

## Understanding De Certeau's Concepts of Strategy and Tactics in Relation to the Educational Policy Analysis<sup>1</sup>

Aznavur DEMİRPOLAT<sup>2</sup>

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

### Abstract

Due to the Industrial Revolution in Britain, the spread of production and consumption paved the way for consumption, especially excessive and luxury consumption, ceasing to be the privilege of aristocrats and other upper social classes. With the development of modern capitalism, the bourgeoisie/middle classes, which started to rise in the West, especially in America and Europe alongside the aristocracy in many spaces, began to utilize consumption and objects of consumption as a manifestation of their own class differences and privileges just like the aristocracy did. Many nineteenth century sociologists, notably Weber, Simmel, and Veblen, approached this process “positively” with great hopes. However, by the twentieth century, French sociologists, especially Lefebvre and members of the Frankfurt School, were pessimistic to modern consumer society and consumer culture. This pessimistic approach, as can be seen in the example of the Frankfurt school, described the prevalence of mass production and consumption in the modern era as the “end/death of the individual”. Contrary to this pessimistic view, de Certeau proposes that consumers who are considered to be passive spontaneously transform any kind of products and production objects imposed on them by the dominant order and/or capitalist system into artistic forms by means of (different) ways of using and reproducing those objects in everyday life. Certeau elaborates the ways of action and production created by the consumer against the “strategies” of the system in daily life as “tactics” of the user/consumer. Therefore, this study aims to reveal Certeau's original approach to modern consumer society and to try to explore his views on this subject through his two basic concepts, namely “strategy” and “tactics”. This study also tries to illustrate that De Certeau's analysis of modern consumption culture and his concepts of strategy and tactics offer new perspectives to those who are working on education policies.

**Keywords:** De Certeau, Consumption, Strategy, Tactics, Education Policy

**DOI:** 10.29329/epasr.2020.373.18

---

<sup>1</sup> This study is the revised and expanded version of the section entitled in “Everyday Life, Strategy and Tactics in Michel De Certeau” (pp. 1-24) included the Textbook of *Sociology of Everyday Life* published by the Atatürk University Open Education Faculty in 2015.

<sup>2</sup> Associate Prof., Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, Çanakkale/Türkiye, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9341-0476.

Email: a.demirpolat@comu.edu.tr,

## Introduction

In pre-capitalist societies, there was a sharper and more pronounced relationship between consumer culture and social status. Compared to the lower social classes, excessive consumption was the key feature of the upper social strata, especially the aristocracy. In traditional societies, consumption habits and consumption objects, among many other social factors, were the basic dynamics that both revealed and produced differences in social status. It is possible to divide societies into two basic classes based on consumption culture and consumption habits: On the one hand, the aristocracy and their highly exaggerated consumer culture, and on the other hand, lower social classes and their fairly simple and ordinary consumption culture that can be seen as a mere reflection of the understanding of subsistence economy.

Until the Industrial Revolution took place in Britain in the nineteenth century, leading the spread of “mass production”, production and trade in many parts of the world were largely aimed at meeting the consumption needs of the upper social status groups, especially the aristocracy. In other words, most of the consumer goods traded and brought from long distances were largely appealing to the tastes and refined likes of these upper social classes rather than meeting common people’s daily nutritional and consumption needs. Moreover, these upper social status groups were trying to maintain a sort of class privilege and continue their political positions via the circulation of such expensive and valuable objects only among themselves.

This On the other hand, the lifestyles and consumption habits of the lower social status groups are quite ordinary when compared to those of the upper social status groups. Contrary to the highly refined tastes and likes of the upper classes, the eating habits and diet regimes of these groups are quite ordinary and largely based on agricultural production in the region where they are located. The development of the industrial capitalism and the increase of mass production brought about the spread of consumption. The development of the industrial capitalism and mass production was made possible by the development of transportation facilities to easily transport large quantities of commodities and raw materials from one place to another. With the development of modern capitalism, consumption objects have continued still to be clear manifestations of class differences and privileges:

Consumers, in the early modern period, may be defined as groups for whom patterns of consumption played a central role in their lives, providing them with ways of marking themselves off from other social status groups. This process also helped to provide them with a sense of social identity. Such groups of consumers began to emerge in the late nineteenth century in the United States and in Western Europe as industrial capitalism developed (Bocock, 1993, p. 15).

### **Approaches to the Consumer Society**

The increasing enrichment of the social status groups that Veblen described as private property owned groups in *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899) led them to transform into a social status group from “conspicuous leisure” to a social class of “conspicuous consumption”. Moreover, Simmel claims that a similar social differentiation emerged in German cities, especially in Berlin in the modern era. In his work “The Metropolis and Mental life”, Simmel argues that consumption is used by the newly emerging bourgeoisie to reveal their individuality and differences from other classes (Storey, 1999, p. 36-37). With the development of modern capitalism, the bourgeoisie/middle classes, which started to rise in the West, especially in America and Europe alongside the aristocracy in many spaces, utilized consumption and objects of consumption as a manifestation of their own class differences and privileges just like the aristocracy did before. As a result of the spread of production and consumption among other social status groups in later periods, the consumption culture became dominant everywhere, leading to the emergence of the consumer society. Thus, as Bauman demonstrated, while work was the determinant of people’s social positions in the early nineteenth century, as with the spread of consumption culture over time, the position of individuals was determined by the level of consumption and “work ethic” was replaced by “aesthetics of consumption” (Baumann, 2005, p. 32).

Due to the transition from the working-based society to the consumer society since the middle of the nineteenth century, we see that two different approaches emerged in sociology on the relationship between new leisure and consumption patterns and the capitalist industries that make them possible. In the nineteenth century, many sociologists, especially Weber, Simmel, and Veblen, had a very positive attitude towards this new situation as they believed that both leisure and consumption in modern society contributed to the existence of possibilities in terms of “collective expression and creativity.” By the twentieth century, however, the positive and optimistic approach seen in Weber, Simmel and Veblen was replaced by a more pessimistic approach. This “pessimistic” approach commenced by and continued with the thoughts of the members of the Frankfurt school and Lefebvre generally “suggested that the apparently more ‘civilised’ spaces of late capitalist society merely served to veil an advanced, and in many ways more brutal, form of capitalist oppression which exploited new forms of mass leisure and consumption to its own ends” (Bennett, 2013, p. 26).

Likewise, this “pessimistic view” observed in Lefebvre’s thought “while recognizing the power of capitalism to manipulate desire, seems to leave little space for human agency” (Storey, 2014, p. 81). As Gardiner expounds, for Lefebvre this ‘commodification’ which is the result of extensive instrumentalization of all areas of life, has transformed (routinized) the daily life practices of modern society. This situation led to the transformation of daily life in an unfavorable manner and thus, in the modern era, man has been deprived of all kinds of creativity and dialogue possibilities.

Many French intellectuals, especially Lefebvre, believe that the “mass culture”, which started to become widespread all over the world, especially in Europe following the Second World War, caused considerable erosion on the values and beliefs of people and societies. French intellectuals suggested that the mediocre and destructive effect of this “popular culture” under the influence of American domination would be seen in many areas, especially French language and culture (Gardiner, 2000, p. 158-159). These criticisms of modern “mass culture” by Lefebvre and other French intellectuals in many ways overlap with the approach of the members of the Frankfurt school who believed that there was a close relationship between the production process of “forms of mass culture” and large companies and thus developed the concept of the “culture industry” to understand the nature of this relationship. For them, all kinds of cultural spaces are both commercialized and industrialized in capitalist production relations (Kellner, 2011, p. 118). Therefore, according to the Frankfurt school, there is no difference between the products of the culture industry and other industrial products when compared in terms of the very nature and logic of production:

Horkheimer and Adorno, for example, argue that the same commodity logic and instrumental rationality manifest in the sphere of production is noticeable in the sphere of consumption. Leisure time pursuits, the arts and culture in general become filtered through the culture industry; reception becomes dictated by exchange value as the higher purposes and values of culture succumb to the logic of the production process and the market (Featherstone, 2007, p. 14).

Of MacKay (1997, p. 3) summarizes this pessimistic approach which dominates the works of the members of the Frankfurt school and their followers and conceives the existing mass culture as the end of the individual:

The Frankfurt School and their disciples, writing in the inter-war period argued that the expansion of mass production in the twentieth century had led to the commodification of culture, with the rise of culture industries... Consumption served the interests of manufacturers seeking greater profits, and citizens became the passive victims of advertisers. Processes of standardization, they argued, were accompanied by the development of a materialistic culture, in which commodities came to lack authenticity and instead merely met “false” needs. These needs were generated by marketing and advertising strategies and, it is argued...increased the capacity for ideological control or domination.

As Godzich (2000, p. VII) shows, Certeau has academic and original works in many areas from Christian mysticism to everyday life practices. The fundamental shift in Certeau's academic studies began with the student movements that emerged in France in 1968. His effort to understand the student movements of 1968 motivated him to study and reflect on more about social issues, particularly the elements that “constitute the culture of society”, rather than his studies on Christian theology and mysticism. To this end, he became interested in many social and cultural issues from

education to language minorities. This shift in academic interest led him to new quests and questions regarding the everyday life. Accordingly, the question (“how do we create?” instead of “how do we exist?”) that Certeau tried to answer influenced the essence and development of his academic and intellectual works in the later period (Giard, 2008, p. 14). As a result of his search for answers to this question, which he formed as “how do we create?”, he published his work *The Practice of Everyday Life*, in which he presented his analyses of modern everyday life and the nature of consumption society. In this study, he undertakes to reveal the way how consumers as a part of both modern daily life and consumption processes participate in this process, more precisely, how they transform or reproduce the consumption objects presented to them in the market. Therefore, as opposed to the “pessimists” such as the members of the Frankfurt School and Lefebvre, Certeau indisputably expresses that the consumers are not passive agents against the “strategies” produced by the system as they reproduce all kinds of products offered to them by the market through their “tactics” that they have produced; he also shows that this process is quite creative and artistic:

What characterizes the everyday for de Certeau is a creativity that responds to this situation. By ‘making do’ with a ready-made culture, but also, and crucially, by ‘making with’ this culture (through acts of appropriation and re-employment), everyday life evidences an ‘inventiveness’ (Highmore, 2002, p. 148).

De Certeau does not agree with the criticisms and “pessimistic” attitudes of French intellectuals and the members of the Frankfurt school concerning modern consumption and mass culture. On the contrary, he “takes a far more optimistic view regarding the centrality of mass culture in late capitalist society” (Bannett, 2005, p. 55). De Certeau’s positive approach is largely due to his belief that people who are considered as passive consumers within all systems actually transform any symbolic and material products offered to them by the system or modern consumer culture by means of the ways they use such products and ‘tactics’ they use so that they can go beyond all limitations and predictiveness of the system: “De Certeau defines consumption as the realm of the use of an object by those who are not its makers. But even in the realm of use there is a moment of production, of making, doing, or “poiesis,” a moment of active re-creation” (Poster, 1997, p. 122). On the other hand, for Gardiner (2000, p. 165), in order to understand how “Certeau actually conceptualize[s] the resistant qualities of everyday life and cultural consumption”, one has to “examine Certeau’s critical assessment of the work of Michel Foucault, especially the latter’s ideas about power, resistance and disciplinary practices.” Furthermore, as Gardiner (2000, p. 166) states, Certeau counts Foucault’s analysis of modern power very valuable; yet Certeau’s most fundamental criticism of Foucault is that while trying to analyze the “strategies” produced by the power, Foucault ignores “tactics” produced within the spaces of the power by those who are characterized as weak or passive (Gardiner, 2000, p. 168). Accordingly, de Certeau’s criticisms of both Foucault and Bourdieu are based on the opinion that “they view subjectivity as a reflex of broader structural processes – discourse, habitus – that

determine subject position and generate action independently of the reflexive subject” (Mitchell, 2007, p. 91).

### **Modern Consumption and Resistance**

In his work *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Certeau states that the users who are considered to be passive in the production and consumption processes of the power or the dominant system attempt to demonstrate “modes of operation or schemata of action”:

The purpose of this work is to make explicit the systems of operational combination...which also compose a "culture," and to bring to light the models of action characteristic of users whose status as the dominated element in society (a status that does not mean that they are either passive or docile) is concealed by the euphemistic term "consumers." Everyday life invents itself by poaching in countless ways on the property of others. (Certeau, 1988, p. xi-xii).

Contrary to the popular belief of “passive consumers” within the capitalist system, Certeau claims that they are neither passive users nor docile consumers, but they have “models of action” running based on their own operational logic. For him, the consumer, who is thought to be passive within the rational logic of the system, transforms all consumption objects (ranging from commercial production to media production) offered to him by incorporating such objects in his reproduction or manufacturing process with the help of his unique operational logic and models of action. What allows consumers to reproduce any kind of products offered to them in the capitalist system is that they transform such consumer objects by means of their “ways of use”. Certeau (1988, p. xiii) explains this reproduction process of the consumer with the example of the South American natives:

For instance, the ambiguity that subverted from within the Spanish colonizers' “success” in imposing their own culture on the indigenous Indians is well known. Submissive, and even consenting to their subjection, the Indians nevertheless often made of the rituals, representations, and laws imposed on them something quite different from what their conquerors had in mind; they subverted them not by rejecting or altering them, but by using them with respect to ends and references foreign to the system they had no choice but to accept. They were other within the very colonization that outwardly assimilated them; their use of the dominant social order deflected its power, which they lacked the means to challenge; they escaped it without leaving it. The strength of their difference lay in procedures of consumption.

In the same way, Certeau describes the logic of this reproduction and the “ways of use/consumption” with other examples. According to him, it is possible to see the transformational power of reproduction and ways of use in symbolic and imaginary cultural fields such as language and works of art. In the French society, for example, the culture tools and products imposed and disseminated by the intellectual classes that produce the language of society are transformed by the

common people by introducing them into the process of reproduction through their own specific ways of use. “To a lesser degree, a similar ambiguity creeps into our societies through the use made by the common people of the culture disseminated and imposed by the elites producing the language.” (Certeau, 1998, p. xiii). For him, the rationality of the capitalist production or system and the logic of producing objects do not have any decisive role on the consumer’s “ways of use” of those products offered. Therefore, according to Certeau, the main thing to understand is how these individuals, ranging from people who sit hours in front of television to those consumers shopping in supermarkets and who are considered to be passive in all these processes, reproduce the products or production objects offered to them and what they produce from such objects. However, this very creative reproduction process of the consumer or the user occurs and spreads in a very invisible/secret way in the spaces and areas determined by the dominant system because unlike the dominant production systems, consumers do not have any space of their own to clearly show what they are producing. Therefore, consumers who are considered to be passive must cunningly infiltrate into all areas of the dominant order and economic system, even to the deepest corners in a subtle and unnoticed manner. In this respect, the reproduction of the consumer shows “itself not in its own products...but in an art of using those imposed on it.” (Certeau, 1998, p. 30-32).

In addition, for him, it is necessary to understand the “methods of action, practice and production” of consumers in order to understand the ways of use and methods they employ within the capitalist system because he believes that “these ‘ways of operating’ constitute the innumerable practices by means of which users reappropriate the space organized by techniques of sociocultural production” (Certeau, 1998, p. xiv). Moreover, individuals/users who are thought to be shaped by the dominant structure, culture or production system “make (*bricolent*) innumerable and infinitesimal transformations of and within the dominant cultural economy in order to adapt it to their own interests and their own rules.” (Certeau, 1998, p. xiii-xiv). For him, the feature that makes consumers so successful within the system or the dominant cultural economy is their possession of a special form of knowledge that has its origins in ancient Greece, or even earlier. The Greeks called this form of knowledge as ‘metis’ (Certeau, 1998, p. 82). Thus, understanding tactics and “ruses” and forms of resistance employed by consumers who are thought to be passive in the material and symbolic productions of the power or the dominant economic system “will be of fundamental importance in Michel de Certeau’s notion of ‘l’invention du quotidien’” (Sheringham, 2006, p. 152). It is also necessary to delve into the two basic concepts employed by Certeau, namely strategy and tactics for further understanding of this situation.

### **The Concepts of Tactics and Strategy**

De Certeau suggests that there is a dual structure in all societies: on the one hand, the dominant order or (economic) system, and on the other, the users who are thought to be passive

within this system. While the system maintains its existence through “strategies” it produces in its own dominant space, individuals who are seen as passive consumers continue their existence through “tactics” they develop, that is, by transforming all production objects presented to them and making new productions and manufactures from them. He defines strategy as “the calculation (or manipulation) of power relationships that becomes possible as soon as a subject with will and power (a business, an army, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated” (Certeau, 1998, p. 35). Moreover, he maintains that strategy has primarily a precisely defined area of power, or a space, and it continues to exist through this area, and its forms of rationality (political, economic or scientific) can only be realized through this area. He defines tactics as “a calculated action determined by the absence of a proper locus” (Certeau, 1998, p. 35-36). However, the rationality of tactics is entirely different from the rationality of strategies: strategies establish their relations with the power that supports them within the space through objective calculation whereas the rationality of tactics is realized by means of the pleasures attached to the daily life practices of the agent and therefore tactics is artistic (Certeau, 1998, p. 37-38).

Unlike strategy, tactics as the “art of the weak” has neither a power nor a space so consumers perform tactics throughout the space of the other. However, since tactics does not have any center or space, it cannot encompass the entire space of the system; it is included in the space of the other by infiltrating piece by piece. Temporally, strategies are always more advantageous due to the space they have; conversely, since tactics has no space of its own, it is constantly vigilant to capture the possibilities that it can use to its advantage. Tactics cannot have a spatial superiority over strategy as well as any clear and holistic action plan to do this. Rather, tactics only has to take advantage of the opportunities and make successive moves to do so. The only thing that can make tactics advantageous in this situation is its ability of mobility. Therefore, under these conditions, the success of tactics is the result of its ability and art “to make use of the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary powers.” (Certeau, 1998, p. 37-39). As Buchanan (2000, p. 93) states that “De Certeau defines this ‘making’ as a *poiesis* whose chief characteristic is its lack of visibility.” Besides, tactics cannot keep its gains and for this reason it “must constantly manipulate events in order to turn them into opportunities.... achieved in the propitious moments when they are able to combine heterogeneous elements” (Certeau, 1998, p. xix). Certeau tries to explain this situation by referring to the example of a woman shopping at the market:

In the supermarket, housewife confronts heterogeneous and mobile data-what she has in the refrigerator, the tastes, appetites, and moods of her guests, the best buys and their possible combinations with what she already has on hand at home, etc. (Certeau, 1998, p. xix).

According to Certeau, another important difference between strategy and tactics regarding the space and extension is their “ways of operating” in the space that belongs to the strategy. Tactics that



do not have any space or spatial domain move in these areas produced by the strategy and use their cunningness to transform the operations of strategies. Certeau explains the different ways of operations of strategies and tactics with the example of the workers at the factory. Workers within the factory system or space "... introduce into it a way of turning it to their advantage that obeys other rules and constitutes something like a second level interwoven into the first... and they create a certain play in the machine through a stratification of different and interfering kinds of functioning." Certeau tries to explain this situation by giving another example, Algerians living in Paris. These people living in cheap housing facilities available for immigrants in Paris cunningly transform their own "ways of dwelling" and "ways of language use" by penetrating them into the system and thus create for themselves "a space in which he can find ways of using the constraining order of the place or of the language" (Certeau, 1998, p. 30).

### **Act of Reading as a Resistance**

Certeau contends that we need to look at the role of "act of reading" common in the modern society in order to understand the ways of daily action/resistance or "tactics" consumers develop for the products offered to them by the (production) system in the modern consumer society. For Pawley, the text-reader relationship is generally explained with reference to the "market model" as seen in Robert Darnton and the act of reading is formulated as a passive action; however, De Certeau, like Roger Chartier, points out that the text-reader relationship is not a relationship in which the reader would be merely seen as completely passive:

Along with Roger Chartier's theory of appropriation, de Certeau's conceptualization of the reader as poacher has been immensely influential, especially among literary scholars eager to emphasize reader agency and at the same time keen to move away from the close textual rigors of the New Criticism and into the expansive world of cultural history... In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, he describes reading as a process that "transforms another person's property into a space borrowed for a moment by a transient." The reader "insinuates into another person's text the ruses of pleasure and appropriation: he poaches on it, is transported into it, pluralizes himself in it" (Pawley, 2009, p. 78).

For Certeau, what we call the "act of reading" is the "exorbitant focus of contemporary culture and its consumption" and consequently, when the text-reader relationship is understood, it will be possible to understand the nature of the relationship between production and consumption in the modern consumer society too. In this sense, he believes that not only the symbolic products or messages produced by the mass media, but also the economy itself has turned into "semicracy" in the modern society. Therefore, according to Certeau, production-consumption relations have been replaced by the ever-increasing acts of writing-reading in the modern society. To sum up, Certeau discusses that many people conceive act of reading as the reflection of utmost passivity of the consumer; rather, he perceives it as the main particularity of consumers' mode of production, that is

'silent production'. For him, the reader in this process "insinuates into another person's text the ruses of pleasure and appropriation: he poaches on it, is transported into it, pluralizes himself in it like the internal rumblings of one's body" (Certeau, 1998, p. xxi).

### **Tactics and Strategies in Analyzing Education Policy**

Although conventional approaches to education policy gave priority to education system and its active subjects such as managers and the role of teachers, they did not pay enough attention to the position of students and their parents in this process. For instance, Brever and Wrets (2017) and Saltmarsh (2014) suggest that one has to consider the position of students and their parents, not as passive consumers of the education process but as the active participant of it to have more appropriate approaches to both the education process and critical evaluation in education policies. Just like Saltmarsh (2014), Braver and Wrets (2017, p. 243) believe that De Certeau's concepts such as strategy and tactics and his views on consumer culture in modern society, especially his concept of consumption "offer a complementary analytical tool for critical study of policy in education." As they claim that, in general, the approaches to policies in education make evaluations and criticisms largely through the logic of the system and its strategies; however, they do not seriously examine whether there are areas of resistance within the education system, and they consider both students and their families as the passive side or consumers of the educational system. Therefore, those approaches do give less attention to consumers (students and their parents) or how they produce resistance to the (educational) system by their own tactics and the way they use the products offered to them. Following De Certeau's views, Saltmarsh (2014) is of the opinion that the practices in everyday life are not shaped only by the strategies produced by the dominant system or structure, but strategies together with or in collaboration with tactics create practices in everyday life. Furthermore, for Saltmarsh, critical studies on education or education policies should understand how the interactions between the system and students and their families work. In other words, the policy studies must pay more attention to recognizing the sides and people involved in the educational process than regulating educational relationships among them. As Brever and Wrets (2017) state that although De Certeau accepts Foucault's panopticon theory, he rejects Foucault's views which consider people as passive objects in the face of the power. Unlike Foucault, Certeau believes that the actors, who are considered to be passive, transform the product offered to them with the way they use it and the tactics they apply. According to them, critical approaches to policy studies in education must take into account the system itself and the teachers seen as its active practitioners as well as students and their families who are seen as passive consumers.

Having stated the mutual interaction between the policy and culture in terms of everyday practices, Saltmarsh tries to illustrate what benefits and possibilities Certeau's analysis and concepts such as strategy and tactics will bring to those who study policy in education. Her main argument is

that most of the policy studies on the efficiency of the education system often focus on how educational institutions implement education policies and what should be done to be more efficient and thriving in the educational process. However, as seen in the studies carried out in Australia, she boldly expresses that adopting a holistic approach to the educational process and including shareholders in all these processes, especially the students and their parents, will not solve the problem. In other words, incorporation of both students and their parents into the education system in creating educational policies does not guarantee the possibilities of existence of a far more efficient and trouble-free education in schools. The main reason for this is that against the system and its subjects, especially teachers' strategies, the students and their parents will continue to produce their own tactics. It is possible to see this situation in every area of daily life, from reading texts to students' study activities; instead of studying in the etudes organized for his/her homework, the student can write a letter or a poem to his/her girlfriend/boyfriend. Similarly, whenever there is any problem between the student and the teacher, the student's parent will not have a consistent but different attitude towards the teacher and school administration. Therefore, as stated above, for her, critical studies on policy in education must pay attention to understand what the system's strategies and the consumer's tactics are and how they "work" (Saltmarsh 2014).

Moreover, in relation to teachers' position in the process of education, Saltmarsh (2014) claims that more holistic approaches to education usually ignore or cannot adequately analyze the position of teachers in this process as they often have two different roles, both as parents and as subjects of the system, and thus it is not possible to explain clearly their position in the system: Are they the subject of the system who produce strategies or the parents who produce resistances to the system by means of the tactics in the cracks of the system? On the one hand, teachers, especially school principals, act like a company manager in times of neoliberal policies, on the other hand, they can turn into parents (consumers) who produce tactics against the system within the process of education. Just as the teachers, commentators or analysts who are involved in the policy studies in education structures are not the passive observers; rather they could be, at the same time, among the consumers, which means that the experts who study on policy production in education can also be involved in this process they observe. According to the author, as De Certeau illustrates, in many respects there are many similarities between scientific activities and what is happening in the process of reading and interpreting text. For Saltmarsh (2014, p. 4-5), interpreter/analyst does not have a passive position in the policy processes in education:

the interpreter/analyst is not an innocent bystander in this space of subjectivity. Positioned in multiple ways in relation to such endeavours, the analyst/interpreter's complicity in the regulatory and homogenizing endeavours of political programmes, the production of policy knowledges, their conditions of possibility and the cultures in which they are implicated cannot be overlooked or treated as an irrelevant indulgence... those closely involved in processes of policy formation and

implementation can simultaneously be among its target populations, recipients of its effects and unintended consequences, and everyday makers of its cultures.

### **Conclusion**

It is possible to generalize Certeau's analysis on the relationship of "text- reading" to all other social areas in modern consumer society, especially the economic sphere in order to understand the tactics (ways of use and reproduction) the consumer, who is thought to be passive, employs to differentiate the products offered in the market by the system and makes new productions. The main point that Certeau tries to show in his work *The Practice of Everyday Life* is that contrary to the popular belief, the individual in the modern consumer society is not a passive consumer; the modern individual transforms all "symbolic and material products" offered to him in his daily life practices, from the act of walking in the street to the act of shopping in the market, by means of the tactics he employs (the ways of use and reproduction) and creates new areas of freedom in the modern consumer society (Poster, 1997, p. 9). Therefore, unlike the "pessimists" such as the members of the Frankfurt School and Lefebvre that see the consumer society as completely passive subjects and describe this period as the end of the individual, Certeau firmly pronounces that consumers are not passive subjects to the "strategies" produced by the system as they reproduce all products offered to them by the market through the "tactics" they have produced, and this reproduction process is quite creative and artistic.

Moreover, De Certeau's analysis of modern consumption culture and his basic concepts of strategy and tactics offer new perspectives to those working on education policy. Traditional approaches in education studies generally explain education processes and policy analyzes in education system by examining education system and its active subjects, namely teachers and students and their parents as consumers who are passive participants of education. However, as shown in this study, the most important contribution of De Certeau's analysis to studies on education policies is that both students and their parents are not passive consumers in the modern education system; they are consumers producing resistance mechanisms to the system by means of their own tactics and "ways of use". Therefore, De Certeau's perspective and his concepts of strategies and tactics can be highly important in understanding the educational process and conducting more consistent policy analyses in education.

### **References**

- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*. Open University Press.
- Bennett, A. (2005). *Culture and Everyday Life*. Sage Publications.

- Brewer C. A., & Werts A. B. (2017). Utilizing Michel De Certeau in Critical Policy Analysis. In M. Young, & S. Diem (Eds.), *Critical Approaches to Education Policy Analysis. Moving Beyond Tradition* (pp. 243-260). Springer.
- Buchanan, I. (2000). Michel de Certeau: Cultural Theorist. Sage Publications.
- Certeau, M. de. (2008). *Gündelik Hayatın Keşfi*, (1st vol.), (L. A. Özcan, Trans.). Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Christine Pawley. (2009). Beyond Market Models and Resistance: Organizations as a Middle Layer in the History of Reading. *The Library Quarterly*, 79(1), 73-93. doi:10.1086/593376.
- Dale, F. S. (2015). *The Orange Trees of Marrakesh: Ibn Khaldun and the Science of Man*. Harvard University Press.
- Featherstone, M. (2007). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gardiner, M. E. (2000). *Critiques of Everyday Life*. Routledge.
- Giard, L. (2008). Bir Araştırmannın Hikayesi. In M. de. Carteau, L. Giard, & Mayol, P. (Eds.), *Gündelik Hayatın Keşfi* (1st vol.), (pp. 9-37). Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Godzich, W. (2000). Foreword: The Future Possibility of Knowledge In *Heterologies*, (B. Massumi, Trans.), (pp. VII-XXI). London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Highmore, B. (2002). *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory*. Routledge.
- Kellner D. (2011). Frankfurt Okulu'ndan Postmodernizme Televizyona Dair Eleştirel Perspektifler (S. F. Varol, Trans.). *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi Akademia*, 2(1), 118-134.
- MacKay, H. (1997). *Consumption and everyday life*. Sage Publications.
- Mitchell, J. P. (2007). A fourth critic of the Enlightenment: Michel de Certeau and the ethnography of subjectivity\*. *Social Anthropology*, 15(1), 89-106. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8676.2007.00001.x.
- Poster, M. (1997). *Cultural History and Postmodernity*. Columbia University Press.
- Robert, B. (1993). *Consumption*. Routledge.
- Saltmarsh, S. (2015). Michel de Certeau, everyday life and policy cultures: the case of parent engagement in education policy. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(1), 38-54. doi:10.1080/17508487.2015.961166.
- Sheringham, M. (2006). *Everyday life: Theories and practices from Surrealism to the Present*. Oxford University Press
- Storey, J. (1999). *Cultural Consumption and Everyday Life*. Hodder Education.
- Storey, J. (2014). *From Popular Culture to Everyday Life*. Routledge.