice of field members and their work with practitioners. Is the emphasis on the practitioner and the importance of developing management capability

through action and reflection a part of the power structures to enable the practitioner to be domesticated into forms of practice which are about control? Is the acceptance of this practice as a legitimate area for knowledge workers in an HEI another part of this process of control? If the knowledge worker identifies with a field rather than a discipline is this actually about using conceptual pluralism to describe and understand practice, or is it separating the knowledge worker from debates about epistemology which facilitate challenge and critique practice? Engaging with these types of questions requires an investigation of the actual sites of knowledge production. Throughout this section particular people's work has been used to support and challenge ideas and theoretical approaches regarding knowledge, but the context in which that work has been produced remains to be investigated. The individual academic as a knowledge worker, and the HEI as a site of knowledge production are problematic, and this is directly connected with macro-micro issues or what Young (1998) describes as "the sites of policy and practice where educational ideas become and often fail to become practical realities" (p47). The next section will investigate the construction of knowledge workers as intellectuals, and the nature of intellectual work.

4.3 Developing a sociology of intellectual work

Historically and culturally intellectual activity is regarded as a minority occupation and one which has elitist tendencies, and there is a tendency to talk about intellectuals and the qualities of their intellectualism. This section will begin by looking at how knowledge workers are conceptualised as intellectuals before going on to look at knowledge work located in HEIs.

4.3.1. Intellectuals and intellectualism

Attempts to define the knowledge worker as having some special characteristics which make him (it is usually a him) an intellectual is difficult, and as Molnar (1961) argues it is often contradictory. The term intellectual can be dated to the time of the Dreyfus affair when artists and writers were labelled by the right-wing, but whether intellectuals have a political as well as a thinking role is a matter of dispute (Maclean *et al.* 1990) [3]. The intellectual can be seen as someone who devotes their life to cerebral activity:

> "By 'an intellectual' I mean here to refer to anyone who takes a committed interest in the validity and truth of ideas for their own sake, i.e. for the sake of their truth and validity rather than for that of their causal relationships to whatever other ends" (Montefiore 1990 p201).

In undertaking this knowledge work the intellectual accepts the knowledge traditions which he inherits and is a part of, and this is evident in how ideas are connected with the past through discussions about knowledge and the citation of authors. Furthermore, as Shils (1990 p258) argues the purposes of intellectual work and an understanding of what is regarded as an acceptable standard is symbolically transmitted to new a generation who "have grown up" within the traditions, and learn where and how to locate their work and ideas. Kuhn (1975) has been central in raising questions about how knowledge is "gained, accepted, and assimilated" (p9), and he argues that knowledge is not objective but is located within epistemic communities. Kuhn's observation of scientists led him to argue that knowledge production and knowledge change focused around paradigm maintenance and paradigm shifts. In his 1969 *Postscript* he revisits the concept of paradigm and presents a definition focusing on epistemic communities:

> "A paradigm is what the members of a scientific community share, and, conversely, a scientific community consists of men who share a paradigm" (*ibid.* p176).

What this scientific community "share" are a number of connections related to professional identity, such as: being the practitioners of a scientific speciality, absorbing the same technical literature, membership of professional societies; reading the same journals, and the use of citations. In addition to this there is a "tacit knowledge" that

comes from the doing of science and in being trained in the rules and assumptions of the paradigm. This is a special community which is well defined and is the arbiter of professional achievement:

> "The group's members, as individuals and by virtue of their shared training and experience must be seen as the sole possessors of the rules of the game or of some equivalent basis for unequivocal judgements. To doubt that they shared some such basis for evaluations would be to admit the existence of incompatible standards of scientific achievement. That admission would inevitably raise the question whether truth in the sciences can be one" (*ibid.* p168).

The paradigm which the group all share is labelled by Kuhn (1975) as "normal science" which are "universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners". In other words how experiments are designed, operationalised, interpreted, and reported on is based on agreed and accepted assumptions about the world and how it can be known. A paradigm shift takes place not just when things do not go to plan and the lack of a neat and tidy solution becomes obvious, but when the epistemic community accepts the new way of thinking, seeing, and defining the world. Such changes are incremental and are rarely the product of one person. The most important aspect is how these changes are disseminated in journals and eventually reach the lay person through their impact on teaching and textbooks: "what were ducks in the scientist's world before the revolution are rabbits afterwards" (*ibid.* p111). Such paradigm shifts enable progress to take place and "carry scientists and those who learn from them closer and closer to the truth" (*ibid.* p170).

The link between intellectual work and practice is a concern, and Shils (1990) argues that very few presidents and emperors have been intellectuals, and those who succeed to high office tend to leave behind, sometimes forever, their intellectual activities. However, while there is a tendency to focus on the individual intellectual or epistemic communities through a celebration of their ideas, the conceptualisation of a knowledge worker as an alienated or distanced thinker has been challenged (Lemert 1991). Molnar (1961) describes this position as follows:

> "An intellectual cannot be measured by his mental powers, insights, and creativity alone. It is, rather, the social milieu of which he is a part, and the nature of his relationship to this milieu, that determine his role and status as an intellectual. In order to speak of 'intellectuals', therefore, those who belong to this category must possess some degree of common consciousness of their role, their place in society, their relationship to those who are in power and to those who seek it. In short, the intellectuals form a *class* not by virtue of their organization, but to the extent that they have similar aspirations and influence, and a chance to be heard" (p9).

In this sense how an intellectual understands and acts out their role in society has increasingly become a focus within the literature [4], and Maclean *et al. (*1990) present a debate about the political responsibility of intellectuals and the relationship between ideas and how they are interpreted and used. Martindale (1987) talks about the social role of intellectuals, who along with others who are given 'a role' in society, have responsibilities and hence rewards. He relates this social role to structures in which an intellectual may not have an overtly lead role in society, such as being the president, but is still able to wield considerable power. Typologies of intellectuals have been developed and Martin (1987) argues that a criterion to distinguish one intellectual from another is whether their role is to legitimise the status quo or to critique it. What is interesting here for Martindale (1987) are the questions which this raises about who an intellectual serves and where do those who become intellectuals come from? In this sense the contextual setting in which intellectuals are located assumes importance, and so structural and historical analysis are helpful. Popeil and Mohan (1987) argue that the growth in intellectuals and intellectualism in both numbers and role is related to their place in the drive towards modernity and the challenge to the church's monopoly on knowledge and definitions of truth. They draw on the work of Karl Mannheim to argue that the rise of the intellectual is connected with structural social changes:

> "There are no intellectuals in societies other than recent ones, strictly speaking...The bourgeoisie needed such men of ideas freely competing in the intellectual market by virtue of the assumption it held so dearly that free competition ensures rationalization, and by virtue of its (the bourgeoisie's) mechanism of progress of which it was thought to be the chosen instrument" (p34).

The separation of intellectual from manual work is a central feature of the organisation of capitalist states (Poulantzas 1978), and intellectuals are regarded by marxists as being social based and serving particular interests. Gramsci (1971) is important here

as he conceptualised intellectuals as being essentially concerned with material issues rather than the lofty concerns of the truth, and hence his work is important in the location of the intellectual between structures of power and the actual workings of the education system (Swingewood 1987, Brym 1987). "Traditional intellectuals" (Gramsci 1971 p9) are historically located and enduring with privileges and dominance over society, but face challenge from organic intellectuals who are produced from the workings of a new social class as it grows and develops. Change takes place through a social group developing its organic intellectuals as a means of achieving an "assimilation and conquest" of traditional intellectuals (p10). What seems to be of interest in this analysis for this study is the importance of the social formation of organic intellectuals, their social location, mobility, and their preparation through the workings of education systems.

National structural and cultural factors have been identified as having a mediating impact to produce varied social roles of intellectuals in different countries. Popeil and Mohan (1987) argue that while the bourgeoisie needed intellectuals to legitimise challenges to feudalism, it remained ambivalent. Whereas in France intellectuals have a strong sense of worldliness and feel free to comment on practice, in America intellectuals have been marginalised. In Britain, the endurance of the Establishment has meant that intellectuals outside this sphere have tended to be understood as alienated from the realities of life:

> "In Britain intellectual activity is tolerable only on two grounds: firstly, as an ornamental activity of a gentleman, a way of adorning his leisure hours and ennobling and fortifying his general posture, or second, if devoted to professional ends, as serving accepted utility values. The affair of Anthony Blunt showed how easily the Establishment forgives even the most harmful actions motivated by intellectual consideration if they are committed by a gentleman. They are regarded, as it were, as an extension of his eccentricities, and in the estimation of his own king they are absorbed in the general acceptability of his character and breeding. According to that code no gentleman can be a cad even if he acts like one. The attitude of the middle classes is more severe. The intellectual is an outsider with an aura of elitism about him, and suspect as to his attitudes on questions of public interest. There is no doubt that in England an invidious sentiment intensifies the middle class attitude. Intellectualism, on the whole, has been identified with the upper classes" (p38) [5].

Locating the intellectual within an historical and social context both problematises the role of the intellectual and makes sustaining that role problematic. For Molnar (1961) intellectuals are in decline because they have shifted their role from philosophical to ideological concerns, and in pursuing collective goals intellectuals have left behind the pursuit of knowledge related to social realities. Furthermore, the technology of communication increasingly means that intellectuals no longer have control over ideas, and Maclean (1987) talks about the growth in "theatocracy" where what is said is less important than who says it. Within a consumer driven 'ideas' market intellectual work may no longer be guaranteed by privilege and is now promoted on the basis of political and pragmatic means (Pels 1995). Intellectual work is by its very nature political because it is about values, ideas, and theory, and there has been a shift in the identity of the intellectual which is characterised by Pels as being from the grand idea to the specific, and he describes the situation for intellectuals as follows:

> "While intellectuals have for centuries stood rather close to God, they have lately come down in the world in the footsteps of their former employer. They are less magisterial and solemn than they used to be. In the postmodern and post-Marxist West, intellectuals have massively renounced their exalted position as guardians of universally grounded values and truths, or as spokesmen for classes that they first endowed with a solemn historical mission. They no longer claim an exquisite calling, an obligatory normative identity, or a special accountability for the whole. Shorn of its rationalistic paraphernalia and missionary ideology, the intellectual profession reveals itself to be as beautiful and ugly as all other occupations, and vulnerable to the temptations that wait upon all forms of professional specialization" (p79).

This connects with arguments that knowledge work is not only located in the especial work of an elite caste, and that we should stop talking about intellectuals and instead talk about intellectual work. Montefiore (1990) argues that if intellectuals have responsibility, then "everyone has in a sense to recognize himself or herself as bearing some small share of this responsibility. This may be taken as tantamount to arguing, somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, that everyone must be considered, to some small extent at least, to have something of the intellectual in them" (pp201-202). The hesitancy in this statement is perhaps warranted as Montefiore's co-editor informs the reader that this widening of the scope of intellectual is "no more than an innocent eccentricity" (Winch 1990 p13). However, Connell (1983) argues that we need to stand

outside of the traditional power structures which have created and sustained intellectual work as an elite activity and see it instead as a labour process. In this sense intellectual work undertaken by those in society who are not structurally or socially regarded as intellectuals is made visible (Gramsci 1971). Connell (1983) goes on to argue that intellectual work is a job in which there is equipment (pen, and paper), manual activity (writing), and abstract activity (thinking). Intellectual work can go wrong and be involved in systems of oppression, or it can lead to enlightenment and understanding. This challenges the Foucauldian argument about direct connections between knowledge and power:

> "The more immediately active power is in an intellectual labour process, and the more dominant interests shape the criteria of intellectual work and evaluate the products, then the more likely the product is to be composed of lies...Truth is merely one of the possibilities. Whether or not it is treated as a preferred outcome depends on the social context and organisation of the work" (*ibid.* p239).

For Connell this raises the question: what are the conditions in which intellectual work takes place? This context is the inter-relationship between policy, the institutional setting, and professional practice, and the danger for Connell is that hierarchical relationships about the validity of different types of knowledge work will undermine both the school and the HEI as sites of knowledge production. In particular he is concerned about credentialism and how the award of credit supports problem solving but denies the possibilities of intellectual challenge. Intellectual work is facing contradictions, it cannot be both radical and stabilising at the same time, and the issue for knowledge workers in HEIs is that "administering the credentialling system, is quite plainly constructing, operating and extending a new system of authority. We are shoring up a structure of power and privilege which is legitimated by our own claims to knowledge" (*ibid.* p251).

This analysis takes the research questions a stage further by asking about how a knowledge worker in an HEI both constructs their own identity and has it constructed for them by the institutional and social context in which they are located (Ozga 1998). A

field member is a part of an elite group which is economically, and socially advantaged by their occupational location within an HEI. Field members engage in intellectual work such as research and publication which is exclusive, and gives them legitimacy to speak through oral and written texts regarding practitioner professional concerns. It has been argued (Higher Education Review, 1995) that "an academic is committed to the advancement of learning even (especially) where its use is not immediately evident. The discipline, too, is a 'client'" (p4), and so the field member within an HEI has a responsibility which may not meet current demands to be fit for purpose. However, the analysis in Chapter 3 suggests a strong field member orientation towards the practitioner and this would support the conceptualisation of intellectual work in its broadest sense in which collaborations in teaching, research and publication are inclusive. Bolam's (1998) identification of field member's work as falling not just into the category of knowledge for understanding, but also for action, suggests that the field member in an HEI would not see their role as a part of an other worldly elite. In this sense, if knowledge is about seeking improvements then cerebral work will continue but it will not be in Connell's (1983) terms *intellectual work* as the purpose of problem solving is to enable rather than to challenge.

This sociology of intellectual work has enabled the relationship between knowledge, power and professional practice to be investigated, and it leads the analysis to an exploration of the site of knowledge production and how field members relate to the contextual setting of an HEI.

4.3.2 HEIs as sites of intellectual work

The context in which knowledge workers in HEIs undertake their work has been and continues to be conceptualised differently. The professional practice of members of HEIs has been the focus of research by Becher (1989), who like Kuhn (1975), is interested in knowledge communities, but he broadens out his focus to consider the relationship between disciplines and professional identity:

> "...the ways in which particular groups of academics organize their professional lives are intimately related to the intellectual tasks on which they are engaged" (p1).

Becher has developed knowledge domains in which there are different tasks to be performed and he argues that they are evident in the creation, evolution and reproduction of tribes of academics and the territories they inhabit [6]. Knowledge production within the HEI is about how territories are marked by the spatial characteristics of which parts of the campus you visit, through to stereotyping of disciplines, and how new entrants are inducted into professional attitudes and values. The academic within the academy is conceptualised as pursuing recognition as a means of power and this is displayed in rituals and values to do with citation, the pecking order of departments, and the formal and information communication [7]. Becher's work enables recognition of how different knowledge claims relate to the knowledge communities which surround disciplines, however the "wider context" is relegated to a concluding chapter in which Becher shows that government and agency interventions in knowledge development through, for example, investment and research grants is causing "epistemic drift" (*ibid.* p137). Regulation is increasingly through externally driven agendas for problem solution rather than through academic peer group recognition and control. The weakness in Becher's analysis is that it does not locate the professional practice of "academic tribes" and the "territories" they inhabit to questions about the "structures of privilege and power relations as a condition of knowledge production" (Skeggs 1997 p20). This is essential at a time when the HEI as a site of knowledge production is under strain, and as Alderman (1996) has shown the older universities have been increasingly subjected to quality audit procedures, and the growth of the polytechnics from the 1960s had a different approach to the professional practice of staff, in which they were not the "agents for the preservation and transmission of the intellectual and cultural values of society... they were supposed to prepare students for the world of work" (p180). With the end of the binary divide from 1992, the new universities continued to be heavily managerial and this culture has been promoted in the older universities through the HEFCE quality assessment

procedures. The growth of management and the impact on the professional practice of academics in HEIs has been charted and analysed (Dearlove 1992, Halsey 1992, Ozga 1998, Smyth 1995a), and Miller (1995) argues that while academics "may retain quite high degrees of technical control, they can be seen to be losing 'ideological' control of their work" (p57). This is more than a change in language, such as, from student to customer, but a reorientation of the purposes of higher education as a provider of skilled labour supported by the adoption of corporate management structures and systems.

Recently, Davies (1997) argues that the portrayal of universities as sites of radicalism is a construction by Thatcherism as a means by which to discipline the academy. The 'looney left' in the HEI "pushing out poison to the students" (*ibid.* p1) had long been recognised as an exaggeration, and in fact, intellectual endeavour had been neutralised by the structural and cultural conservatism of the academy:

> "Academics have particular intellectual responsibilities, but they might be expected to bring a critical perspective to their work and to be free to critically engage with the wider society. Yet the nature of the university and that of academic culture itself stand against the realisation of these aims... universities were not pristine institutions engaged in neutral tasks as some have claimed. The university system was embedded in the structures of a profoundly unequal society. Universities excluded the majority and were deeply implicated in the reproduction of social hierarchies. In short, universities were inherently conservative institutions but they operated through the medium of liberal ideology. As a result, the academic community was expected to draw a sharp boundary between itself and the conflict-ridden society beyond the university walls. Consequently, left-leaning academics faced enormous obstacles to being political. However, as demonstrated above, the existence of these pressures is not a sufficient explanation by itself for the general absence of politicisation. For, academics brought with them to their workplace their professional aspirations and the prejudices of their class. Both of these influences drove academics towards a voluntary accommodation with institutional power" (*ibid.* pp13-14).

This analysis enables the HEI as a site of knowledge production and the power structures which have become known as 'the academy' to be problematised. For the HEI members who locate their work within the field of education management the dilemma is in how they draw intellectual boundaries relative to other networks present in their own and other HEIs, such as educational effectiveness, educational improvement, and education policy sociology. However, this type of analysis on its own

is limited and the policy context in which HEIs are located has had a significant impact on professional practice as teaching and research have come under scrutiny through cuts in funding and the introduction of HRM. Furthermore, the HEI as a site of knowledge production has been challenged because it separates the production from the use of knowledge (Young 1998), and increasingly research is moving to places of implementation. For the knowledge worker in the field of education management the contradictory location of their professional practice is evident and does question the security of their location within an HEI. At its simplest level the demands of the academy within the HEI are for publications and research, while the demands for the manager within the HEI are for income generation. How are field members in HEIs responding: to changes in contractual conditions affecting their own and their colleagues' employment? To increased central government agency control over the professional development of teachers? To the channelling of funds through contractual bidding systems with the TTA and OFSTED? To the inspection of their work by OFSTED? To attractive alternative employment locations (with higher salaries) such as school or LEA based practice, or freelance consultancy?

The dilemmas facing field workers in HEIs are not new to the 1990s, and are evident in other fields. Work by Hammersley (1996), Whitty (1985), and Young (1998) on the rise and fall of the sociology of education is interesting in how it shows the complexities in the location of knowledge workers in HEIs in responding to their own intellectual interests but within a particular policy context. Commentators argue that the growth in the sociology of education from the 1960s is connected with the expansion of education and the arguments about the importance of disciplinary knowledge in the preparation of teachers (Hammersley 1996, Young 1998). However, by the 1990s the sociology of education in the form of courses and publications had seriously declined, though Hammersley (1996) argues that sociological work continues to be a feature of educational research and teaching: "...the sociology of education no longer represents a well-defined and well-integrated field of study. Research by sociologists has become

dispersed across a wide range of areas and has been internally fragmented into competing approaches having little contact with each other" (pp398-399). The reasons given for these changes are partly structural and are linked to the policy context in which successive Thatcherite governments questioned and then reformed the preparation and inservice training of teachers by removing the social sciences in favour of more competence based training. Within this context the intellectual terrain inhabited by those who located their professional practice within the sociology of education has been challenged. Young (1998) argues that we can label the positions adopted by sociologists of education as either "intellectualist" who focused on the discipline, and "politicist" who focused on the impact of research on practice:

> "In the 1970s they tended to adopt an intellectualist rather than a politicist stance to their research. In other words, the priority was on winning battles within the sociology of education as a sub-discipline rather than on the broader political implications of their analyses. This *intellectualist* stance that privileged *sociological* questions was important at the time, especially for those working in the Education Departments of universities, where the intellectual culture was often highly prescriptive and framed by unquestioned assumptions about education as a 'good'. There is little doubt, however, that such debates limited the broader role of sociology of education in contributing to debates about policy and practice" (pp175-176).

Whitty (1985) notes that this retreat to the academy saw the abandonment of what he calls "the Fabian policy-oriented tradition of the Halsey-Floud era" (p169) in favour of intellectual arguments about the curriculum and educating the teacher into the goals of social justice. Deem (1996) argues that the significance in the change, or a "policy turn", was in the shift from narrating policy developments to a more theoretically informed and critical stance taken towards a highly politicised and large volume of policy and legislation from the 1980s onwards (Deem *et al.* 1995).

The growth and decline in the sociology of education, but the endurance of sociological enquiry, raises issues about how knowledge workers in HEIs are able to make their own choices regarding their professional practice or the extent to which those choices are made for them. Furthermore, while knowledge workers may seek to take either an *intellectualist* or a *politicist* stance, there is also evidence that they are not mutually

exclusive, and there may be a difference between how an activity (whether intellectualist or politicist) is labelled and how it is conducted (Hammersley 1996). As I have shown in Chapters 2 and 3 the field of education management has secured a place within HEIs for its knowledge workers, and from the 1960s those field members have both experienced and observed the changes to and within the sociology of education. This raises some interesting questions: where do field members come from? What is regarded as a legitimate claim for worthiness to be employed within an HEI? What is the disciplinary background of field members and how does it relate to professional practice? Is an analysis of knowledge workers through a description of positioning, that may or may not change over time, a useful way of understanding the professional choices and identities of field members? What enables the networking of members of HEIs into clusters of people who are interested in similar questions and issues? Is the positioning of someone within a particular area of activity an intellectual and/or a political approach, and is this typology helpful? What is the relationship between the labelling of professional practice and the activities undertaken? These types of questions require empirical investigation, and the next chapter will describe a methodological framework in which this work can take place.

4.4 Summary

The analysis presented in this chapter has been concerned with exploring knowledge production and its connections with structure and power. Furthermore, an investigation into the role of the intellectual as a mediator between power and knowledge has enabled the structural location of intellectual work within an HEI to be problematised. This has extended the possibilities for engaging with the research questions of this study: firstly, developing an analysis based on the sociology of knowledge enables the professional practice of field members in HEIs to be seen in relation to the organisation and control of knowledge production, and how this is connected to dominant group interests and values; and, secondly, extending the analysis based on a sociology of intellectual work raises issues about the structural location of knowledge workers and

the HEI as a site of knowledge production. There are contradictions here which are concerned with the relationship between the knowledge worker being positioned by structural determinants such as the financing of research, and the positioning by the knowledge worker as an agent of their own research and teaching interests. The complexity of this approach is illustrated when knowledge workers give glimpses into how they understand and handle these dilemmas. Skeggs (1997) states the following about her own work:

> "Researchers are located and positioned in many different ways: history, nation, gender, sexuality, class, race, age, and so on. We are located in the economic, social and cultural relations which we study. These positions inform our access to institutional organizations such as education and employment. They also inform access to discourses and positions of conceivability, what we can envisage and what we perceive to be possible. Representations also circumscribe the subject positions which we occupy. For instance, through reading numerous accounts (representations) of feminist research I have learnt what it means to be a feminist researcher and position myself accordingly. This positioning process is not without contradiction. Researchers are positioned within institutions, by history, by disciplinary practices, by dominant paradigms, in theoretical fashions, in genre style, by funding arrangements, and so on. All these positionings impact upon what research we do, when and how we do it. However, there is no straightforward correspondence between our circumstances and how we think: we are positioned in but not determined by our locations" (p18).

Who or what is shaping the professional choices and positions of field members is directly related to the research questions raised in Chapter 1 about the individual field member and the policy context in which they and their work is located. Furthermore, the connection between these questions and my own biography raises interesting issues about what it means to be a part of the field which I am researching, and how I have experienced and been explicit about the positioning process.

The chronological framework developed and utilised in Chapters 2 and 3 enables the shifts and continuities within the development of the field to be mapped, and in particular the developing knowledge claims through approaches to research, theory and pedagogy as being focused on practitioner interests to be analysed. Chapter 4 has been about using the research questions to ask connected sociological questions about knowledge, knowledge workers and the sites of knowledge production. The

focus on knowledge production enables the following question to be asked: in what ways is the production and organisation of knowledge within a field related to dominant group interests and values? Asking this type of question enables the professional practice of field members to be related to systems of control. Nevertheless, on its own this type of analysis is one-dimensional, and the chronology in Chapters 2 and 3 illustrates the importance of individual agency in both seeking employment and that of others within HEIs, and in establishing an HEI as a legitimate site for knowledge production both about and in collaboration with practitioners. The creation and development of formal and informal networks of knowledge workers in HEIs at home and abroad is illustrative both of an academic elite separate from the world of the practitioner who they purport to work on behalf of, but also an integration with that world through an emphasis on intellectual work in which the practitioner is actively involved through the identification of learning needs, processes, and accreditation.

The focus on intellectual work and the interaction between the field member located in an HEI with the field member located in a practitioner setting enables the following questions to be asked: has the focus on practitioner interests and problems been at the expense of a responsibility to epistemology? Has the intellectual work of the field member in an HEI been more about communicating knowledge to make education policy work rather than to produce theoretical insights to support critical understanding and alternative models of effective management practice? Asking these types of question reveals the goal of establishing the legitimacy of the field within an HEI to be understood as contradictory. It challenges the power status of the disciplines and hierarchical teaching methodologies by claims to be a field which seeks to integrate the production of knowledge with the use of that knowledge. However, it could be that not only does it undermine its own legitimacy to be located within an HEI, but also it disconnects from the essential nature of intellectual work to challenge and to comment on the world. The inter-relationship between the choices and actions of the knowledge worker and the determinants of knowledge production can be investigated at a deeper

level by considering the location within an HEI as a site of knowledge production. The dilemma for the field member seems to be in how they meet the requirements of the academy to produce scholarly defined knowledge and at the same time work within management systems which requires knowledge to be packaged in measurable formats for the RAE, and income generation activities such as modularised courses and consultancies. As I have illustrated by using the rise and decline of the sociology of education, members of HEIs can take up positions in relation to their work, they can change those positions, and can seek to present the purposes of their work under different labels.

Designing and undertaking an investigation to explore these sociological questions within an intellectual history of the field of education management requires a qualitative approach, and so Chapter 5 will be concerned with presenting a rationale for a research design to collect the professional biographies of field members located in HEIs from the 1960s onwards. Chapter 6 will present a descriptive analysis of these biographies, before going on in Chapter 7 will to present and theorise the data by using Bourdieu's sociology of practice.

Chapter 5

Research design

5.1 Introduction

This study is concerned with the knowledge claims of the field of education management in England and Wales and the research questions presented in Chapter 1 focus on the individual field member located in an HEI. These types of questions are concerned with seeking to understand the working life of the field member through describing their professional practice within a particular institutional location. A connected series of questions concerning the relationship between the professional practice of the field member in an HEI and the policy context in which educational aims and processes are being determined is also presented as relevant to this study. So far the study has taken these questions forward by using a chronological framework to both describe the development of education policy and to chart both the entry of field members into HEIs and how their practice has developed. The study then moved on to use a sociological approach in which conceptualising field members as knowledge producers enabled a broader range of possible questions to be asked about the link between power and knowledge.

Professional biographical life stories have been gathered from sixteen selected members of HEIs who are or have been located within the field in the last thirty years, and from written documentary evidence from BEAS/BEMAS. The oral evidence is from semi-structured interviews and the respondents present their understanding of the development of the field education management, and how they have positioned their work within it, and how they see the relationship between their professional practice and the changing policy context. I have explored career choices; what ideas are important and useful to them; who they network with and which alliances have been formed and re-formed; the actions taken and what the person regards as significant or not about these choices. This approach enables the study to investigate the knowledge claims of the field and how those within it promote and demote different trends.

Within this context an intellectual history is not so much a linear history of ideas and knowledge claims of and about the field, but the problematisation of the intellectual positions taken by field participants. Capturing, describing, and understanding this complex and dynamic activity requires an integration of theory and empirical work. This will enable Bourdieu's sociological theory of practice in Chapter 7 to show the relationship between theory and data. As Skeggs (1997) states:

> "Methodology is itself theory. It is a theory of methods which informs a range of issues from who to study, how to study, which institutional practices to adopt (such as interpretative practices), how to write and which knowledge to use. These decisions locate any knowledge product within disciplinary practices and enable and constrain engagement with other theoretical and political debates" (p17).

This chapter begins by presenting the design of the study in which oral and written texts are described, before going on to explain the process of data gathering and analysis.

5.2 Designing an intellectual history of the field of education management

In approaching a study of knowledge workers located within HEIs I have drawn on the work of researchers who have focused on researching small groups, often called elites, who are able to exercise power and influence. Field members in HEIs are a professional elite in which they have, and continue to provide, intellectual leadership for practitioners in schools and colleges. The description and analysis of the development of the field in Chapter 3 illustrates that the working lives of field members have the characteristics of a professional and academic elite role, and the exercise of power and influence can be seen through a range of activities. Firstly, the development of accredited postgraduate provision such as the creation, shaping, validation, and revalidation of both full and part time postgraduate courses for practitioners; secondly, the attraction of research degree students to departments from both a national and international market; thirdly, the award of research grants for work within educational institutions and with educational practitioners, and the contribution to knowledge and management practice through publications in articles, books, and papers; fourthly, the

development of networks bringing together practitioners and researchers through organisations such as BEMAS, and the development of international networks (CCEAM) with research, publications, and conferencing in North America, Australia, Europe, and the Commonwealth (IIP). In this sense the professional practice of field members in HEIs meets the criteria presented by Moyser and Wagstaffe (1987) in which field member work is specialised, and differentiated.

The exercise of power and influence as an elite group is very complex, and while Chapter 2 presents evidence of considerable power in the entry of field members into HEIs and the establishment of the field as a legitimate area of study, there is also evidence of a field that would resist any attempt to be labelled or characterised as being remote from practitioners in schools and colleges. Moyser and Wagstaffe argue that there are ambiguities in how we attempt to define or characterise an elite, and it is not only simplistic to talk about horizontal separation as a structurally separate caste but also in a vertical way or what they call the "depth" of the elite; they ask the question: "at what point, definitionally speaking, does the top give way to the middle, or the bottom?" (*ibid.* p10). The type and amount of integration between field members in HEIs and practitioners raises even more questions because both are public sector workers and perhaps stratification is based less on economic criteria and bureaucratic role, and more on cultural distinctiveness in which rewards for field members in HEIs are linked to particular titles and academic credentials. In this sense field members in HEIs are less of a professional *elite* and may be better described as professional peers, in which authority based on structural location is less significant than the exercise of power (Lukes 1974) and influence through institutional location.

Seeking data collection through oral and written texts required access to, and the co-operation of, field members in HEIs who are a professional elite in the sense that they are both structurally senior to me. In this sense I am researching "upwards" (Walford 1994 p2), but at the same time my own and their professional practice are integrated

through research, publications, and national and international networks. In approaching this work I was very mindful about how I saw these people. Firstly, all but three of the sample are professors and have the recognition and consecration from within the field and the academy. Secondly, while two of the interviewees had retired at the time, and three more have retired since, the rest are still active, and I am bound to continue to work with them in other contexts, at conferences, or even face them across an interview desk at some future stage in my career development. Thirdly, they are all well experienced in research methodology and they may accept or reject the epistemological assumptions underpinning my work. In approaching males (all but 3) who are older than me and have been in the field longer and are structurally further up the hierarchy, then I recognised the importance of territory and the setting. What is on the walls in relation to mementoes from international conferences, or the books on the shelves say a lot about the person's location within the academic community. I approached these encounters by recognising that human interactions are not neutral processes and can be best investigated through what Bourdieu (1990) calls "social magic" in which there are people with similar dispositions developed under similar social conditions who have specific stakes and interests.

Further reflection enabled me to engage in a different reflection on my own role: firstly, by reviewing what is public about these people in relation to their publications and through tracing their careers it became evident that their professional biographies followed a similar pattern to my own: teaching and management within an educational institution, postgraduate study, and an appointment into higher education. Secondly, no one else is doing the work which I have undertaken and these people are speaking with me about their biographies within a formal setting for the first time. There is perhaps a vulnerability amongst the interviewees because I am defining who is and is not important in the story by the selection of the sample. Acknowledging the interview process as a dynamic strategy rather than purely a power structure enables the study

to be seen as an investigation with a professional elite who are also my professional peers.

This study could have taken a life history approach which is the history of a single life (Amos Hatch and Wisniewski 1995), and could either be from birth onwards, or as O'Donnoghue and Dimmock (1997) show could be "topical" and have a selective focus. It would have been exciting and possible to take one of the members of the field of education management and to build their life history through in depth "conversations" (Woods 1985), but also interviewing others in the field about their work, and using other stories gathered from documents and life events. However this study is concerned with moving beyond the single life history to identifying patterns and trends in the intellectual development of the field.

I have drawn on the growing literature on oral history that has challenged the primacy of traditional documentary methodologies (Perks and Thomson 1998). Oral history is often presented as a second class method to the objectivity and authority of documentary sources (Wachel, 1990), and it's validity is often conceptualised in relation to positivist criteria. Burgess (1982) notes that questions have been raised about the representativeness of people, reliability as a witness, and problem of accuracy of memory. In addition to this Seldon and Pappworth (1983) identify the variables affecting the neutrality and objectivity of oral history, and the points they raise are rooted within the context of control reminiscent of the experimental laboratory. The criticisms of oral history tend to be the ones prevalent in all critiques of qualitative research and especially interview processes in which the role of the researcher is problematic and must be neutralised rather than seen as a resource within a very complex human process. Within this study any conceptualisation of oral history as being marginal to the authentic work of the historian could mean that the richness of the story is underestimated and so the link between history and the social sciences is lost. The emphasis within this study is on situate voices, there is a range of literature

which promotes and debates the argument that "stories are particularly suited as the linguistic form in which human experience as lived can be expressed" (Polkinghorne 1995 p7). The knowledge claims are that stories give us access to the traces of human experience of events and processes, and enables understanding of identity, meaning, and disposition. It enables a recognition of not just the intellectual engagement with lived experience but also the emotional aspect to living in a complex world.

Polkinghorne describes the importance of stories in which the narrative recognises the complexity of agency through events, sequences, discontinuities, chance, and motivations within an context. In this sense action is "emplotted" (Erben 1993) in which people create and live within a narrative structure which gives meaning and sense to their lives. Life events do have coherence and a causal relationship in which stories have a beginning, an end, sequencing and selection. Erben building on the work of Riceour considers the relationship between time and existence:

> "Time is experienced by persons at both the naturalistic and reflective level, and life is composed of the narratives by which time is experienced. These narratives place upon existence - past, present, future - a cohering feature constituting the reasons for thoughts and actions. The understanding and explanation of existence occurs in... all those elements that affect individuals by being members of society - unhappiness, pity, joy, anguish, solemnity, peace of mind, gaiety, etc. - have narratives without which they cannot be experienced" (*ibid.* p17).

The interview as the talking curriculum vitae is a construction and the meeting ground between the autobiography of the interviewee and the biographical intervention of the interviewer, where Cotterill and Letherby (1993) argue for the recognition of their intertextuality.

Stories are about unveiling the professional situations which field participants find themselves in, and Denzin (1989) argues that human experience can be routine, habitual, but also problematic and he calls the latter *epiphanies* "or moments of revelation in a person's life" (*ibid.* p33). Denzin distinguishes between four types of epiphanies:

> "(1) the major event, which touches every fabric of a person's life; (2) the cumulative or representative event, which signifies eruptions or reactions to experiences which have been going on for a long period of time; (3) the minor epiphany, which symbolically represents a major, problematic moment in a relationship or a person's life; and (4) those episodes whose meanings are given in the reliving of the experience" (*ibid.* p71).

The importance of professional life stories means that the interaction between the personal and professional remains integrated, and issues to do with career, publishing, theoretical interests, and networking are foregrounded, and are seen as places where debates about what is knowable and what is worth knowing take place.

There are a range of methodological issues that arise from this approach and are centred around the ethics of working with colleagues and the responsibilities to both them and the broader field of which I and they are a part. These issues are discussed in the following two sub-sections of the chapter and focus on the construction and analysis of oral and written texts.

5.3 Oral texts

Undertaking an historical study of the field of education management was and still is unique within the field in England and Wales, and in designing the study I wanted to go straight to the people who have or continue to locate their professional practice within the field. In doing this I knew that I wanted to move beyond their books and articles to the choices and professional decisions they had made. In doing this my approach is to give primacy to the oral texts and in Chapter 6 they will be privileged through how the data is presented and analysed. As Fitz and Halpin (1994) argue the use of interviews is very powerful because the researcher has the potential to ask individuals directly about their work and actions. In preparing and undertaking the interviews there are a number of issues that I have had to think through such as sampling, and gaining access.

5.3.1 Identifying the sample

The first aspect of the interviewing process is the identification of appropriate field participants to interview and to gain access to their time and space. The approach

taken has been to construct a "non-probability" sample in which people and events have not been included in a random way but have been "hand picked" or selected (Denscombe 1998). The starting point was to consider that the field is now very diverse compared with the early 1960s, and the first boundary to be drawn was that of seeking the professional life stories of those located within HEIs. A review of publications from the 1960s, and studying the names and membership of the founders of BEAS/BEMAS enabled a choice to be made. This is a "purposive sample" in which I identified that the people I wished to approach had a particular story to tell which is relevant to the research questions (Cohen and Manion 1994, Denscombe 1998). In addition to this I also used "snowballing" in which I checked my list with people as I interviewed them and the responses confirmed the list, and I made one addition (Brown and Dowling 1998, Cohen and Manion 1994). This approach was used by Ozga and Gewirtz (1994) in their "Elites Project" who describe:

> "We identified suitable informants by mapping administrative careers and identifying 'stables' of administrators who were clustered around particular directors of education. Publications, official correspondence and archives gave us information about those who were active and influential. Once started on the process, it took on a momentum of its own, as all our interviewees talked about one another, introduced us to former colleagues and told us about significant others" (p127).

Like Gewirtz and Ozga I became increasingly aware of the interconnectedness between those interviewed with each other, but what has prevented the reification of the respondents into a closed elite community is that the oral and written texts showed connections with members of other networks in HEIs and with field members in schools, colleges, and LEAs.

The final list of interviewees is as follows:

Professor Sir George Baron
Professor Les Bell
Professor Ray Bolam
Professor Tom Bone
Dr. Mike Bottery
Professor Tony Bush
Professor Lynn Davies
Professor Ron Glatter
Professor Eric Hoyle
Professor Meredydd Hughes
Agnes McMahon
Dr. Janet Ouston
Professor Peter Ribbins
Professor Sir William Taylor
Professor Hywel Thomas
Professor Len Watson

This selection has been randomly coded and it enables the time span from the 1960s to the present day to be covered. Table 5 below is based on the chronology developed in Chapters 2 and 3 and it is used here to show the time span of individual field member location in an HEI:

Table 5
A chronology of the interview sample

	1944-74	**1974-88**	**1988-onwards**
Context	Educational administration.	Curriculum management.	Site-based management.
Interviewee	02, 03, 06, 09, 12, 13, 14, 16.	01, 02, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16.	01, 02, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16.

Table 5 shows that while some members of the sample left the field either before or around the mid 1970s, and others have joined the field from the 1970s onwards, there is no clear generational divide in which I could talk with confidence about the first

generation as opposed to a second, or third one. There are some field members in HEIs who span the whole period and their significance is in providing an understanding of change and continuity. However, while some early field members were clearly still active at the time of the data collection, there is a larger representation of people from the 1980s onwards and this is important in allowing the diversity and growth within the field to be included. This sample also has the advantage of enabling the professional practice of field members within HEIs as presented through an analysis of publications, research, and training provision in Chapter 3 to be investigated: firstly, representatives from particular centres of training and research over the time period are included; and, secondly, specialist areas of expertise and people with national and international reputations for particular aspects of work such as theory, finance, and professional development are included. The sample is mainly male and this reflects the pattern within the field. The sample inevitably means the exclusion of particular people, and not all HEIs have been included, and limiting the study to sixteen is based on a desire to give depth to the analysis rather than to survey general activity. Gaining access to the names on the list and the actual experience of doing the interviews validated the selection, and in listening to their stories the trends and patterns began to emerge. This resonates with the experiences of Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame (1981) who identify how from within the research experience there is a saturation process whereby:

> "a single life story stands alone, and it would be hazardous to generalize on the ground of that one alone, as a second life story could immediately contradict those premature generalizations. But several life stories taken from the same set of sociostructural relations support each other and make up, all together, a strong body of evidence" (p187).

5.3.2. Access and gatekeeping

The research experiences of those who have sought and gained access to interview those who are powerful within educational settings shows that it is both problematic and an ongoing process of negotiation (Ostrander 1993). Seeking access to civil servants, ministers, and/or chief education officers can present problems that I did not have to face, such as legal or constitutional constraints on what can or cannot be said

(Walford 1994). However, in common with these types of political elites, the sample I selected would have a view on who I was and whether they should or should not talk with me, and in addition to this whether the process would damage themselves or those who they were professionally responsible for (Whitty and Edwards 1994). Access proved to be unproblematic and I benefited from what Gewirtz and Ozga (1994) call "access-easing factors" (p193), in particular, at the time of the data collection my work was invisible to the broader field and I did not face rejection or questions based on my location within the field. Kogan (1994) raises the question of why people agreed to be interviewed for his research and he concludes that it was a "reasonable mixture" of "an altruistic desire to contribute to knowledge (and) a narcissistic desire to get into print that persuaded them" (p71). While the same might be said for research in general, and this study included, I gained a strong impression, and was told on more than one occasion, that what I was doing was seen to be of value. It became apparent that I had chosen an opportune time to begin to study the history of the field. All five of the steering group of what became the ESRC funded seminar series *Redefining Education Management* are in the sample, and as I visited and talked with these field members it became apparent that the climate and context was ready for a review of the field and my research was seen as a welcome inclusion. Informal discussion with the interviewees confirmed their interest in supporting me as a novice researcher who was beginning a career that they recognised in their own biographies, and their own debt to significant people who had given them access to research processes and learning opportunities.

In June 1995 I had already been working on the focus of the study and beginning to map out the field in relation to its activities, and it seemed an appropriate time to go into the field and test out my observations gathered from my own professional life story and from the library based research which is presented in Chapters 1-3. I sought access to two people from within the early days of the field by contacting one directly who was known to me, and through a gatekeeper for the second person. As a result of these two

interviews and the production of a transcript, I then formalised my list of further interviewees, and during June and July 1996 I interviewed thirteen from the list, and the final one was delayed until September because of a bereavement. Of these fourteen, one was contacted through a gatekeeper and the rest were approached directly by me (Appendix 1). The letter was followed up by a phone call, and a date and time of the interview was arranged, with a second letter to confirm the arrangements (Appendix 2). The visits are listed in Appendix 3, and there was a mixture of visiting people at home and in their office, and I did not interview them according to an historical time frame but as their own and my diary allowed. One interview was held in my office at Keele as the respondent was driving down the M6 and this was more convenient for him.

While a reliance on gatekeepers can have difficulties concerning the control over how a person is presented, it does mean that the interviewer is vouched for (McPherson and Raab 1988, Ostrander 1993). Within this study any potential problems were minimised because a gatekeeper was only used in two out of the sixteen contacts, and on these two occasions it was focused around seeking agreement for me to contact, rather than detailed negotiations. What is significant here is that while I was seeking access to interview members of a professional or academic elite, they are also my professional peers and Platt (1981) describes what it means to gain access to interview your own colleagues. In particular she emphasises the impact of being a part of a "shared community membership and the continuing relationship" (p82), where the interview encounter is not transient and anonymous, and making a mistake within the interview, on either side, is something which endures and can be relived through joint membership of the same networks.

5.3.3 Conducting the interviews

The procedures followed in the design, conduct, and analysis of the sixteen interviews followed the techniques that are regarded as good practice (Blaxter *et al.* 1996, Powney and Watts 1987), and in my introductory letters and the beginning of the interview I gave appropriate disclosure about the purpose of the study and issues to do with confidentiality were discussed [1]. I negotiated the use of the tape recorder, and that I would also take some field notes to back this up and to help my train of thought. On one occasion the tape recorder did not work properly and I relied on field notes combined with the transcript from a second interview. After each interview I followed this up with a letter (Appendix 4) and then much later a copy of the transcript was sent back to the interviewee for them to check any factual errors and to indicate any areas which they did not want to be quoted directly (Appendix 5). I negotiated with all the interviewees that I could put their names in the study but not give direct attribution to their statements or direct quotations in the presentation of the data or analysis.

I followed McHugh's (1994) guidance on the preparation for an interview by having a two staged process: firstly, remote preparation where I read about the field and prepared the analysis I have presented in chapters 1-3, and I then followed this by developing an interview schedule combined with doing my homework about the particular individual (Ostrander 1993); secondly, proximate preparation in which as I conducted the interview I used the schedule as an *aide-memoire* and enabled the conversation to develop as the topics and issues were engaged with. I used a semi-structured interview format in which there are a series of questions but they are open ended so that I could follow up with supplementary questions to probe deeper into the narrative being presented. As Mason (1996) shows this is not an easy process as it requires both attention to the ethical position of the interviewee combined with the empirical imperative of ensuring that there is an ongoing "conversation with a purpose" (p45).

While I am using the descriptor of an interview schedule I did not have a long list of questions, and the process is best captured by Ball's (1994b) description: "the aim is, as far as possible, to hand over control of the content of talk to the interviewee - to create, bearing in mind the inherent peculiarities of the interview, as naturalistic an encounter as is possible." (p97). This enables the interview to be developmental and can minimise the impact of power differentials because the interviewee is an informant with a particular story to tell, rather than an anonymous survey respondent (Platt 1981). I began by asking the interviewee to talk me through their professional life story from leaving school, and within this a number of issues were probed according to the following themes:

- Career: changes in location from one phase of education to another;
- Employment context: impact of a location in an HEI on professional practice;
- Networks: involvement in formal and informal networking at home and internationally;
- Policy Context: impact of education policy and legislation on professional practice;
- Positioning: views on the purpose and ongoing development of the field of education management, drawing of boundaries relative to other networks and fields;
- Professional: type of professional practice, changes in direction, and continuities in practice;
- Research: types of and views on their research projects;
- Teaching: types of and views on provision and pedagogy;
- Theory: interest in theory, types of theory and involvement in debates.

In undertaking this research and establishing a working rapport with the interviewees I drew on a number of sources from reading about the techniques, process, and value systems underpinning research traditions, and learning from the folklore of other colleagues. There are a number of interesting and informative accounts of the experiences of researchers interviewing those who are structurally and culturally powerful within educational settings, and these have raised issues relevant for my own use of the interviewing process. These are issues related to power, status, and what might be described as the 'rules of engagement' or how both myself and the

interviewee understood the dynamics and structure of being interviewed. Platt (1981) shows that being a member of a shared community means that there are assumptions about what is and is not known, and a judicious use of probing is needed to avoid a blurring between the gathering of data and tacit knowledge. This is particularly relevant to my status as a field member researching my own field, and this type of experience has been illustrated by Ball (1994b):

> "...I found myself treading a fine line in the interviews between knowledgeability and naivety. That is, between being seen as understanding 'the field' and its main issues and still having something to learn. In a sense, the interviewees had to feel that I was informed enough but that there were still things that they could teach me. I would deliberately present myself as more or less knowledgeable or more or less naive as seemed tactically appropriate" (p99).

Achieving symmetry (Platt 1981), or the balance between what might be regarded as professional distance required in a formal interview process and the professional intimacy that comes from being members of the same intellectual community, is difficult and is tied up with ethical considerations. I knew the importance of maintaining the integrity of what I wanted to find out and this meant the need to structure the process in relation to time, place, and agenda, but at the same time I needed to be sensitive to the interviewee and respect who they are and their particular place in the field. Like Kogan (1994) I found that bias is inevitable and that the supplementary questions reflect my own concerns about the field and that I found myself empathising more with narratives which took an critical and reflexive approach to how the field has developed.

5.3.4 Analysing and interpreting the data

The handling of the data is consistent with the value system on which this study is based. Once the interviews had taken place the tapes were transcribed, and the oral texts checked and rechecked for accuracy. The oral texts were then read, re-read and analysed according to the research questions developed from the analysis presented in Chapters 1-3. These questions focus around historical and sociological issues about

knowledge claims, knowledge production, sensitised through the concepts of power and structure.

I related the data to these questions by undertaking what Mason (1996 p54) describes as an "interpretative sense" in which I looked for the meaning or patterns within the narrative, combined with a "reflexive sense" by reviewing my own role within the process. I coded the data, used a cut and paste facility on the word processing package to aggregate the data, and I then worked through this to refine and edit so that comparisons and contrasts could be made. Through this process the oral texts generate both factual and subjective data in relation to events, experiences of those events, combined with attitudes and views about those events. While these patterns can enables general connections and distinctiveness in professional practice, the data provides "thick descriptions" through the use of quotations and extracts from individual stories (Schofield 1993).

Reliability is achieved through ensuring and demonstrating that the data collection is connected to the research aims combined with a requirement for honesty and accuracy (Mason 1996). While there is face validity and what I hear during interviews or read from written sources may seem to ring true for me, I have adopted methodological triangulation through using both oral and written texts (Cohen and Manion 1994). Deem and Brehony (1994) support this type of technical validity and the structure of this study is designed to enhance internal and external validity through the research aims which inter-relate the voices of field members with the policy context in which their work has taken place. In addition to this Deem and Brehony argue that there are other philosophical issues underpinning validity and I would agree that a purely descriptive approach to data is problematic as it is based on what they call "naive realism" (*ibid.* p164). In this sense validity is not an absolute state but "is best regarded as something which is to be worked towards rather than fully achieved" (*ibid.* p165). The role of theory and theorising is central to this process, and I have found Ozga's (1994)

arguments regarding this to be convincing and consistent with the research aims of this study:

> "Essentially, I want to argue that what we are doing when we are engaged in seeking to understand education policy must, of its nature, be 'theorized' as we are seeing to make statements about how things connect, about how things come to happen as they do, and, simply put, theories are statements about such matters. However, theories are not all of the same size, weight, complexity or quality. Theories may seek to explain only individual cases, or they may point to patterns of phenomena. Whatever, their quality, their purpose is to help us sort out our world, make sense of it, provide a guide to action and predict what may happen next. We construct theories routinely, by thinking about information we routinely collect. There is thus no question of divorcing 'theorizing' from data collection. Rather, the intention is to stress the need to look at what we find out in a self-conscious, theorized way, interrogating our theoretical 'hunches' and their associated sensitizing concepts while looking at policy at the macro, meso or micro-levels, or all three. (pp217-218).

Within this study theory is not used to organise or discipline the voices as a part of an epistemological test, but instead it uses Bourdieu's approach in which theorising is integral to the data. This gives primacy to the oral texts which are then supported and illuminated by the written texts in Chapter 6. The next sub-section of the chapter will describe the type of written texts I gained access to, and the approach taken in the use of written texts within the project.

5.4 Written Texts

Within this study the written texts are analysed and used to support and illuminate the oral texts. Documents are essentially frozen speech, they are what Shipman (1988) refers to as one of the "traces of activity" (p114) and for him the importance of documents is in triangulation. This is more than just checking factual accuracy but also in testing out theories and providing rival explanations. He goes on to argue that:

> "The advantage of documents as sources of evidence is that they have been compiled for other purposes than to provide information for social scientists or historians. They can be assumed to be a reflection of feelings undisturbed by the presence of the researcher" (*ibid.* pp113-114).

In this sense I was able to triangulate or use "multiple measures" (Lather 1986) in a similar way to Ozga and Gewirtz (1994) who state:

> "Of course, we used other methods to 'check' what was said, drawing on our shared experience as historians - we do not which to give the impression that we

> simply accepted the official version. We used recognised secondary sources to guide us towards primary sources. We knew where to look for relevant documentary evidence - the Public Records Office...We made use of such sources and the accounts of others as a basis for comparison and cross checking of informants' accounts as well as to help us 'map' the period. The memoranda and correspondence prepared by Ministry officials held at the Public Record Office and released under the thirty year rule were especially helpful... Methodologically, then, we were combining the relatively straightforward with rather more complex and potentially contradictory approaches" (p131-132).

The multiple measures are concerned with the 'snowballing' effect of the interviews through checking observations and arguments with other interviewees. Furthermore, the life career of the respondent could be traced through their involvement in BEAS/BEMAS and this is public through the Journals, and through the minutes of meetings of BEAS/BEMAS Council meetings, and AGMs.

For this study I identified the BEAS/BEMAS network as an important site where field participants have tended to locate themselves through setting it up, membership, holding office, and promoting its interests and status. I wrote to the Hon. Secretary of BEMAS requesting access to the archive (Appendix 6), and the Council agreed to release the papers which had been held by successive Secretaries since the establishment of BEAS in 1971. I am a member of BEMAS and know about the Society, I receive the two journals, and I have attended both the annual and the biennial research conferences. I knew the Hon. Secretary and she contacted me by phone after seeking permission to give me access to the papers, and we then made arrangements to collect the papers from her home. These papers have not been formally archived but each successive Secretary has put minutes and papers into the files and by going through the papers it was clear that the majority were restricted, with some in the public domain. It is not possible to identify if anything has remained closed as the lack of a formal archive means that the full audit of documentary sources has not been done [2]. Anecdotal evidence from interviewees suggests that some papers and copies of the BEAS/BEMAS publications may be scattered across the different generations of field participants who have held office.

The BEMAS papers that I have had access to are listed below:

- Minutes of Executive Committee of BEAS.
- Minutes of Annual General Meeting of BEAS.
- Minutes of Council of Management of BEMAS.
- Minutes of Annual General Meeting of BEMAS.
- Reports of official groups set up by the Council of Management.
- Reports to be tabled at meetings of Council of Management and/or AGM, for example, Treasurer's Report, and Membership/Recruitment reports.
- Papers for discussion produced by BEMAS officers, for example, on the development of the Society.
- Letters, for example, correspondence over connections with other groups such as the BIM, CCEA.
- Letters, for example, correspondence with Solicitors to do with the Legal Status of BEAS/BEMAS.
- Letters, for example, correspondence between members of council and Secretary such as apologies for non attendance at meetings, and sending copies of letters and information to the Secretary.
- Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association for BEAS 1973.
- Letters, for example, correspondence from people requesting information or to be put in touch with someone who can help them with their research.
- Publicity Material such as examples of membership forms and leaflets.

In sifting through the files I was well aware of Jones' (1994) observation that there is unlikely to be a scarcity of documentation. I classified the papers using Scott's (1990) typology [3] and there are three relevant types: firstly, business and other organisational documents which are no longer in use but remain with the company or organisation and can be accessed by seeking permission; secondly, the law requires the public disclosure of certain information by companies and the Companies Registration Office has a huge archive of annual reports and other documents such as registers of shareholders; and thirdly, published documents that have a private origin.

The reasons for these types of documents to be within the papers is due to a number of factors: firstly, most organisations have recurrent records of routine work, and

sometimes special records to do with a particular initiative or investigation (Hakim 1993). The growth of businesses and organisations which are regulated by law and by convention means that there is a growth of documentation to do with the management of the organisation, for example, minutes, reports, membership lists etc. Secondly, there are regular records that may be produced for external purposes because the state has created a framework of law which means that documents are published, for example, the Articles of Association lays down the structure of BEMAS and the reporting mechanisms. The creation of an organisation which has a separate legal existence to the individual or group of individuals which run it, means that there are legal requirements to have documentation to do with the management of the company, for example, Council of Management, AGM, and audited accounts. Thirdly, the nature of the business means that there are documentary products of the organisation and in this case there are examples of membership flyers, journals, and newsletters.

In undertaking this review of the BEAS/BEMAS papers I followed Scott's (1990) advice that:

> "the general principles involved in handling documents are no different from those involved in any other area of social research, but that the specific features of documentary sources do require the consideration of their distinguishing features and the particular techniques needed to handle them" (p1).

Scott defines documents as "unintentional messages" and has as "its central feature an inscribed text" (*ibid.* p5), and this resonated with my awareness of Shipman's (1988) concern about how the authoring process operates in relation to the design and recording of oral events such as meetings, and how they are shaped by the context. For example, I was struck by the different ways in which minutes were recorded and laid out when comparing those from the 1970s and those from the late 1980s, and there is a shift from recording decisions to having action points with named actors. In addition to this I had to recognise that the organisation of information may be demanded either by an outside agency in a particular way, and/or the means of recording it such as a computer database determines what is and is not recordable

data. Furthermore, the historian's filtering process is vital when it comes to sifting through papers which have not been through the hands of a trained archivist. I used a process that was based on a combination of good practice from both Shipman (1988) and Scott (1990), in which I studied the document according to the following criteria: what is the purpose of the document? Can the document be authenticated by looking at the source of document? Is the documentation is full and complete? Is the document credible in the accuracy of what is reported? Is the document relevant to understanding the purpose and contextual location of BEMAS within the field of education management?

In putting this filtering process into action I reviewed the papers of the types indicated and I was aware of Jones (1994) concern that the researcher should consider the purpose of the document as those produced for public consumption tend to have a "gloss" which encourages simplicity, and disguises internal debate. Jones goes on to argue: "I cannot overstate, from my own experience, the importance of getting under the surface of documentation, probing and analyzing the story behind its production" (*ibid.* p181).

Shipman (1988) states the need to take into account the phenomenology of the process of document development. Furthermore, data collected for official purposes, such as by the police or by the courts, tends to group and label people according to categories and the growth of computerised data bases enhances this: "the coding of data for processing by computer is a typical categorising procedure, often involving mutilation to obtain a fit." (p109). The importance of authenticity is reinforced by Shipman who finds it necessary to remind the social scientist of the tradition of historical method:

> "The historian is trained to reconstruct past events by reference to their specific place and time. The historian's use of documents is grounded within this context. Social scientists, concerned more with change than with concrete particular time and place and the absence of training in using documents in the social sciences often results in uncritical use. Historians spend lifetimes in establishing the

authenticity of documents. Others seize them without thought as convenient grist to their mill" (*ibid.* p111).

I collected the BEMAS papers from the Secretary, and I checked through the types of documents and noted any gaps in the dating to signify missing papers:

- AGM minutes - between 1972 and 1983 the minutes are signed, but from 1983 onwards they are unsigned. The minutes present in the files are for 1972-1991, with 1989 and 1990 missing from the papers. Between 1972 and 1987 attendance of the number of members is recorded; 1991 not recorded.

- Executive Committee of BEAS 1971-1973 the minutes are included. For the BEMAS Council of Management the minutes are coded, collated and catalogued for the years 1973-83. For the years 1984-89 full minutes are present but they are not catalogued or coded, for 1990-1992 the minutes are not catalogued or coded, and it is only in comparison with previous years that it can be identified that there are missing minutes. No minutes are included after 1992.

I checked the origin of the document through noting the typed copies rather than carbons and the signature of the relevant officers. This became more difficult in recent years through word processing, and the lack of signatures. The use of documents from about 1985 are not as reliable as those from earlier years of the Society. The procedure of minuting means that any corrections of factual accuracy are included as a part of the process of being a true and correct record. This supported the credibility of the papers, and I was able to triangulate references to other documents, for example, a report, or paper, or conference matters by checking another document such as the BEMAS journal which lists current officers.

Sincerity is raised as an issue by Scott (1990 p22) and is "whether the author of the document actually believed what he or she recorded, and involves an assessment of why the author chose to produce the document". The papers are a part of the procedures of the organisation and/or are required by law to enable accountability such as financial statements. The authoring process is not so much self initiated as a duty of the office held. Representativeness is difficult to assess, however, the minutes of the AGMs are in the papers I was given access to but not all reports referred to in the minutes are in the files. In this sense the documents have been 'deposited' but not in an archive. The style of the documents was familiar and did not vary from the

conventions I am used to seeing as someone who has taken minutes and/or written reports. The conditions in which the documents were produced seem to be from notes taken at meetings and then formally written up by the Secretary in a private location, and a similar assumption can be made about Reports and Papers tabled.

I decided not to use semiotics, or content analysis through looking at the frequency in which a word or concept is used. In particular frequency is not the same as significance, and as Scott argues any attempt to separate the objective reality of a document from the author is a false method and "texts must be studied as socially situated products" (*ibid.* p34). The interpretation of a document can consider the intended meaning, and the researcher as the audience can consider the received content. However, and internal meaning is a matter of conjecture, and as Scott goes on to show:

> "The most that can be achieved by a researcher is an analysis which shows how the inferred internal meaning of the text opens up some possibilities for interpretation by its audience and closes off others...The interpretation of a text which is offered by the researcher must pay close attention to the perspectives and interests of its various potential audiences" (*ibid.* p35).

My interrogation and filtering of the BEMAS papers is not conclusive and is subject to reinterpretation; as Shipman (1988) states, "all documents are distant from the reality they reflect" (p108). In this sense while there are important technical conventions that I have followed in how the documentation has been handled and used in this study, I am using an approach which is consistent with the construction of the oral texts outlined in the previous sub-section of this chapter. In particular, I am using a critical rather than a positivist approach to the documentation (Jupp and Norris 1993) in which the exercise of power and influence is not so much through tracing the cause and effect connections between encoding, transmission, and decoding, but instead the focus is on what the document can tell me about the exercise of power. This enables the historical and sociological questions at the centre of this study to be investigated as the emphasis is on the connections with the production and reproduction of knowledge, and how field members developed the purpose and knowledge claims of the field through formal

networks such as BEAS/BEMAS. The professional practice of field members and the positions they have taken within the field can be illustrated and supported by the written texts, and in the next Chapter this will be organised through the use of footnotes. The minutes of meetings or a discussion paper produced by a member are able to show what field members regard as controversial and problematic for the field, and how and whether the issues have been resolved. I have also been able to see how those located in official positions within the organisation make connections between the developments within the policy context and practitioner needs. As the focus of the field as illustrated in Chapters 1-3 is on the concerns of practitioners I have been able to see how they have been conceptualised through BEAS/BEMAS activities.

5.5 Summary

This chapter has described and analysed the meaning of oral and written texts as a central focus of the research design of this study. The processes used and values underpinning construction of the texts has been explained. The next chapter is concerned with presenting an analysis of the oral texts, supported by the written texts, by foregrounding patterns of professional activity and the subjective viewpoints of field members.

Chapter 6

An analysis of the oral and written texts from within the field of education management

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the analysis of data from the professional biographies of sixteen field members located in HEIs from the 1960s onwards, and is supported through reference to the documentary sources within the BEAS/BEMAS papers made available by the BEMAS Council. Within the main body of the chapter the oral texts will predominate so that the voices of the field members interviewed will be privileged, and the BEAS/BEMAS papers will be presented through the footnotes to illuminate the oral extracts. This is consistent with the approach to professional biographies explained in Chapter 5, and is based not so much on telling the story, as enabling an understanding of the contradictions and dilemmas in people's lives to be foregrounded and to understand how the professional self is and has been constructed. Goodson (1995) sees the interactions as "trading points" in which the issues of understanding and identity are negotiated and worked through.

The approach taken is to use the sociological questions raised in Chapter 4 to present and analyse the oral and written texts. However, in order to describe and understand the historical development of the field it is essential to break these questions down into a more focused enquiry: what is the purpose of the field of education management? What are the areas of debate and controversy within the field? How do field members come to be located in HEIs? In what ways does an employment location in an HEI have an impact on professional practice? What networks exist and what is the impact of those networks on the development of the field? How do field members see the link between their work and the policy context in which practitioners are located? In this way the trends and themes within the field will be analysed so that the positions and positioning of field members can be revealed. While the individual contributions of field members through their professional practice will be acknowledged the emphasis is less

on the content of their particular publications than on what this illustrates about patterns of activity and location within the field.

The questions raised are investigated through dividing the chapter into two sections: the first section focuses on how the field was and is conceptualised, and begins by presenting the practitioner focus of the field before moving on to investigate intellectual approaches to theory. This section will end with a discussion about how the orientation towards practitioners and to theory can be made visible through debates about how the field is labelled. The second section of the chapter will present the data that shows the relationship between the individual as told through the professional biographies, and the structuring effect of the individual's location of their professional practice within an HEI. Integrated into this is the importance of national and international networks which both created and currently sustain field member location within HEIs. The complexity of these relationships is further explored through looking at how the individual within an institutional setting is located within and affected by a broader policy context.

6.2 Conceptualising the field

There are patterns within the interview data that illustrate how the field member has and continues to engage with what it means to be located in an HEI and within a particular policy context. This can be seen in relation to how the field has and continues to be conceptualised, and this can be explored by focusing on:

- the practitioner orientation.
- the relationship of theory to practice.
- the labelling of the field.

6.2.1 The practitioner orientation

A clear theme within the professional biographies is the importance of working with practitioners, to know and understand their context in order to support improvement and development. This is consistent and stable across the sixteen field participants

located in HEIs. The main emphasis seems to be on the needs of educational practitioners, such as headteachers, to understand their professional practice in relation to developments such as comprehensivisation in the 1960s and 1970s, and site-based management from 1988 onwards. An improvement in how educational institutions are managed also focuses on organisational needs, and how, for example, the curriculum could change in order to meet institutional goals. For example, from an early field member:

> *(16) The increasing scale of the educational enterprise was one such reason. By the end of the (19)50s new universities were being established. People often forget that they predated Robbins. New post-secondary institutions, a wider range of work, schools becoming larger - these were the days when it was argued that for a full range comprehensive school to have a sixth form of adequate size a roll of 2,000 students was needed. These were large, complex organisations where you needed to understand what you were doing... There were quite a lot of heads who got interested early on in the study of educational administration because they found it provided insights into what they were doing and helped them to do it better. That practical aspect of the subject has always been prominent, especially in the UK. A lot of the people in the field have shared that view that I've just tried to press, inadequately I'm sure, that the principal purpose of the study of educational administration and management was to improve the administration and management of schools, colleges and universities.*

Field members are very clear that improvements in the management of an educational organisation is better through practitioner reflection within and about the action to be performed. Furthermore, this reflective process can be trained and developed in combination with what we know about what determines effective practice:

> *(03) ...the basis of my thinking was we had to convert practice into teachable forms. In other words, it wasn't just a case of learning from Nelly, but of systematising it and building up a body of knowledge, a discipline if you like, which could be passed on through courses, developed to some extent through research but I felt that the main thing was to develop courses for practising administrators whether Heads, or Local Authority people or Department of Education people or whoever and the more academic side would develop through the normal teaching (such as the) MA.*

Training and the role of long and short courses in higher education is directly related to an understanding of 'usefulness' for the practitioner. A decision to run a short course, or to revalidate a longer award bearing course is preceded by the question: who will benefit from training? As one field leader states: *(13) So I was interested in... how do*

you actually help people to develop and grow, and gain real insights about their practice.

The tension between what is current practice and what ought to be the best practice is evident from the early days and remains unresolved. This is made more complex by connections with teaching and learning. Individual and organisational development is normatively related to improvements in teaching and learning:

> (13) ...*I would say that it is there to improve education for the pupils and students and you know the other beneficiaries of education generally. I think we can only establish our claim to significance as it were, and to make a contribution, in that particular way. I mean there are lots of people now, and it is quite interesting some of the current debates around structure, some of the people are saying let's get closer to the classroom and the teaching learning process and... these debates about structure and policy and process and management have a very profound effect on teaching. But... we have got to do more, to demonstrate that, but I think a lot of people feel it intuitively, because of all of this stuff about leadership makes a difference.*

What remains at issue from the early days is that the field has not been able to demonstrate a cause and effect connection between what ought to be effective management and actual educational outcomes.

For field members who joined from the 1970s onwards there is a sense in which people were entering a network which had been created but not yet firmly established. The richness of the networks underpinning the conceptualisation of the field continued with more recent field members, and furthermore, the central focus of management for educational success continues to be a strong feature. One field member argues:

> *(01) But I also think that the school management issues make an enormous difference, good or ill to the way schools are organised... What to do with sometimes very simple things like whether the teachers are feel secure and rewarded and backed up... personally I do feel that... the way the school is managed and organised can make an enormous difference to, I suppose of any organisation, especially university departments of education.*

Another field member confirms this:

> *(05) Once you have 3 people working together on a task, there is inevitably some management of that task... if people are working together then inevitably there are rules about management, implicit agreements about how they're going to organise themselves. And it's a bit like culture. I mean you get 3 people working together and a work culture develops and they have values that develop*

about how they work. And if you start from that point then the next point is well it might be a good idea to make this explicit... about it because then you can be explicit about the values that you have and the purposes that you have. I suppose the purpose of management of a school is in order to attain the purposes of the school and I would use purposes rather than objectives because purposes for me includes many more things than objectives does, in a way that the school is, which is both successful but also it is consistent with the values of the school. Because one of the things where I think schools are very different from other organisations, because they are dealing with children, is the way in which the adults interact with each other is part of the educational experience for the children. So that if the schools values are that the children should behave in a way which is respectable of others, then you cannot have a management style which is not respectful of other adults and expect the children to be respectful of each other. Whereas if, for example, I'm a customer in a bank if the bank staff are all shouting at each other, that doesn't make the customers shout at each other. Whereas in a school the management is intimately part of the educational experience of the children.

While the connection between management and educational outcomes remains axiomatic for field members, there are those who feel that there are dangers in this approach. It seems that what is needed is research into the connections, otherwise the purpose and status of management knowledge and skills will remain on shaky ground. This is illustrated by the following observation:

(02) ...*the relationship between organisational structures, teaching and learning. The nearest thing we have to that at the moment I suppose is the effectiveness material but that's pretty limited I think. I don't think that the school improvement material touches this issue and I don't think the whole management thing touches the issue... my nightmare scenario is shaped like an hour glass. In the top part of which is management. In the bottom part of which is teaching and learning, and the shape of that represents my view of the relationship between them. All this management activity going on... and then there's the teaching going on. Now with the national curriculum of course the linkage is being made. Whether it's being made in desirable ways is another question but there's more of the linkage there. I believe in management, but I just wonder whether it's not getting out of hand and becoming self-sustaining and self-referential.*

Central to this issue is the relevance of course provision. From the early days in the development of the field, professional development was directly related to customer demand and their definition of need. Need is defined in relation to content, pedagogy, and the method of assessment, and the field is seen as pioneering and modernising in relation to how course quality is defined by agencies such as the CNAA. A significant leader in developing a taught postgraduate course at Master's level from the early 1970s made the distinction between a Ph.D. which is traditionally based on individual interests, and undertaking a management course which emphasises the impact research would have on organisational development. Furthermore the taught master's

degree has a different approach to pedagogy and assessment and so challenges the academic traditions of higher education. His own words explain the position:

> *(06) ...but the fundamental philosophy still continued that it was about the individual and about the organisation, that the project was a major element, and the methodologies used were far more varied, and some things that someone like you would take for granted these days, but in the mid seventies were, and in some universities, still are unknown... We also, never had any written examinations. Now this wasn't part of the management tradition. The DMS had written exams, but we regarded them as irrelevant, both for the purposes of the programme and the needs of the students. And so when we went to the CNAA, I managed to talk the CNAA into agreeing - no written exams, and we never have had. It creates problems, mainly for the staff, but it's still the case. I wouldn't say that that was a polytechnic tradition, it would have been, in those days, impossible for universities, but it was impossible in a good few of poly(technic)s as well. It was only because we had talked the CNAA into agreeing, as in fact that (name) who was then the chair of the management committee of the CNAA said we would never get it through - but we did. It was a bit touch and go, but we succeeded.*

This approach to postgraduate courses in an HEI has now become the norm as one current field leader comments:

> *(07) I think if you look at what's happened to inservice work and the nature of inservice work there's been a shift from theory to professional relevance and I don't think that's entirely wrong. So I think what's happened in nearly all educational management courses is that they've developed a strong professional relevance theme. And that's certainly there in the Leeds Metropolitan MSc; it's there in the Manchester Met(ropolitan). MSc; it's there in the Warwick MA; it's there in the O(pen) U(niversity); it's there in Birmingham; it's there in L(iverpool) J(ohn) M(oores) U(niversity). It's certainly there in Sheffield and it always was. But I don't think that necessarily means there isn't a critical analysis of both policy and its implementation. But I think almost what has to be done in order to make the courses attractive is to ensure that they have some kind of professional relevance. And I think that's entirely right.*

The credibility and any claim for legitimacy for the lecturer/trainer is rooted in their own credentials as practitioner and their ability to present themselves as people who know and understand the practitioner context:

> *(09) ...it was a case of organising short courses. I still had a fair amount of credibility with a lot of the heads in (place name) because I had been one of them, and that gave me credibility and access also in connection with my research on headship which was taking place at this same time.*

As former practitioners became absorbed into the academic life of higher education, they were able to maintain the credibility of their courses by buying in serving practitioners as part time lecturers.

Considerable emphasis has been put on pedagogy and what it means to work with adults in developing their management practice. A strong trend within the biographies of early field leaders is the use of simulation or intray exercises, and the work of William Taylor is seen as significant in this development. This type of pedagogy facilitated a problem solving approach in which understanding begin with the activity and not with external theories. In this sense judgements are made about what is and is not helpful or useful for the practitioner, and it is clear from one of the early field leaders that issues of educational policy, or theories from sociology and economics lack direct relevance to the immediacy of organisational decision-making, for example:

> *(03) We were concerned with the clientele. The people who came on courses and who wanted to study were practitioners or would be practitioners, and... to allow oneself to drift too far into major policy issues, say of national resources, devoting them to nursery schools or to apprenticeships and so on, were not really helpful to them in their actual concerns. You see what I mean? That the place of nursery schools in the national policy obviously had a place in developing the potential of a nursery school teacher, but it wasn't the main concern... the sociologists were concerned with major issues of social class and said 'well the administrators must understand the social class structure in this country and they must have an understanding of the basic economic issues facing policy makers'. Well, yes, I mean, I agree, but if you're dealing with a certain clientele and it was, as I see, a field of mainly of practitioners, practical applications, it was the translation of policy into that field.*

Early field leaders established that national policy analysis for the practitioner was not a relevant area for study and debate. Instead the dominant theme is to understand the context in which the practitioner found him/herself and to work with them to manage the problems generated by it and to develop institutional policies. Furthermore, there is a strong emphasis on the political neutrality of both the practitioner and the lecturer, in which one early field leader characterised his work as *dispassionate academic study*. A feature here is that those within HEIs work with the practitioner and do not make a presentation of the self as being somehow distinctive in the traditional interpretation of being an academic. The use of the label trainer constructs the knowledge worker as neutral, for example:

> (03) ...*and when you talk about the intellectual background to all this I was never interested in achieving anything. I mean I didn't want to change anything. I simply wanted to look at it and study it... I think I was more or less looking at it as an anthropologist looks at things... I mean he studies this tribe which eats their children. Well why do they do it and what particular sauce do they use? I was*

concerned with not improving education at all, but in simply examining it and how it worked and how people achieve their objectives, and what stopped them. So I never felt passionately for or against comprehensive schools. I think if anything I felt keenly that it should be non-promotional. That educational administration was a study, not a crusade... and that was different from the sociologists' point of view. Or the psychologists, who had certain views about how children should be brought up. I think it was probably a weakness. I mean should the university teacher or the teacher anyway be committed to anything? Or should he simply expound? Or should do both? I mean obviously if you're with children you've got to be committed. You want them to grow up in a certain way... A study like educational administration, the academic anyway is concerned with examining the phenomenon as dispassionately as possible and providing the material upon which other people can construct their value systems.

This approach enables field members to develop a generic approach to a range of educational phases at home and abroad, for example:

(06) We did find a certain number of jobs which you would now class as consultancy that were disassociated from a taught programme. We didn't have much time for many of them, but we did do some. Mainly overseas, but some in Britain as well. And I should say that parallel to all of these things, from 1970 onwards, I and increasingly other people working overseas, in varying amounts per year, but sometimes quite a lot. I myself have worked in thirty different countries, other people here are well known to the world bank of the British Council and so on. I say we have had a tradition of parallel to our British work, doing things overseas and that the overseas bit tended to be training and/or consultancy, and often linking the two together, and that's still the case.

However, some current field members are concerned that the presentation of self as neutral is not really sustainable and is damaging to the educational professional. The following excerpt is a critical review of the field and its purpose:

(10) One of my more favourite quotations is a Chinese quotation which says they lower their heads to pull the cart instead of raising their heads to look at the road, and that seems to me to be always a danger if the predominant management literature is going to be about efficiency and effectiveness. Having said that I don't believe that that's necessarily what teachers want to do. But it's, it seems to be me to very much what they find themselves having to do. I mean the latest research I've been doing which has been in LEA, GM, private schools, and trust and private hospitals suggests very, very strongly from the interviews that the lower down the hierarchy you go, the more and more work and responsibility without necessarily power is dumped on people... and interestingly the only people who have seemed to have any sense of empowerment and get up and go are those at the senior management levels, and that's because of the entrepreneurial motivation and the ability to manage in a market situation that many of them feel. People lower than senior management levels I found don't tend to have that sort of motivation and therefore what they get is the problems with implementation...the implementation of other people's visions which is not necessarily the most motivating thing in the world. In that situation you end up with professionals who I think by most definitions of professionality cannot be described as such. More likely they will be people who rise to little more than technicians, who are implementing other people's directives. Whether those directives are at the senior management level of school, or whether they are the policy level in government. So I personally find it disquieting and worrying that we maybe creating a society whereby we have professionals who do not think

about the function of their profession, who don't see it's role within society, who don't see their professional practices as being an ecology of professional practice whereby they interact with other professions, other social forces and have a need to have a strong voice within society about the way that society is going in education, particularly it seems crucial to me not only that teachers should be able to provide the best possible education for children in subject matter, but they should be able to provide them with an experience of what it's like to participate, to criticise, to join in debate so that when they leave school at the age of 17 or 18 they don't enter as political virgins into society... And it seems to me that the more that teachers and schools and hospitals and all the rest are put into a competitive situation, the more necessarily they must think in terms of competitive advantage. And to that extent I agree with a view of life (where) you become something by doing it and it seems to me that that really is the great danger, that we end up, whether we like it or not, with people who hold very different values from the ones that say held under a social democratic consensus from (19)46 onwards, precisely because they are now practising in a different world.

This extract conceptualises the teacher as someone is who both interested in and needs an engagement with broader structural and conceptual issues. In this sense the knowledge worker is not the neutral conduit through which practical knowledge flows and is distilled, but takes a position and sets an agenda related to structural issues such as professionalism and democracy. This type of critique is recognised as valid within the field and is directly connected with concerns about the growing entrepreneurialism amongst field members in HEIs. Two field members describe their concerns:

(05) Now thinking about education management I am quite concerned, I'm very concerned about some of the very simple minded ways in which people think about the management of institutions.

(08) I'd be inclined to say because it's easier. I mean it's much easier to do management by ticklist; it's much easier to say if I adhere to these 10 good points about leadership or about something else, I will be a better manager, or my school will be a better school. And it's much easier to engage in that than it is to engage in controversial issues. And as soon as you start raising issues around equity and implicitly disadvantaged groups or democracy and the idea of freedom of speech and human rights for children and all the things that, you know, bother me, then you know, you can't do it by ticklist, you can't do it by manuals. You've got to keep engaging in that dialogue. You've got to be prepared to take risks. And I think many people prefer risk-free management Or try to, you know. The point about the ringbinder is it's safety play, isn't it?

Some current field leaders (including those from the early days who are still in post), endorse their concerns about the neutrality legacy by putting a strong emphasis on values. In this sense, while the alliance with a particular doctrine or political party is not

advocated, a strong claim is made for management to be rooted in explicit value systems which connect with broader structural issues. For example:

> (05) ...a*nd the school where I'm a governor, which is a girls' school, very ethnically mixed in a poor district in (place name), the rhetoric is about passing exams whereas the practice is often about creating a decent environment... And I don't think we should lose that and sometimes I do feel as if I'm getting rather old fashioned and, you know, out of date. But I do think that schools should be concerned with issues of equity and as well as issues of attainment. And that does, that worries me. So one of the things that if one is conscious and make explicit what your management is then you make your values explicit. Whereas if all of those things remain implicit nobody knows what they're up to and I think you can slip into action, and action has consequences in two ways. Action has consequences on values and culture, but it also has implications for the children's development.*

Since this research began leading field members have instigated a debate about the development of the field through an ESRC seminar series. One of the leading field members who initiated this talked about his views about the field:

> *(15) Well I suppose the first concern I have, the underlying concern is that a division is emerging it seems to be between policy making in educational management and academic development if you like. So that the TTA initiatives - HEADLAMP, NPQH, what we know is going to follow for middle management and for experienced heads... that those initiatives have been weakly underpinned by the academic work.. so these initiatives are being driven by government and they're being driven by quangos if you like. I respect what the TTA is doing but... we've been forced back into the position of reacting to it. And so this is an attempt to say well lets, let's bring together, leading figures, to have a look at this again and say what does it mean for educational management? We respond to it kind of, you know, in bits and pieces, but we haven't got a global kind of response to this and nor are we doing any real agenda setting... The government is forcing on schools... the notion that you must look at what's going on outside education, so if you look at NPQH, for example, you need to demonstrate you're drawing on best practice outside education as well as inside it. That's politically driven and actually I think it's nonsense. We take it in and we contextualise it. Taking it without a context is useless... The third issue is the one of theory development. There hasn't been much new theory development recently. We had that burst in the (19)70s, Cohen and March, Baldridge, Greenfield, Hoyle and a little bit subsequently - the collegiality area, although that's weakly developed in terms of theoretical underpinning, and shifted towards organisational culture... But it's gone very quiet and relatively quiet in terms of theory development. And partly that's because the practice has dominated the agenda again. It's linked to that. And that's essentially atheoretical. You will search high and low for a theoretical perspective, and we shouldn't neglect that it seems to me... but these are the kinds of things that I want to come back to, and say isn't this the time now for a reappraisal of what the field is about, some position papers, some agendas for research and you know what are the key issues now that we need to underpin?*

What this current description of an agenda for the development of the field raises is the status of theory and how it is conceptualised within the field.

6.2.2 Theory and practice in the field of education management

A coherent feature from the 1960s is that theory and practice within the field are presented as being directly related, in which the starting point is the experiences and context of the practitioner:

> (16) ...w*e will be wrong I think to say that management is entirely and exclusively task oriented, practical, improvement focused, effectiveness, economy and efficiency oriented. Suggestions are sometimes made to this effect. But there was hardly anything more practical than where one started with groups of heads being brought together one evening a week, or for a weekend conference, to discuss the improvement of education in the context of the work of their own schools. Any discussion that didn't have some kind of practical relevance - and that doesn't exclude the consideration of appropriate theory - was soon turned round by the participants, who were articulate and experienced people who knew what they wanted from these programmes and were not prepared to waste their time. I didn't regard a practical orientation as meaning you had to eschew theory, though I am not entirely comfortable with the word because it carries a lot of baggage. I'd prefer to use other terms if I could, but that means more words and more sentences and more conditionals. So I'll stay with theory. By theory I mean trying to understand a particular phenomena in the light of research, as much as possible of which is empirical research. It is important to look at problems and issues in the context of research and also in the context of the best that has been said and written in the field by the best people... When I speak of theory all I'm saying is make sure that what you think, what you say, what you do, does reflect research, does reflect the best that is being thought and said by reputable students of the subject. That's hardly a political prescription. It's has little to do with status and a lot to do with how best to bring about improvements in the level of argument, in the quality of the factual base, in the extent to which a wide variety of interests are fairly and properly represented and so forth.*

The conceptualising of practice and what it means for the practitioner is facilitated by a process of theorising in context as well as an engagement with other's research and theoretical models. Theory is good 'to act from' in order to improve practice, and competence comes from this broader level of understanding about practice. One professor from the early days sums up the approach as follows:

> *(09) Well my approach is that of the applied scientist. Because of my practitioner background, that in any theorising the test that I always want to apply is what difference does this make to the practice of education management. So that theorising which doesn't have that kind of, of practical implications - and I'm not really interested in - so I think improving practice is very much the idea.*

He went on to encapsulate the problem solving approach of the field:

> *(09) ...however many theories you've got to solve your problems and you've got to do the best you can using the materials available and so on... But again it's typical of the way that I think about these things, being back with practitioners again.*

An illustrative example presented by one of the early field leaders is consistent with this approach to theory:

(06) So I think that the distinctive role of higher education is to bring to bear the best critical or reflective theory and practice available, and make this available to the student and/or the organisation. Now, that needs a bit of defining. I've never believed that the job of educational management teaching is to take theories and train people to apply them. What I think of as the engineering model. Whereby your principles of management, a term I hate, which you then, via case study and other techniques, train people to apply to particular situations. My view has always been and my experience keeps on confirming this, both my experience as a manager, as a Head of Department in the University for example, and my experience in teaching confirms for me that we have to start with the situation in which the student is placed, which is always unique, complex and ultimately not understandable. And that management development, therefore, becomes a process of sort of educating the intuition. We can only hold a certain amount in our minds, when we take decisions or respond to situations, and we act, we behave, on the basis of an intuitive understanding of situations and almost a habitual response type behaviour. Now it seems to be that what we ought to be doing is helping people to have more sophisticated responses, drawn from a wider range of potential scenaria, that is, to see possibilities that would otherwise have seen in themselves and in others and in situations, and to be sensitive to a much wider range of possible explanations as to why such and such happens, that is, what is the nature of the organisation or the situation in which they are responding. So that the responses become less knee-jerk habitual and more based upon more insightful, more sensitive, more acute understanding of what is being played in a situation... So it seems to me that the role of the university or higher education is to provide opportunities for people to experience that process within situations that are conducive to that sort of learning.

While the emphasis on professional relevance has not prevented debates about knowledge claims, the main orientation of field members is directly connected to interpretations of usefulness and relevance.

The legacy of the Theory Movement in North America had a big impact on enabling field members to develop their position in relation to the relevance of theory to practice, and vice versa. To sum up so far, the position taken in England and Wales is that understanding begins with practice, and this is seen in contrast to the traditions of North America where theory is given a special significance. The work of Griffiths (1964) and Halpin (1958), for example, was severely challenged by the Greenfield paper at the IIP in 1974, but for domestic field members there is a realisation that the challenge had begun much earlier:

(12) ...the impact here was that he was pushing an open door. Everybody knew that, you know, there were two sociologies in the (19)60s and anybody who was teaching sociology of education here wasn't surprised by what Tom Greenfield was saying but the Yanks were knocked for six really. It was quite interesting. It was quite heated.

A number of field members from both generations argue that the Greenfield paper had more of an impact on the North Americans than in England and Wales. One current professor in the field argues that in his view: *(11) positivist methods had already been changing, and Greenfield led the way for the field... It was clear that by 1966 at the IIP that the Theory Movement was already dead. Dan Griffiths was clear that it was already dead.* Another field member who received the IIP members after the Bristol stage of the conference notes how knowledge work is linked to professional location, and hence the challenge to the Theory Movement was not so much about ideas as about identity. In response to the view put forward that Greenfield was *pushing on an open door*, this professor argues:

> *(14) I think we are flattering ourselves on that. I was NOT there, but I know all about it... and they came to (place name) something like 2 days, 3 days after he had made that speech. And the place was buzzing with it. And Dan Griffiths was the most annoyed, well the one who showed most annoyance, and I got to know Dan Griffiths right away because just by coincidence I was giving the opening speech in (institution name)... and I was setting the scene for (place name) and Dan Griffiths was chairing it. And so as soon as Dan Griffiths arrived in (place name) he and I were in contact and although, you know, he was a very much more senior man to me, a big name, he talked a bit and I got his view of Greenfield before I heard the other side... I think we are flattering ourselves in that respect, in that we had not made the investment in the traditional social science disciplines that the Americans had made. And so nobody here would feel that they were personally being attacked, and that what they had spent the last 6 years or 10 years doing was being attacked. It's fairly easy to be objective about something if you've not made a heavy investment.*

This observation about the engagement of the indigenous field participants with theory enables us to connect with how field members in HEIs made claims about the role of theory. The emphasis on the concerns of the practitioner means that theory and theorising are directly connected with relevance, problem identification and problem solving. In this sense, the *heavy investment* in theory has been in its use rather than in debates about knowledge construction and epistemology. One field member recalls:

> *(03) I don't know whether there were passionate debates in our setting. It was a matter of from what elements do we bring into educational administration - has sociology a part? Has economics a part? Can the psychologists help? But in my mind the political, the external world, the relationship with the external world was the issue. What kind of relationships can we build up with practitioners, whether heads or local authority people, other academics. And I don't think there was ever a great amount of leisurely discussion in seminars and so on about purpose. It was rather like settling on a desert island and trying desperately to put a house together, with any bricks or stones or pieces of wood. Well that's*

putting it rather a rather silly way but it was the relationships - to ensure that we brought in all the elements...

What came to dominate thinking from the mid-1980s onwards is the importance of conceptual pluralism and is illustrated in the work of Baron and Taylor (1969), Hughes, Ribbins and Thomas (1985), and Bush (1986, 1995). This approach is described as follows:

> *(15) I mean the way in which I've applied my theoretical models to practice with students has been quite significant. If you say to them 'go away and analyse an event, a situation, a group, whatever in your own school or college, using one or more of these models' it works. They can come back and describe what's happening in relation to a particular situation using one, two, three or more of those models. They can make micropolitics work in groups, very easy, very powerful in that sense. They can show how collegiality works or doesn't work and by drawing on those theoretical concepts they understand what it means much more. So if they're being encouraged to become more collegial because Wallace, for example, says it's the official model of good practice now, they can go away and become more rigorous about that, are we collegial? When I do sessions for heads and I say 'do you run a collegial school?' they will put their hand up. Why? Because this is normatively the right thing to do... So you run a collegial school. Are all your staff involved in decision making? Maybe, maybe not. But it's a one facet test. Is your decision making by consensus? And so by having those components of theory you can test practice. It can also help you eventually to determine whether the theory itself needs modification.*

Theory development is about whether theory is or is not useful. Collegiality has been used by field members in the post 1988 period and it has raised debate because its highly normative characteristics makes it difficult to identify or realise in practice. This approach is illustrated by the following:

> *(11) I have been working in Higher Education and in schools. I have worked for 21 years in universities but I am not really interested at all in HE, but for me those 7 years in teaching in a secondary school were seminal. I have spent twenty years working to understand secondary schools, and education management is just one way of doing it. Education management was protean in its early days both in methodology and at a practical level. You can make of it what you wish. The emphasis was on trying to understand school: how and why we do things. How schools are managed is very strong within education management as practice, and theory is designed to enable, and to be clear what might be done and how might it be done. However, we need to be careful as we can start to believe that management has a purpose of its own! My own model is that we aim to: 1. Understand, 2. Enable, 3. Identify what can be better, and 4. Change and improvement. I have concerns about Critical Theorists who begin by change as the aim, we need to understand first, and to act as enablers.*

The outward looking and conceptual diversity of the field is regarded as a strength. Each clustering of field members within particular HEIs seem to have developed an approach to how conceptual pluralism is understood and operates in their teaching and research. The following extract is an example of how one person spoke about the

approach within a particular cluster of field members in one HEI, and this is confirmed within the interview data as being the approach taken by others in that HEI:

> *(02) ...I've always made the distinction between organisation theory and management theory in very crude terms. Organisation theory is theory for understanding. Management theory is theory for action. And there's two major traditions there historically I think. Organisation theory is largely sociological but also somewhat socio-psychological, but it's largely sociological and Weberian. And latterly, phenomenological and so forth. Those are theories for understanding organisations and understanding management as one, the key one, but one component of it. Management theory is more concerned with theories for action... how they should inform practice. Now then you can't make a hard and fast difference between the two... I say to my students, they're there and I will swing from one to another... if micropolitics is a part of organisation theory which it is in my conceptualisation, that helps us to understand schools and universities and so on. But... how do we take it forward into management terms? I don't know. What do you do? Do you train managers to be political operators? How do you set about training? I mean it would be a nonsense to even set about doing it. It can only be critique if you like.*

The strengths of this approach is that is enables the practitioner to have access to a broader range of ideas as well as enabling action to take place. It is recognised that there is a tension between the two and that giving practitioners access to the broader social sciences could be dysfunctional, but does in the end lead to a more informed and empowered profession. It is not that the social sciences are irrelevant, but it is how the ideas are presented in ways that enable the practitioner to make connections which is important. In this sense it is a field which draws on the social science disciplines rather than forms a unified discipline in itself:

> *(11) ...I think the field's gone through a number of phases in, and in some of the earlier work I think in the Theory Movement, say in the (19)50s and (19)60s, that there was, I suspect there was a hope that it might be a kind of Hirst's notion of a form of knowledge rather than the field of knowledge, but I suspect that the one thing that has largely been agreed is that it is essentially a field of knowledge, which means that although it studies an area which can be more or less closely distinguished, it doesn't have so many of its own fundamental concepts and tests, distinctive tests of truth and the like. I mean it's not like mathematics, logic, you know or whichever subjects you define - physics - as a fundamental field, or even history, and that's really one of the things which I meant by it being a magpie discipline. And I think that was recognised really right from the very beginning, especially in the early book by Baron and Taylor, do you remember it, which did look at that issue. And I think certainly in the UK there are not many people who ever thought that it was a distinctive discipline, that it would ever be a mathematics... But having said that, Evers and Lakomski in a recent paper talked initially about the roots of the field, the philosophical and especially the epistemological knowledge based roots of the field and they argued that it's gone through a number of phases, that the (19)50s and (19)60s was a phase very much dominated by logical empiricism or logical positivism and it's positivistic view of the kind, of the world, and some of the most early and influential work on*

that was done by people who made massive efforts really, like Dan Griffiths and Andrew Halpin, Getzels and Guba, and Hoy and Miskel was probably the last great kind of statement of that field, and of course that's a long time afterwards, but remains a kind of very influential statement of the field. And that was the kind of dominating paradigm for quite a long time. And then in the (19)70s partly under the onslaught of Tom Greenfield, but also with the kinds of people who surrounded him, people like Christopher Hodgkinson in particular... but what Tom (Greenfield) did is to bring it very kind of centrally into ed(ucational) admin(istration). So that would be the kind of thing that happened in the (19)70s, and subsequently there have been various other kinds of development like the growing influence of critical theory and culturally based views, and most recently some postmodernist work and in their analysis, Evers and Lakomski see that as kind of one track. You could argue that at the end of that track that the field is now presented with two alternatives which are very, very different. On the one hand you have postmodernism and on the other hand you have coherentism, which a growing number of the major theorists in the field are becoming increasingly persuaded by. It draws on the work of Quine in particular, but also on the seminal work of the Churchlands. The people who've mediated it really have been Evers and Lakomski but there are others - Willower, for example as far as I understand him seems to see that you can track it back through Dewey as well, so that would be another.

This type of perspective presents an overview of how developments in England and Wales can be related to the broader international field. Certainly, it is the case that the main theoretical debates have been and continue to take place abroad. One current professor within the field argues that philosophical debate about knowledge is inevitably a minority occupation, and it is unfair to construct theory and theorising as detached from immediate practical concerns. However, it is regarded by field members that what is significant about the development of the field in England and Wales is a very strong pragmatic tradition: *(11) education management is very much a 'magpie discipline' and 'in the nest there are many silvery things which have been pinched'.* He goes on to think through some reasons for the particular orientation towards theory in England and Wales:

(11) ...there are several possible arguments that you might hear, one of which is that the development of the field in this country is always seen a kind of close relationship between practitioners and theoreticians and sometimes they have been the same people who have done both, whereas if you look at the roots of the field in a number of other countries, which have made an important contribution to understanding and to acknowledging those kinds of educational administration, they may have been led by theorists essentially rather than, rather than by practitioners... But it may be that whereas in Australia, Canada, in most of the places where the fundamental development of thinking within the fields have been led by theorists... And another might just be that our tradition does tend to be, this is one of the ways in which UK scholarship in this whole area tends to get labelled as more pragmatic, and that means a kind of greater impatience with attempts to theorise a fundamental way. To an extent much has been resolved in the early Baron and Taylor book. It's never been seriously

challenged... I'm not saying that our field in the UK has not been interested in theoretical discourse. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is that what it's not been so interested in what I would call fundamental philosophical theoretical discourse. There's a certain impatience or the attitude is often more kind of a weary long suffering, are you at that again. And there's a kind of slight, although very polite, because we are polite folk on the whole, although as you know, academic discourse can also be some of the most nasty that you'll ever encounter, but there's a kind of polite long suffering surprise that you should be, one should be interested in some of those, those kinds of issues. But that's not to say that people are not interested in theorising.

There is some concern in England and Wales that conceptual pluralism is a disguise for indulgent pragmatism that could undermine the field. For example, from the early days the danger of becoming a consumer of theory is seen a potential problem:

(14) I think that the social sciences had quite a lot to give us and that we gained from doing that, but there was a real danger that people were picking little bits of Etzioni or little bits of something or other when they had never read Etzioni himself, they'd never read Weber, whatever. They had heard a lecture about it or they had read in a secondary source something about it and they could use it. And remember of course sometimes people who are very good teachers can teach something more effectively than the man who had the idea himself. They could use it, but they lacked the context, and you know, ask a few penetrating questions and they started to shift their ground a bit.

If theory is seen as technically useful then the consumption of it by an HEI lecturer could be focused entirely on theory for action, and there is concern that there is a strong anti-intellectual cluster which ignores or marginalises the social science tradition within the field. The importance of the disciplines upon which the professional development of practitioners should be based is reinforced:

(04) I don't think we do students any favours to mask the disciplines. I actually think we should sort of lay them bare and say these sets of sessions are coming at us from this perspective and you should understand that, because otherwise you are in a sense sort of misleading them, but you are not giving them a coherent set of analytical tools.

Views about the field's engagement with theory and models from business settings highlights the debate about the maturity and academic credibility of the field. From the early field leaders there are those who reject external models, of which those developed in industry are a part, but in contrast there are those who argue that what is important is how the transferability is handled. More recently, the development of theoretical models which have come from educational contexts such as the work of Cohen and March (1989) is seen as sign of how the field has moved on and is less dependent on theory developed in non-educational contexts:

(15) ...*But it's now become established in its own right and is not in my view now dependent on the earlier established disciplines from which it was derived. And in that particular sense I think the area where I've taken a very particular view is that although educational management was derived in part from the principles of general management, nearly always applied in practice to industry but claimed to be generalisable, and it's developed its own distinctive theory and body of practice which means that it penetrates with general management work but is nevertheless separate from it... I think what's happened progressively, and again it's much easier to backward this than it is to look forward on it, is the development of an indigenous literature and underpinned increasingly by research of education and management specific to the UK context... But we were trying to develop that and BEMAS played an important part in that at that time because George Baron was involved with that, Meredydd Hughes was very centrally involved in it, and so was Ron Glatter, very centrally involved in it. And so people who I think were genuine leaders with international, strong international reputations were involved in setting up BEMAS and so the conferences that they held, both the annual conferences and the periodic research conferences, were important sources in terms of generating papers where theories, concepts, principles were being applied to the schools and colleges in this country and building up what has now become really quite a substantial literature; not without its flaws and it's limitations which can be seen and still plenty of opportunity for people in the field to develop material, but developed its own literature base and I think that made it... enabled it to become independent over the United States tradition and to loosen its dependence on industrial models. Of course we still use those industrial, we still derive things, I mean appraisal is a classical example of something that started in industry and has been applied, but contextualised. You could see TQM for example as being an area of things that have been developed from the general management field. But equally there are lots of other things that have developed really quite independently and separately. So if you take financial management, I see that has having developed with minimal dependence on financial management in industry. In fact it would be probably be unrecognisable by many people who do financial management in industry. It doesn't have a strong accounting base in the way it's talking about, you know, it's grounded very firmly in LMS and to a lesser extent in GM finance and FEFC finance. Quite correctly. It's not a profit oriented approach. How could it be?... So I think that development's really been quite significant and so although my claim to it being a mature discipline may have been overstated... I think it is a genuinely established discipline now.*

Claims regarding the establishment of the field are also tied up in how the field has sought to label itself. This enables us to see the significance of the focus on practitioners in relation to their professional development, and the particular role of theory in providing a means to describe what is and to prescribe what ought to be. Debates about what the field is called provides a forum for understanding how field members see their work and their professional identity within an HEI. The next section will explore this by looking at the shift from educational administration to education management during the 1970s and 1980s.

6.2.3 The labelling of the field

How the field has labelled itself and continues to discuss terms such as administration, management, and currently, leadership, is central to understanding its growth and its location within HEIs. This will be explored by focusing on the creation of BEAS in 1971, and the renaming as BEMAS. The data sources will not only be from the interview data but also the documentary sources from the BEAS/BEMAS papers.

The origins of BEAS are located in field member international networking, and one of the early field leader notes the suggestion from William Walker that the IIP be in England meant the need to establish an organisation to arrange and support such a prestigious conference:

> (03) ...*I want to say Bill Walker really fired me. I think he said that... the Americans have got UCEA - we are going to have a Commonwealth body, and you're doing it in Britain (name). Well that was the line. Now Bill Taylor was very prominent as well. He was the person I worked with very closely... And after that it was decided that there'd be a meeting in Australia in 1968 and it was barely mentioned first of all that we should have an IIP later. So he organised it and in Australia 1970 he said 'Now (name) you're going to have one in Britain'. Now Eric Briault was there, Bill Taylor was there at that meeting and I said 'well we can only do it if we have a committee or an organisation. I mean I can't do it alone. Bill Taylor can't do it, you know individually'. So BEAS was founded and I'm quite certain about this as the reason for its foundation. But it also, I mean in the minds of other people as well, was founded in its own right, but I mean my first reaction to Bill's suggestion was we must have something to organise it from. And therefore BEAS, an association or a committee in London or Bristol was the obvious answer... Well it was successfully resolved that BEAS should include England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland... and that it should be linked with the Commonwealth countries.*

The formation of a network of people who created BEAS was by invitation from George Baron and William Taylor [1]. Furthermore, the international origins of BEAS is confirmed by three early leading members of the field:

> (09) ...*George Baron was another person that I had made contact with from 1965 onwards, so I would be one of the people that he invited to meet to discuss the possibility of setting up BEAS... at that stage an interest in this area was something very, very new really. And those of us who were developing an interest as soon as we heard of anyone else who was doing anything in that field we would be tending to be getting in touch with them and meeting them if possible. I mean that's how either in late (19)65 or early (19)66 I made contact with both William Taylor and with George Baron, and they were interested in what one was trying to do in (institution name). I got to know Tom Bone for the first time at this meeting in 1970 and he and I have kept up our relationship ever since and so on. Very quickly those of us who were actively interested would get to know each other.*

(14) ...I got to Australia in 1970 and when we came back we were all full of enthusiasm and so I was one of those who helped set BEMAS up... in the early period I was very active. I don't know if you know but in 1974 they had an IIP in the UK which was considered really to be a terrific success and it was 3 weeks... It was, it had one week in Bristol, organised by Bill Taylor, one week in London organised by George Baron, and one week in Glasgow, organised by me. I became heavily involved in BEMAS, but gradually because of the other things I was doing, I became more of a peripheral member.

(06) *...I think we ought to go back to about 1964ish... Bill Walker, if I remember rightly had done the masters degree at University of Alberta in Edmonton, and certainly had Canadian contacts, and at some point, and I remember Bill Walker talking to me about this... it was suggested that Bill work with UCEA as their leg man, as it were, on developing a conference. This is the IIP 1966. Now this was originally intended to bring together Canadians, Australians, New Zealanders and Brits into this three week visit to America, which was distinctive in that it included the visitation programme in the middle. While I was luckily one of the, I think five Brits who went, Bill Taylor was another. And we started off for around about a week in Michigan and then we went for 'walk-a-bout' in groups of around three for ten days and then came together in Alberta. Now it was out of that that people said 'lets have some more, but lets have a wider range of countries' so we came together in Armidale. I was at that one, and out of that a group of us decided we ought to set up what was BEAS, and I remember attending the initial meeting, which I think was at the London Institute. Now I was only a boy around the place at that stage, I was there but the leading people were Eric (Briault), Bill (Taylor) and George (Baron). Tom Bone was involved. Wheeler and his wife... became the leg persons, the organisers of the IIP in the UK subsequently. So we had the BEAS set up, and then was it in (19)74 that we had the UK IIP and then we held every four years since.*

The aims of BEAS were to work collaboratively with established networks at home and abroad to ensure that the teaching and research of educational administration had both academic respectability and relevance to practitioners [2]. The BEAS papers show that the organisation engaged in types of activity to facilitate the intellectual development of the field through organising conferences, and supporting contacts with networks at home and abroad [3]. A Journal was set up and is described by the first editor as follows:

(09) *...Now by that time I'd been involved in the starting of the BEAS in 1971 and that involved getting to know new people, being on the Executive, it was an Executive Committee we had, as a governing body at that time. The meeting to set up BEAS took place I think in October 1971, and the first meeting of the new Executive took place at the beginning of January in 1972, and it was at the second meeting in March that we decided to publish an Educational Administration Bulletin... it was an open question then whether it would develop into a journal or whether in due course a journal would be set up separately but clearly it was necessary to have some kind of newsletter for this new society that had just been set up and that if you were joining the society there had to be some kind of literature for members.*

There is a clear emphasis on the practitioner from a wide range of educational institutions, and the struggle to attract this wide spectrum of members is a central feature of the early days and continues to the present. The original aim was to seek members from the LEAs, and the DES, as well as from schools. The emphasis on the practitioner is illustrated by the need to establish credibility with the very groups which BEAS was seeking to attract as members, and so Briault became the first Chair. In a letter to the SEO in 1973 Briault stressed the distinctiveness of BEAS through taking an inclusive approach to membership:

> "There was a determination at the meeting not to follow the pattern set elsewhere of creating a separate association composed solely of people concerned with research and teaching in educational administration. It was felt that this would tend only to produce a gulf between the study of educational administration and its practice" (BEAS/EC/15).

However, while this was an aim of BEAS, and later BEMAS, the network continued to find practitioner recruitment challenging [4] and to be limited by practitioner interpretations of field members in HEIs:

> (14) ...*But there has been another division... it's the division between those with responsibility for something and those who were commentating on something or analysing it or teaching it. And that division has always been a serious one for BEMAS. At the beginning the key people were in universities: Bill Taylor, George Baron, Ron Glatter and one or two more. They needed to be seen to have some higher level practitioners and so they brought in Eric Briault who had at that time one of the most prestigious names in the country. But Eric was to some extent a figurehead chairman. And where BEMAS was going depended really on people like George Baron. But they were conscious that they needed to have people from the authorities and people from schools and colleges... Now as BEMAS went on it tried to involve real policy makers, real managers, people like Tomlinson, but they never had many people from the local authorities and I can only remember one who ever came from the DES at any senior level... and if you say what did those senior DES people think about BEMAS, my guess is that a lot of them had never heard of it; they didn't reckon it at all, but if they did, if the question was thrown to their attention they would tend to be a little contemptuous perhaps of a body like BEMAS because they saw it as being composed of people who didn't have to take responsibility. People who had the luxury of analysing and commenting and who could look back afterwards and say that's undoubtedly a mistake... But, you know, at the time somebody had to make a decision with politicians breathing down their neck and they, these people found it hard to believe that BEMAS had something to offer. Of course, its members did have something to offer and the dilemma then and I think still now was to somehow make a contribution to national policy making while recognising that you don't have the responsibility, you don't have to live with the consequences, you're not answerable directly to the minister or the prime minister. You can't afford the luxury of mistakes, and the senior civil servant can't.*

BEAS became a forum for the attempt to link the field member in the HEI and the practitioner within the LEA, DES, school or college, but it was doing it at a time when the stability of the post-war settlement and the educational administrators who had sustained it were being challenged. BEAS symbolised as well as facilitated the field's claim to be about practitioner concerns, but agreed notions about accountability were being redefined as central government began to intervene more in policy implementation. As the school as an organisation gained more prominence in the drive to improve educational outcomes from the 1970s, the practitioner focus became less inclusive and increasingly focused on the school. Educational administrators in Whitehall and LEAs did not see BEAS as a forum in which their power base could be protected, and at the same time the labelling of the field as administration was not attractive to practitioners in schools.

In 1980 BEAS changed its name to BEMAS, and investigating this change of name is interesting in enabling an understanding of how the field viewed its own development and how labelling signified its purpose [5]. The retrospective view of those interviewed who were involved in the discussion and implementation of the change is that it was not an important issue. The founders of BEAS see the word 'administration' as being an obvious label, and it was used in the England and Wales in direct response to the use of the word internationally in North America, and Australia. What is central here is that the drive for international recognition and a parity of esteem affected the initial labelling of this network, and an acceptance that management was a lower status activity than administration:

> (14) ...a*nd they saw a sort of hierarchy of administration which involved policy making and strategic thinking, and management which had got involved hands-on direction, and below that training which was what you did for people on the way up. We started off with the British Educational Administration Society, which I think was a conscious effort to show we were working at the same level as they were working at in the States, involved policy... and George Baron was probably the driving force in that.*

In the creation of BEAS the label of administration is seen as an inclusive concept that would enable the practitioner from all sectors to identify with [6]. However, an ongoing

engagement with practitioners raised the issue of how administration was understood. A central concern is the importance of the disciplines and how administration had traditionally enabled both theory and practice to be inter-related:

> *(16) If you claimed the study of education was a discipline in its own right, it had to have its own tests of truth, its own sources of data, its own distinctive methodology. There was a risk that this claim for disciplinary status would squeeze out the vital contribution that came from sociology, philosophy, politics, economics and all the other disciplines on which effective practice and valid theory depended. This takes me back to the point I was making about the term management. There seemed to me to be a risk of narrowing to a craft what was properly a multidisciplinary field of study. That isn't to denigrate the importance of good management. And as I indicated earlier I've modified my view about the use of the term as matters have developed. I recognise that some of the people who speak of themselves as being specialists in education management have roots in the social sciences as strong as those who call themselves students of educational administration. But the point is still worth making that the underlying disciplines of the social sciences are vitally important to the successful development of the study of administration and management. The intellectual, conceptual and methodological bases of educational administration need to be as deep and broad as possible if theory and practice are to flourish.*

The debate seems to centre around the argument that the term management best describes the work of a Headteacher or LEA officer, and this is officially not considered to be a *doctrinal issue*. However, one of the early field members who argues in favour of management sees his experiences of the debate in a different way:

> *(06) ...and here I am echoing the concerns of people who were very critical of me in the early seventies, and what I represented to them, as being almost amoral. People at (institutional name) university at the time, for example, often used to charge me privately and publicly with leading an amoral movement of sheer instrumentalism, simply doing what the employer wants sort of thing, and not paying attention to issues of policy, values and these sorts of things. Now that was because they had a view that management was purely instrumental, if it was anything else, you called it administration, but management was being purely executive, it was simply doing as you were told, but being efficient about it. And this distinction efficiency and effectiveness. Management only being efficient, in their view. Now this, of course, was a complete misunderstanding of the way in which the word manager was used in context. We talk about the general manager, the managing director. These are not purely instrumental things, these are the guys who decide where the place is going to go, or what the mission is going to be, and so we had a problem for a long time of people being constrained with the particular traditions, and I found it particularly interesting having moved from one tradition - the school teacher, administrator, university don at Oxford of all places, into the dirty handed, low status world of the poly(technic).*

This type of argument seems to have won the day and when combined with the school practitioner orientation it became very powerful. This is illustrative of how the

development of the field has been shaped by concerns about image and reputation with practitioners:

> (12) ...*I mean there was always this debate about what the various terms mean, administration, management and leadership, and in the early days everybody assumed that following on the American model, that administration embraced management and leadership. But in practice what you found was that people in schools, you know, common usage was administration equals clerical work, and that was sending out the wrong signals. So we introduced management into the title because that rang all bells, but we hung onto administration because of the academic interest market and the American interest market. So we stuck with Education Management and Administration which also of course would reflect in the title of the society. I don't know what came first to be honest, whether it was the title or the society or the journal. It was all going on at the same time. And then you get the leadership debate which I've always regarded as substantively important but if you like normatively spurious because I'd always assumed that leadership was embraced within the notion of management of administration, you know. What you do is you define your term, and if you talk about vision and mission that's the issue there, but on the other hand some managers have got to be told. It's as long as you define clearly what it is that you mean in terms of function and your responsibilities it didn't seem to me to matter very much whether you called it administration, management or leadership. But then you get this big, sort of debate, you know people like Hodgkinson and so on, more recently and Gerald Grace in his book. It's a long standing debate which has gone through various stages, and essentially it comes down to being clear about your definitions. Actual terms don't matter that much.*

In this sense the development of a home grown field depended very much on how practitioners identified themselves and connected into networks such as BEAS. The then Chair of BEAS describes the events and the role of a particular headteacher:

> (09) *I became chairman in (19)78 I think of the Council and that's a paper by (person's name) that went to the Council meeting... Now he was a Headmaster. You see a year or two earlier he'd become a member of Council. He was a Headmaster who turned up at annual meetings and he was stirring things up a bit from the practitioner point of view, beginning to say that BEAS was becoming rather an academic organisation, wasn't taking sufficient account of the practitioners and so on. So we got him on to Council. I mean in a way that could be regarded as a way of dealing with the opposition by bringing them in. But, quite genuinely we wanted people on the Council who had views of their own and representatives, so he was an articulate Headmaster, very interested, so he was quite surprised I think by the fact that, after he'd made rather a hostile speech that the next thing that was happening was that the people concerned were proposing him for Council... it shows that we accepted it very readily, considering it was such an important decision... but the discussion didn't take very long either in the meeting. It certainly wasn't a meeting where people were sort of taking sides and against it or that sort of thing. I think we were glad to be prodded into doing something which we felt probably it was time to do something about you see.*

How this change was handled has some individual responses, but there is a general consensus that the change was acceptable and necessary for the field to develop. Three responses provide an illustrative sample:

(16) It seemed to me that if it was to be useful and successful, the study of administration needed to be rooted in sociology, social psychology, statistics, economics, politics and others of the social sciences. That of course had been reflected in the collection which I edited with (name) and to which I made a contribution. But that was not how things developed. But perhaps if we'd stayed with this approach to administration and not picked up the growing interest there was in management, which of course had to do with effectiveness and efficiency and economy and all the other things that from the late (19)70s up to today have been so prominent, we would never have got the degree of interest and support within the system that the coupling of administration with management has produced.

(03) Yes, I was hesitant about it because I was worried about the links with UCEA and CCEA which were using the term administration and the world looked upon it as administration, I felt, rather than management. But the polytechnic group felt, you know, management... we had some rather, dotty arguments I think about which was superior. I mean administration seemed to me up there, linking with policy, management was down there once policy had been settled. Whereas they'd say 'no, management is up there, administration is where the clerks get busy'... pointless argument... and now it's been resolved by having both in. I think it's a very minor matter though.

(13) I think the reason that it didn't appear to be very significant at the time, because I think that it was probably generally felt that it was grossly overdue... It was very much uncontentious. I think there was a general view, certainly the practitioners of course, being what's distinctive about at BEMAS compared to many other of the, that sort of society both in the UK academia or in the educational world, like BERA and so on, and certainly abroad, is that it does have this mixture of practitioners and academics. And so I think that the practitioners were probably stronger on the change than the academics, but I don't think it was ever a huge area of debate.

In this sense the change seems to be related to how best to ensure that practitioners are attracted to and are inclusive within the network. The consequences were that practitioners increasingly became of a particular type as the focus shifted to a dominance of schools as the site for management activity.

The shift to management is also made more complex as there were issues of status, power, and validity between leading field members and their different locations within HEIs. For the early field leaders looking back provides an opportunity to see that their arguments about educational administration had been inevitably and quite rightly over taken by management:

(03) I don't know whether we had any influence on other places... the fact that we'd got a department going with the name educational administration, dealing with the present day situation, was a stimulus, but it was developing all the time, all over the place. It's very difficult. I never looked upon myself and never regarded myself as a kind of prophet or anything... There was first of all the... Bill Taylor, Meredydd Hughes, myself which set off something called educational

administration which rapidly became aborted and a new growth, much more important, developed of education management. I mean wasn't ours simply a damp squib of a thing? Did it have any effect at all? I should have thought not.

However, underpinning the end of the educational administration tradition is not just debates about words and meaning, but it is also about the modernisation of higher education in which the polytechnic approach to how the field was conceptualised fitted with the spirit and desires of the age. For those located in traditional HEIs in which there were Departments of Education the emphasis is more on administration, compared with those who were located in polytechnics and often began their work on educational management within departments focused on business management:

(06) ...So we got for a while, two parallel movements, the universities and the ploy(technic)s. Starting up with the lone little voice from (place name), and increasing in numbers but not all that significant an influence. So you still had administration on one side, and this was the local authority world and the university world. Eric Briault representing the local authority world and you got the Poly(technic) world of these rather grubby handed practitioners. Now what was interesting then was that you had a back lash amongst the practitioners. And you got fairly influential head teachers... who objected vigorously to being called administrators. As far as they were concerned, administrators were the people in the LEA office or were the school bursars. Previously these guys would have said 'I am a head and not an administrator', but increasingly they were saying 'I am a manager' and they were using the Poly(technic) meaning of manager - the managing director, rather than the university meaning of manager which was simply an engineer or a technician. Now it didn't happen earlier because of the dominance of the universities and the local authorities within the BEAS, but increasingly we went for recruitment of Heads and we were increasingly successful. The price of that success was Heads saying 'It's just not on' and so I claim very little direct influence here. I had been pushing quietly, because given our status I was only in the Poly(technic), even when I became Head of Department in (19)76, that didn't mean a thing in the universities. To be a Head of a Department, for lots of these people at the Poly(technic), was rather equivalent to being Head of Department in a rather small technical college you know. A non job compared to being a lecturer in a university. And of course there were the salary differentials as well. So I had very little influence over directly. I argued in the Council once or twice for it, but it was met by a general, not hostility, administration is the word. But when the Heads came in, they came with a lot more clout because there was a group that were being actively recruited and BEAS had to listen to them. So the only virtue I would claim in this is that I was part of a much larger movement which changed the climate.

On one level there is also a degree of pragmatism which was necessary to facilitate a break with the past and to create a differently labelled curriculum for practitioners. In this sense there is the view, already expressed in previous extracts, that the words management and administration can be used interchangeably. However, one of the

leaders from within the polytechnic sector is very clear that management was an attempt to break with the traditional university and academic approach:

> *(06) So management represented not so much historic accident of label but actually represented a new thrust conceptually and in practice in terms, of course design, and that sort of thing a whole new thrust or whole new tradition of what the game was about. The final element that was different was that it introduce practices rather than theory from training. The universities generally speaking with some exceptions were very innocent of training methods training techniques, the ohp was a bit of an innovation, but I in fact was involved in things like intray simulations and so on and this was all very daring... There was this tradition of training needs and this was a foreign concept in the universities there was the notion of systematic training methodology in which you went through a series of stages, which in my view were too rigid, my views don't matter, there was a training tradition in management studies and it so happens that this place was one of the hearts of it and in very much as it applied in local government.*

Nevertheless, those from the traditional universities who were also using, and pioneering the training methods, and have taken a critical stance to this presentation of management as ultimately beneficial to practitioners. For one field leader there is something more subtle going on as the drive to be seen as managers is central to the profession's struggle for status in a world in which public sector services were coming under pressure to be more accountable:

> *(02) We didn't actually use the word management until well into the (19)70s... It may be that what we do now has pretty well always been done. But we've created a language... somebody ran schools, but there was no management. I started teaching in 1953 a school of 500 and there was a Head, a Deputy who had a full timetable and a secretary. And that was it. I mean there were no scale posts until the Burnham agreement of 1956. That's when we created a great hierarchy. Management jobs were done and then eventually management became a bigger thing, partly as a result I think of comprehensivisation and larger schools - people started to attend to that. But we still weren't using the term. Then we began to use the term management and then we began to create all kinds of management positions and the question for me is the pull/push question - did we create all these management positions and of course some of these, the titles, particularly in higher education, are now hilarious... Now then, are those jobs to be done? Are those roles for people to be filled for salary purposes? And this was the great point in the (19)50s and (19)60s. I mean we created three levels of Heads of Departments and then five scale posts. Then the problem, the real problem came when there had to be parity in the primary schools so we had to create management-type roles in primary schools and the labels that were attached to them were bizarre as you well know. And since then with the whole quality movement we've created a linguistic world which we inhabit and I'm not sure if it's not getting floating away from reality... So I think there was a push there in terms of money to be spent and roles to be created rather than a pool of jobs to be done. Now I'm not dismissing the fact that there are many more jobs to be done. I'm not denying that, but I think it was much push than pull... So we have created, we have created a language for this and people are inventing jobs for themselves.*

6.2.4 Themes in the intellectual history of the field of education management

What the first part of the data analysis illustrates is that the professional biographies of the early field leaders established certain themes which are central to any claim for significance: firstly, the emphasis on the practice and improvement of management by individuals and organisations; secondly, that practitioners can and should be trained to be effective managers; thirdly, theory should be relevant to both the understanding and implementation of practice; and, fourthly, educational outcomes are connected with effective management of people and organisational goals.

Field members in HEIs did not see themselves as a separate intellectual caste and regarded intellectual work as inclusive both in the focus on practitioners and in seeking to work with practitioners through networks such as BEAS/BEMAS. Debates over labelling illustrate that increasingly the practitioner became regarded as the manager within the school context, and this had an impact on the nature of the engagement with theory from the social sciences. Management theory and its usefulness as a spotlight to focus on different parts of professional activity came to dominate from the mid-1970s, and the legacy of administration became associated with the limitations of bureaucracy rather than its connection to broader issues of democratic structure and public service. The claims made by the early field members remain familiar and central to the later generations, in which the labelling issue remains salient in the debates about whether what practitioners do is management and/or leadership.

While the field has become more and more concerned with the effective management of schools there are important critiques and concerns coming from within the field regarding the activities of a large and growing entrepreneurial trend. Field members point to their own publications and research as illustrative of their concern to engage with theory and to ensure that management is linked to debates about values. Positions have been and are being taken, but it seems that discussion about positions and positioning is not a central feature within how field members see their purpose both

within the field or as members of an HEI. It seems that such intellectual debate would deflect from a focus on the concerns of the practitioner, and undermine claims for neutrality that is essential to the workings of conceptual pluralism. This needs further exploration of the data as it suggests that understanding how the interviewees and others came to locate themselves within the field and the various choices made and positions taken is pertinent to an construction of the historical development of the field. In this sense I cannot separate discussions about practitioners, theory or labelling without describing and understanding the people who spoke, wrote and bore the field into existence. There is a need to investigate the background of field members, the impact of their location in an HEI, and the bigger picture of the policy context in which this was happening. The next section of the chapter will explore this through investigating the lives and situated contexts of the sixteen field members interviewed.

6.3 Creating the field

Any understanding of how the field of education management is conceptualised is directly related to how the field member located in an HEI understands the nature of their professional practice and interests. The first part of this section will focus on the individuals who have been centrally involved in the creation of the field, and the networks which they created. However, on its own this is only a part of the story, and hence later parts of this section will focus on the situated context in which professional decisions and choices have been and are being made.

6.3.1 The professional biographies of field members

A central and significant theme in the lives of the interviewees is the importance of professional practice within an educational institution. Prior to moving into higher education, twelve of the sixteen interviewees had been practitioners in schools before seeking promotion to middle and/or senior management roles. The impact of this background has a strong influence within the field and is illustrated by one professor from the early days:

(09) I think I'd better begin by mentioning my career before I thought of myself at all as an academic. I was in education for 16 years before I became an academic, 4 years as an assistant master teaching mathematics in a grammar school in (place name), for 4 years as a head of a maths department, that was in (place name)... Then 8 years as a headmaster in (place name)... and up to fairly late in that period of 16 years, I had no specific reason to think of myself as doing this on the way to an academic career. I was appointed headmaster at the age of 35 of a four form entry grammar school which was expanding to become a five form entry grammar technical school of about 900 pupils. When I went into that headship I certainly had no idea at all of changing career in a few years. I enjoyed being a headmaster and the opportunities that it gave me, but after the first 4 years or so I began to wonder whether I would want to be doing it for another 25 years or so... and an opportunity came to go on a school master fellowship to Balliol and that term in Oxford was a term I enjoyed very much. It gave me a chance to look back at what I had been achieving and to start reading, in a way I hadn't read before, about management and consider to what extent is this relevant to schools and so on. I became aware of the American literature - this would have been about 1961. The new theorising in the States was taking place in the late (19)50s. I learnt about what was happening in the States and it interested me very much. When I went back to school I still hadn't really developed the idea but quite soon after that I began to think well is there a way to be involved in this other than as a headmaster. And an opportunity came in 1965 to take up an academic post as a lecturer at (institution and place name). It was, it was quite a bit step in a way and particularly for my wife and young family, because it would involve a drop in salary of about 20% I think, with no guarantee of future advancement on the university side... because it was just an ordinary lectureship and with no promise of anything beyond that. I was particularly interested in looking at headship at that time, and a widening of interest came later, but at the time I was interested in critically examining the job that I had been doing myself as a headmaster.

The nature and type of practitioner role within an educational institution does seem to have had an impact on the focus of interest and approach once in an HEI. In looking back at his experience a more recent entrant into an HEI notes:

(10) I wonder if as a deputy head I always found myself caught between two stools so to speak, between listening to the worries and the concerns of teachers in the classroom and the managerial situation as it applied from the top, and the problems there. And I think deputy heads particularly are pulled both ways. They still have their feet in the classroom, and I was a class teacher all the way through being a deputy head, so my feet were still in the classroom; I was still very, very aware of the problems there, but I was also as a person who was moving on to a headship, and I think I would if I had not moved into the university. I was aware of the managerial demands. But it's meant that I've not taken one perspective or the other... I've tended to sympathise with the teacher and whilst I understand what management is trying to do, or what some managers are trying to do, it's made me perhaps more questioning of what they ought to be doing rather than if I had been in that position myself.

The professional biographies show consensus in the need to go beyond action and to seek out the literature and people who at the time were important to understanding their practical context. There is a strong intellectual drive to understand roles within an educational institution, and it was almost as if the individual had to take a break from

being a practitioner, either through a sabbatical or through a change in employment, in order to begin this process of understanding. Raising questions and intellectualising practice is a central feature of all the field participants interviewed. Many had begun to write and research about management issues before moving into an HEI, and practice is more than doing, but is about sharing good practice through the research process.

On entering an HEI all had continued to teach, though management and administrative responsibilities are a central feature. For two of the interviewees very senior roles had taken them out of the field as an area of study into a very significant area of their own practice as institutional leaders. More typical within the sample is the appointment within an HEI at a junior place on the academic ladder, such as contract researcher or lecturer, and career development had led to promotion. For example:

> *(03) Well, first I must be a little biographical. I joined the (institution name) in 1946 and occupied the post of School Relations Officer. That meant I was in charge of organising teaching practice and, you know talking to schools about that kind of thing. I was in that job for about 8 years and during that time I began lecturing and visiting schools. I arranged a lot of visits for people from overseas countries and so that led me on to lecturing because they wanted to know all about the schools they visited, they want to know about local authorities. That led me to an interest in the administration of education, because the questions were in that area. In 1954 I was appointed as a lecturer in... British Educational Institutions, a wide title, but that was simply the educational system, how it worked, including independent schools and the rest of it. Because nobody else in the (institution name) or anywhere at that time, they dealt with the history of education, they dealt with sociology and all the rest of it, but the poor people from overseas said, you know, well what is a public school and how is it funded? And what's the difference between that and a private school? And who decides who to teach what? Do you see what I mean? And they didn't get the answers from the psychologists or anyone... and then in 1963 the person who was Reader in Educational Administration retired and I was offered the job and said all right, history is out. That's finished. That's an historian job. What I want to study is what is now. I was Governor of 2 or 3 of the first (place name) comprehensive schools and there it was quite clear that everyone was kind of learning.*

In telling their stories about how they came to locate themselves within the field of education management a very strong theme is that their own practice could be enriched by an engagement with research and reading. It is almost as if work had to be something more than technical work in the sense that they developed an intellectual engagement with teaching and management which raised questions and stimulated ideas which were then pursued. For example:

(16) So in career terms, everything links up. You can't look at what someone has taught and published without reference to how their own career has developed.... Understanding what I was doing has always been my chief motivation for choosing certain themes on which to research and to write... I wrote a book on the secondary modern school when I was teaching in secondary modern schools and the two things fed each other - the writing and the work. Perhaps one was a better teacher or Deputy Head or whatever from reading about the subject, and perhaps one wrote a better thesis through knowing about it at grass roots. All the teacher education things I've done have followed the same pattern. I'd been working in colleges and departments and institutes and so on as well as writing about them. When I became a Vice-Chancellor I started reading that up and writing about it. It's always been a matter of trying to use the academic work to feed the practice and at the same time make the practice give the academic work a greater sense of realism and value.

In addition to enquiry into practice, ideas were nurtured and intellectual development facilitated through study and contact with people in higher education:

(11) ...I'm very interested in theory and as you know that in part comes from that wonderful two year course, Diploma that I did at the (Institution name)... It was just a marvellous department, the most brilliant teaching I've ever had. And I remember it with huge affection subsequently, really settled my interest...

The transition from professional practice within a school or LEA to being a lecturer and researcher in an HEI is unique for each individual, and the balance between professional and personal concerns inevitably varies. For some, changes in their personal lives such as bereavement or divorce interconnected with professional choices. Alternatively a re-evaluation by a person of their life led to changes in their professional location, while for others the necessity of having to earn an income influenced their professional portfolio. Interestingly time away from practice through secondments or an investment in a postgraduate course created professional dilemmas as to whether to go back into the classroom or seek a post in an HEI. Some serendipity operated here combined with the importance of gatekeepers. One current professor tells his story as follows:

(04) Graduated with a degree in Economics and Politics, (institution name). Went into industry as a graduate trainee which I actually was very clear about wanting to do. I think it was the wrong company, maybe the right company but the wrong time. I began to feel my brain was shutting down, principally the subject, principally politics... So I went there and did the PGCE... Half of me thought I would quite like to do a Masters Course. I taught first in (place name) where I miraculously became Head of Department... So I taught there for four years and then I switched to (place name) which was another school which was changing to comprehensive the year I went there. Again I was Head of Humanities and Head of the Year... so I taught for nine years in schools, but I had one year out which is when I did my Masters degree at (place name) ... and it was at that point that actually I began to think about an academic career. I had only just

taken the job I was in and it was interesting. Where do I go next and they said you know have you thought of doing a Ph.d and they also said you don't need to do this as a student, we can get a research grant. And there were personal reasons due to a bereavement and my marriage ending, which actually caused me not to act, I would sit on my hands because I actually didn't know really what to do. Educational administration in local authorities wasn't something I had particularly considered... I was seconded in 1976/77, sat on my hands for a year and then at the end of that period, 1978, I thought well let's give the academic route a whirl. Partly on the logic that if I didn't like it I could easily come back into schools as Deputy Head which the chances in a sense of finding it to the academic route I was less likely, far fewer jobs. I then put together a proposal for Leverhulme and whilst that was in process a job was advertised here in (institution name) wanting an economist because (they) wanted an economist who could apply economic issues to what was then called educational administration and I applied and I got it. So I came here then in 1979. Before the interview I had never even heard, I mean it's extraordinary to reflect on it now, but the words educational management, educational administration, in relation to schools were phrases that I had not even thought of because I remember the tutor at (institution name) telling me when I was talking about the post, he said: 'there was an house journal something called Educational Administration, you know I might want to look at that'. And I had never looked at it before, I can't remember whether I actually looked at it before the interview... the whole notion of educational administration as a field of study was something that I had no purchase on whatsoever. Even to the extent that if I had ever regarded myself as an academic it would have been becoming an economist of education.

An employment location within an HEI is not the same as the acceptance by the academy. All have undertaken study either part-time or full-time in which accreditation had been sought through Master's and Doctoral work. The seeking of credentials is complex with motives varying between an interest in studying management practice and wanting to secure an entry into the academy. The realisation that an employment location within an HEI brought about questions about entry into the academy varies from person to person, and for each individual over time. Two extracts provide examples:

(16) It's 35 years since I first gave those lectures on courses for heads. I don't know that we saw ourselves as pioneers. Contrary to the impression that some people have, academic life is profoundly competitive. Young academics tend to look for interesting and worthwhile niches within which they believe they might be able to make a contribution to theory and to practice. To be successful you need to be identified with something that hasn't been fully exploited elsewhere Here was a worthwhile new field, and there were a lot of reasons why it seemed likely to become more important.

(06) There was no job description... really informal back in the (19)60s, hadn't all become routinised with job descriptions and person specifications and all the rest of it and in those days... the Director interviewed everybody... so I said to him what do you want me to come and do and he said (name), I want you to come and develop this place into the best place in education management in Britain, and I said I won't come on those terms unless you change that to best in Europe.

There is considerable evidence that careers have not followed linear patterns, and a shift in employment direction into and within HEIs was not a smooth path and often illustrates structural barriers such as income (often a drop in income) and the securing of tenure. However, in spite of this, there is a lot of evidence from within the professional lives of field members about the importance of working in an area which they find stimulating, and from this emerges an intellectual and professional position. Professional practice is centred around the creation and development of short and long term courses (particularly Master's and more recently Ed.Ds); undertaking management and leadership roles within their institution such as Head of Department, Dean, or Vice-Chancellor; the supervision of research students/staff, and the bidding for research grants; writing, publishing and editing of books and journals; membership and undertaking officer roles in national and international networks such as BEMAS, and the CCEA; and, increasingly for current field members the development of consortia and the writing of bids for contracts for training work such as the NPQH training or assessment centres.

Talking with the interviewees about their professional practice within HEIs shows that there are similar types of work related to the particular configuration of the field of education management combined with the structural influences of the nature and purpose of an HEI. For example, there is a strong emphasis on working with practitioners through teaching and consultancy. It is evident that work has inevitably changed and developed over time, and this has been affected both by the situated context in which the interviewees are located as well as their goals in carving out a particular identity within the field and within their institution. Patterned through the professional biographies are traces of how the individual has developed and often articulates their professional identity. Two extracts illustrate this:

> (07) ...*I've certainly shifted and I'm now more interested in policy implementation and my area of particular interest is the difficulties with implementation, why there's a mismatch between what the policy is and what the implementation of it is. I do see myself as centrally located within the field of educational management... but what I'm trying to do is to bring in the policy elements.*

(01) *...but interestingly I've been thinking more recently about what's my disciplinary base, in a sense of how do I see myself addressing it? ...my perspective I think in terms of the interests I've got now is essentially historical and political, which goes back to my training, and it also probably couldn't be anything else.*

One interviewee talks about how their work became more and more international, culminating in the presidency of the CCEA in 1986. Another, is able to divide their career into three phases: teaching full time students, then moving into short courses, before mainly working on externally funded research projects. Some of the interviewees talk about their work primarily in relation to teaching, others talk more about particular disciplines and the knowledge claims which both interest them and have validity within the field. There is a strong thread of sociologists and historians cutting through the field members from the 1960s. The approach taken in this study is not to undertake a content analysis of individual and group publications, but to consider how this professional practice is linked to both the act and conceptualisation of positioning within the field. One current leader of the field talked about the influences in writing a book about theory:

(15) ...I was conscious and I still am in a way that educational management... wasn't the codified subject at all at that time - whether theory or practice. There wasn't a single book you could look at and say 'that's it', you know, a definitive book. The OU (Open University) was probably strongest in the literature simply because it teaches through that way, but we wouldn't have pretended that it was a definitive approach. Around the same time the Meredydd Hughes et al. (1985), which had Thomas and Ribbins in it, was published which also had a very substantial piece on the theory by Meredydd Hughes, in fact it was a very, very long chapter, I don't know how long, but very long, 40 or 50 pages or something, you know, much longer than the average chapter in an edited volume. I'd been influenced partly by that. Secondly there was a similar piece of work was prepared by Rob Cuthbert. Rob Cuthbert was then working at, he's come out of the field now but he was then working at the further education staff college in Blackburn and was a consultant to our Management in Post Compulsory Education course. And he did some work for us which had a loosely similar approach and it had tried to bring in some theoretical perspectives but obviously FE specific and it was the short part of the course and so partly I was thinking that's an approach that is worthy of much further development, and I was conscious of the fact that important pieces of theory were lurking in strange places, you know, in odd articles here and there. I mean one of the interesting examples is a piece of work I still use by Noble and Pym, on what they call the receding locus of power in education, which I still use and which is important and there are all sorts of other things from the United States as well. So I was influenced by all those things to do it. I also wanted, I mean as I suppose as anybody wanted to try and make some kind of mark in an area that people hadn't done before, because I had a strong social science background myself as well.

Another current field leader talks about his work as editor of the leading Journal in the field:

> *(11) I mean I have written about some aspects of them myself but even from my part I think my main contributions actually have been as editor of the Journal, encouraging that discourse and I must admit with a certain amount of trepidation because you can only go so far in front of what actually interests your readership and your membership. But I have actually been heartened by the fact that a great majority of the feedback on the say special editions of Evers and Lakomski's original book and Chris Hodgkinson's book and Tom Greenfield's book has actually been very supportive.*

For others there is a sense of how their own professional location is intertwined with opportunities for work to grow and develop. A number of interviewees talk about how particular places became centres of excellence within the field such as the London Institute, Birmingham University, and Bristol University. The professional biographies show a considerable amount of excitement and turbulence in both creating and being created by the growth of the field. The majority of those interviewed locate their intellectual identity within the field, though retirement from an HEI, or a return to full time professional practice as a manager, means that some of the early field leaders do not see themselves as being able to make a contribution. A small number of current field members prefer to see their work as changing within the field, and for a very small minority they do not want to be totally identified with the field and preferred to move into and out of it.

6.3.2 The location of field members within higher education

How field members came to be located within HEIs has been told through their stories which have been captured within their professional biographies and reported on above. The reasons underpinning these career shifts have a strong sense of agency, but also there are elements of serendipity. However, it is more complex than this, and consideration needs to be given to the contextual issues supporting the recruitment to, and co-option of field members within, the HEI.

In some ways the location of field members within HEIs is related to the initiative taken by those who were around in the 1960s. In answer to a question about why field members were able to position themselves in this way, one of the early field leaders observes:

> *(03) Well because I didn't see any sign of practitioners developing the study of educational administration. If they had so desired where would they develop it? Would they develop it in a university or a polytechnic, or both? Where it actually developed was the universities and the polytechnics... I mean they could have set up a college for heads of schools. They could have set up a college for local administrators. But it didn't happen. There were suggestions of that kind of thing... but supposing it had happened and they had set up such bodies. How would they have developed the teaching business you see? Unless they'd set up a kind of business school for education.*

However, this professor also noted that there were structural and cultural factors which had to be engaged with for professional activities to be located within the HEI. In particular, legitimacy depended on how the knowledge claims of an area of study linked to the established disciplines:

> *(03)...the three disciplines were almost worshipped... and if you wanted to get in on the act, you had to establish a discipline... you simply had to function within the idea of social science disciplines.*

Two professors from the field develop this further, and argue that in the universities in the 1960s any new curriculum development had to be located within the social sciences. As there were already Departments or Institutes of Education this enabled educational administration to be coherent with the foundation disciplines underpinning of pre-service teacher education:

> *(12) ...I think there has been a paradigm shift really and I think the Baron and Taylor (1969) book was essentially about the nature of the discipline, you know,*

what's the nature of the field? It was very much arising from educational studies post-Robbins. One of the things that people often forget or don't know is that the masters degrees that were set up in the (19)60s and (19)70s were primarily designed to equip people in initial teacher education to teach the B.Ed. which came in as a result of Robbins. And in order to do that they had to develop a coherent strategy, philosophy if you like of the curriculum for initial teacher education. You know people were going to teach the B.Ed. what do they need? And what they looked to was the disciplines. So if you look at the stuff in the late (19)60s, early (19)70s teacher education is all about the four disciplines and that transferred into educational administration as it was called at that time, and you had, Ed(ucational) Admin(istration) as a discipline or field. I mean the term itself has, I think, two principle sources - one is American, that's what it's called in the States; and the other is public administration in this country, which George Baron... and they were concerned to legitimate it within the normal framework of the university life. Hence it's firmly based on the four disciplines, nobody can argue with that, that's what universities do.

(02) ...it was the disciplines, sociology, philosophy, I mean this was the big development I suppose in the (19)60s... Then the first interdisciplinary area to emerge was the curriculum... but this high status thing was the disciplines, and that bedevilled teacher education. I mean that was in retrospect that was absolutely wrong for teacher education at that time the quest for academic respectability and this manifested itself through the BEd. The BEd of course was made very academic, discipline based degree... and then I suppose that management came after. And I can't say when it became respectable as a discipline because most of these you see came from somewhere else. I mean Bill Taylor came from sociology and I came from sociology and... George Baron was an historian... So people were inevitably coming at it from, and still are of course to a large extent, coming at it from out of the basic disciplines.

In this sense constructing educational administration with connections to the disciplines is a political move in order to achieve the consecration and acceptance of the established academy. Similar issues affected the polytechnic, and college of higher education sector, and location in a business school was a factor. A professor from the early years of the field described how the first M.Sc. was created and the context of its conception and birth:

(06) Why was it called a programme in education management? Firstly, it was the first in the country to be so called, secondly the reason is a very simple one and not at all profound not at all mundane not at all ideological quite unrelated to the debates that came later and Ron Glatter's paper. It was simply that the staff who taught in the early days were not specialists in education they knew nothing about the literature on educational administration that had come from America and what they did know was the industrial commercial literature, the organisation theory, personnel management theory; the second thing, was it was a Department of Management studies; the third thing was that the bread and butter programme in the Department in those days was the Diploma in Management Studies... It was a two year part time course, one year full time, and you did papers in the first year, you had personnel management, financial management etc., and in the second year they integrated these and you had a project. Now when they were looking round for something to call their programme... they called it Diploma in Education Management and they were in a Management Studies Department, and... it was a polytechnic validated not CNAA validated

Diploma in Education Management... that is where it started in September of 1968 in (institution name) and so I was then called PL (Principal Lecturer) in Educational Management, I think probably the first person in the country...

Courses in education management grew more rapidly in the polytechnic sector than the universities, a reason given is that it was more difficult for a new area of activity to enter the traditional university than the polytechnics, and the latter were seeking new markets. Validation of polytechnic courses through the CNAA meant that this organisation had a big impact in the promotion and configuration of the field.

The connection between the growth of the field and the generation of income by higher education cuts across the old binary divide. There is a realistic approach that while field members have been recruited rapidly into HEIs in the last thirty years, the level, type and security of acceptance remains conditional. One current field member from an 'older' university notes:

(05) ...and I would say that acceptance only came when we demonstrated that we now have the largest masters degree in the (institution name); when we demonstrated that in fact we could recruit students. I mean it was almost a bums-on-seat activity... and when we could demonstrate that this was an intellectually valid activity.

The field members who were interviewed have been or continue to be leaders of and within the field of education management, and their location within an HEI is significant to them. They could have been trainers in LEAs or private consultants, and still engage in much of the professional practice which they value. In addition, one member of the field notes that the pressures faced by LEAs since 1988 has led field members in HEIs to add to their professional activities by undertaking consultancies and training. However, in the debates about knowledge claims and the central focus on the practitioner, there is clear understanding of why field members are located in HEIs, and it centres around the importance of the university tradition towards learning and creativity. Three extracts illustrate this:

(05) So what I've been trying to do here is to say we are academics and I'm constantly saying this to people, we are not management trainers although we do management training, but we are not management trainers who don't think about the bigger issues. We are academics. We are constantly wanting to ask questions and to look at the long term outcomes of what we do... I think we are about working with teachers to enable them to be more reflective and to put some skills in that reflection. I don't think you can sit round and contemplate your

naval. I think you do have to have some skills. You do have to have knowledge. You do have to have research and expertise. You have to have analytical tools. You have to have all of those things that universities are concerned with... So on one hand I want to be in there and working with the practitioners. On the other hand I want to be standing back from them and thinking about what education managers are doing, and why, and how... you're asking me really is education management a valid field of academic study. I think it is, but I'm not entirely sure about that. But I think for this (institution name) it is a question. But I would ask that about a lot of things that go on within an education department in a university. Is something like school effectiveness a valid academic study? Is being interested in post-compulsory education a valid academic study? Because if you start defining what's valid very narrowly you end up just with curriculum and pedagogy. And I think that we people have something valuable to offer the education system.

(02) Somebody has to run schools... I've always taught my MEd and because of the way I teach the Ed.D. my concern is with understanding educational organisations. I make this very clear... if I was training you I'd be doing something else, but the one thing I'm trying to get you to do on this course is to understand organisations, which means taking in some ways a non-management view of organisations. And so a lot of it is critical and debunking and so on but I always say to students and remind them probably every session despite what I'm saying somebody has to run schools and let's make no mistake about this.

(12) I mean I would teach my students you should be critical of all of us. You should read Stephen Ball and you should use his critique or Fred Inglis and use their critiques of managerialism and subject them to the same degree of critical scrutiny as anybody else. Perfectly proper. You know it's all part of the academic process. Meanwhile schools have got to be managed, LEAs have got to be downsized, things have got to be done, and you come to the question has the university got a role in that. And I believe that it has. So I want to take each of those criticisms one at a time and say let's look at this and you know, how legitimate is it in reality? Some of them are based upon misconceptions, misunderstandings.

Location within the university provides an opportunity for critical reflection and development which is distinctive. For one of the early field leaders from the polytechnic sector there is a strong sense of how this tradition created and sustained a type of engagement with the practitioner which was different to the older universities. The argument is that the Master's degrees in the universities in educational administration had a different purpose to those in polytechnics:

(06) *...it assumed that the way that Heads would become changed was through knowing theory and the research. The aims of these other degrees, the Bristols, the Oxfords, the Londons were very much constrained by the culture of the organisations to be respectable and researchy and so on, now that's not a criticism but simply to point out that they had a particular character. The management ones came from quite different stock they started with two concerns, a concern for the learning that the individual did and a concern for this being applied within the organisational context... so we started off with the assumption that there were two aims could be in tension, the individuals learning and developing and organisations changing and for that reason the Diploma in*

Education Management had, as a major part of it, about one third of the total, a management project not a dissertation...

How an area of professional practice and study comes to be located within an HEI is also connected with debates about credentialism. Field members from the polytechnic sector put emphasis on training in management as a cultural and pedagogic break with the traditional lecture and seminar format of the universities. Furthermore, those in the polytechnics did not get involved in research degree supervision as this was seen to be more individual and esoteric than supporting a practical management project. However, in the post-1988 period there is a wider recognition of the importance of postgraduate study having a purpose linked to individual and organisational development, but there is also a concern that the growth of the market culture combined with an emphasis on technical skill and practice is leading to a 'dumbing down' of university research in general, and educational studies in particular:

(04) ...*My understanding of that is that administration is the sort of higher level activity. Management was a fairly low level activity but there was a process of cultural change where management actually became a more high status word and it seemed to me to be in many respects a kind of pragmatic recognition of the fact that some people were increasingly using the word management to define higher level activities like teachers and managers as against Headteachers and administrators... But what for me happened in the mid eighties is that the Masters course here running up to that time was about raising questions, was about saying look, you know, we should think of organisations as complex things and the way in which I conceived the idea of somebody becoming Master of Education meant that at the end of that process they were people who were aware of the unsettled ground on which they were standing. If somebody becomes a master of a discipline he/she is somebody who is actually aware of the uncertainty of the nature of knowledge... Whereas what I actually think we have now moved to is a degree of conviction and belief around how you manage organisations, about having value statements, having mission statements, about having an objective which is derived from that and the school development plan sequence of audit, priority setting, implementation, evaluation. And that in many respects all of these things are sort of fairly unproblematic. Like you know we have menus as to what constitutes effective schools or how you improve schools. The world apparently has become a much simpler place, you know the Government... I mean I am exaggerating you know, but the idea that management was something that you treated as a kind of problematic activity which was the scene to be around, this of course, in the early eighties, became much less as we began to negotiate with LEAs and see if we could provide... courses with, under prescribed solutions. And some of that is no doubt is also kind of market driven. You would prescribe and people would come on the courses. And that's contributed and broadened the field, and I think that's contributed to one of the things I think has occurred in the nineties. Post Reform Act researching in England, Wales and Scotland and Northern Ireland are people who are not at all identified with management as a discipline, their study becoming engaged in researching management as an activity.*

Concern about the ownership of studies is not unique to the field, but has been played out in relation to professional practice such as consultancy and research. For the older universities changes in postgraduate education is connected to customer demand, and the growth in the professional Doctorate or Ed.D., is seen as a part of this:

> *(01) I wasn't involved in the initial discussion... I suppose it was a range of things. One must have been a recognition that the home market for M.Eds. was declining, that is, you're not getting the students walking through the door in the numbers we've had before. Which is a national phenomena and it's basically because since (19)87 there's been that kind of decline. And it was also a sort of thinking and it was (names of people) and a few others about what was going on in the field and also an awareness that they had, of the Ed.D. that was operating in the States. And so one of my colleagues, (name) made a visit to the US and looked at a number of these programmes and came back and the idea for it was formulated. We... then worked on developing the model from I suppose in practice in the first year and it, and it obviously fulfilled a need and initially, I mean it's levelling off now because lots more institutions have come into the field, but we've attracted a lot of very good people, very quickly. And still does. I mean we've got a lot of people on the programme. And we've got aims for the programme which are to... understand, commission and undertake research. It's a research focus but on the other hand it's not a research apprenticeship in the way that the Ph.D. was originally perceived. And also of course it's very different, I mean it's a degree for busy practitioners, senior professionals.*

The ability to create new qualifications in HEIs continues to be connected with knowledge claims and the research credentials of those supporting the proposal. However, the context in which field participants are located in HEIs continues to change, and the barriers hindering the ongoing recruitment of field members are noted. In particular, as the academy is increasingly controlled through managerial strategies such as the RAE, there is a concern that field members with considerable practical experience but limited publications will find it difficult to gain lecturing positions. The struggle to have the study of educational practice recognised as legitimate in some HEIs is talked about by a large number of the interviewees, for example:

> *(15) I mean there are still people who are professors of education, for example, who look down on educational management - it's not a proper discipline but... they tolerate it because it brings in income. Maybe that's even true of my own university, rather than having the proper status that it ought to have. But I don't know how long that will take and how long do you take to become an established discipline. Probably after I've retired. Then I suppose the problem is that theories, concepts, principles, all those kinds of things take a long time to develop and to take hold.*

In particular, contractual arrangements and income generation targets mean that field members in HEIs face similar leadership and management contradictions to those

experienced by practitioners in schools and colleges. One current professor in the field describes the context as follows:

> *(11) ...I think as universities as a whole have faced the euphemistically described efficiency savings from year to year which is increasingly biting at the same time as we've had a huge expansion of numbers. I mean if you look at it the... our kind of populations are 60-70% more students and hardly any more staff. Well it doesn't take a genius to work out that something's got to give on that... Those in work are actually working much longer hours, significantly much longer hours than we used to. And to an extent we had that dilemma and I expect, and talking to others being as an external examiner and an advisor it seems to me that dilemma... is really quite wide-ranging. That to an extent you do need to have regard to where the money is in determining what you do, because if you don't, you won't be able to actually pay for the staff that you have, let alone new staff. So that we have and I suspect others have as well, I'm trying to square the circle and some uneasy balance between doing the things that we feel should be done in a kind of fundamental sense and doing the things that we have to do because the research selectivity exercises for example and related things that the grading that you get and your unit of resource is in part determined by those kinds of considerations... we in the field (are) working in areas we might not have chosen... And it's always a question of balance.*

Trying to maintain that balance is difficult, and the changing policy context in which higher education has been and is located is having a significant impact on how field members determine their professional practice. The growth of managerialism within HEIs and the end of the binary divide has put pressure on the traditions of the academy. While the newer universities are working to take on the vestiges of academic respectability through increasing their research and publications output, those within the older universities are faced with undertaking professional tasks which take them away from traditional academic activities. For field members this means that the ground continues to be unsafe both intellectually and structurally, but in securing a position field members are working hard to maintain and enhance their knowledge claims within educational studies, and their identity within the HEI. The early field members who promoted the connection with the social sciences were in the university sector, and the emphasis in the polytechnics was on changing rather than understanding practice through external theory and research. Intellectual insecurity comes from these different cultures within the structural location of field members in which there is also a strong political motivation to establish significance: the market opportunities for the growing

polytechnic sector, and the claims made about consistency with social science traditions for the older universities [7].

The marketisation of higher education has encouraged the development of polytechnic style approaches to courses through the language of provision and accreditation. This has made it increasingly difficult for field members to maintain their claim for connections with the social sciences, even though the academy and accountability processes such as the RAE require it. Furthermore, the significance of working with the practitioner in support of individual and organisational development is also under pressure as the construction of who a practitioner is and what makes a practitioner effective is being determined by policy changes. The tensions for field members are growing through the pressures to be both simultaneously an entrepreneur and an academic. Trying to hold on to the educational values and traditions of postgraduate study and higher education is proving difficult within a restructuring educational system. One current field leader describes the impact of structural change on the nature of work in educational studies in general, and the field of education management in particular:

> *(12) ...the other thing is that of course a major economic structural factor is the way in which it was funded. It was funded on the pooling system... the money, their source of income was virtually guaranteed. So it was in economic terms a provider-led market. Provider dominant market. And the customers who came along took what was on offer. They had no option. Very little option. And of course there's lots of discontent around in the system at that time about, you know, the normal criticisms of universities, they're theoretical and irrelevant if you like. And that's why you get things like COSMOS and the Schools Councils doing what they're doing and also the short course movement within universities through further professional studies and so on... So you've got these two parallel developments. The Theory Movement on the one hand ,and the, you know, the more nitty-gritty stuff on the other, mainly the short courses. And that's more or less the picture that Meredydd (Hughes) portrayed in 1981. And then you get the attack on that, on the theory front which leaves people in a state of disarray really. Although since, you know, it's dangerous to overstate this because... we always said to our students... look, we're primarily here about knowledge for understanding, that's why you're coming for a Masters degree and we believe there's a body of knowledge which is worth gaining access to and coming master of and we hope that it will inform your practice - in other words it will inform action, but we don't claim to be trainers. Now meanwhile you've got the MCI strand, which has trends earlier but comes to a head and things like competency based... Once the funding changes, and once the things like TRIST etc. come in and the schools are bidding for things, which was the early model, then of course it becomes a customer led market and the universities are having to jump through hoops as far as they are concerned... And so once you introduce the*

market, then all this business about theory becomes one of several possibilities as far as customers are concerned. And the universities have got to adjust their provision in order to meet this. And national agencies are set up which gradually begin, NDC, TASK force and then finally TTA which is the kind of latest expression of these, begin to not only reinforce it, but actually to insist that these operate in this kind of way, by the way in which they structure the whole business through from initial training in the schools and management training. So there's been a profound shift, largely due to those two mutually interacting forces... the introduction of the market and the need for the field, the discipline to be more responsive. And so we're now struggling with the question, how do we seek to reconcile the National Professional Qualification with Masters degrees?

In addition to the control of educational provision through the creation of the TTA as an accreditation body, the targeting of research monies is also noted as a means of shaping the direction of education:

(10) ...when I was asked to look at this area and I went into the library and started doing the literature surveys and all the rest of it, what I found was as I think you've found yourself, was a great gap pre-1970 something like that. American stuff, not an awful lot of British stuff at all. Now I assumed and I think I still do assume as well, that most of this has been initiated from the top. And I don't mean within education. I mean within the government. I think it was initiated perhaps under the later Labour governments, say since Callaghan's Ruskin speech and things like that with the notion that there needs to be a more business like element in schools and so on and so forth. But in my own mind, there seemed to be an awful lot of influence, an awful lot of money, an awful lot of exhortation, an awful lot of promotions available, an awful lot of inservice going on, or being put to teachers as things that they should be doing... It suggests that policy and money gently move people in certain ways and this is obviously what the government intends to do, it seems to me, or policy makers intend to do, they intend to move educators more into considering these issues. So it came as no surprise to me that there was a huge influx in the educational management literature because it seems to me that there was money and influence and promotions for people who said the right things in interviews because of these sorts of things. So it then of course became essential it seemed to me to teachers in schools that if they wanted promotion that they actually said the right things and used the right term and so on and so forth in speaking, it would become increasingly the case. And so perhaps it's now driven more by what's happening at the chalk face, but it seems to me that initially the push for educational management literature didn't come from within education. It came from outside of it and it came from the policy makers and the politicians.

Current members of the field are very much aware that research is a political tool rather than a knowledge creating process. In this sense the emphasis is more on *is it fundable* than broader issues of interest based on the agency of the researcher. This is not unique to the field of education management, but the direct interventionist nature by recent governments combined with the promotion of business management techniques has made the field more vulnerable to entrepreneurial policy initiatives. In this sense careers are linked to policy shifts and how field members take up positions in relation to work opportunities. One current field member argues that there is a need to see how

the current inservice educational professional training agenda is being developed outside of the university setting, and that this is about cutting the link between professional and democratic values:

> (10) ...*I believe that we've moved into what some people have called a post-Fordist situation. I think Smyth describes it very well, which is basically retaining policy at the top and pushing responsibility down to the bottom, and the way in which you keep people focused on their particular tasks, put them into competitive situations with other people, so you have an educational market at the lowest levels, but when it comes to actually deciding on what you should market, you're very, very strongly instructed in what you do. Now that means that you compete really only in terms of the quality of much the same product. So if that's true, you need to have a managerial elite in place to implement these sorts of policy directives it seems to me and combine that with a sort of a Peters and Waterman entrepreneurial leading creating cultures and leading by dynamic charismatic forceful personalities, that sort of thing as well. Now it seems to me that the HEADLAMP and the headteachers qualification fit into that mould beautifully; that what you're doing is you're setting up a blue print for the sort of headteacher you want. You are only allowing institutions that are going to provide you with the sort of training that you want those people, you're only going to give them the opportunity to run these things if they do what you want them to do... Two elements of those, both seem to me, add up to the sort of managers do we want of the future rather than the turning the question around and saying well, what is the school for? Is it for things like citizenship? Is it for developing greater democracy? Is it for developing critical empowered, emancipated citizens? That does not seem to be part of the agenda.*

The overt growth of entrepreneurialism within the field is a concern amongst field members who were interviewed. One interviewee stated: *(08) Well it gives people a lot of jobs, doesn't it? And a sort of cynic in me would say, you know, it's total social invention. Its a business, its a way of working... Creation of jobs for people...* This entrepreneurialism is seen through the growth in training rather than professional education, combined with an emphasis on practitioners training practitioners. This has sustained the growth in private consultancies and secondments from schools, combined with a clear directive which puts more emphasis on skills and know how from outside of education. Field members are seeking to disassociate from this trend through an emphasis on values and how they underpin management training and practice. One observation about the field is based on an intellectual mapping of the field, which illustrates the diverse positions taken up by field members:

> *(10) From my perspective it seems to me that there are probably three dominant strains of educational management literature at the present time. One is the effective management literature, the rational, bureaucratic, the aims and objectives and the following through, deriving principally from one area of the*

business literature, and at its most cohesive it probably stems from Taylor, Scientific Management. But it also seems to me, that's the sort of stuff... that wants to implement policy it seems to me. But there is another strand, that's not going to motivate staff. It's not necessarily going to motivate managers either. It might get your policies implemented but it's not going to make them do more than they actually have to do. And so it seems to me that at the same time you've actually got vying with that another strand in the management literature which you probably call the Peters and Waterman, the entrepreneurial, the charismatic leader stuff, you know, the linchpin head I suppose is as good a description as any. He, it's usually a he but it could be a she, creates the culture, creates the vision and people are empowered to achieve his vision. Not empowered to achieve their vision. To achieve his vision. Now it seems to me that there is an uneasy tension between those two coming down from above; and depending who happens to be Secretary of State for Education and what is the present feeling towards teachers and whether they are too fed up and whether they need to be empowered again, you will get one or the other, but it seems to be they fit into a post-Fordist scenario very nicely, dissemination of policy, entrepreneurial motivation. It seems to me that works very nicely. I think there is also another third strand in the literature which I probably include myself in and you've mentioned Smyth, you've mentioned Angus, you could have mentioned people like Fazal Rivzi and people like that, in fact Smyth's book is full of those sorts of people, you could have mentioned Peter Ribbins, you could have mentioned Bernard Harrison who is now in Australia, but used to be at the University of Sheffield, you could have mentioned Gerald Grace, you certainly could have mentioned Thomas Greenfield and people like that. That sort of critical management literature which asks what are the fundamental purposes of education and suggests that it's a wider scenario than delivering some form of policies from above, usually predicated on economic demands, usually predicated on delivering some sort of work force and some sort of policy determined by such demands. In that situation that sort of scenario, that sort of literature tends to be marginalised... that sort of literature will always be on the periphery, unless you get a government coming in who actually sees notions of community, participation, democracy as central to an agenda.

All three types of literature and work are being undertaken by field members in HEIs and stems back to the original aims of the field to work with practitioners in order to improve. However, the dominance of the polytechnic tradition in the promotion of technicist action is consistent with the shifts in the policy context. In seeking to reconceptualise working with practitioners in a different way to the traditional universities, field members have both sought to shape their identity as modern but in doing so have made themselves open to colonisation by a particular trend in educational policy. In the older universities this is being handled in different ways as some take on the entrepreneurial trend through, for example, bidding for contracts to be Centres for the NPQH, or for funds from the TTA to run inservice courses. At the same time, the academic culture remains strong and shapes the aims of field members who locate themselves within an HEI out of a desire to research into and to critically understand professional educational practice. This professional schizophrenia for field

members who have carved out their identity within an HEI and want to maintain their critical and reflective stance in relation to how schools are and should be managed is the biggest challenge faced by the field. As one current field leader argues:

> *(07) In Britain I think it exists because it was defined by education policy. And that's why I think it's different as a field from similar areas with different titles in other countries. It partly is defined by the work of educational management researchers. And it's partly defined by the kind of networks that I've been talking about that developed in order to meet the needs of practitioners in particular situations. I think its problem as a field is precisely that it was developed significantly if not wholly as a response to educational policy, because what exists outside, largely outside educational management, is the critique of that policy.*

At a much deeper level these issues have been and continue to be evident in the networks which field members have created [8]. The intellectual and structural contradictions in the professional biographies of field members are played out and resolutions sought through positional associations with particular leaders, writers and researchers, and this affects where a boundary is drawn regarding the nature and purpose of professional activities. In the next section the networks underpinning the development of the field and debates over boundaries will be examined.

6.3.3 Networks and debates about boundaries

Acknowledging and mapping the formal and informal networks in the field reveals how professional connections have been shaped by individual interests combined with the structuring impact of the functions and purposes of HEIs. These networks both created the field and have been shaped by the dynamic growth of the field. The level of complexity and of the creativity of the connections is evident in the stories of all those who were interviewed. Stories from three professors from early years illustrate this:

> *(09) I'm just reminded of the fact actually that when I went to (place name) in (19)65, Bill Taylor had just organised a summer course for Heads in Oxford, where he was at the time, before he moved to Bristol. And I found it very helpful to go and talk to him about it and partly with his encouragement I went for a month to the States in 1966 to follow up things which I had become aware of before. Jack Culbertson, the Executive Director of UCEA, briefed me and provided invaluable advice. During a month I visited 4 summer courses in different places of the States which he regarded as really good courses. Spent a few days in each one of them - Boston, Wisconsin, Southern Illinois University and Chicago. So again this was all part of learning about the development of the field and it was on those courses that I first saw simulation exercises being used*

on a very big scale. And when I got back I wrote an article on the subject for the DES journal Trends in Education No.7 1967.

(16) Out of that a number of other things developed in the (19)60s. One was the link that developed through George Baron with Bill Walker (Professor WG Walker), who at that time was developing the study and practice of educational administration in Australia from his base at the University of New England in Armidale. Sadly, Bill is no longer with us - he died in 1991. I met Bill Walker on one of his visits to this country in the (19)60s and began discussing with him and with George Baron the setting up of what came to be the International Intervisitation Programme in Educational Administration, the IIP, which predated the setting up of the British Educational Administration Society. Thus the latter originated through an international rather than a national initiative... So that was another development that sprang from the contacts I'd had with Gerald Collier in (19)62, with Canadian and US educational administrators in (19)63, (19)64 and (19)65, and then working with George Baron and Bill Walker and others for the first of the International Intervisitation Programmes which took place in the US in 1966. Subsequent IIP's were held at four yearly intervals until well into the (19)80s... The 1970 IIP was my first visit to Australia, and gave me lots of contacts with people working in educational administration there, some of which continue to this day. I mention this specifically because I don't think that the development of educational administration in England, or indeed in the UK generally, can be understood without reference to the links that developed early on between people in Australia, the United States, Canada and New Zealand. In the development of these contacts Bill Walker and people around Bill Walker played a very important part... In 1969 I got together with George Baron to produce the collection Educational Administration and the Social Sciences. At that time I was writing in two main fields - educational administration and teacher education. To an increasing extent I began to concentrate upon teacher education, although there were the three simulation books and one or two other things in educational administration still to come.

(02) I wrote the paper and sent a copy to Jean Floud, who wrote back and said fine, but you've forgotten Durkheim. And I didn't really understand what she meant by that. I knew later when Basil Bernstein started publishing... But I then had a letter from Bill Taylor who said 'I've just sent a paper to Jean Floud for a comment and she says you've virtually written the paper - we ought to meet'. So then I met Bill and you know, have been friendly with him ever since. So that was, that was the start of my interest in organisation theory, and that has remained my main interest and perspective on management... The next development personally I actually can't now remember how it happened... I wrote a paper for Journal of Curriculum Studies called 'How Does the Curriculum Change?' and they published it in 2 parts... I was coming at it I suppose from diffusion theory, diffusion of innovations, and linked that with what I was learning about organisations and so my make on that I suppose was what we would now call the management of change.

What these three extracts show is that the creativity in academic life is not just a product of the individual scholarly activity, but is essentially linked to the social and intellectual processes of debate. This can be informal through letter writing, lunches, and telephone calls, through to important events such as national and international conferences. There is a sense in which prominent members of the more established fields in North America and Australia sought to inspire and induct a new offshoot of the

field. Hence the conceptual ideas about theory and pedagogy do not float free of the communities of scholars and practitioners who eagerly sought to know and understand about them. The importance of international network organisations is acknowledged by one of the current professors within the field:

> *(15) As far as international developments are concerned, I think the CCEA has been hugely important development in sewing together developing traditions... you have to give credit to Bill Walker, Robin Farquhar and Meredydd Hughes who were the first three presidents... firstly, they are from different countries; secondly, they promoted an international approach to education and management; and I think helped to develop it as a discipline internationally, all over the world, and in countries that really haven't operated very much before. Particularly in those countries where we don't have one department or something. If you think about Singapore which I know very well, has only got one department of education in the whole country and within there a small team of people doing policy and management studies... So in that sense the international dimension is hugely more important in small, isolated communities of scholars if you see what I mean than it is in the UK, which has got, well even more so now, but even in the early years had at least a few centres of expertise, you know, there was Birmingham, Bristol, London, OU, one or two others. At least had that kind of level of interaction going on. If you're the only department, the potential for isolation without an international perspective is very real. So I think CCEA was very influential in that sense.*

This type of networking was important to the early leaders of the field, and continues to be important for those who have followed on. There are a number of interconnected reasons given by a range of field members for their investment in travel and time. The significance of reading the North American literature as a means of providing inspiration and triggering home developments is acknowledged. There is a strong sense of what might be discovered through investigating the work which was taking place in a more mature field. Individual and connected field members pursued interests through seeking out research and ideas regarding, for example, pedagogy. In the absence of an indigenous literature they actively read and went to conferences to hear people like Dan Griffiths.

Early field members actively sought particular people out and fostered international connections through conferences such as the IIP and organisations such as the CCEA. Through these connections there was an increasing recognition of carving out an area

of professional practice in England and Wales which was different, new, and innovatory. As one founder field members describes:

> *(09) It was more a case of you coming together and a certain excitement of camaraderie developing because we were recognising that this was an entirely new area. We were almost like missionaries I suppose...*

The interface between these connections is important, and how talking and sharing enables and continues to support the development of those located in the field, for example:

> *(14) I think it was very important but then remember I was one who was on the circuit. For those who got to all the early conferences it was very important. It brought them into contact with people like Dan Griffiths or Tom Greenfield... You know, you got to know people like that... I became very friendly with Bill Walker. So at one level you came to be known by people who were international figures. Another level you got the chance to contribute papers to conferences and have them published.*

The strength of the agency of the individual is connected to a web of professional connections, and an understanding of where the centres of activity are and who the key people are. Furthermore, long lasting friendships were forged which sustained contact and professional practice such as receiving invitations to talk, to teach, and be involved in collaborative projects.

The person given most status and significance internationally is William Walker. As one of the early field leaders states: *(03) I met Bill Walker and I'd put a star opposite him. He was the chap who really created the drive... He was inspirational*. William Walker is regarded as being instrumental in the development of the field in England and Wales:

> *(14) Bill was a quite exceptional man. He was not as intelligent, as talented, as creative as many other people whose names we've mentioned. He couldn't hold a candle to Bill Taylor. But Bill Walker was possessed of certain qualities that were vital. One was energy. He had more energy maybe than any man I've ever known! They called him Tarmac Walker because he was always flying out to somewhere... Secondly, he was focused. I think he focused in a way that was almost selfish except it wasn't for Bill personally, it was for whatever he was associated with. If it was an Australian association or whatever it was, the CCEA whatever, Bill was focused and determined and he would push himself into circles... and get money out of them. He was above all a network man. He hardly ever stayed still, so he was flying around and visiting... he maybe only had a short visit but he somehow found it worth his while to come to Scotland, to go to wherever it was, Leeds, whatever, see people, and make them feel they were involved with him and enlist their support. And Bill could come to see you on what was a social call but by the end of it you'd agreed to do something for it...*

> *Bill's influence was terrific in getting it set up. At the same time Bill belonged to that era of a relatively small group when it was physically possible to know everybody and visit everybody.*

International connections are important across all generations of field participants and leaders. For the early leaders this international networking is clearly about the creation of the field, in which the case for academic respectability could be supported through working with people who were part of an older, more established field. This enabled the connection with William Walker to be made combined with contact with ideas and new research:

> *(16) I mention this specifically because I don't think that the development of educational administration in England, or indeed in the UK generally, can be understood without reference to the links that developed early on between people in Australia, the United States, Canada and New Zealand. In the development of these contacts Bill Walker and people around Bill Walker played a very important part...*

Amongst more recent field members the professional identity and location of individual field participants continues to be shaped by international contacts:

> *(12) But also I've always had very close links with the States and Australia. And then latterly with Europe. So I was always closely in touch with the UCEA, I went and did my first study visit there... did various conferences and so on throughout the (19)70s and (19)80s. Most recently the AERA conferences... we've always had lots of links with Australia. People like Hedley Beare have been over here... I think it's important to bear in mind that for people like me UCEA is an important reference point, and AERA and Division A.*

Today Australia is still seen as making a very significant contribution to the field, particularly in the area of theory, and in research methodology. The data is patterned with references to Australian names, in particular Colin Evers and Gabrielle Lakomski. From North America, Tom Greenfield's legacy is given great prominence by both generations, and in particular for his paper at the 1974 IIP. One field member describes him as: *(14) very, very special,* and another states:

> *(11) To challenge an epistemic community in the way that he did was very brave. It was very hard what followed, and it took courage. What he did was to help us, he made the break and we followed. He was a beautiful writer, a very elegant writer. He could be a wonderful talker...*

Greenfield's work had a tremendous impact on both sides of the Atlantic, but in particular it challenged the Theory Movement in the United States. Dan Griffiths is regarded as important by a range of field leaders across the generations:

> *(09) Internationally Dan Griffiths has been an outstanding figure... is for me the most stimulating of the American writers and it was quite amazing when in 1979 he wrote his turmoil article, 'Educational Administration in Turmoil' ... well it is quite remarkable. He'd been such a doughty presenter of a very traditional viewpoint but had done so very, with a very clear mind and in that article he said that he developed doubts about all that he'd ever been writing about and so on, which is a very honest thing to do.*

Prominent North Americans who are in touch with the current generation are noted as Chris Hodgkinson from Canada. From the USA Dan Duke and Bill Boyd are noted. The only European contribution which is mentioned is that of Per Dalin from Norway. This latter point is one which enables us to recognise how the field both sought and was given recognition in English speaking nations.

The development and growing maturity of the field in England and Wales has shifted from dependency to one of supporting the development of the field in other countries through teaching and publications. One field leader almost describes this:

> (15) ...a*nd one of the things that happened is that British literature has become probably as important as United States literature in those countries that don't have their own indigenous literature yet. And you can say that of Singapore, certainly so in South Africa where I'm going next month, even New Zealand, which is probably a bit too small to develop a substantial literature base, although it's got some of course, but it's only got two or three departments, hasn't got a strong literature base, is depending more on the UK literature. And I think that's an important achievement for British educational management if you like and there's a kind of export drive going on here. And you know, like the lion on an egg business. And I think that's very important and hugely under-recognised by government is the export potential, not just in terms of books being sold although that's always nice but in terms of students saying I want to do my postgraduate work in the UK rather than in the United States, or rather than Australia, but they're the main competing places. I mean (it) would be great, much more underpinned if the government took it a bit more seriously than it does.*

Domestic networking is strong through all field members and an interesting pattern emerges of new field members being co-opted and inducted into the field through postgraduate study and employment. The early field members describe a range of professional practices which have been stimulated and/or necessitate collaboration and mutuality such as course development, external examining, and acting as referees. More recent field members have continued to build on these social and intellectual webs through professional practice such as employment within the same HEI; meeting each other at interviews, external examination boards/vivas, conferences, validation

events; working collaboratively on consultancy, research projects, and publications. One senior professor notes the following about these connections:

> *(11) Perhaps there have been some mechanisms which have affected the field. Perhaps the RAE has affected our numbers (now 50 professors compared with 4 in the early 1980s), and the way we work. I would describe the connections within the field as a loosely coupled network. It is not so much that we are competitive, rather than we are not integrated. Yes we are connected through BEMAS, and through Journals, and we see each other on the Examination Board circuit. We have developed along epistemic lines as you can see that we each contribute to each others edited books. We are not close but we are not hostile. Though I regret that we are not closer.*

What this observation identifies is the rapid growth in the field within HEIs, and the excerpts presented so far from the professional biographies show the dependence and inter-dependence of field members on each other through formal and informal connections. The professional inter-relationships between members of the field dominates the professional biographies of those interviewed. Certain people in centres of educational administration and/or management came to dominate the field and are recognised as being central to its establishment and growth. The people noted as being central to the story are:

- Professor, Sir George Baron, at the London Institute.
- Professor, Sir William Taylor, at Oxford and later at Bristol University.
- Professor Meredydd Hughes, at Birmingham University.
- Professor Ron Glatter, at the Open University.

George Baron and William Taylor are universally seen as the founders of the field, and there are strong professional connections between themselves and other field members. Furthermore, status and professional credentials are strongly linked with Baron and Taylor from being invited to join meetings which eventually created BEAS through to building on their approach to training. Field members are very keen to note their association with Baron and Taylor, and place themselves in connection with them. Their co-edited book (1969) is referred to as significant in enabling us to understand both the knowledge claims of the field which they were creating through to the importance of such a publication in obtaining academic legitimacy.

Professor Meredydd Hughes was appointed to his chair in 1977 at Birmingham University, and his importance is noted for his work in BEAS/BEMAS, on the development of theory, and internationally as the President of the CCEA. One of the current professors in the field in particular noted the importance of Meredydd Hughes work on leadership, and in particular his analysis of the head as chief executive (Hughes 1985).

Professor Ron Glatter is noted in the early development of the field for his work on pedagogy and training at the London Institute (Glatter, 1972). Within the development of the field, one current professor notes that (11) ...*he was the fourth professor*, and his role at the Open University in the development of postgraduate courses in education management receives wide acclaim.

Other significant participants from the first generation include Professor Len Watson from Sheffield Polytechnic (later Sheffield Hallam University) who is regarded as a *facilitator* and *networker* within the development of the field. Eric Hoyle was Professor at Bristol and is recognised as making a very important contribution in the area of thinking and publishing on change, and micropolitics (Hoyle, 1982):

> *(09) Eric Hoyle I think over the years has made a big contribution... his thinking on quite a number of issues I think are very fresh and stimulating. The work he's done on roles - the role of the teacher, the sociological aspect of education management has done a very big contribution to that.*

Professor Ray Bolam, at Bristol and now at Cardiff, is identified as being a significant leader of the field. In his work at Bristol he is noted for his leadership of research projects combined with the establishment of the NDC. One field leader notes Bolam's importance:

> *(13) ...for the sharpness, I suppose we get more from Ray's thinking than almost anybody else. Because he's an extraordinarily sort of fertile mind, a pragmatist I suspect as well, but also a very fresh approach and his writing is very direct and so is his speaking... he is always at the frontier I feel... but also very much focused on this link, as I am trying to be, between theory and practice.*

Professor Tony Bush at Leicester University is noted for his contribution to theory development through the publication of *Theories of Educational Management* (Bush 1986, 1995). One colleague in the field notes: *(05) Tony's work, particularly his analytic work, I think is very impressive.* Professor Peter Ribbins at Birmingham University is noted for this work as the editor of the BEMAS journal *Educational Management and Administration*, and his work with Tom Greenfield (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993): *(13) ...you know he has covered an enormous breadth and I think Peter's contribution is, just the scale of it as well as the BEMAS editing... but he is certainly a leading figure in advancing the field there.*

The growing diversity of the field has led to a range of people being noted according to the specialisms which they have developed. For example, the contribution made by Thomas at Birmingham University, and Levacic at the Open University, with the application of economics to the field was noted by a number of people. However, individuals did talk about how the work of particular people had, and continues to have an impact on their thinking and their work. For example, one current field member acknowledges the influence of the work of Professor Michael Eraut on professional development, and Professor John Elliott on action research. Another talked about how their critical approach to the field's knowledge claims is influenced by the work of Professor Stephen Ball of Kings College, and Professor Gerald Grace, formerly of Durham University. How an individual takes inspiration from the work of others is complex and historically located within their professional experience. A number of the most recent entrants into HEIs talked about how they sought and obtained intellectual nourishment not only from outside of the field of education management, but also outside of mainstream educational studies. In this sense the importance of the disciplines is strong in the professional work of these colleagues:

> *(10) ...because of the way in which I work and because of the way in which I read stuff not necessarily within the educational management, and it doesn't have to be current. I mean I have to say I don't, there are really very few people apart from maybe the people I've mentioned so far, very few people who I'd go out of my way to read as such. There are people I keep coming back to. I mean for a view of our conception of reality I keep coming back to somebody like E.H.*

> *Carr in What is History? over and over again because I think that he just describes the issue of values and selectivity so well. In terms of the whole question of social engineering, questions of historicism, questions of the construction of scientific theories, I come back to Karl Popper over and over and over and over again. I've never found him dated. I find him a beautiful lucid writer and immensely stimulating.*

However, this type of engagement with a broader intellectual tradition is not a strong feature in the professional biographies. Rather, it is connections with practitioners which dominate who and what is recognised as significant within the field. As I have shown, the roots of field members within higher education lie in practitioner roles in schools and LEAs, and those who pursued an academic career note the significance and contribution of colleagues to the field. The work of Tom Bone, Eric Briault, Tim Brighouse, Michael Marland, Pauline Perry, Toby Weaver, and Gordon Wheeler are given special notice by field members.

Networks within the field are complex and consist of professional inter-relationships which are both domestic and international, and are between those who study practice and those who engage in practice. Furthermore, these dichotomies are themselves simplistic as geographical location is limited by travel and increasingly less of a barrier through electronic communication. In addition to this those who study education management also have to practice it as Heads of School or Deans of Faculty within HEIs. There has always been a tradition within the field of those who are regarded as practitioners, such as Professor Tim Brighouse, and have moved between schools, colleges, LEAs, and HEIs.

The nature of professional practice within the field is a productive tension between individual aims and the situational context in which the individual is located. Peer recognition from within the field respects the varied membership:

> *(07) Different groups recognised different things... If you're talking about teachers and the local education authorities they were, and still are, influenced by programmes, by courses, and occasionally by publications but mainly I think they are interested in good, relevant, interesting, professionally delivered programmes. The academic community, firstly by publications, secondly by research grants. And the reason for that I think is the publications are more visible than research grants. You don't see a research grant, you see its product*

or its products. Yes, I mean, research grants are important and people who get a lot of them are highly thought of.

There are a range of factors which a number of colleagues raise as being important such as publications, status, and the building of a cluster of people into a centre of national and international acclaim. However, what seems to dominate the data is the importance of professional respect for people who have supported the completion and dissemination of work.

Where field members draw boundaries in relation to networking and their professional practice enables us to see their position in relation to other groupings within educational studies. Field members talked about this in relation to: school effectiveness, school improvement, and policy sociology. The latter grouping has received most attention from the field and so the analysis will give more focus on the views about this network.

The growth in school effectiveness and school improvement networks are of interest to current field members and there are a number of critiques presented about how these groupings position themselves. The main theme focuses on the limitations of the knowledge claims of effectiveness and improvement groups:

(05) In the meantime of course the school effectiveness people were very much off in their own world, and I am still very critical of a lot of what is done in school effectiveness because I think it doesn't take account of organisation. It's research base isn't as unambiguous as it's presented and I think there's a huge hype about it and I'm also very worried about how it's being sort of adopted as part of government policy in a way in which I think distorts the original research approach.

Underpinning this critique is a view about how those who are attempting to create something distinctive and significant within educational studies creates boundaries which can be more about power and control issues within academic groupings than about educational issues. This is taken further by other field members who are quite clear that the effectiveness and improvement groups are trying to construct something which in the end boils down to management issues. While collaboration across the networks enables the field of education management to reconsider the unresolved

issue of the link between management with teaching and learning, the distinctiveness of management is maintained, and its relevance to accessibility by practitioners is seen as a key feature in the struggle for status with other networks.

The position taken here is that there is much which the effectiveness, improvement, and management networks can focus on collectively as common concerns and issues, but there is a distinctive approach which distinguishes one group from another. This is also reflected in the views about policy sociology, though the critique of the network and of particular people is much sharper.

The relationship with policy sociology is one which all field members interviewed had a view on, and this remains salient because of Glatter's (1979) paper. The general consensus is in agreement with Glatter's argument about the continuum. For example, five field members talked about this:

> *(16) ...Well if you're associated with OFSTED or you are a senior advisor locally and your job is to improve the management of a set of primary or secondary schools for which you are responsible, you probably won't have the time to read and argue at the level of theory that a professor of the subject at a university can and should be arguing. So the continuum is created by different people doing different jobs and respecting each other's contributions.*
>
> *(09) ...I've certainly always regarded it as a continuum really and simply in terms of differences of approach rather than fundamental differences. Yes, I thought the Glatter article was a very good article. I was broadly in agreement with that. Inevitably there's bound to be specialisation I think, but I would like to think that there's still continuity in the field, that it isn't a case of two different fields.*
>
> *(07) ...I think the division between education policy and education management in this country is a false division... I think it's time we developed a much stronger policy thrust within educational management.*
>
> *(04) ...You have got people who are actually engaged in researching into education management whose main preoccupation is how basically an acceptance of the models that the Government is imposing and its about how do we make these work. And I think that there is quite an overlap there with the school effectiveness movement. And then there are the people who are actually treating the changes as much more problematic, not too many of whom I feel would actually be sitting in the education management camp... maybe that's an interesting distinction between those who are prepared to ask fundamental questions about education management as an activity critically, as against trying to treat it (as) problems with these new systems... and help people to get it right. You see the best work I suspect within people who would actually regard themselves in the education management and administration field and are*

prepared to ask fundamental questions, is not taking place in the U.K. it's taking place in Australia, like Evers and Lakomski, in the book Knowing Educational Administration.

(15) ...You see Ball's work, when he writes about the politics and micropolitics of education for example, he is coming very close to that strand of work in education management, a bit of Hoyle for example. And represented to some extent in my own writing... But in his work, he comes close to management and then moves away again.

What is a clear theme within these extracts is that position is not a static thing but is constantly being evaluated, and the growth of the management imperative through legislative change has challenged field members to look at their work. In doing this field members not only recognise that they and the policy sociologists converge in certain areas of interest and activity, but also that the latter have some important observations to make regarding education management. For example, one leading professor accepts the problematic nature of the strong pragmatic tradition within the field. Another, recognises the weaknesses in the growth of 'how to do it' materials. But there is also the view that policy sociology has a pessimistic view of human nature and hence sees management as essentially manipulative rather than potentially so. This is reinforced by another professor:

(11) ...they are sometimes critical of things which they think exist rather than actually do exist... Much of the criticism of education management comes from a particular community, and they see things from their perspective. It is exclusive. Education management is an unusually permeable field, and there have been aspirations to being a form of knowledge. There has been a clearer purchase on what is the right thing to do, but we have not always been clear on where it has come from. Tom Greenfield's work has been fundamental in this by questioning the field about how and why do we know something. He has challenged status and claims to knowledge. The policy sociologists are an ageing community like the rest of us. Their approach seems to based on the assumption that the issues have been worked out for them, and therefore a clearer approach to their investigations. Not sure that they can be this certain and that it has been worked out. Having said that they produce some wonderful work, for example, Andy Hargreaves, and Stephen Ball... Education management has a substantive agenda determined by reform. It is protean, and an applied discipline.

Furthermore, while the field of education management has a clear sense of purpose in working with and on behalf of practitioners, it is heterogeneous in how it is going about this. There is the view that the policy sociologists have taken a narrow view of the field and do not see the range and diversity of different positions (or micro networks) within it:

> *(07) I think it's a total misrepresentation of what happened... and what is happening. The field of education management was established well before the new right emerged. And in fact a lot of the new right policies have developed from a labour party policy statement, which I think is quite an interesting... interesting situation. At another level I think they're correct. Some of the material on how to do it is developed from a totally non-critical perception of education policy. And I think that to some extent is true. It is a bit like that. But I think the significant people in the field do not present that perspective. The OU's work, for example, certainly doesn't. Tony Bush certainly doesn't. Peter Ribbins certainly doesn't...*

The dilemma of working within a particular policy context is seen to have created a particular response by field members, however, a growing emphasis on values and how they underpin management and internal policy development is seen as a means of protecting the field from the charge of being a creature of policy shifts.

The field of education management's critique of policy sociology has not been articulated in published form prior to this research being undertaken. The critique centres on a number of issues, and importantly the view that policy sociology is too negative, and that their main approach is that they: *(05) are very good at knocking things*. This is regarded as unhelpful to practitioners as in the end, as one current professor argues: *(02) schools have to be run*. This is also demonstrated by another leading field member:

> *(07) ...and it's very easy to say well, okay we shouldn't have markets; okay we shouldn't have competition; okay we shouldn't have local financial management; okay we shouldn't have a national curriculum. The new right agenda shouldn't exist. But in fact it does and it's actually been very successful in getting itself established at the level of policy. I think what Stephen Ball particularly exaggerates, Gerald Grace less so, is the extent to which the new right policies have been successfully implemented in schools. And I think there's a gap discontinuity between the policy and its implementation. A very significant gap which we need to explain. And that's what I'm interested in, but I'm interested in it at the level of primary schools, where I think the ground was far more fertile for accepting some of those policies than it ever was in secondary schools. And yet those policies have actually been implemented less thoroughly, less successfully, less wholeheartedly in primary schools than some of the research literature suggests they have in secondary schools.*

This approach to practitioners and understanding their context has its roots in how the field of education management was originally conceptualised. A number of field members are concerned that policy sociologists start from a particular position which closes down areas of enquiry and exploration. For example:

(13) ...I am interested in practical application, I am interested in implementation and I am interested in pedagogics and I think there is nothing wrong with any of those, and I am also interested in ethical issues and in values and I am interested in theory. But I suppose it is true that I haven't got the absolute certainty that a neo-marxist or a marxist would have, or even someone from the new right. We are into the world, and I gather from recent writings that I've read that the rest of the world is catching up with us, and the complexity of the world is something that I and many others had been aware of for a long time, and one builds that in as well. That one can't, one hasn't got an absolute sense of certainty about these things, but one has got a sort of broad idea of where one stands.

This critique is taken a stage further by a current field member who argues for the importance of research being data rather than theory driven:

(05) I am quite critical, in fact very critical sometimes of the policy sociologists. Usually about the nature of evidence... (Name) work which I think is very exciting has challenged conventional thinking in a whole variety of ways, is I think theory driven initially and it's theory driven from I suppose a neo-marxist position... and the research seems to me to be that he uses instances from his interviews for example to illustrate the theory, to support the theory... I'm not sure, you see, whether the policy sociologists ever see themselves - and this takes me back to what I said very early on about them being very negative about things - as to whether they ever see themselves really as being useful to practitioners in schools. Whereas I would judge a lot of what I do by that criteria - is what I do of value to quality education? And not finding that in OFSTED terms or the exam result terms but is it actually of value? So I'm in a sense a pragmatist. I'm prepared to say this is where we are, how can we as a profession ensure that we make the best of where we are? ...I think the policy sociologists are saying we oughtn't to be here in the first place. Which is possible, you know, it's an issue you could debate but it doesn't help the people who are actually here. It doesn't help them to become powerful, reflective practitioners who appreciate that what they do is of importance.

This viewpoint enables an engagement with the broader context of how an area of study gains legitimacy and how other knowledge workers respond. If academic life is a competitive arena, then this viewpoint enables us to see that the critique of the policy sociologists is interpreted as a part of their own struggle for survival within academia:

(15) ...but there has been a struggle for status. And I'm not an expert in this field but you could argue that any new subject has to grapple for curriculum space if you like with established disciplines. And what educational management had done, and now I'm slightly overstating for effect, has forced out disciplines like sociology of education. It's killed it stone dead. And why? Because educational management is perceived as relevant to what goes on in schools and sociology of education is considered as esoteric as a means of entertaining academics. But I think there is an issue where something that's pragmatic and relevant and useful has replaced something that was much less so. And I'm slightly overstating it because its not just educational management driving out sociology. But if you take the whole notion of education post-PGCE if you like, it's been a big growth area. Educational management has grown and grown and grown as a proportion of total CPD activity. It's certainly true in (institution name). True probably everywhere. And others areas have been squeezed. Those that have survived remarkably are those that are also perceived to be applied. So special

education, for example, remains buoyant in many institutions. It's another applied discipline. What some people would regard as the underpinning theoretical things have largely disappeared. Certainly this has been thrown out of PGCE work, thrown out is probably slightly strong, it probably isn't strong would be correct, government's dictated that it comes out and has become very weak. I think there is a battle for status and there are still people who would take the view that these underpinning disciplines of education are far more significant because they're better developed conceptually. My answer has always been 'well, they maybe developed conceptually, but they're not of any use to anybody'. And in that sense applied disciplines, particularly educational management in that sense, who are drawing on those conceptual traditions make the connections with practice that sociology of education failed to do.

The rise of education management as a popular field for educational professionals is presented as an established fact and its growth should be subject to analysis and interpretation, but at the same time those who are doing this are the ones who are losing out in the debates and practice about relevance:

(16) ...n*ow of course when you refer to policy sociologists, whose work I respect as much as I disagree with it, there have been a number of prominent voices that have given the impression that they have a radical agenda of a particular character. I don't think this has been altogether helpful to the perception of the field. Up until (19)89 and to some extent since, a strong marxist and neo-marxist contribution was made by some very able and articulate people who wrote well, chose important topics and were good at getting the headlines. However positive this may have been within the framework of academic disputation and debate that enriches the life of institutions and academic groups, there's no doubt that given the extent to which policy making has become politicised, your work is looked at with a view to where do you stand on certain issues and then labelled in a way that sometimes makes it easy for its importance to be disregarded. And that, to say the least, is unfortunate.*

Furthermore, one of the early field members who has only recently retired argues that working with practitioners in understanding their context and enabling them to move forward is not a simple task and this requires the field member to get their hands dirty:

(06) What has happened, of course, is that for reasons which the people you refer to as policy resent like mad, and I have got my doubts about as well, the pragmatic imperative has been more and more for management development to be seen as a tool, as instrumental. And this has, to a large extent, accounted for the huge expansion of it. Now this has come partly from top-down demand. Partly from bottom-up. I must admit in this place we are responding far more to bottom-up than to top-down, and I am very unhappy at this managerialism that is now giving management a bad name... Well, I suppose that one of the tensions within education management as compared with the old ed(ucational) admin(istration) was always how long a spoon would you need in order to sup with the devil? If you are actually wanting to change the world, to improve things in one sense or another, to make schools more effective, let us say - what sort of bargains do you have to negotiate in order to get the entry, in order to have an influence? Now you find you have to compromise yourself from the purity of these policy people, there are not many of the policy theorists who have actually been responsible for managing policy.... But there aren't that many around, who move back and forwards between the two. There are some who were administrators, and have now become academics and you somehow feel that

their theory is a reaction against their previous practice... From the other side, as it were, I think that there is need for some of these people to get their hands dirtier, to realise that if you are actually going to do anything except shout from the sidelines, if you are going to get in there and play, then it is a pretty rough and tumble world, and one of the things that I think some of these people have discovered is that it is one they are not well fitted to play. They don't get the customers, in other words, and so the reaction to this is that it is not fair to have to get customers, that I ought to be able to pursue my scholarly activities and be paid a handsome salary to do it, with good secretarial and computer support by the tax payer, irrespective of any accountability, I ought to be able to do it on my terms. Now I think some of these people will have to learn that it is not that simple that accountability is more than how many articles and books have you published, and that if they really want to make an impact and contribute to the debate, it might actually be necessary to engage in the world or management or management studies a bit more.

The ideological stance is fine in theory but not in practice, and this is taken further by another current field member who debates the impracticality of certain theories:

(01) ...if you take let's say what Kemmis and Carr's emancipatory action research, and... they are basically saying that collaborative action research can be emancipatory because working in group you can realise that what constrains you isn't, is going to be the structure and it empowers you to challenge the system in the state and try and do something about it. And that's fine. And then when they write their bits about how to do action research, they say start with something you can tackle. You know start with a manageable problem. So it's actually a cop-out I think.

In addition to this one current leading field member argues that the rise in policy sociology was inevitable given the politicisation of education policy from the 1980s, and in fact this field is just as dependent on the policy context for its intellectual and practical survival as education management:

(12) I mean it depends what level we take this at, you can adopt the marxist stance and say we're all part of the same structure, but then so are they, if it's an us and they situation. In other words Stephen (Ball) is equally, I mean he's funded by the ESRC, he's funded by the university, so we're all caught up in it. We can't step out of it. There are degrees of involvement, degrees of compromise I guess. And that gets tied up with personal biographies, personal attitudes, stances towards methodology for instance as well as underlying theory. And it becomes quite complicated.

The reasons given by field members for the different positions taken are linked to different knowledge claims about how practitioners should be conceptualised and about how the field member in an HEI should go about their work. One of the reasons given is that the policy sociologists are connected to the social science traditions implied in how educational administration has been understood and practised within the older and traditional universities. In addition to this the strong practitioner element

within the professional biographies of field members has a unique bearing on their orientation: *(05) I think there is a tension which partly reflects the differences in backgrounds of most of those people, because most of the policy sociologists are originally sociologists and most of the education management people are educational practitioners.*

While the concerns raised about the boundaries of the field and how networks are isolated or interconnect, it would be wrong to see the field of education management as being mainly 'on the defensive'. The extracts presented show how the field cannot be simplified as taking a homogenous technicist position. The field has clear values that unify its membership and these have been shown to focus on the practitioner within an organisational setting. Members have clear research and professional practice identities but emphasis has shifted, through a complex interaction of ideas, reading, contact with other networks combined with institutional and policy restructuring. Field members admit to pragmatism in the sense of not having an overt doctrinal or political position, but this does not mean that field members lack integrity. What seems to matter more are values and ethical approaches to understanding and supporting the educational professional within a particular policy context. Where field members have become entrepreneurial by enabling policy to be implemented unreflexively, there are attempts to critique this trend and to marginalise it. However, the tradition of neutrality is preventing the adoption of more open approaches within the field to declaring and revealing a position.

It seems that field boundaries are concerned with how research, theory, and methods of pedagogy are or can be of relevance to practitioners. Debate seems to be more about issues of relevance than about epistemology, for example, the current promotion of collegiality is about how best it can be achieved than it is about the knowledge claims of normative models of organisational behaviour. There is some permeability in these boundaries through publication in journals outside of the field, and in reading

about research and theory that may not be regarded as being relevant to many field members. However, for the majority of the field members interviewed there seem to be places where they do not go. For a field located between policy and practice, and recognised as important by some policy scholars (see Angus 1994, Whitty and Edwards 1994), territory has been carved out connected with immediate practitioner needs. It could be argued that this is an intellectually safe place to be as it only requires debates about the utility rather than the nature of theory, and this fits within the problem solving agenda created by the policy context from the mid 1970s. Nevertheless there are other intellectual legacies within the field which continue to live on within the professional practice of field member such as: firstly, the democratic traditions within public sector educational administration; secondly, the humane management of Greenfield; and, thirdly, the challenge of the social sciences through Hoyle's (1986) theory for understanding. Whether these legacies continue or wither is related to individual biographies combined with their institutional setting, and the type and level of intervention by central government agencies both in the work of practitioners and the professional practice of field members in HEIs.

6.4 Summary

What this analysis of the data shows is that each person has an individual story to tell about how and why they came to locate their work within an HEI, when it happened, and for those from the early days how they stayed, moved into retirement or into other forms of professional practice. The growth of the field and its location within HEIs is recognised, and field leaders are both delighted and concerned at the same time:

> *(13) ...what is quite extraordinary is the explosion of course, of the whole field. I mean, do you know how many universities in England are running masters degrees in Educational Management? Do you know the number, do you want to know the number? Sixty one. That is by one of our tutors... did a little survey for us, which actually he wrote a piece for the TES as well, which was sort of summarising some of the things... But then of course the enormous explosion of books.*
>
> *(12) ...that when Ron got his chair at the OU there were 4 professors... there are now over 50.*

Trying to map the field as a means of understanding this development has required an approach to historical investigation which has been challenging. Consider the following observation made by one field leader:

> *(16) I used to get very annoyed when at the beginning of all this, when I was in my early 30s, some of the grey beards in their 60s would come along and say well, of course, we did all this x years ago and nothing is new under the sun and it all goes round in cycles. That was a form of asserting authority through age which simply wouldn't wash in an undeferential society. It was also fundamentally wrong. Each age must to some extent re-invent a field of study in a contemporary context, which is likely to be significantly different from that of the past. It's possible to show that many of today's debates about teacher education have been around since Lancaster and Bell undertook their pioneering work at the beginning of the 19th century. That is sometimes used to denigrate current initiatives in the field. It's all been done before, it'll all come round again, it's like the number 11 bus, and so on. I'm not sympathetic to those who seek to use history to trivialise the present. Insofar as we can act in the present with greater intelligence, sensitivity and understanding, by seeing how some of today's problems relate to longstanding political and institutional issues, history can be valuable. That doesn't trivialise the present but provides a base in which you can better understand and act within the present.*

This extract encapsulates the value system on which this study is based. Furthermore, it provides a reference point for the presentation of the stories by field participants. It both legitimises an historical approach and at the same time makes connections between intellectual work and practice.

As a field member researching the history of the field this extract also raises important ethical issues in the presentation of the professional biographies. While the gathering of professional biographies is exhausting for the researcher the strength of it lies in the emotional engagement of working with another human on a central aspect of their identity. In this sense I am not colluding with the "intellectual cover-up" within mainstream methods (Wilkins 1993 p94) and I am not distancing feeling, because of a central life aim to avoid joining what Emihovich (1995) describes as "desiccated intellectuals..." (p40). However, the potential of researcher indulgence has to be offset against the location of this type of work within the broader context of the academy. Goodson (1995) has noted the growth in the use of narratives as a form of enquiry and how potentially empowering this can be because the implicit race, gender, and class biases within traditional methodologies can be challenged. However, while the

language of narratives is optimistic, Goodson goes on to argue that it could be potentially disempowering and he reminds us that voices are "stratified" (p96) in the sense that some voices are structurally more powerful than others, and certainly within the study the boundary between the "story giver" and the "research taker" is not a clear one.

The oral and written texts reveal a diverse field, but one which has a common focus on practitioner needs. For some their interests lie in the utility of theory, for others in pedagogy. Most of those interviewed locate their work firmly within the field, while others move into other areas within educational studies. For some their work has been their life's work, while for others there is evidence of change and repositioning. There is considerable evidence of how trying to keep the spaces clear for work that interests the individual is becoming harder. The relationship with external agencies such as the LEA in the provision of short courses through to the TTA in the award of contracts to run courses is very strong. This is regarded as problematic by those interviewed and views have been put forward about whether the field is reacting to policy change rather than seeking to shape it.

Professional location seems to be important, and the oral and written texts suggest that the academic traditions of the Department (or School or Faculty) of Education within an HEI into which field members located themselves has had a huge impact on the development and focus of the field. However, the field member's engagement with the academy is insecure; the field member enables managerialist targets in HEIs to be achieved, but it is recognised that it can be seen as a field that enables policy to be implemented rather than making a direct contribution to the development of the social science disciplines. The field has yet to work through what its claims about political neutrality actually means for the continued location in an HEI, and the consequences this has for working with practitioners. The dilemma seems to centre on meeting practitioner needs rather than developing interests in and about the work of

practitioners. There is a strong tradition of pragmatism which is connected with this practitioner legacy, and what seems to be an embodied understanding that schools have to be managed and action has to be taken. The position taken is that this does not question the integrity of field members, it has enabled a creative approach to problem solving in professional practice. However, reflection on the part of field members during and through the interview process has facilitated an understanding of how pragmatic reactions to practitioner needs can be seen to have supported policy change rather than provided alternatives. In particular, field members interviewed are concerned about the increased secularisation within the field through entrepreneurial cultures and activities in HEIs.

In summary, this presentation of the oral and written texts has enabled a description and an analysis to be made about the development of the field. However, further questions and issues remain in need of investigation, and in particular how the practitioner legacy in the professional biographies of field members is connected to and shapes intellectual work. This seems to be related to boundaries, and how what distinguishes one member of an HEI from another is understood. It also seems to be linked to how field members conceptualise the purpose and practice of being in a field, and how knowledge production is understood. This analysis will be taken a stage further in Chapter 7 through a reflexive presentation of the work of Bourdieu and his theory of practice.

Chapter 7

Analysing intellectual work within the field of education management

7.1 Introduction

The data presented in Chapter 6 have provided some important descriptions and analysis about the knowledge claims of the field and where field members draw their intellectual boundaries. While I have so far sought to represent the voices of the sixteen field members through asking historical and sociological questions, I intend in this chapter to take the explanatory framework a stage further by using a theory of practice. The theoretical concepts developed and used by Bourdieu are helpful here in supporting the use of theory to explain professional practice [1].

7.2 A Theory of Practice

Bourdieu is concerned with social relations and a central aim is to attempt to remove the dichotomy between the individual and society. His model of practice, and of human behaviour, is based on a rejection of a false choice between objectivism and subjectivism. As I have argued the placing of Bourdieu's thinking tools at this stage in the study is consistent with his sociology, and is based on an awareness of how empirical work can be disciplined through traditional methods employed in theory testing:

> "...I would like to come back to the initial question about the relationship I have to canonical authors, and to try and answer it by reformulating it in a form in which it seems perfectly acceptable, in other words, in the form of the fundamental question of the theoretical space in which an author consciously and unconsciously situates himself or herself. The main function of a theoretical education (which can't be measured by the number of footnotes accompanying books and articles) is that it enables one explicitly to take into account this theoretical space, that is, the universe of scientifically pertinent positions at any given state of scientific development. This space of scientific (and epistemological) stances always imposes its order on modes of practice, and in any case on their social meaning, whether this fact is realized or not - and all the more brutally, no doubt, the less it is realized. And becoming aware of this space, that is, of the scientific problematic as a space of possibilities, is one of the main conditions for a self-aware and thus controlled scientific practice...The difficulty of sociological writing stems from the fact that you have to struggle against the constraints inscribed in the theoretical space at a given moment - and especially, in my case, against the false incompatibilities that they tend to produce; and this has to happen in full awareness of the fact that the product of this labour of breaking away will be perceived through categories of perception

> which, being adjusted to the transformed space, will tend to reduce the construction proposed to one or other of the terms of the opposition that it transcends" (Bourdieu 1990 pp30-31).

This reflexive awareness of how empirical work opens up possibilities is central to the research aims of this study. Bourdieu's starting point in his sociology is to ask the question: "how can behaviour be regulated without being the product of obedience to rules?" (*ibid.* p65). His work on Kinship (Bourdieu 1965, 1977) led him to question the work of anthropologists who in his view look for and use rules to explain social practice. Similarly, he resists the charge made against him that his rejection of structuralism means a regression to subjectivism. He doubts the work of phenomenology with its emphasis on rationality and spontaneity to replace structure. For Bourdieu (1990 p11), this does not mean that we descend into chaos, because most people most of the time take themselves and social world for granted; practice is depicted as "an improvisatory performance". People do not choose to improvise rather "no other approach could possibly work".

Through the concept of Habitus Bourdieu gives recognition to the individual or agent that previous structural approaches had marginalised. Furthermore, through the concept of the Field the agent is capable of strategising, that is, people do have goals and interests and this means that the individual can locate what they are doing within their own experience of reality rather than fit it into the analytical models produced by social scientists. This next section will begin by looking at Habitus, before going on to consider Field.

7.2.1 Habitus

If the agent is not to be conceptualised either as individual consciousness separate from the social context, or the individual determined by the structure, then Bourdieu bridges the subjectivity-objectivity divide by the use of Habitus. For him Habitus has been "invented" as a means of explaining the "paradox" of the individual being directed towards ends but not driven by them. Habitus "as social life incorporated" is meant to

enable us to transcend the opposition between the individual and society (*ibid.* p31).

Habitus is described as the 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' and 'regular' without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor" (Bourdieu 1989 p53).

Habitus is embodied: it is inside the head of the agent, it is about a "feel for the game" (Bourdieu 1990 p9) in which the agent is not engaged in a rational calculation (a subject) or obeying externally defined and driven behaviour demands (an object), rather the Habitus disposes agents to do certain things. Bourdieu describes this as follows:

> "The habitus as the feel for the game is the social game embodied and turned into a second nature. 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 that 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" (*ibid*. p63).

For Bourdieu, Habitus is about representing action, and can only be understood through the agent's interactions with others. It is ways of talking, moving, and making things, which is not about rules but about regularities in social actions [2]. Dispositions are not the product of rational action or self interest, but a socio-historical conditioning about actions that are regarded as "reasonable" by those who occupy the same social space (*ibid.* p109).

Bourdieu's aim is to reintroduce the socialising and socialised agent. Habitus is learned more by experience than by teaching, and through a socialisation process the Habitus remains durable. During the socialisation process the objective social conditions in which the agent lives are inculcated and so the Habitus is "structured structures". Furthermore, as the agent develops practice related to different contexts then the dispositions within the Habitus are "structuring structures". An agent can operate in a

range of fields of activity and practice is still linked to the core Habitus and so Habitus is *transposable*. In this sense Bourdieu talks about a "generative habitus" (*ibid.* p9):

> "I am talking about dispositions acquired through experience, thus variable from place to place and time to time. This 'feel for the game', as we call it, is what enables an infinite number of 'moves' to be made, adapted to the infinite number of possible situations which no rule, however, complex, can foresee" (*ibid.* p9).

The generative aspect of Habitus is also illustrated in the reproductive capacities of agents, but Bourdieu avoids the pitfalls of objective determinism through the development of the concepts of Field and Strategies.

7.2.2 Field

While Habitus developed from Bourdieu's (1965) work on the Kabyle in the 1960s, the concept of Field is a product of much later work on cultural reproduction and the sociology of art (1993). The link between Habitus and Field is related in the question: what effect does Habitus have? If Habitus is a system of dispositions in which agents engage in certain behaviours in certain circumstances, then the social spaces in which this takes place need to be investigated. 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" (Bourdieu 1990 p91). This is not without difficulty, and Bourdieu identifies a number of problems: firstly, Habitus and the Field may not be in agreement, and while Habitus is more often in play than rational calculation or structural determinism, there are times of crisis when these other principles are in play; secondly, behaviours that are the product of rules have clarity in their construction and hence observation. However, Habitus:

> "*goes hand in hand with vagueness and indeterminacy*. As a generative spontaneity which asserts itself in an improvised confrontation with ever-renewed situations, it obeys a *practical logic*, that of vagueness, of the more-or less, which defines one's ordinary relation to the world" (*ibid.* pp77-78).

In other words, attempting to objectively bring into existence groups risks concealing the true position and interests of those groups (*ibid.* p126) [3].

In the concept of the 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 field, economic field, cultural field, and education field. Each field is a structured system of social positions held by people or institutions. The nature of the social positions defines the situation for people, and the field is structured internally as a set of power relations.

A field is a dynamic concept as shifts in power relations and position change the structure, and so 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" (Jenkins 1992 p84). What brings people together is a "social magic" (Bourdieu, 1990 p88) 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 truth. Central to understanding the individual - collective dynamic interactions is that of *position*. Agents can occupy a range of positions and can create new ones. Positions are about: domination, subordination, or equivalence [4]. A Field is a competitive arena in which position is achieved by the access allowed to *capital* or goods/resources: economic, social, cultural, symbolic. Bourdieu (1988) has much to say about whether intellectual work is concerned with cultural power that is indifferent to the market, or whether this activity is more about temporal power allied with political and economic interests [5].

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, key note speeches, 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) [6]. Bourdieu (1988) takes the economic metaphor of the field further by presenting the identity and location of intellectuals within a struggle for recognition or distinction in which "one person's pedigree can be another's mark of infamy", he goes on to say:

> "The different sets of individuals (more or less constituted into groups) who are defined by these different criteria have a vested interest in them. In proffering these criteria, in trying to have them acknowledged, in staking their own claim to constitute them as legitimate properties, as specific capital, they are working to modify the laws of formation of the prices characteristic of the university market, and thereby to increase their potential for profit" (p11).

Change is concerned with the complex interrelationship between external and internal struggles within Fields [7], and his leads to questions about access to a Field. This seems to be linked to two factors: firstly, what are the specific interests of the Field? In other words, what is its purpose and what do agents compete or stake claims over? Secondly, what are the strategies of capital accumulation used by agents? In other words, what knowledge and skills are invested? This is summed up by Johnson (1993):

> "To enter a field, to play the game, one must possess the habitus which predisposes one to enter that field, that 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 skill, 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" (p8).

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 pX). This relationship between the agent's position, for example, through the symbolic form of a book or 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 p135).

In summary, this section seeks to provide the thinking tools with which to revisit the oral and written texts presented in Chapter 6, and the analysis resulting from this process is presented in the next section.

7.3 The practice of intellectual work

The empirical data gathered and reported on within this study focus on educational professionals who began their careers either teaching in schools before gaining promotion to middle and senior management, or working in local administration. Their professional biographies show that they have repositioned themselves within a different part of the education system but have still retained the work and needs of teachers as their professional focus. Patterned through the interview data is the significance of the practitioner and the importance of action. The practitioner is located within a complex and contradictory context in which field members in HEIs actively work to develop and present problem solving strategies. Underpinning this is the importance of researching practice and an intellectual engagement with published research in informing the work of practitioners, combined with an interest in debating knowledge claims underpinning practice. Within each professional biography different emphasis is given to each element, and there is evidence of both stability and change over time.

Field members are disposed to put the needs of school practitioners at the top of their agendas and stake symbolic capital through an embodied understanding of the professional and practical dilemmas of what it means to take action. There are regularities in their activities in support of practitioners especially through how policy changes are translated and interpreted. The establishment of short and long term courses is based on a clear understanding that practice can and should be improved. Field members are very much aware of their own agency to bring about change in their own professional lives, and attribute this to the practitioners they work with. Concern about structural injustices is not overt within the professional biographies and this reveals the gendered nature of Habitus.

The experiences of having been a practitioner is a structured structure in which dispositions in current professional practice are linked to prior experiences. While it seems that capital has been appropriated through colonisation by government agencies, the professional biographies show a remarkable resilience against many of these trends. Field members have welcomed the development of the management imperative, but they have not proactively collaborated with the particular configuration of performance management embedded in recent policy and legislation. Furthermore, current field members are keen to stake claims about the importance of critiquing and challenging these trends. This has not undermined a commitment to the importance of management within educational institutions, and there is a consistency within the oral and written texts over time and within current field members, of the desire to understand the practitioner context. Increasingly values based analysis is being foregrounded as a means to both do this and to distinguish their activity from the entrepreneurial trends in the work of other field members in other HEIs.

Concerns and worries about the entrepreneurial trends within the field can be understood through Habitus, and how it reveals the questions that field members raise about their own practice and what this means for each of them in how they sought to

intellectualise their work. The move into an HEI is a central part of their own intellectual engagement with understanding practice, and to build on their experiential or insider knowledge of what it means to make things happen. Once located in HEIs field members working with practitioners in schools and colleges becomes structuring structures in which new learning confirms and builds on their practitioner-orientated dispositions. Interest in and work about the relationship between management, and teaching and learning is an intellectual space where this is played out. The data present examples of dilemmas for field members in HEIs and their professional biographies and stories enable the choices made and positions taken to be revealed. There is an interplay between the agency of the individual in how their knowledge, skills and values both structure and are structured by their professional context. Pragmatic tendencies amongst field members do not indicate that they float free of a value system, rather the engagement with values is a dialectical relationship between what could be done with what has to be done.

The feel for the game is such that all can play, but the structural context makes the capital they stake unequal, and so the impact of the binary divide is significant in the growth and configuration of the field. Struggles over knowledge claims have clustered around what is relevant, and within the polytechnic sector this was directly related to a unitary organisation in the integration of individual and strategic goals. In the older universities the established academic tradition led field members to stake claims for relevance and significance within social science theory and for the importance of critical evaluation. Language is a part of the struggle with those disposed to technical competence using action orientated words and metaphors, compared with others who are concerned to link practice with debates about democracy.

Social space extends beyond institutional location and the professional biographies show an ongoing disposition to build national and international networks. Creativity in academic life is not just a product of individual scholarly activity, but is essentially

linked to the social and intellectual processes of debate. Claims made about practitioners and their work in relation to values and culture are played out within these networks. This takes the form of collaboration and the mutual staking of claims for significance through to boundary construction in which field members compete for recognition. The contested boundary between the field of education management and policy sociology is understood and explained in terms of the structured and structuring effect of Habitus. Field members are clear about the significance of having been 'at the chalk face' in which there is an historically and culturally embodied understanding of what it means to have to act. Ideological commitment in their view does not help the immediacy of practice or facilitate responsibility.

It seems that what the analysis has so far revealed is that field members are clear about what distinguishes them from those who locate their work within other fields in educational studies, but the strategies for distinction within the field are more complex. There are clear attempts to claim distinction based on the type of intervention in practitioner work, and location in an HEI is critical to this. For those who established the field in polytechnics the imperative was to intervene in actual practice to guarantee organisational and individual improvement, and this legacy remains strong. For those in established universities the claim is for the importance of research and reflective scholarship, though the emphasis on practical relevance is also strong here. For each field member the particular balance of intervention within a practitioner context through research, teaching, and consultancy in order to develop understanding and/or practical strategies remains a central part of the struggle within the field.

Field members in HEIs have a generative Habitus through building networks of people in support of the field's entry into and growth within higher education. On one level this helps to explain how entry into the academy has been facilitated and sustained by the outcomes of Habitus in the form of courses, publications and research grants, and consecrated through appointments and the award of the title professor. However, the

field remains insecure in its relationship with the academy. Changes in the funding of HEIs, and in particular the funding of practitioner professional development, has had an impact on field members, and in particular they have faced, like other HEI workers, the growth in fixed term contracts. In this context trying to maintain employment within a centre or department is connected to the generation of work. Field members as HEI practitioners have had to handle the contradiction between policy determined provision with debates about what is appropriate for an HEI to be involved in. Opening up provision to the market has made field members in HEIs one type of provider, and this is increasingly being marginalised in the requirement to collaborate in partnership with the private sector. Contract compliance with outside agencies has shifted accountability mechanisms away from internal quality processes to external value for money requirements. Bourdieu's mapping of intellectual territory and its relationship with fields of power and class enables a recognition that field members do occupy a dominated position. The pragmatic entrepreneurial tradition is about seeking a dominant position along with economic interests, but field members remain dominated. This is in tension with field members' intellectual interests and the importance of a cultural space in which to research, and understand, with and about practitioner interests.

Field members do engage in debates about epistemology and theoretical controversy but only a minority of those interviewed feel safe and comfortable enough to make claims for distinctiveness here. Intellectual or cultural spaces are mainly on the international stage, and through channels that remain open such as the journal *Educational Management and Administration*. All knowledge workers within HEIs are having their ways of seeing and being within the world challenged and restructured, but this is all pervasive in the field of education management because the external levers of temporal power in the form of contractual compliance have a direct connection with the professional practice of field members in HEIs, and with practitioners in schools and colleges who are the focus of the field's claim for significance and purpose.

Universities as sites of knowledge production are under pressure not just economically in sustaining employment, but also from claims that commercial enterprises are more productive sites. For the field members who are seeking to locate their work between practice and the academy this presents a number of dilemmas. If practice at school or LEA level can be better developed by internal processes or through action research, does this conceptualise the field member in an HEI as a facilitator or a consultant? In which case, what does this mean for their location, as this type of knowledge worker could be located in an LEA or as a private consultant. This issue is connected to how a field member actively understands and seeks to locate their work within a field of study and how debates about research questions and theory are constructed and resolved within a field. In its simplest setting, if the training of aspiring and serving headteachers is to be based on the best practice from non-educational settings does this mean that the debates about what it means to transfer theory from business to education will become redundant?

The oral and written texts provide a considerable amount of evidence that field members do engage in practice as if they are a member of an academic or university field, and there is evidence of an academic Habitus. This is illustrated by their work in postgraduate accreditation through to membership of national and international networks. While the field is recent, compared with the field in North America and Australia, the data show that through the last thirty years field members have sought to establish their purpose and hence their boundaries. Nevertheless, this remains problematic as field members have been more involved in improving practitioner management capability than in establishing a secure intellectual foundation for the field. A strong practitioner focus is itself not a problem, and other applied fields such as medicine could make similar claims for legitimacy, but what is at issue is the nature of this purpose. Conceptualising intellectual work as a labour process, rather than the property of an elite caste, offers a view of the practitioner as directly and legitimately involved in intellectual work and knowledge production. There is evidence of this type

of relationship between field members in HEIs and field members in other institutions through the design and delivery of postgraduate courses, systems of accreditation, networking through BEMAS, and, collaborative publications. However, the intellectual role of practitioners has been undermined by successive policy changes and legislation (Hargreaves and Evans 1997), and the professional practice of field members in HEIs has not actively engaged with what this means for its own knowledge claims.

Working with and on behalf of practitioners was and still is seen to be self evident, and the result of not exploring what this means has consequences. In particular, field members who actively ask questions and seek to develop the epistemological base of the field are few compared with the field in North America and Australia. Increasingly field members in HEIs are seeking distinction through specialising in a particular aspect of management such as HRM, and some are staking claims for particular research methodologies such as the use of biographies, but there is no active debate about purpose and knowledge claims. The oral texts reveal a concern about the entrepreneurial approach of much of the writing and teaching within the field, and how values based analysis is an important contribution, but as yet this has not developed beyond a minority interest. While the oral texts show the continued dominance of conceptual pluralism as the means by which theory and practice are inter-related, actual engagement in the epistemological assumptions on which it is based, such as Evers and Lakomski's (1991a) analysis of intellectual turmoil in the field of educational administration, is minimal.

It could be argued that such debates deflect attention away from sites of knowledge production outside the academy (Ladwig 1996). Connell (1983) argues that this is dangerous:

> "Intellectuals' ability to talk to themselves is one of the conditions of intellectual work in general, one of the ways of distancing thought from the demands of immediate practice. But it also invites the intellectuals' primal political sin, which is talking only to themselves. The effect is not so much to radicalise or help other people as to exclude them, make them feel stupid and put down" (p249).

Connell (1983) goes on to say that not only does this undermine intellectual work but also leaves a vacuum that has been filled by the new right and its solutions to practical concerns. Writers have shown their frustration with what Ranson (1995 p442) calls the "fissiparous tendencies" in policy studies and suggests that this activity is more about posturing than intellectual positioning. Furthermore, Halpin (1994) argues that the dominance of sociological explanations of policy may raise important questions, but could prevent alternative questions, theorising, and explanations from taking place. Asking questions about knowledge claims, and foregrounding the orientation taken by different people to the work that interests them, is a way in which the position of the field member can be open to scrutiny. However, the field has individual and collective memories and folklore about the Greenfield challenge in 1974, and field members have learned very quickly that intellectual debate does not always happen within intellectual and moral boundaries. There is a strong tradition of claiming neutrality within the field of education management and of assuming a distinction between the political self and the professional self. However, claiming neutrality is itself a position and field members are finding it increasingly difficult to sustain or justify this in a highly politicised policy context.

It is almost as if there are intellectual places where the field member does not go or is unwilling to go. However, as Adler *et al. (*1993) argue not going to those places means that gendered theory continues to be used rather than problematised. The emphasis on scientific and rational knowledge claims remains an enduring feature within the field, and the problematic nature of this is located in claims about neutrality. Hartley (1998) sheds light on this in his analysis of how the field remains essentially modernist in its knowledge claims, but absorbs the language and rhetoric of challenges, such as postmodernism, in what he regards as a "modernist makeover" (p154). In other words, the writing of texts which aim to solve the problem of the glass ceiling by advocating rational policy-making to achieve equal opportunities does not challenge enduring power structures. As Blackmore (1989) argues:

> "Feminist theory does not ask merely to include women as objects in the patriarchal discourse, in which sameness is emphasized rather than difference. It rapidly becomes evident that it is impossible to incorporate or 'add on' a feminist perspective. Rather, a feminist critique ultimately leads to the need to reformulate the methodologies, criteria of validity and merit and ultimately the political and epistemological commitments underlying the dominant notions or discourse. Feminists demand not just equality, but that they become the subjects and objects of an alternative, autonomous discourse which chooses its own measures and criteria. It is necessary not only to explain the pervasiveness and persistence of gender divergence and gender subordination (which are not the same thing) but also to provide an explanation that avoids a rigid universalism and provides a way of understanding cultural and historical difference. It is also essential that theory provides the basis for a politics directed towards changing this subordination, a politics of change" (p120).

Blackmore goes on to show how this approach questions the assumptions underpinning performance management systems and leadership styles. In this sense, the practitioner cannot be trained to take on the rhetoric of so-called women friendly organisations, and then assume that the problem of gender has been solved. This connects with the rational processes of identifying practitioners as having needs which must be met through training, rather than the practitioner having interests which go beyond the institutional requirement of the right to manage and be managed. Yeatman (1990) argues that the inclusion of women (and other excluded groups) has resulted in them holding highly paid jobs in the labour market, but this tends not to be based on voice as they remain silenced by the legacy of structural injustice. She identifies these women as femocrats who are privileged in the labour market but are connected to economically disadvantaged women through their joint location within patriarchal structures and cultures. It is the femocrat commitment to radical change for all women which identifies their political interests and strategies. However, this creates dilemmas for femocrats as in challenging masculine power structures they are weakening their privileged position which could undermine their radical project. While site-based management has privileged the practitioner as the rational expert this has masked the realities of everyday work, and constructs the potential femocrat as a technocrat. Furthermore, this limits the role of the knowledge worker in an HEI to that of facilitator of that expertise rather than someone who is a knower about the interests and work of

the practitioner. As Deem (1996b) argues, education which is connected directly to practical improvement excludes social scientists:

> "...who do research in educational contexts or on educational processes because they find them methodologically or theoretically interesting, and not because they believe that their research will help to improve education. Such researchers may or may not be based in education departments" (p150).

The oral texts illustrate that intellectual work within the field is connected to both a practitioner and academic Habitus. The latter is rooted, both historically to the 1960s and institutionally through a location in an HEI, to the social sciences. The inter-disciplinary nature of the field and of its members in HEIs is recognised within the oral texts, but revealing and utilising it remains difficult. Perhaps Yeatman's (1990) conceptual analysis is helpful here in highlighting how those who are practitioners in HEIs not only demonstrate their commitment to practitioners in other educational institutions by focusing on strategies to bring about technical improvement, but also have a political commitment to connect improvement with debates about power. Perhaps asking questions which challenge rather than resolve will recapture words such as mission, empowerment, and relevance, as being more about structural change than neutral processes.

Those who take risks with theory such as Baron and Taylor (1969), Bush (1986, 1995) and Hoyle (1982, 1986) make enduring and significant contributions to both the development of the field and to supporting practitioner development. Nevertheless this is dangerous territory, especially within the current policy context whereby research into headteacher and middle management leadership is approved and funded. What is not the subject of enquiry are the realities for teachers of being in receipt of other people's visions and delegated 'over' workloads (Power *et al.* 1997). The shift within site-based management towards performance management is being explicitly linked to changes in power relationships within organisations (Al-Khalifa 1989) and within the state (Clarke *et al.* 1994) but this is not being addressed within the field. This is particularly linked to the restructuring of the state and takes the study back to the initial

questions about the individual and the connections with the policy context. Bottery (1998) argues that through the development of public sector management there has been a shift in power relationships. In particular, the work of the practitioner is being contracted according to "the requirement for the individual user of a service both to choose what it is they require of that service, *and* to make that choice explicit in such a manner that it can be determined whether the service has responded effectively to that choice or not" (Yeatman 1994). According to Sullivan (1997) the values and behaviours of the commercial contract are being transferred into the structures of governance. The complexity is such that what we know so far about the restructuring of the public sector remains unclear as we have seen new practices being overlain on top of others, some absorbed and others resisted (Yeatman 1997).

This type of analysis is relevant for the field as practitioners do not come 'freely' to contractual practices. In this sense the knowledge claims underpinning current policy drives towards performance management (DfEE 1998) need to connect with the power structures underpinning the type and nature of public sector work. This has implications for how professionalism is understood and practiced, and field members are in a position to engage in this type of analysis. The shift away from rational and normative theories of management, to more descriptive analysis about the realities of being a practitioner is beginning to be a feature within the field and is illustrated by the use of biography or what Ribbins (1997) describes as "situated portrayals" (p12). However, as I have illustrated in Chapter 3 there remains a growing entrepreneurial trend within the field which is more concerned with enabling reform to take place, than in studying the impact of these changes on practitioners and their work. It seems as if the issue is being side stepped by a process of relabelling as ‘educational leadership’ rather than an engagement with the nature of the practitioner context. In this sense history is repeating itself as the original adoption of management was based on a drive to modernise and hence appear to be relevant, and within the current context the problem seems to be that the benefits of management are being overshadowed by the

pejorative use of managerialism, and so relabelling could help to market provision. Perhaps the field needs to look more at substance than at packaging so that it can seek to investigate the contextual translation of policy into practice. The oral texts show how individual field members are raising this type of issue and work is taking place to try and shift the field to a more reflexive approach.

The choices made by field members in HEIs about where they could and should locate their work is important in how the field has been constructed. In its broadest sense, the field grew up separate from ITT, and so it does not go into the classroom. The limitation here is that field members have not been able to make connections between pedagogy and the management of the organisation, and this limits the knowledge claims about the connection between effective management and educational outcomes. The field is returning to this issue, but it is doing so by entering the territory inhabited by the improvement and effectiveness networks, and consequently the distinctiveness of the field could become blurred.

The field has an uneasy relationship with policy sociologists, and it is interesting that field members claim and can demonstrate both an interest in and use of policy analysis, but they would wish to retain a separateness from the policy sociology networks. Field members use and engage with many of the same concepts as policy analysts, and there is much within conceptual pluralism that policy sociologists would recognise. However, field members in England and Wales are unlikely to enter terrain in which structural issues such as power are problematised and debated. The connection between practitioner work and the social sciences has been eroded, and the oral texts show how particular people either on their own or in clusters are struggling to maintain this intellectual space. Doing this has become more about making connections between theory and practice, than about contributing to the development of theory. While important work has taken place in the development of organisation theory based in educational settings (Bush 1995), the practitioner pull

towards problem solving has focused the field towards normative models rather than theories that might explain and challenge. The consequence of this is that the field has tended to concentrate on enabling practitioners to cope with change and then to control change, rather than to develop alternative models of practice. The importance of the seminar series *Redefining Educational Management* is in the growing recognition that as field member location in HEIs is being marginalised by policy changes such as the NPQH, the field is struggling to promote the importance of postgraduate study.

7.5 Summary

Thinking with and theorising through the use of Bourdieu's theory of practice provides some interesting ways in which Habitus and positioning within a Field is both revealed and is revealing: "I think that enlightenment is on the side of those who turn their spotlight on our blinkers" (1990 p16). The central theme generated through this process is concerned with enabling the practitioner to work within the policy context through the development of management skills and knowledge. The orientation of the field member towards the practitioner is to support responsibility through appropriate and reflective action. Positioning within the field is based more on the type of intervention within the practitioner context than in the knowledge claims underpinning this. This raises particular challenges for the field, not least in how it engages with debates about power, social injustice, and research which is about enabling us to critically evaluate the impact of site-based management on the working lives of practitioners. Chapter 8 will not only summarise the study, but will also provide a reflexive approach to how researchers internal and external to the field could engage with the themes identified within this study.

Chapter 8

Conclusion

8.1 Summary of the study

The study began with the aim of revealing and analysing the professional practice of members within the field of education management located in HEIs. The initial research questions focused on two inter-connecting levels concerning the individual field member and how their work is created and shaped by the policy context in which their working lives take place. These questions were further developed by firstly, undertaking an historical approach to the development of policy in which the work of field members has been located; and, secondly, through problematising this analysis by asking sociological questions about knowledge production and the university as a site of knowledge production. Through using the set of thinking tools provided from the work of Bourdieu it is possible to both describe and to begin to understand the historical development of the field through analysing the oral and written texts presented in this study. The outcome of this analysis is presented in Table 6.

Table 6
An intellectual history of the field of education management from 1960

	1944-74	1974-88	1988-onwards
Policy Context	Educational administration.	Curriculum management.	Site-based management.
Field of Practice	Growing.	Established.	Focused.
Field of Study	Searching.	Investigating.	Optional.

Table 6 shows that as a field of practice the emphasis has been on establishing the legitimacy of management activities and structures. Before the mid 1970s this was growing, and by the mid-1980s this had become more established. However, it is the advent of site-based management that has legitimised the management imperative for the practitioner in relation to roles, activities, language, and credentials. Management has become more focused through specialisation in finance or marketing, and practice is being redefined around performance connected to outcomes. Field members in HEIs

have had a significant role here in training, consultancy and evaluation research. The implication that this raises for the field is whether field members in HEIs are able to retain an input into what being a manager means for practice and for the practitioner. This is linked to how the field sees itself as a field of study with particular knowledge claims based on an interaction between theory and practice. Table 6 presents the field of study as one where field members in HEIs sought out theory in the pre-1970s period and connections with networks in North America and Australia were fruitful, and this combined with the growing emphasis on the social sciences in education at the time. In the mid-1970s field members were using social science theories, and increasingly, especially in polytechnics, were investigating management theory. From the mid-1980s onwards conceptual pluralism provided field members with an exciting framework in which the social sciences and management theory could be used to support practitioner understanding and action within their organisation, but it also provided field members with the opportunity to eschew theory. In this sense debates about knowledge claims is optional.

The oral texts indicate that current field members are concerned about this trend, and this underpins the motivation by field leaders in establishing the seminar series: *Redefining Educational Management*. The rapid growth of the field within HEIs may symbolise entry into the academy, but the growing entrepreneurial approach to the practice of education management is seen as being more about income generation than contributing to knowledge. This raises questions about institutional location, and the dilemmas faced by field members in HEIs in how they resolve the contradictions in their own work.

8.2 A reflexive approach to the practice of theorising

By focusing on people and how their identities both shape and are shaped by professional practice I have been able to construct a history of change and continuity in education policy and practice that is rooted in the lived experiences and positions of

those directly involved. The research issue that forms the core of my investigation is an intellectual history of the field of education management from the 1960s to the present day. The main focus of my data collection is through the collection of the professional biographies of selected field members, and I have been concerned with gaining an understanding of the professional choices and decisions about how individuals came to locate and identify themselves within the field.

This study has reported on activity and itself has been an activity, but I have sought to go beneath the usual presentation of a technical description of a research design and findings. I would agree with Gewirtz and Ozga (1994) that facts cannot be revealed just through the implementation of historical method, and that history is not a "theory-free zone" (p187). In Seddon's (1996) words I have attempted to reveal a:

> "conceptual lacework (which) involves making not only the products but also the processes of intellectual work visible so that other researchers can see how it is that particular meanings and significations have come to be salient, how they are grounded in empirical experience/data, and their place and relative importance in the researcher's conceptual framework" (pp211-212).

In many ways it has been ambitious in seeking to investigate a large, growing, and vibrant field, and the reflexive approach to understanding practice has been both personally and professionally painful yet exhilarating. However, the project has been practical in the sense of having been focused, designed, managed, completed, and evaluated. It has also been theoretical; it is modest in that the study does not claim to provide a complete application and review of Bourdieu's work, but it does present an explanation of an area of professional practice through using the theoretical lens of Habitus and Field. Bourdieu's work in this sense enables understanding, and this study has not just been about a replication of his ideas, but a clarification and a recognition that such an approach is of worth.

A particular strength about this reflexive approach is that it enables self awareness about my own role within the study to be foregrounded. There are clear power and gender issues between my position within the field, and those who I have worked with

in this study. As an insider the advantage lay in my subordinate role as a newcomer to an HEI in which those I spoke with could be characterised as being in control of the capital, or what Bourdieu describes as "curators of culture" (Swartz 1997 p124). However, those I have worked with could reply that my role is that a "creator of culture" (*ibid*. p124) and so it could legitimately be asked whether this study is actually about the scholarship of charting the intellectual history of the field of education management, or is it a means by which I am entering the field and playing the game? In this sense I am engaging in the "symbolic labour" which is the work of intellectuals (*ibid.* pp219-220), and I am part of the struggle for symbolic power through the naming and categorising people and groups.

Thinking with Bourdieu has enabled a creative interaction between theory, historical methodology, and empirical research. Grenfell's (1996) work leads him to ask the following questions about what it is we do when we think with Bourdieu:

> "If we think in these terms and construct research along these lines, what does that give us?, what have we gained?, what have we lost?" (p302).

If I ask this question, the study has brought a number of gains: firstly, I have been able to reveal myself as an historian in which I have made transparent my position in how and why the traces from the past have been constructed into evidence and have been storied; secondly, I have been able to reveal theory and practice as not being dichotomised through the application of theory to practice, but that theory is within practice, and practice is within theory; and, thirdly, I have been able to present the field member within a complex process rather than become stranded in a methodological objectivity versus subjectivity *cul-de-sac*.

The analysis has been able to use the language and concepts of Habitus and Field to describe and explain intellectual positions and positioning within the field. This may not be helpful for the field member in an HEI if we adopted Connell's (1983) argument that Bourdieu's work is pessimistic as it makes visible how the field produces and

reproduces itself, but not how it might escape from dominant power structures. However, Swartz (1997) argues that Bourdieu not only has a theory of what being an intellectual is, but also that his work has a strong normative strand. Intellectuals are meant to "be critics rather than servants of power", and field members work to establish and maintain spaces for intellectual autonomy (*ibid.* p222). This is a contradiction in the work of Bourdieu as his sociology is meant to be about describing positions rather than the taking of a position. It could also be argued that Bourdieu is himself in an employment context which gives him the security of tenure and economic freedom that is not evident for many field members in HEIs in England and Wales, and he is not subjected to mechanistic management accountability systems. Nevertheless, rather than concern myself with this as a problem, I can use it to act as a metaphor for the working lives of field members in HEIs and to raise further questions. A field member might ask: what intellectual position am I taking in the field? How does that position relate to the positions taken by others in the field? How does that position relate to economic, political and cultural structures or fields? In taking that position am I dominating or being dominated? These types of questions enable field members to develop practice in relation to what Connell (1983) describes as the "possibilities" for action through the contradictions of professional practice, and by understanding the "traps" that can limit action because assumptions are made about power and the ability to act.

The possibility exists within the field for a revitalisation of knowledge claims, and this is patterned within the oral texts. Further research could be undertaken to map the building and development of clusters of field members in particular HEIs and/or those working on particular projects. In this way the inter-relationship over time between field members in HEIs, LEAs and schools could be described and understood. This opens up possibilities to explore the broader field as identified by Fitz (1997) and at a time when the academy is coming under pressure this could reinforce and develop the claims for field members to be located within HEIs. However, the trap remains that

those who are subjected to management systems (myself included) in HEIs will not be able to seek alternative ways of knowing to support the practitioner not just in problem solving but in asking: who defines the problem? It could be argued that without this reflection about professional practice, knowledge production could be shifted from the debates in the seminar room to the tick lists in training manuals, and the field's claim to have a legitimate right to be located in HEIs will be lost. As this study shows the relationship with the international field is important both historically and currently for field members who seek spaces to protect and develop their commitment to intellectual development. The location and entry of field members in HEIs in England and Wales is connected to the networking with field members in North America and Australia. This remains an under researched area, and projects could be undertaken to write the history and interconnections between the IIP, CCEA/CCEAM and BEAS/BEMAS. While such professional practice may not have immediate connections with the practitioner context, this type of historical work may enable the field to recapture the conceptualisation of relevance. This could support field members across all sectors in understanding their intellectual heritage and the debates about value systems underpinning practitioner development.

Another potential trap is in the narrow focus taken by some field members on micro-studies, and the assumption that the right to manage by practitioners will enable problem solving. Taking up a defensive position against other networks may help internal and external marketing, but it does not support the work of the practitioner that the field claims to be its prime purpose. Possibilities for the field member widen when micro-studies are based on reflective and reflexive intellectual positioning in which spaces are sought to connect their work with wider macro-studies. Whitty and Edwards (1994) argue that this is border territory, and that how theory is or is not used can be seen to be a claim for a particular way of working from different networks of academics rather than a particular characteristic of historical investigation *per se*. Halpin (1974) has recently shed light on this by arguing that if sociology is privileged in the study of

education policy then it could be seen as "disciplinary parochialism" because those from other disciplines such as history, economics and anthropology could make an important contribution "to our understanding of the sources, nature and effects of education policy" (*ibid.* p200). This does not legitimise conceptual pluralism but recognises how individual field members need to be in touch with their own disciplinary origins and make these known through their work. In this way, understanding changes to the working lives of practitioners requires not just a continuation of the field's focus on neutral problem solving, but also an engagement with theory which enables issues of social justice and power to be included. This is within the historical tradition of the field as illustrated by the work of Greenfield. A particularly exciting area of possible future research is in undertaking life histories of particular field members and/or the bringing together of edited collections of their work in the style of the Greenfield and Ribbins (1993) in order to foreground the importance of their professional practice and its contribution to the development of the field. Research could be undertaken into the historical development of particular aspects which the field regards as central to its purpose such as award and non-award bearing provision. This could enable the accumulated insider knowledge about pedagogy and the relationship between theory and practice to be used to provide and debate alternatives to those being imposed by government agencies.

How field members in HEIs, including myself, move forward professionally and intellectually can be understood by Bourdieu's theory of practice in which positioning and repositioning within the field and movements into other fields and networks can be described and conceptualised. As Grenfell and James (1998) argue "everything is up for grabs. It appears as if everyone is free to play, everything is negotiable" (p25). The strength of Bourdieu's work is in enabling the field to understand the problematic nature of the positions taken by field members within a dysfunctional structured and structuring context. The entrepreneurial trend within the field is staking a claim for a particular form of relevance, but in doing so it encourages intellectual impoverishment.

A SWOT analysis or a development plan will not provide the practical or intellectual means by which the field can explore its knowledge claims and its relationship with external agencies. Intellectual debate, challenge, and positioning is within the field's own intellectual tradition as well as a feature of academic life in general. Nevertheless the field could present itself as being trapped between practice and the academy and be written off by both, rather than present itself as seeking to work within the contradictions and dilemmas that are being experienced. Bourdieu does and does not help on this matter as he argues for intellectual autonomy in order to both critique and reveal the structures that might seek to limit intellectual work, but at the same time he does not enable those involved in intellectual work to know how this work is to be paid for or to be given employment security (Swartz 1997).

Trying to maintain intellectual spaces within a hostile policy context is not easy as shown by changes in position by sociologists of education in the 1970s and 1980s, but it is not impossible. Field members can and do concern themselves with knowledge claims but there are questions that many have stopped asking since the Glatter (1979) review about the continuum between management and policy studies. If the focus of intellectual work within the field is the practitioner then what this actually means needs to be subjected to analysis, and whether knowledge is being produced to meet the requirements of dominant elites within society in order to control and domesticate the public sector practitioner, or whether knowledge production is about enabling the practitioner to relate their work and their working lives to the broader social, political, and economic system. This has implications that are beyond the responsibility and remit of the individual field member in an HEI, and there are formidable obstacles both within the field, within HEIs as sites of knowledge production, and the cultural context in which intellectual work is understood and judged in England and Wales. Nevertheless, as the biographies of the sixteen field members have shown, these present possibilities and challenges that field members have faced already in their professional lives, and so there are resources available from work on the history of the field. There is also

potential in the recognition of a critical future for the field as school management is being displaced by school improvement. The seminar series *Redefining Education Management* not only highlights such problems but also identifies potential for development by asking questions about how field members are positioned and should position themselves in relation to the changing policy context and the growth and location of other allied networks. Intellectual debate can be distracting, self referential, and disconnected from the people it is meant to be about, but it is also essential to any field member's claim for legitimacy within an HEI.

Footnotes

Chapter 2: The policy context and the field of education management

[1] Sinclair, Ironside and Seifert (1996) argue that there is a direct connection between the policy context and the adoption of management systems: "Schools are changing, not because of some ill-defined shift from Fordism to post-Fordism, but as a direct result of the business-like imperatives introduced by the reform programme" (p655). In particular they note the impact of these changes on the practitioner:

> "This suggests a radical departure from the traditional organisation of schools on the basis of teams of professional teachers operating as colleagues. Rather than promoting flexibility through professional teamwork, the logic of recessionary pressure and market vulnerability leads to the fragmentation of the workforce into a rigid hierarchical division of labour. The flexibility required by managers struggling to minimise their labour costs and to maximise their share of the market for pupils is quite different from the flexibility adopted by professionals seeking to strengthen their pupils' learning experiences. The flexible teacher of the 1990s is one who is prepared to undertake a flexible (expanding) workload, to work flexible hours as decided by the management, to become a generic teacher instead of a specialist, and to accept a flexible contract of employment" (p654).

There is a range of literature which seeks to both chart and critique the changes illustrated by Sinclair *et al.* (1996), there is work which focuses on the public sector worker (Clarke *et al.* 1994, Farnham and Horton 1992a, 1992b, Pollitt 1990), and more specifically on the teacher (Avis *et al.* 1996, Fergusson 1994, Hatcher 1994, Ozga 1995a, Strain 1995). This type of work seeks to describe and set the changes within an historical framework, and in particular focus on the impact of managerialism through the restructuring of the public sector and the changes to power relationships within it. I highlight it here as an alternative way in which the policy context can and is engaged with by other HEI workers in contrast to those who locate their work within the field of education management.

[2] As this section of the chapter illustrates the Table can be seen to be simplistic in its use of particular labels for the three periods identified. For example, the Table uses the term "Proletarianised" to describe teachers in the period from 1988, and what Dale (1989) means by this is that we have witnessed:

> "...the effective removal of the organized teaching profession from any formal influence over or consultation about education policy. This is compounded by the abolition of the Burnham Committee and the removal of teachers' salary negotiation rights and the imposition of a contract of employment which lays down the hours they have to teach. It confirms the shift from licensed to regulated professional autonomy which is taken ever further by proposals for the appraisal of their professional performance" (p114).

Whether teachers have become proletarianised is a matter of controversy (see Ozga and Lawn 1988), and I do not intend to debate it here, suffice to say that I am aware that the use of labels can disguise quite complex arguments. However, this does not diminish the use of the Table format both here and in the rest of the study as it enables signposts of significant changes to be recognised and investigated.

[3] Feintuck (1994) identifies the role of choice as being central to the 1988 Education Reform Act, and this introduced a quasi-market rather than a classical free market. While competition is introduced there are differences on both the supply and demand side. On the supply side the provision of education within the public sector is not privately owned and the profit motive is not uppermost. On the demand side, the

person who purchases the product may not actually be the user in the way that a parent may decide which school a child attends. However, this needs to be set within a context of a strong state in which there have been centralist tendencies such as the National Curriculum and the creation of government agencies such as OFSTED and the TTA (Deem *et al.* 1995).

[4] Restructuring has happened in a range of western liberal democracies which has been brought about either at national level e.g. England and Wales, and New Zealand; or at state level e.g. USA (Kentucky 1969), and Australia (Victoria mid 1980s); or at district level e.g. Canada (Edmonton late 1970s) (Lawton 1992). The work of Caldwell and Spinks (1988, 1992, 1998) in Australia has been important in legitimising site-based management, and Caldwell (1997) has argued that: "...self-management has been received well, despite opposition or scepticism at the outset and shortcomings in implementation along the way. Any reading of opinion in all the nations where significant change has occurred to date suggests that most schools would not wish to return to previous, more centralized arrangements" (p63). This work has been the subject of critique (see Smyth 1993, Whitty *et al.* 1997), and the reply has been to label this type of work as "anti-management" (Caldwell and Spinks 1998).

Chapter 3: The development of education management in England and Wales from 1960

[1] The International Intervisitation Programme has since 1978 had a Standing Committee which has been chaired at different times by: Robin Farquhar, Dan Griffiths, both from North America, and Meredydd Hughes, from Birmingham University, England. Membership of the Standing Committee also includes links with the Inter-American Society for Educational Administration and the European Forum for Educational Administration (Ribbins *et al.* 1991). At the IIP in 1970 the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration was created, and this has close links with BEAS and then BEMAS in the UK. In particular BEMAS pays subscriptions to the CCEA (now CCEAM) and members receive copies of its journal: *International Studies in Educational Administration*.

The purposes of the IIP are:

- "to open new channels of communication among leaders interested in the study and practice of educational administration and policy;
- to provide opportunities to share and examine ideas within an international perspective, thus both stimulating participants and enabling them to examine their own values, concepts and attitudes as they communicate with fellow professionals;
- to provide opportunities to explore the potential, and follow up endeavours, in areas of research, development, dissemination and training, for those who are interested in the study and practice of educational management and administration. It can be assumed that motivation among leaders in various countries for follow-up action and communication is strong, and that the potential for individual stimulation and growth, as well as for collective professional accomplishment is marked" (*ibid.* 1991 p2).

Initially the international aspect of the IIP was limited to developed countries only, based on the need to facilitate dialogue through a cultural homogeneity, and that the issues for the recruitment and preparation of administrators were regarded as different in the developed compared with the developing world (Culbertson 1969). However, in the Report from the 1990 IIP in Manchester (Ribbins *et al.* 1991) there are contributions from England and Wales, Australia, USA, Canada, but also Nigeria, India, and the South Pacific.

[2] Culbertson (1969) tells the story in the following way:

> "Because the need for more systematic international exchange was increasingly apparent, the following idea was expressed by the executive director of UCEA in a letter dated August, 1963, to William Walker: '...we ought to look forward to the day when we can have an international conference on educational administration!' Professor Walker's response was immediate: 'The sooner we have that international conference the better.' The idea was reinforced by William Taylor, in a letter of November, 1963, which expressed an interest in studying the development and use of simulation within an international perspective". (p3-4).

[3] Baron (1968) argues that the Headteacher (or rather in his terms, Headmaster) was by the late 1960s being conceptualised differently: "the shift away from the concept of the Headmaster as possessing authority by virtue of his personal qualities, towards the Head deriving authority from professional competence and a lively understanding of the environment of which his school forms a part" (p3). In the same volume, Taylor (1968) presents the issues related to training for this "professional competence" and the need to consider both empirical and normative questions: "What do Heads do?" and "What should they do" (*ibid.* p145). In presenting the outline of a course organised by the Oxford University Department of Education from June to July 1966, the emphasis is on human relations, and the approach taken is not to instruct Heads but to "give an opportunity for analysis in an academic setting of the range of problems which in practice Heads of Schools must necessarily solve in their own way" (*ibid.* p150).

Taylor's (1976) concern about the shift from administration to management also connects with issues about the link between training and development:

> "The capacity on the part of the head and senior staff for sound judgment is more likely to be fostered by an extended and appropriately conceived liberal and professional education than by late-in-the-day efforts to provide specific management knowledge and expertise. Given an adequate grounding in the natural or social sciences and the humanities, such specific training can be useful. Without such a grounding it is all too likely to be either useless, or illiberal in its consequences, or both. Education and training in educational *administration* as distinct from education *management* takes longer, offers fewer quick rewards, and sometimes seems to lack 'relevance' to the task at hand. But the concept of educational administration includes a good deal more than is usually encompassed by education management, taking in ideas from sociology, political science, history, economics and other social sciences that are often either missing from or presented in a highly derivative manner from the management literature. It is important that opportunities for a more broadly based training of this kind should be available alongside more specific and narrowly conceived courses in education management" (pp48-49).

There is a remarkable endurance of this approach to the preparation of Headteachers within the field, however, while the social sciences feature in the work of Hoyle (1986) and Bush (1995), problem solving increasingly becomes a technical feature of much of the work of the field through entrepreneurial models of management and training (Grace 1995) as typified by the NPQH.

[4] The workings of the CNAA is a research project in itself. However, one of the interviewees from my study used and supplied me with the copies of minutes from the meetings of the *Educational Organisation and Management Board* in 1983 and 1985. While this is not a representative sample of the documentation, the interviewee did use these minutes to illustrate how the conduct of the Board helped to shape the field by its interventions in the design and content of validated courses. One example of this is that the growth in Information Technology was seen to be important, and that courses

in education management should include this so that its application to school management could be extended.

[5] Bolam (1997) describes the work of the NDC as follows:

> "...from 1983-88 the Government funded a university-based National Development Centre (NDC) for School Management and Training which co-ordinated over 40 HEI-based regional centres, responsible for over 90 twenty-day 'basic' courses and one-term 'training the trainer' courses for over 6,000 headteachers and deputy headteachers, and promoted the idea of management development to LEAs and schools" (p9).

Bolam (1986) has provided a full account of the origins and development of the NDC, and in particular the shift from training to development in which the emphasis was on: "the process whereby the management function of an organization becomes performed with increased effectiveness" (p261). The location within an HEI is significant as even though the NDC built on good practice from non-educational settings, the research imperative for management development was seen as essential.

[6] While it is out of the scope of this study to engage in a full review of terminology, it is interesting to note that in the nineteenth century the term 'manager' was used to describe those who managed voluntary and school boards, and this was seen to be of lower status than those accorded the title 'governor' of grammar schools (Gordon 1974). Furthermore, Baron and Howell (1974) note that this distinction remained long after the 1944 Education Act, in which they talk about the "managing bodies for primary schools" but the "governing bodies for secondary schools" (p146), and that this was not just terminology but illustrative of different status as managers in primary schools had less formal powers in relation to resources, the curriculum, and the appointment of headteachers.

[7] The Theory Movement in North America can best be understood with a brief historical background. Evers and Lakomski (1991a) find it useful to see the development of educational administration in three phases:

- Classical theory: illustrated by the work of Taylor (1911) with the emphasis on planning and controlling.

- Human relations approach: illustrated by the work of Mayo (1933) and the Hawthorne Studies in which the importance of the human emotion and informal groupings were recognised as important in the work place.

- Behaviour science: illustrated by the work of Barnard (1938) and Simon (1945), from which the Theory Movement developed.

While all these theoretical approaches continue to have an impact, it is the Theory Movement which is singled out because of its attempt to seek a scientific and unified approach to administration. The main writers are Griffiths (1958, 1964, 1969), Halpin (1958) and in which the emphasis was on creating an objective and reliable theory in which facts and values are separated. The debate did not stand still (Culbertson 1964), and in fact by the late 1960s Griffiths (1969) argued that: "the search for one encompassing theory (if anyone is searching) should be abandoned. There is a need for a number of theories concerning various aspects of administration...each theory may help in the understanding of the totality... We have learned that a modest approach to theory pays off. Theorizing in terms of basic understanding of administration is proving more fruitful than did the highly abstract and formal theories of a decade ago" (pp166-167). Nevertheless the Greenfield challenge in 1974 was significant and threw the field into an intellectual turmoil (Griffiths 1979), with responses both from Daniel Griffiths and Donald Willower (Evers and Lakomski 1991a).

[8] Intellectual turmoil is a phrase used with the field of educational administration in North America (Griffiths 1979, Greenfield and Ribbins 1993), and Australia (Evers and Lakomski 1991a, Gronn 1985). Gronn's work on leadership (1996) is illustrative of debates about knowledge claims within this field, and turmoil is used when there are conflicting positions over epistemology as illustrated by the work of Evers and Lakomksi (1991a). What is interesting about these debates, as in the work of Evers and Lakomski, is that they draw on work from North America and Australia but there is no mention of the field in England and Wales. It is also interesting to note how David Hartley (1998) has characterised the field of education management as being in intellectual turmoil, and he concludes with trends in England, but the literature he draws on to make these judgements is not from the field in England and Wales. It could be argued that intellectual turmoil is being imposed where it doesn't exit, or that it exists but the field has not written or published about it. Furthermore, it might have something to say about how epistemological discussions are taking place abroad rather than in England and Wales.

[9] The Seminar objectives are:

- To assess the impact of the 1988 Education Reform Act, and other subsequent major policy initiatives on the management role of headteachers, principals and senior management teams in schools.

- To consider the implications of recent national changes in the training of headteachers, particularly the TTA initiatives, for headteachers' training and learning.

- To develop a forum for the exchange of views amongst leading academics, policy-makers and practitioners about the discipline of educational management in the changing policy climate of the late 1990s.

- To clarify and redefine educational management theory and assess its applicability to self-managing schools and colleges.

- To assess and redefine the contribution of general management theory to practice in educational contexts.

- To review recent research in educational management and to consider priorities for future programmes of research in this field.

These objectives have informed and have been developed during the course of the 4 seminars that have taken place between June 1997 and October 1998.

[10] Anecdotal evidence seems to suggest a drift towards leadership as a way of defining the field's purpose and the activities of field members in HEIs. For example, when I was appointed to a post at Leeds Polytechnic (later Leeds Metropolitan University) it was as a senior lecturer in education management, and they have recently advertised for a senior lecturer in educational leadership. There are a growing number of clusters of field members who are labelling their Centre's as Leadership e.g. at Humberside University.

[11] The most dominant approach is to advocate and work within a developmental model. This is illustrated in a variety of work such as the need to establish a climate which is receptive for appraisal: (Bennett *et al.* 1992, McMahon 1992); the importance of training (Routledge and Dennison 1990); the integration of appraisal with whole institutional planning (Campbell 1996, Copley and Thomas 1995, Stenning and Stenning 1984); the appropriate matching of the appraisee and appraiser (Hellawell 1990a, 1990b, Metcalfe 1994); and the monitoring and evaluation of appraisal (Jones

1993). A minority position is the promotion of performance appraisal (Stenning and Stenning 1984, Davies 1996).

Chapter 4: An intellectual history of the field of education management

[1] Foucault's work has been used to help to understand and explain recent policy developments and implementation in schools. Ball (1990a, 1990b) argues that the use of Foucault's concept of discourse is useful in understanding education policy in the 1970s and 1980s as an arena for debate in which theories and issues emerged and where articulated in what Ball (1990a) calls "discourses of derision".

[2] The field's claim to support school improvement can be considered, and it could be argued, using Bernstein's (1971) terminology, that the use of "lower status" knowledge based on practice and an "integrationist" curriculum based on conceptual pluralism was a part of the challenge to established power structures within education from the 1960s (Young 1998). In this sense the emphasis within the professional practice of field members in HEIs on dealing with the present by focusing on the future could be seen to be emancipatory as it is an attempt to break with the structures which limit the right to manage.

It could also be a response to the postmodern world in which it is through practice at a site based level that change and the meaning of change is developed for the practitioner. This is what Hargreaves (1994) argues in *Changing Teachers Changing Times* in which "scientific certainty" is being replaced by "situated certainty" which is:

> "the certainty that teachers and others can collectively glean from their shared practical knowledge of their immediate context and the problems it presents. This school-based search for missions, visions and continuous improvement gives much needed weight to the validity of practitioner knowledge and to the needs and demands of each particular context within which these practitioners work. Yet is also defers and devolves important social, moral, and political concerns about the shaping of future generations to a process determined primarily in individual schools and systems" (p59).

Fullan's (1991, 1997) work is located within this conceptualisation of change processes, and the growing emphasis on this work both within the field of education management (West-Burnham 1990, Whitaker 1993) and educational improvement and effectiveness (Stoll and Fink 1996) raises questions about whether the knowledge claims underpinning change could justify regarding it as being a field of study in itself. Certainly the *What's Worth Fighting For*... trilogy (Fullan 1992, Fullan and Hargreaves 1992, Hargreaves and Fullan 1998) contains much which those interested in management, improvement and effectiveness would recognise and use, but this work does not seek to locate itself within one or other of these fields.

This type of work is subject to similar criticisms made of education management, and is illustrated by Ozga's (1995) review of Hargreaves (1994) where she critiques the failure to critique management systems, and especially how they translate policy into practice, and create certainty in times of turbulent change, rather than seek to investigate the realities for teachers work.

[3] Gagnon (1987) has distinguished between intellectuals and intelligentsia. The term intelligentsia was used in nineteenth century Russia and Poland for a social group which is cohesive and is anti-establishment. The term intellectual grew in France in the 1890s to label those who supported Alfred Dreyfus, and is used to define a more diverse group. Historically, the term intellectual has been used to describe those who do or do not support the establishment.

[4] Gagnon (1987) has asked whether intellectuals are the servants or the critics of power, and he has gone on to show how the activities of intellectuals is historically located and constructed. In the same collection, Swingewood (1987) illustrates this by showing how intellectual work has been hindered by the drive towards consensus politics and systems in the post-war period.

[5] British culture has a love-hate relationship with intellectuals, and there is a tendency to see intellectual activity and those identified as intellectuals as either the focus of amusement, such as Professor Maurice Zapp and his endless journeys to seek recognition (Lodge 1975), or portrayed as melancholy figures who are either redeemed into the real world (often by being prey to women such as the Michael Palin character in *My American Friend*), or the sad figure of Inspector Morse whose life is inextricably bound up in academia through many of the numerous murders he has to solve, but he is constantly reminded of how he was lured away and then let down by a woman and hence failed to get his degree. Often intellectual life is presented as a state of celibacy and how choices are made for either cognitive and professional pleasure opposed to emotional and physical pleasure. Intellectual life is essentially masculine in which professional and personal identity comes from organisational norms, and the rational pursuit of knowledge through scientific discourse and reporting. Knowledge from narrative and lived experience is emotional and irrational, and hence invisible and invalid.

The intellectual is the stuff of drama and the "campus novel" is very popular. Professor Ian Carter has audited that between 1945 and 1988 there have been "204 don-infested dramas...145 of them were set in Oxford and Cambridge, 22 were minor redbrick, 11 were 'new English' and only 4 were set in Scotland, 4 in Wales" (Radford, 1997). However, Radford (1997) has shown that while there have been significant TV dramas in the form of Tom Sharpe's *Porterhouse Blue*, Andrew Davies' *A Very Peculiar Practice* novels, and Evelyn Waugh's *Brideshead Revisited*, it is perhaps the economic situation of the academic and the attack on scholarship in the 1980s which has caused the don to slump in status, rather than the clichés of the ivory tower.

[6] In classifying knowledge Becher (1989) provides a multi-dimensional framework to investigate the epistemological features of knowledge:-

- Abstract and reflective or hard and pure: this is identified as the natural sciences and maths in which there is linear development by building on previous work. Outcomes tend to be concerned with universal and value free truths.

- Concrete and reflective or soft and pure: this is identified as the humanities and social sciences in which there is debate about the nature of the questions to be asked and the nature and validity of outcomes. There is emphasis on an iterative process, the use of findings as illuminative, and a valuing of the complexity of social processes.

- Abstract and active or hard and applied: this is located within the science based professions in which trial and error approaches dominate. Progress may or may not take place, but the emphasis is on mastering the natural world through the use of a practical and problem solving method in e.g. medicine and engineering.

- Concrete and active or soft and applied: this is located in the social professions e.g. education, social work and law in which the intellectual roots are reinterpreted and developed, therefore no accumulation of knowledge which is agreed and accepted. This domain is concerned with understanding the complexity of human relationships and interactions, and is therefore unstable and open to change. Outcomes are focused on identifying the best

> ways of doing things and in arranging human interactions, and can be judged according to pragmatism, or, utilitarianism, or, theory, or values/ethics.

Becher (*ibid*.) uses the example of discovery and describes how it is very important in some fields of enquiry and less so in others. For example, discovery is very important in molecular biology but not so much in taxonomies of plant life. In mechanical engineering it has been replaced by invention. Discovery is out of place in other areas of enquiry such as history.

[7] Academics who have experienced problems within this type of setting have often told their stories. For example, Waldrop (1993) provides an interesting story of the development of chaos theory amongst economists, and within this the account is given about how one of the protagonists writes a paper in "plain English" on the assumption that it could be read by all. The outcome was:

> "Wrong. If he hadn't know it before, he says, he learned it soon enough. Theoretical economists use their mathematical prowess the way the great stags of the forest use their antlers: to do battle with one another and to establish dominance. A stag who doesn't use his antlers is nothing. It was fortunate that Arthur circulated his manuscript informally that autumn as an IIASA paper. The official, published version wasn't to see the light of day for another six years" (p49).

Within the social sciences the use of life history work has a recent and contested history, for example, Bertaux and Bertaux-Wiame (1981) show that they had to undertake their "experimental work" in using and collecting life stories as a part time activity because of hostility within the academy.

Chapter 5: Research design.

[1] There is evidence within the social sciences of researchers who decide not to disclose their political commitment fully (Ozga and Gewirtz 1994), and those who do (Walford 1994, Troyna 1994). Making research open to peer scrutiny through reflective biographies (Ball 1994b) enables ethical decisions regarding disclosure between the researcher and the researched to be opened up to peer review. Gordon's (1989) critique of McPherson and Raab (1988) is illustrative of this, whereby the latter describe the access issues in the Scottish policy community:

> "First and foremost, people have helped and trusted us, and this has influenced all of our decisions about the presentation of evidence. We were not inviting the persons we wished interviewed to be indiscreet, nor, for the most part would they have wished to be so. In a sense our research was tapping the trust which binds members of the policy community together across dispersed structural locations and even across lines of conflict on particular issues. We, in our turn, were trusted and vouched for" (p62).

Gordon's (1989) approach is to raise questions concerning the reciprocity of the research relationship:

> "I think this raises a couple of important issues for policy research. First, what were the authors trusted to do? What is indiscretion? Had they exposed the whole policy community as a group of 'dirty lackeys of the capitalist class'. Would this have been indiscreet? It seems to me that McPherson and Raab, by accepting the ethos of discretion that cloaks the civil service, are to a major extent condemning themselves to an 'internal' account of events. The second consideration is who can do such policy research? What does it take to be 'vouched for'? Does one have to be male, senior, and definitely not marxist? The

academic status of any piece of work must be closely questioned if only certain people at certain times can have access to certain data" (p106).

These are not easy issues to engage with and goes straight to the heart not just of method but of the embodiment of the human as a researcher. This is the irony of the relationship between agency and structure not just for those field participants who told their professional life stories to me but also to myself, and the extent to which I am a determiner of my own cognitive and emotional perspectives, and the extent to which I am determined by the structures in which I live and work. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) argue perhaps the confessional tone is off-putting, but it is only by actually declaring what was done and why it was done, "warts and all", that debates about the construction of evidence can take place.

[2] The judgements made in reviewing the documentation were based on using Scott's (1990) classification of document types related to authorship, access, and audience. Documents can be:

- Closed documents are those available to author and a small number of insiders;
- Restricted documents are those available in a more ad hoc way to outsiders who request and are given permission to see them;
- Archival access is where the documents have been placed in e.g. a library and are open to all who meet the administrative criteria of the storage organisation e.g. library membership and/or the payment of fees;
- Published documents are full open and are given public circulation through publication and their widespread availability.

[3] Scott (1990) presents a typology of documents:

Type 1: personal diary.

Type 2: private individual or family archive kept in own possession e.g. kept at home.

Type 3: private archive which has been deposited in a library.

Type 4: published diary or published collection of letters.

Type 5: confidential records produced in organisations which are still in use e.g. medical records.

Type 6: business and other organisational documents which are no longer in use but remain with the company or organisation and can be accessed by seeking permission.

Type 7: law requires the public disclosure of certain information by companies and therefore the Companies Registration Office has a huge archive of annual reports and other documents such as registers of shareholders.

Type 8: these are published documents which have a private origin e.g. timetables, directories, pamphlets, newspapers etc.

Type 9: documents protected by the Official Secrets Act and disclosure has to be formally authorised.

Type 10: very few in this category as official papers are either closed or open; however, Royal papers are in a private archive which access is granted by the monarch.

Type 11: government papers which are classified as open e.g. in the Public Record Office.

Type 12: there is a huge range of official publications e.g. reports of Royal Commissions, Hansard, and Census reports.

The BEAS/BEMAS documentation can be seen to be Types 6, 7 and 8. The majority of the papers have been coded by the person who drew them up such as the Secretary, and I have used that coding the presentation of evidence in Chapter 6. Where no coding exists, for example, a document in the public domain such as membership forms or conference flyers then the document is referred to in full.

Chapter 6: An analysis of the oral and written texts from within the field of education management.

[1] The BEAS papers show the following events in the official development of the organisation:

1971 Foundation Meeting took place in London on 23rd October 1971 in which Baron and Taylor brought together interested people.

1972 the first meeting of the Executive Committee of BEAS took place.

1973 First AGM (AGM/74/2A) took place. BEAS became BEAS Limited and was formally incorporated on 26th October 1973. A Council of Management was formed to replace Executive Committee.

The 1972 Membership enrolment form, explains what BEAS is and why it was formed.

"...it was decided at a conference held at the University of New England, New South Wales, in August, 1970, to set up a Commonwealth Council on Educational Administration with headquarters in Australia. One of this Council's objectives is 'to encourage the establishment in Commonwealth countries of national associations of those concerned with the improvement of educational administration'. Following discussions among a number of those who attended the Australian conference, the meeting mentioned above (23/10/71) was arranged and was attended by 73 participants representing a wide cross-section of interests and experience in education."

[2] The Memorandum of Association of BEAS Ltd, 26th October 1973, explains the aims of BEAS:-

The overall aim is "to promote, maintain, improve and advance education of the public by the advancement of the practice, teaching, and study of, and research into, educational administration...". The specific aims are:

(a) To conduct research into educational administration and to publish the results thereof and to promote high standards in the teaching thereof.

(b) To provide a forum for the discussion of new approaches to the preparation and development of administrators and new developments in research.

(c) To facilitate the dissemination of knowledge about research, training and practice in educational administration.

(d) To link theory and practice in educational administration by encouraging fruitful collaboration between those engaged in teaching and research in educational administration and practising administrators working in educational institutions and authorities.

(e) To maintain close contact with other national associations concerned with education in the British Isles, and elsewhere, particularly those representing practising administrators and public authorities.

(f) To encourage the formation of local groups of those actively interested in the aims of the Society.

(g) To maintain close contact with international organisations and with national organisations in other countries, which are concerned with the development of educational administration, and to facilitate appropriate international activities and exchanges.

Aims h-r are concerned with the legal aspects e.g. Charitable status, and financial management.

[3] The activities of BEAS/BEMAS are varied and the following is illustrative rather than a complete description:

- Made links with international networks such as UCEA, CCEA, Ontario Institute for Studies in education (1972 AGM/BEAS/BM/5 Minutes). BEMAS formal link with BERA (1990 Council of Management June 1990 Minutes).

- Formation of local or regional groups in the UK (1972 AGM/BEAS/BM/5 Minutes).

- Formation of special interest groups e.g. Teaching of Educational Administration (1973 AGM/74/2 Minutes).

- Made connections with other formal groups in the UK e.g. the Local Government Training Board invited BEAS to make comments on a document on management development in education departments. The Royal Institute of Public Administration invited a BEAS member to a sub-committee to consider the implications of findings on its Report into the Teaching of Public Administration (1974 AGM/75/2 Minutes). Links made with the SEO (1977 AGM/78/2. C/77/14 Minutes).

- Setting up annual and research conferences (1979 AGM/80/2 Minutes).

- Establishing a BEMAS series of publications (1988 AGM Sixteenth (Uncoded) Minutes).

[4] Practitioner involvement is seen as an important issue which permeates the BEAS/BEMAS papers. There are a number of strategies developed to improved practitioner membership:

- The introduction of institutional membership resulted in an increase to over 1,000 members (1985 AGM/85/4 Minutes). However the 1986 Report of the Treasurer and Membership Secretary for the BEMAS AGM 12th Sept 1986 said that the introduction of institutional membership for schools has not had a significant effect on individual membership. The Standing Committee on

Membership, Publicity and Liaison report to the same meeting argued that institutional membership should be extended to FE and Adult Education Centres on same terms as schools.

- BEMAS gave bursaries 2 x £200 towards costs of school practitioners to go to the European Forum Intervisitation in France Nov 1982. Subject of this is the management of contraction (1982 AGM C/82/27 minutes).

- The 1986 AGM/uncoded minutes contain a report by the Chair of the Publications Committee (uncoded), to the AGM about the establishment of a new magazine described as: "a new popular - style magazine focusing on the needs of managers in the school/college contexts", and the "content would focus not only on the process of managing but also on the context within which managers operate". The benefits were seen as: "the society would received regular high profile publicity which would help promote growth through increased membership and given added recognition to BEMAS as the leading national organisation in the field of Educational Management and Administration." This magazine became known as *Management in Education*.

[5] While the early days had shown the BEAS leadership pioneering the development of the organisation, by the late 1970s the organisation had developed all the symbols of a formal organisation:

- 1975 AGM/76/2 Minutes are reported for the first time on letter headed paper.

- 1976 AGM/77/2 Minutes contain the reporting finance in line with company rather than local government practice.

- 1982 AGM/C/82/27 Minutes use a logo for the first time.

However, the professionalisation of the Society by the development of a dedicated administrative staff is an ongoing issue within the documentation. This is seen as important in enabling BEMAS to be noticed and to have an impact.

BEAS/BEMAS have also noted external and internal recognition of achievement by leading people within the Society:

- 1976 AGM.77/2 Minutes report that Eric Briault and A. R. Barnes have been awarded the CBE.

- 1977 AGM/78/2. C/77/14 Minutes report the promotion of Glatter to a chair at the OU and Hughes to a chair at Birmingham. Gordon Wheeler's appointment to the directorship of the FE Staff College at Coombe Lodge.

- 1986 AGM (uncoded) Minutes record the BEMAS honour for the past leaders as William Walker and William Taylor are made Honorary Vice Presidents of the Society.

The development of the organisation was organically and symbolically linked with the development of the field. Within the BEAS/BEMAS documents is a paper (C/77/16) "Overview of how Educational Administration has achieved recognition in Britain" in which there is a general overview of the development of educational administration. The following are highlighted as being important:-

The role of teaching: the significance of this from the opening statement: "over the last ten years there has been an increasing interest in the contribution which

teaching can make to the improvement of practice in the administration of education in this country".

Course provision: a range of providers from HEIs, FE, DES, College of Preceptors, LEAs. Varied provision is noted through short courses, one term, and longer courses with awards.

Publications: while there has been a reliance on non educational context and the USA, there has recently been more use made of case study material and research from a British context. The importance of the work of OU in this area is highlighted.

Chairs: "...the creations of chairs at the Open University and more recently at Birmingham University in addition to the original chair of educational administration at the University of London Institute of Education suggests that progress has been made in the academic recognition of educational administration as a field of study".

Within this context the significance of BEAS is as a forum of a range of people, combined with the conferences and the Journal. Research is now higher on the BEAS agenda, and the paper presents suggestions as to how the then Educational Research Board might be interested in supporting e.g. a major conference, or a research seminar. The author concludes: "I would simply argue that educational administration is a significant area of research of growing importance to which the Educational Research Board might properly consider giving financial support in order to facilitate the exchange of ideas among research workers already working or considering moving into this field of study".

Within the papers there are other documents like this which seek to review the development of the Society and the field, and an ongoing theme is the need to develop research. For example, a paper (C/78/3) sets out to consider "how far we are achieving the aims we set ourselves and which are set out in our constitution". It is argued that BEAS has been successful in:

- In bringing people together;
- International links;
- Disseminating knowledge about research etc.

However the Society could improve in the following areas:

- in promoting research into new ways of preparing, developing administrators;
- in urging the need for training and study for officers, heads, and principals;
- in encouraging thinking about the content of studies, which he said was being left to the CNAA and the Local Government Training Board;
- through indicating the types of research needed, and the need for public funds for research;
- in promoting the institution of new departments in universities or polytechnics.

What is clear from these early papers from field leaders is that the field and BEAS was developing a sense of its purpose and how it might have an impact on educational administration.

[6] The BEAS/BEMAS documents confirm the events outlined in the oral texts about the change of name. The following is a list of events contained within the documents:-

1980 Letter from (name) Hon. Secretary, BEAS, to the solicitors at (name) 3rd June 1980.

> "...Council of Management are now looking at the possibility of changing the name of the Society to make it appear more relevant to the needs and interests of certain potential membership groups such as schools and colleges..."

1980 Note (C/80/8) "BEAS National Council Meeting - 19th June 1980: Proposal to change names of the Journal and the Society". No author to the Note, but the minutes of Council of Management (C/80/21) confirms that a paper (C/80/8) is presented regarding the changes. The Note contains the proposals that BEAS should be renamed "Educational Management and Administration Society", and that the Journal should be renamed "Educational Management and Administration". The reasons given as currently there is a barrier for teachers to join as administration is seen as routine paper work, and also that administration is 'bureaucratic' in its "pejorative sense". The work of BEAS is being "misrepresented" and,

> "There is good reason to believe that BEAS is failing to reach a large potential clientele especially school teachers who associate educational administration almost exclusively with activities carried on in local education authority offices, in the DES, and perhaps in the running of large institutions of higher education."

The Note also argues for the removal of the word "British" "which connotes (more debateably) national government, officialdom, international links at a remote level - which, like the term administration puts the society 'out of range' for teachers".

The latter point seems to have been lost within the debate but goes unrecorded. The minutes of Council of Management 19th June 1980 show: "It was AGREED to recommend that the Society be renamed "The British Educational Management and Administration Society". Agreed that the term 'Management' be introduced into title of Journal.

1980 Minutes of Eighth AGM show that 43 members present, and the meeting reviewed the discussion reported on in minutes of Council of Management (C/79/22) (9th November 1979). The change of name is presented as follows in the minutes:

> "...stemmed from a concern that considerable numbers of potential members might have a wrong image of the Society owing to the limited connotation of the term 'Administration' in the Society's title, many staff in the schools sector particularly identifying administration with the world of the education officer. Accordingly, a motion was to be put to an extraordinary general meeting immediately following this meeting to the effect that the Society's name should include the term 'Management'. The proposed name was 'The British Educational Management and Administration Society Limited."

Proposed increase in membership meant that Council should change from 15 to 20 with 9 elected members (6), four officers (4), and 7 co-opted (5).

1980 Minutes of Extraordinary General Meeting 43 members present. The Minutes record that on the subject of a change of name, (name/headteacher) spoke in favour of the change of name "referring to the reactions of teachers who assumed that the Society was concerned with administrators (in LEA offices) and not with schools". The motion was proposed by (name) and seconded by (name). The outcome was that "the motion was PASSED by a large majority with one dissenting vote".

[7] Illustrative of this, though it does need further research is how from the mid 1970s and certainly after the change of name in 1980, BEMAS became more management orientated. Access to BEMAS membership details regarding the institutional location of

members and Council members would prove interesting as it would enable the impact of members from polytechnics and colleges of higher education to be charted.

The growing managerial nature of BEMAS is illustrated in both the content and tone of the documents, though it is somewhat ironic that the actual organisation of the documents starts to fragment with gaps and a lack of rationale for the coding. The following is an example from the documents which illustrate the need for an in depth research project about the development of the Society:

1987 Paper (Jan 1987) on "BEMAS Development" is focused on how to encourage and facilitate the involvement of members in BEMAS activities. The analysis of the problem for the Society is managerial "one might describe BEMAS as typically MBO orientated. Objectives might be identified but the process of achievement is left to the practitioner. There may be organisational support provided the individual can make the contacts that derive from the informal BEMAS networks. It is suggested that this support benefits only a minority". The solution is managerial "to develop an organisation whose members are actively engaged in promoting its aims, and one which is also a voluntary one, requires a needs led enterprise. People will only be involved voluntarily in something which they consider to be worthwhile for as long as it so remains".

There is increasing concern that BEMAS lacks impact and this is related to a number of factors. For example, in the 1990 Council of Management May 1990 Minutes there is concern that the increase in provision means that there are now a larger number of provider bodies which has "diminished the 'uniqueness' which BEMAS once had". Other documents add to this by seeing the situation as one of mission, marketing, and the efficient use of resources e.g. 1990 Report "Recommendations of the Policy Discussion Group of the British Educational Management and Administration Society, May 1990" written the Development Officer. The business side of BEMAS activities is promoted through the services which it provides, and there is a paper in 1990 submitted to the Strategy Review Group in which it is argued that: "the BEMAS structure was created in a different era. At the time it was probably typical of small academic voluntary societies. However, in the intervening years knowledge and understanding of managerial principles have improved and developed. Under either of the above scenarios a more clearly functional and accountable structure is required". The future of BEMAS is presented as being within its membership services (e.g. publications, events, lobbying role); membership development and external relations (e.g. recruitment, media and publicity); and, income generation (e.g. if subscriptions are not raised then income could be generated through conferences and books. The recommendation is to restructure around these functions and, in particular, the creation of "managers of services (who) would be responsible for co-ordinating supporting, monitoring and evaluating the quality of operation of their service. The chairs of associated committees could form a co-ordinating group."

There are a number of papers and correspondence about how BEMAS could develop its role regarding the Management Charter Initiative. For example: a 1991 "Note to accompany the Council Minutes on the Management Charter Initiative" an officer argues: "It is my belief that this opportunity, or series of opportunities, has come at a time when BEMAS will need to widen its portfolio of services nationally and to the Regions if it is (to) do any more than merely survive as a small Society with an increasingly vulnerable membership; and this is at a time when there can never have been a greater potential interest and demand for a Society with expertise in education management".

[8] The BEMAS documents show that while there is an ongoing concern about the level and type of membership, and as I have illustrated above [7] this is related to the need to refocus activities within a market context, there is also a concern about the impact of the Society in terms of policy. What this impact is and how it might be developed is not

always clearly articulated, and so I have only been able to identify instances of this concern rather than chart any patterns.

There is the view that BEMAS should stop reacting to events, and be actively involved in what is going on. In a 1984 Paper (24th October 1984) there is a recognition of the need to develop the BEMAS role, e.g. the need to respond more quickly to policy developments; to have a higher public profile; to recruit more new members; to involve more members in international activities e.g. CCEA and European Forum. The way forward is seen to be in the need to "spotlight" topics for conferences and involve the regions in this. There is a need to react rapidly to developments by creating "a small executive group...to act between Council meetings?" "Would we be prepared to operate in this way?"

There is the view that BEMAS needs to be involved in debates about policy: the 1985 Paper (30th January 1985) argues in favour of BEMAS having a national voice over debates in management and administration, and that the views of practitioners and researchers should be contributed. The paper gives recognition to three areas where BEMAS has made some contribution e.g. value for money; management of the teacher force, and school development and improvement. The paper goes on to argue that better input to these debates could be by:- firstly, BEMAS could run one day conferences and these could be in association with other bodies; secondly, invite "particular individuals" to establish working groups which lead to conferences, publications, etc. and seek grants. The questions for Council are: "firstly, do we wish to make more focused inputs of this nature to such national and professional debates; secondly, if we do, what the issues on which BEMAS should be making inputs?; thirdly, how could the process be organised to produce worthwhile outcomes?"

It seems from the reporting of activities that BEMAS is following policy rather than critically evaluating it. For example within the documents are papers regarding an article written by the Chair of BEMAS regarding the management of GM schools. The article identifies the changing status of management from being regarded as manipulative to being creative: "the emergence of GM schools with greater independence has now helped to challenge the old consensus: this is healthy and, I believe, invigorating". BEMAS is presented as being potentially helpful: "BEMAS, as I say, can help. It collects together both within its own membership and through its related networks virtually all the leading people in education management and administration in the UK: people who are experience, critical, also neutral - but above all supportive of anything which promotes good education. Through conferences, magazines, journals, its research and development groups, it provides a rich resource of enormous potential value to all GM schools. We should welcome you warmly".

While the possibility of becoming a pressure group and taking a political position is a part of the debates the emphasis remains on retaining neutrality. There is a 1987 Paper which is unauthored as an "aide memoire" of the "significant points" made at the previous council meeting. Debate about the role of BEMAS is focused on provision: "currently we provide Journals and mount (annual) conferences but anything other than that is left to individual member initiative". There is a tension here between the service side of the society or becoming a voice. The document reports that the argument was made about whether BEMAS turns into a pressure group or retains its current strengths: "(name) warned against becoming just one more special interest group. It was our diversity that made us a refreshing resource, allowing us to examine the management implications without a political stance. We should pinpoint the managerial problem areas". The way forward is seen to be managerial and to have a strategic development plan with e.g. recruitment, individual beneficiary, corporate identity, and three year plans for the development of groups: "(name) pointed out that our Constitution empowers rather than limits. We should be attempting to establish what the members identified as the issues for them. Should we do a review of our current state? Should we address ourselves to the role of a development officer?"

[1] The relevance of this work to this study is in this breadth as well as Bourdieu's theory of practice. Bourdieu has written over twenty books and hundreds of articles in which he has written about language, museum attendance, marriage rites and ritual exchange among the Kabyle, French university students, academics and intellectuals. As Johnson (1993) states:

> "Bourdieu's wide ranging work cuts across established academic disciplines and provides a powerful and highly productive model for social analysis in diverse fields of activity" (p1).

There has been a rapid growth in the number of articles and books which are both about and making use of his ideas (Calhoun *et al.* 1993, Grenfell *et al.* 1998, Robbins 1991, 1993). There have been studies which have used Habitus (Harker and May 1993, Hodkinson and Sparkes 1997, Nash, 1990, Reay 1994), and Field (Ladwig 1994), in which writers are often experimenting with the theory and working on their understanding of it.

Apple (1993) raises concerns about the ability of Bourdieu's ideas to effectively explain, and he is concerned about "faddism" as we move from theory to theory and we may lose more than we gain as we forget that class and capitalism are still central to understanding structure, ideology and power relations. Swartz (1997) adds to this argument by making visible that Bourdieu's intellectual origins are located in French traditions in which empiricist positivist science is strong and is seen as central to republicanism and the provision of secular alternatives to Catholicism. Wacquant (1993) engages with these concerns by arguing that instead of focusing on the issue of production, that is, what Bourdieu does or does not do to enable a simple understanding of what he has to say, instead we should focus on the issue of consumption, that is, what are the factors which determine or affect the receipt of Bourdieu's writings?

Brubaker's (1993) reflexive review of his own writing about Bourdieu illustrates the complex nature of our encounter with theory. He states:

> "...my account was not mistaken in its content, but it was mistaken, I now believe, in its perspective. Its reading of Bourdieu's work, I would now say, was too literal, too logical, too theoretical, too sociologically naive - too respectful, I would almost say, of the texts, endowing them with a dignity and a definitiveness that they were not intended to possess" (pp216-217).

Brubaker goes on to describe how his attempts to pin down Bourdieu by collecting definitions of habitus were misplaced as Bourdieu does not define but illustrates Habitus in practice. Engaging with theory and the work of Bourdieu is not easy and the movement between his publications, and there is a tendency to raise questions about understanding the writing in relation to the writing style. Wacquant (1993) has described it as follows:

> "The most frequent reaction among his American and (especially) British readers has been one of bafflement, frustration, and dismay, sometimes giving way to vociferous indignation - one of them went so far as to vituperate Bourdieu for his 'incapacity' to write" (p237).

Bourdieu (1990) argues that we must beware of common sense explanations, and that "the strategy of abandoning the rigour of technical vocabulary in favour of an easy and readable style to be dangerous" (p52). The reasons given are twofold: firstly, it encourages conservative thinking and supports the status quo because simple

explanations enable the assertion that "everything is just fine as it is"; and, secondly, if we provide simple explanations then it will encourage us to think that the issues are simple and so we will be open to manipulation:

> "When it comes to objects of inquiry as overladen with passions, emotions and interests as those of social life, the 'clearest', that is, simplest discourses, are probably those which run the greatest risks of being misunderstood, because they work like projective tests into which each person imports his or her prejudices, unreflective opinions and fantasies. If you accept the fact that, in order to make yourself understood, you have to work at using words in such a way that they say just what you wanted them to say, you can see that the best way of talking clearly consists in talking in a complicated way, in an attempt to transmit simultaneously what you are saying and your relationship to what you are saying, and in avoiding saying, against your will, something more than and different from what you thought you were saying." (*ibid.* pp52-53).

I agree with Wacquant (1993) that Bourdieu is subject to more criticism than other writers because he is dealing with the context in which the academic consumer is living and working, and so I am not dealing with a theoretical model developed by someone else about someone else, but rather I am engaging in a discussion of empirical data, observations, and theoretical concepts which have been developed by another academic about academics.

Wacquant (*ibid*.) identifies key factors affecting the translation and transference of theory from one context to another and makes specific reference to the Anglo-American context. Firstly, the isolation of sociology from history, anthropology, and philosophy in the USA is within a different tradition compared with France, and so American sociologists tend to read Bourdieu in binary mode, agency/structure, and interpretative/positivist, and this is contradictory to his epistemology. This is what Wacquant (*ibid*.) refers to as "intellectual ethnocentrism" (*ibid.* p243) and while he admits to the prevalence of this in other countries, he goes on to argue that the case of the USA "is special in that this urge is encouraged by the worldwide hegemonic status of American social science, which makes it less attentive and open to foreign intellectual currents than foreigners are, by necessity, to American ones." (*ibid.* p243). For me the issue is how do we understand the French intellectual and the intellectual tradition which we can trace back to the Dreyfus Affair? I would agree with Wacquant (*ibid*.) that rather than conceptualise Bourdieu as a part of a French intellectual tradition as if it is unified and somehow peculiar and separate, I should understand the intellectual traditions which have shaped Bourdieu's thinking and writing. Bourdieu constantly reflects upon and develops his response to his origins and to other writers which he has lived through and debated over a period of time. In other words Bourdieu is a part of a field and he has dispositions and his work is a product of intellectual struggles and strategies (Brubaker 1993).

Secondly, there is a tendency to partially read Bourdieu because of an over concentration on a particular aspect of his research and what is missed is the way in which Bourdieu takes his theory of practice and works and reworks the concepts over a number of projects and publications. If I only read *Homo Academicus* I would have an interesting understanding of Habitus and Field, but without reading his other works I would not have the ongoing conceptual development. This has not been helped by the time delay and failure to sequence the translation and publication of Bourdieu's work for English speaking social scientists. The research can be frustrating but this I have challenged by recognising that the way I approach my work needs to take into account not just how my work is structured by the sequence of publication, but how I have read Bourdieu. I have not read it in historical sequence and so I need to take this into consideration, and challenge my understanding and interpretation.

[2] In this way the individual has a "practical sense" (Bourdieu 1990 p10) or is an "acting agent" (*ibid.* p13). Doing is not just doing, and neither is it determined to be done, instead doing is related to the struggles that you are in: your position, your expectations, or "the only thing to do" (*ibid.* p11) or put another way "agents to some extent *fall into* the practice that is theirs..." (*ibid.* p90). For example, in growing old we may be in difficulty if we hang on to old ways of identifying and struggling for our interests which were developed in different games.

[3] While Bourdieu rejects people just following rules and/or just following intuition, he argues that there are strategies in which an agent is not goal determined, but "can be directed towards certain ends without being consciously directed to these ends, or determined by them" (*ibid.* p10). Bourdieu could at this stage run into difficulties because if an agent is not purely a product of phenomenological constructs nor driven by structures then how the individual relates to the collective without an acceptance of objectivity is potentially a problem. The agent is not the carrier or the product of structure. Bourdieu talks about "social determinants" or the conditions which have "made a particular way of being or doing possible" (*ibid.* p15), and he goes on to argue that the "specific determinant" of an intellectual is the "illusion of freedom from social determinants". Bourdieu argues about the importance of sociology in enabling freedom from this illusion of freedom because of its role in understanding the relationship between the "instruments of knowledge of the instruments of knowledge" (*ibid.* p16). He argues:

> "And so, paradoxically, sociology frees us by freeing us from the illusion of freedom, or, more exactly, from the misplaced belief in illusory freedoms. Freedom is not something given: it is something you conquer - collectively" (*ibid.* p15).

Practice is objectified because of the tradition of rational categorising in science, and Bourdieu's own position is central to these questions and answers, and he attempts to resist the labelling or "constitutive *naming*" (*ibid.* p55) which turns statements said with authority into reality. This can be illustrated by Bourdieu's (*ibid.*) resistance to being categorised and he shows how over time he has either been a Marxist or not a Marxist according to struggles going on within the social sciences. When asked about his links with Habermas and "universal norms" Bourdieu is not concerned with a search for this universalism, but rather he is more interested in who is interested in it. In other words what is going on in a field which makes "universal interests" of universal interest? This enables Bourdieu to promote the value of history in exploring the type of conditions which are producing this type of struggle within a field, and it enables him to theorise about theory, that is, how and why is such theory being promoted, and to what effect?

In this sense Bourdieu is able to distinguish a group from class. He argues that the weakness in Marxism is that the creation of class on paper as a structural entity to explain has led treating class as reality. Class as a group of agents only exists if it is created by political activity, and this is the same as all groups:

> "...groups - family groups or other sorts - are things you have to keep going at the cost of a permanent effort of maintenance, of which marriages constitute one stage. And the same applies to classes, when they exist, even in a tenuous state (has anyone every asked what it means, for a group to exist?): belonging to a group is something you build up, negotiate and bargain over, and play for" (*ibid.* p75).

Within a Field competitive struggles can be observed and essential to this is language, "...words are both currency and commodity in the academic marketplace." (Jenkins 1992 p157) Bourdieu gives counsel to the sociologist to take care in the words s/he uses. The struggle is about legitimacy and there are vested interests in a Field, and this is illustrated by those who classify in the Field, those who are in the classified products

of the Field. Reputation and status fluctuates, and depends on peers and how/whether institutions validate it. There is a process of misrecognition in which power relations are not seen for what they are but are interpreted in a way that is seen as legitimate. This happens mainly through pedagogic action, it is diffuse and is daily through the family, and through institutionalised education.

[4] Bourdieu argues in favour of an empirical and reflexive approach to knowledge creation in which we can see the knowledge claims made by intellectuals within the spaces which they occupy (Bourdieu, 1988 pxvi). This is illustrated by Bourdieu in his description of the scientific field:

> "The scientific field, which has reached a high degree of autonomy, has this peculiarity: you have a chance of success in it only if you conform to the immanent laws of the field, that is, if you recognize truth practically as a value and respect the methodological principles and canons defining rationality at the moment under consideration, at the same time as bringing into battle in the competitive struggles all the specific instruments that have been accumulated in the course of prior struggles. The scientific field is a game in which you have to arm yourself with reason in order to win. Without producing or requiring supermen inspired by motivations radically different from those of ordinary people, it produces and encourages, by its own logic, and outside any normative imposition, particular forms of communication, such as competitive discussion, critical dialogue and so on, which tend in fact to favour the accumulation and control of knowledge. To say that there are social conditions for the production of truth is to say that there is a politics of truth, an action constantly exercised in order to defend and improve the functioning of the social universes in which rational principles are applied and the truth comes into being." (Bourdieu, 1990 p32).

Bourdieu talks about Fields as being "relative autonomous spaces" (*ibid.* p88) in which the "autonomy" is concerned with a sense of self evident and accepted rules which the group has your own and a known history. The "relative" is how the Field connects with other Fields, such as in the link between the Fields of economic and political power with the cultural Field. While the latter is dominant it is also dominated by economic and political power because of the market, and the ability to bestow prestige on artists through the volume and nature of ownership.

All fields are located within the field of class relations and as illustrated in Figure 1 in which there are two poles of Dominant and Dominated:

Figure 1:

The field of power is within the field of class relations and is located at the dominant pole because of the relationship between economic capital, class and power. The location of the university or intellectual field is towards the negative pole of the field of power: "intellectuals and artists occupy a dominated position in the field of power" (Bourdieu,1993 p125). On this negative pole the intellectual seeks recognition based on cultural power and an indifference to the market; though Bourdieu does give recognition to the intellectual who seeks the economic and political power at the dominant pole of the field where the managers of business and industry are located (1988 p36, 1993 pp38-40). The tensions within the intellectual field are described as follows:

> "Dominated among the dominant, writers and artists are placed in a precarious position which destines them to a kind of objective, therefore subjective, indetermination: the image which others, notably the dominants within the field of power, send back to them is marked by the ambivalence which is generated in all societies by beings defying common classifications. The writer - or the intellectual - is enjoined to a double status, which is a bit suspect: as possessor of a dominated weak power, he is obliged to situate himself somewhere between the two roles represented, in medieval tradition, by the *orator*, symbolic counter-weight of the *bellator*, charged with preaching and praying, with saying the true and the good, with consecrating or condemning by speech, and by the *fool*, a character freed from convention and conformities to whom is accorded transgression without consequences, inspired by the pure pleasure of breaking the rule or of shocking. Every ambiguity of the modern intellectual is inscribed in the character of the fool: he is the ugly buffoon, ridiculous, a bit vile, but he is also the alerter who warns or the adviser who brings forth the lesson; and, above all, he is the demolisher of social illusions" (*ibid.* p165).

The intellectual within the university holds an "institutionalised form of cultural capital" (1988 p36) and the conflict of the faculties within the university is related to the field of power in which law, theology and medicine are in a dominant position because of their connection with providing the government with "the strongest and most durable influence on the people", compared with less status knowledge areas which have no temporal power such as history, geography, mathematics and philosophy. (*ibid.* p62).

[5] Figure 2 (Bourdieu 1988 p122) illustrates the creation, definition, and legitimisation of the social sciences in the curriculum as a "Trojan Horse" (*ibid.* p120):

Figure 2:

The social practice and strategies are confirmed by Bourdieu as being illustrated by claims and counter claims about theory and method, and he goes on to give recognition to the connection between the growth in the social sciences and the demand for the practical and the empirical:

> "Similarly, through new institutionalised modes of production and circulation of cultural works (debating clubs, study groups, symposia etc), encouraged by their relation with the bureaucracies, there are new modes of thought and expression, new themes and new modes of conceiving intellectual work and the role of the intellectual, which filter through into the intellectual world. The appearance of the public or private demand for applied research and of an audience of readers attentive to the social usage of the social sciences - higher civil servants and politicians, educators and social workers, advertisers and experts in health etc. - encourages the success of a new kind of cultural producer, whose presence in the academic field (in the enlarged sense which is increasingly tending to become the norm) constitutes a decisive break with the fundamental principles of academic autonomy, and with the values of disinterestedness, magnanimity and indifference to the sanctions and demands of practice." (*ibid.* p123-124).

Bourdieu defines these intellectuals as "academic managers" who are entrepreneurial in the seeking of funds, and in the marketing and promotion of what they are doing and its relevance. The political nature of the university field becomes obvious in the staking of capital and struggle between positions identified with the reproduction of hierarchy and the plurality of the "active intellectual" (*ibid.* p124). In this sense a sociology of the

curriculum may reveal domination, but it can also support those who dominate by providing alternative ways of controlling (Swartz 1997).

[6] Bourdieu argues for the need to understand the significance of a range of indices connected with the university field. There are indices to do with marriage or batchelorhood, with education, Legion of Honour, voting, Roman Catholicism, and Bourdieu argues that we should guard against objectifying this into a "totalising system" and rather we should investigate them as "products of *habitus*" (1988 p49-50). Being an intellectual who is located within the bureaucracy of the university is not about being a person type, but is a way of seeing and being within the world. Participating in the intellectual game requires a Habitus which secures an interest in ideas rather than economic necessities, combined with the cultural capital to be able to invest (Swartz 1997). There are those who have an identity which is located in a cultural space within the field, and there are those who locate within the temporal space and seek to engage with the field of power. This tension between temporal and cultural power is represented within the university in the form of "specifically academic power (which) is founded principally on control of the instruments of reproduction of the professorial body" (such as the Universities Consultative Committee which appoints tenured professors in France), and the "collection of powers of different kinds, encountered especially among the social science specialists: the scientific power or authority displayed through the direction of a research team, scientific prestige measured through the recognition accorded by the scientific field, above all abroad, intellectual renown..." (1988 pp78-79).

[7] Bourdieu focuses on the educational field and shows the importance of external factors such as legislation or economic crises, but he argues strongly that struggle within a field is not just about reacting to external pressures but to understand it you must look at the "whole logic of the field" (Bourdieu, 1990 p43). Changes in educational demands do not determine how a Field responds in which there is a mechanistic cause and effect relationship, rather, what is significant is how and why agents within the Field, linked to their Habitus or dispositions, give legitimacy to particular claims for recognition. Bourdieu uses the example of the growth in demand for credentialism in previously under represented areas of study in French education such as sociology. There is to use Bourdieu's words a "chain reaction" and a "dialectic" in the relationship between the struggle within the Field and with external demands. Economic dislocation has led previously educationally disenfranchised groups to see education as a means to "reproduce" themselves. This, in turn, threatens those who previously held a dominant role within the field of education, and in order to maintain their position they make intensified demands (*ibid.* pp43-45).

References

Adams, N. (1993) *Legal Issues And The Self-Managing School* Harlow: Longman.

Adler, S., Laney, J. and Packer, M. (1993) *Managing Women: Feminism and Power in Educational Management* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Al-Khalifa, E. (1986) "Can education management learn from industry?" in Hoyle, E., and McMahon, *A. World Yearbook of Education 1986: The Management of Schools* London: Kogan Page.

Al-Khalifa, E. (1989) "Management by halves: women teachers and school management" in De Lyon, H. and Migniuolo, F. (eds.) *Women Teachers: Issues and Experiences* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Alderman, G. (1996) "Audit, Assessment and Academic Autonomy" *Higher Education Quarterly* Vol. 50. No. 3. pp178-192.

Amos Hatch, J. and Wisniewski, R. (1995) "Life history and narrative: questions, issues, and exemplary works" in Amos Hatch, J. and Wisniewski, R. eds. *Life History and Narrative* London: The Falmer Press.

Angus, L. (1994) "Sociological Analysis and Education Management: the social context of the self-managing school" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 15 No.1 pp79-91.

Apple, M. (1993) Review Symposium: "The Work of Pierre Bourdieu" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 14 No. 3. pp322-325.

Audit Commission (1989) *Losing an Empire, Finding a Role: The LEA of the Future* London: HMSO.

Avis, J., Bloomer, M., Esland, G., Gleeson, D., and Hodkinson, P. (1996) *Knowledge and Nationhood* London: Cassell.

Aylett, J. (1991) *Managing a New Era: an eductional management training pack* London:Hodder and Stoughton.

Bailey, T. (1982) "The question of legitimation: a response to Eric Hoyle" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol. 19. pp99-105.

Ball, S. J. (1990a) *Politics and Policymaking in Education: explorations in policy sociology* London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (1990b) "Management as moral technology: a Luddite analysis" in Ball, S.J. *Foucault and Education* London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (1992) "Theoretical debates in education policy analysis: managing editor's note" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 7. No. 5. p493.

Ball, S. J. (1993) "Culture, Cost and Control: Self Management and Entreprenuerial Schooling in England and Wales" in Smyth, J. (ed.) *A Socially Critical View of the Self Managing School* London: The Falmer Press.

Ball, S. J. (1994a) "Some reflections on policy theory: a brief response to Hatcher and Troyna" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 9. No.2 pp171-182.

Ball. S. J. (1994b) "Political interviews and the politics of interviewing" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Ball, S.J. (1995) "Intellectuals or technicians? The urgent role of theory in educational studies" *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. XXXXIII No.3. pp255-271.

Barber, M., Evans, A. and Johnson, M. (1995) *An Evaluation of the National Scheme of School Teacher Appraisal*, London: HMSO.

Barker, B. (1991) *The Cambridgeshire Management Workshops professional development and practical guidance for school like in the 1990s* Dereham: Peter Francis Publishers.

Barnard, C. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Baron, G. (1965) *Society, Schools and Progress in England* London: Pergamon Press.

Baron, G. (1968) "An Overview" in Allen, B. (ed.) (1968) *Headship in the 1970's* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

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.

Baron, G. (1979) "Research in Educational Administration in Britain" in Bush, T., Glatter, R., Goodey, J., and Riches, C. (eds.) *Approaches to School Management* Harper Educational Series.

Baron, G. (1980) "Research in Educational Administration in Britain" *Educational Administration* Vol.8 No.1 pp1-33.

Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Baron, G. and Howell, D.A. (1974) *The Government and Management of Schools* London: The Athlone Press.

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

Barry, C.H. and Tye, E. (1975) *Running a School* London: Temple Smith.

Becher, T. (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories* Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Bell, L. (1991) "Educational Management: An Agenda for the 1990s" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.19, No. 3 pp 136-140.

Bell, L. (1992) *Managing Teams in Secondary Schools* London: Routledge.

Bell, L. (1996) *Education Management: some issues of policy and practice* Inaugural Professorial Lecture, Liverpool John Moores University, 14th February 1996.

Bell, L. (1997) *Primary Schools in the Education Market Place: Some Issues for Educational Management* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997.

Bennett, H. with Lister, M. and McManus, M. (1992) *Teacher Appraisal: Survival and Beyond* Harlow: Longman.

Bennett, S.J. (1974) *The School: An Organizational Analysis* Glasgow: Blackie.

Bernstein, B. (1971) "On the classification and framing of educational knowledge" in Young, M.F.D. (ed.) (1971) *Knowledge and Control* London: Cassell & Collier Macmillan.

Bertaux, D. and Bertaux-Wiame, I. (1981) "Life stories in the bakers' trade" in Bertaux, D. (ed.) (1981) *Biography and Society* Berverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Birley, D. (1970) *The Education Officer and His World* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Blackmore, J. (1989) "Educational leadership: a feminist critique and reconstruction" in Smyth, J. (ed.) (1989) *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership* London: The Falmer Press.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., and Tight, M. (1996) *How to Research* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bogdanor, V. (1979) "Power and Participation" *Oxford Review of Education* Vol. 5 No.2 pp157-168.

Bolam, R. (1981) "Editorial" *Educational Administration* Vol.9 No.3 ppi-ii.

Bolam, R. (1986) "The National Development Centre for School Management Training" in Hoyle, E., and McMahon, *A. World Yearbook of Education 1986: The Management of Schools* London: Kogan Page.

Bolam, R. (1990) "The Management and Development of Staff" in Saran, R. and Trafford, V. eds. (1990) *Research in Education Management and Policy: Retrospect and Prospect*. London: The Falmer Press.

Bolam, R. (1997) *Changes in Educational Management Training* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997.

Bolam, R. (1998) *Redefining Education Management: Research Priorities* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Liverpool October 1998.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Pockington, K., and Weindling, D. (1992) *Effective Management in Schools A Report for the Department for Education via the School Management Task Force Professional Working Party* London: HMSO.

Bollington, R., Hopkins, D. and West, M. (1990), *An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal*, London: Cassell.

Bone, T.R. (1976) "Comment by Dr. T.R. Bone, Principal of Jordonhill College of Education, Glasgow" in "Barr Greenfield and Organistion Theory: A Symposium" *Educational Administration* Vol.5 No.1. pp10-12.

Bone, T.R. (1982) "Educational Administration" *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. XXX No. 1 February pp32-42.

Bone, T.R. (1992) "Changing Circumstances in the United Kingdom" in Miklos, E. and Ratsoy, E. *Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change*. Alberta, Canada: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

Bottery, M. (1992) *The Ethics of Educational Management* London: Cassell.

Bottery, M. (1994) *Lessons for Schools? a comparison of business and educational management* London: Cassell.

Bottery, M. (1998) *Professionals and Policy: management strategy in a competitive world* London: Cassell.

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

Bourdieu, P. (1971) "Intelletual Field and Creative Project" in Young, M.F.D. (ed.) (1971) *Knowledge and Control* London: Cassell & Collier Macmillan.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Bourdieu, P. (1988) *Homo Academicus* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

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., Chamoredon, J.-C., and Passeron, J.-C. (1991) *The Craft of Sociology: Epistemological Preliminaries* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J. D. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Bowe, R. and Ball, S. with Gold, A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools* London: Routledge.

Brighouse, T. (1988) "Politicising the Manager or Managing the Politicians? - Can the Headteacher succeed where the Education Officer failed? *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.16. pp97-103.

Brown, A. and Dowling, P. (1998) *Doing Research/Reading Research* London: The Falmer Press.

Brubaker, R. (1993) "Social Theory as Habitus" in Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., and Postone, M. eds. (1993) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Brym, R. J. (1987) "The Political Sociology of Intellectuals: A Critique and a Proposal" in Gagnon, A. G. (ed.) (1987) *Intellectuals in Liberal Democracies* New York: Praeger.

Buckley, J. (1985) *The Training of Secondary School Heads in Western Europe* Windsor: The NFER-Nelson Publishing Company Limited.

Bunnell, S. (ed.) (1987) *Teacher Appraisal in Practice* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Burgess, R.G. (1982) "Personal Documents, Oral Sources and Life Histories" in Burgess, R. G. (ed.) (1982) *Field Research: a Sourcebook and Field Manual* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Burlingame, M., and Harris, E. L. (1998) "Changes in the Field of Educational Administration in the United States from 1967 to 1996 as a Revitalization Movement" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.26 No. 1. pp21-34.

Bush, T. (1986) *Theories of Educational Management* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Bush, T. (ed.) (1989a) *Managing Education: Theory and Practice* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bush, T. (1989b) "School Management Structures - Theory and Practice" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol. 17 pp3-8.

Bush, T. (1995) *Theories of Educational Management* Second Edition. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Bush, T. (1997) *Crisis or Crossroads?: The Discipline of Educational Management in the late 1990s* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997.

Bush, T. (1998) "The National Professional Qualification for Headship: the key to effective school leadership" *School Leadership and Management* Vol. 18. No. 3. pp321-333.

Bush, T. and Kogan, M. (1982) *Directors of Education* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Busher, H. (1998) *The interaction of schools' external environments with their internal management processes* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Liverpool October 1998.

Buxton, R. (1973) "Comprehensive Education: Central Government, Local Authorities and the Law" in Fowler, G., Morris, V., and Ozga, J. (eds.) (1973) *Decision Making in British Education* London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Caldwell, B. J. (1997) "The impact of self-management and self-government on professional cultures of teaching: a strategic analysis for the twenty-first century" in Hargreaves, A. and Evans, R. (eds.) *Beyond Educational Reform* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Caldwell, B. J. and Spinks, J.M. (1988) *The Self Managing School* Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Caldwell, B. J. and Spinks, J.M. (1992) *LeadingThe Self Managing School* London: The Falmer Press.

Caldwell, B. J. and Spinks, J. M. (1998) *Beyond the Self Managing School* London: The Falmer Press.

Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., and Postone, M. (eds.) (1993) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Callahan, R. A. (1962) *Education and the Cult of Efficiency* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, B. (1996) "Is Appraisal on Target?" *Management in Education* Vol.10. No.4 pp28-29.

Clarke, J., Cochrane, A. and McLaughlin, E. (eds.) (1994) *Managing Social Policy* London: Sage.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education* Fourth Edition, London: Routledge.

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. (1989) "Leadership and ambiguity" in Bush, T. (ed.) (1989) *Managing Education: Theory and Practice* Buckingham: Open University Press.

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

Copley, J. and Thomas, D. (1995) "Comprehensively Appraised" *Management in Education* Vol.9 No.4. pp5-6.

Cordingley, P. (1998) *Pedagogy, Management and the TTA Research Agenda* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Liverpool October 1998.

Cotterill, P. and Letherby, G. (1993) "Weaving Stories: Personal Auto/Biographies in Feminist Research" *Sociology* Vol.27 No.1. pp67-79.

Craig, I. (1989) *Primary Headship in the 1990s* Harlow: Longman.

Crawford, M., Kydd, L., and Riches, C. (eds.) (1997) *Leadership and Teams in Educational Management* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Creissen, T. and Ellison, L. (1998) "Reinventing School Leadership - back to the future in the UK?" *International Journal of Educational Management* Vol. 12. No. 1. pp28-38.

Culbertson, J. (1964) "The preparation of administrators" in Griffiths, D. E. (ed.) (1964) *Behavioural Science and Educational Administration* The 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Culbertson, J.A. (1969) "A New Initiative in Educational Administration" in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Culbertson, J.A. (1988) "A century's quest for a knowledge base" in Boyan, N. J. (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* New York: Longman.

Dale, R. (1989) *The State and Education Policy* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Davies, B. (1996) "Appraisal Trios - a Case of Three Blind Mice" *Management in Education* Vol.10. No.2. p26.

Davies, B., and Ellison, L. (1990) *Managing the Primary School Budget* Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers Ltd.
Davies, B. and Ellison, L. (1991) *Marketing The Secondary School* Harlow: Longman.

Davies, B. and Ellison, L. (1992) *School Development Planning* Harlow: Longman.

Davies, B. and Ellison, L. (1994) *Managing The Effective Primary School* Harlow: Longman.

Davies, B., Ellison, L., Osborne, A., and West-Burnham, J. (1990) *Education Management for the 1990s* Harlow: Longman.

Davies, L. (1990) *Equity and Efficiency? School Management in an International Context* Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Davies, J. (1997) *Universities, Academics and Politics in the Era(s) before Thatcher* Paper presented to the History of Education Conference, Cardiff, 12-14th December 1997.

Davies, J.L. and Morgan, A.W. (1983) "Management of higher education in a period of contraction and uncertainty" in Body-Barratt, O., Bush, T., Goddey, J., McNay, J., and Preedy, M. (eds.) *Approaches to Post School Management* London: Harper and Row.

Day, C. (1988) "The relevance and use of classroom research literature to the appraisal of teachers in classrooms: issues of teacher learning and change" *Cambridge Journal of Education* Vol.18 No.3. pp333-346.

Day, C. (1989) "Issues in the management of appraisal for professional development" *Westminster Studies in Education* Vol.12 pp3-15.

de Bono, E. (1993) *Surpetition: Going Beyond Competition* London: Harper/Collins.

Dearlove, J. (1992) "The academic labour process: from collegiality and professionalism to managerialism and proletarianisation?" *Higher Education Review* Vol.30 No.1 pp56-75.

Deem, R. (1994) "Researching the locally powerful: a study of school governance" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Deem, R. (1996a) "Border Territories: a journey through sociology, education and women's studies" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 17. No. 1. pp5-19.

Deem, R. (1996b) "The future of educational research in the context of the social sciences: a special case?" *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. 44. No. 2. pp143-158.

Deem R. and Brehony, K. J. (1994) "Why didn't you use a survey so you could generalize your findings? Methodological issues in a multiple site case study of school governing bodies after the 1988 Education Reform Act" in Halpin, D. and Troyna, B. (eds.) (1994) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues* London: The Falmer Press.

Deem. R., Brehony, K. J., and Heath, S. (1995) *Active Citizenship and the Governing of Schools* Buckingham: Open University Press.

DES (1983) *Teaching Quality* London: HMSO.

DES (1985), *Better Schools*, London: HMSO.

DES (1986) *Better Schools, Evaluation and Appraisal Conference* 14-15th November 1985 Birmingham. London: HMSO.

DES (1991a) *The Education (School Teacher Appraisal) Regulations 1991*. London: HMSO.

DES (1991b) *Circular 12/91 School Teacher Appraisal*. London: HMSO.

DfEE (1998) *Teachers: meeting the challenge of change* London: DfEE.
Delamont, S. and Locke, M. (1990) "Methodological Dialogue" in Saran, R. and Trafford, V. (eds.) (1990) *Research in Education Management and Policy: Retrospect and Prospect*. London: The Falmer Press.

Dennison, W. F. (1998) "Education 2000 - Trends, Influences and Constraints to the Turn of the Century" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol. 16. pp33-42.

Denscombe, M. (1998) *The Good Research Guide* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Denzin, N.K. (1989) *Interpretive Biography* Newbury Park, Ca: Sage Publications.

Doe, B. (1997) "Identity Crisis" *The Times Educational Supplement* 13/06/97.

Downes, P. (ed.) (1988) *Local Financial Management in Schools* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Elliott, J. (1991) *Action research for educational change* Buckingham: Open University.

Emihovich, E. (1995) "Distancing passion: narratives in social science" in Amos Hatch, J. and Wisniewski, R. (eds.*) Life History and Narrative* London: The Falmer Press.

Eraut, M. (1998) *Headteachers Knowledge, Practice and Mode of Cognition* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Milton Keynes June 1998.

Erben, M. (1993) "The problem of other lives: social perspectives on written biography" *Sociology* Vol.27 No.1. pp15-25.

Evers, C. and Lakomski, G. (1991a) *Knowing Educational Administration* Oxford: Pergamon.

Evers, C. and Lakomski, G. (1991b) "Educational administration as science: a post-positivist proposal" in Ribbins, P., Glatter, R., Simkins, T., and Watson, L. (eds.) (1991) *Developing Educational Leaders* Harlow: Longman.

Everard, B. (1995) "Values as Central to Competent Professional Practice" in Busher, H. and Saran, R. (eds.) *Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools* London: Kogan Page.

Everard, B. and Morris, G. (1990) *Effective School Management* London: PCP.

Farnham, D. and Horton, S. (eds.) (1992a) *Managing the New Public Services* Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Farnham, D. and Horton, S. (1992b) "Human Resources Management in the New Public Sector: Leading or Following Private Employer Practice" *Public Policy and Administration* Vol. 7. No.3. Winter pp42-55.

Feintuck, M. (1994) *Accountability and Choice in Schooling* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Feinwick, I.G.K. (1976) *The comprehensive school 1944-1970* London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Fergusson, R. (1994) "Managerialism in Education" in Clarke, J., Cochrane, A. and McLaughlin, E. (eds.) (1994) *Managing Social Policy* London: Sage.

Fidler, B. (1994) "State of the art review: staff appraisal" *School Organisation and Management Abstracts* Vol.13 No.2. pp61-70.

Fidler, B. (1995a), "Staff Appraisal and the Statutory Scheme in England", *School Organisation* Vol.15. No.2.

Fidler, B. (1995b) "Taking stock after the first round" *Management in Education* Vol.9 No.4. pp3-4.

Fidler, B. and Cooper, R. (eds.) *Staff Appraisal in Schools and Colleges*, British Educational Management and Administration Society, Harlow: Longman.

Fincher, C. (1975) "The Demise of Administrative Mystique" in Houghton, V., McHugh, R., and Morgan, C. (eds.) (1975) *Management in Education: The Management of Organizations and Individuals* London: Ward Lock Educational/Open University.

Fitz, J. (1997) *Research and Restructuring: Problems and Prospects for Educational Management Studies* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Cardiff 1997.

Fitz, J. and Halpin, D. (1994) "Ministers and Mandarins: educational research in elite settings" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Translated by A. M. Sheridan-Smith, Tavistock Books Limited. London: Routledge.

Fulton, Lord. (1968) *The Civil Service* Vol. 1. Report of the Committee 1966-68, Cmnd. 3638. London: HMSO.

Fullan, M. with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991) *The new meaning of educational change* London: Cassell.

Fullan, M. (1992) *What's worth fighting for in headship?* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Fullan, M. (ed.) (1997) *The challenge of school change* Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing Inc.

Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. (1992) *What's worth fighting for in your school?* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gagnon, A. G. (1987) "The Role of Intellectuals in Liberal Democracies: Political Influence and Social Involvement" in Gagnon, A. G. (ed.) (1987) *Intellectuals in Liberal Democracies* New York: Praeger.

Gewirtz, S. and Ozga, J.(1990) "Partnership, pluralism and education policy: a reassessment" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 5. No. 1. pp37-48.

Gewirtz, S. and Ozga, J. (1994) "Interviewing the education policy elite" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Glatter, R. (1972) *Management Development for the Education Profession* London: Harrap.

Glatter, R. (1979) "Education 'policy' and 'management': one field or two?" In Bush, T., Glatter, R., Goodey, J. and Riches, C. (eds.) (1979) *Approaches to School Management*. London: Harper Educational Series.

Glatter, R. (1987) "Towards an Agenda for Educational Management" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.15 pp5-12.

Glatter, R. (ed.) (1989) *Educational Institutions and their Environments: Managing the Boundaries* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Glatter, R. (1997) "Context and Capability in Education Management" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.25 No.2 pp181-192.

Glatter, R. (1998) *From Struggling to Juggling: Towards a Redefinition of The Field of Educational Leadership and Management* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997.

Goodson, I. F. (1995) "The story so far: personal knowledge and the political" in Amos Hatch, J. and Wisniewski, R. (eds.) *Life History and Narrative* London: The Falmer Press.

Gordon, L. (1989) "Review Symposium: Governing Education" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 10 No. 1. pp105-109.

Gordon, P. (1974) *The Victorian School Manager: A Study in the Management of Education 1800-1902* London: Woburn Press.

Grace, G. (1995) *School Leadership: Beyond Education Management* London: The Falmer Press.

Grace, G. (1997) "Critical Leadership Studies" in Crawford, M., Kydd, L., and Riches, C. (eds.) (1997) *Leadership and Teams in Educational Management* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Hoare, Q., and Nowell Smith, G. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gramsci, A. (1973) *Letters from Prison* Selected, Translated from the Italian and Introduced by Lawner, L. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Green, H. (ed.) (1993) *The School Management Handbook 1993* London: Kogan Page

Green, H. (ed.) (1994) *The School Management Handbook 1994* London: Kogan Page

Green, H. (ed.) (1995) *The School Management Handbook 1995* London: Kogan Page

Greenfield, T. (1978) "Where does self belong in the study of organisation? Response to a Symposium" *Educational Administration* Vol.6 No.1. pp81-101.

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

Grenfell, M. (1996) "Bourdieu and Initial Teacher Education - a post-structuralist approach" *British Educational Research Journal* Vol.22 No.3. pp287-303.

Grenfell, M. and James, D., with Hodkinson, P., Reay, D. and Robbins, D. (1998) *Bourdieu and Education* London: The Falmer Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1958) "Administration as Decision-making" in Halpin, A.W. (ed.) (1958) *Administrative Theory in Education* London: Macmillan.

Griffiths, D. E. (ed.) (1964) *Behavioural Science and Educational Administration* The 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1969) "Theory in Educational Administration:1966" in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979) "Intellectual turmoil in educational administration" *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 15. No. 3. pp43-65.

Griffiths, M. (1998) *Educational Research for Social Justice* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gronn, P. (1985) "After T. B. Greenfield, With Educational Administration" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.13 pp55-61.

Gronn, P. (1996) "From Transactions to Transformations" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.24 No.1. p7-30.

Hakim, C. (1993) "Research Analysis of Administrative Records" in Hammersley, M. (ed.) (1993) *Social Research Philosophy, Politics and Practice* London: Sage.

Hall, V. (1996) *Dancing on the Ceiling: A Study of Women Managers in Education* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Hall, V. (1997) *Redefining education management: taking gender into account* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Cardiff October 1997.

Hall, V. (1998) *We are all adult educators now: the implications of adult learning theory for the continuing professional development of educational leaders and managers* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Milton Keynes June 1998.

Hall, V. and Southworth, G. (1997) "Headship" *School Leadership and Management* Vol. 17. No. 2. pp151-170.

Halpin, A.W. (ed.) (1958) *Administrative Theory in Education* London: Macmillan.

Halpin, D. (1990) "Review Symposium" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 11 No. 4. pp473-476.

Halpin, D. (1994) "Practice and Prospects in Education Policy Research" in Halpin, D. and Troyna, B. (eds.) (1994) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues* London: The Falmer Press.

Halpin, D. and Fitz, J. (1990) "Researching Grant Maintained Schools" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol 5. No. 2. pp167-180.
Halsey, A. H. (1992) *Decline of Donnish Dominion: the British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hammersley, M. (1996) "Post Mortem or Post Modern? Some Reflections on British Sociology of Education" *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. 44. No. 4. pp395-407.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* London: Tavistock Books.

Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times* London: Cassell.

Hargreaves, A. and Evans, R. (eds.) (1997) *Beyond Educational Reform* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (1998) *What's worth fighting for in education?* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, D.H. and Hopkins, D. (1991) *The Empowered School: the management and practice of development planning* London: Cassell.

Harker, R.K. (1984) "On Reproduction, Habitus and Education" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol.5. pp117-127.

Harker, R., Mahar, C. and Wilkes, C. (eds.) (1990) *An Introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu* London: Macmillan.

Harker, R. and May, S. A. (1993) "Code and Habitus: comparing the accounts of Bernstein and Bourdieu" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 14. No. 2. pp169-179.

Harris, A., Bennett, N., and Preedy, M. (eds.) (1997) *Organizational Effectiveness and Improvement in Education* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Harrison, M. (1976) "Comment by Michael Harrison, Chief Education Officer, Sheffield" in "Barr Greenfield and Organistion Theory: A Symposium" *Educational Administration* Vol.5 No.1. pp3-4.

Harries-Jenkins, G. (1984) "Education Management: part 1" *School Organisation and Management Abstracts* Vol. 3 No. 4 pp213-233.

Harries-Jenkins, G. (1985) "Education Management: part 2. A bibliography" *School Organisation and Management Abstracts* Vol. 4 No. 1 pp5-16.

Hartley, D. (1997) "The New Managerialism in Education: a mission impossible?" *Cambridge Journal of Education* Vol.27. No. 1. pp47-58.

Hartley, D. (1998) "In search of structure, theory and practice in the management of education" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol.12 No. 1 pp153-162.

Hatcher, R. (1994) "Market relationships and the management of teachers" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 15 No. 1. pp41-61.

Hatcher, R. and Troyna, B. (1994) "The 'Policy Cycle': A Ball by Ball Account" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 9 Nol.2 pp155-170.

Hattersley, M. (1995) "Potential Threat Defused" *Management in Education* Vol.9 No.4. p11.

Hellawell, D. (1990a) "Headteachers' Perceptions of the Potential Role of Governors in their Appraisal" *School Organisation* Vol.10. No.1. pp65-82.

Hellawell, D. (1990b) "Headteacher appraisal: relationships with the LEA and its Inspectorate" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.18 No.1 pp3-15.

Hellawell, D. (1993) "An inside glimpse of headteacher appraisal" *Managing Schools Today* Vol.2 No.8 pp34-37.

Hennessy, P. (1989) *Whitehall* London: Secker & Warburg.

Higher Education Review (1995) "Editorial: The academic Profession" *Higher Education Review* Vol. 27. No. 2. p305.

Hinds, T. (1986) "Book Review: Hughes, M., Ribbins, P., and Thomas, H. (1985) *Managing Education: The System and The Institution* Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and Winston", in *Educational Management and Administration* Vol. 14. pp231-233.

Hirst, P. (1974) *Knowledge and the Curriculum* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hodgkinson, C. (1978) *Towards a Philosophy of Administration* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hodgkinson, C. (1993) "Foreword" in Greenfield, T. and Ribbins, P. (eds.) (1993) *Greenfield on Educational Administration* London: Routledge.

Hodkinson, P. and Sparkes, A.C. (1997) "Careership: a sociological theory of career decision-making" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol.18 No.1 pp29-44.

Hopkins, F., Howard, J., Johnston, I., Glover, B., and Woodburn, S. (1991) "Teacher Appraisal, Professional Development and School Improvement: a case study" *School Organisation* Vol. 11 No.1. pp37-53.

Houghton, V., McHugh, R., and Morgan, C. (eds.) (1975) *Management in Education: The Management of Organizations and Individuals* London: Ward Lock Educational/Open University.

Howell, D.A. (1978) *A Bibliography of Educational Administration in the U.K.* Windsor: NFER .

Hoyle, E. (1976) "Comment by Professor Eric Hoyle, University of Bristol" in "Barr Greenfield and Organistion Theory: A Symposium" *Educational Administration* Vol.5 No.1. pp4-6.

Hoyle, E. (1982) "Micropolitics of Educational Organisations" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.10 pp87-98.

Hoyle, E. (1986) "The management of schools: theory and practice" in Hoyle, E., and McMahon, *A.* (eds.) *World Yearbook of Education 1986: The Management of Schools* London: Kogan Page.

Hughes, M. (ed.) (1974) *Secondary School Administration: A Management Approach* Second Edition. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.

Hughes, M. (1976) "The professional-as-administrator: the case of the secondary school head" in Peters, R.S. (ed.) (1976) *The Role of the Head* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hughes, M. (1978) *Education Administration: Pure or Applied?* Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Hughes, M. (1985) "Leadership in professionally staffed organisations" in Hughes, M., Ribbins, P., and Thomas, H. (1985) *Managing Education: The System and The Institution* Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hughes, M. (1997) "From Bulletin to Journal" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.25 No.3 pp243-263.

Hughes, M., Carter, J. and Fidler, B. (1981) *Professional Development Provision for Senior Staff in Schools and Colleges: A DES Supported Research Project: The Final Report*, Birmingham University Faculty of Education.

Hughes, M. and Ribbins, P. (1980) "Emerging Issues and Suggestions" *Educational Administration* Vol. 8 No. 1. pp274-279.

Hughes, M., Ribbins, P., and Thomas, H. (1985) *Managing Education: The System and The Institution* Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hughes, M., Ribbins, P., and Thomas, H. (1986) "Response" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol. 14 pp233-234.

Ironside, M. and Seifert, R. (1995) *Industrial Relations in Schools* London: Routledge.

James, C. R. and Newman, R.C. (1985) "Staff Appraisal Schemes in comprehensive schools: a regional survey of current practice in the South Midlands and the South West of England" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.13 No.3. pp155-164.

James, C. R. and Mckenzie, J. (1986) "Staff Appraisal Schemes in comprehensive schools: a regional survey of current practice in the South Midlands and the South West of England - a survey of developments during 1985" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.14 No.3. pp197-202.

Jenkins, K. (1991) *Re-Thinking History* London: Routledge.

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.

Jones, J. (1993), *Appraisal and Staff Development in Schools*, London:David Fulton.

Jones, P.W. (1994) "Research perspectives on the World Bank" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London:UCL Press.

Joseph, K. Sir. (1984) "Speech by the Rt Hon Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State for Education and Science, at the North of England Education Conference, Sheffield, on Friday 6th January 1984". *Oxford Review of Education* Vol.10., No.2. pp137-148.

Jupp, V. and Norris, C. (1993) "Traditions in Documentary Analysis" in Hammersley, M. (ed.) (1993) *Social Research Philosophy, Politics and Practice* London: Sage.

Kellner, P. and Crowther-Hunt, Lord. (1980) *The Civil Servants: An Inquiry Into Britain's Ruling Class* London: Book Club Associates/Macdonald Futura Publications Ltd.

Kemmis, S. (1991) "Emancipatory Action Research and Post Modernisms" *Curriculum Perspectives* Vol. 11. pp59-65.

King, R. (1984) "School Management and the Sociology of Education" *Education Management and Administration* Vol. 12. p59-62.

Knight, B. (1989) *Managing School Time* Harlow:Longman.

Kogan, M. (1971) *The Politics of Education. Edward Boyle and Anthony Crossland in conversation with Maurice Kogan* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kogan, M. (1975) *Educational Policy-Making* London: George Allen and Unwin.

Kogan, M. (1994) "Researching the powerful in education and elsewhere" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Kuhn, T. (1975) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Sixth Impression) London: The University of Chicago Press.

Kydd, L., Crawford, M. and Riches, C. (eds.) (1997) *Professional Development for Education Management* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Kyriacou, C. (1995) "An Evaluation of Teacher Appraisal in Schools within One Local Education Authority" *School Organisation*, Vol.15, No.2.

Ladwig, J.G. (1994) "For Whom Reform?: outlining educational policy as a social field" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 15. No. 3. pp341-363.

Ladwig, J.G. (1996) *Academic Distinctions* London: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1986) "Research as Praxis" *Harvard Educational Review* Vol. 56., No. 3. pp257-277.

Lauglo, J. (1996) "Forms of Decentralization and their implications for Education" in Chapman, J.D., Boyd, W.L., Lander, R., and Reynolds, D. (eds.) (1996) *The Reconstruction of Education: Quality, Equality and Control* London: Cassell.

Lawrence, I. (1992) *Power and Politics at the Department of Education and Science* London: Cassell.

Lawrence, I. (1994) "Master Plans" *Times Educational Supplement* 18/11/94 p11.

Lawton, D. (1992) *Education and Politics in the 1990s: Conflict or Consensus* London: The Falmer Press.

Lawton, S. (1992) "Why restructure?: an international survey of the roots of reform" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 7. No. 1. pp139-154.

Lemert. C. C. (ed.) (1991) *Intellectuals and Politics: Social Theory in a Changing World* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc.

Levacic, R. (ed.) (1989) *Financial Management in Education* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Levacic, R., Glover, D., Bennett, N., and Crawford, M. (1998) *The rationally managed school? Headteacher practice and preparation for school based management within a state control framework* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Milton Keynes June 1998.

Lodge, D. (1975) *Changing Places* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Lowe, R. (1988) *Education in the post-war years* London: Routledge.

Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View* London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Maclean, I. (1990) "Responsibility and the act of interpretation: the case of law" in Maclean, I., Montefiore, A., and Winch, P. (eds.) (1990) *The political responsibility of intellectuals* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marland, M. (ed.) (1986) *School Management Skills* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Marland, M. and Rogers, R. (1991) *Marketing the School* Oxford: Heinemann Educational.

Mathias, J., and Jones, J. (1989) *Appraisal of Performance: An Aid to Professional Development* Windsor:NFER-Nelson

Martin, W. C. (1987) "The role of the intellectual in revolutionary institutions" in Mohan, R. P. (ed.) (1987) *The Mythmakers: Intellectuals and the Intelligentsia in Perspective* Westport, Connectict: Greenwood Press Inc.

Martindale, D. (1987) "The sociology of intellectual creativity" in Mohan, R. P. (ed.) (1987) *The Mythmakers: Intellectuals and the Intelligentsia in Perspective* Westport, Connectict: Greenwood Press Inc.

Mason, J. (1996) *Qualitative Researching* London: Sage.

Mayo, E. (1933) *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization* Boston: Harvard Business School.

McHugh, R. (1979) "Notes from Discussions in the Plenary Sessions" *Educational Administration* Vol.7. pp43-47.

McHugh, J. D. (1994) "The Lords' will be done: interviewing the powerful in education" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

McMahon, A. (1992) "Teacher appraisal: development and accountability" *Journal of Teacher Development* Vol.1. No.1. pp19-28.

McMahon, A. (1998) *Promoting Continuing Professional Development for Teachers: An Achieveable Target for School Leaders?* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Milton Keynes June 1998.

McMahon, A. and Bolam, R. (1990) *A Handbook for Secondary Schools* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. (1988) *Governing Education: a sociology of policy since 1945* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. (1989) "A Prisoner's Dilemma: rejoinder to Liz Gordon" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol.10 No.4 pp475-480.

Metcalfe, C.K. (1994) "Re-appraising Appraisal: a re-examination of some of the issues involved in staff appraisal in the light of experience of a scheme of peer appraisal" *British Journal of In-Service Education* Vol.20. No.1. pp95-108.

Miller, H. (1995) "Review Essay: Dons, Domination and the State" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 16. No. 2. pp259-266.

Mills, C. W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mintzberg, H. (1973) *The Nature of Managerial Work* New York: Harper and Row.
Molnar, T. (1961) *The Decline of the Intellectual* Cleveland, Ohio: Meridan Books/The World Publishing Company.

Montgomery, D. (1985) "Teacher Appraisal: a theory and practice for evaluation and enhancement." *Inspection and Advice* Vol.21 No.1. pp16-19.

Montefiore, A. (1990) "The political responsibility of intellectuals" in Maclean, I., Montefiore, A., and Winch, P. (eds.) (1990) *The political responsibility of intellectuals* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, C. (1979) "Management education - dissimilar or congruent?" *Open University Course 321, Management in Education Unit 1*. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Morris. Lord Morris of Grasmere (1974) "The administrator today" *Educational Administration Bulletin* Vol.2 No.2 pp25-31.

Morris, E. (1998) *Speech to the Seventh British Appraisal Conference, 26th January: Appraisal: Effective Teachers, Effective Schools* London: DfEE.

Moyser, G. and Wagstaff, M. (eds.) (1987) *Research Methods for Elite Studies* London: Allen and Unwin.

Nash, R. (1990) "Bourdieu on Education and Social and Cultural Reproduction"
British Journal of Sociology of Education Vol. 11 No. 4. pp431-447.

O'Donoghue, T. and Dimmock, C.A.J. (1997) "The Principal's Contribution to School Restructuring Initiatives Aimed at Improving Teaching and Learning: Exploring the Potential of the Edited Topical Life History Research Approach" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.25 No.1. pp35-49.

OFSTED (1996) *The Appraisal of Teachers 1991-1996* London: OFSTED

Ormston, M. and Shaw, M. (1993) *Inspection: A Preparation Guide for Schools* Harlow: Longman.

Ormston, M. and Shaw, M. (1994) *Inspection: A Preparation Guide for Schools* Harlow: Longman, Second Edition.

Osborne, A. (1990) "The nature of education management" in Davies, B., Ellison, L., Osborne, A., and West-Burnham, J. (1990) *Education Management for the 1990s* Harlow: Longman.

Ouston, J. (ed.) (1993) *Women in Education Management* Harlow: Longman.

Ouston, J. (1998a) "Introduction" *School Leadership and Management* Vol. 18. No. 3. pp317-320.

Ouston, J. (1998b) "Managing in Turbulent Times" in Gold, A. and Evans, J. (1998) *Reflecting on School Management* London: The Falmer Press.

Ostrander, S. A. (1993) " 'Surely you're not in this, just to be helpful' Access, Rapport, and Interviews in Three Studies of Elites" *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* Vol. 22. No. 1. pp7-27.

Ozga, J. (1987) "Studying Education Policy through the lives of the Policymakers: An attempt to close the Macro-Micro gap" in Walker, S. and Barton, L. (eds.) (1987) *Changing Policies, Changing Teachers: New Directions for Schooling?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Ozga, J. (1990) "Policy Research and Policy Theory: a comment on Fitz and Halpin" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 5. No. 4. pp359-362.

Ozga, J. (1992) "Review Essay: Education Management" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 13, No.2 pp279-280.

Ozga, J. (1994) "Frameworks for Policy Analysis in Education" in Kallos, D. and Lindblad, S. (eds.) (1994) *New Policy Contexts for Education: Sweden and the United Kingdom Educational Reports No. 42/1994*. Sweden: Umea University.

Ozga, J. (1995a) "Deskilling a profession: professionalism deprofessionalisation and the new managerialism" in Busher, H. and Saran, R. (eds.) (1995) *Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools* London: Kogan Page.

Ozga, J. (1995b) "Review Essay: New Age Traveller" *Curriculum Studies* Vol. 3. No. 1. pp90-95.

Ozga, J. (1998) "The entrepreneurial researcher: re-formations of identity in the research market place" *International Studies in Sociology of Education* Vol. 8. No. 2. pp143-153.

Ozga, J. and Gewirtz, S. (1994) "Sex, Lies, and Audiotape: Interviewing the Education Policy Elite" in Halpin, D. and Troyna, B (eds.) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues* London: The Falmer Press.

Ozga, J. and Lawn, M. (1988) "Schoolwork: interpreting the labour process of teaching" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 9. No. 3. pp323-336.

Pels, D. (1995) "Knowledge politics and anti-politics: toward a critical appraisal of Bourdieu's concept of intellectual autonomy" *Theory and Society* Vol. 24 No. 1. pp79-104.

Perks, R. and Thomson, A. (1998) *The Oral History Reader* London: Routledge.

Peters, R.S. (ed.) (1976) *The Role of the Head* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Peters, T. (1988) *Thriving on Chaos* London: Guild Publishing.

Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982) *In Search of Excellence* Glasgow: Harper/Collins.

Platt, J. (1981) "On interviewing one's peers" *British Journal of Sociology* Vol. 32. No. 1. pp75-91.

Playfoot, D., Skelton, M. and Southworth, G. (1989) *The Primary School Management Book* London: Mary Glasgow Publications Limited.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1995) "Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis" in Amos Hatch, J. and Wisniewski, R. (eds.) *Life History and Narrative* London: The Falmer Press.

Pollitt, C. (1990) *Managerialism and the Public Services* Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Popeil, G. and Mohan, R. P. (1987) "Intellectuals and Powers: S.M. Lipset, Julien Benda, and Karl Mannheim" in Mohan, R. P. (ed.) (1987) *The Mythmakers: Intellectuals and the Intelligentsia in Perspective* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Inc.

Poster, C. (1976) *School Decision-Making: Education Management in Secondary Schools* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism* Translated by Patrick Camiller London: NLB.

Power, S., Halpin,D. and Whitty, G. (1997) *School Managers, the State and the Market* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997.

Powney, J. and Watts, M. (1987) *Interviewing in Educational Research* London: Routledge.

Pratt, J. and Locke, M. (1979) "Research and the Professional Development of Administrators" *Educational Administration* Vol.7 No.1. pp75-81.

Preedy, M. (ed.) (1989) *Approaches to Curriculum Management* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Preedy, M., Glatter, R., and Levacic, R. (eds.) (1997) *Educational Management: Strategy, Quality and Resources* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Puffitt, R., Stoten, B., and Winkley, D. (1992) *Business Planning for Schools* Harlow: Longman.

Raab, C. (1994) "Where We Are Now: Reflections on the Sociology of Education Policy" in Halpin, D. and Troyna, B. (eds.) (1994) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues* London: The Falmer Press.

Radford, T. (1997) "Paperback Bounders" *The Guardian Higher* 11/02/97.

Ranson, S. (1995) "Theorising Education Policy" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 10. No. 4. pp427-448.

Reay, D. (1995)" 'They employ cleaners to do that': habitus in the primary classroom" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* Vol. 16. No. 3. pp353-371.

Ribbins, P. (ed.) (1997) *Leaders and Leadership in the School, College and University* London: Cassell.

Ribbins, P. (1998) *On Ladders and Greasy Poles: Developing School Leaders Careers* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Milton Keynes June 1998.

Ribbins, P., Glatter, R., Simkins, T., and Watson, L. (1991) "Introduction Developing Educational Leaders: Sharing Ideas" Ribbins, P., Glatter, R., Simkins, T., and Watson, L. (eds.) (1991) *Developing Educational Leaders* Harlow: Longman.

Richardson, E. (1973) *The Teacher, the School and the Task of Management* London: Heinmann Educational Books Ltd.

Riches, C. and Morgan, C. (eds.) (1989) *Human Resource Management* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Rizvi, F. (1994) "Tom Greenfield and Educational Administration" *Curriculum Studies* Vol.2 No.1. pp119-127.

Robbins, D. (1991) *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Robbins, D. (1993) "The Practical Importance of Bourdieu's Analyses of Higher Education" *Studies in Higher Education* Vol.18 No.2. pp151-163.
Routledge, M.D. and Dennison, W.F. (1990) "Introducing Appraisal - what has been achieved?" *School Organisation* Vol.10. No.1. pp51-56.

Russell, T.J. (1976) "Comment by T.J. Russell, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge" in "Barr Greenfield and Organistion Theory: A Symposium" *Educational Administration* Vol.5 No.1. pp10-11.

Saran, R. and Trafford, V. (eds.) (1990) *Research in Education Management and Policy: Retrospect and Prospect*. London: The Falmer Press.

Schofield, J. W. (1993) "Increasing the Generalizability of Qualitative Research" in Hammersley, M. (ed.) (1993) *Social Research Philosophy, Politics and Practice* London: Sage.

School Teachers' Review Body (1994) *Third Report* Cm 2466 London: HMSO.

School Teachers' Review Body (1995) *Fourth Report* Cm 2765 London: HMSO.

Scott, J. (1990) *A Matter of Record* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Seddon, T. (1996) "The principle of choice in policy research" *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 11. No. 2. pp197-214.

Seldon, A. and Pappworth, J. (1983) *By Word of Mouth: Elite Oral History* London: Methuen.

Shils, E. (1990) "Intellectuals and responsibility" in Maclean, I., Montefiore, A., and Winch, P. (eds.) (1990) *The political responsibility of intellectuals* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shipman, M. (1988) *The Limitations of Social Research* Third Edition. Harlow: Longman.

Silver, H. (1983) *Education as History: Interpreting Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Education* London: Methuen.

Silver, H. (1990) *Education, Change and the Policy Process* Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Simkins, T. (1998) *Values, Power and Instrumentatility: Theory and Research in Education Management* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Liverpool October 1998.

Simon, H.A. (1945) *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization* New York: Macmillan.

Sinclair, J., Ironside, M., and Seifert, R. (1996) "Classroom struggle? Market oriented education reforms and their impact on the teacher labour process" *Work, Employment and Society* Vol. 10. No. 4. pp641-661.

Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender* London: Sage.

SMTF (1990) *Developing School Management: The Way Forward* London:HMSO.

Smith, R. (1992) *The Heads and Deputies Handbook: Managing Schools in the 1990s* Lancaster:Framework Press.

Smyth, J. (ed.) (1993) *A Socially Critical View of the Self Managing School* London: The Falmer Press.

Smyth, J. (ed.) (1995a) *Academic work: the changing labour process in higher education* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Smyth, J. (1995b) "Devolution and Teachers' Work: The Underside of a Complex Phenomenon" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol. 23. No. 3. pp168-175.

Southworth, G. (1997) *Change and continuity in the work of primary headteachers in England: lessons for rethinking educational leadership and management* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997

Squire, W.H. (1987) *Education Management in the UK* Aldershot: Gower.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again* London: Routledge.

Stenhouse, L. (1969) "Trends and Issues in Education in the United Kingdom" in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Stenning, W.I. and Stenning, R. (1984) "The Assessment of Teacher's Performance: some practical considerations" *School Organisation and Management Abstracts* Vol.3. pp77-90.

Stewart, J. and Walsh, K. (1992) "Change in the Management of Public Services" *Public Administration* Vol. 27 Winter 1992 pp499-518.

Strain, M. (1995) "Teaching as a Profession: The Changing Legal and Social Context" in Busher, H. and Saran, R. (eds.) (1995) *Managing Teachers as Professionals in Schools* London: Kogan Page.

Strain, M. (1997) "Records of Achievement" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.25 No.3 pp213-242.

Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996) *Changing Our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness and School Improvement* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Sullivan, B. (1997) "Mapping Contract", in: Davis, G., Sullivan, B., and Yeatman, A. (Eds.) *The New Contractualism* (South Melbourne, Macmillan Education Australia Pty Ltd).

Sungaila, H. (1990) "Organizations Alive: have we at last found the key to a science of educational administration?" *Studies in Educational Administration* No 52 May 1990 Commonwealth Council for Educational Adminstration.

Swartz, D. (1997) *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu* London: The University of Chicago Press.

Swingewood, A. W. (1987) "Intellectuals and the Construction of Consensus in Postwar England" in Gagnon, A. G. (ed.) (1987) *Intellectuals in Liberal Democracies* New York: Praeger.

Taylor, F.W. (1911) *Principles of Scientific Management* New York: Harper.

Taylor, W. (1968) "Training the Head" in Allen, B. (ed.) (1968) *Headship in the 1970's* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Taylor, W. (1969) "Simulation and the Comparative Study of Educational Administration" in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Taylor, W. (1973) *Heading for Change* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Taylor, W. (1976) "The head as manager: some criticisms" in Peters, R.S. (ed.) (1976) *The Role of the Head* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

TTA/OFSTED (1996) *Review of Headteacher and Teacher Appraisal: Summary of Evidence* London: TTA/OFSTED.

Tipton, B. (1982) "Planning Academic Structures for Educational Administration" *Educational Management and Administration* Vol.10 pp57-64.

Tomlinson, J. (1986) "Education system restructured" in Ranson, S. and Tomlinson, J. (ed.) *The Changing Government of Education* London: Allen and Unwin.

Trotter, A. (1993) *Better Self Management: A Handbook for Education Staff* Harlow: Longman.

Troyna, B. (1994) "Critical Social Research and Education Policy" *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. XXXXII, No. 1. pp70-84

Turner, G. and Clift, P. (1988) *Studies in Teacher Appraisal* Lewes: The Falmer Press.

Usher, R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and Education* London: Routledge.

Wacquant, L. (1989) "Towards a Reflexive Sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu" *Sociological Theory* Vol.7.

Wacquant, L. (1993) "Bourdieu in America: Notes on the Transatlantic Importation of Social Theory" in Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., and Postone, M. (eds.) (1993) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

Waldrop, M.W. (1993) *Complexity* New York: Touchstone.

Walford, G. (1994) "A New Focus on the Powerful" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Walker, W.G. (1969) "Trends and Issues in the Preparation of Educational Administrators" in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Wallace, M. (1997) *Combining Cultural and Political Perspectives for Analysing Interaction in Educational Management Settings: the Best or Worst of both Conceptual*

Worlds? Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Cardiff October 1997.

Wallace, M. and Hall, V. (1994) *Inside the SMT: teamwork in secondary school management* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Wallace, M. and Weindling, D. (1997) *An Overview of Recent ESRC Sponsored Research Relevant to School Management* Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series: Redefining Educational Management Leicester June 1997
Walters, B. (1994*) Management for Special Needs* London:Cassell.

Watson, L. E., and Garrett, V. (1994) "Issues around partnership: reflections on a European teaching programme in higher education" *British Journal of Inservice Education* Vol. 20 No. 1. pp73-80.

Weaver, T. Sir. (1979) "Education: retrospect and prospect: an administrator's testimony" *Cambridge Journal of Education* Vol. 9 No.1. Lent. pp2-17.

Weick, K. E. (1989) "Educational organisations as loosely coupled systems" in Bush, T. (ed.) (1989a) *Managing Education: Theory and Practice* Buckingham: Open University Press.

West-Burnham, J. (1990) "The Management of Change" in Davies, B., Ellison, L., Osborne, A., and West-Burnham, J. (1990) *Education Management for the 1990s* Harlow: Longman.

Westoby, A. (ed.) (1988) *Culture and Power in Educational Organisations* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Wheatley, M.J. (1994) *Leadership and the New Science* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publications Inc.

Whitaker, P. (1993) *Managing Change in Schools* Buckingham: Open University Press.

White, P and White, J. (1976) "Comment by Pat and John White, Department of the Philosophy of Education, University of London Institute of Education" in "Barr Greenfield and Organistion Theory: A Symposium" *Educational Administration* Vol.5 No.1.pp6-10.

Whitty, G. (1985) *Sociology and School Knowledge: curriculum theory, research and politics* London: Methuen.

Whitty, G. and Edwards, T. (1994) "Researching Thatcherite Education Policy" in Walford, G. (ed.) (1994) *Researching the Powerful in Education* London: UCL Press.

Whitty, G., Power, S. and Halpin, D. (1997) *Devolution and Choice in Education: The School, The State, and The Market* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wiley, N. (1979) "The rise and fall of dominating theories in American Sociology" in Snizek, W.E., Fuhrman, E.R., and Miller, M.K. (eds) (1979) *Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective* London: Aldwych Press.

Wilkins, R. (1993) "Taking it Personally: A Note on Emotion and Autobiography"
Sociology Vol.27 No.1. pp93-100.

Williams, M. and May, T. (1996) *Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Research* London: UCL Press Limited.

Williams, V. (1995a) "The context of development" in Williams, V. (ed.) (1995) *Towards Self-Managing Schools* London: Cassell.

Williams, V. (1995b) "Towards 2000 - organization and relationships" in Williams, V. (ed.) (1995) *Towards Self-Managing Schools* London: Cassell.

Winch, P. (1990) "Introduction" in Maclean, I., Montefiore, A., and Winch, P. (eds.) (1990) *The political responsibility of intellectuals* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woods, P. (1985) "Conversations with Teachers: some aspects of life-history method" *British Educational Research Journal* Vol.11 No.1. pp13-26.

Wragg, E.C., Wikeley, F.J., Wragg, C.M. and Haynes, G.S. (1996) *Teacher Appraisal Observed* London: Routledge.

Yeatman, A. (1994) *Interpreting Contemporary Contractualism*, Inaugural Professorial Lecture, Macquarie University, 25th October 1994.

Yeatman, A. (1990) *Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats. Essays on the Contemporary Australian State* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Yeatman, A. (1997) Contract, Status and Personhood, in: Davis, G., Sullivan, B., and Yeatman, A. (Eds.) (1997) *The New Contractualism* South Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia Pty Ltd.

Young, M.F.D. (1971a) "Introduction" in Young, M.F.D. (ed.) (1971) *Knowledge and Control* London: Cassell & Collier Macmillan.

Young, M.F.D. (1971b) "An approach to the study of curricula as socially organized knowledge" in Young, M.F.D. (ed.) (1971) *Knowledge and Control* London: Cassell & Collier Macmillan.

Young, M.F.D. (1998) *The Curriculum of the Future* London: The Falmer Press.