

## Chapter 2

### Globalisation, managerialism and communities

What does globalisation have to do with the restructuring of the Jewish community schools in South Africa? The simple answer is – everything. The deeper meaning of each term of this dissertation's title can only be understood by viewing it through the lens of globalisation. The *restructuring* of educational systems worldwide has been affected by a combination of global economic restructuring and reduced social spending; both manifestations of neo-liberal thinking or what might be called the ideologies of the market (Ball, 1998). The *Jewish* religion, like any other religion, goes beyond national borders and time. Jews have always had to deal with the reality of global dispersion and with the complexity of maintaining their identity as a minority group (Sacks, 2003). *Communities* have been created and reinforced so as to resist the homogeneous tendencies of globalisation and to provide a voice for diverse social groups (Marginson, 1999). And lastly, global processes and macroeconomics are widely implicated in the social and educational policy context in *South Africa* after 1994 (Jansen, 2001b; Sayed, 2001; Donaldson, 1997).

To explore the restructuring of the Jewish community schools through the narrow lens of organisational change or micropolitics, without paying attention to the globalised context within which the change occurs, will therefore only provide a limited account of the process. However, this statement needs to be qualified further. First, I do not claim that globalisation by itself can explain the restructuring or that a direct link between globalisation and my inquiry can be established. I merely suggest, like Dale (1999:8), Bottery (2000:1) and Taylor et al (1997:54), that the researcher has to understand the nature of globalisation in order to explore how some of its ideological discourses have been translated and interpreted in a specific setting. Second, acknowledging the existence of global processes does not translate into adopting a determinist approach to restructuring. It is evident that all nations – and institutions, for that matter – do not respond in the same way to globalisation, and that the specific interpretation of globalised processes depends on local and institutional capacities and histories as well as on political, social and economic conditions (Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002; Taylor et al, 1997). It is for this reason that researchers usually point to the global–local axis as an important concept for those who research

changes in educational institutions in the new globalised order (Welch, 2001; Deem, 2001; Fitzsimons, 2000; Marginson, 1999).

Accordingly, the aim of this chapter is to develop a conceptual argument that seeks to lay bare the workings of globalisation and its expression in the restructuring of schools. This conceptual analysis is based on both a re-description and reinterpretation of the literature. My thesis is that local and global influences have led the restructuring of the Jewish community schools in two opposing directions: the economic/managerial force that pulls the institution towards greater efficiency, cost reduction and the application of other business principles to the management of the schools; and the community/religious force that aims at strengthening the community values and the religious character of the schools. Each route comprises a distinct discourse that sometimes complements and sometimes contradicts the other, thereby promoting contradictory and paradoxical practices within the context of faith-based community schools. My assumption is that in this context the schools will have to confront two key challenges: first, how to become financially viable in the new neo-liberal economy without compromising their mission and values; and second, how to preserve the community and religious values without narrowing its borders and augmenting its exclusivity.

In order to pursue this conceptualisation I will begin by exploring the notion of economic and cultural globalisation, their inherent contradictions, their envisaged gains as well as their perils, and their impact on education and society in general. I will argue that these global processes have unleashed two parallel, yet seemingly contradictory, processes: the one that pulls schools towards new managerialism and the strictures of the market, and another that pushes schools toward communitarianism. In my analysis I will critically discuss the first process, namely the market-led restructuring of educational institutions and the attendant practices and ideology of new managerialism. Special attention will be given to the impact of new managerialism and marketisation on selective stakeholders of education, that is, principals, teachers and parents. This will be followed with a critical analysis of the second process – the resurgence of communities, including religious communities – and their complex nature. I will use the conceptual tool of *gesellschaft* (society) and *gemeinschaft* (community) to explore how communities function and how they adapt to marketisation and globalisation. In this context I will explore the notion of faith-based community schools, their “good” and their “bad”. Lastly, based on this

conceptual analysis and on my argument that both processes have interacted in the restructuring of the Jewish community schools, I will construct a polarised framework that will demonstrate the conflictual tenets of both new managerialism and the liberal notion of community. This exposition will provide the platform for broader theorising about the origin and nature of the restructuring process, its intended and unintended consequences, as well as the experiences of the stakeholders in this process.

### *Conceptions of globalisation*

Globalisation is usually referred to as linkages and interconnections between states, and the creation of a world system. We are now part of a new global economy in which productivity and competitiveness are based on knowledge and information, and where most jobs are influenced by what happens both globally and locally (Castells, 2001). Globalisation is not only an economic process. It also refers to other processes such as the political, cultural, sociological, semiotic, linguistic, etc. (Marginson, 1999). The scope and intensity of these interlinking processes are challenged in the literature (Welch, 2001; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000). The notion that they exist and have impacted on almost every facet of political, economic and social life across the globe is, however, mostly uncontested (Dale, 1999; Marginson, 1999; Wells et al, 1998).

It is not my intention to dwell on the notion of globalisation and all its complexity, but rather to isolate some of its paradoxical and contradictory processes that might shed light on the restructuring of the Jewish community schools. For this purpose I will focus on two main processes and their relation to education, namely, economic and cultural globalisation.

### *Economic globalisation*

As an economic process, globalisation is associated with the restructuring of the nation state in terms of deregulation of financial controls, the diminishing of national borders coupled with the increase in transnational interactions, the opening of markets and notions of efficiency, the selective globalisation of science and technology, the flexibility of labour and the interconnectedness of the economy through networks (Castells, 2001).

Economic globalisation is also associated with the spread of neoliberalism that is perceived to maximise economic efficiency and to guarantee individual freedom. It is believed that the free hand of the market will ensure a more efficient world

economy and will improve the material conditions of people across the globe (Wells et al, 1998). Neoliberalism symbolises a move from Fordist economies based on protected national markets to neo-Fordism in which global competition encourages corporate downsizing, cost cutting and flexibility, which reduces wages and curtails the power of unions. It further stimulates entrepreneurship and the move towards the flexible production of goods using a workforce of part time, temporary and contractual employees.

*The perils of economic globalisation*

Supporters of globalisation often speak about its potential for democratising and enriching our lives by providing access to markets, cultural practices, employment opportunities and products as never before. Yet the mass demonstrations and the violent expressions against globalisation across the world indicate that not all humanity is benefiting from globalisation, and that it creates a binary divide between those who are able to enjoy the new globalised economic order and those who are its victims (Hargreaves, 2003; Rizvi & Lingard, 2000).

Significantly, globalisation has a negative impact on those who economically benefit from its existence and who are able to participate in this “knowledge society”, mainly because it demands flexibility and adaptability to unpredictable changes. The unintended consequences of the knowledge society are job insecurity, job-hopping, job redundancy, pension insecurity, the collapse of welfare safety nets and the erosion of supportive communities and relationships (Hargreaves, 2003; Bottery, 2000). Taking part and “winning” in the global economy therefore creates anxieties and uncertainties. These are defined as “manufactured uncertainties”, to distinguish them from those uncertainties and risks that are created by nature (Giddens, 1999). Uncertainties are sometimes perceived as a political choice created by governments who trade off security for the encouragement of free choice (Hargreaves, 2003).

The greatest threat of globalisation is perceived to be its impact on the fundamentals of human character, described as the “corrosion of character” (Sennett, 1998). In the new globalised order individuals experience personal and social insecurities, coupled with the growing threat of crime and violence to their physical and mental safety. This affects the individual’s basic capacity to trust others and to establish meaningful relationships. Furthermore, the need to secure employment in times of rapid change creates a “society of suspicious minds” where people,

motivated by personal interest and competition, spend their lives looking over their shoulders (Hargreaves, 2003). Words like loyalty, mutual commitment, long term goals and delayed gratification do not ensure success in the global market. This economic context puts pressure on families, especially on the parental role model, since the same short-term adaptive behaviour that earns workers success in the modern workplace, impacts negatively on their family life that requires long-term commitment, obligation, trustworthiness and purpose (Sennett, 1998).

Notably, globalisation is an especially threatening phenomenon to the middle class who feel insecure and uncertain by the shrinking of the public sector (Brown, 1990) and by the tearing up of societal maintained safety nets (Bauman, 2001). Middle-class parents are becoming increasingly concerned about their “imagined future” and those of their children who are now under threat to find jobs in both the old and new professions and in management positions (Ball, 1998). It is perceived that these uncertainties promote parents as consumers of education to seek the competitive edge at the expense of others, and to look for value-added education. Information technology is increasingly seen as the best value to add to their children’s education (Bigun & Kenway, 1998; Kenway et al, 1993).

#### *Economic globalisation and education*

Economic globalisation has spurred various processes in education. First, neoliberalism advocates that education, like any other social service, should be turned over to competitive market forces. This leads to the privatisation of educational systems, decentralisation, greater parental choice as well as greater competition between schools for “clients” – all antithetical to the classic notion of the welfare state as the provider of education. It is assumed that through the market, schools would become more efficient and more effective (Chubb & Moe, 1990). More specifically, it has been recommended that schools should be restructured in line with corporate structures so they can compete in the knowledge society (Schlechty, 1991).

Second, globalisation exerts pressure on educational systems to develop the knowledge and skills of their pupils in order to compete in the global market, especially information technologies (Hargreaves, 2003; Bigun & Kenway, 1998; Hargreaves, 1994). This requires schools to alter their curricular and mode of teaching in order to accommodate the flexible specialisation required by the new production techniques. It requires education systems to enhance students’ outcomes in

employment-related skills and competencies and to create higher goals and standards. The knowledge society has changed the traditional conception of what is knowledge, and schools are expected to enable pupils to construct knowledge drawing on a range of information, to review it from different perspectives, to criticise and improve on it and to apply it to new situations (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1998). Yet, it is observed that while globalisation has affected education at a macro level, it has not changed much at a classroom level. It is perceived that even in those countries that are involved in the global economy and that occasionally use computers in the classroom, both teaching methods and curricular remain largely unchanged (Carnoy, 2002).

Third, it is claimed by some theorists – referred to as *realists* (Wells et al, 1998) or *sceptics* (Tikly, 2001) – that even though national borders have become more porous and the power of global corporations has increased, nation states do not lose their power or essential role. Most people remain nationalised and are still attached to the places where they live. It is therefore argued (Green quoted in Wells et al, 1998) that while many nation states reduced their control over certain areas of education by privatisation, decentralisation and budget cuts, the control has been reinstated by various mechanisms such as national curricular and tests linked to performance-based funding and other accountability measures for quality assurance. Performativity is therefore perceived to be another form of indirect steering, or steering at a distance, which replaces intervention and prescription with target setting and accountability (Ball, 1998).

Fourth, global and economic changes led governments to question the funding and organisation of public services. This advanced the ideology and techniques of new managerialism as a replacement to the bureaucratic organisational regimes of schools. New managerialism is a concept that aims to explain and describe the new discourse of management, derived from the private, for-profit sector, whose introduction to the public sphere was enthused by the search for efficiency, excellence and effectiveness (Deem, 2001). New managerialism involves new forms of employee involvement, in particular the promotion of a “corporate culture” in which managers seek to capture both the minds and hearts of employees in order to achieve the ends that they desire (Ball, 1998; Hatcher, 1994). In the wake of globalisation new managerialism becomes both a governance system and a vehicle for educational change.

*Cultural globalisation*

Globalisation, viewed as a social and cultural process, has transformed the world culture and has stimulated a homogenised consumer culture in which people everywhere use the same technologies, eat the same food, wear the same clothing, speak the same language and are exposed to the same media images. This universalised style has been captured in the ironic phrase – the McDonaldisation of society (Ritzer, 1993).

Paradoxically, increased cultural homogeneity occurs simultaneously with increased cultural heterogeneity. Cultural diversity is created either by local or national reconstruction of the global messages, or by the struggle of some marginalised groups to assert their own cultural values – which themselves could be global, such as religious fundamentalism or feminism (Carnoy & Rothen, 2002). Moreover, the negative fallout from economic globalisation leads many of those who cannot share its benefits to turn inwards towards culture, religion or ethnicity as an alternative source of meaning (Hargreaves, 2003). This paradox of globalisation is the topic of Benjamin Barber's book *Jihad vs. McWorld* (2001). On the one hand, the distribution of products such as MTV, McDonald's and Reebok create a homogenous global theme park which Barber calls McWorld (describing any sterile cultural monism, for which America is not solely responsible), and on the other hand, it creates balkanised nation states and raging cultural fundamentalism which he calls Jihad (not necessarily Islam). In contrast to Huntington<sup>1</sup> who views the struggle as a clash between two civilisations (West against the rest), Barber perceives it as a dialectical expression of tension built into a single global civilisation, where the emergence of ethnic and religious divisions are actually created and propagated by McWorld and its modern media and communication technologies.

As society becomes simultaneously more fragmented and more homogenised, as nation states relinquish part of their control and national identity, and as big corporations have established new global structures, the national and individual identities are in a continuous process of being dislocated, displaced or recreated. In the new global order identities are no longer perceived as unitary or essential – but rather as fluid and shifting. New, instant identities are being created based on

---

<sup>1</sup> Huntington, S.P. The age of Muslim wars. *Newsweek*, December 2001–February 2002. Special Davos Edition.



forgetting rather than remembering the past; we can now choose the identity we want (Bauman, 2001). This has been described as the “crisis of identity”; a consequence of not only globalisation but also of the changing theoretical landscape, in particular the rise of postmodern uncertainties (Hall, 1992). The theoretical essence of postmodernity, and more generally of post structuralism, is succinctly summed up by Hartley (1997) based on the writings of Lyotard, Derrida and others:

First, there are few taboos left ... Anything goes ... Few would now defend the grand ideas of modernity. Democracy is not seen as a cause worth fighting for, unless there are vested economic or political interests ...

Second, this is an age of risk and uncertainty ... Even the certainties of science seem uncertain. ... Many of the big stories – the “grand narratives” – of science are now in disarray ... The old guard resort to ridicule in order to shore up their fractured support. Even language itself is said to be devoid of meaning. All texts, this included, can be continuously deconstructed, reinterpreted, an infinite regression to the meaning ... When there are no absolutes, we become confused ...

Third, this is no longer a period of consensus. The voices of those who cannot count themselves as able bodied, white, middle class, male, liberal and heterosexual now cease to remain silent ... It is the discourse of consumption, not of production, which now holds sway. The media’s message is to urge us to consume in order to be, not to produce in order to live ... (Hartley, 1997: 51-52).

I have argued so far that two dialectic influences have intensified the national and individual “crisis of identity”: globalisation, which makes the world both more homogenised and more diverse; and postmodernity, which is associated with fragmentation and disintegration (see also Welch, 2001). Hall (1992) maintains that identities in the wake of changing conditions could end up in three places: one, they could return to their roots and to their traditions (old or newly invented, see also Giddens, 1999); two, they can disappear through assimilation and homogenisation; and three, they can be translated and can create what Hall describes as a “culture of hybridity” (1992:310) – a dialogue and fusion between different cultural traditions.

It is argued that because religion plays an important role in the formation of identity, it emerged as a global force towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Sacks, 2003). The refusal of dialogue has been perceived to have given rise to fundamentalism, defined as an *‘embattled tradition locked into the new communication systems, the new cosmopolitanism produced by the globalisation of modernity’* (Giddens, 1999: lecture 3). I will return to the topic of identity, religion and fundamentalism in Chapter 3.



Most religious leaders would undoubtedly view the resurgence of religious communities positively; however, it poses a moral challenge to religious institutions. Sacks (2003), writing from a Jewish Orthodox viewpoint, warns of the dangers caused by politicising religion, by the mixture of religion and power and by the rise of tribalism, separatism and intolerance. To counteract the possible negative impact of the resurgence of new communities and identities, scholars from different contexts advocate the “politics of difference”. This politics acknowledges the differences and the diversity of cultural, national and ethnic communities, and rejects the totalising meta-narrative of cultural identity and its tight relation to national identity (Fitzsimons, 2000). Significantly, Sacks (2003) acknowledges the politics of difference as the difference between various religions, but does not refer to the diversity within a religion. Religion is thus represented as monolithic – as an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983) – a concept that will be further explored in this dissertation. Given the politics of difference, schools play a key role in identity formation and in the management of diversity, which explains the growing demand by different social groups to establish their own educational systems (Marginson, 1999).

It therefore seems that the intended and unintended effects of cultural globalisation and the paradoxical formation of both homogeneity and diversity, could be viewed as either negative or positive. Much depends on one’s conception of identity, how it has been interpreted and adopted in the local contexts and, most importantly, ‘*whose interests are served*’ by the cultural transformation (Ball, 1998:128).

The narrative so far describes the global economic and cultural transformation that provides the broader context within which the restructuring of the Jewish community schools could be explored and theorised. I argue that there is no essential determinacy to the ways in which globalisation processes work, mainly because the various globalisation processes contain inherent complexities and tensions, such as those between the local and the global, between fragmentation and control and between homogeneity and diversity. Marginson stresses this point with his observation that ‘*the more intensive the forces of globalisation, the more intense are the surges of dialectic and difference*’ (2000a). These tensions within the process of globalisation create their own sites of resistance whose trajectories and consequences cannot be predicted.

The inherent complexity of globalisation affects the educational arena by promoting parallel conflictual and contested processes. Subsequently, two main discourses have permeated the education context: neoliberalism, with the attendant concepts of marketisation, restructuring and new managerialism; and communities and identities. These discourses and how they have affected educational institutions will be explored in the following sections.

### ***Market fundamentalism and education***

I argued earlier that the need to provide a work force for the nation state economy to compete successfully in the global market has exerted pressure on educational systems to become more efficient, economic and effective. This has subsequently brought about the market-led restructuring of educational systems around the globe, as well as the adoption of new managerialism as both a delivery system and as a vehicle for educational change. The aim of this section is to explore these processes and to assess their impact on educational systems. I will begin by unpacking the notions of restructuring and marketisation of education. I will continue by analysing the concept of new managerialism, its claims of efficiency and effectiveness and the main mechanism by which it pursues these goals, that is, decentralisation, accountability, the setting of clear goals and the adoption of a corporate culture. In this context the impact of new managerialism on the selected stakeholders in education – namely parents, teachers and principals – will be discussed.

### ***School restructuring***

Over the past two decades, there has been a widespread movement targeting the restructuring of schools. The Thatcher and Major governments in the United Kingdom during the 1980s and 1990s, undertook the fundamental restructuring of schools and attempted to establish education markets (Whitty, 1997; Ball, 1997a; Deem & Brehony, 1992). Chubb and Moe (1990, 1991) recommended that the United States should follow that example. Market-led restructuring of educational systems and institutions were also widespread in Australia (Kenway et al, 1993), New Zealand and other educational centres (Vandenberghe, 1999; Whitty, 1997) as well as in South Africa (Chisholm, 1999). The extent to which restructuring reforms have been implemented and the result of their implementation vary considerably due to local conditions (Daun 2002; Whitty, 1997).

Restructuring became a popular name to any reform or change in education (Lawton, 1992). The logic of restructuring is that problems in education could be ascribed to the basic structure of schooling. Market-led restructuring emphasises choice, privatisation and decentralisation (Daun, 2002; Boyd & Lugg, 1998). It is claimed that it would save costs, improve students' achievements and increase accountability (Daun, 2002). Hargreaves (1994) maintains that in some instances restructuring can be reduced to top-down reform or ruthless retrenchment. This argument is plausible especially because most school restructuring occurs in times of economic crisis (Barton, 1998; Deem, 1996).

Why has market-led restructuring of educational institutions become so prevalent? Globalisation has been suggested as one explanation (see also Carnoy, 2002; Hargreaves, 1994). The research literature offers other explanations, some of which are loosely connected to globalisation. It is suggested that this popularity relates to changes that have occurred in the way people think about education (Boyd, 1992) and that “market fundamentalism” (Soros, 2002) has become the “new orthodoxy” (Ball, 1998). Some researchers view the development of market ideology in education as a natural evolution in school governance taking over from the professionals and the bureaucrats (Reed, 2001; Murphy, 1999; Boyd, & Lugg, 1998), referred to elsewhere as “bureau-professionalism” (Clarke & Newman, 1997) or “welfarism” (Gewirtz. & Ball, 2000). Levin (1998) compares the spreading of market-led restructuring to an epidemic. He argues that under certain conditions, any organisation would be susceptible to the same type of reform. The popularity of market-led restructuring has been attributed to a number of other factors, namely to: the perception of certainty that the marketisation discourse provides in the postmodern world (Welch, 1998a); the internationalisation of knowledge (Deem, 2001); policy borrowing (Halpin & Tronya, 1995); and policy entrepreneurs such as academics, politicians, consultants and sponsors – for example, the World Bank – which transport ideas from one context to another (Deem, 2001; Ball, 1998a; Currie, 1998; Whitty et al, 1998).

The problem with new ideas is that they are spread and repeated uncritically even if those who repeat them can only comprehend them in terms of clichés (Rees, 1995). The next section will therefore explore what market-led restructuring has meant in the educational context and how it has impacted on schools.

*The school as a business*

Market-led restructuring is premised on the belief that schools should be run like a business; that is, that “business knows best” (Jamieson, 1996). At the head is the chief executive officer (CEO), or a CEO-like manager, and students are the clients/customers. The market and not the state is responsible for allocating resources, and it demands that educational institutions – whether these are schools, colleges or universities – would become accountable and cost effective. Putting education in the market place means shifting education from being a “provider capture” to a “consumer capture”, whereby education appears as a commodity, allowing parents to choose between a range of products that suit their needs. It is expected that schools would become more effective because of competition. Customers can exercise their choice, which is believed to be morally good (Menter et al, 1997).

Those who advocate market ideology, such as Chubb and Moe (1990; 1991), criticise the politics and bureaucracy of the bureau-professional regime in education. It is argued that under that regime schools are ineffective, mainly because decision makers are too distant from the education users; they are not responsive to local demands and are not accountable. It is implied that politicians, bureaucrats and professionals – under the façade of democratic governance and professional expertise – have furthered their own goals. Moreover, it is claimed that the bureaucracy has been instituted in order to stop other stakeholders with different interests from gaining power or authority, and that bureaucracy therefore impacts negatively on the functioning of schools and of pupils’ achievements (ibid).

The market discourse produces political capital gains due to its rhetoric of high efficiency and cost reduction, the demise of central control and professionals’ control, and its support of libertarian ideology in terms of choice, individualism, diversity and ownership (Foskett, 1998; Hartley, 1998).

The notion that schools should be run like a business is, however, open to a range of interpretations. It could mean that education could provide a profitable business for entrepreneurs or it could mean that education be managed like an enterprise or a corporation. The literature has debated the appropriate relationship between business and education. Fullan (2001) argues that schools and businesses are on the same evolutionary path and that they have much to learn from each other. Bottery (1994) also recommends a dialogue between schools and business. He maintains that education cannot ignore the lessons of commercial organisations, but it

has to be selective and adopt only those techniques and strategies that are compatible with educational philosophies and values. On the other hand, Hargreaves<sup>2</sup> argues that business and schools are incompatible. The main agenda motivating business is to generate profit while the nature of education is a social good. It is therefore unrealistic to demand that business act against its own survival by developing a moral agenda. Hargreaves qualifies (2003) that business can behave morally, but only when morality serves, or at least does not threaten, its interests. Soros – an entrepreneur who acknowledges the economic benefits of the global market – expresses a similar sentiment: *‘The amorality of financial markets is one of the factors that contribute to their efficiency: It allows participants to be single-minded about maximising their returns without regard to the social consequences’* (Soros, 2002:4).

Other educational researchers have also reasoned against equating schools with markets. There are three main lines of argument here. The first argument deals with the obvious differences between market ideology and schools on both the demand and supply sides (Woods et al, 1995; Tooley, 1995). On the demand side, management (supply) and customers<sup>3</sup> (demand) have the potential to exert some control over the product (the education of pupils) (Vandenberghe, 1999; Whitty, 1997). The educational benefits to society cannot be quantified and consumers cannot monitor the quality of schooling because their knowledge of the “product” is limited. On the other hand, professionals are the experts and the monitors of quality; they decide what should be provided for the customers (Foskett, 1998; Hawley, 1999). Parents choose a school because “it feels good” (Adnett & Davies, 1999; Ball & Vincent, 1998; Deem, 1994), because of its role as a producer of social capital (Ball, 1997c) or because of its proximity to their home (Menter & Muschamp, 1999; Hatcher, 1994) and not because of the effectiveness of the provisions. Furthermore, parents or pupils as customers are reluctant to exercise their “exit” threat, even when schools do not respond to their demands (House, 1998; Woods et al, 1995).

On the supply side, there are numerous barriers to consumer responsiveness, such as national curriculum, reputation, locality and financial constraints (Bagley & Woods, 1996; Hatcher, 1994; Woods et al, 1995).

These differences have encouraged some analysts to describe the education context as *quasi-market* or *imperfect market* (Whitty & Power, 1997; Jamieson,

---

<sup>2</sup> Hargreaves, 25 February 2002 – Public lecture GICD, Johannesburg.

<sup>3</sup> Note that the notion of the customer in education is not clear (Woods et al, 1995; Hartley, 1994).

1996), which combines both bureaucratic and market controls (Vandenberghe, 1999). In this *quasi-market*, for example, per capita formula funding and parents' choice substitute the notion of profit that underpins real markets (Hatcher, 1994).

The second argument relates to the tendency to idealise the market and its rewards (Adnett & Davies, 1999; Woods et al, 1995). First, not all businesses are profitable or efficient (Boyd & Lugg, 1998). Second, the market is only able to expand at the expense of another, thereby producing winners and losers (Morley & Rassool, 2000). Winners in the education market are the “able”, “middle class” students (referred to as “cream skimming”), while the losers are the children from working class backgrounds, those with special education needs, and other “expensive” clientele (Welch, 1998; Whitty & Power, 1997; Woods et al, 1995). Third, the human costs of the market are high, including employee redundancy, low morale among those who stay, bullying and greed (Rees & Rodley, 1995). Fourth, it is argued that market forces could only motivate a change that is not enduring, and that schools and teachers change just enough to compete and to win in the market place (Sergiovanni, 1998). Fifth, market rewards shrewdness and institutional survival rather than community principles, such as care and concern for social justice. It encourages commercial rather than educational decision-making, individualism rather than collectivism, suspicion rather than cooperation and expediency rather than need (Hargreaves, 1993). Deem and Brehony (1994) suggest, for example, that the marketisation of schools has negative effects on the governing body as it exacerbates the value divisions between governors in the same schools. They claim that, contrary to its rhetoric, marketisation does not encourage greater efficiency, but rather the investing of resources in market appeal and image. They further claim that:

- because of their need for new recruits schools are more concerned with future pupils than with the needs of present pupils;
- schools have a false sense of autonomy as each school solves its own problems, even though these are general and not specific;
- schools move towards uniformity rather than diversity because they try to attract the same type of student;
- each school turns inwardly, examining its image and market appeal; and
- there is not much concern with educational issues.

The third argument focuses on the overall mistrust in the market ideology and its negative impact on individuals and communities. As been mentioned before, both Soros (2002) and Hargreaves (2003) imply that market forces serve self-interest rather than public interest. It has been maintained that market forces are socially constructed, never neutral and that the state is always implicated in their framing and regulation (Barton, 1998). Moreover, the market tends to trade on the insecurities of clients, making it advantageous for business to promote uncertainties and crises. The political economy of uncertainties is good for businesses – it disciplines customers by fear and elicits passive submission to the rules of business (Bauman, 2001). It is further argued that market ideology is a disguised modernist bureaucratic approach infused by postmodernist rhetoric. It is therefore used as a deceiving strategy by the state (in public organisations) or by employers (in private organisations), in order to offer a modern world's certainty of meaning and truth, while appealing to the postmodernist consumer culture (Hartley, 1998; 1994; Morley, 1997; Hatcher, 1994).

Linked to that is Apple's (2001) assertion that the neo-liberal notion of the market transforms our idea of democracy, turning it into a "thinner" economic concept based on "possessive individualism", instead of a "thick" political one. This is assumed to have a negative impact on the notion of community, and its net result is an atomised society of disengaged individuals who feel demoralised and socially powerless (McChesney, 1999 quoted in Apple, 2001).

Based on the above criticism, it is evident that the introduction of market-led restructuring of educational institutions would bring with it various conflictual issues. It has therefore been suggested that the marketisation process would not solve the problems of education but would merely exchange one set of problems for another (Murphy, 1999).

Market ideology demands strong management that can control the labour force and deliver what has been described as the three Es: economy, efficiency and effectiveness (Morley, 1997; Randall, & Brady, 1997). Those who advocate market-led restructuring usually endorse managerialism as a transformative device. The next section will elaborate on the concept of managerialism and new managerialism and will explore their impact on the educational systems and stakeholders.



*Managerialism and new managerialism*

Managerialism is a rational, technicist approach to educational management based on *'the belief that all aspects of organisational life can and should be managed according to rational structures, procedures, and modes of accountability in the pursuit of goals defined by policymakers and senior managers'* (Wallace & Pocklington, 2002:68). In this logic, educational institutions, among other public services, should follow models of restructuring in the private sector, in businesses and in industrial types of organisations (Clarke et al, 2000; Deem, 1998; 2001; Avis, 1996; Deem & Brehony, 1994).

The main claim of new managerialism is that it would rescue public services, such as education, from the “bureau-professionals” or “welfarism” whose “aged” and “worn out” type of governance failed to manage efficient and effective schools (Simkin, 2000; Murphy, 1999; Vandenberghe, 1999; Troman, 1996; Tyack, 1993). As mentioned earlier, those who advocate the managerialist discourse suggest that bureau-professionalism has as much to do with the *'consolidation of power and protection of privilege as with altruism'* (Whitty et al, 1998:54) and that the bureau-professional regime has been based on *'hierarchy, secrecy and paternalism'* (ibid) and is not necessarily democratic (Deem, 1996; Thody, 1994; Brehony, 1992). By contrast, managerialism claims to offer a progressive and liberating potential, especially as it responds to stakeholders' needs and empowers managers and others within the schools (Whitty et al, 1998).

Managerialism is based on early Taylorist claims that management is a rational, scientific discipline (Morley & Rassool, 2000; Morely, 1997, Bottery, 1992). Some of the key values and techniques highlighted by managerialism include:

- the promotion of a corporate mission with goals, targets, monitoring procedures and performance procedures;
- strict financial management and devolved budgetary controls;
- the monitoring of efficiency and effectiveness through the measurement of outcomes and individual staff performances;
- the use of internal cost centres;
- the fostering of competition between employees;
- the marketisation of services;

- management of change which is a primarily top-down activity, with staff adopting a passive role; and
- increased responsiveness to clients/customers and the creation of a disciplined, flexible workforce, using flexible/individualised contracts, outsourcing, appraisal systems and performance-related remuneration (Trowler, 2001; Morley and Rassool, 2000; Deem, 1998; Morley, 1997; Randle, & Brady, 1997).

Pollitt (1993) proposes that managerialism is more than a set of practices. He presents it as an ideology since it manifests five attributes of ideology: first, it involves a framework of values and beliefs indicating how the world should work, that is, by adopting good management practices from the private sector. This framework perceives management to be crucial for organisational and social amelioration and endorses managers' rights to manage. Second, it concerns social groups and social arrangements. It represents a shift in the relations of power between professionals and managers, with the latter being placed in a dominant position; it is orientated towards the customer and the "market" rather than the producer; it emphasises individualist rather than collectivist conceptions of employment relations; and it assumes that staff in an organisation can be relatively easily managed through clear procedures. Third, it is systematically structured. The belief in the potential of better management is connected to the favourable analysis of corporate sector achievements and the lack of confidence in the state and its inefficient structures; the general tendency towards privatisation; the popularity of management solutions to what was previously considered as political problems; and the increased concern with "results", "performance" and "outcomes". Fourth, managerialism is developed and maintained by social groups such as managers, owners, governments, etc. Those groups may find it convenient to adopt, at least rhetorically, certain elements of managerialism, even if they do not subscribe to the whole package. And fifth, managerialism as an ideology provides a justification and a guide for action.

So far I have used the terms managerialism and new managerialism interchangeably. This is not a case of overlooking the differences, but rather indicates the incoherence in the research literature with regard to these differences and the lack of a working definition. Discussions by Fitzsimons (1999), Wallace and Pocklington (2002) and others have broadened my understanding of these concepts and provided

me with satisfactory answers to questions that have intrigued me since the onset of this research, namely: What is new about “new managerialism” and how does it differ from “old managerialism” (assuming that if there is new managerialism, there must be an old one)?

Wallace and Pocklington (2002) use the discourse of power to explain the differences. They differentiate between three variants of managerialism according to the mechanism each variant uses to increase managerial control over others’ agency: namely *neo-Taylorism*, *entrepreneurship* and *cultural management*. These three ideal types of managerialism complement each other by providing a comprehensive set of control mechanisms and may be operated together when policy makers seek to maximise their degree of control.

*Neo-Taylorism* controls through overt means and is contingent on compliance. Power is concentrated in the hands of policy makers and managers acting on their behalf. It operates through detailed specification of who is to do what to achieve identified targets. It introduces narrowly focused training and strict forms of measurement in order to assess and enhance performance as well as to impose accountability. It is a centralised system, and school staff and managers must comply regardless of their own values and practices, or face disciplinary measures (Wallace & Pocklington, 2002; Pollitt, 1993). This set of practices is loosely termed “old managerialism” (Hartley, 1997; Ball, 1997a).

*Entrepreneurship* uses covert indirect control offered by the market. It emphasises decentralisation, choice and competition. The operation of the “hidden hand” of the market ensures competition for institutional or individual survival. Efficiency is maximised through the consumers’ self-interest to receive value for money. Compliance is achieved through consumer demand, which disciplines the producers and shapes the product (Wallace & Pocklington, 2002).

*Cultural management* is contingent on indirect control based on overt and covert mechanisms designed to align the beliefs and values of managers and those they manage with the beliefs and values of policy makers (ibid:69). Compliance is achieved through commitment to the creation of a shared vision, and the means (techniques) to realise it. For example, capacity building may be employed to encourage the achievement of official goals. The long-term aim is to transform compliance into commitment, thereby winning the “hearts and minds” of those who are managed (Fullan, 2001a). In other words, stakeholders have to be ‘*captured by the*

*discourse*<sup>4</sup> (Trowler, 2001). This is known as *new managerialism*. Whereas neo-Taylorism focuses on intensifying systems of direct control, new managerialism offers a “people-centred” model of the organisation where competitive success will be achieved by loosening formal systems of control and by motivating people to produce “quality” and to strive for “excellence” themselves (Ball, 1997a).

Fitzsimons (1999) employs the Foucauldian’s concept of *governmentality* (the “art of government”) to explain new managerialism. Governmentality is defined by Foucault as *‘the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analysis and reflections, the calculations and tactics, that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power’* (Foucault, 1991:102). In this analysis new managerialism is a form of power that “regulates” rather than “controls”. Regulation relies on self-monitoring, whereas control is more direct and explicit. New managerialism therefore attempts to achieve cultural hegemony not by domination alone but also by the ways in which individuals implicate themselves in their own governance, that is, self-governance. Foucault forwards the notion that human beings are constructed to think that they can tell the truth about themselves, referred to as “technologies of self”, and thus they become subjugated as subjects to lead useful, docile and practical lives (Marshall, 1995). “Technologies of domination” is another Foucauldian concept which refers to those acts that classify and objectify individuals, for example, established norms, examinations, promotions, remedial treatments and, when necessary, disciplinary punishments. Individuals tend to accept these objective classifications and thus construct their own identities accordingly (ibid). Self-governance as a form of governmentality occurs at the intersection of technologies of domination and technologies of self. This explanation sees new managerialism as a governance structure, which accounts for both agency and domination.

While there is a danger that new managerialism would be conceptualised as a totalising and deterministic framework, using the concept of governmentality links power with resistance. According to Foucault, power is not omnipotent – on the contrary: *‘Power can only exist where there is a possibility of resistance and, thereby, the attainment of freedom’* (quoted in Marshall, 1995:30). In support of this concept

---

<sup>4</sup> The word *discourse* can be related in a limited way to the language that is used. In its most extended form, discourse can mean ideology or even culture. Trowler (2001) defines it as more than a text and less than a culture – as social practice conditioned by social structures. In this interpretation, discourses are intimately situated in social contexts; they both reflect context and constitute them.

Trowler (2001) argues that not all academics are “captured” by the managerialist discourse and that some of its practices are mitigated. Similarly, Wallace and Pocklington (2002) advance the idea of “counter-policy” to capture how stakeholders react against a policy initiated in the managerialist central government, which does not align with their beliefs and values.

Even though any exercise of power may bring about resistance, new managerialism is difficult to resist, either because of its invisibility or because of its seemingly rational claims. For example, Currie (1998) claims that new managerialism and its attendant notions of governmentality and performativity have negatively affected universities in Australia, the United States, Canada and New Zealand by shifting the emphasis from “what is true” to “what is efficient” and “saleable”. In the conclusion to her study, Currie proposes that the subtle way in which these practices have infiltrated universities weakens resistance. “Herculeum efforts” are therefore required in order to counteract these changes. A similar argument is highlighted by Fitzsimons (1999):

Because managerialism sees itself as the antidote to chaos, irrationality, disorder, and incompleteness, there are no spaces within such a social order in which autonomy can be contested legitimately. Managerial definitions of quality, efficiency, improved productivity or self-management, construct a particular version of autonomy. Those who do not desire these managerial constructs of autonomy are simply defined as absurd, as under managerialism, these notions appear as self-evidently ‘good’. Even the presentation of resistance itself indicates an engagement already within the definitions provided by managerialism.

To sum up, while new managerialism can be perceived as a totalising technology that subsumes education in its discourse – mostly by advancing the language of efficiency, quality and self-management – its power is not unlimited and it creates its own sites of resistance. This resistance is, however, limited because of the pervasive power of the discourse and its invisibility. It is for this reason that Fitzsimons (1999) and Trowler (2001) call on academics to adopt critical theoretical positions that locate the managerialist discourse in relation to power, and thus challenge this increasingly hegemonic way of seeing the world; a challenge that I attempt to pursue in this case study.

### ***New managerialism***

The aim of this section is to unpack the conflictual nature of new managerialism by analysing some of its claims and practices. I will begin by exploring the main tenets

of new managerialism, that is, the notions of efficiency and decentralisation, and the corporate notion of shared goals and accountability. I will end this section by exploring the changing roles of managers, teachers and parents within the managerialist structure.

### *Efficiency*

New managerialism and the market ideology introduce the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness into education, based on the notion that more efficient management will create better schools by freeing up resources and using them in a more effective manner. Efficiency may be translated into cost effectiveness, value for money, responsiveness to market forces, controls on spending, outsourcing of services, performance indicators, quality assurance, accountability, output measures and income generation (Lawton, 1992).

At face value, no one would object to the idea that educational institutions should run efficiently and effectively. However, there are paramount problems with this approach.

First, there is the danger that efficiency would become synonymous with pure “economism”, that is, the attempt to cut spending and increase the quantity of teaching regardless of the quality of education that is provided (Vandenberghe, 1999; Barton, 1998; Welch, 1998; Whitty et al, 1998; Randle & Brady, 1997).

Second, it is not even clear whether efficiency in education could be measured at all. It is based on the assumptions that a direct link between input and output can be established and that input costs and output benefits can be measured accurately. Both these assumptions are questionable. Furthermore, emphasis on efficiency provides opportunities for concealment and displacement of costs to parents, to the community or to other cost centres (off-budget costs) (Muetzelfeldt, 1995).

Third, it is argued that the corporate drive for efficiency is counterproductive as it lowers workforce morale and ultimately reduces output and profits (Troman, 2000). Similarly, Bottery (2000) maintains that management often uses job redundancy as a pretext to offload burnt-out workers and takes in fresher, cheaper workers in order to achieve greater efficiency. He argues that these are immoral practices that may increase employee insecurity, promote distrust in management and loss of commitment and loyalty to the organisation, which will eventually affect the organisation’s productivity.

Fourth, the notion of efficiency subjects schools and teachers to “human accounting”, that is, the grading of the effectiveness of individuals and organisations according to performance indicators; this reduces the idea of a good school to measurable criteria of performance whilst ignoring important aims and goals of education that extend beyond the measurable, such as social values (Morley & Rassool, 2000; Welch, 1998; Rees, 1995). This human accounting brings some critics to suggest that the drive for performance would create a “McDonald’s society”, (Ritzer, 1993) advancing distinctive notions of efficiency, quantification and calculability, predictability, control and profit (the bottom line). In education, efficiency means that time, space and people are all optimally managed. Quantification and calculability mean that everything is measured and costed. It therefore allows for competition, which rewards the winners and exposes the losers, as well as setting yardsticks by which teachers’ performance can be rated by their learners or peers. Predictability is achieved by emphasising systems and standardisation of educational outcomes. Control is attained by introducing non-human instead of human technology – a process which is referred to as the “dehumanisation” of education (Welch, 1998; Mok, 1997; Hartley, 1995).

Fifth, a major concern around the efficient management of schools is who benefits from the cost saving and, more importantly, who decides on the criteria that define what counts as costs and benefits (Fitzsimons, 1999). It has been argued that the money saved by efficient management is not used to promote educational needs, but is instead used for the “glossification” of the schools (Whitty & Power, 1997). This glossification seems to be focused on a number of core activities, such as the refurbishing and decoration of buildings, the production of publicity materials, communication with the press, prospectuses and a variety of public events (Gewirtz et al, 1995). It is also suggested that the efficient use of resources requires schools to make strategic marketing choices and to favour those clients who will bring the greatest return for the least investment; less attention is given to marginal and disadvantaged groups and there is increased segregation along the “ability” line (Vandenberghe, 1999; Welch, 1998; Randle & Brady, 1997). Good schools with more resources therefore attract the “good” pupils, while weak pupils occupy failing, weak schools, or schools that are facing economic crisis (Whitty et al, 1998).

Sixth, in order to control the extent to which schools are run efficiently, new levels and forms of bureaucracy are created which could offset the efficiency gains



and paradoxically bring back the same mechanism that managerialism tries to dispel (Morley & Rassool, 2000; Webster & Mosoetsa, 2001).

Lastly, adopting the corporate model of efficient management sends an incorrect message to the new generation about ethics and care. This argument has been taken up by Apple (2001) who maintains that most corporations are totalitarian institutions, where jobs are cut ruthlessly and profits are much more important than the lives, hopes and well being of long-standing employees. He questions whether this is the model that education should borrow. It therefore seems that the dilemma facing educational institutions is how to be both efficient and caring. The question is – can schools afford to care?

Gumport (2000) emphasises this point when she argues that when applying the logic of efficiency to higher education, the notions of creativity, caring, relationships, etc., are devalued and considered to be irrelevant. While she concurs that no one would deny that educational institutions have to survive financially, gains in one dimension mean losses in another. For example, a campus can generate resources while compromising its moral and social values:

The danger is that an attempt to gain legitimacy through the use of market discourse and managerial approaches may end up losing legitimacy by changing their business practice to such a degree that they move away from their historical character, functions and accumulated heritage as educational institutions (Gumport, 2000:87).

It therefore appears that under new managerialism, values such as care tend to be sidelined in the pursuit of monetary considerations. In the corporate context there is talk of respect, but not of care – neither for other persons nor for the environment (Hargreaves, 1994). When care is promoted, it is assigned a second-order status and it is conditioned upon managerial calculation rather than being given an unconditional ethical value (Bottery, 2000). The same applies to trust (Bottery, 2003), where trust in people has been shifted to trust in expertise and processes (Hargreaves, 1994). Moreover, Hargreaves emphasises that in the “knowledge society”, traditional types of paternalistic care, such as giving charity, are no longer enough. What is required is responsiveness to pupils’ diverse needs, ideas and feelings; care *‘must become a relationship in which those who are cared for (pupils or parents) have agency, dignity and a voice’* (2003:47). Moreover, care must not be restricted to one’s immediate community; care must be extended to those who cannot benefit from the global world.

To sum up, there is little evidence to suggest that education is benefiting from the new managerialist demand for efficiency. Quite the opposite is more likely. The literature review has demonstrated that the call for efficiency and financial gains creates social, cultural and personal losses, and that they tend to undermine values that educational systems should be fighting for, such as care and trust. Efficiency and financial benefits need to be carefully balanced against these social costs. This calls for leaders with a strong “moral purpose” (Fullan, 2001) who can ensure that the quest for efficiency will not compromise the social and moral agenda of education.

It has been assumed, yet not proven (Daun, 2002), that greater efficiency could be achieved by decentralising the decision-making process, bringing it closer to where the money is spent and thereby reducing the overhead costs associated with centralised administration. These claims will be investigated in the next section, where the notion of decentralisation, its conflictual character and its impact on education are examined.

### *Decentralisation*

Decentralisation has been a global trend in education systems since the late 1980s. Examples of this are School Based Management (SBM) in the United States and Canada, and Local Management of Schools (LMS) in England and Wales. Approaches to educational reform in the South African context after 1994 have also been constructed within the discourse of decentralisation, and this is provided for in the South Africa Schools Act 84 of 1996 (Fleisch, 2002, Sayed, 2002; 1999; Rossouw, 2001; Carrim, 2001).

The history of educational reform shows how educational governance shifted from decentralisation to centralisation and back to decentralisation, without having a significant impact on the problems they were intended to solve (Elmore, 1993; Tyack, 1993; Cuban, 1990). It seems that both processes are offered in order to solve the same problems, such as efficiency and cultural diversity (Bray, 1999). Moreover, Tyack (1993) argues that schools typically respond to demands for change by adding a new mechanism or agency, and those rarely disappear. Most changes in governance, whether centralisation or decentralisation, have therefore generally left institutional deposits and have resulted in school structures being more complicated than before.

Centralisation has been linked to the Fordist/Weberian/modernist ideal form of bureaucratic organisation, which is characterised by a set of rules and procedures with

strict lines of control and authority extending upwards through a pyramid hierarchy. The decision-making process is concentrated at a central or top authority, leaving tightly programmed routine implementation to lower levels in the organisation (Lauglo, 1995). It promotes coordination and integration, uniformity and standardisation as well as economies of scale. Centralisation is associated with strong nation states and has been extended to civilian public services and organisations operating in a modern society.

Decentralisation marks a shift away from this model towards a post-bureaucratic, post-Fordist regime, which emphasises outcomes rather than rules, and results rather than methods (Exworthy & Halford, 1999; Hatcher 1994). Decentralisation is seen as being more suitable for organisations that operate under conditions of instability in the postmodern society and need to become more flexible, responsive, dynamic and innovative so that they can respond quickly to opportunities or unanticipated problems. It is claimed that decentralised systems are democratic and can empower teachers and parents. Decentralised systems are perceived to be efficient, accountable and responsive to local needs. They seem to provide more flexibility and choice to individual schools, improve their effectiveness and quality and increase funds available to deserving teachers through performance-based payment (Astiz et al, 2002; Schlechty, 1991).

Decentralisation may be seen as a prerequisite for the introduction of market relations. Once discrete, semi-autonomous units are established, specific budgets can be attached and units can be instructed to carry out their own buying and selling of goods and services. Schools have more control over their budgets and day-to-day management, receiving funds according to a formula determined by the number of pupils (Exworthy & Halford, 1999). It is assumed that decentralised, semi-autonomous institutions would improve their performance in order to compete for clients and thereby access more funds. At the same time, clients (parents) would monitor the quality of education they obtain for their children.<sup>5</sup>

Interestingly, both governments and marginal groups favour decentralisation. For governments it means curbing expenditure and for oppositional or marginalised groups it means furthering their own interests. Lauglo (1995) explains that there are various rationales for decentralisation. There are those rationales that are concerned

---

<sup>5</sup> The limitations of these assumptions were discussed earlier in this chapter, in the section on the difference between markets and schools.

with quality and efficiency, such as professionalism, management by outcomes and market mechanisms, and there are political rationales for decentralisation, such as liberalism, participatory democracy, populist localism, etc. Lauglo argues further that in addition to the publicly manifested justifications for decentralisation, there are practical circumstances relating to the scale and complexity of the education system one wishes to reform. These practical considerations include the magnitude of the educational enterprise, the heterogeneity of the clientele, the financial burden of the central authorities, the problems with communication, the vested interests of those in authority in augmenting or defending their power and legitimacy and the political expediency for both concentrating and distributing authority. Weiler (1993) likewise maintains that decentralisation may be seen as an attempt by states to increase their legitimacy, to neutralise conflicts in society and to mobilise more resources from civil society. Elmore (1993) exemplifies this argument by maintaining that the move for either centralisation or decentralisation in the American education system was less about efficiency and more about politics. More specifically he sees it as a debate around the issue of *'how to construct a public for public education'* (38); in other words, what constitutes "the people" – is it the parents, the community or the broader society? And whose interests does decentralisation or centralisation serve?

Decentralisation is the main mechanism by which new managerialism shifts the power relations within a school. Decentralised systems increase the power of managers and lead to a stronger, hierarchical top-down-type management in schools, as well as to a wider gap between teachers and managers (Whitty et al, 1998). It appears that in decentralised systems, opportunities for the professional development of teachers are threatened rather than enhanced. Decentralisation therefore marginalises, de-professionalises and disempowers teachers, despite its democratising rhetoric (ibid). This de-professionalism of teachers is linked to the introduction of a new form of regulation over the profession. Traditionally to be professional meant to own both the ends and the means of education. As Hartley (1997) points out, however, under new managerialism, decentralisation separates the "ends" and the "means" of education. The control and regulation of teachers' labour is achieved through mechanisms such as accountability and performance-based payment (Lugalo, 1995).

From a critical point of view decentralisation could be seen as a purely budget cutting exercise (Bray, 1999; Whitty et al, 1998), and there is no clear indication that

it enhances pupils' achievements (Whitty et al, 1998) or efficiency (Elmore, 1993). It is argued that the rhetoric of devolution and decentralisation has made no real impact in practice; first, because most key decisions are not devolved (Bates, 1996), and second, because even when structures are decentralised, this does not mean that stakeholders at school level would know what to do with them (House, 1998). Braslavsky (2001) refers to the latter phenomenon as one of the paradoxes of decentralisation. She maintains that stakeholders are often disconcerted when the central authority withdraws, and are unable to maintain the old order or to set up a different one. Consequently, they demand the return of central authority to bring back the "good old times". Another paradox of educational decentralisation is the continuation of mediocrity or the maintenance of poor institutional and pedagogical practices learned under the previous regime. This happens when stakeholders do not wish the return of the old order, but at the same time they do not feel the need to create another order or to invent alternative forms of regulation or practices. Consequently, those stakeholders would mostly follow routine practices are no longer required (ibid) or would attempt to conserve or reinvent the past (Whitty et al, 1998).

In some instances decentralisation may be seen as a mechanism to shift to schools or teachers the responsibility to solve problems that the central agency could not solve before. In this way the legitimacy of the central agency is not threatened (Ball, 1998a; Whitty et al, 1998; Troman, 1996a; Lawton, 1992). In this view, decentralisation is seen as a manipulative system, which aims to absolve the central authority of much of its responsibility and allows the centre to distance itself from unpopular decisions while leaving the schools to deal with them (Morley, 1997).

Linked to this is the argument that new managerialism provides strong centralised control while giving the appearance that power has been devolved to individuals and autonomous institutions (Whitty et al, 1998). More bluntly, decentralisation has been perceived as mere window-dressing (de Clercq, 2002). Astiz et al (2002) attributed these contradictions to the conflictual process of globalisation, which has pushed nations and organisations into various mixes of decentralised and centralised educational systems. This has resulted in all kinds of paradoxes, such as in the case where authority is centralised and implementation is decentralised. Other instances include schools that manage themselves financially while the outcomes are centrally controlled (Vandenberghe, 1999; Elliot & Crossley, 1997; Whitty & Power,

1997; Boyd, 1992), or schools that self manage their budgets, while the conditions of funding are decided by a central agency (Hartly, 1994).

While decentralisation has been considered as a pre-condition for the establishment of market relations, there is an inherent contradiction between the concept of decentralisation and the essence of market ideology. As mentioned before, decentralisation claims to be a democratic move as it undertakes to place power in the hands of the stakeholders – principals, teachers, local communities and parents – so that they can develop the kind of education that reflects their preferences and interests. Decentralisation therefore relates to what has been described as a “stakeholder society” (Whitty et al, 1998). Market principles tend to foster a form of “possessive individualism”, which focuses on the needs of individuals, and is in contrast to decentralisation’s rhetoric of stakeholder society. It seems that the advocates of marketisation use the notion of community or stakeholders to evoke positive feelings towards the changes, especially since the rhetoric of “community” appeals to people from the “right” and also from the “left”. However, according to research undertaken by Whitty et al (1998), in practice most governments are reluctant to encourage communities to build their own schools, and that most schools are centrally controlled.

In summary, the idea of decentralisation is seen to be paradoxical and precarious. It is driven by both political and economic imperatives. Politically, it claims to be a democratic process, which could increase the flexibility and responsiveness of schools to the diversified needs of local communities, and would give more power to stakeholders to develop the type of education that reflects their preferences. From an economic perspective, decentralisation claims to reduce the inefficiencies of bureau-professionalism, thereby decreasing the costs of education. However, research has hardly confirmed these assumptions, but rather claims that what decentralisation appears to be giving with one hand it takes away with the other. Devolution of power is therefore offset by control mechanisms, such as outcomes and goal setting. The rhetoric of empowerment and autonomy is counteracted with performativity and regulation devices, such as contracts and performance indicators. These control mechanisms, however, carry their own conflictual nature, as the following sections will demonstrate.

### *Goal setting*

In the managerial way of thinking, an organisation needs to promote a corporate mission, with goals, targets, monitoring procedures and performance measurement (Morley & Rassool, 2000). For schools this means plans, mission statements, targets, strategies and the production of symbols that schools are expected to have. Those who advocate the market ideology, such as Chubb and Moe, argue that when schools define their core business (just as a firm like McDonald's does) and select students on that basis, they would run more efficiently.

The potential advantages of achieving consensus among school staff, management and other stakeholders about the goals of schools and the ways to achieve them, is not debatable. What is new in the new managerialist thinking is the idea that shared goals are now dictated by the harsh realities of the market, in which schools sink or swim (Hatcher, 1994). Meyer (2002) asserts that the notion of clear goals is especially attractive to those educational organisations that operate in volatile and turbulent contexts. By defining their goals and missions these institutions can decide which activities should be "inside" or "outside" their boundaries. In this way, institutions could respond to the demands of the changed environment and eliminate some of the uncertainties created by the market.

The notion of clear goal setting in education raises some important questions. The first pertinent question to ask is whether this corporate technique is compatible with the way schools function. Reimer and McGinn (1997) argue that schools are not rational organisations that work systematically towards clearly articulated goals, but are rather complex and irrational organisations with hazy and multiple goals. Moreover, in education it is not even obvious who the "customers" are, whose interests the system should serve and to whom it is accountable. This undoubtedly is what makes education a complex and difficult enterprise to manage.

Yet Reimer and McGinn acknowledge that schools fail because they do not have clear goals and visions and because they are trying to do too many things and to satisfy too many stakeholders. They also concede that in many cases the variety of goals and needs results in the creation of various functionary bodies within the organisation, which they describe as *'quilts to which patches have been added over the years'* (1997:47). The multiplicity of goals and agendas create duplication of and confusion about functions, as well as poor coordination and communication between different units within the organisation. Moreover, the unspoken targets and strategies



of the staff who work in the organisation often influence goal setting and could prevail over declared goals and objectives.

In the new managerialist thinking less attention is given to the way in which schools function while there is an expectation that the establishment of clear goals would resolve inherent tensions. Educationalists disagree. Hargreaves (1995) rejects this corporate approach and suggests that schools should find a balance between bland and vacuous missions which appeal to many different interests and between mission statements which can become so fixed that they will not enable schools to respond to changing needs. He therefore advocates that schools have “moving missions” which are temporary and approximate and do not require complete consensus.

The second question revolves around whose goals and missions are promoted. Hargreaves’s (1994) distinction between vision and voice is a useful concept to debate this issue. Hargreaves maintains that in the postmodern context, the voice of teachers, which was previously marginalised, should be heard. However, the rise of dissident voices threatens traditional centres of power and control. Hargreaves therefore maintains that there is a strong sense that the vision that is articulated is the principal’s vision, while teachers learn to suppress their own voices. Real collaboration means creating a vision together. By complying with the vision of management, ownership of the educational endeavour is individual rather than collective and hierarchical.

The third question is how consensus can be achieved. For Hatcher (1994) the notion of common consensus, or a shared vision within a school, is bound to fail. This failure derives from the conflicts present in working relations within both schools and wider society. He therefore proposes that a call for consensus is sometimes merely rhetorical. At the most it can create an enforced collaboration or “contrived collegiality” (Hargreaves, 1991) which meets the implementation needs of bureaucratic systems rather than the development needs of teachers and schools.

Consensus and shared goals have the propensity to be exclusive rather than inclusive. Bottery (2000) makes this point by arguing that goal setting represses any critical individual reflections and excludes those with a different mind-set. Moreover, it contrives to eliminate pluralism and the associated conflict of values. It consequently promotes a totalitarian remedy to an existential problem, instead of developing a societal culture in which individuals learn to appreciate and to struggle with diverse views and experiences. Educational institutions should therefore

welcome conflict and resistance, and should perceive them as a sign of a healthy change process that provides stakeholders with the opportunity to deal with the emotions of change (Fullan, 2001). Fullan also argues that leaders who surround themselves with only like-minded people trade off a smooth beginning for failed implementation.

The fourth question is what types of goals are likely to be promoted when adopting the corporate techniques of setting clear goals. It seems that these are increasingly defined as instrumental and narrow and that they tend to focus on the short term and the quantitative, at the expense of the broader, more qualitative and long-term goals (Bottery, 2000). Moreover, when targets are set beyond the reachable, they tend to exclude or stress those who cannot attain them.

Simkins (2000) compares the bureau-professional agendas to those of new managerialism. He maintains that the former are based on the needs of individual clients and client groups as interpreted by the professionals. The latter focuses on organisational objectives and outcomes, as defined by managers in response to their interpretations of the environmental forces which the organisation faces. There is therefore the perception that the norms of bureau-professionalism are defined in terms of the well being, needs and rights of clients, while those of managerialism are based on concepts of efficiency, organisational performance and customer orientation.

The fifth question that the notion of setting clear goals raises, is how to achieve these goals. In the new managerialist way of thinking it is not enough for goals to be articulated clearly at the top – it is also important that the culture of the organisation will be changed to achieve these goals. The attempt to change the culture of an organisation is referred to as “internal marketisation” (Hartley, 1999) or “corporate culturism” (Willmott, 1993). It aims to shift bureaucratic control towards techniques of ideological control, based on the manipulation of company culture (Hatcher, 1994). This means that the educational system has to achieve compliance not by coercion but rather by the development of a “corporate culture”; the control of the workforce therefore becomes subtle and indirect. In this form of control, or governmentality, employees are encouraged to identify with the corporate goals by internalising new attitudes until they can no longer see contradictions or injustices within their organisation. This approach attempts to determine how staff think and feel about their work, which sometimes requires managing the hearts and souls of employees (Hochschild, 1983). In this view, the art of management becomes

manipulation. It demands loyalty from employees and at the same time it excludes, silences, punishes or harasses staff who do not appear to have “appropriate attitudes” (Willmott, 1993; Pollitt, 1993). On the other hand, those who devote themselves to the realisation of key corporate objectives would derive a sense of meaning as well as material incentives. Gunter (1997) likewise criticises the manipulative use of management techniques. She claims that these strategic tools provide organisations with a false sense of certainty and will fail to rescue an organisation, mainly because they disregard history and context and because they fail to understand how history provides a counter culture to the consensus-building approach.

This section suggests that researchers are sceptical as to whether the rational managerialist approach, which requires organisations to define shared goals and missions, is workable in educational settings, desirable, inclusive or ethical. It is argued that clear goal setting fails to give recognition to the complexity of change and to the people who work in an organisation. Moreover, it tends to focus on like-minded people by ignoring those with different ideas. This points to another contradiction within the managerial discourse that advocates both exclusion and inclusion. Decentralisation is offered, based on its responsiveness to the diverse needs of the community. At the same time, the articulation of clear goals has the unintended consequence of narrowing the borders of the community so that goals can be pursued more efficiently. It therefore seems that the same contradictory pattern of new managerialism emerges. The gains that the drive for democracy, choice and decentralisation intend to achieve are taken away by the imposition of organisational cohesiveness and defined goals and borders, thereby creating homogeneous organisations where comparison and competitiveness between employees can be identified and regulated. Control over the market may be achieved through standardising measurements, examinations, textbooks, performance indicators, contracts and other accountability mechanisms. These will be discussed in the next section.

### *Accountability*

Accountability is a central feature in new managerialism. Like any private business in the free market, schools live or die depending on their results. Schools and teachers must therefore demonstrate that they can influence pupils' outcomes. This calls for visibility and transparency.

Educational accountability includes at least four parts: information about the performance (test scores, etc.); standards for judging this performance; consequences (rewarding success and punishing failure); and an agent or constituency that receives information on the performance, judges the extent to which standards have been met and distributes rewards and sanctions accordingly (Newmann et al, 1997). It is assumed that an accountability system based on these four parts will motivate teachers to work harder and to become more effective in meeting clear goals for student performance. Linked to that is the introduction of a *contract of performance*, where quality assurance will be achieved by detailed performance targets.

This type of accountability is best described as external accountability, as teachers are held accountable to an outside body. External accountability relies on performance indicators. It excludes non-observable and non-quantifiable features of education and ignores the unintended effects of learning in favour of the predictable and the measurable (Elliott & Crossley, 1997). Subsequently, accountability may exclude essential aspects of teaching that are not easily measured or even noticed, such as a caring approach to pupils or the human qualities and the emotions that teachers bring into the teaching situation. External accountability is distinct from internal accountability, whereby teachers are held accountable to each other and to other stakeholders by their shared responsibility, expectations and values (Abelmann & Elmore, 1999). Research supports the view that internal accountability, which is based on a strong normative environment and on a belief in the capacity and efficacy of teachers and principals to affect students' learning, is more related to school performance than to external accountability (ibid).

While it is difficult to argue against the logic that schools should be accountable, it is unclear how this is to be achieved (Astiz et al, 2002). Accountability is a specifically ambiguous concept since there is no clarity with regard to '*who is to be accountable to whom for what*' (Elmore, 1993:45). Moreover, the implementation of accountability mechanisms is a complicated process (Fuhrman, 1999; Abelmann & Elmore, 1999; Newmann et al, 1997). Fuhrman (1999), for example, maintains that in theory, the new accountability gives schools much autonomy – as long as they perform. However, when the outcomes are not satisfactory, accountability serves to strengthen the involvement of the central agency in local affairs, a point that was also taken by Simkins (2000) and Scribner et al (1994). Fuhrman (1999) challenges policy makers and educators to deal with the inherent conflicts and contradictions of external

accountability systems by devising a new accountability system that will provide more flexibility to the schools to maximise student performance.

Critics of new managerialism view accountability as a mechanism for the regulation and control of teachers' work. It has been viewed as a device that replaces professionalism and as a mechanism that subjects academics to measurement by performance indicators (Welch, 1998a; Ball 1997a). It has also been seen as a way to transfer the responsibility of effective education (the "means" of education) on to teachers, while allocating the regulatory and monitoring role (the "ends" of education) to central governance (Morley & Rassool, 2000).

Hood (1994) argues that accountability is based on a basic distrust of teachers, and that in order to control the labour of untrustworthy agents, managers have to spell out goals with maximum precision and set up monitoring and incentive schemes. Ball (2000; 1997b) adds that this distrust affects both the institution and the individuals. At the institutional level there is a danger that authentic social relations are replaced with judgemental relations wherein individuals are valued for their productivity alone. At the individual level there is the possibility that commitment, judgement and authenticity within practice are sacrificed for impression and performance. Teachers are perceived to compromise their own judgements about "good practices" and students' "needs" to comply with the rigours of performance, and incur "costs" to the self in this process, such as alienation, inauthentic practice and meaningless relationships.

Accountability may be viewed as another discourse of power provided by those who control the quality of the performance (Ball, 2000). As has been argued before, however, power creates resistance. Ball maintains that as a response/resistance/ accommodation to the "terrors of performativity" (after Lyotard) and the demands for visibility and transparency, teachers tend to use fabrication and to promote a culture of opacity. By paraphrasing Foucault, Ball defines fabrications as the '*versions of an organisation (or person) which do not exist... they are produced purposefully in order to be accountable. Truthfulness is not the point – the point is their effectiveness, in the market or for the inspection, as well as the work they do "on" and "in" the organisation – their transformational impact*' (ibid:9). The paradox of fabrication is that, on the one hand, they are '*an escape from the gaze*' (ibid), but on the other hand fabricating the organisation indicates submission to the rigours of performativity and competition. Fabrication therefore becomes something

to be sustained, and adhering to that replaces authenticity and commitment. As a result, Ball argues, performativity and accountability do not just change what teachers do, but who teachers become. He therefore sees accountability as a struggle for the teacher's soul.

It is feasible to suggest that the attempt to capture teachers' souls is the managerialist alternative for commitment. Traditionally, educators were expected to have commitment to the work, rather than to be subjected to the power of targets, standards, performance indicators and contracts. Commitment is tied up with the notion that teaching is an emotional labour (Hargreaves, 1998). Teachers need to *feel* so they can judge and plan what and how they teach. Moreover, Hargreaves (ibid) found that when teachers are emotionally engaged with their work they are prepared to work beyond the official call.

The notion of commitment must be treated with caution. First, it is idealistic to consider all teachers as committed or involved. Second, a compliant loyalty among colleagues could camouflage incompetence by moving problem teachers and managers around the system instead of confronting them (Hargreaves, 2003). Third, there is also a danger in uninformed commitment (groupthink) when the group goes uncritically with a powerful leader, including only like-minded people and excluding other ways of thinking and being (Fullan, 2001). Leaders therefore need to constantly check against uninformed commitment and at the same time they need to create the conditions in which teachers will cultivate their commitment, bearing in mind that internal commitment and loyalty cannot be activated from the top but must be nurtured by the various leaders at all levels of the organisation (ibid).

In conclusion, accountability, like the other tenets of new managerialism previously discussed, carries its own contradictions. I argue that much depends on how it is implemented, who determines what counts as valuable or effective performance and who decides on the validity of the measures or indicators. By applying the notion of power to the analysis of accountability, it may be viewed as a control and regulatory mechanism that could increase fabrications, inauthenticity and the alienation of teachers from their work. Commitment has been suggested as a contrasting feature, but the limits of this concept have also been noted.

*New managerialism and educational stakeholders*

I have so far critically analysed the main principles of new managerialism and its inherent contradictions and paradoxes. As mentioned earlier, Pollitt (1993) proposes that new managerialism as an ideology represents a shift in the relations of power between stakeholders, and that it is developed and maintained by social groups such as managers, owners, governments, etc. who may find it convenient to adopt selectively some of its techniques. The purpose of this section is to explore the new roles and positions of managers, teachers and parents in the new managerialist context.

*The changing role of the manager*

New managerialism glamorises managers, increases their authority and gives them the freedom to manage (Simkins, 2000; Morley & Rassool, 2000; Exworthy & Halford, 1999; Hartley, 1999). The global rise of the “management guru” (Whitty et al, 1998) and the remarkable growth of the education management industry with its technicist “management by ringbinder” approach (Gunter, 1997) are indicative of the perceived significance of management. Management in this approach is seen as a generic skill, which does not require field expertise. It is assumed that all organisations are basically the same, and that they all need to be managed efficiently. Principals are viewed in the same light as the CEO in industry (Grace, 1997). Power is concentrated at the top, either in the hands of the principal alone in small schools, or in the hands of the principal and a like-minded management team in larger schools (Whitty et al, 1998).

It is argued that new managerialism requires strong managers who are “multilingual” in the sense that they can move from the older language of school as a public service to the managerialist language of school management, which includes the language of the market (competition, choice and decentralisation), the language of financial management (cost effective, efficiency, performance-related payment) and the new educational discourse (accountability, standards, outcomes). This involves an ability to argue that these languages are compatible and could enhance good educational practices (Gewirtz & Ball, 2000).

In this view, managers are held responsible for the performance of their institutions, for increased enrolment and for ensuring compliance with demands. Managers are often required to implement efficiently and smoothly goals that have



been set outside the schools by regulating and controlling teachers' work towards the achievement of these goals. In this process the role of managers and their sense of identity are being redefined. It is perceived that the self concept of principals has had to shift from that of educational leader/paternalist/community servant to that of a manager/salesperson of an education commodity (Menter et al, 1997). However, the trajectory and the quality of that shift seem to depend on local and institutional factors, such as the market position of the institution within the local competitive arena, the micropolitics of the school, etc. (Gewirtz & Ball, 2000).

Research is inconclusive as to the extent to which the management of schools is becoming more or less participative (Simkins, 2000). Some researchers observe a tendency towards non-consultative or pseudo-consultative decision-making processes (Gewirtz et al, 1995). Other research identifies a trend towards the establishment of "middle management", that is, deputy heads, coordinators or heads of subject departments (Simkins, 2000). Research evidence suggests that middle managers play a crucial role in mediating change by "buffering" potential conflict between senior managers and academics. The research proposes that the majority of middle managers operate strategically to ensure that their staff is protected and that educational values are promoted as far as possible within the new management culture (Gleeson & Shain, 1999). Some researchers propose that the manager's power should not be exaggerated. For example, Flynn (1999) suggests that subordinates may challenge and evade managerial direction overtly or covertly by various means. Wallace and Pocklington (2002) likewise suggest that the power of the manager is constrained by the agency of other stakeholders and by structural factors that set limits to the extent of the manager's agency.

The response of managers to new managerialism varies. Principals adapt to or resist their changed role (Grace, 1997). This depends on their individual preferences, styles of leadership and their assumptions about the nature of who and what is being managed. Some managers are attracted to the new language and culture of managerialism and perceive it as a progression up the career ladder (Exworthy & Halford, 1999; Whitty et al, 1998; Randle & Brady, 1997; Menter et al, 1997). In some cases it appears that managers make an active decision to use the new managerialist rhetoric for their own ends; some managers even use "bullying" strategies. Other managers have continued to function in the traditional bureau-professional style, combined with a grudging acceptance of market imperatives

(Simkins, 2000). It seems that even those principals who do not believe that the markets or new managerialism are the solutions to all educational ills, have to operate on those principles in order to be able to compete, stay in control and enjoy their enhanced status (Grace, 1997).

Whitty et al (1998) do not assume that managers are the “winners” of new managerialism, as they themselves are being subjected to new forms of accountability. Australia and New Zealand report high principal turnover. Moreover, the nature of their work has changed: it is more intense and focuses on finances, buildings, external demands, issues of “corporate” image and effectiveness (Simkins, 2000; Gewirtz & Ball, 2000; Randle & Brady, 1997). It is important to note that principals are usually drawn from the teaching workforce, sometimes more for political reasons than suitability (Menter & Muschamp, 1999; Reimer & McGinn, 1997). This could make the situation even more complicated for principals as they have to adopt a new value system. Many of them do not have the training or the personality to do so. Engaging in a complex change process without the competency to do so leads to low self-efficacy, insecurity and a tendency to revert to more centralised decision making, thereby reintroducing the problems of centralised bureaucracy (Reimer & McGinn, 1997). Linked to this is the supposition that managers may welcome cultural homogeneity and subsequently the absence or removal of ideas, people and situations that challenge them or their new authority within the context of new managerialism (Willmott, 1993).

This notion of a strong manager is criticised on ethical and practical grounds. Grace (1997) advocates democratic governance. He maintains that the call for one strong person in charge of the change process is based on Chubb and Moe’s flawed idea that reforms must be imposed on teachers who would naturally resist the introduction of market forces into education, mainly because their jobs are threatened if they and their school do not perform. Grace (ibid) argues that this assumption ignores the effects that such an imposition has on the lowering of the morale and on the feeling of ownership. Fullan strongly advocates that leadership must be cultivated at all levels of the organisation. He warns against the notion of the charismatic “super-leader” who would rescue the organisation in times of crisis. He maintains that this kind of leadership will provide episodic relief followed ‘*by frustrated or despondent dependency*’ (2000:1). Fullan believes that leaders, rather than managers, are the key to successful educational change mostly because of the complexity of educational

change and its attendant emotions. Leaders should have the right qualities, namely, moral purpose, understanding of change, the ability to build relationships, to create and share knowledge and to tolerate ambiguity while pursuing coherence.

Moral and ethical management of schools is about both “ends” and “means”. The new managerialist notion of a strong manager who achieves results emphasises the “ends” but pays less attention to the “means”. In this context Bottery (2000) argues that because managerialism makes the periphery responsible for the implementation of policies that have been formulated at the centre, it hauls out the ethical core of leadership and reduces it essentially to a technical-rational function.

It is claimed that the practices associated with new managerialism increase the professional and social distance between those who manage and those who are managed, that is, teachers, due to the division of values and purposes (Gewirtz & Ball, 2000; Hartley, 1999; Whitty et al, 1998; Woods et al, 1997; Elliott & Crossley, 1997; Randle & Brady, 1997). This cultural distance is created since senior management needs to adopt corporate views, while teachers’ prime concern is the needs of individual pupils (Simkins, 2000; Fergusson, 2000). There is evidence that in some cases, management and teachers are unable to engage in effective communication or to reach consensus on their contested values (Elliot & Crossley, 1997). Consequently, there is an increase in both manipulation and micro-political activity on the part of heads and their staff (Ozga, 2000). This can impact negatively on any educational reform because positive relationships among the school community are imperative in order to achieve effective change (Fullan, 2001).

#### *The changing role of teachers*

Change puts some people in the limelight and others in the shadows (Bascia & Hargreaves, 2000). The new managerialism thinking changes the school as a workplace by shifting power within the organisation and by placing managers at the leading edge of change, while professionals find themselves at the “sharp edge” (Flynn, 1999; Clarke et al, 2000).

As alluded to before, globalisation exerts pressure on schools to prepare students to live and work in the knowledge society. Consequently, Hargreaves (2003) maintains, teachers find themselves caught in a triangle of competing interests and imperatives. First, they need to be *catalysts* of the knowledge society, promoting the skills and knowledge to prepare pupils and societies for economic productivity –

teaching for the knowledge society. Second, teachers need to be *counterpoints* for the knowledge society, concerning themselves not only with performance and cognitive development, but also with cultivating moral, caring and trusting characters – teaching beyond the knowledge society. And third, teachers are also the *casualties* of the knowledge society which has high and diverse expectations of teachers, while at the same time subjecting them to cost cutting, downsizing, increased class sizes, increased working hours and other efficiency-motivated reforms, as well as standardisation and prescribed outcomes. In this scenario teachers are expected to teach despite the knowledge society.

The notion of teachers as the casualties of the new social and economic order is a common thread in the research that explores the impact of new managerialism and marketisation on teachers and teaching (see also Whitty, 1997; Hatcher, 1994). In a market sense, teachers are the source of cost within the organisation rather than an added value (Menter et al, 1997). This would inevitably propel those who manage schools to consider cheaper substitutions, for example, employing newly qualified rather than experienced teachers; utilising a flexible workforce and coercing teachers to work “more for less” (Hargreaves, 2003; Menter & Muschamp, 1999; Whitty, 1997). It is found that new managerialism increasingly marginalises teachers, excludes them from participating in substantive decision making (Smyth, 2002) and de-professionalise teachers (Fink & Stoll, 1998; Woods & Jeffrey, 1996; Bates, 1996). De-professionalisation involves the dilution of the quality of the teaching profession, the lowering of academic standards, the deterioration of teachers’ pay, autonomy and conditions, as well as the assessment of performance by external agencies which weaken the professionals’ control over their labour (Menter & Meschamp, 1999; Randle & Brady, 1997; Hatcher, 1994). Moreover, under new managerialism teachers are viewed as skilled technicians rather than as reflexive practitioners. As such they are expected to attain specific learning outcomes instead of developing the pupils’ diverse potentials; their motivation is perceived to be extrinsic instead of intrinsic and their form of accountability is based on contractual compliance instead of on professional commitment (Whitty et al, 1998).

On the other hand, some research findings suggest that new managerialism also re-skills teachers. For example, re-skilling occurs in the learning of new assessment procedures (Menter & Muschamp, 1999), in learning how to budget and marketise schools and by increasing teachers’ flexibility (Hatcher, 1994; Troman,

1996). New managerialism can therefore provide opportunities for teachers to take new responsibility and to pursue the rewards that come with this (Conley & Goldman, 1995). It has also been found to have a positive impact on enterprising teachers who are able to acknowledge the managerialist aspects that can benefit the schools while neutralising the undesirable ones (Forrester, 2000; Shain & Gleeson, 1999; Woods & Jeffrey, 1996).

Recent research on the impact of new managerialism on teachers focuses extensively on the emotional and social effects. It is argued that under new managerialism teaching is no longer seen as a secure occupation and a job for life. This insecurity is reinforced by the increase in short-term contracts and part-time working arrangements, which claim to provide schools with the flexibility to respond to market changes (Avis, 1996; Hatcher, 1994). This has created resentment and tension between those on the permanent staff and those who have had fixed-term contracts (Webster & Mosoetsa, 2001).

As teachers are faced with uncertainty about the future (including the possibility of retrenchment), their main concern becomes their self-preservation. Consequently, it is found that teachers are set against each other as they attempt to calculate their utility value to the school, turning the school into a fractured organisation (Menter et al, 1997; Gillborn, 1994). Research reports that some teachers are so anxious that they constantly watch their backs and tell “bogy” stories about heads and inspectors (Tebbutt & Marchington, 1997).

With the intensification of work, teachers have less time in staff rooms where they used to socialise with colleagues. There is therefore less informal interaction of the kind that induces personal trust. As a result, social relationships in schools become more formalised through such organisational structures as “contrived collegiality”, whereby collaboration is mandated rather than facilitated (Hargreaves, 1991). This control and regulation of academic labour has replaced collegiality, trust and professional discretion and has supported a culture of uncertainty and alienation (Deem, 1998; Menter et al, 1997; Webb & Vulliamy, 1996; Hargreaves, 1994),

New managerialism affects personal identities and impacts on teachers’ physical and emotional well-being. Some teachers experience increased levels of stress and a breakdown in close and intimate relationships both at work and at home (Troman, 2000). Other teachers react to change by separating the real self from the professional identity and live a double life (Halford & Leonard, 1999). It is found that

teachers present two very different accounts of their views of the change – one public and one private. The public view is positive, while the private view is negative. This contradiction contributes to teachers' stress and low morale (Menter & Muschamp, 1999).

As discussed, new managerialism marginalises teachers, reduces their economic benefit, undermines their professionalism and autonomy and creates strained relationships between teachers and managers. At the same time, it is important for management to demonstrate that teachers support the managerial regime, that they are accountable and that there is consensus on the shared goals and the means to realise them. In order to manufacture this image there is a growing engagement in the internal marketisation of the relationship between managers and teachers. The worker/teacher may become regarded as an internal customer who needs to be “enchanted” by the manager/principal. It is assumed that once teachers become satisfied customers, they will make pupils happy. This internal marketisation has been seen as a new rhetoric of compliance in the management of teachers, whereby emotions are instrumentalised for performative purposes (Hartley, 1999). Willmott (1993) is highly critical of this tactic, which he perceives to be another corporate technique to achieve compliance. He maintains that in the corporate cultures of new managerialism, employees do not only have to act in a technically competent manner but also have to think along these lines. In this context even criticism is considered to be disloyal. Employees must “buy in” or “get out”. Consequently, their democratic rights and their freedom of speech and thought – with the challenges and insecurities that they bring along – have been curtailed.

Research and observation suggest that teachers both resist and comply with changes. Their resistance can be overt, covert or subversive (Randle & Brady, 1997; Elliott & Crossley, 1997; Troman, 1996). It is suggested that teachers eventually stop resisting because of fatigue and concern with their own professional survival (Gillborn, 1994). Compliance, on the other hand, does not mean that innovations will be implemented in full. Compliance may breed mediocrity as teachers might change just enough to win in the market place or to receive the desired incentives (Sergiovanni, 1998). Some teachers have lost interest in their work or have left the profession (Chisholm, 1999; Woods et al, 1997; Menter et al, 1997; Troman, 1996). Others are reported to become sceptical and to adopt a passive “wait and see” attitude (Conley & Goldman, 1995).

Woods et al (1997) summarise the different modes of teachers' reactions: *the supportive conformists* – these are pragmatic teachers who learn to pace themselves differently according to the new demands; *the surviving conformists* – those who lose their spontaneity and vision and feel reduced to a “machine”; *the disturbed conformists* – the angry and cynical; *the non-compliants* – those who are defiant, confused and try to reclaim other areas of their lives; *and diminished individuals* – those who have been reduced to struggling for survival in a damaging context.

In conclusion, new managerialism comes with a fundamental distrust in teachers. It aims to reduce the cost of teachers and teaching and therefore requires teachers to work “more for less”. Teachers' autonomy is taken away and there is an attempt to control their labour externally by contracts, performance criteria, specific outcomes, the setting of clear goals and other accountability measures. This discourse is mostly criticised in the literature as it contradicts the previous discourse of professionalism and exacerbates a situation whereby teachers are demoralised, demotivated and disillusioned.

While the discourse of new managerialism has systematically disadvantaged and pressurised teachers, it claims to give more power to parents and the community. This is based on the notion that new managerialism shifts the discourse education from the “provider capture” to the “consumer capture”. The question is whether, in practice, the parents and the community are the real winners of new managerialism. This is the topic of the next section.

#### *The changing role of parents*

Decentralisation goes hand in hand with the call for greater parental choice and participation in schools. There is, however, an increasing sense of confusion and puzzlement among parents with regard to their role in the education of their children. Are they supposed to be supporters, partners, co-educators, governors or customers? (Bridges, 1994). Bridges allocates to each role different levels of participation as well as its own conflictual characteristics.

*Parents as supporters* are required to support the work of schools by ensuring that their children act in accordance with school requirements as far as dress code, attendance and homework are concerned. Parents need to support school events, contribute to school funds, become members of a PTA (Parent–Teacher Association), etc. In this notion parents are expected to routinely support the school regardless of



whether they are able to choose the school for their children, whether their values and goals are compatible with those of the schools, and whether the schools offer them opportunity for participation in devising the school mission.

*Parents as partners* are seen as participants in the education process: it implies a move towards more equal distribution of power in the relationship between parents and schools. This partnership can only directly engage a small number of parents. The notion of parents as partners is based on the recognition that real support needs consent and responsibility. Parents therefore need to be actively involved and take responsibility for all aspects of schooling. However, this seems to be more rhetorical than practical and could be easily manipulated. This point is raised by Thody (1994a) who maintains that the perception of democracy and empowered citizens is mostly illusionary. She questions whether the motivation behind the rhetoric of delegating more power to parents is to obscure where the real power in fact lies or another way by which the government can cut its expenses by getting '*volunteer, part-time, unpaid, public servants*' (ibid:13). Arnstein (1969) likewise argues that citizen participation and their level of involvement can be described along a continuum starting from the level of non-participation, whereby authorities manipulate and offer empty rituals of participation without any real power, to a higher level which offers varied degrees of tokenism, such as informing, consultation or placation, to the highest level of citizen power, in which she includes partnership, delegation of power and citizen control.

*Parents as co-educators* are, together with the teachers, held responsible for their children's academic achievements. The main features of this category are a sharing of power, mutuality, shared aims and goals, joint action with parents, professionals and pupils working together and responsive dialogue. Again, this seems to be more rhetoric than practice (Bridges, 1994).

*Parents as governors* – Bridges (ibid) refers to the United Kingdom experience whereby parents as governors became a movement in the marketised context of the 1980s and 1990s. He maintains that a large percentage of these parents are bewildered by the new responsibilities and lack the stomach for sometimes politicised conflicts; that there is little measurement of accountability and that most parents-governors do not feel empowered by their positions. Again, parents as governors could only relate to a small number of parents, and they are supposed to represent community rather than individual needs.

Even though governing bodies is a relatively recent phenomenon in South Africa, there is research evidence that their achievements are uneven and are contingent on social conditions (Karlsson, 2002). These findings echo research from New Zealand (Robinson et al, 2003) and the United Kingdom (Thody, 1994; Deem & Brehony, 1993). Deem (1996), who views governing schools as a political activity, argues that decentralisation has given greater local control and autonomy to lay people who are not expected to have any educational expertise. She further maintains that governors are often co-opted rather than elected; that they are usually those who have the time, money and cultural and political capital to enable them to assist others in a voluntary capacity, and that their outlooks are therefore not always consistent with the individuals they are supposed to represent. She concludes that governing bodies are neither particularly efficient nor democratic and that the decision-making process does not ensure full participation. Robinson et al (2003) refer to the capacity of the governing body to perform their roles. They argue that capacity does not only relate to individual capabilities but is dependent on the match between the individuals' abilities, the functions that they are supposed to fulfil and the organisational structures that can support these functions. They assign a greater role to the government in developing local capacity in order to make governing bodies both democratic and effective.

*Parents as customers/consumers* – The notion of parents as customers represents a radical change from all the other roles. As customers, parents are clients for a service that is provided by someone else. They are perceived to have a greater control over, and choice in, the education of their children, described elsewhere as “parentocracy” (Brown, 1990). The paradox is that parents have the choice, not to participate, but to complain if they are not getting what they want, or to choose another institution. This concept marks ‘*the triumph of individualistic ethos of competition for personal self-interest over the collectivist ethos of collaboration in the interests of general welfare*’ (Bridges, 1994:73). As discussed before, parents are, however, not informed customers.<sup>6</sup> Hartley (1999) maintains that parents often do not make rational choices based on objective evidence and that other factors may apply, mostly based on emotional, irrational or intuitive criteria.

---

<sup>6</sup> See also the discussion on schools as quasi market earlier in this chapter.

Whereas in the past, discussions around parents and schools have focused on how parents should fulfil their responsibilities as co-educators, the new managerialist discourse outlines the obligation of schools to fulfil their responsibilities towards parents (Whitty et al, 1998). The relations between schools and parents have become contractual. Whitty et al maintain that in many cases these contracts tend to ensure that parents will support schools and that they have the right disposition towards school policies. So while these measures are usually presented as a mechanism by which market forces make schools more accountable to parents, in some cases they use the notion of partnership to make parents more accountable to schools. It is possible, Whitty et al argue, that we are witnessing not only the commodification of students but also the commodification of parents. Linked to that is Hargreaves' (1997) observation that when parents are clients and consumers, the contractual relations between them and the school tends to fracture the community sense, privileging one section of the community, while marginalising others.

Deem and Brehony (1993) argue that the notions of consumer and parent power seem to militate against harmonious partnerships between schools and parents, where consensus is most likely to be achieved in situations where the issues under debate are not directly related to teaching and learning. In another study, Deem (1994) reiterates that the conceptualisation of lay participation as consumers decreases the amount of democratic involvement in the educational system and tends to privilege private, individual interests over the wider public interests.

The emphasis on individual interests over public interests poses a particular challenge to the Catholic Church, which resonates with my study. The essence of the conflict is the gap between the individual rights of parents as consumers, and the Church's position by which an emphasis is given to the Church and the community in determining the direction of their schools (Arthur, 1994). There is the possibility that the parents as either governors or customers could change the Catholic character in a school since they could technically take over the governance of these schools and impose their own ethos. The conflict, as Grace (2002) points out, is between an essentially authoritarian and hierarchical leadership, which takes the role of defender of the community and "public good", and between groups of school governors and parents who claim to be the democratic voice of lay involvement on the future of Catholic schools. This conflict is further complicated by the Church's emphasis on the role of the family in the education of their children, which contradicts its tendency to

exclude parents with different voices from the administration of the schools (Arthur, 1994). In the past, when this conflict was brought to test and after parents were prepared to “take the cardinal to court”, the Church conceded to the parents. This has been perceived as a clear victory for the marketisation process and for the ideology of “parentocracy” in the United Kingdom (ibid).

In summary, as market forces and the discourse of new managerialism increasingly influence education, the relationship between parents and schools has been redefined. It seems that parental entitlement emanates from the right to choose rather than to participate in the management of schools. The parents’ role has shifted from the more democratic conceptions of parents as partners or co-educators to being customers and governors. It is argued that both these positions have had intended and unintended consequences for education. In many cases these are dependent on local and institutional conditions as well as on political expediency.

This narrative further suggests that the changing role of parents towards the concept of customers is especially intricate in the context of faith-based community schools, where parents’ rights challenge what has been perceived to be the authority of the church. This raises some related questions: To whom does the school belong and whose interests should it serve? These, however, are topics for deep analysis and are not in the scope of this dissertation.

I have argued so far that postmodern influences and globalisation exert pressure on educational organisations to become more efficient, flexible and effective, so they can adapt to changing market conditions and respond to diverse needs. In spite of the research evidence which demonstrates the conflictual character of new managerialism, there are writers from different political standpoints who see its ideology and practices as a logical and rational way to achieve these aims. The expectations are that the practices of new managerialism would destabilise the complacency, rigidity and paternalistic attitudes of bureau-professionalism, and would replace it with an efficient corporate-like management. The question is whether new managerialism can deliver this promise.

### ***New managerialism and the promise of security***

In the new managerialist thinking everything is described as certain, objectively recognisable, measurable and therefore comparable. It seems that this rhetoric offers some level of security and certainty in a complex, fragmented and changing world. As

mentioned before, this process – cynically described as the McDonaldisation of society – provides some sense of security by its predictability, standardisation and familiarity. Some scholars, like Bottery (2000), are disturbed by the huge popularity of McDonald's-like products. Bottery sees this as the result of a contradiction within globalisation and postmodernity, which has caused the world to become both controlled and fragmented. He argues that this fragmentation drives people to seek even greater control and direction. In education, there would be little dispute, for example, about the number of children in a class or the number of teachers at a school. It imposes a rigid curriculum in times of growing uncertainty about what constitutes knowledge; it advocates the establishment of common core values and goals despite growing relativism (Hartley, 1997). While cultural uniformity could provide a sense of security and familiarity, it may contradict the new managerialist pledge to be responsive to diverse needs and to be inclusive.

A review of the current research has not provided the evidence to conclude that new managerialism could fulfil its promise to provide certainty and security. The literature demonstrates rather that new managerialism initiates contradictory processes which negatively impact stakeholders. Hartley (1997) maintains that new managerialism will fail because it tries to do the impossible, that is, to provide certainty under postmodern conditions. He doubts whether the professions will “buy into” the strategic goals of new managerialism and assimilate it into their “common sense”. Morely and Rassool (2000) also have doubts as to whether new managerialism would provide the promised security. They maintain that new managerialism does not regulate the chaos but sends it underground in the form of failing schools, teacher stress, disaffection and social exclusion. Rees and Rodley are quite candid when they vehemently declare that the claims of new managerialism are fraudulent:

Managerialism turns out to be a fiction, but a serious and persistent one because of the widespread fascination with theories of management and the status of the managers (1995:15).

As an educationalist who has been socialised in the discourse of professionalism (probably not different to many of the researchers who have been cited in this chapter) and who has been adversely affected by a managerialist reform, I find it difficult to applaud the practices and ideology of new managerialism and of marketisation – it is probably easy to detect this hostility in my tone of discussion. At the same time, like

Simkins (2000), Menter et al (1997) and many others, I do not idealise the situation that existed prior to the managerialist reform. My experience and frustration with educational organisations and their slow pace of change (if at all) make me aware that under certain conditions, such as in the face of fiscal or ideological crisis, radical reform is sometimes unavoidable. It is for this reason that I would like to interrogate the notion of new managerialism not as a form of governance, but as a short-term change process that would initiate a reform whereby institutions would have to change and become more efficient and effective. This is the function of the next section.

### *New managerialism as a change process*

It is widely recognised that different circumstances require different management strategies (Fullan, 2001; 1999). A technicist approach based on a rational epistemology of change and strong management might be useful to rescue an organisation from chaos. Fullan (2001) disagrees. He maintains that in times of crisis we should not call on a strong manager with all the answers, techniques and decision-making power, but rather it is a time for real leadership to emerge that will help the institution to solve complex problems. While Fullan realises that coercive-type leadership is sometimes used for urgent crisis situations, he maintains that the long-term effectiveness of the intervention is uncertain, especially as people resent and resist leaders that demand compliance. Thus coercive leadership could achieve short-term compliance, but may fail to achieve internal commitment in the long run. Fullan elaborates:

When organisations are in a crisis they have to be rescued from chaos. But a crisis usually means that the organisation is out of synch with its environment. In this case, more radical change is required, and this means the organisation needs leadership that welcomes differences, communicates the urgency of the challenge, talks about broad possibilities in an inviting way, and creates mechanisms that motivate people to reach beyond themselves (2001:47).

The practice of new managerialism and its technicist-rational approach to educational change negates what the research has convincingly advocated about change since the 1980s. It is now well-established knowledge that change equals complexity (ibid); that it is a slow process (ibid); that imposing change on unwilling participants does not ensure success (Grace, 1997); and that one cannot mandate what matters (McLaughlin, 1998). It has been argued that leaders of change need to take into

account the history and context of the institution, and that what really matters are the subjective meanings that individuals assign to the reform and how leaders deal with the emotions of change as well as with resistance (Fullan, 1999). Hargreaves (1998; 1997) strongly urges leaders to pay attention to the emotions of change. He proposes that managerialist-type change, which focuses on targets, performance and standards, would not get to the heart of teaching, which is about establishing bonds and caring relationships with students, parents and colleagues.

Wallace and Pocklington (2002), who extend Fullan's notion of complexity, claim that new managerialism ignores the limits of the manageability of complex educational change and the resistance to it. They maintain that change is complex because it contains so many factors that are beyond any individual understanding, awareness or control. The more complex the change, the larger the range of its components and the amount of interaction between them. Wallace and Pocklington argue that stakeholders may choose different courses of action according to their own values, beliefs, knowledge and interpretations of the situation and their access to power. As a result, no one has complete control over the change, and the consequences of educational change are unpredictable and mostly unintended.

To conclude, this section suggests that new managerialism is limited as a change process and that what might be gained in the short term will negatively affect the long-term goals of the reform. New managerialism is perceived to be a quick fix that could exacerbate the educational problems it purports to solve, and that its top-down approach to policy implementation and change could lead to outcomes far from those intended or expected by its initiators (Trowler, 1998; Hartley, 1997).

More recent research explores the way forward after new managerialism. Whitty (1997) proposes a new role for teachers' unions to counterbalance the forces of the market. He is, however, concerned that the perceived failure of market mechanisms to improve education might bring forward more measures to further marketise schools (Whitty & Power, 1997). Hartley (1997) suggests that the way forward is through dialogue and recognition of differences as well as acknowledgment of the relativity of the "truth". Therefore, the "truth" cannot be imposed but will need to be negotiated by all. Welch (1998a) calls on academics to defend democracy for the benefit of the social good and to counteract new managerialism. Hargreaves (2003) reports on attempts by governments in the United States, England and elsewhere to reverse the marginalisation of teachers and to



reintroduce the concept of teaching as a learning profession. This is an attempt to attract high calibre people back into the profession and to reverse some of the negative effects of managerialism. Grace (1997) suggests that a solution could be found in “active citizenship” – a concept of active public culture in education – a culture that will prioritise the community and public good before market, consumers and individual self-interest.

The notion of school as a community is often raised as the way forward to combat new managerialism and to counteract the perils of globalisation (Hargreaves, 2003; Arthur & Bailey, 2000; Bottery, 2000; Beck & Foster, 1999; Strike, 1999; Hargreaves, 1997; Grace, 1997; Sergiovanni, 1994). The increased demand for community is paradoxically one of the unintended consequences of new managerialism. All the uncertainties of flexibility and contractual work, the absence of trust, care and commitment, the superficiality of teamwork, and mostly the alienation of school staff from the work and from each other, impel people to look for alternative sources of meaning and attachment. Apple warns, however, that this yearning for morals and values can cause education to fall prey to authoritarian populist religious fundamentalists who believe ‘*that God spoke only to them and to no one else*’ (2000:711).

This brings me back to my inquiry, that is, the restructuring of the Jewish community schools. The research explores how faith-based community schools have responded to new managerialism. It asks whether community schools can offset the perils of new managerialism, and under what conditions Apple’s forewarning could become a real threat.

However, the notion of community has its own intricacies and inherent conflicts. Before any attempt to understand the meeting point between new managerialism and community can be made, it is therefore imperative to understand the notion of community and to unravel its complex nature, its strengths as well as its limitations.

### ***On communities***

The word “community” creates a sense of nostalgia towards an ideal world of kinship, loyalty and friendship. It is ‘*society with a human face*’ distributing social goods where ‘*we speak the language of “we” instead of “I”...*’ (Sacks, 1995:xvi).

This ideal notion of community does not always match the reality; not in the sense of falsity or fabrication, but rather because a community is constructed in the style we “imagined” it (Anderson, 1983). Though the ethos of this *imagined community* is often elusive and implicit, it consists of a real weaving of traditions, beliefs, rituals and stories into a narrative that people speak and act upon (Arthur and Bailey, 2000). The story that a community tells is the way in which the community can understand itself. Belonging to a community means to know its tale. Community is therefore not a hastily gathered collective of friendly people with a common, immediate goal; it is a *community of memory*, defined in part by its past and also by its memory of the past (Bellah et al, 1985 quoted in Noddings, 1996). Belonging to a community – the notion of “we” – is a source of security and certainty. The sense of security is enhanced by the perception that durable communities of memories have strength and resilience, and that they would not fall apart when an immediate common purpose is either achieved or discarded (Noddings, 1996).

There is, however, also a “dark side” to communities – that is, their tendency towards parochialism, conformity, exclusion, distrust or hatred of outsiders, intolerance and coercion (Strike, 2000; Noddings, 1996; Sacks, 1995; Ignatieff, 1993; Enslin, 1990). For Sennett (1998), “we” is a dangerous adjective, used for self-protection and for the rejection of outsiders.

This introduction alludes to two different ways of understanding communities, which are embedded in the persistent debate between liberalism and communitarianism. The debate reflects the tension between *‘the needs, desires, rights and duties of the individual qua individual, and those of the individual as member of a community’* (Snauwert & Thebald, 1995). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore that issue in depth. The next section will, however, briefly discuss the main difference in the liberal and communitarian perspectives of community.

In the liberal conceptualisation, communities are essentially exclusive entities that marginalise those with different values. The liberal view tolerates communities as long as they are voluntary associations, their values are not obligatory by force and they discriminate on no other basis than the association’s constitutive values, which Strike (1999) terms as “substantive inclusiveness”. The liberal view prefers to see society as a setting that allows an individual the right and freedom to pursue his/her own needs and to determine the course of his/her life. The individual does not have responsibility to the community but only to other individuals and to the protection of

their rights, for example, freedom of association. Interaction between individuals is based on *contracts*, policies and rules that ensure the protection of individual rights and the equal distribution of social goods. These contracts need to be informed by ethical deliberation, but abiding by them demands some kind of straightforward obedience (Beck & Foster, 1999).

The communitarian positive view of the community is less focused on the preservation of individual rights and more concerned with the fulfilment of obligations or responsibilities to the community (Etzioni, 1993). In the communitarian view, individuals have the responsibility to serve the common good, however defined by the particular tradition. Communitarians reject the liberal view that social contracts would create viable communities. They have strongly attacked the liberal traditions for, among others, their neglect of community, their faulty concept of the individual as an independent being instead of as a social and cultural entity and their reliance on bureaucratic structures and procedures. Those who advocate communitarianism maintain that the liberals, by their alleged nihilism, create a “vacuum” in societies, making them vulnerable to fascism and anarchy (Noddings, 1996).

Instead, communitarians assert that common traditions, proximity, shared values and commitment to care provide the glue that holds a community together (Beck & Foster, 1999). They promote words such as trust, mutual responsibility and commitment. The existence of a community claims to strengthen moral standards, to demand the type of individuals that can sacrifice for others, promising that if people obey common standards they will find a mutual strength and emotional fulfilment they cannot experience as isolated individuals.

Liberals, on the other hand, argue that communitarianism ignores the diversity within a community. They question issues of power and control in the community and whether there is room for dissent or individual autonomy. They also highlight fascism as an example of *total community* (Noddings, 1996). Sennett (1998), for example, rejects communitarianism and argues that it falsely emphasises unity as a source of strength and mistakenly fears that social bonds would be threatened when conflicts arise in a community. Sennett argues that strong bonding between people means engaging their differences over time. He further maintains that people are bound together more by verbal conflict than by verbal agreement. He explains that in conflict people have to work harder to communicate and that they would bind together eventually by finding new rules of engagement. Thus the scene of conflict becomes a

community as people learn how to listen and respond to one another not “in spite of”, but rather “because of” the differences. In this view there is no community until differences are acknowledged. This view of the communal “we” is far deeper than the often superficial sharing of common values, such as appears in modern communitarianism. Sennett refers specifically to the instant communities that have emerged in the wake of globalisation and the new economic conditions – for example, the temporary communities created for the purpose of teamwork or the corporate shared goals. Teamwork, for instance, does not acknowledge differences in privilege or power and is therefore a weak form of community; all members of the work team are supposed to share a common motivation, and precisely that assumption weakens real communication.

Noddings (1996) maintains that there are ways to avoid the “dark side” of community. One way is to exclude oneself from the community, even though one cannot easily drop out of one’s race, religious tradition, family or national heritage. Moreover, when individual members drop out of a community, it does not protect that community from its inherent flaws. Another way to overcome the flaws of a community is to create liberal communities. Noddings doubts whether this is possible, mostly because liberalism does not provide a centre strong enough to hold people together with shared goals. There is no real “we” in liberal thought and a community needs a strong centre; it has to stand for something. Noddings maintains that even when secular humanist groups prioritise liberal values, the glue that holds them together is not their liberal values but rather their common rejection of institutional religion and the desire of their members to belong to a group that shares their beliefs. Ignatieff agrees that the lack of liberal centre curtails the liberals’ power to affect change: *‘The world is not run by sceptics and ironists, but by gunmen and true believers’* (1993:189).

Another way to avoid the “dark side” of the community is to adopt a third model of the community, which draws from a combination of the strengths of both perspectives (Beck & Foster, 1999; Noddings, 1996). This combines liberalism’s concern about the individual with the communitarian’s commitment to the creation of social systems that build upon shared values such as mutual acceptance, care and respect.

Bringing this argument to the educational arena, Strike (1999) explores the middle way in educational communities and argues that it can be maintained when a

school adopts “thick”, but “vague”, constitutive values that can accommodate diversity. Constitutive educational values, according to Strike, are those that generate a conception of good education and communal projects to pursue it. In the case of religious schools, where practices are based on *comprehensive doctrine* or *tradition*, the balance between shared values and inclusiveness is fragile. Strike (ibid) refers to a study of Catholic schools conducted by Bryk et al (1993) who maintain that the success of these schools is attributed to the fact that they are not narrow sectarian institutions, but rather institutions that incorporate secular-humanistic constitutive values. They are therefore able to accommodate a significant degree of cultural and religious diversity in spite of tensions and dilemmas. Grace (2002) agrees only partially with these findings and argues that it is optimistic to believe that there is no indoctrination at Catholic schools. Given the paucity of detailed school-based educational research on religious schools, there is no confirming or disconfirming data.

In spite of the debate and lack of empirical research, I intuitively concurs with Strike (2000) that faith-based community schools are not inherently illiberal and that they could become the middle way between liberalism and communitarianism if the balance between “cohesion” and “diversity” would be managed, if they would not function as a “total community”, and if their educational leaders would draw on the strengths of both perspectives. It has been observed, however, that there is a tendency for schools to draw on the weaknesses of these perspectives. Schools that are managed by contracts, rules and structures to enforce them therefore become too concerned with creating a unified citizenry that fits into a narrow worldview (Beck & Foster, 1999). In the context of faith-based schools this can mean that schools might lose sight of the fact that even religious communities are non-monolithic and are composed of, and exist for, people with a range of needs, beliefs, wants, hopes, and varied levels of practice.

Strike (2000) correctly maintains that *‘the devil of schools as communities is in the details, not in conception’*. Noddings (1996) adds that whether a community is “good” or “bad” depends on the morality of its shared norms and the means to ensure conformity to these norms. There could be no separation between the “ends” and the “means” of educational institutions. It therefore seems that much depends on how the institutions operate, how they balance shared values and inclusiveness and how they affect the students and the broader community.

The next section explores the functioning of community schools, looking at what may shape their ability to become the middle way between liberalism and communitarianism.

*The functioning of community schools*

To understand the different ways in which communities function, many scholars turn to the classic distinction between *gemeinschaft* (community) and *gesellschaft* (society) made by the German sociologist, Tonnies, in 1887.<sup>7</sup> *Gesellschaft* refers to more formal, contractual organisational relationships. Presently it is the world of the market and new managerialism. *Gemeinschaft* refers to informal kinds of collective relationships usually associated with communities. Because they are based on shared values, rituals and memories, communities give people a sense of belonging. This sense is more lasting and secure than any associated with the contractual relations of *gesellschaft*.

In *gemeinschaft* people remain united in spite of separating factors, whereas in *gesellschaft* they are essentially separated in spite of unifying factors. In *gemeinschaft* both people and practices are valued intrinsically, whereas in *gesellschaft* they are valued instrumentally. In *gemeinschaft* interactions with others are intimate, governed by love, friendship, familiarity and mutual enjoyment of shared practices, whereas in *gesellschaft* members seek their own benefit and are strangers to each other. Interactions between members of the *gesellschaft* are kept at arm's-length, governed by contract and law. Shared understanding is a crucial element of *gemeinschaft*. Understanding is tacit and implicit and created by the intimate relationships between members of the community. While contracts depend on mutual agreements, understanding is the very opposite of a contract and is the precondition for all forms of community (Strike, 2000).

Tonnies's classical categorisation is criticised by Strike (2000) and others for his underestimation of the diversity of types of communities and the variability of social glue that holds them together. Strike also comments that in Tonnies's account, *gemeinschaft* communities are total communities, which control all aspects of one's life (work, recreation and family life). Strike argues that this type of community does not exist in modern life, except in extreme cases such as the Amish communities, and

---

<sup>7</sup> This analysis of *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* is based on articles by Beck & Foster, 2000; Strike, 2000; Noddings, 1996; Furman & Merz, 1996; and Sergioanni, 1994.

that *gemeinschaft* values are therefore essentially describing a premodern society. Scholars have emphasised that *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* represent ideal types that in fact do not exist in their pure forms and should be used as conceptual tools to categorise and explain certain reforms as well as to track movement along a continuum. Noddings (1996) and Sergiovanni (1994) rightly argue that the *gesellschaft* values are not all bad and that school communities need to possess characteristics of both *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*. However, Noddings reaffirms Tonnies when she states that as the institution moves towards the *gesellschaft* end of the continuum, the *gemeinschaft* values become weaker and the longing for community pushes people into a search for associations that will satisfy their need to belong.

A central issue in this case study is whether globalisation and the attendant ideology of new managerialism have changed the way in which faith-based community schools function. As has been argued before, the new economic order has strengthened both the *gemeinschaft* and the *gesellschaft*, that is, to use Benjamin Barber's catchy phrase (2001), both the McWorld and the Jihad. Both offer a sense of security and stability in a changing world. Thus, on the one hand, a great number of schools have adopted the market ideology and new managerialism, and have increasingly committed themselves to the values of a *gesellschaft* society. As alluded to earlier, there is a risk that in this scenario rules, procedures, laws and contracts would replace personal judgements and commitments and would devalue the ethos of care, thereby weakening the *gemeinschaft* values of schools.

On the other hand, globalisation has unleashed a parallel strong pull towards *gemeinschaft* values. The danger is that in the wake of economic and cultural globalisation communities might define their borders too narrowly. In this context, schools, and especially those based on faith, might adopt the negative view of community. Instead of providing their pupils with their particular worldview or cultural identity as a starting point for autonomy and liberal citizenship, they might seek to entrap their pupils in a particular narrow vision of the world. These schools pose a threat to individual autonomy by using coercion, or even "gentle" methods of persuasion, and in the long run may close the mind of the new generation to reflection and critical thinking. In this scenario we could witness the establishment of schools with a distinct illiberal character shifting towards the "dark side" of the community. That was the reason for Noddings's (1996:267) appeal to educators to reject an



uncritical call for community and to look at both good and bad examples of communities, in order for them to make an educated decision about their schools.

This case study, that is, the restructuring of the Jewish community schools, provides one example of community. It explores the response of faith-based community schools to marketisation and managerialism. It asks whether schools can apply the cold logic of the market (*gesellschaft*) without losing their sense of community (*gemeinschaft*). It explores whether members of a community, placed under contractual relationships, could still retain their commitment, closeness and informality. I will argue, contrary to Noddings, that the *gesellschaft* values of the global social order do not replace the *gemeinschaft* values, but rather that they undermine the old type of community values and force it to change.

As has been mentioned before, one should not assume that the consequences of the restructuring of Jewish community schools are already known, as these are dependent on the combination of global and local, the history of the institution, the social and ideological forces in and around the institution, the level of its capacity and leadership and what course of action would be taken by the different stakeholders as well as their access to power.

In order to follow the trajectory of the change initiated by the restructuring of the Jewish community schools along the *gesellschaft*–*gemeinschaft* continuum, I will develop a bipolar framework that will contrast certain tenets of new managerialism with features of community schools. This will be the aim of the next paragraph.

### ***New managerialism in the context of community schools – a conceptual framework***

It is argued in this chapter that there are many structural and cultural differences between the discourse of community (especially as it tends towards the “liberal” notion of community) and the discourse of managerialism in education – as Table 1 illustrates in ideal-type form. This exposition formed the basis for theorising about the origin and nature of the restructuring of the Jewish community schools and the experiences of stakeholders in that process.

**Table 1 – Ideal-type differences between the communitarian and managerial approaches to schools governance.**

<b>The community discourse (<i>Gemeinschaft</i>)</b>	<b>The managerialist discourse (<i>Gesellschaft</i>)</b>
School as a social good. Education is public interest.	School as a business. Education is a commodity.
Centralised, hierarchical system.	Decentralised system. Stakeholder society.
Decision making through a combination of bureaucratic rules and professional autonomy; consultative.	Managerial decision-making is a top-down process formulated by managers. Managers tend to use specific management techniques, mostly corporate techniques, to make decisions.
Building community over time by professionals from the field of education. It is a “community of memory”.	Building organisations, such as a community school, is a generic skill. New, instant identity.
Emphasis on community needs. (Thick democracy)	Emphasis on individual rights. (Possessive individualism)
Emphasis on care and responsiveness to community needs.	Emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness.
Loyalty to members of the community, to the profession and to public service.	Loyalty to the organisation.
Implicit shared values.	Explicit goals and mission statement.
No separation between “ends” and “means”.	“Ends” are separated from “means”.
The community is where one belongs, choice is limited (parents as partners or supporters).	The individual can choose the organisation according to needs and affordability (parents as customers).
Informal relations based on collegiality, trust, mutual obligations, emotional and normative ties.	Formal relations based on contracts and “contrived collegiality”.
The balance between cohesiveness (exclusiveness) and diversity (inclusiveness) is maintained.	Claims diversity and inclusiveness. In practice – homogenisation and exclusiveness.
Intrinsic value for the individual as a member of the community.	Instrumental value for the individual.
Performativity is in relation to the “community of practice” in a loosely coupled organisation.	Performativity is controlled by indicators and surveillance.
Commitment (internal accountability).	Accountability (external accountability).
Produces uncertainty because of the conflicts and micropolitics inherent in a democratic process.	Provides certainty by its predictability and clear direction.

The model presented in Table 1 illustrates the tensions between “management culture” and “community culture”, which stem from the basic conflict between the view of school as a business, and the view of school as a social good. It is therefore suggested that market-led reforms are likely to conflict with traditional culture and values in faith-based community schools. It is suggested that a top-down restructuring might have short-term benefits, especially for the financial viability of schools, but is likely to impact negatively on the sustainability of the reform, its educational benefits

and community values. Marketisation and managerialism are likely to shift the emphasis on cultural and traditional values, such as community and shared needs, to the commodification of schools' products and services. It heralds a shift from the needs of the consumers, to competition with other schools, whereby the schools are likely to become "institution responsive" instead of "customer responsive". Managerialism is likely to exacerbate the contradictory value system and threaten the fragile democracy that could exist within the ethos of "liberal" faith-based community schools: individualism and competition alongside values of collegiality, loyalty and commitment. Furthermore, since marketisation inevitably generates role and value conflicts amongst stakeholders, it is likely to impact negatively on the school community, as it might generate diverse responses to the restructuring. For example, teachers might resist and struggle to adapt to the new managerial culture, while parents might accept, even celebrate, the emphasis on efficiency, effectiveness and performance-based pedagogies.

My thesis is that while some tenets in these discourses contradict each other, synergies also exist. These synergies tend, however, to pull the discourse of the community towards what has been described as its "dark side". For example, when the managerialist notion of clear goals is applied in a community context, it could narrow the borders of the community and exclude those with different opinions or certain qualities. The managerialist promise of certainty provided by explicit laws and rules, could create a homogenous community with a strict code of conduct where debates and conflicts are not welcome; accountability could turn into blind commitment and the culture or performativity could alienate teachers from their own community. This dissertation will test that thesis.

In the introduction to this chapter I suggested that in order to understand the restructuring of the Jewish community schools it is necessary to attend to both the global and the local conditions. Fullan (2001a) similarly maintains that complex educational change is about the small picture – which is the meaning (or lack of meaning) that individuals make of the reform – and it is also about the big picture. In order to understand the restructuring of the Jewish community schools it is therefore essential to understand the global, local and institutional conditions for the change. The next chapter will provide the ideological (Judaism and Zionism), national (South African), local (Jewish community) and institutional (Jewish community schools) contexts of the restructuring.