

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 895

EA 018 693

AUTHOR Bates, Richard
TITLE The Culture of Administration, the Process of Schooling and the Politics of Culture.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 56p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; Critical Thinking; Cultural Context; *Educational Administration; *Educational Theories; *Educational Trends; Humanistic Education; Management Development; Organizational Change; *Organizational Theories; *Politics of Education; Qualitative Research; Research Methodology; *Social Science Research; Sociocultural Patterns

ABSTRACT

Theoretical analysis of educational administration as presented by advocates of corporate culture is inappropriately applied to the analysis of schooling. The corporate culture model has diverged from the "New Sociology of Education" approach, which interprets administrative processes as cultural politics (Bates 1983). That "corporate culture" is a commonly held system of beliefs and behaviors in organizations was documented 30 years ago by Whyte (1956). Whyte's concern about the effects of organizational life on individual self-concept is not expressed by contemporary advocates of corporate culture, who treat organizational culture as managerial culture (Deal and Kennedy 1982). Technological transformations are provoking alterations in the social organization of work, from traditional worker controls to bureaucratic manipulation of company culture. This new rhetoric has been swiftly transferred to the schooling processes; for example, Dunigan (1985) favors manipulation of school culture in the pursuit of excellence--a parallel to the managerial notion of "success." Analyses of school and community cultures suggest that good administrators develop a collaborative basis in the articulation of cultural politics. Commitment to education and democratic values means advocacy involvement by teachers, pupils, and parents and implementation of such values. Seventy-seven references are included. (CJH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED271895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Richard J.
Bates*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

THE CULTURE OF ADMINISTRATION,

THE PROCESS OF SCHOOLING

AND THE POLITICS OF CULTURE

Richard Bates

Deakin University

Australia 3217

Prepared for the Annual Conference of the American
Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986.

The Culture of Administration, the Processes of Schooling
and the Politics of Culture

INTRODUCTION

Administration is traditionally conceived as a technology of control (Bates, 1980); that is, with the creation of a distribution of power which attempts to depoliticise both those involved in the execution of managerial directives and the recipients of their 'services' (Bates, 1983; Hummell, 1982). Much of the theoretical and empirical work of those engaged in the study of educational administration has been informed by such a perspective (Bates, 1982). Indeed, alternative conceptions to the resulting 'science' of administration have, until recently, been notable by their absence. However, in the past decade the beginnings of a conception of administration rooted in a notion of cultural politics and informed by critical theory has begun to be articulated (Bates, 1983; Foster, 1982). This alternative conception acknowledges the observations of such critics of the traditional model in educational administration as Greenfield (1972, 1978, 1980) and Hodgkinson (1978) regarding administrative authority and the exercise of power, but embraces a more cultural analysis derived from the New Sociology of Education (Young, 1971; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Bernstein, 1975; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bates, 1983; Whitty, 1985; Giroux, 1983). While this thesis is in the early stages of development it is possible to see the appropriateness of the analysis it provides to the understanding of the processes of educational administration. This is nowhere more evident than in terms of the analysis of schooling (Bates, 1986; Angus, 1986) and of the formal structures of education systems which envelop the work of schools (Bates et al, 1983; Bates et al, 1984; Angus, Prunty & Bates, 1984).

As this alternative theoretical tradition and the empirical work informed by it presents itself as a cultural analysis it has been located by some within the burgeoning literature on organisational culture (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1984). Others have taken a further step and identified our analysis with that of the advocates of corporate culture (Millikan, 1984; Duignan, 1985). We have serious objections to being identified with the ideological thrust of such literature which is entirely opposite to our own. This paper explains why we object to such attempts at cooptation. It does so, firstly, by raising serious theoretical objections to the emasculated conception of culture presented by the advocates of corporate culture and, secondly, by demonstrating through appeal to three empirical studies, why the model presented by the advocates of corporate culture is inappropriate in the analysis of schooling.

The Rhetoric of Corporate Culture

It is common in contemporary discussions of administration to emphasise the importance of culture in the management of organisations. 'Corporate culture' is argued by many prominent management theorists to be a system of beliefs, behaviours, myths and rituals which is fundamental to the motivation of organisation members and to the success of the organisation. Deal and Kennedy, for instance, argue that

Companies that have cultivated their individual identities by shaping values, making heroes, spelling out rites and rituals, and acknowledging the cultural network have an edge. These corporations have values and beliefs to pass along - not just products. They have stories to tell - not just profits to make. They have heroes whom managers and workers can emulate - not just faceless bureaucrats. In short, they are human institutions that provide practical meaning for people, both on and off the job (1982:15).

This is hardly a new insight. Company managers have been attempting to construct and impose company cultures upon their workers for a very long time. Indeed the attempts of managers to impose such all-embracing cultures on the members of their companies was documented thoroughly some thirty years ago by Whyte in his classic study of The Organization Man (1956).

While Whyte was deeply concerned about the effects of organisational life on the individual's sense of self, no such reservations are expressed by the contemporary advocates of corporate culture despite a slew of studies demonstrating the frequently pernicious effects of corporate culture both in general (e.g. Berger, Berger and Kellner, 1973; Hummell, 1984) and in particular (for a recent and appalling example see Adams, 1984). Contemporary advocates of corporate culture building ignore such work and direct their efforts wholly towards the promotion of 'successful' management i.e. management which increases managers control over the organisation.

Successful management, according to such advocates, is as much a matter of getting the culture right as it is in getting the technology right or correctly assessing market forces. Indeed, Deal and Kennedy are committed to encouraging such a focus by providing leaders with a 'primer on cultural management' (1982:19). They describe their intention as follows

Our aim is to heighten the awareness of our readers, to jog them into thinking about the workplace in its role as a mediator of behaviour, and to show the positive effects of culture building. Along the way, we hope to instill in our readers a new law of business life: In Culture There is Strength (1982:19).

Deal and Kennedy are not alone. Similar attitudes towards organisational culture are advocated by Peters and Waterman (1982) in their best selling analysis of the management practices of 'successful' corporations. Members of management schools have enthusiastically embraced these new found insights and begun to study and report the phenomenon of organisational culture (Louis, 1981; Dyer, 1982; Martin & Siehl, 1983; Schein, 1984).

It might well be thought that such interest in organisational culture would be welcomed by those of us who have been interested in the application of anthropological or ethnographic techniques to the analysis of contemporary organisational and social structures. Indeed it would be welcomed if it did not violate two of our most important commitments.

The first commitment is to academic integrity. This can be illustrated by the contrast between the integrity of the anthropological concern with understanding over against the managerial concern with manipulation. For instance, while anthropologists have been seriously concerned with the difficulties that their studies of primitive cultures create for those cultures, and with the problems of maintaining the integrity of those cultures in the face of the inevitable interventions that their studies involve, the managerial tradition has no such scruples. The whole point of studying organisational culture is, for such advocates, the increase of managerial effectiveness. Setting aside the question of whether such effectiveness is itself an illusion (MacIntyre, 1981) created solely to sustain the authority of managers, serious questions may be asked about the ideological and material interests served by such analysis and by the conception of culture which informs it. I will return to the point concerning material and ideological interests in a moment. My concern here is that the concept of culture embraced by the advocates of corporate culture is a very limited one which is largely ignorant of the widespread debate over the notion conducted during the past three decades among anthropologists and sociologists. I will discuss this debate and its significance in a few moments. What I wish to emphasise here is that the restricted notion of culture embraced in work such as that of Peters & Waterman and Deal & Kennedy serves particular (managerial) interests by excluding the notion of cultural politics and by treating organisational culture as synonymous with managerial culture. This, I argue, involves an academic sleight of hand which appears to legitimise the analysis but which in fact fails to address those issues at the heart of contemporary academic debate over the notion of culture.

My second commitment is hardly a matter of choice but is, rather, thrust upon me by the politicisation of cultural analysis by the advocates of corporate culture. It is quite clear that such advocates are conducting cultural analysis on behalf of managers. They are not, for example, incorporating a consideration of the interests of workers into their analysis, excepting that there is an assumption that what is good for the corporation is good for workers too. This assumption is, to say the least, questionable. Indeed, if there were no political, social or economic differences between the interests of managers and managed then the supposedly analytic distinction between the two groups would be pointless. However, as such differences clearly do exist and as the advocates of corporate culture have so clearly sided with the managers it seems only fair that someone should be asking what such a cultural analysis might look like if it were conducted on behalf of the managed. This paper begins to address the issue.

One further consideration prompts this paper. That is, crises of production invariably provoke transformations of both technology and of the social organisation of production. It is clear that the development of micro-electronics and the associated production and communications revolutions are both provoking and requiring wide ranging alterations in the social organisation of work (Burawoy, 1979; Braverman, 1974; Edwards, 1979). This is acknowledged by Deal and Kennedy who argue that the practice of cultural management by 'symbolic managers' is becoming not simply another management technique, but in the decentralised corporation of the future, the only effective solution to the danger of fragmentation and loss of control.

In the dispersed, helter-skelter world of the radically decentralised atomized organization, some glue is absolutely essential to hold independent work units together. The role that culture plays will be even more critical than it is in today's corporate world. Without strong cultural bonds, atomized work units would fly off in a centrifugal plane. The winners in the business world of tomorrow will be the heroes who can forge the values and beliefs, the rituals and ceremonies, and a cultural network of storytellers and priests that can keep working productively in semi-autonomous units that identify with the corporate whole (1982:193).

In short, Deal and Kennedy and their colleagues are arguing for a shift from traditional forms of bureaucratic control, towards techniques of ideological control based upon the manipulation of company culture. Although they do not explicitly address the issue it appears that such a shift towards ideological forms of control implies the intervention of managers in the very consciousness of workers. That is to say, while the traditional bureaucratic techniques of control implied a system of rules, regulations, penalties and rewards tied to hierarchical structures of authority, (but which were relatively external) and while the prevalence of such structures may have incidentally shaped the consciousness of workers (Berger, Berger & Kellner, 1973), the new techniques of ideological control direct themselves expressly to the alteration of consciousness through the substitution of 'company culture' for the traditional culture of workers. Such attempts at transformation are of great historical significance and the processes by which they are contested or won are worthy of serious study.

One of the agencies through which such transformations are encouraged is schooling. Bowles & Gintis (1976) and Hamilton (1980), among others have pointed out the significance of mass schooling in producing the transformation of working class consciousness demanded by the alteration of the means of production associated with the industrial revolution. With such historical precedent before us it is not surprising that current alterations in the technology and social organisation of production should see the new rhetoric of corporate culture swiftly transferred to the processes of schooling.

Corporate Culture and Educational Practice

In business, much of the emphasis on corporate culture is wrapped up in the rhetoric of the pursuit of excellence. In education similar notions are being introduced via the rhetoric of corporate management and school effectiveness. These moves can be clearly seen in Australia, where a number

of academic educational administrators are pursuing their traditional function of translating the contemporary rhetoric of (mainly American) business into the discourse of schooling. Beare (1982), for instance, was one of the first to advocate the manipulation of education's "corporate image" and the reconstruction of the internal and external cultures of schools so that they might effectively compete in the "marketplace".

Millikan (1984), a colleague of Beare's, has begun a more detailed analysis which celebrates the 'success' of non-government schools (and conversely, the failure of government schools) in creating "effective" school cultures. His stance is clearly within the manipulative managerial tradition when he claims that the differences between government and non-government schools can be reduced through the "development of culture" in all schools.

... it is not elitism, or religionism (sic), or wealth which is the magic formula, but rather the development of culture within each particular school which is important ... the materials for this development are already present in each and every school, but as yet insufficiently understood or utilised (1984:3).

Duignan (1985) also advocates the manipulation of school culture in the pursuit of excellence. His argument is far more explicit than that of Beare or Millikan in acknowledging its inspiration in the recent business management literature. Following discussions of Peters and Waterman's In Search of Excellence Duignan abstracts the cultural implications of their analysis by suggesting that its central conclusion is that

... an institution, such as a school, must have central code of values and beliefs that form an essential ingredient in the cultural life of that institution. Also, the members of the institution must be committed to these values as exemplified in their actions and behaviours (Duignan, 1985:4).

Drawing then upon the American literature on effective schools (and coupling it with the current hysteria over 'declining standards') Duignan then goes on to suggest ways in which a 'culture of high expectation' can be developed in schools. The techniques and strategies are drawn directly from the business literature and appeal to a 'passion for excellence'.

But what, exactly, is wrong with such analyses? Firstly the notion of culture lying behind such accounts is essentially trivial, static and manipulative. Secondly, such accounts omit any serious consideration of cultural politics. Thirdly, such accounts fail to distinguish between the relationships of material production which characterise the corporation and the processes of cultural production and reproduction which characterise the school. Each of these criticisms depends for its validity on an alternative conception of culture. While the argument that follows is based upon a critique of traditional conceptions of 'high' culture a similar critique can be mounted of the notion of 'corporate' culture.

The Notion of Culture

There are, as Raymond Williams points out, three general categories in the definition of culture.

There is, first, the 'ideal', in which culture is a state or process of human perfection, in terms of certain absolute or universal values. ... Then, second, there is the 'documentary', in which culture is the body of intellectual and imaginative work, in which, in a detailed way, human thought and experience are variously recorded. ... Finally, third, there is the 'social' definition of culture, in which culture is a description of a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour (Williams, 1961:57).

Theories of education have traditionally drawn upon the first and second notions of culture (Peters, 1966; Hirst, 1974). These notions lend themselves to the creation of the idea of 'High Culture', that is, one which claims to

identify and celebrate the greatest achievements of the human mind. It is this notion of culture which is embraced by cultural high priests such as Eliot (1950), Leavis (1930) and Bantock (1963) and whose advancement they advocate as the central objective of education. It is easy to see that the 'pursuit of excellence' in the corporate world appeals to a similar logic (though, I hasten to add, a rather different substance).

From such a perspective the notion of culture is largely unproblematic. Certainly there are marginal disagreements about the standards that shall apply to the determination of greatness, but the terrain on which such argument shall proceed and the criteria of excellence to be employed are largely agreed among the priests of high culture and the tasks of the school become (at least theoretically) quite straightforward: the celebration of high culture; the inculcation of its social, political, moral and aesthetic norms; the development of such skills and behaviours as are needed for its perpetuation; the categorisation of individuals according to their prospective contribution to the development of high culture; the allocation of individuals to appropriate positions within the social and economic structures essential to the maintenance and continuance of high culture.

Though the debate from which this critique is drawn is located in the European tradition and focuses largely upon a classical literary and artistic cultural inheritance, the logic of the argument is clearly applicable to the corporate and educational debate now taking place in the United States.

Such a notion of culture captures the idea of excellence as its own privileged property (see Bourdieu, 1984). But the way in which it does so is only understandable if Williams's third category of definitions is adopted as a viewpoint: that is, if culture is regarded as a description of "a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning [or, one might add, commerce and science] but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour" (Williams, 1961:57, emphasis added).

The essential difference between the first two categories and the third is that the idealised and largely unquestionable notions of culture implicit in the definition of high culture now become the objects of study in terms of their social, political, organisational and ideological functions. The study of culture is transformed from a consideration of the exclusive terrain of high (or managerial) culture and becomes instead 'the study of relationships between elements in a whole way of life ... the attempt to discover the nature of the organization which is the complex of these relationships' (Williams, 1961:63).

The shift towards studying the 'whole way of life' of a particular society entails a shift away from the study of high culture which was largely the province of an elite minority (as is the managerial culture of the corporation), and a broadening of focus to include the study of those elements of the whole culture which had previously been ignored. One of the early shifts of focus undertaken by the cultural studies movement in pursuit of this objective was the study of 'popular culture' (Hoggart, 1957; Williams, 1961). Inevitably this reconceptualisation of cultural studies as 'the study of relationships between elements of a whole way of life' raised quite directly the question of relationships between 'high' and 'popular' cultures. The answers were formulated by the cultural studies movement largely in terms of class analysis.

The contrast between 'high' and 'popular' cultures was seen by the cultural studies movement as structurally related to the social, political and, above all, economic organisation of society. Moreover, as the organisation of any society at a particular historical moment was the result of struggle between groups (classes in classical Marxism, but in later analyses extended to gender and race divisions as well) then differences in cultures within society become important as ideological representations of social, political and material interests.

The theory of culture which was developed by the cultural studies movement was, therefore, decidedly more comprehensive than previous theories of culture in that it embraced the study of the variety of cultural forms existing in complex societies rather than accept that culture was to be equated with 'high culture'. Secondly, the cultural studies movement undertook to relate cultural differences to material (class) differences in its explanation of the overall structure and relations of society. Thirdly, and most importantly, it developed a notion of cultural politics which emphasised the ideological nature of cultural constructions and the part they played in the struggles between different groups. The resulting theory was therefore capable of providing a framework for the discussion of the dynamics of social change. An excellent example of this is the analysis of English education contained in 'Unpopular Education' (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, 1981).

It is this notion of cultural politics which is absent from the discourse of administrative theorists such as Beare, Millikan and Duignan. Beare's advocacy of corporate management techniques in education; Millikan's advocacy of the development of school culture around 'the universally understood philosophy of what school is about' (1985:9); Duignan's advocacy of a 'culture of high expectations' (1985) largely ignore the forms of cultural struggle that are revealed through the analysis of cultural politics. Beare and Millikan, moreover, in their suggestions that government schools should emulate non-government schools in their commitment to excellence (read 'high culture') wholly misread the importance of the cultural studies movement and the implications of the study of education as a cultural enterprise and schools as cultural sites.

In order to understand how serious this misrepresentation is it is necessary to explore the notion of organisational culture as it applies to schools; show how the internal cultures of schools relate variously to the cultures of the wider society; sketch briefly the role of schools in cultural politics and, finally, examine the role of administrators in the culture of the school.

The Idea of Culture

If we avoid restricting our understanding of culture to an exclusive focus on the 'high' culture of a particular society or the 'managerial' culture of a particular corporation and, instead, contextualise those privileged notions of culture within an examination of the 'whole way of life' of that society or corporation, we are much more likely to achieve an understanding of the dynamics of that society and of the ways in which cultural politics contribute to that dynamic. But studying the 'whole way of life' of any society would seem to be a tall order. How might we approach such a task?

Certainly we need to expand Williams' definition of culture. One of the most useful ways of doing so is suggested by Clarke and his colleagues.

The 'culture' of a group or class is the peculiar and distinctive 'way of life' of the group or class, the meanings, values and ideas embodied in institutions, in social relations, in systems of beliefs, in mores and customs. Culture is the distinctive shapes in which this material and social organisation of life expresses itself (Clarke et al, 1981:52).

In part, then, culture is constituted and expressed through institutions, social relations, customs, material objects and organisations. To this extent culture is observable, and empirical descriptions can be provided of the ways in which the meanings, values, ideas and beliefs of social groups are articulated through various cultural artifacts. These artifacts constitute the structures through which individuals learn their culture.

Learning can be thought of as the process by which the interior, subjective experience and understanding of the individual is formed and shaped through interaction with the objective structures of the culture and the values, beliefs, mores and meanings they articulate. That is, becoming an individual entails the mastery of the maps of meaning contained in the social life and artifacts of a particular culture (Clarke et al 1981).

However, becoming an individual is not simply a passive process of soaking up the maps of meaning articulated through the social structures into which one is born. Culture is not something solely objective and external to individuals who comprise a particular society, class or group. Culture is also carried, communicated and shaped through individual attempts to understand, master and participate in the life of the group. Learning a culture, living a culture is, therefore not simply an inheritance of objects but rather a taking part in the processes of history. In this dialectical process there are both possibilities and constraints for, as Marx suggested

Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past (1951:225).

One of the most important circumstances invariably transmitted from the past is membership of particular groups within the overall society. Most societies, and certainly all complex societies, contain within them a variety of groups whose experiences of and relationships with the wider society are substantially different. Some of the most obvious differences are those of race, religion, gender, geography and class. As the experiences of members of these groups differ it is likely that their social consciousness will also differ, that is, they will learn to understand and relate to members of their group, to members of other groups and to the society as a whole in quite particular ways.

It cannot, therefore, be assumed that all members and groups within a society (or corporation or school) will share equally a common culture. For instance even where certain historical events have wide reaching influence on all groups (such as the Great Depression or the two World Wars in Western societies), the relationship of particular groups to the event, their experience of it and their understanding of its significance may well be different.

This being so, the quest for understanding of the culture of a particular society, the whole way of life of that society, cannot succeed if it assumes a unitary pattern of beliefs, values, mores, understandings, relationships, institutions and artifacts which are shared more or less equally by all members of that society. This does not mean that particular cultures will not present themselves as the most comprehensive and therefore the most legitimate culture within society, one which embraces various sub-cultures and provides the cultural underpinnings of the society as a whole. Dominant cultures make such claims continuously. Rather, the cultural studies perspective insists that the culture of a society cannot be understood unless the nature and organisation of the relationships and struggles between dominant and subordinate cultures are taken into account. Indeed, it is the struggle between such cultures that constitutes the major dynamic of cultural change.

The outcome of such a perspective is that the search for the 'whole way of life' of a specific society becomes the search for various cultures within it and an examination of their relationships revealed through the struggles between them during concrete historical moments. It is this struggle between groups which constitutes the terrain of cultural politics, the object of which is the exercise of cultural dominance or hegemony.

In the attempt to achieve or maintain a particular hegemony the education system of any society is clearly crucial, for the socialisation of the young into the existing relationships of power within the society is essential to the reproduction of the privileged position of the dominant groups. By the same logic, the education system is also a crucial agency through which the existing hegemony can be contested and an alternative hegemony at least partially achieved.

Schools can, therefore, be seen both as an ideological apparatus over which struggles for control will take place within the wider society, and as sites within which struggles to maintain or challenge the existing hegemony

are likely to take place. This is clearly illustrated by the origins of mass education systems in the nineteenth century and the attempt to use such systems as mechanisms of moral and social control, for as Johnson suggests

... the early Victorian obsession with the education of the poor is best understood as a concern about authority, about power, about the assertion (or the reassertion?) of control. This concern was expressed in an enormously ambitious attempt to determine, through the capture of educational means, the patterns of thought, sentiment and behaviour of the working class. Supervised by its trusty teacher, surrounded by its playground wall, the school was to raise a new race of working people - respectful, cheerful, hard-working, loyal, pacific and religious (Johnson, 1970:119).

But as a mechanism of domination schools have certain drawbacks. This is because, as we saw earlier, the learning of a culture is not simply determined by the presentation of that culture by history or by a dominant class in its own interests. Rather, the production and reproduction of a culture is crucially dependent on the interpretation of that culture by the learner within a context shaped through struggle between competing cultures and interests. If the learners' roots are in a different culture (local and working class perhaps, instead of national and upper class) then their interpretations of the culture offered by the school may well be at variance with the controlling authority's intentions. If the disjunction is too great then pupils and parents may well lose faith in the school or even see it as an alienating experience. This was clearly the response of working class people in the face of the imposition of Board schools and the destruction of working class schools in Victorian England (Gardener, 1984). Moreover, when the teaching population includes substantial numbers of people whose roots are in the working class then the school system itself may undergo a major ideological crisis (Grace, 1978; Goodson & Ball, 1985).

Such an analysis suggests that 'successful' educational administration can be defined in at least two ways. If the definition of culture adopted is

derived from the notion of 'high' culture, then administration can be judged successful or not in terms of its ability to reproduce that culture among those who have inherited it and produce that culture among those who have not (or at least persuade those who lack such an inheritance of their lack of talent and worthiness - Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979). Many traditional forms of educational administration can be seen as elaborations of just such a rationale.

The second definition of successful administration derives from the alternative 'whole way of life' definition of culture which takes account of the nature of cultural politics. It arises from an awareness which is eloquently put by Greenfield

What many people seem to want from schools is that schools reflect the values that are central and meaningful in their lives. If this view is correct, schools are cultural artifacts that people struggle to shape in their own image. Only in such forms do they have faith in them; only in such forms can they participate comfortably in them (Greenfield, 1973:570).

Such a view of the purposes of schools implies that educational administration can be judged as successful to the degree to which it assists in the articulation and development of the aspirations and maps of meaning which are the cultural inheritance of its members thus helping them to articulate and defend their interests in the wider social context.

As we shall see in the studies to be discussed in a moment, schools differ significantly in their enhancement or their inhibition of various cultural aspirations and interests. For the moment, however, it is sufficient to argue that the perspective of the cultural studies movement allows for an analysis of the different ways in which schools intervene in the cultural politics of their society. For instance, differences between dominant national interests and subordinate local interests are clearly shown in arguments over the conduct of schooling (Tyack & Hansot, 1980). In terms of promoting the

existing hegemony, the school is required to comply with the demands of the dominant culture (Callahan, 1962). However, in many schools, that culture may well be remote from or antagonistic to the local culture of the school community.

Particular schools may this be faced with the conflicts resulting from being bound 'vertically' to the requirements of the dominant culture and 'horizontally' to the requirements of the localised culture. Where the local culture is consonant with the dominant culture (as can be argued is the case with many elite non-government schools) there is little discontinuity for pupils or teachers. Where the local culture is a subordinate culture, things may be very different. In such situations schools, especially where they are successful in inculcating the dominant culture in certain pupils, may serve to disconnect such pupils from the local culture (Jackson & Marsden, 1966). Alternatively, among other pupils the local culture may be strong enough to disconnect pupils from the dominant culture promoted by the school, thus provoking resistance, contestation and, almost inevitably, failure (Willis, 1977).

It is only within such an understanding of the struggles between cultures in the wider society, of their historical development and of the structures of domination and subordination that exist between them that we can begin to understand the complex features of the cultures of schools, the linkages that exist with various cultures in the wider society and the limits and possibilities of administration in the development and modification of such cultures. The notion of corporate culture offered by advocates of the managerial tradition is an impoverished substitute for such understanding.

Cultural Politics and the Cultures of the School

If there are theoretical objections to the superficial analyses of culture offered by the apologists of the managerial tradition what of their relation to empirical studies? It is not my purpose to explore this question in terms

of the culture of the firm, that has been done elsewhere (e.g. Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980; Perrow, 1982, 1983; Hummell, 1982; Fischer & Sirianni, 1984). Rather I wish to proceed by examining a limited number of studies of schooling in order to give empirical substance to the critique presented above.

There are, of course, hundreds of accounts of life in schools, ranging from the fictional through the ethnographic to the statistical. The point of this discussion is not to survey, synthesise, abstract or generalise about such studies but, rather, to illustrate from a limited number of recent studies the ways in which the cultural politics of schooling proceed in a variety of environments and to contrast the understanding so derived with the simple models of education contained in the managerial perspective of traditional educational administration.

The formal construction of schooling in official accounts, regulations and prescriptions follows a fairly clear cut path. The goals are more or less agreed, or at least defined by an expert body. A contemporary example is provided by Goodlad (1984:37) who suggests that whatever differences exist among educators and public there is general agreement over the importance of academic, vocational, social, civic and personal goals in American education. Following such definition the curricular structure of education systems is formally structured around these goals and the provision of facilities and teachers is organised to articulate the curriculum. Administrative structures are put in place in order to control the apportionment of resources, police compliance with regulations and ensure that legal authority is maintained among teachers and pupils. As Waller suggested in his classic study of the sociology of teaching the whole structure is held together by the authority of officials who maintain the despotism of the system through the exercise of 'power theoretically vested in the school superintendent and radiating from him down to the lowest substitute teacher in the system' (1967:9).

The reality of school life may vary considerably from this formal model.

Indeed each of the studies to be considered here shows how far the school can

move from obedience to such a hierarchy under the influence of various cultural imperatives. Indeed, each of these studies displays clearly the complexity of the interaction of cultural politics within the school and the limitations of the managerial tradition in explaining events.

Three studies will be discussed. The first is a study of three high schools in a metropolitan education system in the northern U.S.A. (Cusick, 1983). The second is a study of six elementary schools in various parts of the U.S.A. that were judged exemplary in their adoption of an innovative systems approach to the organisation of schooling (Popkewitz, Tabachnik and Whelage, 1982). The third is an Australian study of working class and ruling class adolescents and their (government and non-government) schools (Connell et al, 1982).

1. The Culture of Metropolitan High Schools - Cusick

Cusick's study of three metropolitan high schools was initially undertaken in order to examine the effect of biracilaism on the culture of a single school. Two further schools were initially studied in order to pursue 'questions centered around the development and implementation of curriculum (1983:2). In the event the three studies became amalgamated into a more general study of the problem of order in schools and the way in which order could be understood through the examination of four themes: biracialism, attendance and discipline, creation of curriculum and teacher lives.

The background of the study was formed by an interest in three major events: firstly, the federally forced integration of public schools in the late sixties and early seventies; secondly, by the attempted introduction and failure of techniques of 'organizational rationalization' during the sixties and seventies; thirdly, by recent explanations of schools as 'loosely coupled systems' (Cusick, 1983:1-3). Cusick wanted to know what these events had to do with the day to day life of those working in schools.

One of his first conclusions was that there was only a tenuous relationship between the formal structure of the school and the commitment of students. While the formal structure of the school was much as we have described above, Cusick rapidly came to the conclusion that the student body was fragmented into a number of hostile or potentially hostile groups.

The students in that school had so little in common with one another that none of them seemed to want to get involved, nor did there seem to be anything with which they could get involved. There really was no reason for students to have any consensual basis, communal spirit, or mutual cooperation. The various individuals and factions did not even like each other, and while they did not openly riot, and fights were infrequent and remained isolated, the reason they remained isolated was that the formal organization was structured to "keep the lid on" (Cusick, 1983:22).

In fact the administration responded to the potential for violent confrontation by structuring the school day so as to allow as little time as possible for student contact out of classrooms, thus localising the potential for confrontation to situations where teachers were 'in control'; by diverting the energies of administrators into the policing of infractions of the rules and by employing two police officers, three hall guards and four administrative secretaries to document infractions. As Cusick suggests

The total organization was geared up to prevent the potential conflict among students from developing into violence. "Keeping the lid on" devoured all the excess energy that might have been used for pursuing other ends. Biracialism was not merely another element that had to be considered. It dominated everything else in the school (Cusick, 1983:23).

Interestingly, however, the problems of biracialism were not addressed by the administration or by the students in the normal course of events. As far as the administration was concerned the problems were problems of "discipline and attendance" rather than of race. Indeed the basic administrative problems were defined as firstly, getting kids into school and secondly, getting them into classes.

Rates of absenteeism ranged from ten per cent to forty two per cent in local schools. In the school studied by Cusick the rate averaged seventeen per cent. Even when most students could be persuaded to come to school the difficulty of getting them to classes remained.

... it was the group that were in the building but not in class that caused the most trouble. They were the ones who were in the halls and lavatories, and the parking lots, who fomented the fights and assaults, and who showed up at the end of the year with a zero grade point average (Cusick, 1983:27).

The general tactic of the administration in the face of such difficulties was to employ policing strategies which forced students generally into class and displaced the major difficulties from the shoulders of the administrators onto the shoulders of the teachers.

Among themselves, administrators were fond of speaking of their endless "problems", but it seemed to me that more often it was the teachers who handled the problems. After all it is the teachers who are trying to change the students by pushing him somewhere he may not want to go, or asking him to become something he is not. Administrators most often ask only that he or she be orderly while not doing much of anything (Cusick, 1983:30).

Even where incidents flowed out of the classroom into the administrators office the administrators faced only one student at a time and the main concern was to use rules and regulations to defuse situations, return the student to the classroom and thus maintain 'order' in the school. In fact, administrators had a very limited number of options available. the more serious of which were subject to legal restrictions and bound by due process. Incidents and infractions were more likely, therefore, to be dealt with at a personal level in terms of the relations the administrator developed with the student. Cusick comments "in the schools I studied, for most administrators, maintaining good personal relations was more important than adhering to policies and procedures" (Cusick, 1983:33). 23

Associated with this emphasis on personal relations was a general doctrine that the primary role of the school was that of 'fulfilling the needs of kids'. This justified both the administrators' substitution of personal relations for the rule of regulations and their pressure on teachers to do 'what was good for kids'. The implication was, of course, that where infractions of regulations, breaches of courtesy, or violence occurred, the teacher or the school was failing to fulfill the needs of kids. As the school was dependent on local funding and funding depended on reputation, any school which was identified as not meeting the needs of kids was at risk. Such a doctrine led directly to what Bernstein (1975) called a therapeutic rather than an academic modality. In each case the instructional and curricular side of the schools was subordinated to the need to maintain attendance and discipline and attendance and discipline was maintained through personal relations directed towards persuading teachers, pupils and community alike that the schools were indeed meeting the needs of the kids.

The emphasis on therapeutic order in the school had direct effects on the curriculum. The displacement of academic goals meant that students with academic orientations had left the school until only some 200 out of some 2400 were likely to enrol for harder classes. The result was that teachers found it necessary to devise more and more courses of a less demanding kind. The result was a proliferation of course offerings accompanied by a breakdown of any generally recognised conception of the total curriculum. While students needed civics, math, science, English, physical education and social studies in order to graduate, the number of options created under these labels was enormous. One school offered no less than twenty seven options that would satisfy, more or less, the English requirement.

Coupled with this proliferation of courses was a pedagogy which responded directly to administrator pressure on teachers to develop, through personal relations, a classroom practice which kept the kids in classrooms and resulted

in as few disciplinary problems as possible. 24

In effect, the subject matter of a number of classes we witnessed was not so much art, or drama, or literature, but the personal relations between teachers and students (Cusick, 1983:53).

In the most extreme cases, Cusick comments, there seemed to be little other than personal relations going on in the classroom. A significant number of teachers at each of the three schools seemed to be engaged in 'non-teaching'. That is, they set no formal agenda for classroom activities, prescribed little in the way of content or assignment and used any and every diversion as a mechanism for comment, thus elevating the incidental to the status of the core curriculum. Such behaviour was justified in terms of relating to students, showing that one liked them. It can be seen that such classrooms provide an extreme case of Bernstein's (1975) therapeutic order, ritualised in ways that emphasise expressive communication. Indeed the whole process was a highly ritualised form of cultural production of a very particular kind.

Both curriculum and pedagogy were driven by the same rationale. The logic of this rationale was that as large numbers of the students were 'unteachable' a curriculum must be developed which at least engaged their interest and pedagogy employed which appealed to their better natures. The former aim was achieved through the proliferation of courses which were 'sold' to the students with little judgement of relative worth being made. Thus the issue of making discriminatory judgements between students - especially between white and black students - was avoided. As far as the pedagogy was concerned even where there was a formal course prescription the activities of the classroom were not necessarily related to that prescription for they were designed in large part, not to communicate knowledge and provoke learning but to realise a form of personal relations which was directed to the maintenance of attendance and compliance. Such a system was justified as 'being good for

kids'.

This interpretation is not necessarily a condemnation of the teachers for, as Cusick points out, there were few alternative forms of adaptation open to them.

Consider the position of a teacher faced with a set of students, many of whom have a history of nonachievement. They may be perfectly decent adolescents, quite open to good relations with teachers and peers, but with little interest in literature, history, mathematics, science or world affairs, or auto mechanics. One has to 'survive' for the period with these students who give so much evidence of so little interest in the acquisition of positive knowledge. The way one does that is build some decent relations with the students, which not only helps keep them in a moderate state of order but satisfies the administrators' desire for teachers who "like the kids" and who do not send kids to the office. And these good relations, rather than the agreed upon and approved body of knowledge, become the real genesis of curriculum (Cusick, 1983:71).

As Cusick suggests, numerous attempts have been made to intervene in this state of affairs through such management techniques as program evaluation review, management by objectives, planning programming and budgeting systems or accountability models of one sort or another. Almost without exception these attempted interventions have failed to achieve their desired effect. Following analyses such as Cusick's it is possible to see why. The rational, ordered models of school administration and reform begin with the authoritative prescription of curricular and pedagogical form from which is derived a social and organisational structure in which authority is exercised to ensure compliance with goals and submission to the structure. In many schools, however, this authority structure, while it encourages a formal educational culture within the school, fails to deal with the negotiated order which is what allows the tenuous maintenance of attendance and discipline that are the prerequisites of any educational activity whatever.

The negotiated cultures of schools such as those studied by Cusick contain contradictory elements which originate in the outside community which the formal culture of the school fails to address. The intrusion of these

cultures into the school and the official denial of their existence creates a situation where the formal curriculum is subverted, the displacement of purposeful activity centered around the real interests and aspirations of students takes place and the substitution of 'personal relations' for a constructive pedagogy creates a therapeutic environment directed solely towards social control and containment.

What can possibly be done in such situations? One attempt to answer that question was the development of a comprehensive individualised program of educational reform called Individually Guided Education created at the University of Wisconsin in the sixties and applied in many schools in the following decade. The next study reports some of its achievements.

2. Individually Guided Education - Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Whelage.

In their study, Popkewitz and his colleagues undertook to produce ethnographic accounts of the responses of six elementary schools to the IGE program. This program is directed towards the transformation of the curricular, pedagogical, evaluative and organizational structures of schools in order to promote an ordered but individualised educational program. The schools selected for the study were rated by observers as exemplary in their implementation of the reform program.

IGE is in fact a systems approach to educational reform based upon three major assumptions. The first is that knowledge can be formulated in advance of instruction through the statement of behavioural objectives which also provide the performance criteria for subsequent evaluation of learning. The second assumption is that such knowledge can be organised and packaged in planned sequences which facilitate the grouping and regrouping of learners according to their place in the resulting hierarchies of learning as determined by appropriate tests. The third assumption is that the role of the teacher is restricted to the implementation and operation of the resulting predetermined

system, largely on the basis of test results and through the allocation of worksheets and learning packages and the organisation of pupils and materials (Popkewitz et al, 1982:36).

The educational system which is designed on the basis of these assumptions is startlingly comprehensive.

As a systems approach to the reform of schooling, IGE is intended as a comprehensive program coordinating research and development, teacher training, curriculum materials, school administration and district practices, as well as student and teacher behaviours (Popkewitz et al, 1982:39).

The study of IGE in operation could, therefore, have been expected to show how effective such a comprehensive program was in reorganising school practice to comply with its assumptions and prescriptions and indicate what effects it had in improving educational outcomes. It might also reasonably have been expected that the all-embracing nature of IGE would have led to a convergence of the practices and cultures of the schools. This was not the case.

Three quite different responses to IGE were discovered. The first response, which was labelled 'technical' was characteristic of three of the six schools. A fourth school was characterised as adopting a 'constructive' approach to IGE. Two further schools were said to have developed an 'illusory' practice. The differences between the forms of adoption of IGE in these schools can quite easily and appropriately be read as differing outcomes of various cultural politics.

The cultures of 'technical' schools were characterised by their emphasis on using IGE to gain a technical efficiency over the tasks of schooling. Knowledge was regarded in such schools as infinitely subdivisible. The resulting fragments could each be translated into a set of discrete skills the mastery of which, as displayed through test results, somehow added up to produce the overall educational objective. Continuous testing was fundamental

to the success of the program for it was through testing that progress was displayed, learning packages allocated and grouping and regrouping determined. The practices of technical schools came to be dominated not by a discourse of learning but by management concerns with rates of production and efficiency. Indeed in such schools 'management is the central concern of curriculum development and efficiency is the controlling criterion for curriculum design' (Popkewitz et al, 1982:68).

As a result of this orientation both classroom interaction and pedagogical practice was dominated by management concerns. If the curriculum was standardised and subdivided and if progress through the curriculum was monitored continuously through pre and post tests under conditions of continuous record keeping, then the pedagogy of the classroom could be expected to reinforce routine and standardisation. This was in fact the case. Substance was displaced by form.

Instructional and evaluative procedures in the technical schools emphasized the number of worksheets completed and the scores obtained on post tests. Quantity was not related to any criterion of quality. The intellectual content, reasoning and forms of expression a child used in solving a problem were not included in any measures of achievement (Popkewitz et al, 1982:71).

The consequences of this technical orientation were serious for both pupils and teachers. As a result of the testing program and of the infinite hierarchy of standardised objectives to be mastered, pupils came to be regarded as deficient. The objective of the program was therefore to detect and remedy deficiencies in the child's stock of knowledge and skills. The more quickly such deficiencies could be remedied the more efficient the system and the better the pupil.

The consequence of these procedures was to emphasise the virtues of industriousness in both pupils and teachers. Getting through the work of correcting deficiencies became the overriding concern of both pupil and

teacher. The teacher's role became, as a consequence, defined away from the notion of instruction and towards the imperative of management. Testing, grouping, allocating learning packages, testing and regrouping became the endless sequence of events and the rapidity of the flow of such activities became the criterion of success for pupil and teacher alike. A further result of this imperative was the attenuation of classroom discourse. Communication was typically abrupt and confined to a shorthand directed towards procedures for the completion of worksheets.

Popkewitz and his colleagues summarize the general effect of the technical utilisation of IGE

The dissociation and fragmentation of knowledge and work in these schools produces a definition of professionalism that limits the purposeful quality of teaching. Students are offered a mode of thought that cannot penetrate the complex patterns of communication dominant in contemporary society. Schooling is thus robbed of its imaginative and liberating character. The emphasis on only the most limited skill acquisition legitimates a style of work which is fragmented, isolated, and unrelated to truly purposeful activity (1982:92).

The 'constructive' school provided a major contrast with the 'technical' schools. Firstly the conception of knowledge in constructive schools emphasised the ways in which knowledge is created. Knowledge was seen as related to and arising out of the solution of problems. Moreover, aesthetic forms of knowledge were emphasised as ways in which to produce and communicate understanding and attempts were made to integrate different kinds of knowledge and skills around the understanding and solution of problems.

The resulting forms of interaction between pupils and between pupils and teachers were, as a consequence of these orientations, much more complex and diffuse than the abrupt, managerial shorthand of the technical schools. The pedagogy was child centred and saw children not as deficit systems but as lively, enquiring, growing, dynamic individuals. Children's activities were monitored to assess attitudes and emotions that were fundamental in giving

purpose to their social and intellectual activities. Teachers, as a result, saw themselves as professionals, responding continuously to the activities of pupils by introducing appropriate knowledge, setting up problem situations to which such knowledge was relevant, helping pupils to work with each other to devise solutions and generally guiding the intellectual and social agenda of the classroom. IGE was, in fact, used as a somewhat loose framework by which such practice could be justified. As a modern solution to educational problems IGE was used symbolically to justify a practice which departed significantly on occasion from the systems oriented approach presented by IGE.

The third kind of response to IGE noted by Popkewitz and his colleagues was labelled 'illusory'. The reason for this typification was that while the organisation, curriculum and pedagogy of the two schools concerned appeared on the surface to be directed towards the production of learning, such learning seldom took place. While there were facts and subjects to be taught and while the schools displayed many of the ceremonies and rituals of a formal curricular practice, the social processes and daily activities appeared to have no substantive meaning. That is, while the formal ceremonies of IGE took place, little learning occurred.

The explanation of this apparent discontinuity provided by the teachers was that the conditions of childrens' lives outside the schools (broken homes, poverty, indifference to education, lack of resources and support) prevented learning occurring despite considerable investment in teaching. Popkewitz and his colleagues present an alternative explanation. They suggest that IGE was adopted in such schools not as a means of improving instruction but as a means of managing pupils in a way which brought order to the school. The rituals of pre-testing, processing of learning packages, post-testing and grouping and re-grouping ensured, not that learning took place but that the place and purposes of all pupils were adequately and continuously monitored throughout the day.

But why, it seems reasonable to ask, if the procedures developed by IGE were being followed, did learning not occur? The major explanation provided by Popkewitz et al., is that although such mechanisms were apparently employed (testing was continuous and records were kept) little notice was taken of them. As a result teachers set tasks for students that were quite independent of what they knew about levels of student understanding and ability. They made decisions about instruction without taking into account feedback from students about achievement; they made little effort to explain important ideas or to help students acquire the skills needed to complete worksheets. In fact, the rituals of passing out textbooks, supervising the completion of worksheets, recording test scores and grouping and regrouping children became devices to create the illusion that everyone was engaged in purposeful activity related to the tasks of schooling (Popkewitz et al., 1982:135-36).

The functions of such schooling were explained by Popkewitz and his colleagues as establishing a particular social relationship and a particular form of consciousness in the pupils. In such schools, they argue,

. the rituals of classroom life establish a particular relationship between children of the school and the categories of schooling. By participating in the routines of classes labelled reading, science, mathematics and so on, children are being taught that these categories are central for judging the competence of the individual pupil. Yet most children may be taught that they are personally incompetent, while the organizational forms make the content seem available. The content and skills are actually inaccessible to most children. What seemed, initially, a lack of substance, may simply be a different kind of substance (Popkewitz et al., 1982:141-42).

What this study shows, among other things, is that the formal authority system of the school which articulates a particular curricular and pedagogical practice is heavily influenced by the interpretation and adaptation of that formal structure by the members of the school. The adoption of the IGE structure and procedures should have led to a standardisation of practice across this group of schools. Clearly, however, the culture of the teachers,

their interpretation of the educational practices advocated by IGE and their interpretation of and interaction with the cultures of the pupils and the wider society led to various differences in the settlements that were reached in each school. Essentially the educational practice of the school was an outcome of the cultural politics characteristic of each particular site.

These findings support and extend the conclusions derived by Cusick from his study. They also point to the differences between the actual culture of the school and the school's representation of that culture to the wider community. In fact, both studies support Meyer and Rowan's (1977) development of Weick's (1976) thesis that schools ritualise their relationships with their communities on the basis of a managerial representation which legitimates their existence but does not accurately depict the internal processes by which they operate. In this sense, it is argued, schools are 'loosely coupled' with their environment, allowing their internal cultures a degree of autonomy without jeopardising public support. Popkewitz et al., summarises this conclusion as far as the implementation of IGE was concerned.

The liturgies and technologies of the program are a ceremonial mask concealing the reification of existing school values and practices. Emphasis on a universal method to improve children's abilities and skills draws attention away from the differential conditions of schooling and the biases of those conditions. Efforts to define the problem of schooling as the management of individual development, however, enhance the legitimacy of those who manage and those whose standards define development (Popkewitz et al., 1982:174).

This conclusion raises the question of the ways in which the internal cultures of schools are related to the external cultures of the society. It also raises the possibility that certain relationships might well be obscured by the legitimating rhetoric of the managers of schools which purposefully misrepresents the nature of the schools internal culture. This possibility relates in turn to the argument that schools systematically produce and reproduce cultural differences based upon class relations while simultaneously

claiming to provide universal equality of access, provision and opportunity. The next study, that of Connell, Ashenden, Dowsett and Kessler (1982), addresses this issue directly.

3. Making the Difference - Connell, Ashenden, Dowsett & Kessler

Making the Difference is the initial report of research based upon lengthy interviews with 'a hundred 14 and 15 year olds, their parents, their school principals and many of their teachers' (1982:17). These students were not, as in many studies, chosen at random:

Half of those hundred students were the sons and daughters of tradesmen, factory workers, truck drivers, shop workers; the other half were the children of managers, owners of businesses, lawyers, doctors (Connell et al., (1982:17).

The purpose of the research was to find out 'why the relationships between home and school worked so much better for one group than for the other ...' (Connell et al., 1982:17).

Fundamental to this attempt was the study of the various forms of attachment between students and their schools. In both ruling and working class schools three basic types of attachment were found. The first type was characterised as resistance. It might initially be thought that such a form of attachment would be, as the teachers in Popkewitz's 'illusory' schools believed, a direct result of impoverished families whose valuation of education was low and whose general attitudes to authority are aggressively antagonistic. Not so, say Connell and his colleagues. Resistance is found among the children of the well to do who enthusiastically support the value of education as well as among the offspring of the working class.

The explanation offered by Connell et al., is based upon accounts of schooling provided by both resisters and by pupils in general. Their complaints of heavy handed discipline, inconsistency in the application of

rules, poor teaching and lack of respect for pupils on the part of teachers were a consistent theme of the interviews. So much so that Connell and his colleagues argue that such comments constitute:

... a serious and significant critique of the school as an institution, and that elements of it are widespread among school pupils. We have two reasons for thinking this. One is that the same kind of criticisms ... were made over and over again by our interviewees, including those who are doing very nicely at school and are far from being 'hoods' or resisters. The second is that sustaining a resistance to teachers ... is pre-eminently a social activity. It can't be done by isolated individuals, but depends on a good deal of support and encouragement by the rest of the class (1982:85).

While the causes of resistance may well be common in working class and ruling class schools and between successful and unsuccessful students, the consequences for ruling class and working class kids are different. In ruling class schools resistance may take the form of aggressively 'working class' behaviour in both home and school. This does not necessarily mean that such pupils will end up in the working class for parental wealth and culture may well cushion many of the worst effects of such behaviour even though such behaviour may lead to a certain degree of downward social mobility. For working class kids resistance is likely to take the form of aggressively 'macho' behaviour which is seen as a particular demonstration of masculine potency. This is, of course, likely to lead to a systematic oppression of girls who may themselves adopt 'macho' behaviour. The consequences for working class kids may well be 'unemployment or the rotten jobs all the kids want to avoid' (Connell et al., 1982:86-87).

The second form of attachment to school reported in this study is labelled compliance and is typical of the behaviour of 'kids who want to work well'. In ruling class schools such determination has both positive and negative effects. On the positive side, classes are motivated and willing to learn. On the negative side, such students and their families can exert a great deal

of pressure on teachers to live up to the very high levels of performance demanded. Such teachers are very much dependent for livelihood and social acceptance on the goodwill of pupils and their families. In working class schools the opposite is the case: working class pupils are dependent upon their teachers for sponsorship into upwardly mobile educational and occupational opportunities.

Most students, however, fall between these two extremes. Their relationship is labelled pragmatism. That is they adapt to the exigencies of school life without being academically demanding or outstandingly difficult. It is stressed by Connell and his colleagues that these styles of association are relationships rather than categories of students and that they involve strategies which are employed by various students in various situations within the school. They are alternative styles of relationship which can be employed as strategies depending on the places, people and situations in which pupils find themselves.

Associated with such styles of relation to school is the production of masculine and feminine identity. This varies markedly between ruling class and working class schools. In ruling class (traditionally single sex) schools, the nearly universally shared goal is the project of competitive success. This is most notoriously the case with male sports in ruling class schools. It is a project supported and encouraged by ruling class families as a demonstration of masculinity. The ruling class project for girls and one frequently adopted in ruling class girls schools is the project of competitive sociability directed towards home, family and the development and maintenance of advantageous social networks. Currently however, such 'feminine' traditions are being somewhat modified by demands on the part of some families for the production of career oriented women.

In working class (typically coeducational) schools the formation of masculine identity is complicated by the conflict between the academic project of upwardly mobile males and the oppositional behaviour of the majority. For

many boys in working class schools, masculine identity may well be formed through opposition to the official norms of the school rather than through acceptance of the competitive academic project. The creation of masculine identity in such circumstances is, as we have already argued, partly dependent upon attempts to ensure the submission of girls to masculine demands. Thus while the projects of competitive academic and sporting prowess among ruling class boys and competitive sociability among ruling class girls complement each other, the project of masculine assertion among working class boys is based upon resistance to school and the dominance of girls. The project of competitive academic achievement on the part of working class boys implies a rejection of their class identity. For working class girls such a project implies, in addition, a rejection of patterns of working class femininity.

As far as the organisation of pupils within the school is concerned, it is argued that the effects of streaming (whether official or unofficial) within ruling class and working class schools is quite different. In working class schools streaming is regarded as 'a means of saving a few supposedly talented kids from what most of their teachers see as failure, rather than attaching them to success' (1982:119). By contrast, streaming in a ruling class school is simply a matter of separating out degrees of likely success and is used as a device to increase pressure throughout the school. The consequences of school organisation for working class and ruling class kids are, therefore, markedly different as are the teacher-pupil negotiations that take place as a consequence.

The effects of streaming are closely related to the second major organisational feature of schools, that of the curriculum. Connell and his colleagues argue that the social organisation of pupils and the social organisation of knowledge are inextricably linked:

The rationale of the streaming system is differential ability, and that in turn is defined in relation to a particular kind of learning. Any school is the scene of a number of different kinds of learning and sometimes substantially different curricula; but all the schools we studied are organized around a particular organization of learning and content we will call the 'hegemonic curriculum'. The crucial features of this curriculum are hierarchically organized bodies of academic knowledge appropriated in individual competition (Connell et al., 1982:120).

The first effect of such a structure is that the knowledge placed at the top of the hierarchy marginalises all other knowledge. Thus any knowledge that is not academic and related to getting a good job is regarded by pupils, parents and many teachers as irrelevant. The problems that such organisation produces for the teachers of 'non-academic' subjects such as music, art, social studies or French and for teachers of all but the 'A' stream in working class schools are quite severe. Any alternative curriculum is inevitably a subordinate curriculum.

The competitive academic curriculum exposes teachers and students alike to external definitions of success and failure. The consequences can be quite severe in both working and ruling class schools. In the extreme, ruling class schools have subtle and not so subtle ways of suggesting that 'failing' pupils (or teachers) might be better off elsewhere. Such success is determined in relation to the competitive academic curriculum and knowledge outside the bounds of this curriculum (even social studies, music, art, French and other 'soft' or 'vegie' subjects) is devalued. Thus, not only is successful performance valued but successful performance in undervalued subjects is discounted.

In ruling class schools, Connell and his colleagues argue, the effect of this structuring of the curriculum is largely to concentrate the effort of the whole school on the institutional, individual and class project of competitive success. In working class schools, the effect is rather different. In addition to the shame and guilt felt by many working class parents over their

unfamiliarity with the academic curriculum (and despite their high valuation of education), the exclusion of working class knowledge from the schools agenda creates uncertainties and divisions in working class life, thus fragmenting the working class and increasing the possibility of ruling class hegemony.

The effect of the hegemony of the academic curriculum within mass secondary education, then, is not to obliterate ideas and practices which grow out of working class needs and experience. It is to disorganize and fragment them; and at the same time it produces resistances to the imposition of the academic curriculum. In doing so it is both part and paradigm of the operation of class hegemony in Australian life (Connell et al., 1982:126).

In summarising their study these researchers argue that the cumulative effect of the differences in relation between pupils, families and schools in ruling and working classes can be summed up in a distinction between two kinds of relationship. Ruling class schools, they suggest, have a market relationship with their schools which makes them an organic part of their class. Working class schools, on the other hand, have a bureaucratic relationship with their clients which serves largely to attenuate and disorganise working class relations.

The market within which ruling class schools operate allows the constant adjustment and refinement of ruling class education to meet the changing needs of the ruling class. That is, as the conflicts between fractions of the ruling class develop, as managerial, political or technological procedures are altered, so the ruling class schools are forced, through the market, to adjust. Ruling class parents in fact buy a commodity and ruling class schools need to constantly adjust to the requirements of their market. The educational entrepreneurs who govern private schools make sure that they do.

Working class schools, on the other hand, are controlled through the bureaucratic mechanism of the state which articulates certain forms of

intervention in working class life. Rather than a market relationship which ensures responsiveness on the part of teachers, principals and boards of governors, the bureaucratic structure through which the state controls working class schools is constituted by legal requirements and rules. The recruitment of pupils and teachers is constrained by rules. The school careers of pupils and teachers are constrained by legal requirements and the structures of prescription and examination. The division of labour among staff and pupils, the allocation of resources, the rights and responsibilities of teachers, parents, pupils and administrators are laid down in bureaucratic rules. Rather than marketing a service, alternatives to which parents can readily buy elsewhere, the principal administers a service which working class parents are obliged to accept.

The result of all this regulation is to place working class schools and their teachers in a far more authoritative relation to working class families than is the case with ruling class schools and their families. As a consequence the working class school actively intervenes in working class formation in a manner quite different from the ruling class schools' symbiotic relationship with the ruling class.

It is clear that the school is not only the only cultural institution impinging on working class life; but it is probably the most important. A high school is often the biggest thing, physical or financial, in a new working class suburb; and it and its feeder primary schools the only community facility with which virtually all the families in the district are connected. School is comparable with television and radio in the amount of kids' time it occupies, and enormously more important in organizing peer relationships and their lives generally. Just as an institution, then, regardless of what its staff and policy-makers are trying to do with it, the school represents a massive intervention by the state into working class lives (Connell et al., 1982:166).

The effects of this intervention are argued by Connell and his colleagues to be massively disruptive for working class life. In particular, the discounting of working class knowledge, the unresponsiveness of schools to

working class consciousness, interests and aspirations and the substitution of the competitive academic curriculum divide and fragment working class experience.

The things that working class people confidently and securely know are pushed aside or devalued as not being proper, socially-recognized knowledge. In the context of the hegemonic curriculum, routes for knowledge can only be realized as competitive individual appropriation (Connell et al., 1982:169).

What Connell and his associates have succeeded in portraying in their research is the complexity of the cultural politics of schools. They have shown how the internal dynamics of schools vary as a result of the negotiations between teachers, pupils, administrators and parents over what is to comprise the culture of the school. They have shown how these negotiations are constrained in particular ways by the organisation of class and gender relations in the wider society, and they have shown how these negotiations are differentially constrained and facilitated in working class and ruling class schools.

What emerges from their study, as well as the studies of Cusick and Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Whelaga, is a view of the cultural politics of schools which is infinitely more complex than that presented by the 'symbolic managers' of corporate culture. As a consequence of these studies we should be disabused of the notion that the 'management' of the culture of the school can be prescribed through a primer of any kind. Rather, it would seem that the processes of administration are themselves likely to be heavily influenced by the varieties of cultural politics with which they must contend and which is their purpose to shape and influence.

Administration and the Culture of the School

Administration as traditionally understood is a technology of control. This technology is, in part, a technical achievement, in that the organisation and division of labour, the structures of communication and accountability, the physical surroundings and the artifacts constructed to promote particular courses of action are the result of technical design. In part, however, the technology of administrative control is also ideological in that it is persuasive. Even the doctrine of administrative impartiality and neutrality associated with Weber's discussions of bureaucracy is a highly ideological representation of human relations, requiring, as it does, both the subordination of individual interests to those of the hierarchy and the depoliticisation of individual action (Hummell, 1982). The claim made by advocates of such organisational forms is that they are instrumentally effective. This being so, the purposes of those whose ability to ensure the mobilisation of bias in organisational life is thereby enhanced are the more deeply sedimented into various aspects of organisational life by their invisibility. The culture of management, that is the interests and power that dominate the organisation are thereby made opaque. The recognition by corporate managers of the 'cultural' aspects of organisational life may be seen therefore as making explicit what has already been implicit in various conventional techniques of management.

It could be argued that the shift of the predominant form of production from industrial to information based technologies has increased the difficulties facing bureaucratic forms of authority with a consequent emphasis on the ideological imposition of meaning in the society as a whole. Renewed interest in the culture of organisations and of schools in particular can be seen as part of such a movement, for cultures of all kinds are heavily saturated with ideology - that is, with attempts to give meaning to life and

to extend the sway of particular interests. For

It is culture that gives meaning to life. The beliefs, languages, rituals, knowledge, conventions, courtesies and artifacts, in short the cultural baggage of any group are the resources from which individual and social identity are constructed. They provide the framework upon which the individual constructs his understanding of the world and of himself. Part of this baggage is factual. It is empirical, descriptive, objective. Another part of this cultural baggage, perhaps the greater part, is mythical. It is concerned not with facts but with meaning. That is, the interpretative and prescriptive rules which provide the basis for understanding and action (Bates, 1980:37).

It might be expected, therefore, that if culture is what gives meaning to life, then cultural politics would be at the heart of political battles over ideologies and commitments. If that is generally true of the wider society then it is specifically true for schools.

We have seen that the cultural politics of the school are frequently complex and that the cultural baggage brought to the school by various groups may result in serious conflicts over both ideology and technology. We have seen how the negotiation of such conflicts can lead to a variety of accommodations, some of which are truly educational in their outcome, others of which give the appearance of education but are in fact little more than empty (if not misleading) rituals. We have seen that the ritualistic forms of school organisation have frequently have contradictory outcomes, pitting consensual against differentiating functions within the same structure, or bureaucratic against therapeutic forms of personal relations. We have also seen how the internal cultures of schools are both derivative of and contributors to divisions of class, race, gender and age in the wider society. We have seen that differing types of schools relate in differing ways to their clientele and we have argued that some schools articulate with the cultures and values of their clientele very successfully, contributing significantly to the production and reproduction of skills, attitudes and relations in ways which confirm both school and class cultures. We have also argued that other schools articulate with their communities in ways which

fragment and disorient those communities, rejecting their skills, knowledge, values, aspirations and interests and disconfirming the value of their activities. It is tempting to conclude that the former schools are well administered and the latter poorly administered. Such a conclusion depends very much upon a prior ideological assumption: that it is the purpose of schools to articulate and confirm the cultures and aspirations of their communities.

There is, of course, support for such a position. Greenfield, for instance, argues that

What many people seem to want from schools is that schools reflect the values that are central and meaningful in their lives. If this view is correct, schools are cultural artifacts that people struggle to shape in their own image. Only in such forms do they have faith in them; only in such forms do they have faith in them; only in such forms can they participate comfortably in them (1973:570).

It is on the basis of such arguments that the movement for community participation and governance has grown, becoming occasionally, as in Victoria, enshrined in government policy. One of the major concerns voiced about such moves however, is that participation politicises the work of the school, thus potentially interrupting its task of educating children in the skills required for employment and life.

There seems little doubt that community participation in schooling is likely to politicise the activities of the schools in ways which are not common currently. However, the implicit argument that such politicisation is an undesirable outcome of participation ignores the political settlement which has allowed schools to be structured in the ways in which they are and to support the interests which they do. Schools are, in their very nature, political institutions, for they encourage and promote particular cultural views, views which are the outcome of political struggles between

... schools are historical and structural embodiments of forms and culture that are ideological in the sense that they signify reality in ways that are often actively contested and experienced differently by various individuals and groups' (1985:23).

This being so, there is a strong argument to be put in support of good administration being political in nature, enabling the articulation, and where possible the resolution of conflicts contained within the cultural politics of the school. Tyack and Hansot (1982), following Dewey, put that argument strongly, suggesting that at both local and national levels 'democracy and social justice need to be recreated in each generation' (1982:262) and that the schools have a major role to play in such political action.

But such a view of educational administration is far from the 'scientific', apolitical maxims of current administrative theory such as those promoted, for instance, by Hoy and Miskel (1982) for it involves not simply the formulation and implementation of reliable and neutral techniques of management but rather the active embracing of a political role involving analysis, judgement and advocacy and the adoption of an active stance towards issues of social justice and democracy.

In the first place, and in order to develop such an administrative praxis, analysis is required of the culture of the school. What, a good administrator might ask, is the nature of the school's culture? The analysis might well use techniques such as those employed by Popkewitz and his colleagues, or Cusick and take into account the framework offered by Bernstein for the distinguishing of the effects of various ritual and ceremonial practices. Determining whether the culture of the school is technical, illusory or constructive; if its rituals are bureaucratic or therapeutic; whether classroom relations are based upon principles of learning or solely on rituals of personal relations is important in arriving at an initial analysis. Within this analysis the nature and effects of the organisation and distribution of knowledge (Bates, 1980) evaluation systems (Bates, 1984) and pedagogy

(Bernstein, 1975) is also important. The forms of relation through which pupils articulate with the existing culture of the school and the particular conflicts that result would then become the starting points for change.

Allied with the analysis of the cultures of the school, is an analysis of the communities from which the school draws its pupils. It is axiomatic that pupils carry with them into the culture of the school the cultures of their home and community. These cultures are, as we have previously suggested, produced and reproduced continuously through the cultural politics of class, race, and gender relations. They are, as Giroux suggests, particularised forms of production. As a consequence

If we treat the histories, experiences, and languages of different cultural groups as particularized forms of production, it becomes less difficult to understand the diverse readings, responses, and behaviours that, let's say, students exhibit to the analysis of a particular classroom text. In fact, a cultural politics necessitates that a discourse be developed that is attentive to the histories, dreams, and experiences that such students bring to schools (Giroux, 1985:39).

Such analysis is essential then, both because it facilitates the development of curricular, pedagogical and evaluative practices in the school which connect with the lived experience of students but also because it has the potential for revealing to teachers, pupils and parents alike the various ways in which power and culture relate and the ways in which schools are implicated in the production and reproduction of particular practices and relations.

Following such analysis of school and community cultures and their interaction within the cultural politics of the school, good administrations depends very much upon judgement over particular courses of action. If appropriate arenas are developed which allow cultural politics to be articulated in ways which can imaginatively transform current practices, then administration is likely to develop on a collaborative (dare we say

democratic?) basis. This does not, however, mean that administrators, any more than teachers, pupils or parents are expected to withdraw from the process of decision making. Informed advocacy, on the basis of such administrative analyses as those outlined above, has a major role to play in the determination and execution of policy within the context of cultural politics.

Advocacy, whether administrative or not, is inevitably suffused with values and ideology. The question then becomes: what overriding values are to inform the work of the school? Clearly, in any society that calls itself democratic, principles of respect for persons, social justice and equity are fundamental. A case can also be made that the educational process, at its best, is also closely associated with such principles. Indeed, as Connell and his colleagues have pointed out, 'Education has fundamental connections with the idea of human emancipation, though it is constantly in danger of being captured by other interests' (1982:208).

The 'other interests' referred to are articulated by Fay as opposing theories of organisation. On the one hand there is the instrumentalist model, concerned with manipulation and control. On the other, there is the educative model, concerned with understanding and autonomy.

Both the instrumentalist and the educative models promise freedom; but in the former it is the freedom that results from knowing how to achieve what one wants, whereas in the latter it is the freedom to be self-determining in the sense of being able to decide for oneself, on the basis of a lucid, critical self-awareness, the manner in which one wishes to live. In the educative model, the practical result of social theory is not the means for greater manipulative power, but rather the self-understanding that allows one's own rational thinking to be the cause of one's actions: i.e., social theory is a means towards increased autonomy (Fay, 1977:207).

If there is a fundamental connection between commitment to education democratic values and social justice then good administration involves the continuous advocacy and implementation of such values in the cultural politics

of schooling. The organisation and culture of the school require such ideals if schools are to be truly educative. Thus while 'it is easy to fall into the habit of regarding the mechanics of school organization and administration as something comparatively external and indifferent to educational ideals' (Dewey, 1902:22-3) it would seem that for schools to have an educative purpose rather than a purely instrumental one, administration is inevitably caught up in the negotiation of educational ideals through the processes of cultural politics. Such negotiation, as Dewey suggested, is in itself an educative process and one which is far removed from the manipulative imposition of 'corporate culture'.

In the end, therefore, it would seem that those involved in the administration of the school are inevitably caught up in a cultural politics in which educational and social ideals are involved as well as pragmatic decisions about the formal organisation of school practices. Some may well decide on the basis of an administrative analysis of their situation that the particular conjunction of cultural and political power in the organisation of their school serves the causes of democracy, social justice and education less well than it does the maintenance of class, racial or gender relations which can be defended only on instrumental grounds which serve the interests of dominant elites. The struggle of such administrators to reorder their world so as to reassert the primacy of educational principles in the cultural politics of schooling is part of the struggle towards democracy, justice and a better world.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Stanley (1984), Roche vs Adams, London: Jonathan Cape.
- Angus, Lawrence (1986), Class, Culture and Curriculum: A Study of Continuity and Change in a Catholic School, Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Angus, L., Prunty, J & Bates, R. (1984), Restructuring Victorian Education: Regional Issues, Geelong, Australia: School of Education, Deakin University.
- Bantock, G.H. (1963), Education In An Industrial Society, London: Faber.
- Bates, Richard J. (1980), 'Educational administration, the sociology of science and the management of knowledge', Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(2), pp.1-20.
- Bates, Richard J. (1980), 'Bureaucracy, professionalism and knowledge: Structures of authority and structures of control', Education Research and Perspectives, 7(2), pp.66-76.
- Bates, Richard J. (1982), 'Towards a critical practice of educational administration', OCEA Studies in Educational Administration, No.27, pp.1-15.
- Bates, Richard J. (1982), Reproduction and Contestation: Class, Religion, Gender and Control at Christian Brothers College, Schools as Negotiated Realities Project, Research Monograph No.1, Deakin University.

Bates, Richard J. (1983a), Educational Administration and the Management of Knowledge, Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Bates, Richard J. (1983), 'Morale and motivation: Myth and reality in educational administration', Educational Administration Review, 1(1), pp.26-52.

Bates, Richard J. (1983), 'Administration, culture and critique: Towards a reflexive practice of educational administration', pp. in T. Sergiovanni and J.E. Corbally (eds) Administrative Leadership and Organisational Cultures, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bates, Richard J. (1984), 'Educational versus managerial evaluation in schools' pp.127-43 in P. Broadfoot (ed.) Selection, Certification and Control, London: Falmer Press.

Bates, Richard J. (1986), Management and the Culture of the School, Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Bates, R.J., Angus, L., Smith, L. & Watkins, P. (1983), 'Continuity and change in Catholic education: A study of CBC', Geelong, Australia: School of Education, Deakin University.

Bates, R.J., Prunty, J.J. & Angus, L.B. (1984), The Administrative Restructuring of the Victorian Education Department. Studies in Educational Change, No.1, School of Education, Deakin University.

Beare, H. (1982), 'Education's corporate language', Unicorn, 8(1), pp.12-28.

- Berger, P., Berger, B. & Kellner, H. (1973), The Homeless Mind, New York: Random House.
- Bernstein, Basil (1975), Class, Codes and Control Vol III: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984), Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste, Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre & Passeron, J.C. (1977), Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1979), The Inheritors, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bowles, Samuel & Gintis, Herbert (1976), Schooling in Capitalist America, London: RKP.
- Braverman, Harry (1974), Labour and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1979), 'Towards a Marxist theory of the labour process: Braverman and beyond', Politics and Society, 8(3) & 8(4).
- Callahan, R.E. (1962), Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1981), Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England since 1944, London: Hutchinson.

Clarke, J., Hall, S., Jefferson, T. & Roberts, B. (1981), 'Sub cultures, cultures and class' pp.53-79, in T. Bennett, G. Martin, C. Mercer & J. Wollacott (eds) Culture, Ideology and Social Process, London: Batsford.

Clegg, S. & Dunkerley, D. (1980), Organisation, Class and Control, London: RKP.

Connell, R.W. (1985), Teachers Work, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R.W., Ashenden, D.J., Kessler, S. & Dowsett, G.W. (1982), Making the Difference, Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.

Cusick, P.A. (1983), The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School: Studies of Three Schools, London: Longman.

Deal, T. & Kennedy, A. (1982), Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Dewey, J. (1902), The Educational Situation, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Duignan, P. (1985), 'Near enough is not good enough: Developing a culture of high expectations in schools', OCEA Studies in Educational Administration, No.37, pp.1-12.

Dyer, W.G. (Jr) (1982), Culture in Organizations: A Case Study, Cambridge M.A.: Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Edwards, Richard (1979), Contested Terrain, New York: Basic Books.

- Eliot, T.S. (1950), Notes Towards the Definition of Culture, London: Faber.
- Fay, Brian (1977), 'How people change themselves' pp.200-38, in Terence Ball (ed.) Political Theory and Praxis, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fischer, F. & Sirianni, C. (eds) (1984), Critical Studies in Organization and Bureaucracy, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Foster, William, P. (1982), 'Toward a critical theory of educational administration', American Research Association, New York, pp.1-31.
- Friere, P. (1985), The Politics of Education: Culture, Power and Liberation, South Hadley, Mass: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gardener, P. (1984), The Lost Elementary Schools of Victorian England, Beckenham: Kent, Croom Helm.
- Giroux, Henry (1983b), Theory and Resistance in Education, London: Heinemann.
- Giroux, Henry (1985), 'Critical pedagogy, cultural politics and the discourse of experience', Journal of Education, Boston, 167(2), pp.22-41.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984), A Place Called School, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Goodson, Ivor & Ball, Stephen (eds) (1985), Teachers Lives and Careers, Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Grace, G. (1978), Teachers, Ideology and Control, London: RKP.

Greenfield, Thomas B. (1973), 'Organizations as social inventions: Rethinking assumptions about change', Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 9(5), pp. 551-74.

Greenfield, T.B. (1978), 'Reflections on organizational theory and the truths of irreconcilable realities', Educational Administration Quarterly, 14(2), pp.1-23.

Greenfield, T.G. (1980), 'The man who comes back through the door in the wall', Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(3), pp.26-59.

Hamilton, David (1980), 'Adam Smith and the moral economy of the classroom system', Journal of Curriculum Studies, (forthcoming).

Hirst, P. (ed.) (1974), Knowledge and the Curriculum, London: RKP.

Hodkinson, C. (1978), Towards a Philosophy of Educational Administration, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hoggart, R. (1957), The Uses of Literacy, Harmondsworth: Penguin Book.

Hummel, Ralph P (1982), The Bureaucratic Experience, 2nd ed., New York: St Martin's Press.

Jackson, B. & Marsden, D (1966), Education and the Working Class, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Johnson, Richard (1970), 'Educational policy and social control in early Victorian England', Past and Present, 49, November, pp.96-119.

- Leavis, F.R. (1930), Mass Civilization and Minority Culture, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Louis, M.R. (1981), 'A cultural perspective on organization', Human Systems Management, pp.246-58.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981), After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory, London: Duckworth.
- Martin, J. & Siehl, C. (1983), 'Organizational culture and counter culture: An uneasy symbiosis', Organizational Dynamics, Autumn, pp.52-64.
- Marx, K. (1981), 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' in Marx, Engels, Selected Works, London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. (1977), 'Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony', American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), pp.340-63.
- Millikan, R.H. (1984), 'School culture and imagery: What does it mean, and what can it do for my school?', The Secondary Administrator, 2(1), pp.3-11.
- Perrow, Charles (1982), 'Disintegrating social sciences', Phi Delta Kappan, 63(10), pp.684-8.
- Perrow, C. (1983), 'The organizational content of human factors engineering', Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(4), pp.521-41.
- Peters, R.S. (1966), Ethics and Education, London: Allen and Unwin.

Popkewitz, T.S., Tabachnik, B.R. & Wehlage, G. (1982), The Myth of Educational Reform: A Study of School Responses to a Program of Change, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Schein, E.H. (1984), 'Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture', Sloan Management Review, Winter, pp.3-16.

Tyack, D. & Hansot, E. (1980), 'From social movement to professional management: An inquiry into the changing character of leadership in public education', American Journal of Education, 88(3), pp.291-319.

Fuller, Willard (1967), (first published 1932), The Sociology of Teaching New York: Wiley & Sons.

Weick, K.E. (1976), 'Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems', Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(1).

Whitty, Geoff (1985), Sociology and School Knowledge, London: Methuen.

Whyte, William H. (1956), The Organization Man, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Williams, R. (1961), The Long Revolution, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Willis, Paul (1977), Learning to Labour, London: Saxon House.

Young, Michael, F.D. (ed.) (1971), Knowledge and Control, London: Collier Macmillan.