Why the Leadership and Management Divide Matters in Education: the Implications for Schools and Social Justice

Por qué Dividir el Liderazgo y la Gestión en Educación: Implicaciones para las Escuelas y la Justicia Social

Por que Dividir a Liderança e Gestão na Educação: Implicações para as Escolas e Justiça Social

Anthony Thorpe

University of Roehampton

Talk of school leadership has become highly significant in the context of current education policy developments and discourses in many parts of Europe and the Americas. This article seeks to explore why the leadership and management divide matters in education and what the implications for schools and social justice are. The article makes a contribution to the understanding of the concepts of leadership and management through identifying that the increasing obsession in education with leadership, and denigration of management, is firstly based on a decontextualized conception of what is means to run educational organizations and systems; and that this decontextualized view of leadership has no concern for, or capacity to address, matters of social justice. A historical approach is used to analyse the particular meaning of the divide of leadership and management in education before going on to draw on theoretical analyses of problems with the sharp division between leadership and management and the critiquing of 'leadership' as a concept. It is argued that a very different understanding of what it means to lead schools is needed in order to cultivate and sustain a better education systems and organizations to promote social justice.

Keywords: Leadership, Management, Leadership rationales, Education policy, Social justice. Schools.

Hablar de liderazgo escolar en los discursos políticos sobre el desarrollo de la educación se ha convertido en un elemento muy importante en muchas partes de Europa y las Américas. Este artículo busca explorar por qué la división entre liderazgo y gestión educativa, así como determinar cuáles son las implicaciones que esta división genera en las escuelas y la justicia social. El artículo profundiza en la comprensión de los conceptos de liderazgo y gestión educativa a través de analizar la creciente obsesión hacia el liderazgo educativo, y por el contrario, la denigración asociada a la gestión. Este hecho se basa, en primer lugar, en una concepción descontextualizada sobre cómo liderar organizaciones y sistemas educativos; y, por último, en que se trata de una visión descontextualizada del liderazgo que no se preocupa ni por la capacidad de dirección, ni por asuntos de justicia social. Se utiliza un enfoque histórico para analizar el significado particular de la brecha de liderazgo y gestión educativa, y a continuación se recurre al análisis teórico de los problemas asociados a la marcada división entre el liderazgo y gestión educativa y la crítica de este concepto de "liderazgo". Se argumenta que es necesario cambiar la forma en la

---

que comprendemos lo que significa dirigir las escuelas de manera que se fomente la mejora de los sistemas y organizaciones educativas que promuevan la justicia social.

Descriptores: Liderazgo, Gestión, Fundamentos de liderazgo, Política educativa, Justicia Social, Escuelas.

Falando de liderança escolar em discursos políticos sobre o desenvolvimento da educação tornou-se um elemento muito importante em muitas partes da Europa e das Américas. Este artigo procura explorar por que a divisão entre liderança e gestão educacional e identificar as implicações que essa divisão gera nas escolas e justiça social. O artigo explora a compreensão dos conceitos de liderança e de gestão educacional, analisando a crescente obsessão com a liderança educacional, e, inversamente, difamação associado à gestão. Este fato baseia-se, em primeiro lugar, em uma concepção descontextualizada de organizações como líderes e sistemas de ensino; e, finalmente, quando se trata de uma visão descontextualizada de liderança que não se importa nem a liderança, nem questões de justiça social. Uma abordagem histórica é usado para analisar o significado especial do gap em liderança e gestão educacional, em seguida, a análise teórica dos problemas associados com a divisão nítida entre liderança e gestão educacional e crítica do conceito de "liderança" é usado. Argumenta-se que é necessário para mudar a nossa forma de entender o que significa para executar as escolas para que os sistemas e organizações educacionais melhoria que promovam a justiça social é promovida.

Palavras-chave: Liderança, Gestão, Fundamentos da liderança, Política de educação, Justiça social, Escolas.

Introduction

Talk of school leadership has become highly significant in the context of current education policy developments and discourses in many parts of Europe and the Americas. This article seeks to explore why the leadership and management divide matters in education and what the implications for schools and social justice are. The article makes a contribution to the understanding of the concepts of leadership and management through identifying that the increasing obsession in education with leadership, and denigration of management, is firstly based on a decontextualized conception of what is means to run educational organizations and systems; and that this decontextualized view of leadership has no concern for, or capacity to address, matters of social justice. A historical approach is used to analyse the particular meaning of the divide of leadership and management in education before going on to draw on theoretical analyses of problems with the sharp division between leadership and management and the critiquing of 'leadership' as a concept. The article ends with a consideration of where these debates take schools and the cause of social justice and what the possible ways forward might be.

The dominance of the term 'leadership' to the exclusion of 'management' can be seen in the education policy statements of the United Kingdom (UK) government with the exhortations that everyone is a leader (DfES, 2003) rather than seeing both terms as inextricably linked concepts (Bush, 2008). It is worth pointing out that the UK contains four constituent countries in which education policy and governance has diverged increasingly since devolution so what happens in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales does not necessarily occur in England, and vice versa. However, titles such as 'senior leadership team', 'middle leaders' and 'key stage leader' now dominate school structures and discourses in England. Yet, it has been argued, the conception of leadership within

these titles conceals a narrow concern with the short-term implementation of government policy (Gunter & Thompson, 2009). Therefore, as other countries European and in Latin America increasing seek to reform schools and colleges through the leadership terminology and discourse (Bush, 2014; Slater 2013) concerns need be raised about the implications of the concept of leadership for social justice in education and wider society.

A recent special issue of Educational Management Administration and Leadership (Bush, 2014) explored the growing field of school leadership in Europe. The issue includes articles about transformational leadership in Norway along with calls for more use of transformational leadership and its psychological cousin emotional intelligence in Greece and the Republic of Cyprus. It is a little worrying to see such calls as the ideas behind transformational leadership as the only preferred form of leadership and denigration of other approaches and historical discourses has important implications for social justice. The same special issue also include articles from Iceland and Italy which are more sceptical of the claims of 'leadership' to solve all the problems. However, Slater (2013) that transformational leadership is the 'unifying approach' which schools in Mexico, Spain, and the United States should be drawing upon it to promote student achievement and well-being. He makes good points that school principals can help to enhance teacher motivation and that educationalists in each country could learn from examining the practices of each other but that transformational leadership is the only 'answer' to the perceived problem is more debatable especially if it is accompanied a decontextualized version of leadership.

This article contends that the division of leadership from management has negative implications for improving education for all and the achievement of social justice. It is the practice of 'running' schools and other educational organizations that should be focused upon rather than the laden terms or labels of administration, management and now leadership. I use the word 'running' as a noun in relation to the idea of the operation and functioning (OED, 2011) because, in English, it has multiple meanings and some vagueness that helps to distance the practice from the other labels or terms. The professional practice of running schools is loosely defined doing the things that need to be considered and done (in addition to that which teachers do in the classroom) so that an educational organization and system can live and flourish. Understanding how teachers teach and how students learn is one of those considerations but it is not the only aspect of the practice. Of course there should be a concern for students' learning but it is not the only thing that makes for a flourishing educational organization and promotes social justice. It is a form of reductionism to think education and schooling is just about fitness or readiness to learn, that is to say, a mechanistic approach in which students are given, and defined by, their roles. Instead the practice of running schools also involves advocacy for social justice within the educational organization, the wider education system and society (Anderson, 2009).

The article begins with the use of a historical framework to uncover the peculiar relationship that the education sector has to leadership and management debates as a result of the comparatively late stage at which education professionals became engaged in its theorization and practice. It is argued that this ahistoricism leaves many education professionals with little appreciation of the contested nature of these key terms and the implications for social justice. This analysis draws and expands upon the historical development of the terms administration, management and leadership (Gunter, 2004;

Bush, 2008) which sees one word replaces another to indicate a 'better' form of the contested concept of that activity of making schools and educational organizations 'happen'. The article then moves to analyse the problems with 'leadership' as a concept through the decontextualize of the practice of running schools (Mertkan, 2013) the vacuous nature of the concept itself (Eacott, 2013), and use of short term goals and means often contrary to the concerns of social justice leading to the death of education leadership and the rise of 'leaderism' (Gunter, 2011; O'Reilly & Read, 2010).

1. Methodological Approach

This conceptual article combines the use of two analytical approaches to generate new insights into the leadership and management debates and the implications for schools and social justice. Firstly, a historical analysis is used to uncover the peculiar relationship that the education sector has to leadership and management as a result of the comparatively late stage at which education professionals became engaged in its theorization and practice. Historical analysis has been somewhat under used to understand organizations (Mutch, 2014) yet any developed understanding of how organizations (educational or otherwise), and the people who work in them, operate needs to draw upon experiences and events which are historical and embedded within those generative mechanisms which combine to bring them about. In other words, to claim an understanding of the practice of running schools which is decontextualized makes no sense as schools are organizations with specific contexts formed within their histories and the culture around them. Therefore, a historical analysis of how the term 'leadership' has emerged to dominate the practice of running of schools is illuminating and essential before the implications for social justice can be identified. Secondly, analytical tools are used to uncover the current uses of the term leadership and draw insights from theorists who question the dominance of leadership discourses (Eacott, 2013; Gunter, 2011; O'Reilly & Reed, 2010).

2. A very short, and not entirely accurate, story of Western history of the move from administration to management to leadership

The next two sections seek to outline a Western history of the move from administration to management to leadership as one term replaces another. However, there are, as the sub-heading suggests, many caveats to this story. Firstly, that it comes from very particular contexts of the United States and the UK; secondly that is very brief and there are more twists and turns to events than may be suggested below; and thirdly, that the briefness means some interesting diversions and contributions to the field are unfortunately missed out or passed over. However, the story is one that illuminates why leadership has become divided from management in English schools and enables an exploration of the implications for social justice.

The development of the 'science' of management comes after the advent of the industrial revolution and at the same time as the development of the professions in the late 18th and 19th centuries to which it is linked. Management as a discipline (or subject) was largely focused on manufacturing and it has been suggested that management's true genius lies in 'turning complexity and specialization into performance' in organizations

(Magretta, 2003:2). In its 'classical' form, writers such as Henri Fayol (French), Fredrick Winslow Taylor (USA) and Max Weber (German) sought to identify the perfect or ideal way to manage an organization such as a factory (Cunliffe, 2008; Pugh, 2008), though in an example which illustrates the dangers of inaccuracy in this short story, it should be noted that Weber was not particularly an advocate of bureaucracy but someone who sought to describe it. Yet the practice that was often referred to as administration and the science of management was not applied to educational organizations in terms of the literature with the exception of the United States of America (USA).

In the USA writers such as Joseph Mayer Rice and John Franklin Bobbitt were keen to develop Taylor's (1911) scientific management principles as part of the 'social efficiency movement' (Bellman, 2013). Rice published his book entitled 'Scientific Management in Education' in 1913 just a couple of years after Taylor's 'Principles of Scientific Management' (1911). Yet in many other countries of the world this application of scientific management did not happen at this time. Perhaps European countries with their established histories of education and advanced provision of higher education, in which the state either had direct control of, or else benign support for, schooling had less need for these ideas when compared to the poorly developed schooling system in the USA with its teachers who had extremely low levels of education (Bellman, 2013). Bobbitt was appointed as a professor of educational administration at Chicago University in 1909 and he applied Taylor's approach conceiving the school as a factory so seeing students as the workers and teachers as the lowest level of supervision and management. For Bobbitt, these general principles were needed to standardise a young and struggling education system but it was from his writings and those of his student Ralph Taylor that the efficiency idea of education administration emerged.

The two world wars left many countries needing to substantially rebuild their economic and manufacturing infrastructure, and also to promote and react to the demands of their populations for a society which was more prosperous, equal and democratic. Management and the role of the professionals were to play a crucial role in addressing the above needs and wants. Management theory moves away from the 'classical' approach with its 'one perfect way' model to the Modernist 'Systems and Contingency theories' which sought to find the best system for the particular organization taking into account the variables of the situation. There was much emphasis on team work and all those in the organization working together so breaking down rigid hierarchies often proposed by the classical management theorists. The new theories were interested in the insights of psychology and motivation (Cunliffe, 2008).

The work of Nigel Balchin in the UK as an academic writer and an industrial psychologist during the 1930s and onwards presents a sophisticated understanding of people and systems combined with a critique of the managerialist aspects of practice (Collett, 2009). Balchin worked as an academic and in industry developing a greater appreciation of how to motivate workers and ensure positive working relationships which might be at odds with the mechanistic understandings of earlier writers such as Taylor who tended towards simplistic assumptions that economic incentives were all that were needed in these areas. Yet Balchin, writing under the name of Mark Spade (1934), also begins to critique the administration and management culture through the use of humour to identify the failures of some scientific theories and the increasing self-importance of practitioners. Little if anything is written about the management of

educational organizations in this period with the exception of USA where, as the schooling system became increasingly complicated and complex, the scientific management principles continued to be promoted as management becomes a evermore popular term. Yet Callaghan's 'Education and the Cult of Efficiency' (1962) is a notable exception where he critiques the social efficiency ideas, promoted by earlier writers such as Bobbitt, and he begins to questions what educational administration and management has contributed in reality to schools in the USA.

Following the rapid economic, social and political developments of the 1950's and 1960's, the events of the 1970's leave the wider public with the perception that management, as exercised by the professionals, has failed. It is Schön (1983) writing from his context in urban planning and management education in the USA (that is to say the education of professionals) who articulates this perception by saying, 'In such fields as medicine, management and engineering, for example, leading professionals speak of a new awareness of a complexity which resists the skills and techniques of traditional expertise' (Schön, 1983:14). Management and the professionals who exercise it are found wanting and a new type of management is required that will address the need for change in society whilst exercising a greater concern for using limited resources more effectively, which becomes termed and labelled as 'leadership'. More is being written about education administration or management at this time but the place of education in society comes under scrutiny as part of the examination of the failure of professionals. However, Schön's solution of the reflective professional (rather than leadership and deprofessionalisation) was not the answer chosen to solve the problem of education and elsewhere (though it could have been) and, instead, transformational leadership emerges in the mid-1980´s as the solution to (every) problem bringing about the next replacement as the term leadership becomes distinguished from, and then presented as superior to, the word management.

3. The 1980's and Onwards: The Leadership and Management Divide and Distinction

Bennis and Nanus (1985) publish 'Leaders: the strategies for taking charge' as they argue for a new form management which is leadership. Both of the authors were concerned with management in commercial setting rather than education specifically but their division and separation of 'the leader' from the 'the manager' comes to have great influence in a number of education organizations and systems in the 1990s including that of the UK. They write,

> *We have here one of the clearest distinctions between the leader and the manager. By focusing on a vision, the leader operates on the emotional and spiritual resources of the organization, on its values, commitment and aspirations. The manager by contrast, operates on the physical resources of the organization to earn a living. An excellent manager can see to it that work is done productively and efficiently, on schedule, and with a high level of quality. It remains for the effective leader, however, to help people in the organization know pride and satisfaction in their work. Great leaders often inspire their followers to high levels of achievement by showing them their work contributes to worthwhile ends. It is an emotional appeal to some of the most fundamental of human needs- the need to be important, to make a difference, to feel useful, to be part of a successful and worthwhile enterprise.* (Bennis & Nanus, 1985:92-93)

The authors want people who run organization to become familiar with, and draw upon, more sophisticated psychological understandings of their workers. Yet these insights

from psychology and sociology were already part of the literature from the 1930's onwards so this aspect in itself is not new. Perhaps it is the combination of such insights with a desire for a better world which energises Bennis and Nanus's call for the adoption of 'leaders'. Their extensive use of religious language in words, such as 'vision', 'spiritual', 'inspire' and 'aspiration', is redolent of the ethical purpose they had for the new management that would lead a still young nation on to greater things after the turmoil of the 1970s. In emphasising what is new and distinctive about 'leaders', they characterise 'managers' as being stuck in the old ways of thinking with the concerns around productivity and efficiency but it is difficult not to interpret this characterisation as a negative one which recalls those people who had committed atrocities in the Second World War and Vietnam who had resorted to the discredited defence that they were following orders and being efficient soldiers or generals.

So it is crucial to understand that the distinction sharply drawn by Bennis and Nanus between 'leaders' and 'managers' is part of the reaction to the crisis of professionalism and the aspects of 1980's thinking that placed its emphasis on change for a better world and more careful use of resources. That the distinction may have an element of hyperbole in order to drive the point home should also not be ignored. It is particular context of the USA at that time which gives rise to the thought and expression of this division between 'leaders' and 'managers'. Again, it is important for understanding Bennis and Nanus's context that they were concerned with commercial management rather than the education sector in particular.

However, it is at this stage in the 1980's that education professionals in the USA and UK become more engaged in the theorization and conscious practice of management. Some writers in the education sphere, such as Cuban (1998) and Bolam (2002), seek to sharply distinguish leadership from management following Bennis and Nanus. Yet what happened with later iterations of this division is that the reasons behind the call for a new management with a greater concern for social justice and better society were forgotten and a reified divide was put in place. That view of 'leadership' in the 1990's amongst academics was that it could provide an idea 'more capable of foregrounding the moral, professional and democratic dimensions of running educational institutions' (Glatter, 2006:70), was lost in later iterations (see Grace, 1995, for these original hopes for the application of leadership to schools). A concern with 'leadership' as a better way to manage the change required by government dominates UK education policy and much of what is written in education management (see Bell & Stevenson, 2006) as can be seen by this later outlining of the 'leadership' discourse from the UK government department for schools.

> To achieve their full potential, teachers need to work in school that is creative, enabling and flexible. And the biggest influence is the Head. Every teacher is a leader in the classroom. Every Head must be a leader of these leaders. And the Head's greatest task is the motivation and deployment of their key resource: staff. (Department for Education and Skills, 2003:26)

The above quote exemplifies the use of the label 'leader' to the exclusion of 'manager'. Yet crucially the concept of leadership is one that draws upon the transformational leadership discourse from the USA in the 1980's but it takes on a different form in the first decade of the twenty first century as leadership becomes a tool of government in the education sector. The claim that the head teacher is 'the biggest influence' is one that is not founded in research which alternatively suggests that he or she is a

significant but not the most significant influence as that remains teachers teaching in classroom (Day et al., 2009; Sammons et al., 2011).

In summary, this brief history outlines the change of terminology which Gunter refers to when she writes that there has been a 'historical relabeling of this professional practice as successively administration, management and recently, leadership' (Gunter, 2011:130). On one hand these are just labels for the same practice of running schools, yet on the other hand the label have a significant impact upon how that practice is conceived, implemented and enacted. The sections that follow explore some of these impacts though critiques of the leadership and management divide and the very concept of leadership as it is being used by governments in the UK and elsewhere.

4. The Decontextualistion of the Practice of Running Schools and the Vacuous Concept of 'Leadership'

It is worth remembering that there are alternatives to the sharp division of leadership and management and the denigration of the latter. Two further views of the divide which maintain both concepts intact include that leadership and management are overlapping concepts and activities 'particularly in respect of motivating people and giving a sense of purpose to the organization' (Fidler, 1997:26). Lumby (2001) suggests an 'androgynous' approach which does not see leadership and management as opposites whilst Bush and Middlewood (2005) contend that 'leadership and management need to be given equal prominence if schools and colleges are to operate effectively and achieve their objectives' (p. 4). Another approach to the discourse of education management theory sees leadership as part of management (albeit an important one) along with planning, organizing and coordinating (Bush & Bell, 2002).

More recently, Mertkan (2014) has attacked the sharpness of the leadership and management divide in education when she writes of a 'homogenised perspective' of a decontextualised leadership which had become hegemonic in many advanced economies with a shift to towards decentralisation, marketisation and performativity. 'This shift in the focus of reform has created a relentless preoccupation with educational reform through leadership development and led to declined official interest in school management' (p. 226). So the practice of running schools has been recultured and restructured through various mechanisms of theory and policy. As a result, leadership as a term has come to dominate the discourse around the practice and theory of running schools

> *…with the vast majority of literature in the field of school management and administration addressing the issue of leadership and neglecting the issue of management. These studies present, almost exclusively, a universal and decontextualised discourse of educational leadership, which presents leadership as a combination of inspiration, vision and the ability to manage competing tensions while building organisational capacity and leadership capacity in others.* (Mertkan, 2014:227)

She sees her research with head teachers in Turkish Northern Cyprus as showing that the leadership discourse is in reality a barrier to educational effectiveness and reform. Yet Mertkan's conclusion is slightly disappointing as she maintains the distinction between leadership and management arguing for their equal importance and does not seem inclined to abandon that distinction instead hoping for a time when her Turkish

Cypriot head teacher participants can exercise such leadership when the authorities devolve more powers to them.

Other writers have gone further in the critique of 'leadership' itself by showing it to be a vacuous concept which simply needs to be abandoned in education and other contexts. Torrance and Humes (2014) critique the lack of conceptual underpinning for the educational leadership discourse in terms of international trends and the response to those trends in Scotland so identifying a move against the professionalism of teachers inherent with the discourses of that 'every teacher is a leader', and popular forms of this such as 'distributed leadership' and 'teacher leadership' (Harris, 2003). However, Eacott (2013) attacks the very concept of leadership by uncovering how it is an epistemic concept rather than an empirical one so must be treated and understood accordingly.

Eacott notes that current writing on the topic does not examine the difficulties inherent 'with confusing a socially constructed label with an assumed empirical reality' (Eacott, 2013:92). He argues that, 'leadership remains a vacuous concept connected to attributes, factors, behaviours, interventions, all of which lack a solid grounding in a specific context. It is, however, the context that gives behaviours or interventions meaning and significance' (p. 98). So leadership is both a contested and ambiguous term with questionable use in academic research but the leadership which has become the 'label of choice' by governments in the USA, UK and Scott's Australia is, in reality, part of a managerialist project of the state rather than the more ethical, less technicist practice of running organizations envisaged by those aforementioned theorists of the final two decades of the twentieth century.

So government policy in the UK and discourses adopted in schools promote the term leadership and clearly indicate a wish for all education professionals to engage in leadership as part of their professional practice. The references to education management become few and far between during the first decade of the twenty first century in UK government documents. The terms such as 'senior leadership team', 'middle leaders' and 'key stage leader' dominate structures and discourses especially in schools and early years settings where managers or co-ordinators are out of favour. Yet this discourse promotes a hierarchy which the organizational structures and cultures ensure that 'every teacher performs'...and....'where control is secured through organizational structures (roles and job descriptions), cultures (compliance and commitment), and performance (integrating cognitive and emotional processes), and so every teacher leader delivers' (Gunter, 2005:30).

5. 'Leaderism' and the Death of Education Leadership

The attractiveness of leadership and leaders to education professionals may also lie in the negative ideas associated with the word management because of 'managerialism' and New Public Management with the ideas of performance and accountability. Perhaps 'leadership' is seen by education professionals as a more attractive and 'fun' label which is professionally more fulfilling. However, O'Reilly and McDermott (2010) point out that this form of leadership is just managerialism dressed up in a smart uniform as something else and they name this 'Leaderism'. Leaderism is a romantic idea of leaders that thinks they can solve all the problems, it creates unrealistic expectations of leaders by those they purport to lead but also in the minds of government and the wider

community which ends with the condemnation of leaders when they fail to meet these unrealistic expectations.

This leaderism is seen by as a development and re-branding of managerialism which has 'been utilized and applied within the policy discourse of public service reform in the UK' (O'Reilly & McDermott, 2010:960). It is not the leadership promised and looked forward to by earlier theorists but a vehicle for strengthening and complementing the New Public Management discourses which are so often identified as not bringing about the promotion of social justice but, unwittingly or otherwise, complicit in widening social inequality. Leaders become those who implement the visions of others rather than creating their own. Leaders are people who react to demands of customers within the constraints of stakeholder governments and commercial interests. The idea that school leaders might challenge existing inequalities in society is not part of the leaderist agenda though it might well be presented in an emancipatory manner through the use of transformational and religious language for something which is in reality something different. Helen Gunter's policy analysis of school leadership in England shows how such a situation can be brought about.

Gunter contends that education leadership is dying in England (Gunter 2010, 2011). She identifies 'the obsession with hierarchy and supplying governments with evidence about how a particular type of leader, leading and leadership can work better' (Gunter, 2011:128-129) as the problem before outlining how this parlous state of affairs has been reached by the government's tight redefinition of the role and practice of leadership (under the New Labour regime that came to power in the UK 1997) to ensure that schools leaders would deliver its national reform programme for schools at a local level. Gunter asks questions about knowledge, knowing and those who know in order to explore how New Labour set about the transformation of leadership. The premise is that the government 'drew on functional approaches to knowledge where the purposes of knowing were to remove dysfunctions from the system and so the rationales were about outcomes and the narratives about targets, plans and data' (Gunter, 2011:2). Gunter uses the 'conceptual architecture' of Bourdieu to conceive knowledge production as a social practice linked to a 'game' involving 'regimes of practice' and 'players' involved in 'symbolic capital exchange'.

The New Labour government drew on a global discourse of standards in which the 'problem' was presented as one of low standards as measured by crude statistical outcomes. Headteachers were regarded as ultimately responsible for the outcomes of schools but they needed to be 'better leaders' in order to raise standards so the 'solution' was 'the production of a new type of headteacher' (Gunter, 2011:98) who would be a transformational leader implementing government reform. Leadership was seen as 'a good thing' so promoting 'a school system reform based on leaders rectifying failure' (Gunter, 2011:4). Therefore, New Labour created a 'leadership industry' comprising preferred knowledge producers such as the National College for School Leadership and a range of private networks from individual entrepreneurs and consultants through to large-scale international companies as, 'The leadership of schools game could only work if those who were at a distance from classrooms had the status of knowing more and better than those in classrooms' (Gunter, 2011:119).

The New Labour government dealt with the game players by allowing only 'trusted knowers' to play the game so removing democratic debate and negotiation around the reforms. They needed to ensure that institutional leaders were on message and ready to

deal with 'change-blockers' so the only legitimated forms of knowing were 'Common-sense beliefs statements combined with correlations and/or normative claims regarding the correctness of particular leadership structures, cultures and practices' (Gunter, 2011:133). Gunter notes how some head teachers either attempted to pragmatically influence the New Labour agenda to mitigate the damage or else more stridently located themselves in opposition to New Labour Policy Regime's discourse by holding on to values of social justice.

Gunter challenges the idea of the 'single transformational leader' and its rebranding as distributed leadership which, she argues, remain integral to replicating social injustice. Gunter argues that there is a need to 'knock leadership off its pedestal' because, as the research shows, working in an inclusive manner with teachers and children is more important in improving outcomes 'than producing correlations about output data from outstanding and failing schools' (Gunter, 2011:126). Leadership is important but 'as a dynamic process that enables productive pedagogies and assessment, and is underpinned by a commitment to social justice' (p. 126). Gunter notes that little has changed with the Conservative led Coalition as, despite the disinvestment in the education sector, the dispositions to frame problems and their solutions through neo-liberal mind-sets continues as does the 'cult of standards and standardisation'. Her analysis illuminates the dangers for the promotion of social justice in schools by an obsession with a very particular idea of leadership which is concerned with delivering government policy rather than creating a more just world for the school and the wider community (see also Gunter & Forrester, 2008; Gunter & Thompson, 2009).

6. Conclusion

This article has sought to explain why the education sector and many of the professionals who work in it have little understanding of the management context for leadership and take an ahistorical view of leadership and management. It is argued that this ahistoricism leaves many education professionals with little appreciation of the contested nature of these key terms and the implications for social justice in the global society (Anderson, 2009). Seeing leadership leads to the situation where the wider importance of the discipline and insights of management (and older) theory and practice are ignored whilst an obsession with leaders is promoted rather than addressing important issues of resource allocation and social justice (Anderson, 2009; Morrison, 2009).

The attractiveness of leadership and leaders to education professionals may also lie in the negative ideas associated with the word 'management' because of 'managerialism' and New Public Management with the ideas of performance and accountability. Perhaps 'leadership' is also seen by education professionals as a more attractive and 'fun' option which is professionally more fulfilling. Yet this leadership or leaderism is just managerialism dressed up in a smart uniform (O'Reilly & McDermott, 2010). The dull, unattractive and painfully difficult parts of education management theory and practice are left to others to sort out through private companies and outsourcing so diminishing the educational professionals ability to ensure and fight for fairer distribution and reallocation of these resources.

So whilst talk of school leadership has become highly significant in the context of current education policy developments and discourses in many parts of Europe and the

Americas, it is of great concern that the leadership and management divide will be replicated in the discourses of reform in these countries to the detriment of schools and the promotion of social justice. This article has outlined why the leadership and management divide matters in education and makes a contribution to the understanding of the concepts of leadership and management through identifying that the increasing obsession in education with leadership, and denigration of management, is firstly based on a decontextualized conception of what is means to run educational organizations and systems; and that this decontextualized view of leadership has no concern for, or capacity to address, matters of social justice.

A very different understanding of what it means to lead schools is needed in order to cultivate and sustain a better education organizations and systems to promote social justice. Finally, underlying this article is a critical realist perspective which enables leadership to be abducted and retroduced (rather than decontextualised) so that reality can be distinguished from what is not real. The emancipatory endeavour of critical realism can be used to promotes social justice in education and especially that professional practice which cultivates and nurtures educational organizations and systems (Thorpe, 2014).

References

Anderson, G.L. (2009). *Advocacy Leadership: Toward a Post-reform agenda in education.* London: Routledge.

Bell, L. & Stevenson, H. (2006). *Policy in Education: process, themes and impact.* London: Routledge.

Bellmann, J. (2013, march). Concepts of quality management and their transfer to the field of education: Historical examples analysed from the perspective of educational theory. Oral communication presented in *Philosophy of Education Research Semina*r. IoE, London.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bush, T. & Bell, L. (2002). *The Principles and Practice of Educational Management.* London: Paul Chapman.

Bush, T. & Middlewood, D. (2005). *Leading and Managing People in Education.* London: Sage.

Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership: semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management, Leadership & Administration, 36*(2), 271-288.

Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management.* London: Sage.

Bush, T. (2014). Special Themed Issue on School Leadership in Europe. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(4), 1- 174.

Collett, D.M. (2009). Mixing Business with Pleasure. An Evaluation of Nigel Balchin's Twin Careers as Industrial Psychologist and Writer. *History & Philosophy of Psychology, 11*(2), 12–24.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Cunliffe, A. (2008). *Organization Theory.* London: Sage.

Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., Penlington, C., Mehta, P., & Brown, E. (2009). *The Impact of Leadership on Pupil Outcomes: Final Report to DSCF.* Nottingham: Department of Children, Families & Schools.

Department for Education and Skills (2003). *Time for Standards: reforming the school workforce.* London: DfES.

Eacott, S. (2013). "Leadership" and the social: time, space and the epistemic. *International Journal of Educational Management, 27*(1), 91-10.

Fidler, B. (1997). School leadership: some key ideas. *School Leadership and Management, 17*(1), 23-27.

Glatter, R. (2006). Leadership and organization in education: Time for a re-orientation? *School Leadership and Management, 26*(1), 69-83.

Grace, G. (1995). *School Leadership beyond education management: an essay in policy scholarship.* London: Falmer Press.

Gunter, H.M. (2004). Label and labelling in the field of educational leadership. *Discourse, 25*(1), 21-42.

Gunter, H.M. (2010). A sociological approach to educational leadership. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 31*(4), 519-27.

Gunter, H.M. (2011). *Educational Leadership and the place of reform.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Gunter, H.M. & Forrester, G. (2008). New Labour and School Leadership. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 56*(2), 144-162.

Gunter, H.M. & Thompson, P. (2009). The makeover: a new logic in leadership development in England. *Educational Review, 61*(4), 469-483.

Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: heresy, fantasy or possibility? *School Leadership and Management, 32*(1), 313-324.

Lumby, J. (2001). *Managing Further Education: Learning Enterprise.* London: Sage.

Magretta, J. (2003). *What Management is: how it works and why it's everyone's business.* London: Profile.

Mertkan, S. (2014). In search of leadership: what happened to management? *Educational Management Administration Leadership, 42*(2), 226-242.

Morrison, M. (2009). *Leadership and Learning, matters of social justice.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Mutch, A. (2014). History and Documents in Critical Realism. In P. Edwards, J. O'Mahoney, & S. Vincent (Eds.), *Studying organizations using critical realism: a Practical Guide* (pp. 56-88). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Reilly, D. & Reed, M. (2010). Leaderism: an evolution of managerialism in uk public service reform. *Public administration, 88*(4), 960–978.

Pugh D.S. (2008). *Organizational Theory: Selected Readings.* London: Penguin.

Sammons, P., Gu, Q., Day, C., & Ko, J. (2011). Exploring the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes. Results from a study of academically improved and effective schools in England. *International Journal of Education Management, 25*(1), 83-101.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Aldershot: Arena Ashgate.

Slater, C.L. (2013). Educational Leadership in Mexico, Spain, and the United States: Cross-Cultural Implications. *REIRE, Revista d'Innovació i Recerca en Educació, 6*(2), 18-27.

Spade, M. (1934). *How to Run a Bassoon Factory; or Business Explained.* London: Hamish Hamilton.

Taylor, F.W. (1911). *Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Thorpe, A. (2014, july). A critical realist approach to educational leadership and management: possibilities and agendas. Oral communication presented in *International Association of Critical Realism Conference*. London.

Torrance, D. & Humes, W. (2014). The shifting discourses of educational leadership: International trends and Scotland's response. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 10*(2), 1-19.