## Knowledge Production in Educational Leadership Project

**Professor Helen M Gunter, University of Manchester.**

### 1. Interview Schedule for Headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Focus</th>
<th>Key Question</th>
<th>Follow up questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To obtain biographical information. | Why did you become a headteacher? | What do you like about headship?  
What concerns do you have about headship?  
What are your views about New Labour education policy?  
Are headteachers’ views taken into account by policymakers? (Ask for examples to illustrate). |
| Questionnaire data to support this. | | |
| To obtain their approach to school leadership | What is your approach to School Leadership? i.e. What is your preferred way of doing school leadership | Ask for illustrations and why they regard it as leadership.  
The government has a particular model of leadership which is articulated in policy documents and through national programmes (e.g. NCSL), what do they think of it? |
| | Where did your approach come from and how has it developed over time? | Probe on:  
Training and development: use the Questionnaire to probe on access to and use of NCSL programmes, or not. Why do postgraduate programmes etc.  
Reading: what do they read and why? Which research and/or writers and/or theories have influenced them most. (Probe on any text that has shaped their thinking – what are the texts, authors, theories – can they give an example how this has shaped their thinking or practice)  
Role models/mentors: in general life or in own experience.  
Thinking and doing the job: how has experience helped them to develop their approach – with examples. |
| To obtain views on their own effectiveness. | How effective do you think your approach is? | Probe on:  
Examples in regard to what they say, i.e. how their leadership takes place in ways that make a difference.  
How do they know that their practice is effective? |
| End | Anything they would like to add that they haven’t had the chance to say. | |
2. Interview Schedule for people in higher education/private consultants/local government/unions (amended in relation to the person’s employment and role).

**Opening Question:** Could you please talk me through your professional career from leaving school to the present day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Main question</th>
<th>Additional questions/prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career</strong></td>
<td>Opening question</td>
<td>Follow up when mention particular significant incident, event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career trajectory – on leaving school to present day.</td>
<td>What were reasons for any changes made? (e.g. left teaching for HE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish how their professional career emerged, any significant events which impacted upon career direction, reasons for any changes made (e.g. left teaching for HE), anything that happened that had a significant effect on the direction or approach they took, their writing, their research etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Practice</strong></td>
<td>Could you talk to me about the nature of your professional practice? In other words, what do you currently do in terms of research, teaching, theorising, writing etc?</td>
<td>You’ve talked about how your practice has changed over time – do you think the language you have used to talk or write about your research has also changed – if so, in what way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish what their current practice comprises and how they consider this has changed over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing language – implies changing values as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positioning:</strong></td>
<td>Where do you locate your work in the field of education, i.e. where do you see your intellectual home?</td>
<td>Why do you locate your work in that particular area/epistemic grouping?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you see the positioning of your work in (that area) as being straightforward or problematic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To establish where they position their work and why they locate it in that particular area/epistemic grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problematise – their position isn’t necessarily secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>What do you regard as being your particular contribution in your field?</td>
<td>What prompted you to become interested in your field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does that position feel secure? Why, why not?</td>
<td>Through you had to or needed to change your intellectual position during the course of your career?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you had to or needed to change your intellectual position during the course of your career?</td>
<td>What prompted your interest in leadership, particularly school leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What prompted your interest in leadership, particularly school leadership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>What impact has working in higher education had on the nature of your professional practice?</td>
<td>You’ve co-written with other people [name if already mentioned], how did this come about, why work with these particular people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>What formal and informal networks are you involved in? (e.g. BELMAS, SCRELM, BERA SiGs – formal; colleagues – informal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Context</strong></td>
<td>Do you think that working with these particular people has shaped your thinking, writing in any particular way – how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impact, if any, do you feel that education policy and legislation has had on your professional practice?</td>
<td>In what ways have developments in policy affected your work and the direction it has taken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ascertain whether they consider that education policy and legislation has affected their professional practice and what the impact has been?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Important Contributors</strong></th>
<th>Who would you rank as important contributors in your field? Who you would advise us to talk to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is their work distinctive from others?</td>
<td>Why do you think they are particularly important or influential in the field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will help triangulate the sample and also ensure we have not missed anyone who would be of importance to the project enquiry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hopes and aspirations</strong></th>
<th>What are your hopes and aspirations for your field – in what direction do you see it going in the future?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To explore how they perceive the future of their field and where field is heading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Final Question</strong></th>
<th>Is there anything else that they want to say, which hasn’t been covered during the interview but which they think is important for this research?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides interviewee opportunity to disclose anything that they consider is important but has not been asked about during the interview or they did not disclose earlier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Interviews with Ministers and Civil Servants (amended according to role and remit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Focus</th>
<th>Key Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To obtain views on New Labour policy</td>
<td>What were the aspirations of New Labour for Education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the key achievements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What concerns do you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain detail on the person’s particular role</td>
<td>What has been your particular contribution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain reasons for New Labour’s investment in school leadership</td>
<td>Why did New Labour invest in school leadership as a major reform strategy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To obtain views on NCSL</td>
<td>Could you please tell us why the NCSL was set up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What difference do you think it has made? Give reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the NCSL been successful? Give reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td>Who else do you think we should speak to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anything they would like to add that they haven’t had the chance to say.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This data set contains the list of primary and secondary sources used in the Project:

Primary Sources

1. Policy Documents from central government and non-departmental public bodies: white papers; green papers; reports; letters and speeches.
3. Documents released under the Freedom of Information Act: list of the documents about the decision to set up the National College for School Leadership.
4. NCSL Publications about the leadership of schools: a list of publications from the NCSL on aspects of leadership.
5. List of readings provided by interviewees about their work: list of the published texts supplied by interviewees to illustrate their contribution to the field. These were read prior to the interview.

Secondary Sources

2. Literatures on the Leadership of Schools: published texts not from the NCSL.

Primary Sources

(1) Policy Documents


Innovation Unit (2007 accessed) *Next Practice in System Leadership Project with the NCSL*. [www.innovation-unit.co.uk/projects](http://www.innovation-unit.co.uk/projects)


NCSL (2006) Annual Report and Accounts 05/06 Nottingham: NCSL


Standards and Effectiveness Unit/DfEE (1997) *From targets to action*. London: DfEE.


(2) *Published Accounts of New Labour Policy*


**(3) Documents released under the Freedom of Information Act**

Specific request to the Department for Education and Skills was to have access to documents about the decision to set up the NCSL.

20/4/1999: email conversation between Peter Swift and Christina Bienkowska on charitable status and college.

20/4/1999: Letter from Peter Swift to Mr R Wall, Cabinet Secretariat, on the status of the college.

20/4/1999: Minute from Peter Swift to Simon Harker, on the status of the college.

29/4/1999: Minute from Peter Swift to Estelle Morris on status of the college and sponsorship.

4/5/1999: email conversation between Peter Swift and Jane Whitfield (on behalf of Estelle Morris) on status and sponsorship.

5/5/1999: email conversation between Peter Swift and Jane Whitfield (on behalf of Estelle Morris) on status and sponsorship.

6/5/1999: Letter from Peter Swift to Mr R Wall, Cabinet Secretariat, on the status of the college.

10/5/1999: email conversation between Peter Swift and Jane Whitfield (on behalf of Estelle Morris) on status and sponsorship.

7/5/1999: email conversation between Peter Swift and Jane Whitfield (on behalf of Estelle Morris) on the status of the college.

10/5/1999: Letter from Constance Wallace at Pinsent Curtis to Peter Swift with legal advice on status of college.

14/5/1999: Minute from Peter Swift to Mike Pears on the legal advice in setting up the college and the charitable body.

14/5/1999: Letter from Peter Swift to Mr R Wall, Cabinet Secretariat, on the status of the college.

14/5/1999: Letter from Peter Swift to Constance Wallace, Pinsent Curtis, on the status of the college.

14/7/1999: Letter from Constance Wallace at Pinsent Curtis to Peter Swift on issues needing settlement in regard to charitable company status.
23/7/1999: Minute from Peter Swift to Estelle Morris on the governance and management structures of the college.
28/7/1999: Letter from Peter Swift to Constance Wallace at Pinsent Curtis on the status of the college.
29/7/1999: email from Denise (on behalf of Estelle Morris) and Peter Swift on the status of the college.
29/7/1999: email from Peter Swift to Peter Grenville on the status of the college.
31/9/1999: Letter from Peter Swift to Constance Wallace at Pinsent Curtis on the status of the college.
1/9/1999: Letter from Hartley O Brigg at Pinsent Curtis to Peter Swift on the status of the college.
9/9/1999: Letter from Constance Wallace at Pinsent Curtis to Peter Swift on the status of the college.
10/9/1999: Letter from Rob Wall, Cabinet Secretariat, to Peter Swift on the status of the college.
19/10/1999: Letter from Neil Peterson, Head of Regional Operations at the Charity Commission to Mr K Beeton, Schools Capital and Building Division, DfEE. About general liaison and links.
22/11/1999: Letter from Sir Michael Bichard, Permanent Secretary to Sir Robin Jarvin, Private Secretary to the Queen about Royal College status for the college.
23/11/1999: Minute from Peter Swift to Sir Michael Bichard on Royal Charters.
24/11/1999: Email from Jane Whitfield (on behalf of Estelle Morris) to Michael Bichard on Royal Charters.
16/12/1999: Email from Ike Nwaku with Peter Swift on liaison with Charity Commission.
2/2/2000: Minute from Dominic Mahon (O&A Project) to Christina Bienkowska, Peter Swift and Mike Pears about the status of the college.
2/2/2000: Letter from Dominic Mahon to Constance Wallace, Pinsent Curtis, taken over from Peter as Organisation and Appointments Manager re the college.
2/2/2000: Minute from Dominic Mahon to Christina Beinkowska, Peter Swift, and Mike Pears over the status of the college.
7/2/2000: Minute from Christina Beinkowska to Dominic Mahon on the status of the college.
17/2/2000: Minute from Dominic Mahon to Christina Beinkowska and Peter Swift on the status of the college.
22/2/2000: Letter and Memorandum and Articles for the college from Hartley O'Brigg at Pinsent Curtis to I Nwaku, DfEE.
23/5/2000: Minute from Dominic Mahon to Estelle Morris. Much of this document has text that is covered over.
25/5/2000: Letter to Companies House from Estelle Morris to say that the NCSL is a company limited by guarantee and that the word national can be used.
14/7/2000: Hand written note to Hartley O'Brigg at Pinsent Curtis from Rene De Silva regarding enclosed papers relating to Directors of the company.
18/7/2000: Letter from Hartley O'Brigg at Pinsent Curtis to R De Silva to confirm legal requirements for the company.
21/7/2000: Hand written note to Hartley O'Brigg at Pinsent Curtis from Rene De Silva regarding enclosed papers relating to the Directors of the company.
22/6/2000: email between Peter Connor and Dominic Mahon regarding role of Directors.
29/8/2000: Letter from Hartley O'Brigg at Pinsent Curtis to Dominic Mahon regarding the registration as a charity.
25/9/2000: Letter from Dominic Mahon to Barry Woodhead, Company Secretary, NCSL, to tender resignations of himself, Peter Makeham, Christina Beinkowska and Peter Swift as Directors.
12/2/2002: email from Hartley O’Brigg at Pinsent Curtis Biddle to Francoise Ryder to confirm deregistration of the Charity, but retention of registration at Companies House. It is registered as a dormant company. Accompanied with webpage from the Charity Commission to show that registration as a charity was 24th August 2000 and it was removed 16th August 2001.
12/2/2002: email from Francoise Ryder to Barry Woodhead (company secretary) requesting that the college be deregistered as a company.
12/2/2002: email from Barry Woodhead to Francoise Ryder to confirm this.
18/2/2002: email from Francoise Ryder to Hartley O’Brigg to request deregistration of the charity as a company.
21/2/2002: email from Hartley O’Brigg to Francoise Ryder to confirm this has been done.
21/2/2002: email from Francoise Ryder to Barry Woodhead to confirm this has been done.

(4) NCSL Publications about the leadership of schools
Barnes, I. (2005) New Models of Headship, Primary Executive Heads. A study of heads who are leading more than one primary school. Nottingham: NCSL.


(5) List of readings provided by interviewees about their work. Read prior to interviews.


Secondary Sources

(1) Policy Research and Commentaries


(2) *Literatures on the Leadership and Schools*


Final Report

Knowledge Production in Educational Leadership (KPEL) Project

Helen M Gunter and Gillian Forrester

Background

The project explores the relationship between the state, public policy and knowledge by focusing on New Labour’s investment in the leadership of schools as a central strategy for delivering reform. Specifically the project focuses on identifying and examining the types of knowledge, the ways of knowing and the legitimisation of knowers involved in framing, promoting and securing leadership. This is the first study of a range of agents who are actively and variously involved in the development and enactment of policy.

Objectives

(1) to map knowledge, knowers and knowing within the field of educational leadership. This was met through (a) analysing policy texts; (b) analysing literatures on key policy themes; (c) interviews with 116 policymakers including ministers, civil servants, advisors (appointed to role), private sector consultants (contracted to provide a service), headteachers, and researchers in higher education; (d) developing biographical accounts of professional practice. Analysis yielded a descriptive map of the institutional structure of governance with main events, policy priorities, debates and agents (Gunter and Forrester 2008a).

(2) to investigate how those who locate their professional practice within and outside of school leadership understand and articulate their individual and networked positions in the field. This was met through (a) using a conceptual framework (Gunter 2005a,b) to map knowledge production; (b) developing and using a sampling frame to identify and interview knowledge producers and users (Appendix 1; Confidential Ap-

1 This report is dedicated to the memory of field members who died while the project was taking place: Professor Ray Bolam, Professor Jean Rudduck, Professor Harry Tomlinson and Professor Len Watson.
(3) to identify how those who position themselves within and outside of school leadership work with and build networks to regulate knowledge, knowers and knowing. This was met through producing intellectual histories (Gunter 2006a,c), and epistemic genealogies (Gunter and Forrester 2009a). Analysis provided a more detailed understanding of the conceptualised map begun with Objective 2.

(4) to identify how practitioners position themselves within the field, and how they access and use knowledge, knowers and knowing. This was met through (a) an examination of the data from, e.g. NDPBs, regarding leadership provision; (b) an interview with a leading member of a headteacher union; (c) three interviews with current and previous CEOs; (d) interviews with 25 headteachers. Analysis provided a more detailed understanding of the conceptualised map of the field regarding the interplay between agency and structure within professional practice (Forrester and Gunter 2008).

(5) to critically analyse how knowledge, knowers and knowing is being configured and used as a means of understanding modernisation of the public domain through examining the inter-relationship between national policy and local practice. This was met through (a) producing a conceptualisation of field positions based on Objectives 1-4; (b) using critical policy studies analysis to develop explanations of the inter-relationship between policy and practice (Gunter and Forrester 2008b).

(6) to develop a conceptual framework of knowledge production that can describe, understand, and explain how individuals, clusters, and networks use and produce knowledge through collaboration and exchange. This was met through using Bourdieu’s thinking tools to produce a conceptualisation of knowledge production as regimes of practice (Gunter and Forrester 2009b).
Methods

The design outlined in the original proposal was operationalised: first, documentary search of primary sources; second, literature search on policy and school leadership; third, a purposive interview sample of 116 from Government, NDPBs/agencies, Local Government, Unions, Universities, Schools, and Private Sector companies (see Data Sets).

The sample (Appendix 1 and Confidential Appendix 2) was constructed by examining documents and websites to identify organisations and people\(^2\). Validation was achieved by asking respondents to name people who they thought we should interview. The sample was larger than original proposed because: (1) access to senior civil servants was smoother than anticipated; (2) the role of private sector involvement increased between the proposal submission and project start. Interviews and transcriptions all took place within project resources.

Prior to each interview biographical work was undertaken and semi-structured interview schedules were based on:

- **Background**: role and professional biography.
- **Professional practice**: for researchers on purposes and contribution; for headteachers on approaches to leadership; for private sector consultants on business products.
- **New Labour policy**: the aims, gains and concerns about education policy and leadership bespoke to the respondent context.

Each interview was recorded, transcribed and a copy returned to the interviewee for factual checking and to identify any text that they would not wish to be directly quoted. Each respondent was told that their name would appear in this report but it would not be linked directly to data sets.

The full transcriptions were uploaded to NVivo7. ‘Sets’ plus ‘tree’ and ‘free’ nodes were created. Passages of text were coded systematically by individual case and allocated to these nodes accordingly. Data analysis was iterative and as key themes became apparent new nodes were developed and refined and more complex node hierarchies were created. The data from various nodes were reconstructed as field

\(^2\) We are grateful to several people who acted as gatekeepers.
reports and provided consolidated accounts of particular responses and themes. A thematic analysis was subsequently undertaken whereby individual nodes, datasets and cases were investigated and interrogated (electronically and manually) in order to address the project’s main research questions.

The conceptual framework outlined in the proposal was used. First, regime theory (Harding 2000:55) focused on interconnections as a “governing coalition”, who require entry into public institutions (as ministers, civil servants, contracted providers) in order to retain competitive advantage (win elections, contract renewal); second, Bourdieu’s (1990, 2000) thinking tools of field, habitus, capital, codification, and misrecognition, were used to develop understandings of how regimes work as practices. Regimes of practice are networked positions within a field, and as such the staking of capital through entering and positioning provides a dynamic explanatory construct through which the location and practice of power can be understood. Following Bourdieu (2005) Diagram 1 presents the map where positions are taken in relation to proximity to and distance from the state as power and economy. Respondents have been located according to indicators of capital in their biography, professional practice, and dispositions.
Results

Executive Summary

(a) New Labour’s model of educational leadership is the *leadership of schools*, where the emphasis is on organisational and systemic conformity. There is little that is educational about the preferred approach to the leadership of schools.

(b) Policymaking is through *institutionalised governance* where networks of preferred advisors and consultants enable public sector education to be opened up to the market.

(c) Policymaking can be explained as *regimes of practice* where agents take up positions in relation to economic and political power, and stake claims for recognition through their professional practice.
(i) New Labour and the leadership of schools

What emerged between 1997 and 2007 is the leadership of schools whereby centralised regulation of structures, cultures and practices was used to control the local implementation of reform. This is different to professional school leadership pre 1988 where the control of the curriculum was localised, and post 1988 where entrepreneurial school leadership was configured as organisational effectiveness within a quasi market (Grace 1995). New Labour built on Thatcherite performance regulation based on arguments that the market could not deliver reform with the required compliance and speed.

Responsibility and accountability for the delivery and impact of reform through the leadership of schools has important features: first, centralised design and accreditation; second, the single person as transformational leader; third, formal delegation known as ‘distributed’ leadership; fourth, primacy given to private sector language, processes and legitimacy; fifth, redesign of professionalism as technical capability (e.g. data handling) combined with personal attributes (e.g. charisma), underpinned by an overt commitment to New Labour strategies and processes; sixth, use of SESI research and researchers; seventh, contract compliance secured through, e.g. NDPBs such as the NCSL to codify and transmit New Labour strategies; and, eighth, networks of advisors and consultants from the private and public sectors have been contracted to deliver and strategise on product design and tactics (Gunter and Forrester 2008a).

Diagram 2 summarises the local leadership of schools by the single person. The focus on the headteacher from 1997 as school leader is based on the school as the unit of analysis for performance delivery. The Every Child Matters agenda combined with the acceleration of private sector control of provision has meant some job redesign for the effective leader who need not have QTS. The leader is officially trained and licensed according to prescribed standards, and leadership is about localised delivery. Local autonomy is framed around the tactics of delivery in regard to context (Gunter et al. 2008).
Diagram 2: A decade of the leadership of schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Label</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred model</td>
<td>Transformational leadership to deliver national reforms in the school.</td>
<td>Transformational leadership with distributed delegation to deliver national reforms locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Headteacher as chief executive.</td>
<td>School/Academy/Federation/Systemic leader as chief executive and networker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>84 National Standards. 16: knowledge; 35: skills and attributes; and 33 ways in which heads impact on five areas of strategic direction of the school.</td>
<td>149 National Standards across 6 key areas of Headteacher role. 49: knowledge; 52: professional qualities; and, 48: actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Headteacher as inspirational and influential in communicating and building commitment to reforms.</td>
<td>School/Academy/Federation/Systemic leaders to lead reforms locally and nationally and build commitment within a diverse workforce and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key features</td>
<td>Secure and improve standards</td>
<td>Secure and improve standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) State and public policy

The production of the leadership of schools as public policy is located in the interplay between state regulation and capital accumulation (Jessop 2002). What is ‘public’ in policy values and purposes is about the privileging of private interests (Ranson 1995). The approach was to secure “investment for results” (Blair 2006: 1), and so in Driver’s (2006) terms New Labour used “a big stick” (279) from decisions in Whitehall through to the child along a “delivery chain” (Barber 2007). This operated through structures (e.g. NCSL), cultures (e.g. private sector practices), processes (e.g. performance related pay), and people (e.g. advisors and consultants).

A key project outcome is confirmation of institutionalised governance where the state is adapting to the interplay between hierarchy, markets and networks (Newman 2001). Béland (2005:3) argues that “political institutions create constraints and opportunities for those involved in policy-making”, and so formal authority matters: first, the primacy of national public institution remains where delivery is translated into targets, with the Minister linking resignation to outcome measures; second, intervention was extended by establishing specialised Units (e.g. SEU), and by going “quango crazy” (Driver 2006: 280) with, e.g. the NCSL having a remit determined by central government priorities (See Gunter and Forrester 2008e).
Béland (2005) goes on to argue that an institutional focus on its own is limited and the project findings show the relevance of his call for giving attention to “ideational forces” (13) where the power processes which build “trust networks” (Tilly 2005) around ideas is significant. Jessop (2002) calls this a “competition state”: first, regulatory public policies create forms of regulation which does not happen in a rational way, “on the contrary, they involve chance discoveries, search processes, policy transfers and social struggles” (Jessop 2002: 135). Hence policies “travel” to, enter and are interpreted and reworked in “embedded” settings (Ozga 2005), and confusion can be generated by “ensembles of policies” that contradict or generate tensions between what is being required and what is preferred (Ball 1994: 25-26). Policy needs translation, training, monitoring and measuring, and becomes regulated by those who work within it producing a risk management imperative (Hood et al. 2004).

A second and connected feature is that like the Thatcherite governments, New Labour excluded “welfare bureaucrats and professionals” as “inefficient, self-interested and guilty of fostering welfare dependency…” (Gewirtz 2002: 2-3). The data show the problem of ‘risky’ bureau-professional groups with unmodern professional attitudes. A marketised network of private sector consultants have replaced them as attractive outsiders (Collarbone 2005), together with co-opted bureau-professionals who reposition themselves as attractive risk-free insiders in the “big tent” (Hyman 2005). In Kingdon’s (2003) terms this coalition of ministers, civil servants, advisors and consultants as “policy entrepreneurs” who recombine ideas and so provide evidence, language and distinction to legitimise the reform imperative. They have a “willingness to invest their resources – time, energy, reputation, and sometimes money – in the hope of a future return” (122), and as “policy groupies” they “enjoy advocacy, they enjoy being at or near the seat of power, they enjoy being part of the action” (123), where they engage with the preference for the private sector to deliver change, and they feed that preference by doing it. The “return” on the investment is that private interests are enhanced through policy impact and business success.

A third aspect is the use of forms of knowledge and knowledge production to generate a specific change narrative. While the data confirm pluralistic knowledge claims (Gunter 2005a,b) with a range of epistemic groups, New Labour has tended to advocate Mode 1 knowledge from the SESI epistemic groups symbol-
ised by investment in EIPP; and, Mode 2 knowledge where experiential forms of knowing are in play particularly in advocacy statements about the direct relationship between identity, work and leadership (Gibbons et al. 2007). In Young’s (2008) terms “theoretical debates” about disciplines and “political debates” about policy preferences have been blurred. This potential contradictory situation is handled through an underlying preference for the political, where unclear “sticky” (Ozga and Jones 2006) knowledge can be selected, codified into bullet points and transferred in ways that suit functional aims. So narratives use selected evidence and beliefs to justify interventions to provide a solution to a particular need. There has been a privileging of measurement evaluations (e.g. Leithwood and Levin 2005) and both HEI (Ball 2007, Raffo and Gunter 2008) and Think Tank (O’Shaughnessy 2007) research have critiqued the technology and values base of research. It seems that knowledge produced through theoretical debates which “can offer cognitive gains to policymakers over and above the latter’s knowledge and experience” (Young 2008: 105) lacks recognition.

(iii) Regimes of Practice

The project findings demonstrate how ideas matter but it is the interplay between the agency of people and the structures that enable or limit ideas that is a key feature of institutionalised governance and how it has produced a particular configuration of the leadership of schools. Diagram 3 shows how the interplay between networks of agents has been mapped as regimes of practice.
Diagram 3: Regimes of Practice and New Labour Education Policy

Key:
- Government
- Advisor CS: Civil Servant Min: Minister
- HE Policy Studies
- HE Educational Leadership and Management
- HE School Effectiveness
- HE School Improvement
- HE Entrepreneur
- Private Consultant

NB: Numbers of respondents in this position are located at the side of the code.
Regime 1 or “school leadership policy network” (Gunter and Forrester 2008a) is positioned primarily towards the dominance of the economic and political power. Those in formal roles (Ministers, Civil Servants, Advisors) have done two main things: first, continue the close relationship with the private sector, with those (a) close to the PM; (b) actively involved in the Department; (c) actively involved in NDPBs (a few move between). Second, new institutional structures have been created (e.g. SEU, NCSL) and those positioned here tend to have links to schools (former heads) and to SESI. Private sector consultants and those in formal advisory roles directly advise (both formally and off the record) and are controlled through contract renewal. Policy positions headteachers here but the data show that, in Lather’s (1991) words, a large group work “within/against” this regime.

Those who locate within this regime are most likely to:

- Be leader centric. PM Blair is a replicable role model in a ‘we are in new times’ narrative.

- Locate their employment in or be contracted by a public institution to deliver services. Are less likely to be from a local authority or university, and if they are then they tend to be: first, from or supportive of SESI; second, on short-term contract/secondment; third, accepting of private sector knowledge; fourth, politically neutral in self presentation.

- Recognise centralised policy strategy as the starting point for meeting standards and improving performance at local level. Headteachers who model the local transformational leadership role are both included and favoured. Other potential sites for change narratives, such as local authorities, unions, and universities, are framed as problematic.

- Relate their role and identity to achieving national policy and making it work as a means of securing contracts. Criticism is usually about technical implementation.

- Accept neo-liberal thinking about the school as a firm to which ideas from the private sector can be transferred. SESI research is attractive because it is consistent with functional private sector models.

- Be concerned to work with practitioners to help them be contractually enthusiastic. If there are problems raised by practitioners in ways that cannot be ameliorated then this is passed up the delivery chain and used as leverage to develop new business in ways that enhance policy.
Frame their identity about what they want to do, achieve, believe in and value, than with an epistemic community and/or a discipline. There is evidence of rival power bases developing, and this is seen as either a positive ‘diversity’ development or is a problem to be resolved through contracts.

Regime 2 is a form of critical governance, positioned at a distance from the domination of economic and political power. Those who locate here are mainly in HEIs and articulate their work as policy studies, notably policy sociology. Some headteachers have direct association with HEIs through research and postgraduate programmes; they tend to critique New Labour from either the right (they benefited from Thatch-erism) or from the left (they want to see more socially just policies from New Labour).

Those who locate within this regime are most likely to:

- Problematise the historical legacy of leader centric structures and cultures, and develop change narratives around a more socially just and participatory democracy.
- Locate employment in HEIs and frame their work as research. Those who have been practitioners are indistinguishable in intellectual positioning and research disposition from those whose biography is mainly research. As critical knowledge producers they give due attention to the crossing of boundaries between theoretical and political debates (Young 2008).
- Emphasise how neo-liberal agendas dominate at the expense of narratives about democratic development and social justice. They are not prepared to make something work that is undemocratic and unfair. By problematising what is taking place, particularly through a critique of SESI, the aim is to focus on the realities of practice and so create spaces to reveal alternatives. Arguments are made about the need to shift the focus to pedagogy and curriculum.
- Use social theories to frame investigations, and to provide descriptions, meanings and explanations of what is happening. Are more likely to problematise the context and to look at the interplay between the strategic bigger picture and the realities of local practice.
- Be sociologists, and/or to be located in the wider area of public policy. They are less likely to talk about leadership as the prime focus of their work, and indeed they are more likely to talk about
the relationship as being tenuous.

- Use reflexive approaches to knowledge production, and debate the relationship between power, the economy, and professional practice. This position recognises contradictions and what it means to pursue a critical agenda at a time of neo-liberal modernisation. Those who position themselves here cannot stand outside of the globalised economy and funding contracts.

**Emergent Regime 3:** a third regime could emerge from the fringes of Regimes 1 and 2. On the edge of Regime 1 there are two ‘communities’ first, a pool of SESI, some are new entrants with great expectations, others are those who have been inside and find themselves outside. Second, headteachers are positioned in Regime 1 as reform deliverers but two-thirds of interviewed heads find themselves variously distanced from it. Some are ‘strategisers’ who want to develop local educational provision, and some are ‘tacticians’ who face difficulties in implementing reform. Engaging with policy is more dialogic (within/against) than totalising self surveillance (Ball 2007), where their stories show (a) teaching and learning dominates as headteacher; (b) motivation is based on making a difference; (c) reforms are too speedy and the realities of local implementation are not thought through; and, (d) views are communicated through local networks and/or union. Headteachers are assumed within policy to be inside policy but they may not be an insider headteacher, and there is a sizeable group who feel distanced from the NCSL.

On the edges of Regime 2 are those who identify with practitioners and who have a track record of project delivery. Previous research shows that this was a vibrant space for practitioners who had relocated into higher education as ELM knowledge workers (Gunter 1999). The data show that postgraduate masters programmes in ELM remain where SESI and NCSL programmes are located. Repositioning is based on availability as contract and consultancy researchers. There is evidence of criticality in regard to the objectives and outcomes of Regime 1 but it is not sufficient to put potential access to contracts in danger.

Regime 3 could emerge with a focus around practitioner interests. Currently there is more interest in positioning in relation to Regimes 1 and 2 than in creating another regime. For a third regime to emerge there
would need to be a direct linkage between those in HEIs and in schools who want to generate alternative strategies to that which currently dominate through Regime 1 practices.

**Regime practices:** following Thomson (2005: 251) agents from the economic and political fields “breach(ed) the borders” of education and used institutional methods (new structures, cultures, jobs, rules) to secure change. This privileged particular types of knowledge, knowing and knowers. Knowledge production in Regime 1 is highly functional, based on an underlying belief in what is to be done overlain with positivist evidence. This enabled the leadership of schools “game” (Bourdieu 1990) to focus on eradicating failing schools and teachers as a means of keeping middle class parents as consumers of public provision. New Labour has entered into symbolic capital exchange with the private sector who have their own “game” of market expansion in play. All share a “doxic acceptance of the world” regarding effective leadership as an “objective structure” where the conceptualisation of the local chief executive is the product of structured and structuring practices revealed through what is normal and necessary to secure domination (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 168). The exchange is based on shared dispositions to deliver, where the government gives private capital access to new markets and private capital gives government access to a modernising “kulturkampf” (Marquand 2004). Consequently school leaders with QTS are being replaced by effective leaders. The logic of practice that produces such policy strategies is based on unspoken rules of the game where there is “knowledge and recognition” (Bourdieu 2000: 198) of both domination and dominated. Misrecognition can be detected in the failure to speak about the interplay between the “subjective truths” of the leadership of schools by chief executives as the only thing to do, with the “objective realities” of how this has been constructed through the game in play (Bourdieu 2000: 95).

Illusio or “interest in the game” (Bourdieu 2000: 207) is generated by the symbolic effects of this capital exchange where the position is based on the experience of playing it before or seeing it played, and having a “habitus predisposed to anticipate it” (Bourdieu 2000:12). Regime 1 players are provoked and predisposed to the game, and it “speaks” to them as “agents characterized by possession of a certain capital and a certain habitus” (Boudieu 2000: 220). The leadership of schools game will only work if those who
are at a distance from classrooms stake the claim of knowing more and better, and this is enabled through the misrecognition of those who take up a position in government. The “esteem, recognition, belief credit, confidence of others” in headteachers, consultants and professors as deliverers is “perpetuated… (because) …it succeeds in obtaining belief in its existence” (Bourdieu 2000: 166). While there is evidence of attempts to create power bases within the regime, with ‘new’ leadership products and internal conflicts, there comes a time when the staking of capital that threatens the regime is dealt with though contract termination. This acts as a disciplinary process for those at the centre or the edges, and those who are on the fringes of Regime 1 sustain this existence by their loyalty to the doxa in their teaching, research and writing, and so are ever ready to stake their claim for recognition.

Those who are objects of the leadership of schools game are: first, codified beneficiaries such as teachers, parents, and students, who are dominated through the “representations of power” such as titles, role, and pay (Bourdieu 2000: 171). Nevertheless they can themselves dominate: for teachers it can be through reform implementation; for parents it can be at elections; and for students it can be through absenteeism. Second, there are those who are deemed irrelevant to the game and do not find the illusio of the Regime 1 game to be congenial. Hence in Regime 2 another educational policy game is in play: (a) to open up the Regime 1 game to scrutiny and reflexive theorising, particularly through “historical critique” (Bourdieu 2000: 182): and (b) to develop an illusio located in issues of power processes. The doxa is one of knowledge production in an unjust world. Those in Regime 2 who are close to practitioners have a “game” enabling alternative narratives about practice to be opened up. Symbolic exchange may not normally happen between Regimes 1 and 2, but within Regime 2 those who hold major grants from funding councils and esteemed chairs in Russell Group Universities do hold symbolic capital of titles, posts and institution that enables them to speak differently to the New Labour project, and as such there is a capital exchange with others in higher education, local authorities, unions, schools, parents and communities. While the New Labour leadership of schools model may not directly speak to these interests, Regime 2 may speak to matters of social justice and radical change, and hence they provide symbolic effects of countering the charges of irrelevance from Regime 1.
What is currently not in a play is a Regime 3 with a doxa located in researchers, headteachers, teachers and children in a pedagogic relationship. Currently those who might create the necessary narratives to invite investment are too few in number and/or who position themselves as actual or potential players in Regimes 1 or 2. This is mainly due to the lack of symbolic capital around teachers and students as active subjects in educational change, and how the market operates in ways to render their capital as only valuable if they are the objects of reform. For Regime 3 to emerge strongly there would need to be a symbolic capital exchange between HEIs and schools through research and postgraduate study combined with forms of activism (Apple 2006a). The data show that this tends to be happening either under the radar and/or it is not a widespread feature, not least because HEIs have been marginalised. However, the data show that some practitioners are pro NCSL, some are anti, while most are ambivalent, and hence the opportunity exists to revitalise HEIs as places where practitioners can seek support for their professional practice. The intellectual resources exist to enable this to be a legitimate area of interest: first, Young’s (2008) conceptualising of change narratives as theoretical and political debates with a boundary that needs to be understood is helpful in enabling the staking of capital to be opened up to scrutiny and strategising; second, Whitty’s (2002) analysis that crossing such boundaries by policy sociologists as appropriate but not an imperative means that policy as analysis and activity are not automatically oppositional but are distinct contributions to educational change.

(iv) Summary
Symbolic exchange of being close to political power and extending economic power is the logic of practice within New Labour policy made visible through this research. While the state favouring a particular regime of practice in the production of public policy based on a specific form of knowledge suggests a settlement, history shows that such stabilities tend to remain vulnerable to fracture (Ball 2007, Gewirtz 2002). Contradictions are emerging as New Labour is arguing for more bottom-up voice and choice (PMSU 2006), but as Coffield (2007) argues “the current version is focused on faithfully carrying out whatever reforms the government stipulates” (65). If a participatory model is to be developed then the capital from knowledge workers from Regime 2 (and the emergent Regime 3) gains in value. This is a new game and while the resources exist to develop position and positioning, it is likely to remain a minor-
iti game unless Apple’s (2006b) strategy of interruption is deployed and Arendt’s optimism for change is recognised (Gunter 2005c). Whitty (2002) identified a dual strategy of both recognising problems and working for socially just change. While he recognises that it is complex and potentially utopian, the project shows that those working in both regimes can speak rationally and handle contestation.

Activities

Five major conference papers: AERA (Gunter and Forrester 2007b, 2008c); BELMAS (Gunter 2007g, Gunter and Forrester 2008e); BERA (Gunter and Forrester 2007f). Ten national and international seminars (Forrester and Gunter 2007; Gunter 2006b, 2007d,e,f; Gunter and Forrester 2007c,d,e,g,i). Other invitations have been accepted: (Gunter 2008c,d; Gunter and Forrester 2008d).

User involvement: first, the Project Advisory Group included researchers from UK HEIs and educational professionals (Gunter and Forrester 2006, 2007a). Second, users have been given access to findings and analysis, and a seminar has been offered to the NCSL (Gunter 2006d, 2007a,b,c, 2008b; Gunter and Forrester 2007h).

3 The Group was composed of: Professor Mike Bottery (University of Hull); Bill Boyle (University of Manchester); Professor Mark Brundrett (Liverpool John Moores University); Maureen Cain (Private Consultant, former Headteacher, and Doctoral Student); Dr Barbara Cole (Institute of Education, University of London); Professor David Cracknell (University of Chester, and former CEO of Cheshire); Dave Hall (University of Manchester); John Hull (Private Consultant, former Headteacher, and Doctoral Student); Joe O’Connell (Director of CPD in Ireland, former Headteacher, and Doctoral Student); Professor Chris James (University of Bath); Dr Carlo Raffo (University of Manchester); Professor Steve Rayner (University of Gloucester); Professor Peter Ribbins (Emeritus Professor, University of Birmingham); Ruth Watts (University of Birmingham); Charlotte Woods (University of Manchester).
Outputs

(1) Scoping papers (Gunter 2006a; 2007h; 2008a; with Rayner 2007a,b; with Raffo 2008).

(2) Project reporting (Forrester and Gunter 2008; Gunter and Forrester 2008a, 2009a,b).

(3) Data sets.

Impacts

Feedback from users and researchers has been very positive. It is expected that the direct impact will be through the emerging publications from 2008. During the time of the project two other associated projects obtained funding: first, a case study of an academy in the north of England (Woods et al 2007-2008); second, a NCSL commissioned project (Chapman et al. 2008, Gunter et al. 2008). These projects have synergies with the KPEL project, where emerging findings show that while there has been some job redesign and role change at local level, the leadership of schools from the centre remains a stable feature.

Future Research Priorities

(1) Role of formal networks (e.g. BERA SIGs, BELMAS, ICSEI) in knowledge production;

(2) Role of globalisation through a study of international organisations and consultants in knowledge production;

(3) Development of leadership centres in England and internationally;

(4) Following Ozga (2000: 2) and Vidovich (2007) the aim is to “remove policy from its pedestal” by researching the role of governors, teachers, students and parents in knowledge production.
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Abbreviations

BELMAS: British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society
BERA SIG: British Educational Research Association Special Interest Group
CEO: Chief Education Officer
ELM: Educational Leadership and Management
EIPP: Evidence Informed Policy and Practice
HEI: Higher Education Institution
ICSEI: International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement;
NCSL: National College for School Leadership
NDPB: Non-Departmental Public Body
NVivo7: Qualitative Solutions and Research Software: Version 7.QSR
QTS: Qualified Teacher Status
SESI: School Effectiveness and School Improvement
SEU: Standards and Effectiveness Unit
Appendix 1: Interview Sample - confidential - removed
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