



University
of Glasgow

Cavanagh, John B. (2010) *Managing collegiality: The discourse of collegiality in Scottish school leadership*. Ed.D thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/2254/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

**Managing collegiality:
The discourse of collegiality in Scottish school leadership**

John Bartholomew Cavanagh

Dip (Tech) Ed; B.A. (Educational Studies); M.Ed (Management and Administration)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D)

University of Glasgow

Under the supervision of Professor Penny Enslin

University of Glasgow

Faculty of Education

Department of Educational Studies

Glasgow July 2010

**Managing collegiality:
The discourse of collegiality in Scottish school leadership**

John Bartholomew Cavanagh

Dip (Tech) Ed; B.A. (Educational Studies); M.Ed (Management and Administration)

Abstract

In recent years there has been an increasing emphasis on the promotion of collegiality as an impetus for management in Scottish schools. Collegiality is promoted as having the potential to transform teachers and hence education. This study confronts this ambitious claim arguing that the concept of collegiality has suffered from a lack of theoretical and intellectual scrutiny. Collegiality lacks proper understanding as a concept and as a discourse. Terms associated with it are frequently used in perfunctory ways which are inattentive to its conceptual sophistication.

This study attends to complications which emerge when we reflect rigorously on what collegiality means, and how it impacts on various organisations, but in particular school management. Current attempts at developing a collegiate culture in schools are under-exploiting its potential as a transformative management model. We are not managing to be collegiate in the most normative of understandings because we are not Managing collegiality in ways which take account of its conceptual and discursive complexity.

The key research questions are:

From where has the discourse of collegiality come and how has it been promoted?

Whose interest might the discourse of collegiality serve?

The study takes two main approaches in addressing these. It considers collegiality as a concept, focussing on meaning and implications arising from the application of limited understandings of the idea in a variety of organisational contexts. It then draws on continental philosophy to uncover arguments which position collegiality, currently promoted, as a discourse.

The dissertation locates key sources of the discourse of collegiality and the politics and practices of its promotion. It explores the interests claimed to be served by collegiality, contrasts these with the interest more likely to be served, before going on to make normative claims about a rehabilitated understanding of collegiality. It identifies current approaches to collegiality more as being technologies for organisational expediency rather than as conduits of the more attractive and normative understandings which could contribute creatively to a more democratic and 'dialogic' school organisational culture.

In seeking a more creative and potentially transformative conception and practice of collegiality, the study looks at one particular example of a radical reappraisal and critiques this, finding it attractive in some senses but at odds with the parameters within which school managers work. A discussion develops which explores more attractive and normative understandings and casts these before a backdrop of common approaches to the professional practice of school management.

The dissertation contributes to a discussion by which popular understandings of collegiality may be rescued to become more befitting the democratic and socially oriented facets of a school, rather than as a managerialist technology, impacting on learners, teachers and the wider constituency of interest in schooling in rather more limited ways. The study defends normative understandings of collegiality as an organisational impetus tailored for professional arenas, but in so doing it defends management as a necessity in organisational contexts characterised by complexity. Collegiality cannot be an alternative to Management. It is an attractive approach for schools which can be managed if Managed appropriately.

Acknowledgments

My gratitude goes first to my wife, Lynn (a diamond often content to be a stone) without whose support and patience I could never have started let alone finished this. Jack and Linzi have suffered and sacrificed in the process and they have been of immense help both practically and in terms of encouragement. I hope they come to share my love of learning, reading and writing as a result.

Family members, Jack McKemmie, Renee and Joan provided enormous support in a variety of ways and my friends Elaine Brown and Louise Haigh were extremely helpful in picking out the many 'typos' in the final versions of the dissertation. I thank my many friends, in general, for tolerating the inevitable moods and 'distancing' which results from a task of this scale – especially in its final stages.

The Rev. Dr. Scott Shackleton had been on the 'postgraduate journey' before me, whilst fully employed, and he understood the tensions and nursed me through the many attendant frustrations. I have no doubt he prayed very hard as well.

Malcolm L. MacKenzie has to bear much of the responsibility for instilling in me a critical and enquiring mind and a love for educational insights. Malcolm, one of my best ever teachers, has become my closest friend and his support, in many forms, has been unflagging and selfless. I would not have completed but for his encouragement and support, and I thank him for the many ways, in which he has helped me stay 'in-step'.

Dr. Nicki Hedge 'sold' the idea of the doctorate to me during a brief phone call early in 2004. Nicki's 'after sales service' has been of the highest quality and she has become a close academic and personal friend. Professor Penny Enslin, my supervisor, has a degree of humility and an intellect both of which are understated but enviable. These qualities combined with her kindness and her patience sustained me in the more trying times. Penny's confidence in me and her encouragement through the 'dark' days ensured that I completed when, at times, I thought I might never do so. I hope we have developed a strong personal and academic friendship which, although perhaps taken for granted by me at times, will nonetheless endure.

I would finally like to thank and bless Bill Wilson and Dr. Bob Smith (Vermont, both now dead), and many others like them, for sharing their experience strength and hope with me and for giving me the confidence, spiritual strength and faith required to both start and finish this work.

J.B. Cavanagh City of Brechin, July, 2010

Author's Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been published or submitted in support of any other degree or qualification.

John Bartholomew Cavanagh

July 2010

City of Brechin

Contents

Title Page	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Author’s Declaration	v
Chapter One: Introduction	
Collegiality: Its significance, and a preliminary definition	1
Origins of the research	4
Collegiality – a concept in need of analysis	12
Chapter Two: Aims, Outline of Argument and Methods	
Reflections on the title – ‘Managing Collegiality’	14
Questioning collegiality	17
Outline of argument	21
Outline of chapters	23
Methods	25
Chapter Three: Conceptualising collegiality	
A concept in context	31
Defining collegiality – The literature	32
Schools, professionalism and teachers	37
Collegiality: the Ecclesiastical context of the Roman Catholic Church	43
Collegiality and higher education	47
Collegiality, the English public school and ‘the establishment’ - the story of Ronald Cartland	49

Chapter Four: The discourse of collegiality

From concept to discourse	56
Discourse, technology and biopower	58
Governmentality and panopticism	67

Chapter Five: The origins and promotion of the discourse of collegiality

An idea whose time has come	74
Where has the discourse of collegiality come from?	75
A Teaching Profession for the Twenty-first Century: McCrone	78
How has the discourse of collegiality been promoted in Scotland?	91

Chapter Six: Whose interests does the discourse of collegiality serve?

Whose interests are claimed to be served?	104
Whose interests are likely to be served?	
Collegiality and the interests of the grander political agenda	112

Chapter Seven: Towards a rehabilitated conception of collegiality

Reviewing the argument	125
A radical conception of collegiality – Michael Fielding	130
Conclusion and Implications for professional practice: The Glasgow Boys	136
The collegial Head Teacher	141

Appendix A “The Glasgow Boys”	145
--------------------------------------	-----

References	146 -158
------------	----------

Chapter One

Introduction

The idea of collegiality has been around for some time but is now of increasing importance in Scotland's schools, where it has become aligned with policy developments related to the school improvement agenda. At its simplest, collegiality refers to an association of colleagues, but beyond this general idea its meaning is far more complex, embracing a range of issues with a bearing on school management in both theory and practice.

Assuming that there are “norms of collegiality” (Little, 1982) that would be shared by a community of professionals, as well as the wider community, I offer an initial definition as a starting point for my investigation, pending further elaboration and adjustment as the discussion proceeds. My initial account is that collegiality relates to the right to be heard, implying voice and democracy, as well as both the right and duty to influence processes and decisions for the common good through participation and consultation in the given social context. Additionally important is that the idea of collegiality sits in opposition to individualism, not to be confused with individuality nor divorced from community (Kirkpatrick, 2005: 36), and to the type of narrow departmentalism associated with a ‘political’ model of management (Bush 1986, 1995). In such models, narrowly focussed interest groups seek to be influentially represented in their own particular and often self-serving interests (Bush, 1995: 73). In the genuinely collegiate context, it is the ‘collegium’, in its completeness and unity, which is the sole interest group; the collegium involves all¹ members (Bush, 1995: 52). This unity is frequently cited as a central norm of collegiality, which features in different institutional contexts claiming a collegiate identity where narrow politically driven objectives give way to corporate concerns rooted in a sense of common organisational interest. For Bush, this distinguishes collegiality as a discrete ‘model’² or what English (1994: 1) calls a ‘typology’ of educational management. Bush

¹ Bush qualifies his definition and distinguishes two categories i.e. “[...] restricted’ collegiality where the leader shares power with a limited number of senior colleagues to ‘pure’ collegiality where all members have an equal voice in determining policy” (Bush, 1995: 52).

² Bush (1995: 17-28) identifies six models of educational management: Formal, Collegial, Political, Subjective, Ambiguity and Cultural. His 1986 edition identifies five: Formal, Democratic, Political, Subjective and Ambiguity models. His switch from “democratic” to “collegial” is left largely unexplained despite the fact that the detail of his descriptions is very similar. See also Bush, T. (2006).

describes collegiate approaches to management as “strongly *normative* in orientation” (Bush, 1995: 53, my emphasis). The claims I make here, and the position I take at this stage, are both provisional, but it seems sensible to place before my reader an account of collegiality, which I believe, is normative, attractive, desirable, and potentially beneficial to schools. My definition draws on literature beyond Bush, but his idea of collegiality as a model focuses attention on a number of factors, which, for him, distinguish it from the other management approaches. From the outset, I suggest that collegiality, as it is actually operating in schools, is substantially different from the normative understandings, which feature, in much of the academic literature. What then, are these more normative and ‘ideal’ understandings?

I am positioning collegiality as an approach to interpersonal engagement in an organisational setting, which, unlike others such as dictatorship, oligarchy and anarchy, includes within its definition ideas, which render it as something appealing, positive and normatively desirable. Collegiality is premised on certain patterns of social and organisational engagement (i.e. colleagues are collegial in their behaviour) and the context in which they operate can be described as collegiate i.e. conducive to collegial behaviour. A collegiate context is necessary for collegial behaviour which in turn creates the necessary conditions for a culture of collegiality. The normative distinction of collegiality to which Bush (1995) draws attention depends upon certain elements being in place in order that collegiality prevails. Bush acknowledges that advocates of collegiality believe that decision-making should be based on democratic principles but do not necessarily claim that these principles actually determine the nature of management in action. It is an “idealistic model” (Bush, 1995: 53). The mention of “idealistic” suggests to me a split between what is attractive in theory and what is deliverable in practice and this will be a feature of my developing discussion (particularly in Chapter Three and Chapter Seven).

There are certain ideas which are tacitly associated with collegiality which can be drawn upon to further inform an interim definition. Collegiality is frequently associated with professional contexts. Collegiality and professional status are normatively premised upon certain preconditions and assumptions and in advancing my initial account of collegiality I wish to highlight certain key elements which are essential. These distinctive elements embrace the assumption of professional right and professional autonomy afforded by professional membership, for example recognition of parity of professional expertise in spite of any prevailing organisational hierarchy. Contributors to the debate generally share a lexicon which includes central ideas such as democracy, voice, participation, consultation, opinion, consensus and freedom (in the intellectual sense and in the sense of approaches to – in the case of

education – pedagogy). Collegiality is associated with concepts such as participation, loyalty, trust, respectful (but perhaps firm) exchange of views, openness and transparency in decision making and power-brokering. A common understanding of collegiality pays regard to the desirability of the notion of sharing, i.e. of influence, ideas, responsibility and creativity. A collegiate climate is one in which the characteristics mentioned above are not only genuine and evident, but are considered prerequisite and defining characteristics of the collegiate fabric of the context in question. To this extent collegiality has an association with fairness and social justice in that it embraces many of the key characteristics of an open space for interpersonal engagement and human communion. The collegium, i.e. the space in which collegiality is practised and expressed, is concerned with social justice insofar as a genuinely and normatively developed collegiate environment embraces inclusion, and protects individual right to opinion and audience. The collegium is a cooperative context in which ideas are shared, debated, exchanged, reflected upon and subjected to the scrutiny of professional peers. Essentially, the collegiate spirit is one which has at its heart the aim of creating a degree of equality, letting sometimes diverse views surface in the interest of pursuing what is a common and agreed set of aims and values. Implied in all of this are complexities which require, I argue, intense theoretical attention because of the tensions between the norms of collegiality, and the possibilities and practicalities of collegiality in context. The contextual focus of my own developing discussion is the agenda attending the governance³ of the Scottish secondary school.

Collegiality has come to occupy the spaces left by other typologies of educational leadership e.g. management, administration and leadership, but when we analyse its motives and deployment we can see traces of such previous typologies (e.g. formal management models which are at odds with the normative features I have ascribed to collegiality, i.e. those with an emphasis on less democratic approaches and more on control). This dissertation is rooted in the view that collegiality, as it is currently manifest, would benefit from much greater theoretical scrutiny than it has hitherto enjoyed. I develop an argument that there is a mismatch between the normative definitions I have set out, (or Bush's "pure" collegiality), and the actual practice (reality) of collegiality. I shall suggest that current understandings and applications of collegiality are flawed through a lack of conceptual scaffolding. If, as I shall indicate, collegiality is a concept whose time has come, then it is right to explore rigorously the concept and the ways in which it might, if left under-scrutinised, impact negatively on professional practice and on the processes of

³ I use the term governance to include approaches to the direction of some institutional process. The choice of word is made at this stage to avoid using terms like 'management' 'administration' and 'leadership' which can be so easily confused with one another but which are in essence different. Governance I find useful at this stage as a generic term for all of these.

schools which rely on it as an impetus for their governance. Similarly, intellectual effort could uncover obstacles the removal of which would create an environment capable of fostering the normative instantiation of collegiality.

Having offered an initial definition and indicated the need for critical attention to the idea of collegiality in relationship to professionalism and the context of education, I now outline my motivation for the study, noting the context for, and origins of, this research, including the professional and personal interest driving it.

Origins of the research

As a recently appointed Scottish secondary school Head Teacher I have found my day-to-day thinking becoming increasingly focussed on the issue of collegiality. Although I had selected collegiality as my dissertation topic prior to my appointment, I now feel my position demands an even stronger need to understand collegiality as a particular typology (English, 1994) of educational management which is exercising increasing influence on patterns and approaches to school leadership.

Regardless of the position I occupy in a school, Head Teacher or not, the issue of collegiality will continue to have a bearing upon my professional ‘lifeworld’⁴, but there are additional motivations driving this study. As I embark upon a period in my career when I have overall responsibility for a school community, its pupils, staff, fabric and processes, I am deeply conscious of my own development needs. On a daily basis I am undertaking a grave responsibility, very aware that my actions, thoughts and practice will have significant effects on the lives of others, often at structural and practical levels indeed, but also at the very real human and spiritual level. A Head Teacher has the power to make a pupil’s or teacher’s (non-teaching staff also, if we are being thoroughly collegiate) life miserable or joyful (Ginott, 1995). I am aware that my practice, in order to be ethically

⁴ Habermas draws a distinction between ‘lifeworld’ and ‘system’ (Finlayson, 2005: 47-51). Aoudjit (2010) also recognises this difference, postulating that the system has an effect on the lifeworld. In relation to the current discussion on collegiality, the system is represented by the prevailing understanding and application of a particular interpretation of collegiality which conflicts to some extent with a more natural (‘strongly normative’) understanding. Aoudjit, in the cited article on Habermas’ distinction, argues: “Finally, unlike the system, in which individuals are primarily ‘oriented to their own individual successes’ in the lifeworld, ‘they pursue their individual goals under the condition they can harmonize their plans of action on the basis of common definitions’” (Aoudjit (2010: 11) commenting on Habermas (1984: 286). “In sum while the system is the domain of control and efficiency, the lifeworld is the domain of mutual understanding” (Aoudjit, 2010: 11).

sound, must be thoroughly informed and intellectually robust. The progression of this work is, therefore, ethically, morally, philosophically as well as educationally founded, in that it concerns itself with the correct things to do, the correct ways to do them, and, generally, the correct ways to behave as a leader in a school. The work draws its legitimacy from my view that professional conduct should always be based on reflective engagement with the body of wider educational and management theories, incorporating views from both the academic and policy communities near and far - macro and micro. In saying this I am in agreement with Ihara who claims that collegiality, in its perfect form, is a “professional virtue” (Ihara, 1988: 60).

The position I occupy within my school represents only one aspect of my duty towards my employing (education) authority. As a Head Teacher, I am contractually responsible for the operational management and strategic direction of the school. As an ‘officer’ of the council and as a representative of the director of education at the local level of the school, I have a duty to make a contribution to the wider direction of the educational provision in the community and local authority within which I operate. The processes of accountability and the climate of performativity are such that I am judged against (amongst other things) my capacity to engender a collegiate culture within my school.

This becomes complicated by the fact that as a teacher, however, I have various identities over-and-above my contractual identity. I am a teacher, a subject teacher, a colleague, male, a parent, a member of the wider society and community, an executive director of a non-educational organisation, an educational scholar, a school manager and a council officer; I am all these things as well as being a Head Teacher. Sometimes these identities are complementary, working well together, but sometimes they are antagonistic and in tension. However, from my point of view, two things are clear: firstly, I have both rights and duties, by virtue of my position in the technical role of employed teacher and manager of teachers, to contribute to the educational debate. Secondly, I argue that I have other rights and duties that extend beyond this contractual relationship, i.e. those described above which emanate from the variety of identities, which I, and other teachers, have to contend with and balance. The varied identities which teachers, whatever their position, take to school are many and complex in their relationship - one to the others. These professional rights and duties (for myself and other teachers and colleagues), and my views as a participant in wider social affairs, will be part of the story which follows, as I engage with the fuller analysis of what collegiality does, could and ought to mean. However, as suggested, the professional and the technical roles do not always sit comfortably together, and reconciliation can only be properly negotiated if such discussion is rooted in a

sound theoretical framework, stemming from honest and ethical motivations, and from as clear an understanding of collegiality as is possible. In arguing for collegiality, Ihara uncovers what he sees as a dimension to the professional self which has to accept a “commitment to the goals and values of the profession, and that, as such, collegiality includes a disposition to support and cooperate with one’s colleagues” (Ihara, 1988: 60). In this dissertation, I am seeking to be true to my own professional self (as Ihara sees it) regardless of whether I am dealing with collegiality or some other aspect of the professional context, and regardless of whether I come to make claims for or against collegiality as I see it operating. The very act of conducting a critique is a function of the genuine commitment to the goals of the teaching and learning profession, and is additionally a function of genuine and normative readings of what it is to be collegiate. Furthermore, with respect to the motivation for this study, the work is driven by Lester’s view that the professional doctorate (for which the dissertation is submitted) concerns itself with the production and exposure of knowledge:

which is created and used by practitioners in the context of their practice, and of Schön’s (Schön, 1983) constructionist notion of knowledge, where research and practice coexist in a cyclic or spiral relationship: practice gives rise to new knowledge, which in turn informs changes in practice, and so on (Lester, 2004: 758).

To locate the study, the school I manage is situated in a deprived inner city community which features, in many negative ways, in indices of social disadvantage in Scotland⁵. Current trends in management are ‘encouraging’ Head Teachers to develop the school along collegial lines and I am in the early stages of attempting so to do. Many of the children at my school are “Growing up at the Margins” (Coffield, Borrill, and Marshall, 1986). My school is underachieving in terms of key government measures (mainly attainment), but is nonetheless, a ‘good’ school⁶ in the eyes of those most closely associated with it. It is widely acknowledged that in any school a common sense of purpose and a shared set of aims can make the difference (Richman and Farmer, 1974). This reference to shared values and aims is a substantial, popular, and often obvious claim made for collegiality (e.g. Noble and Pym, 1989, Brundrett, 1998). The idea of colleagues sharing values, objectives and ethos, and coming together to give form to

⁵ See the Scottish Government’s ‘Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation’ (SIMD) for ways in which areas of Scotland are classified in terms of deprivation and social disadvantage - available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Social-Welfare/TrendSIMD> (Last accessed 11.7.10).

⁶ Internal research, in my own school, points to a level of self-confidence in the work of the school notwithstanding its reputation as ‘under-attaining’ in terms of Government measures. This research - for internal self-improvement purposes only - is inadmissible in this dissertation due to its empirical nature and as the result of ethical restrictions upon me. The point I make is, however, that the term ‘good school’ is as contestable, as common and popular superlatives such as the term ‘excellence’ – see (Gillies, 2006a, 2006b, 2007, Readings, 1996).

what they offer their students is a palatable construction of what collegiality means. Collegiality is generally understood in this normative sense, but a central purpose of this dissertation is to interrogate the assumption that collegiality is an inevitably good feature of organisations like schools however it is understood and pursued. The idea that collegiate approaches in schools are inevitably good has to be argued with the support of some rigorous reflection and analytical effort. As an idea, the goal of collegiality in Scottish schools has not yet been thoroughly interrogated and is too prone to simplistic adoption by educational policy makers and then, via complicated workings of the processes of power and discourse, by practitioners. Applied prior to rigorous theoretical scrutiny, one might ask: has collegiality the potential to be harmful?

The development of this dissertation has the potential to help shape me, as a new Head Teacher, as I try to come to terms with, promote, improve and sustain a school in which the educational values directed by my own ethical compass can be lived and experienced (or even contested) by all. Within this context, a dissertation on collegiality has the capacity to be a powerful formative professional learning experience. Personal motivation, driven by an inbuilt concern for the promotion of justice in communities where people come together, and the belief that as a teacher I can make a difference to people's lives, is strengthened as well as challenged by my role as a leader of a learning community. I remain optimistic that fair and equitable schools can exist, and that those with the responsibility for leading such communities have a key responsibility to contribute to the realisation of this. The issue here is what role collegiality has to play in this and, indeed, what the very concept means. This question arises out of my own concerns that approaches to collegiality at the present time are perfunctory - or worse still - "contrived" (Hargreaves, 1994: 195). At the very least we are not exploiting to best potential the 'norms' of collegiality which I have provisionally offered in my opening paragraphs above.

Initially, my focus on collegiality emerged from a consideration of 'leadership' in schools, an influential discourse in its own right. This analysis transformed into my current interest in collegiality as a similarly influential element in the ever-changing leadership agenda. As an emerging and influential discourse I sense within it some difficulties and, as I have progressed to this stage in my studies, I have become more sensitive to issues of 'spin'⁷ and rhetoric in

⁷ Spin is a term often associated with the Blair years of U.K. government in particular. Discourse analysts (Fairclough, 2000) are alert to spin and its potential. Diego alerts us to the problem with spin thus: "If the listener is expecting truth, and if the spinner is making statements designed to be taken as truth, but which are, in fact, spin, obfuscation, deception, the listener will make a flawed political judgment - and this is the key issue: spin leads to an improper understanding and improper political action. The victim of spin is not only the political opponent or scapegoat - but especially the person who makes the flawed political judgment. Indeed, the problem with spin is that it sabotages the relationship between facts and their relevance for man's life. If a man cannot be sure of the truth, he has no basis for understanding and therefore no basis for appropriate political action". (Diego 2004) Available at: <http://www.insmkt.com/spin.htm> Last accessed 21.5.10.

relation to claims made for trends, fads and fashions attending educational policy and practice. Collegiality is a term which can be misleading if left ill-defined and underconceptualised. This can be both harmful and convenient, depending upon who appropriates what understanding and for what purpose. By this, I mean that by one definition (that appropriated by managers within a system), collegiality can serve a managerialist purpose, while by another definition the idea of collegiality and the implications of the more normative understandings attending it, might be at odds with a climate of control pertaining to a particular top-down educational agenda.

Interestingly, collegiality is a term which has become implicated with the agenda of excellence, standards and quality, and the relationship of these to the contribution education might make to the economic prowess of the society within which it operates. Such an agenda has been cited by critical commentators (Ball, 1990) as potentially contributing to the diminution of a liberal education tradition. Collegiality seems unobjectionable until properly reflected upon and deconstructed, both as a word and a concept, impacting on ways of behaving as a manager and as someone who is managed. I position collegiality on a continuum of ‘management speak’ which has imposed itself on education in Scotland and beyond, over the last three decades (I draw attention here to terms such as ‘Audit’, ‘Performance Indicators’, ‘Development Planning’, ‘Standards and Quality Assurance’). These terms have permeated the educational policy agenda from the 1980s onwards; they have become concepts associated with modernised positions on school management, but they have come to feature in influential narratives which have had very real effects on people and practices. Surely this can only be safely acceptable if they are properly understood in terms of both the opportunities they offer, and the limitations which constrain them?

Against this background, the topic of collegiality arises from its emergence and genealogy as an impetus for school organisation. This is an impetus which claims to favour fairness, justice and participation, in contrast to models based often on more formal, hierarchical - even autocratic - approaches to management. This claim arises from a key assertion I make that the ways in which collegiality is currently being Managed,⁸ is resulting in it not being managed to best effect. However, I resile from the position that we should avoid Management and instead I adopt the position - key to my argument - that in order to manage collegiality well we must Manage it differently and more effectively; we must avoid throwing the management baby out with the managerialist bathwater. Managerial metanarratives come and go, and their re-emergence in different forms is not unusual (English, 1994). Such re-emergence of older ideas

⁸Refer to Chapter Two for an explanation of my distinction between Manage (capital M) and manage (lowercase m). This distinction plays a crucial part in my argument and reference to it in this introductory may be initially confusing for the reader. I align the distinction with that between ‘achieve’ and ‘control’.

is redolent of what Foucault has called discursive “reactivation” (Foucault, 1991: 60). This has been the case with collegiality, to the extent that when we analyse its motives and deployment, we can see traces of previous typologies of educational management or leadership. Foucault believed that it was not always possible to discern a chronology, sequencing or succession in the history of ideas (Foucault, 1972: 169), and that there can often be overlapping of ideas as they come and go, in and out of fashion (English, 1994: 1). The debate on collegiality, as it is currently manifest, would benefit from academically rigorous reflection leading to greater conceptual clarity, thus confronting what Fielding identifies as ‘intellectual laziness’ (Fielding, 1999: 1). However, it is not enough to simply trace where collegiality has come from; the time has come to interrogate it and the ways in which it might impact on professional practice. A central theme in my argument, which is outlined in Chapter Two, is that current understandings and applications of collegiality are flawed through lack of conceptual scaffolding; there is merit in collegiality if properly developed and understood. To this extent, collegiality will, as I have mentioned already, continue to be central to the organisation of schools, whether in terms of current understandings, or in a rehabilitated form.

There is a natural tension here in that teachers’ rights and duties are intertwined in a very complex way. For example, it is perhaps a desirable quality of Head Teachers to practise collegiate approaches in their schools, but we must never forget that the same Head Teachers are bound by legislation, statutory instruments and what are often (possibly euphemistically) referred to as ‘guidelines’ issuing from Scottish Government, Westminster Government and indeed from legislatures in global-regional and international law as well as at the local level, in individual Scottish local authorities. These guidelines are often ‘compulsory guidelines’ or, what I would call, ‘parachute guidelines’⁹. Part of what must be considered is where the notion of collegiate working sits with the legal framework within which education is established. It would be remiss not to make some reference, in the developing dissertation, to the legal framework (educational law) within which collegiality is being encouraged, since the tensions arising naturally, as a result of this relationship, are altogether too easily ignored, notwithstanding the fact that they are significant. This will be discussed later, when I address some of the complexities attaching to the productive deployment of collegiate approaches in schools and other contexts. The chosen main title of the dissertation ‘Managing collegiality’ is explained in Chapter Two

⁹ ‘Parachute Guidelines’ is an expression I have come across in an unrelated context. The suggestion is that the advice or guideline that one should wear a parachute when jumping from an aircraft isn’t really a suggestion or guideline at all; the term ‘guideline’ is a ‘magical’ word in educational policy discourse analysis - I suggest.

and draws attention to the paradoxes, complexities and tensions which confront schools, as they seek to become collegiate organisations.

In completing this dissertation my wish is to produce new knowledge which will influence practice, and recognise that practice has a role also in influencing theory. A key attraction of the professional doctorate is that it is “founded on processes of thoughtful action, leading to advances in practice, rather than processes of research leading to advances in knowledge” (Lester, 2004: 765). My motivation for completing a professionally orientated higher degree is to hone my on-going practice in education, recognising the role that theory has in shaping practice, rather than engaging in rigorous scholarship for its own sake. The iterative relationship between theory and practice is one which has long fascinated me, and one which can too easily be poorly understood, or reflected upon, by teachers in practice. I am persuaded by the view that “there is nothing more practical than a good theory”¹⁰, but I am also persuaded in the light of experience that genuinely reflective practice can have a profound influence on the evolution of theory. As my academic studies have continued alongside my practice as a teacher, or manager, in secondary schools, I have become alert to what has been referred to as the ‘fracture’ (Humes, 1994: 172) between theory and practice. I am interested in this dissertation in contributing to a new theory of collegiality.

I started this doctorate in 2004 after some debate with senior colleagues in my workplace. My director’s preference was that I undertake the Scottish Qualification for Headship (SQH)¹¹ but I argued a case for undertaking a doctorate which had been an ambition for some time. The ‘co-existence’ of theoretical positions, conceptually complex ideas, and the ‘cyclical relationship’ these have with practice, are very real to me as I reflect on my day to day work. This, I believe, is worth writing about, and in fact constitutes a normative duty on the part of any seriously reflective professional practitioner (Ihara, 1988). Writing the final drafts of this dissertation, I am aware that I have come to a point on a most productive, practical and intellectual journey, which places me in the ballpark of debate, with significant others, in the arena of educational

¹⁰ ‘There is nothing more practical than a good theory’. Primarily attributed to Kurt Lewin (1954) but disputed: also sometimes attributed to physicists Maxwell, Einstein (and a few others).

¹¹The Scottish Qualification for Headship (was) developed in order to help raise standards of education in Scotland. It described the level that aspirant Head Teachers should have reached in the areas of school leadership and management if they were to be equipped to take up a post as a Head Teacher successfully. See <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2003/11/18433/28418>, Last Accessed 21.9.09. SQH has recently been superseded by efforts to establish Flexible Routes to Headship (FrH) See: (Scottish Government, Achieving the Standard for Headship – Providing Choice and Opportunity, (2006) available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/01/31093326/10>.

policy and management, albeit these others may have chosen different paths for professional development.

My interest in the whole issue of collegiality, the apparent lack of a shared definition or understanding, its ambiguity and its uncertainty as a technology or discourse (Masschelein and Quaghebeur, 2005) to guide schools along participative¹² and democratic paths, is borne of a persisting interest in the broader field of school management. I have had an abiding curiosity in relation to the management of education, and schooling in particular, since I began to teach in the early 1980s. My ambition to occupy a management position has been motivated by what I have seen lacking in the management, leadership, governance or administration of schools. (All of these terms have been used successively, concurrently and interchangeably over the decades of my practice; they represent subtle yet significant discursive shifts in the language of educational management). Increasingly, as I hear calls for teaching to be a research informed profession, I recognise that this must apply not only to aspects of pedagogy, but also to the managerial and administrative context within which pedagogical practice takes place and flourishes (or withers). Writing specifically about collegiality, Ihara (1988) makes a very valid point which is not out of place in this immediate context. Ihara argues that “collegiality is partly a set of obligations to colleagues, and ... it can also be understood as a kind of virtue” (quoted in Fielding, 1999: 14).

It is a personal commitment to collegiality, in its best understandings, which has motivated me to undertake and complete this study. Whether as a teacher or a manager, educational management and policy making is complex and the attraction of this programme of doctoral study is that it is characterised by complexity throughout; it takes complexity as given, and encourages the student to engage with intellectual and theoretical issues not only for their own sake, but because such engagement can have a potentially significant bearing on practice. I can also identify a perceived “cyclical relationship” between the management processes in education and the quality of the output of education, although I argue that this is not as simple a relationship as is often suggested by politicians and officialdom in education. Such a relationship, often only assumed into the system for political ends and in an under-scrutinised fashion in the absence of critical reflection and understanding, can come to shape the direction which educational management processes take in less appealing ways. Furthermore, some such ill-conceived relationships, where output in the quality of schools is too closely associated with a culture of managerialism, are in fact counterproductive and at an important

¹² Participative management was a feature of the 1980s and 1990s. It drew the attention of local authorities and HME; it was not promoted nearly as much as collegiality is being promoted now however.

level unethical and possibly uncollegial. The recently re-emerging appeal for a culture of collegiality in schools has intrigued me and focussed me in a particular direction.

The motivation behind my writing is rooted in a genuine wish to understand the concept of collegiality for its own sake, and its potential to impact on schools and their success. I am interested in understanding the discursive shift which saw 'leadership' being relocated to a position less prominent in the school management lexicon *per se*, while still existing as an impetus by which all members in the organisation we call the school are rendered leaders. I do not accept that such discursive shifts are accidental; neither do I think they are part of some calculated conspiratorial approach to macro management of schools. I do, however, see a connection between such changes in language and the subtle workings of discourse.

Collegiality – a concept in need of analysis

While the idea of leadership has to some extent receded and given way to collegiality, the opportunity to interrogate collegiality has not, I believe, been seized in the current context of Scottish school management. The opportunity to compare and contrast impetuses which have come, gone and competed over the years (for example management, leadership and consultative and participative models) has not been taken to a deeper conceptual level. For example, in contrast to some of the criticisms I level at the reality of collegiality in schools at the moment I am interested in understanding if collegiality should be seen more as a cultural force and a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Could it offer a genuine voice to stakeholders and hence creative potential to school management, and in so doing forcefully influence standards and effectiveness in schools? As a Head Teacher embarking upon what I hope will be a positive transformation of a school, and as one already inhabiting the more popular understandings of collegiality (weak and insubstantial ones – in my opinion), I see a gaping need to investigate and arrive at a model for productive participation in schools which is free from (and seen to be free from) some negative readings of collegiality, with which I will deal at a later stage in Chapters Five and Six.

This chapter has sought to put to the reader the professional motivations for the research pursued in the dissertation. It has pointed out that it is motivated from a recognition of the need for professional learning (my own and that of those whose professional paths I cross) of the highest order. I have also made explicit my belief that the context in which I work is demanding of the most rigorous theoretical reflection if the school is to be led well and the

pupils attending it are to benefit. In the following chapter, I start to uncover my thinking, by explaining my title and pointing the reader to the argument which is to follow in the pages to come.

Chapter Two

Aims, Outline of Argument and Methods

Reflections on the title – ‘Managing Collegiality’

The title of this dissertation, ‘Managing Collegiality’ requires explanation as it can be interpreted in different and important ways. I begin this chapter by explaining the ways in which I will employ the verb ‘managing’. ‘Managing’ can suggest, in one sense, the exercise of control over processes or persons. When I use the word ‘Management’ alongside ‘collegiality’, I intentionally establish a paradox, since collegiality is an idea which, in terms of some influential definitions, is at odds with the notion of power and control by someone or something over another. The term ‘Managing Collegiality’ looks like an oxymoron in the same way that ‘Policing Freedom’ (Alderson, 1979) and ‘Planning for Freedom’ (Mannheim in Wolff, 1993) are similarly internally contradictory and logistically problematic. However, it is not as simple as this. In some contexts the notion of collegiality can be read as constraining, despite the implication in the more popular understandings of collegiality, particularly within professional organisations, of a degree of space for both individual voice and opinion; I will go on in Chapter Three to explore this potentially constraining interpretation. Another understanding of collegiality takes us into a discussion relating to the ethical and moral imperative or norm for a community of people to speak-with-one-voice.

A further reading of ‘managing’, this time with a small ‘m’, is in the sense of managing-as-‘achieving’ or ‘being successful’ in bringing about or attaining something i.e. collegiality. I could be successful or otherwise at managing some process: i.e. making it happen or establishing the necessary and sufficient conditions for it to be realised. ‘Managing collegiality’ can mean managing to imbue organisational practice with a collegiate spirit or achieving a collegiate climate in a particular community. Thus contrasted, the phrases ‘Managing collegiality’ and ‘managing collegiality’ comprise an important distinction in my argument throughout the dissertation. I will suggest that prevailing attempts in the wider

policy community, in local authorities, within trade unions and in individual schools at Managing collegiality are likely to result in failure in managing collegiality to its best potential in schools. My argument is that the technologies and approaches to collegiality are unlikely to be successful in bringing about its more normative understandings. Indeed the current discourse of collegiality threatens to undermine the achievement of collegiality.

However, things are even more complicated than this. I will uncover how the very idea of collegiality is, in some very important senses, at odds with the purposeful and legal direction of our schools. There are occasions when it would be improper, illegal and counterproductive to allow unfettered collegiate working to prevail in our schools. It is with this point in mind that I understand that collegiality must on occasion be ‘Managed’, i.e. directed by someone. Collegiality can, and indeed must, be Managed and there need not be any insuperable contradictions inherent in this. In taking this position, I reject inflexible distinctions between ‘formal’¹³ approaches to management and more ‘subjective’ approaches (which include collegiate, democratic and more recently spiritual¹⁴ approaches), and I take an eclectic approach to management in the interest of developing a description of a workable and meaningful collegiate context within which schools can be governed effectively and participatively. We may in fact only ‘manage’ collegiality by ‘Managing’ it, but our approaches to Management will almost definitely require rethinking in such ways as to genuinely involve others in the process, and in ways in which we can in fact manage to achieve collegiality. Thus the management of collegiality will require a reconceptualisation not only of collegiality but of management itself. Tied up in all of this are very complex ideas touching on fine balances between freedom and control, and between formal management approaches and those increasingly popular subjective, cultural¹⁵ and spiritual approaches. I will provide examples of this layer of complexity later. At present schools cannot become self-governing and self-sufficient within current legal frameworks, or without repeal or amendment of our existing educational legislation. Sentimentality must give way to the harsh

¹³ There exists, in the literature on management - including educational management - a welter of references to the distinctions between formal and other approaches to management. Bush’s *Theories of Educational Management* (1986, 1995) are useful summaries of these different models of management in the specific context of education. In the earlier edition Bush identifies ‘Democratic Models’ as discrete ways of viewing educational management. Interestingly in the 1995 edition (same title – same publisher) the term ‘Democratic’ is replaced by the term ‘Collegiate’. Bush spends no effort in explaining the change in terminology and for the most part his description of the model and his definitions remain (almost exactly) the same.

¹⁴ Houston, P. Blankstein, K. And Cole, R. (eds.) (2009: 1), develop the idea of ‘Spirituality in Educational Leadership’ where they define spirituality as “the energy that connects us to each other and to our deepest selves”. This volume devoted to spiritual considerations in management perhaps suggests a further paradigmatic shift in educational management theory.

¹⁵ ‘Cultural’ is another of Bush’s ‘models’ referred to in the 1995 edition of his book but not in the 1986 edition.

reality that education is a legally legitimised social service under the influence of a welter of legislation. My proposal is that a non- or weakly-Managed environment in schools, or an ill-conceived collegiate environment, will not only be potentially damaging, but will be counter to the current legislative context within which schools exist and teachers teach. By contrast, a well-conceptualised reading of collegiality and a sophisticated alertness to the implications of collegiate approaches, might add quality to the responses to the legislative requirements of educational policy. If collegiality in schools is primarily about freeing up the minds of teachers, and about ‘giving-everyone-a-say’, then there is a problem; it has been suggested that, “Libertarianism is the enemy of liberty”¹⁶. Control measures are required to protect the effectiveness of freedom and voice and to establish a ‘*cordon sanitaire*’¹⁷ against anarchy. This said, current Management in schools, and the current Management of collegiality, are both tethering creativity and imagination, and are also imposing serious ethical dilemmas on teachers. Current approaches to collegiality need prompt reconsideration in the interest of truly effective schooling, which favours education over accountability, learning over statistics, and other technologies supporting a climate of increasing performativity. There is a relationship between the purposes of education and the way in which it is managed which policymakers and managers should be careful not to lose sight of, and the model of management adopted could make the difference between a liberal education and one more aligned with instrumental ends. Currently the Management of collegiality is such that the very idea and reality of collegiality is superficial, shallow and may conceal techniques of management and control, which paradoxically constrain collegiality understood in its more normative senses. Collegiality as it prevails in one understanding may in reality be thoroughly non-collegiate in another, more appealing, understanding.

Important questions that could be asked include: Can collegiality be Managed in the same way as freedom can be policed and planned for? Can the necessary control required for a legitimate (legal) education system sit alongside an approach in which those who are thus controlled have some voice in shaping the detail and the parameters of the control? Is it possible to broker an agreement free enough to allow for a more democratic approach to school leadership (or policing as Alderson suggests) to prevail? Schooling, like policing but in contrast with

¹⁶ I attribute this quotation to my academic friend, and former M.Ed supervisor, Malcolm L. MacKenzie (ret) University of Glasgow – Faculty of Education. MacKenzie used this at a Conservative Party conference speech and was criticised in the press by political correspondent for *The Scotsman* - Michael Fry afterwards for ‘bemusing’ his audience. Enshrined in it is the idea ‘*do what you like but go too far and you’ve had it. Too much freedom can be a dangerous thing!*’ I have been unable to track down a paper copy of the original article although I am sure it will be available in *The Scotsman* archives. Allegedly, the Rt. Hon Michael Rifkind congratulated MacKenzie on his speech indicating that he appreciated exactly the point made.

¹⁷ A term used by Elias Canetti in ‘Auto da Fé’ pp 337 quoted in O’Hear, A. (1984: ix).

education, is about social control¹⁸. Could the control be more effective if those controlled are involved in defining the premises, and limitations, of the control? The issues confronting us are weighty philosophical issues requiring hefty philosophical responses.

While Alderson explored ‘Policing Freedom’, Karl Mannheim considered ‘Planning for Freedom’, and his observations are highly relevant to the developing discussion. My discussion has associations with the difficulty identified by Mannheim, i.e. whether we can manage and control “those fields of social growth on the security of which depends the smooth functioning of the apparatuses of society” while at the same time leaving “free”:

...those areas that contain the greatest opportunity for creative opportunity and individualization [...] He who plans freedom, that is, assigns self-determination (sic) free spaces in the regulated structure, must plan, to be sure, also the conformity needed for the life of the society (Mannheim, K. in Wolff, 1993: 540).

The paradox is, I hope, obvious. Similarly if collegiality, understood as communities comprising teachers and other significant stakeholders participating in the creation of the school and its policies¹⁹, is desirable in our schools then we have to plan for, Manage and ‘police’ this participation if we wish to manage it.

Questioning Collegiality

In this dissertation I seek to question current influential understandings of collegiality and the assumptions underpinning them. In so doing, I probe the claims made for collegiality and some conceptual and practical issues attending it, challenging assumptions underpinning a trend towards collegiality in school leadership. To do so I begin by drawing on the work of two scholars who have already begun to unpick the meaning and significance of collegiality as a management approach in schools, and I use their work to help me shape my own research questions.

A significant point of departure for my argument is a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) event in 2007, organised for teachers in one Scottish local authority – North Lanarkshire Council (NLC) - by its Education Department, delivered by Professor Walter M. Humes (North

¹⁸ Although this could be disputed!

¹⁹ This is a popular understanding of collegiality. It surfaces in the key texts and papers (Bush, 1995, is an accessible departure point). I also direct the reader to Fielding (1999) who has a ‘radical’ view of what collegiality should mean. I develop my discussion drawing on Fielding’s views in Chapter Seven.

Lanarkshire Council (NLC), 2007). The occasion in question set out to explore with teachers how collegiality might be harnessed as a productive and effective organisational force. During the event some (rhetorical) questions were posed by Humes; these I will list shortly and they will serve as a starting point for the formulation of the questions I will subsequently pose and seek to answer. Rather than simply addressing the anticipated questions relating to 'how' to be collegiate, Humes challenged his colleagues in education to engage with higher order questions before considering approaches to engaging with collegiality, asking:

- Where has the discourse [of collegiality] come from?
- Whose interests does it serve – policy-makers, managers, teachers, pupils, parents?
- How has it been promoted?
- What is its knowledge-base?
- How does it shape professional thinking and practice?
- Are approaches to it anti-intellectual?

The work of Smyth (1991) also poses a set of generative questions about collegiality. Working some time earlier, Smyth asked similar questions to those posed by Humes, and began to address them. It is interesting to note that Smyth was asking these questions (which I will also list shortly) in 1991, at a time when there was more interest in collegiality at the academic level than there is now. However, Smyth was also pointing to a climate in which collegiality was clearly being promoted at the level of policy and practice, in and beyond the Australian context from which he was writing. Smyth usefully referred to developments in other parts of the world, and pointed to similar trends that were becoming apparent (Smyth, 1991). Smyth asked:

- How is the term collegiality being defined and used in the literature of schooling and teaching?
- Whose interests are served and whose are denied by construing teaching in this way?
- How is this particular construal of collegiality changing the nature of teachers' work in social and cultural ways?
- What is really happening here? Is collegiality being used in the same kind of manipulative way that terms like 'improvement', 'excellence', 'development' and 'professionalism' have been used in the past?
- How has the notion of collegiality become linked to the liberal discourse of the 'team' concept, 'participation', and 'site-based management', and how have these

supposedly devolutionary notions been used to marginalise teachers at the periphery? (Smyth, 1991: 324).

Smyth offers some valuable insights into approaching these questions, and I will refer to them later. While the notion of collegiality has been around for some time, its re-emergence and increasing influence in the Scottish context is relatively recent, so the time has come to consider it in some depth, by reflecting on questions of the sort posed by Smyth and Humes. I tackle a distillation of these questions with the aim of contributing to the development of the understanding of collegiality as a management (big M) model for schools. To do this I draw on Humes' and Smyth's to reformulate a set of my own questions which guide the dissertation. Responses to them are required before we can manage collegiality by properly and more effectively Managing it.

The two sets of questions can be seen as serving slightly different rhetorical purposes. Humes' questions are particularly significant since they were asked in the specific context of an episode in Scottish education in which the role of teachers, their contractual obligations and rights, and their salaries were being radically reviewed. For convenience, this context will be referred to as the McCrone period²⁰. The occasion on which Humes posed his questions was associated with a national approach seeking to prosecute particular types of working practices and conditions of service within teaching. The discourse of collegiality and the teachers' agreement (McCrone) have come to be linked (MacDonald, 2003), but the questions posed by Smyth, in a different context, are similarly important. Humes lets his questions sit, provocatively, awaiting engagement from his audience, whereas one gets the impression that Smyth has a view (as I am sure does Humes) on the answers to them. Humes' technique however is more Socratic in its approach and thus is more in line with the spirit of collegiality which, in its purer forms, encourages colleagues to ask difficult questions of themselves and within their collegium, and acknowledges the professional right and duty to ask such "tough"²¹ questions rather than simply be given answers to them. For my own purposes, I select from both sets of questions in order to frame my own set of research concerns.

²⁰ 'McCrone' is a term on the lips of Scottish teachers and their managers. It refers to the inquiry, into the pay and conditions of teachers in Scotland, chaired by Professor Gavin McCrone and published in 2000 by the then Scottish Executive. The Report had appendices attached to it and following on from it there emerged an agreement document - 'A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century' (Scottish Executive, 2000a, Scottish Executive, 2000b) and the subsequent agreement (Scottish Executive 2001). The language of McCrone, and the term itself, is synonymous with policy and management shifts in school education and its direction and control over the last decade.

²¹ "Tough" was a term Humes attached to a brand of collegiality which for him was much more about probing the 'why' of policy over-and-above the 'how' of implementation.

I am keenly interested in locating the source of the discourse of collegiality: Where has it come from? In considering this, I am aware of Smyth's references to linkage with other educational trends and fashions. Smyth's question, "What is really happening here?" is intriguing. What is obvious in practice, and what both Humes and Smyth are alert to, is that the discourse of collegiality has been promoted in a certain way. It has not emerged or happened organically; both contend that it has been promoted. I suggest that by addressing these questions I will go some way towards a description of how collegiality is being Managed (taken control of). Both Humes and Smyth are eager to understand exactly whose interests are served by the discourse; they present their questions in different ways, but in using terms such as 'shape' when associated with 'culture', 'practice' and 'social' identity, particularly in Smyth's case, they extend their interest to the effects the discourse of collegiality has on teachers. Smyth locates the ascendancy of collegiality with other current trends in educational management, and his answers beg analysis and response. Implicit in the notion of the emergence and promotion of the discourse of collegiality, is the idea that it promises some benefit to those who seek to either promote or embrace it. Whose interest is collegiality likely to serve?

Humes' fourth question (What is its knowledge base?) and Smyth's first (How is the term collegiality being defined and used in the literature of schooling and teaching?) both relate to the intellectual and research scaffolding which attends collegiality. In engaging critically with this theme, I undertake no separate literature review in this dissertation as I will engage with the literature as an integral part of my argument. Humes also asks to what extent approaches to collegiality might be considered anti-intellectual. This dissertation includes among its aims the contribution of intellectual rigour to the issue of collegiality. From the range of questions posed by Humes and Smyth I have selected two which I see as being of fundamental importance. I am not deliberately ignoring the remaining questions and in fact address some of them *en passant*. I am, for the time being, suggesting that current moves in the promotion of collegiality have not drawn as well on a 'knowledge-base' as they may have. With regard to the issue of professional thinking and practice, I can deal with this aspect in discussing the interests claimed to be served by collegiality. I am concerned with understanding:

- From where has the discourse of collegiality come and how has it been promoted?
- Whose interest might the discourse of collegiality serve?

These two questions embrace, for me, key issues to which practising teachers and policymakers must be alert. The first is in fact a combination of Humes' questions one and two. The question asserts that the discourse of collegiality has a source and is being driven. The second of the two

offers the opportunity to uncover the motivation behind the promotion of collegiality and the interests which key players in the policy arena see as being served by it. Both questions serve to alert me further to the reality of collegiality as a discourse as well as a concept i.e. as something which enacts an effect on practice, and not simply a hollow and power-neutral word or concept. I acknowledge that further research and scrutiny of the extended set of questions might be most helpful and illuminating, but for my purposes I am keen to attend to the two main questions which will allow me to explore the sources and motivations for a drive for collegiality as a feature of school management in the current educational context.

Outline of argument

In answering the central questions, my starting point is to recognise that ‘collegiality’ has emerged as an approach to school leadership that seems to promise to allow the key voices in the educational partnership to come together and jointly shape professional policy and practice. However, I will argue that the discourse of collegiality reveals some crucial problems: (1) the very notion of collegiality has not been clearly articulated, either conceptually or theoretically; (2) the origins of the current vogue for collegiality in Scottish educational discourse are not clear and need to be understood.

As well as attending to (1) and (2) above, I will put forward my claim that the ways in which collegiality is being Managed in schools policy in Scotland threatens to undermine the possibility of our managing collegiality, i.e. the achievement of collegiality in our schools.

My subsidiary claims are:

- (1) That the pursuit of collegiality in Scottish education is ultimately a Management (Capital M) strategy that can be seen to act as a conduit of predetermined policy discursively promoted through technologies of power and the use of ‘magical’²² language. This strategic potential of collegiality has been realised by language and techniques of discourse. This linguistic shift is reflective of a trend by which emotionally appealing language is replacing the language of management and

²² I am interested in the ‘magical’ potential of words. Freud claims: “Words and magic were in the beginning one and the same, and even today words retain much of their magical power [...] Words call forth emotions and are universally the means by which we influence our fellow creatures” (Freud, 1922: 113). There are interesting positions being taken on the power of words and the choice of words in relation to control and the exercise of power.

rationality. The term collegiality is ‘emotionally’ different from the term management – it has an inherent emotional appeal in a way in which management does not. My argument embraces my view that such linguistic turns are not accidental (perhaps not calculated either though) and are infiltrating educational discourse in the interests of grander educational agendas. I am suggesting that such use of language is insincere, and that careful consideration of the key documentation aimed at sustaining collegiality as a new order of management in schools reveals more about teacher/manager relations, in the particular socio-economic context within which it is emerging, than it does about innovative and creative approaches to participation and consultation in creating a new approach to professional and stakeholder engagement in educational policy making.

- (2) Collegiality in Scottish schools has come to be associated with the McCrone settlement on teachers’ pay and conditions although there is little attention paid specifically to the terms of collegiality in the original McCrone Report, or the appendices and agreement paper it spawned. Where the ‘terms of collegiality’ (collegiate, collegial and collegiality) do appear they do so in rather glib and rhetorical ways, targeted at the emotions. They appear as words lacking respectable attempts at definition and serious scrutiny, and their occurrences assume a pre-existing definition and an agreement that collegiality is both a productive and unobjectionable force. However the terms of collegiality have appeared more consistently in policy documentation after McCrone, and are very much features of what I choose to call a neo-McCrone policy context. Specifically they have emerged more in reports issued by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education (HMIe), and from documents emanating from teacher trade unions and local authorities in the post McCrone context.
- (3) Close scrutiny of the documentation and effort at imbuing education with the terms and spirit of collegiality shows that thus expressed collegiality amounts to little more than technical approaches to Managing ‘teacher-Management’ relations. While collegiality is being sold as an organisational impetus which will ultimately bring benefit to those in the educational process, it can be deconstructed as a discursive and technological approach to the exercise of power and control, serving the interests of policy makers and managers with clear and predetermined policy visions.

- (4) Because the spirit of collegiality, in its more normative understandings (what I refer to later as the norms of collegiality) and definitions have been relegated almost to unquestioned rhetoric, an opportunity has been missed to properly explore and incorporate the essence of something approaching ‘true’ collegiality in a way which could transform educational management practice and open it to more genuinely democratic processes.

Outline of chapters

I will now signpost the argument to come by outlining the ways in which the chapters to follow will be developed to support my claims. Having made clear my professional and personal motivation for the research (Chapter One), and having argued its importance in relation to my own professional context, I have proceeded in Chapter Two, thus far, to explain my deliberate choice of title and its central importance to the global argument in the dissertation. I have then identified key research issues framed as questions drawn from a wider set posed by Humes (2007) and Smyth (1991) and have outlined the critical position which I will defend as the dissertation proceeds.

In Chapter Three, I undertake conceptual and analytical work and begin to address my criticism of the way in which collegiality has come to play such a pervasive and persuasive part in school management, by going back to basics and addressing some questions of understanding and definition: what is collegiality? This chapter involves reflecting on the ways in which collegiality is understood and experienced in different institutional contexts, including, in particular, the professional context of the school, the teacher and the school management function. In the third chapter I also address the question of what collegiality is not, by discussing the distinction between the commonly conflated concepts of ‘collegiality’ and ‘collaboration’. I draw on the institutional context of parliamentary politics to highlight an example that exposes the problematic, and ‘double-edged-sword’ nature of collegiality.

In Chapter Four, building on the issues prompted by my research questions, I argue the need to understand collegiality in the context of discourses and technologies of management and power. I draw on Foucault’s account of discourse and his notions of ‘Governmentality’ and ‘Biopower’. In this chapter I also draw attention to Foucault’s understanding of Bentham’s Panopticon as a regulatory device, in anticipation of

discussion of the potential of collegiality to operate as a panoptic device if not critically interrogated and sensitively deployed.

Chapter Five addresses the first of my questions: from where has the discourse of collegiality come and how it has been promoted? Here I seek also to locate collegiality on a continuum of management approaches in schools and in the extended policy arenas within which schools find themselves operating. Additionally, I explore the ways in which collegiality has been promoted in the teaching profession and how it has been ‘sold’ (and indeed sold itself) in the absence of serious professional and intellectual scrutiny.

Chapter Six confronts the second of my questions: Whose interest might the discourse of collegiality serve? I briefly develop this question further by asking questions about whose interest it should serve (this becomes the focus of Chapter Seven). The popular discourse surrounding collegiality and the policy community literature supporting it, positions it as a force by which education can be improved. I take some issue with this rather grand assertion. While not fully rejecting it, I am of the view that some careless and glib claims made for collegiality require a defence. I am in no doubt that collegiate approaches hold benefits but I am less clear that the particular brand of collegiality being promoted is the most productive expression. I take the view that collegiality can be understood as a potentially productive idea but it may be a disguise for a form of control over teachers’ work and the output of schools. Locating the emerging discourse of collegiality in the neo-McCrone context I suggest that teachers need to be alert to the nuances associated with the terms of collegiality. Collegiality may potentially serve the interests of teachers, but it may also serve the interests of the Managed context within which teachers work, and within which power is exercised over them.

Chapter Seven begins by recapitulating my discussion on how the discourse of collegiality is operating in ways that might shape professional knowledge and practice if it comes to feature in the arena of practice prior to full conceptual analysis taking place. Such questions were of concern to both Smyth and Humes, and I open a discussion on how a reconceptualisation and a rehabilitation of our understanding of collegiality could shape professional knowledge and practice in ways which could embrace and exploit the more normative understandings I have described in the early part of Chapter One. In this final chapter, I draw attention to some problems attending the application of the norms of collegiality to schools in current legislative climates, and claim that it is overly simplistic to make a sweeping decision to render schools more collegiate prior to embarking upon the kind of theoretical critique to which this dissertation aims to contribute. I consider a model of collegiality which is described by its author as ‘radical’, defending some of the claims made for this account, but critiquing it in

relation to its practicality in current educational legislative contexts. In the final section of Chapter Seven I highlight some implications for professional practice and suggest some directions towards a much-needed debate about a rehabilitated theory of collegiality.

Methods

This dissertation falls into the category of philosophical, rather than empirical, research in that it uses an analytical approach to interrogate important issues about our understanding of the idea of collegiality. But the work that follows is not intended to be a contribution to the discipline of Philosophy. It is primarily about the theory and practice of management of schools, as it emerges and develops under pressure from changes and priorities in the policy community at large. Nor will I be concerned with understanding or addressing any ‘philosophy of collegiality,’ but will rather address what I have called ‘the terms of collegiality’ (and their incorporation into school management) and associated concepts, using philosophical and analytical devices including aspects of discourse theory²³. My concern, however, is not primarily the approaches embraced by the term ‘discourse analysis’ but rather the potential of an understanding of discourse as a device that can help to uncover how it influences people and practices. Although the dissertation is not intended to offer advances in Philosophy as such, I do believe that Philosophy and philosophers have a place in the debate about educational management; the field of educational management requires philosophical investigation and the labour and effort of ‘Public Intellectuals’²⁴. To quote from the American Philosophical Association (APA), I will engage with philosophy insofar as I set out to:

refine analyses, develop and advance, or criticise, interpretations, explore alternative perspectives and new ways of thinking, suggest and apply modified or novel modes of assessment, and, in general [to] promote new understanding (APA).

Such research involves critical scrutiny of concepts, in this case collegiality. I appropriate this approach because it lends itself well to the analysis of, and responses to, the questions I have set out earlier, since they are at once philosophical in nature, and “of fundamental importance in

²³ There are many understandings of discourse analysis. I am applying a broad eclectic form of analysis which may or may not include one or more of the models of discourse analysis drawn to my attention by, for example, by Fairclough 2000, 2001.

²⁴ See Lachs (2009) who argues for the essential role of philosophy in public affairs. This view is also held by Professor Jonathan Wolff (University College London) amongst others who argue that philosophy is eminently relevant to public policy. Wolff made this claim at the Summer School of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain, University of Roehampton, 2008.

[placing] rigorous intellectual demands upon those who pursue them”(APA). In drawing heavily on philosophical tools and analysis, the dissertation engages with problematic concepts that are often taken as less problematic or indeed taken for granted. A central activity undertaken by philosophers is rigorous conceptual analysis, scrutiny of concepts and what we mean and understand when we make certain utterances. Conceptual analysis is essentially about the use of certain terms and defence of the reasons for using these terms. A version of this approach has been associated in particular with the work of Wilson (1963), although this has drawn some criticism by later philosophers (Bridges 2003, Standish 2007) who have disagreed with its focus limited largely to analysis of the use of concepts.

My approach will include examination of collegiality as a ‘concept’. Gallie (1956) has pointed out that concepts are contestable, and I argue that collegiality and other concepts attending it are of this nature - essentially contested or essentially contestable. In analysing concepts, philosophers commonly make distinctions, and draw attention to the implications of distinctions between concepts that interest them and those either closely associated with them or standing in instructive contrast to them. An important distinction in my work, for example, is between collegiality and collaboration as two key discursive entities in educational management.

A further key activity in the method of philosophy is the gathering, interpretation, deconstruction and understanding of existing research, argument, policy and views of others. In this work, the concept of collegiality, as it is becoming manifest in policy and textual discourse attending school management, is worthy of such deconstruction and analysis. I shall do this with a view to explaining and exposing tensions and opportunities, and, more especially, in moving the debate forward by developing a set of responses to the questions established earlier in this chapter, and by developing my own argument about the place of collegiality in the theory and practice of school management.

My choice in taking a philosophical approach to analysing collegiality is rooted in a view that philosophers have an important role to play in suggesting what might properly be the case. Philosophers commonly make normative claims, as I will do towards the end of the dissertation. The lack of philosophical voice and contribution in relation to public affairs has recently drawn the attention of Lachs (2009) who points to the role philosophers have played, throughout history, in influencing and shaping our understanding of matters of public policy and debate.

I am conscious of the issue of two very different traditions in contemporary western philosophy - the continental tradition and the analytical tradition. There are debates between those who follow Wilson (1963), an early proponent of an analytical philosophy of education and those who disagree and challenge him. The analytic and the continental traditions in philosophy both have something to offer and as the dissertation progresses I will draw on both. In summary, I exploit the analytic tradition in Chapter Three in coming to understand the terms associated with the 'concept' collegiality. In Chapter Four I draw more on the continental tradition as I begin to consider the nature, and the impact, of discourse on practice and policy. To this extent, both traditions play an important part in what I am trying to do and I do not foreground either at the expense of the other. The following might serve to help clarify the distinction between the two traditions, but I will repeat that the very distinction is a device which will serve my purposes in fully understanding collegiality and its effects.

In "A House Divided", Prado explains the difference he discerns between analytical and continental traditions in philosophy:

The heart of the analytic/continental opposition is most evident in methodology that is, in a focus on analysis or on synthesis. Analytic philosophers typically try to solve fairly delineated philosophical problems by reducing them to their parts and to the relations in which these parts stand. Continental philosophers typically address large questions in a synthetic or integrative way, and consider particular issues to be "parts of the larger unities" and as properly understood and dealt with only when fitted into those unities (Prado, 2003: 10).

Levy (2003) also sees this methodological difference. He describes analytic philosophy as focussed on problem-solving and continental philosophy as closer "to the humanistic traditions and to literature and art [which] tends to be more politically engaged". Glock is of the view that analytic philosophy is now more a respectable science or skill in that it deploys specific approaches to tackle discrete problems with definite outcomes (Glock, 1997).

Jones (2009: 8) hopes that by understanding these two philosophical traditions, we may better understand their differences and similarities, as well as how they might complement each other. For my own purposes, I will draw on each of the traditions - analytic and continental - to explore collegiality. On the one hand, I seek to uncover it conceptually, and on the other, I seek to understand its likely impacts on the social processes within the context of school and how it becomes "politically engaged". In Chapter Three I look at the concept of collegiality, and apply

the tools associated with the analytic tradition in philosophy by engaging with collegiality as a concept, examining its emergence and its problematic nature through its use in a selection of historical and institutional contexts. In Chapter Four I reflect on what the continental tradition has to offer the philosopher of education (educational management specifically), and develop my discussion accordingly.

For the purposes of a professional doctorate, responses to the central research questions are of immediate importance in terms of implications for practice, and the contribution which they might make towards analysis of a concept which is thoroughly problematic, and linked to other equally problematic concepts. Plant (1978) draws attention to the relative merits of engaging with philosophical analysis, and argues that although it is valuable and in the interests of scholarship, this process takes us only so far. Fielding draws upon Plant's reflections on "community", and alerts me to the idea that: "interminable arguments about the characteristic components of (in Plant's case) community cannot be settled by painstaking meta-analyses or essentialist longings" (Fielding, 1999: 18). Applying this argument to collegiality, I believe that philosophical reflections on collegiality must only be part of the story. There are philosophical questions to be answered which seek to attend to "what it is to be and become [collegiate], different ideals which give substance to wide-ranging and incommensurable practices" (Fielding, 1999: 18). However I am alert to the position that regardless of any conceptual understanding, collegiality has an effect which begs for understanding.

In the dissertation I emphasise the dangerous potential of uncritical application of ideas and concepts to the practical day-to-day business of schools, citing the turn towards collegiate working practices as the central example. The dissertation addresses policy issues from a philosophical position. Collegiality as part of contemporary policy and current practice has a value in the minds of policy makers, and it is assuming a normative currency among educational practitioners. I argue that such attention demands critique from robust and rigorous reflection.

While identifying shortcomings in the ways in which collegiality is understood, and by implication, collegiate working practices are enacted in schools, I argue for something fundamentally desirable and attractive, in the constituency of collegiate working - something akin to empowerment, trust, democracy, inclusion and liberation. My argument does not preclude recognition of the ongoing need for accountability and responsibility, since these too have ethical dimensions over and above the performative currency with which we more often

associate them. In so arguing, I point a way towards a reconceptualisation of what we now, in my view, too perfunctorily call collegiality.

In the course of the dissertation, I will locate the emergence of collegiality on a continuum of school management practice and terminology. I will argue that collegiality has emerged as an idea whose time has come, and which has displaced other ideas associated with the governance of schools. In order to locate collegiality properly in context, I also venture into an historical and genealogical account of management practice and educational policy, but the purpose of this is to help me develop a genealogy of the idea; we cannot ask questions of the “contemporary world” without “historical answers” (Abrams 1982: 1). In summary, the dissertation takes each of three approaches to its conclusion.

Firstly it offers a descriptive account of how collegiality has come to inhabit the discourse of school management and leadership in recent years. I argue that this can be considered in terms of a genealogy, and that the context (socio-economic-political-professional) is of prime importance. This account itself is complex as the result of the essentially contestable nature of collegiality, and the various meanings it holds. Indeed the interpretation and the understanding of collegiality are inseparable from the socio-political-professional context from which these emerge. To this extent, the teacher’s definition is different from the administrator’s which, in turn, is different from the middle manager’s, since each wishes to harness the notion of collegiality to their own purposes and ends (Fielding 1999, Smyth, 1991). Each construes the concept of collegiality differently, and contests the analysis of the other. The descriptive account draws on the primary documentation, as well as from extant critical considerations in and beyond the academy.

Secondly, I develop a reflective and critical understanding of what these various meanings imply, as they are likely to impinge upon the practices and identities of teachers and teacher leaders in schools. Furthermore, by so influencing the people at the heart of the educational process, they will necessarily impact upon the outcomes of the schools. The very nature of the school and the relationships therein will alter radically, depending upon the understanding of collegiality that achieves supremacy at any given point in time. Once again, policy documentation comes into play here since therein we can discern contradictions and conflicts.

Thirdly, admitting to a degree of pessimism and caution with regard to the current discourse of collegiality, I avoid embracing an inflexible position by expressing a willingness at the outset to develop what I believe to be a route towards genuine practice and policy that reflects what is good about our normative understandings of collegiality and collegiate approaches in schools. I

make a set of normative claims which argue for a rehabilitated notion of collegiality, one which does embrace and accord privilege to the ideas of community, democracy, voice, participation, involvement and inclusion. Once again, such sentiments are present, either implicitly or explicitly, in the documentation which supports the discourse of collegiality. The exercise of writing the dissertation has aimed to extract these and expose where they are being sincerely put forward, or where they can be seen to be rhetorical devices acting as conduits for the wider discourse they serve.

Chapter Three

Conceptualising collegiality

A concept in context

In this chapter I set out to develop an account of the concept of collegiality by analysing its use and understanding in the management literature, and in four different contexts, highlighting the importance of recognising social and organisational understandings of collegiality as a discourse. While Chapter Four will draw on the continental tradition in philosophy and explore collegiality as a discourse, this third chapter is about a conceptualisation of collegiality i.e. a thoughtful reflection on how the term is used and what it might mean, as well as its relationship with other associated concepts. I extend the term ‘use’ beyond a common view in analytical philosophy of education of use as focused on ordinary language, such as Wilson’s (1963), to also take into account the ways in which institutional contexts contribute to our understanding of complex concepts, and are sites for their contestation. In this chapter, I draw on the toolkit of analytic philosophy to direct my reader’s attention to issues of definition, dispute, contestation and conceptual complexity. The title of the chapter, ‘Conceptualising Collegiality,’ signals two aims. Firstly, while I intend to conduct some conceptual work on the term, I also, secondly, set out to highlight how under-conceptualisation can result in the emergence of some real problems when developing a collegiate context in an organisation - specifically a school.

In Chapter Two I promised to engage with collegiality in different ways. I suggested that drawing attention to the implications of applying concepts in different situations is legitimate philosophical work. Such work enables philosophers, and hence practitioners, to be alert to tensions and difficulties arising from unreflective application of ideas and concepts. I undertake such work presently, with reference to particular organisational locations (the professional context of the school, the Church, the University), and to a particular example in which the concept of collegiality has been allied to the concepts of collaboration and loyalty. While Chapters Four to Six will focus on the discourse of

collegiality, I will return to a conceptual focus in Chapter Seven which will re-visit the normative dimensions of the concept.

Defining collegiality – the literature

Collegiality is a contested concept. Associated concepts such as professionalism, collaboration, participation, loyalty and consultation are also contested or contestable. Rather than seeking fixed and securely argued definitions for these, I am using them on the understanding that they could enjoy a reasonable degree of shared meaning in the community in which this dissertation might find itself being considered, provided a defensible account of what they mean is developed.

So what is collegiality? The initial definition in Chapter One now needs further elaboration. As my discussion develops, complexities and tensions will emerge in this further consideration of collegiality in theory and practice. I am alert to the reality that collegiality may never be permanently defined, but may be re-shaped to align more with the context to which it is applied. My ultimate aim is to offer my reader an account which confronts some of the criticisms which I level at current understandings of collegiality-in-practice, and collegiality-as-discourse, and which helps to rehabilitate the notion of collegiality as a more productive entity which has creative potential in the field of educational management. Although I do not include an extended, separate literature review examining what the management literature says about the meaning of collegiality, reflection on the literature is an essential and integral feature of my account.

Collegiality can be described as a characteristic of a college, where the college usually comprises a group of professional people. These may be members of a particular profession, a vocation such as a church, a faculty in a university, or a convent or monastery. Collegiality can be a feature of the college, the collegium or collegial gathering or community populated as above. For Reinken:

Collegial relationships are defined in [the] literature as relationships between members of the same occupation who have a sense of belonging together and identifying with others in a common undertaking. [...]. This definition places emphasis on shared attitudes, norms and the formation of informal and formal associations (Reinken 1998: 6).

The collegiate community, e.g. professors, teachers, clergy or professionals in other fields, commonly share a view of their professional endeavour. The college is a necessary condition for collegiality, where the understanding of college incorporates the idea of a group with a shared set of values, assumptions or rules (implicit or explicit). There is normally a degree of social or occupational significance associated with the idea of collegiality; we are more likely to talk of a college of surgeons but less likely to refer to a college of postmen. Collegiality is more commonly associated with higher order professional practice and with the professionals engaged with such practice - for example in educational or ecclesiastical organisations, and especially where there are weighty issues or matters of principle at stake. Collegiality has been defined by Bush (1995: 59) as the normative model of good practice especially for professionally staffed (specifically, in Bush's example) educational organisations. Bush attributes to collegiate models of management a set of features which distinguish them from other models. In doing so, he claims that there are contexts in which collegiate models of management 'fit', and contexts where they 'fit' less well. Bush's understanding of the collegiate environment is one in which there is a degree of shared decision making. For the most part, this decision making is rooted in consensus rather than conflict, and is inclusive by nature. The benefit of shared decision-making is that shared decisions are more likely to translate into actual practice and realisation. The professional environment, in which collegiate models fit best, allows for this sharing of decision-making because there a significant degree of professional equality and equity prevails, (in theory at least) alongside an assumption that the aims of the organisation are shared and are unambiguous. Brundrett (1998) refers to collegiality by invoking other terms, namely those of 'conferring' and 'collaborating', arguing that collegiality in the teaching context exists when teachers do these things. He is not alone in using the term 'collaboration' interchangeably with 'collegiality' and an example which I develop below pays particular attention to issues which arise when this happens. Brundrett also asserts that it is appropriate to align collegiate approaches to professional contexts, given that teachers, their professional expertise notwithstanding, require to work together in the interests of 'coherence' (Brundrett, 1998: 307), and his critique makes specific reference to 'shared vision' (Brundrett, 1998: 308). I will discuss in the contextual examples below problems arising from the idea of common, or "shared vision," in a larger organisation in particular a large school organisational context.

For Webb and Vulliamy (1996), collegiate approaches, although normative and normatively preferred, are speculative and aspirational, rather than those which actually prevail, and they hold the view that: "The advocacy of collegiality is made more on the

basis of prescription, than on research-based studies of school practice” (Webb and Vulliamy, 1996: 443). Little, who has written extensively on the topic, sees this ‘advocacy’ as being rooted in a relationship between collegiality and the school improvement agenda. For Little (1990b: 166), “the reason to pursue the study and practice of collegiality is that, presumably, something is gained when teachers work together and something is lost when they do not”.

While Bush and others accept that collegiate approaches are appropriate in professional organisations, there is an understanding that ‘scale’ i.e. the size of the organisation can be a problem. Bush in particular draws attention to this issue and admits that collegiate approaches may work better in small primary schools than in larger secondary schools claiming:

The size of decision-making groups is an important element in collegial management. They have to be sufficiently small to enable everyone to be heard [....] Meetings of the whole staff may operate collegially in small schools but may be suitable only for information exchange in larger institutions (Bush, 1986, 1995).

However, this said, a site commonly associated with collegiality is that of higher education, which, in terms of scale, outstrips even the largest secondary school. Bush (2003:67) resolves this difficulty of scale and unwieldiness to some extent by introducing the idea of constituency representation, but perhaps this, in and of itself, throws up difficulties²⁵. I will draw attention to such problems in my discussion of the context of the church later in this chapter.

Collegiate approaches demand different interpretations of leadership from the popular understandings of what leadership entails and represents. For example, the ‘trait’ theory of leadership is questioned when referring to collegiate approaches. Heroic leaders may or may not be good collegiate leaders, and charismatic leaders may have the attributes which lend themselves to collegiate management, but they may not. For Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker and Riley (1978: 45):

The collegial leader is at most a “ ‘first among equals,’ in an academic organisation run by professional experts.... the collegial leader is not so much a star standing alone as the developer of a consensus among the professionals who share the burden of the decision”.

²⁵ Hargreaves is of the view that such solutions threaten to create a ‘contrived’ and manufactured collegiality (Hargreaves, 1994: 195).

This observation raises a tension. Even democratic and collegiate contexts have to be ‘led’ or managed, and the parameters of the collegiality set by someone; to some extent a paradox is established. I will return to this tension later. Having noted the features of collegiality emphasised in the literature, the discussion now turns to contextual complexities that challenge some of the assumptions about collegiality noted above.

In what follows I will discuss collegiality as it plays out in four contexts: the context of teacher professionalism in schools, the ecclesiastical context of the Roman Catholic Church, the administrative context of higher educational institutions, and in the mid-twentieth century context of the English public school system and parliamentary politics.

My venture into the context of the university connects with the context of education in general, and that of the school in particular, although I should point out that collegiality in the school is a far more recent organisational development. I consider understandings of collegiality in relation to teachers’ work and teacher professionalism, acknowledging that collegiality attends not only to the profession of teaching, but to other professions, notably the medical and legal professions and the vocation of the church. In relation to the first of these, we hear frequent mention of, for example, a ‘college of surgeons,’ and in connection with the second, the legal establishment in Scotland has a dedicated ‘Faculty of Advocates’, which although adopting an altogether different title nevertheless exemplifies many of the norms of collegiality discussed earlier. The vocational profession of the church is pointed to through references to ‘colleges’ of cardinals and ‘synods’ of bishops. These ‘groups’ represent a sense of common professional purpose in their own contexts, and while my point is that collegiality operates in relation to the context, this is not to deny that future research may lead me to an understanding of collegiality which transcends contextual boundaries. There are common norms of collegiality, but the exercise in contextualisation offers the opportunity to draw out complications and tensions prior to my later attempt to rehabilitate the concept of collegiality.

The linkage of collegiality to the professions is generally accepted; there is a common tendency to associate collegiate behaviour with professional behaviour and *vice versa*. But the very issue of professionalism is not without its difficulty and the word has its own ‘magic’. Humes (1986) analyses the opportunities and risks posed by an overemphasis on professionalism before concluding, in agreement with Corbett (1965: 57) that, operating as a discourse, it can potentially “condition men intellectually to obedience”. Can the same be said of collegiality?

Professionalism and collegiality have associations which I discuss by developing two understandings of collegiality, one of which is liberating, the other controlling. I will point out some tensions which result from the association of collegiality and professionalism. A further complicating factor in the literature on collegiality arises from a common tendency to conflate the ideas of ‘collegiality’ and ‘collaboration’. Collaboration has also entered the discourse of educational leadership and improvement in recent times. The conflation of these two ideas has drawn criticism (Fielding 1999) and demands some theoretical and conceptual scrutiny. I will illustrate this by drawing on a telling historical example, which develops a critique of the perceived relationship between individual behaviour and collegiate behaviour, but which explores the issues emerging when collegiality and collaboration are carelessly associated. The correlation of collegiality with collaboration, and the potential confusion of the two can be dangerous, and it is a professional right and duty to be alert to the subtlety of the distinction, and to draw professional and critical attention to instances where one may masquerade as the other. The historical example I offer highlights some ethical problems with collegiality which could all too easily emerge if it is not subjected to this kind of critical and ‘intellectual labour,’ or ‘conceptual housekeeping’,²⁶ prior to its introduction into the arena of practice. The contextual examples I draw upon here provide me with the opportunity to struggle with complexities which arise when we properly interrogate collegiality, rather than simply assume that it can attach unproblematically to the areas of practice which are specified i.e. the school. This complexity will feature in my concluding chapter, where I draw upon my critique of the prevailing discourse of collegiality to rescue the more normative associations from the current discursive formation. I begin with the example of collegiality in the context of the school, and go on to consider how collegiality is exemplified in the three further contexts mentioned above.

²⁶ An expression used by my supervisor Professor Penny Enslin at an unrelated lecture for the Educational Colloquium of the universities of Glasgow, Strathclyde and West of Scotland (Nov 2008).

Schools, professionalism and teachers

The notion of collegiality in schools is not strictly new, but in the post-McCrone context in Scotland it has become a highly influential. There is extant research into collegiate approaches and practices in school, and the academy has been occupied with this in recent decades.²⁷ Academic work in the 1980s and 1990s defends the place of collegial approaches in schools. This research has tended to be speculative and aspirational rather than practical, although Bush's observations connect theory with small scale case studies (Bush, 1995: 57-61). Fielding (1999) holds the view that, despite some effort going into researching and appealing for collegial approaches, these have generally not been realised in any meaningful way. Academic research into collegiate working has tended to focus on the case study, and has been related to the relationship between the idea of collegiality and professionally staffed organisations (Hughes, 1988: 3). By contrast, in the wake of McCrone, the 'theory' of collegiality, as developed through the kind of research mentioned above, has been appropriated into policy and day-to-day discourse. In the decades of the 1980s and 1990s, teachers would possibly have encountered the idea of collegiality only if they were undertaking some course of academic study. There may have been implied appeals for collegiate practice in schools, but the "clarion" call for collegiality (Cunningham, 2004: 3) is much more recent. In contrast to the purely academic interest, the present context of the school engages with the idea of collegiality more frequently on the back of significant effort within the wider Scottish policy community to promote its virtues in terms of its potential to serve the ends of modernisation in teacher work.

The policy context influencing school practice is now taking hold of ideas which featured in the academy in the past. The claims made for collegiality in schools draw upon the norms of collegiality already suggested in Chapter One. The McCrone episode makes sustained reference to the value of sharing power in schools and beyond, and to the professional rights and duties of teachers. In the prevailing educational climate, when appeals for collegiality feature, frequent mention is made of both the right and the duty of the teacher to have a say in the activities in which she or he is involved. Like other collegiate social spaces, there is an assumption of equality among members of the collegium. In the case of the school, this assumes that, by virtue of professional expertise

²⁷ See Southworth 1988, Noble and Pym 1989 and Fielding, 1999.

and professional training, all teachers are equal. There is the sense that collegiality offers the teaching profession something which if absent would diminish the profession somewhat. According to Rowan (1990: 374) collegiality has the potential to “enhance teachers’ capacity for learning and problem solving, build solidarity and cohesiveness within schools and satisfy teachers’ needs for affiliation”. There is furthermore a general and sensible acceptance of some degree of technical authority in matters relating to the logistics of the management of the school, but in general teachers in a school are more often considered part of a college, and as such have the right to expect to work in a climate within which the norms of collegiality are experienced. The matter becomes complicated, however, when we return to our definition of the college or the collegium.

In literature on the professions in general, and on education in particular, we can identify ‘tried and tested’ understandings of what collegiality is considered to be. According to Starr (1982), collegiality is one of three²⁸ attributes associated with the definition of a professional group. Generally speaking, a collegiate culture prevails when there are constructive and positive relationships between members of a common professional group. These relationships need not, however, necessarily be predicated on a culture of *‘bon homie’* and agreement or “soft collegiality” (Humes, 2007: 6), but on some common “ethical values” (Humes, 2007a: 5) underpinning the professional body concerned. This is to say that implied in a collegiate context is space not only for debate and argument - or “tough” collegiality (Humes, 2007a: 6), but also an attendant expectation that a consensus is possible and can be brokered in the interest of the greater good of the organisation. In this understanding, it could be argued that the collegiate relationship could exist in a culture of ‘not-so-niceness’, i.e. a culture where principles pre-exist personalities and personal relationships. In such a culture difficult issues can be confronted by a team of colleagues with confidence that their professional voice will be listened to and where critique can be distinguished from criticism. Humes seems to prefer the tougher approach, and cautions against the ‘softer’ as being likely to produce “bland consensus that lacks intellectual bite and professional rigour” (Humes, 2007b: 6).

Within the professions, therefore, a definition of collegiality could include a position where in order to be thoroughly collegiate, the profession opens itself to, and invites, critique from both within and beyond its boundaries; failure to do so in the past has drawn negative attention to the profession. In his seminal text Schön (1983), points out that professions

²⁸ Starr distinguishes the ‘sociological’ from the ‘organisational’ and the ‘Teacher Work and Teacher Change’ perspectives.

may no longer be trusted simply by dint of their professional legitimacy; the clientele is more ready to challenge professionals which it sees as becoming self-indulgent. Lawn (1996) has made some extensive comment on the government responses to the teaching profession in order to confront a perceived self-serving attitude within the teaching profession, and his discussion sheds some light on the emergence of collegiality as an idea of the times.

So it could be argued that a true instantiation of collegiality might include an openness to, and encouragement of, such challenge and debate - a not-so-nice culture, in which probing questions are asked of the professions. In a professional context, where the particular profession has a community of clients, a true collegiate relationship might only pertain if the client is involved at the outset in the development of the service provided. This openness to external scrutiny by members of a collegium may introduce a new, vital and challenging norm of collegiality, one which could, in theory, include parents and pupils as vital constituents of the collegium.

Collegiality suggests that an organisation is at one with itself when the individual objective and the collective organisational objective are closely aligned,²⁹ and as a consequence the organisation proceeds more harmoniously than it might in the context of another organisational approach or model³⁰. There is a sense of ‘mannerliness’ associated with the idea of collegiality which lends itself to harmony; this includes ideas of trust, deference, partnership, loyalty, peacefulness and, in general, a sense of culture and common identity.

Arguments for collegiality mentioned earlier, make reference to the teacher’s *duty* to have an influence over what they do in their day to day work in schools; this duty is one reading of what it means to be professional (Ihara, 1988). It is further argued that teachers have a *right* to influence over their world and work. The alignment of collegiality with professionalism within current educational discourse is probably fairly easy to defend from the position that, as salaried professional people, teachers should be prepared to

²⁹ It is appropriate here to draw attention to the work of Greenfield. Greenfield according to MacKenzie (1994) in a paper published by Greenfield in the 1970s “had questioned, in a deceptively quiet and unassuming manner, the fundamental intellectual and theoretical premises upon which research and publications into educational management and administration had hitherto been conducted. His paper (Greenfield, 1975) was the beginning of an intellectual odyssey which has continued to the present time (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993) and which has provoked, in the view of this and other writers, one of the most intellectually exciting and relevant debates in the history of educational thought” (MacKenzie, 1994). Central to his Greenfield’s argument was the view that there is no such thing as an organisation; organisations are human constructs dependent upon the values and motive of those who comprise them; they are essentially and “unexpectedly human” (Greenfield and Ribbins 1993: 1).

³⁰ Bush refers to the models of educational management which have emerged, receded, re-emerged and prevailed.

submit to a sense of duty and a contract of employment “being no different from other workers who exchange their labour for wages” (Smyth, 1991: 325). This formal contract however, is only part of the matter. Frequently in relation to the teaching profession, and indeed other professional spheres, we are drawn to the notion of a moral contract. A teacher, by this argument, has a moral obligation to behave in a way which will be supportive of the enterprise of learning and teaching. This type of claim is sustained by appeals to the professional expertise and knowledge capital held by the professional person, and the duty to redirect that in the interest of the profession concerned. Teachers, from an implied vocational commitment, have an unquestionable part to play in the detail of their work with those they educate, or so the argument goes. The professional behaviour demanded by the formal and moral contract, can be exemplified through the professional behaviour of the teacher where this elucidates the spirit of collegiality described in my initial definition and discussion so far.

A further dimension of the ‘professional’ looks beyond mere compliance by suggesting that professionals have a duty to turn the detail of their professional learning in the direction of supporting and sustaining the professional endeavour with which they are involved. This definition of ‘professional’ expects that teachers use what they have learned to contribute to the aims and objectives of what is being done in schools. To be specific, in this understanding of professional involvement, the teacher will deploy the particular facets of their craft in order to help advance the agenda of the system within which they operate. They will not only draw upon their knowledge of the topic to find ways in which to make this accessible to others, but will make use of knowledge of learners’ wants and needs in order to maintain a good and orderly learning environment. This further facet of professionalism involves the teachers inhabiting a critical persona in which they not only have a voice in connection with the principles driving the agenda, but a duty to use that voice in the interests of wider issues of social justice, fairness and social good.

The above interpretations of professionalism make demands that may come into tension with one another. I suggested in Chapter One that reflective educators can often find their professional identities in conflict with their personal identities; there are complications too in relation to teacher identities as ‘professionals’ understood as ‘good employees’. The latter type of professional person is the one which fits well with current educational policy which has become increasingly centralised and centrally directed. This model of professionalism lends itself to the implementation of centralised approaches to the detail

and content of education. The definition of the professional as one who puts to the fore the technical aspects of what it is to be a pedagogue, can also find itself at odds with the view of the teacher as nothing more than an operational conduit for policy and purpose arrived at elsewhere in the policy community. To consider the latter in terms of reflective practice, this teacher is one involved in the ‘single loop’ process of reflection, (Argyris and Schön, 1974) whereby the professional expertise is required to deliver what has been created elsewhere.

There is a connection between professional reflective practice and collegiality, and the notion of the professional teacher as ‘collegial’ means something more than simply the opportunity to be consulted about what has been ‘handed down’. Collegiality is about more than collaboration and participation, and to nod again to Argyris, it is more about ‘double loop’ professional reflection, whereby the professional becomes involved not only in delivery, but in the creation of what is to be delivered. The professional operating in a collegiate climate is involved in the monitoring and adjustment of that very climate and context. More than this, involved fully rounded collegiality would define such involvement as a professional right and not merely a duty. I suggest we need to recognise that we are dealing here with a fundamental philosophical problem. Do teachers have the *right* to influence what goes on in school? Do they have the right to determine the detail of the curriculum, and do they have the right, by double loop reflection, to re-visit the very premises of what they are paid to sustain and deliver? These are philosophical questions which will have a profound effect on policy in general and, depending upon one’s position, will have a direct influence upon one’s deliberations about what a collegiate educational environment looks and feels like. These questions are of fundamental importance, they are far from rhetorical, and they are not yet settled.

For Noble and Pym (1970: 433):

The claim inherent in professionalism to determination in the exercise of professional functions was extended beyond areas of strictly professional competence into the sphere of general organisational planning and its detailed execution. The extension of the dominant professional ethos to the administration of a large organisation implied right of status equals to be respected and consulted

Noble and Pym point to a more extended understanding of collegiate practice, but their hint of ‘status equality’ presents another philosophical problem if we are to question the extent to which it is only the profession which should feature in the collegium. If we

deconstruct what they say however, the words ‘function’, ‘administration’, ‘respected’ and ‘consulted’ jump from the page. It is possible to be respected and consulted in ways which pay no attention to normative understandings of collegiality. ‘Function’ and ‘administration’ likewise suggest roles far from any expansive interpretation of collegiality. The generous and normative understandings I have suggested are more to do with the right of the teacher to be intimately involved with what the educational process is for, how it functions, and how it is measured and evaluated prior to being realigned and adjusted.

If all members of staff who are professionally qualified are to take part in decision making there must, however, be a common set of values held by the organisation. Such shared values are not, of course, necessarily a natural part of any institutional culture and thus, it is argued, the role of the leader in such collegial organisations becomes one which encourages, enhances and helps to define such shared beliefs (Brundrett, 1998: 308).

This assertion points to the complication that to be collegiate an organisation has to have a common set of beliefs or values, which have to be shaped and ‘encouraged’ by a ‘leader’; this model could be construed as being antithetical to collegiality. The need for a single leader to determine the boundaries of collegiality is again suggestive of a paradox not unlike the one emerging from the example of the Pope in the Church which will be explored in the following section.

Finally, Bush’s (1995) point regarding the issue that, in some organisations, the normative understanding of collegiality which offers a voice to the membership of the collegium, is hampered by issues of scale. Smaller schools can be more easily collegiate than larger organisations, and this in turns suggests that there might not be one broad brush approach to applying collegiality across all schools. The implication of this is that the model of collegiality may differ in detail from school to school, and that the challenge may be to get the principles or norms in place and allow local interpretation of these. The extended implication is that the possibility, or likelihood, of managing collegiality in schools may be some way off, unless we explore more fully and more carefully our relationship with existing ideas and approach to Management.

In the context of the school, there is a clear sense of direction taken by the advocates of collegiality. It will, it is claimed, bring a professional group together, it will encourage and facilitate teamwork and it will ultimately result in an improvement in standards of teaching and learning. However, Bush, Fielding, Reinken and Brundrett are only some of those

who question these claims, suggesting that given the vagueness and blurred ideological status of collegiality, no concrete claims can be made without further analysis of the concept and the tensions and difficulties attending it. Quite apart from the difficulty of definition is the question of whether shared values and beliefs are always necessarily a good thing. In addition, collaboration and collegiality do not necessarily equate, and collaboration between teachers may not be collegiate, and may in fact be subversive! Furthermore, education is value-based and there is an inextricable link between commonality in values and collegiality in its normative definitions. In summary, research has not yet fully confronted some of the antagonisms evident in discussion on collegiality. Some of the examples above, I suggest illustrate situations where the normative understandings of collegiality could run wild if not constrained to some extent. I suggest that collegiality in the context of teachers' work and the school has to be Managed. The developing chapter will look at examples beyond schools and teachers' work which expose some further difficulties and tensions.

Collegiality: the ecclesiastical context of the Roman Catholic Church

To turn to a non-educational context, I now explore the ecclesiastical context with particular reference to the collegial relationships claimed for the governance of the Roman Catholic (RC) Church in the wake of the reforms of the Second Vatican Council (VC²). VC² envisaged a collective approach to doctrinal matters where the bishops and cardinals participated in a collective policy in the furtherance of the mission of the Church (Flannery, 2007 and Fox, 1999). Seeking understanding of the spirit of collegiality, we can think of the convent or the monastery, where community members are pre-united in intention and desire, coming together, staying together and working together in the pursuit of the collegiate agenda, in this case the Christian mission, on earth, of God made man. We might expect the convent or monastery, and indeed the wider body of the church, to have an unproblematic attraction to the notion of collegiality insofar as the mission is common, the doctrine agreed and the premises upon which it is founded are to its adherents incontestable. There are perhaps even readings of the more normative understandings of collegiality which exemplify the tenets of Christianity, in that some readings of the concept of collegiality are easily allied with notions of inclusion, participation, equality and universal rights. The documentation emanating from The Holy See makes clear the Church's position on "the spirit of collegiality" (*affectus collegialis*):

It is thus that "the power of the College of Bishops over the whole Church is not the result of the sum of the powers of the individual Bishops over their particular Churches; it is a pre-existing reality in which individual Bishops participate. They have no competence to act over the whole Church except collegially". Bishops share as a body in the power of teaching and governing, and they do so immediately by the very fact that they are members of the College of Bishops (Adoremus, 1999).

Fox (1999) has suggested that the vision of collegiality expressed in the documents of VC² have never been fully realised, and this is a source of concern and disappointment for him. He complains that in spite of collegiality being central to the vision of VC², there has been a glaring failure on the part of the Church in the decades to follow, and that collegiality, as imagined, has never been realised. Fox's criticism is levelled not only at this failure but at the situation which prevails as the result of the failure:

... in the two years that followed the council, synods of bishops were effectively stripped of any legislative influence. They now operate largely in secret, with agendas and processes drawn up and controlled, by the Roman curia, with little or no opportunity for serious discussion or debate, being responsible to virtually none of the People of God who make up the church. When their work is done, their documents are turned over to the Pope for his considerations (Fox, 1999).

In contrast to a climate which opens up opportunities for participation and involvement, Fox makes the claim on behalf of "many church observers," that "church authority has never been more centralized, and church governance never more contrary to the wishes of the council". For Fox, this illustrates a problem in attempting to imbue any such authoritarian context with a collegiate model of governance. For example, if collegiality is to prevail, who decides the nature and parameters of the collegiality, and are there collegiate processes in place for so deciding? This raises a 'meta' level question regarding collegiality.

Fox further argues that some curial members are determined to fight attempts to share authority in the church.

I heard it said this week from an informed church source that only about six cardinals have decision-making authority in the church today. The source added that these men increasingly do as they wish, acting in the name of

the Holy Father who is less inclined and less able to govern the church (Fox, 1999).

In the context of this Church, we can see that collegiality is understood as an approach which has as its aim the articulation of a collective view or set of aims. The College of Cardinals and Bishops are said to speak with one voice - the voice of the Church - and the reality of the 'universal' church consists in this very oneness. Within the example of the Church, we can see that a collegiate approach has some appeal in terms of its organisational mission; the implication is that collegiality is good, not in itself, but in the interests of the Church. By contrast, non-collegiate approaches to governance are seen as something less democratic. Fox's concern is that such collegiality is not actually present: in his view power is assumed by a small number of individual bishops or cardinals acting in the name of the Pope. Fox condemns this approach seeing it at odds with an agreement reached in the course of VC².

By another argument, traditionalist Roman Catholics may be more likely to see collegiality as being doctrinally at odds with the very nature of the governance of the Church. For the traditionalist, the principle of Papal infallibility remains paramount, and the dispersal of power and decision making is potentially harmful and actually contradictory, to this fundamental autonomy given to the Pope by Christ via Saint Peter, and evidenced in Holy Scripture; the insinuation of collegiality contradicts the doctrine of infallibility. Wrapped up in all of this is an extremely complicated paradox which goes to the heart of Canon Law. Specifically, if the Pope, in presiding over a Vatican Council, accedes to the principle of collegiality, then by virtue of his infallibility this must be God's will. The paradox arises when we see that this particular infallible enunciation compromises the very foundations of infallibility, upon which it is constructed. But the issue is yet more complicated.

Traditionalists, and some bishops themselves, have been against the idea of collegiality for an altogether different reason. Potentially in the context of a collegiate conference, an individual bishop – having 'signed up' to the spirit of collegiality - could have his own voice and opinion silenced by dint of his collegiate bond. Potentially too, a conference (collegium) of bishops could conceivably overrule the Pope, who in Catholic doctrine is the ultimate representative of Christ on earth. Fox's reference to the small number of cardinals, points to an altogether different difficulty, which exposes the possibility of an oligarchy, i.e. something which is neither Papal infallibility, nor collegiality, but a position which offers power to a smaller group of like-minded individuals. This example illustrates how collegiality, understood normatively as democracy (voice and dispersal of power and

authority), can conflict with what is, in effect, the formal framework of an organisation. It illustrates how a wish to offer a participative framework may be laudable, but when done in the context of a legislature, can become conceptually clouded, or perhaps even counterproductive. I revisit this tension in my concluding chapter.

Collegiality ‘sounds nice’, and has emotional appeal, but it is not without its difficulties in terms of implementation. The above example of collegiality in an institutional context has exposed some tensions, difficulties and paradoxes. I will further explore examples that show how collegiality falls within that category of concepts which (Gallie, 1956, 1964 and Smith, 2002) have labelled essentially contested or contestable. Collegiality is commonly assumed to offer an unproblematic and attractive set of qualities, and is offered as an attractive option for developing relationships, working practices and the professional lifeworld of the teacher. Homing in on the tensions which are exposed however, we can identify layers of problems which merit examination. Specifically, who decides how to be collegiate? What legitimacy does the decision maker draw upon? Is collegiality compulsory, even if it is exposed as being perhaps inherently contradictory by some particular understandings? Can collegiality, masquerading as a democratically directed approach, be uncovered as potentially constraining, and counter-democratic? In the Church example above these questions are most evident, and they are in the main questions linked to the power of the individual, versus the power of the collective. They expose problematic tensions in the space between the individual and the group, and between individual rights to influence and the collective view of aims, purposes and ultimately outcome.

As with the school and teachers context, this latter example is, on the face of it, a description of an attractive idea. However, it quickly becomes obvious that in a rigid and traditionally hierarchical institution such as the RC Church, there is a risk wrapped up in the aspiration of collegiality. Collegiality and shared decision making sit at odds with the Canon notion of Papal Infallibility, and yet, if the Pope rules on collegiality, then this is beyond reproach. It occurs to me that unfettered collegiality would quickly run beyond the Church’s control, and yet managed collegiality (a concern for Fox) might result in increased centralised control flying in the face of participation and transparency. Collegiality within the church is a far from simple idea.

Collegiality and Higher Education

Brundrett (1998) has claimed that collegiality has its roots in medieval institutions, particularly universities. It is in consideration of the medieval universities that we can see the clearest examples of collegiate norms already discussed above and in the early pages of Chapter One. I now visit the context of the university collegial model to locate collegiality in an educational (as distinguished from ecclesiastical) context.

Collegiality is not new to the educational lexicon. Brundrett (1998) points out that Lortie (1964) drew attention to the practice of collegial authority where professionals adopt democratic processes to govern their affairs. This rested on the understanding that expertise and the right to a point of view is equal by virtue of professional equality. Bush (1995) classifies collegiality as a 'Model' of educational management in its own right. Many Higher Education (H.E.) institutions operate collegially (or claim to), engaging in the interests of collective purposes and vision within the academic community. The intimate relationship between collegiality and professionalism features particularly in this institutional context. In the context of the university, collegiality is purveyed as a norm of professional and moral behaviour, and has been linked to tenure and progression in the academic hierarchy (Mawdsley, 1999).

Tapper and Palfreyman (2002) identify different HE contexts in which collegiality is expressed: the college itself, and the collegiate university in which federal governance allows a balance of power between the University and its colleges, i.e. between the centre and the periphery. They point out that, in potential at least, collegiality may mean no more than a truncated version of '*academic demos*' (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002: 47) within an institution that is bureaucratically structured and governed in accordance with the best traditions of good management. Reconceptualised it could amount to much more i.e. a powerful tradition of intellectual collegiality that stimulates academics of different ranks and interests to pursue in common very difficult intellectual goals.

Although referring to universities or colleges, Tapper and Palfreyman are drawing attention to collegiality as something which is old in tradition, conceptually complicated, highly regarded and allied to a particular formal arrangement in the governance of professionally staffed and populated organisations of all sorts. Collegiality is offered as a term describing the nature or pattern of practice within the college or other collegiate

organisation. We can therefore assume that people can behave collegially, i.e. that they can function within a collegial context. An organisation can have a collegiate character, so long as certain conditions exist including a sense of common purpose, common value, and professional respect (if not agreement in detail) and cooperation to some extent. Tapper and Palfreyman point to what they see as a uniqueness of the collegiate context claiming that: “For colleges to flourish as collegiate bodies they must be *self-governing, legally independent, corporate bodies*” (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002: 50) [my emphasis]. They further claim that while ‘corporate independence’ and ‘self-governance’ may be necessary conditions for collegiality, for them, the real value of collegiality relates to how the colleges or universities operate and function.

Thus the colleges need to maintain their control of key institutional goals as well as possess the independence to determine how they will achieve those goals *if the collegiality of the colleges* is to survive (Tapper and Palfreyman, 2002: 50).

Considering collegiality in relation to professionalism in higher education, Reinken suggests that “there should be a feeling of intimacy and closeness based on a sense of common experiences, shared fate - what is good for one is good for all - and shared understanding of appropriate behaviour” (Reinken 1998: 6). Intimacy is an interesting choice of word for an academic in a university. It suggests serious alignment of passions and feelings which evoke emotion and, in principle, cannot and should not be breached. On the face of things this may be desirable in a professional community or context, but, when considered more critically, Reinken’s suggestion of such alignment could serve as a barrier to new ideas, rooted in an under critiqued sense of professional etiquette. In general however, institutional understandings of collegiality do frequently invoke references to such aims, norms, associations, ethos, value bases and broadly aligned viewpoints, which I have already acknowledged in my early working definitions.

From the above we can tease out conditions which should prevail for an organisation to call itself collegiate. Of particular interest is the idea that it must enjoy ‘corporate independence and self-governance’, legal independence, self-governing status and corporate identity. I am aware however, that the very definition and understanding of collegiality within the university context may be open to the kinds of criticism levelled by Fox at the Church. In my reflection on the Church example, I have suggested that in order to articulate with the legal and administrative fabric of the institution, collegiality may ultimately require control. Universities are also under pressure from society and from

socioeconomic pressures (Barnett, 2003). They are becoming increasingly managed, and there is the view that the intellectual and procedural independence of the universities and colleges is under threat from the very same forces of performativity which threaten to tether creativity in schools. The extent to which universities are independent institutions with the characteristics identified by Tapper and Palfreyman as essential for collegiality is itself contestable. As with the church, it could be argued that constraints (legal, administrative, bureaucratic) immediately place obstacles in the path of anyone pursuing a genuine normative model of collegial governance in a university.

Collegiality, the English public school and ‘the establishment’- the story of Ronald Cartland

In my final example, I visit an institutional and individual case which highlights the tension between collegiality and collaboration. The institution cited is that of the ‘establishment’ in the context of the Westminster Parliament at the dawn of World War Two (WW2). The individual at the heart of this example is a Member of Parliament (MP), Ronald Cartland. The example illustrates how actions can be interpreted, in one way, as being collegiate and from another point of view as being far from collegiate. The example allows me to take issue with the common collocation of collaboration with collegiality, to distinguish the one from the other, and to draw some negative attention to a reading of collegiality which, seeking to pass as an attractive dimension to organisational management has the potential to be damaging and contrary to common normative understandings.

My example illustrates the dangers of associating loyalty with collegiality - two ideas that should not be confused. In distinguishing collegiality from collaboration and loyalty, I seek to uncover the potential of collegiality, both as a productive force on the one hand, but on the other, as vulnerable to a less democratic role in organisational structures. In doing so, I draw attention to the problems inherent in corrupted definitions of collegiality. My point is that real problems exist when common misinterpretations of the concept are allowed to surface, or when they are conflated with collaboration. Collegiality, in its normative interpretations, is worth pursuing, promoting and defending, but there has to be conceptual clarity about what it is, and how it is very different from collaboration. There are in this instance lessons for those who seek to uncritically apply collegiality to education, prior to undertaking a severe critique of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities

and threats as a model of management. While collegiality may in some cases be a prerequisite for organisational health, it can be read and deconstructed as a force by which ‘dissent is silenced’ (Humes, 2000: 45), and by which collegiality becomes a conduit for power of a group, or an organisation, over the individual.

By aligning oneself with a collegium one may, *ipso facto*, be demitting one’s right to an individual and specific opinion, (as was the concern of some bishops in the Church example) which may fall outside the collective view of the collegium. Such a tension is very vividly exposed in an account (Olson, 2007) of Ronald Cartland’s role in the downfall of Neville Chamberlain as Prime Minister of Great Britain (1937-1940). In a historical study with significant conceptual implications, Olson describes a political situation in which a conception of collegiality could have been potentially harmful if left poorly analysed and unchallenged.

This interpretation of collegiality came to feature in the famous English public schools. Olson draws specific attention to Eton, Harrow, Cambridge and Rugby³¹, but the operation of Rugby, and in particular the philosophy of Thomas Arnold, are worthy of consideration. Boys at these schools were ‘taught to value loyalty’ (Olson, 2007: 3) to each other and, more problematically, to the institution. Loyalty to the institution sometimes proved more difficult to achieve than loyalty to each other. Schools like those above, but also, for example, Westminster, Winchester, Shrewsbury and Charterhouse, experienced riots to which troops had to be called in the later part of the 18th and early 19th centuries. One solution to this problem of disorder was the development of a form of social control within these schools which is very much in tune with popular understandings of collegiality, but which can also be deconstructed as a form of panopticism. To confront dissent, the elite public schools developed their own norms of collegiality and the ‘house’ systems, evident in ‘good’ schools even today. The house system effectively makes the big school small, and creates what Alderson (in the context of policing) has called “the village in the city” (Alderson, 1979: 186-87).

By identifying with a greater good, the group, the selfishness of the individual can be brought under control. By identifying with a sub group, a degree of creative competition and a healthy creative turbulence can be established to promote good-natured group

³¹ Olson (2007) refers to a number of the elite educational institutions. She alleges that in this period (WW2 years) more than a third of all Conservative Party members had attended such elite institutions. Olson skilfully argues that the values instilled in the processes within these schools served to establish certain norms of loyalty and collegiality when the former pupils entered public life and politics. To put it another way, principles took precedence over personalities and there were just some times when you did not cross a certain line.

identity and healthy rivalry. In the context of the school House, or the school in general, criticism was considered disloyal and subtle, powerful social processes were developed to manage such disloyalty. The norms of loyalty developed in these schools, and among likeminded people were, according to Olson, extremely strong and in turn became prerequisites for those who moved beyond school into public, private and very often political life³². For Olson the culture of the school was highly effective in developing in the boys “the gentlemanly norms of their society” (Olson, 2007: 5).

The focus of Olson’s work (and the title of her book) is a group of “Troublesome Young Men” who were schooled in such institutions, and shared the same privileged background and values. These common socio-economic-political roots, in turn, saw many of them becoming involved in Conservative politics at the time of the outbreak of WW2 (the case in point). Olson’s account of their engagement with the debates leading to war, and in particular to the downfall of Premier Neville Chamberlain, gives some useful insights into the positive and the negative potential of collegiality.

To the fore of the events now examined was the young Conservative Party backbench MP Ronald Cartland³³, who in effect led the rebellion³⁴, which brought to an end Chamberlain’s premiership, and with it mounting concerns about his appeasement policies. Cartland and a few other “Troublesome Young Men”³⁵ held the view that, notwithstanding common backgrounds, and the values schooling and socio-political status had drilled into them, their loyalty should be to the country and not to the Party, the Prime Minister or the establishment. In breaking this code by rebelling, Cartland and likeminded others were pilloried, but their personal integrity, distinguished from the priorities of their immediate political and social community and personal ambitions, was what was important. According to Olson, this ability to display personal integrity played a significant part in the ascendancy of Churchill, and, ultimately victory in the war. In leading the rebellion, Cartland effectively undermined his own high political ambition, but he later expressed no regret in doing something which protected his personal, professional and moral profile and, more importantly, his country. Paradoxically, by breaking with the definition of collegiality implicitly shared by the majority of the House of Commons, Cartland invoked

³² Olson - Chapter Two - Playing the Game (Olson, 2007: 21-35).

³³ Ronald Cartland was the brother of writer Barbara Cartland.

³⁴ It is more likely that the speech which significantly reduced the Chamberlain majority, was that delivered by Leo Amery who, in quoting Cromwell’s dismissal of the Long Parliament said: “You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing! Depart, I say and let us have done with you! In the name of God go”! (Olson, 2007: 294-95).

³⁵ Harold Macmillan, Leo Amery, Robert Boothby and, of course, Cartland himself.

a different understanding of collegiality – one which allowed him a voice as a member of the collegium. By being thoroughly non-collegial in one sense he was being genuinely collegial in another. Cartland could see what was at stake in the adoption of an understanding of collegiality which was closer to collaboration - he seems to have been alert to the significance of the difference. The further paradox is that Cartland, with Boothby, Amery and Macmillan, had to *collaborate* in order to ensure that their own views held sway, and the episode reflects a profound complication whereby, in order to invoke one understanding of collegiality, an understanding different from the one pertaining in the public school system had to be deployed. This adds a fascinating layer of complexity to this crucial distinction.

In a speech prior to the debate which sealed Chamberlain's fate, and to some extent Cartland's, Cartland objected to "dictatorship over the mind" and to constant and open challenges to the right to hold one's own opinion (Olson, 2007: 15).

Shortly before this Cartland had written:

"Men who hold views contrary to their Party leaders are termed rebels, and subservience is held of more account than originality. Members who are not in step with their Party Whips are threatened with expulsion and attempts are made to undermine their position in their constituency. Measures are taken to prevent their voicing their opinions both inside and outside the House of Commons" (Cartland quoted in Olson, 2007: 16).

It seems that Cartland had an awareness of a tension between his membership of a collegium and his duty as a principled individual. In following his conscience, he attacked the Prime Minister and his government majority by claiming that Chamberlain was a dictator. In so doing "Cartland had committed the greatest of all heresies" (Olson 2007: 17). Cartland asked the difficult questions many on the majority Tory bench probably wanted to ask, but were afraid to ask. He had, for the purposes of my discussion, confronted a perverse form of collegiality after personal serious reflection, and paradoxically substituted a definition of collegiality that sat more comfortably with his own conscience. Paradoxically, by being non-collegiate in one understanding - that of the Conservative Party collegium - it may have been Cartland and his colleagues (collaborators) who saved the day and the country.

Cartland had been tutored on the importance of "playing the game," and "never batting against your own side" (Olson, 2007: 21). These cautions had come from David

Margesson, the government chief whip, perhaps unnecessarily since these were the ‘cardinal rules’ (Olson, 2007: 21) drummed into the boys in the elite public schools they had attended. Olson draws attention to the significance of this schooling and the code of values resulting from it.

Undisguised ambition, open criticism and rebellion were considered “bad form” and “not playing the game” and were dealt with appropriately. According to Jack Macnamara, a young Irishman who had served in the British army in India before coming to Parliament, most senior MPs agreed on “one matter – the suppression, completely and absolutely, of the new arrivals, who should be prepared to fag and agree, but who must never, never, in any circumstances, open their mouths, not for months and months and months” (Olson, 2007:24).

Cartland asked hard questions and ventured into the realm of ‘tough collegiality’ (Humes, 2007b: 5) and double loop reflection. He had been prepared to question the very premises upon which his party’s war policies were based, thus alienating a powerful Prime Minister. What mattered to Cartland and his group was not so much the gentlemanly good manners of soft collegiality (Humes, 2007a) as the searching questions which have the capacity to disentangle what is right from what is wrong (tough collegiality). In these circumstances, Cartland recognised that there was something of significant importance above-and-beyond ‘playing the game’. Olson attests to Cartland’s integrity and bravery thus:

For men brought up to prize loyalty and collegiality as supreme virtues, it took great strength of will to defy their political superiors like that, especially when such defiance meant not only the loss of future political prizes but treatment as a pariah by one’s *colleagues* [my emphasis] (Olson, 2007: 26).

The Cartland episode provides useful material for reflection on collegiality and professionalism among teachers. It highlights a distinction between collegiality and collaboration, but illustrates the paradox whereby one may, in order to be collegial, rely on collaboration. Cartland broke with one form of collegiality in the interests of pursuing another. The example highlights the complexity of the concept.

Collaboration is usually understood, in educational literature, to be something good and something worth aiming for. Little (1982) and others have referred to it along with, and instead of, collegiality and team working. In an article considering collaboration, Humes (2009) also refers back to the context of war. He points out that there is a very negative understanding of collaboration which we should not lose sight of.

Finally, a mischievous thought. In war-time, the word "collaborator" was used to describe those who gave comfort to the enemy in exchange for benefits or to avoid persecution. It involved sacrificing principle for personal advantage. Is it too fanciful to suggest that parallels can be drawn with present-day forms of collaboration? (Humes, 2009)³⁶.

In current educational discourse however, collaborative teaching, collaborative learning, collaborative management and collaborative approaches to all sorts of matters attending these, have captured the imagination in a positive way. While such educational values seem very appealing, it could be that insular, inward looking and self referential habits and practices, are reinforced by collaboration. Most dictionaries are kind to collaboration, defining it in both positive and negative ways. Collaboration is a word which can be read as either something good, akin to cooperation, or something bad, akin to connivance.

In Chapter Two I pointed to the toolkit often deployed by philosophers of education. I began by suggesting that collegiality, as a conceptual entity had been under-scrutinised. I suggested that a conceptual analysis was required, and identified this as a frequently applied device of analytic philosophers in education and in areas of study beyond. I drew attention to the value added to a debate when philosophers draw upon texts and evidence to interpret and deconstruct these both in the analytic and continental tradition. This chapter has explored thus far the complexities attending collegiality, and it begins to respond to Fielding's accusation of intellectual laziness.

Collegiality presents complexity when introduced into an arena where authority, power and influence enjoy an almost sacrosanct position. In the school context, I had the opportunity to deal with one of two significant tensions that I believe prevail – that of the tension emerging from a discussion of collegiality alongside professionalism. The Church example I drew on illustrated that it remains unclear what the relationship between Papal authority and collegiality actually is. How can collegiality be achieved within an environment where absolute authority exists? Moving to the context of the university, I drew attention to some conceptual and practical difficulties attending the notion of collegiality in an increasingly controlled environment. Drawing on a very different social and political context I looked at a particular episode from history, which I feel exemplifies the second of the two tensions and distinctions which concern me, that between collegiality and collaboration i.e. the Cartland dilemma.

³⁶ Ironically, Amery's elder brother Jack was hanged for treason and *collaboration* in 1945.

This third chapter has undertaken an analysis of the concept of collegiality. It has drawn attention to a number of difficulties emerging when we attempt to cursorily graft collegiality onto pre-existing institutional contexts. The purpose of the chapter has been to explore concept, meaning and usage.

In the example of the teacher and the school, it emerges that collegiality might not only be difficult to attain but might sit at odds with the principle of free-thinking and creativity. Furthermore it might contribute to the problem of an oversimplification of the idea of professionalism. In relation to higher education, I have pointed out the difficulty of deploying the spirit of true collegiality in a context which is increasingly coming under government control. The capacity to promote collegiality requires a degree of institutional autonomy which, many would argue (Barnett, 2003), is no longer around to be exploited.

My final example - the Cartland example - helped me to understand crucial distinctions between two readings of collegiality: playing the game and doing the right thing. Wrapped up in all of this was the relationship between collegiality and loyalty which itself has gone under-explored.

In Chapter Four I move from this analytical approach to draw on the continental tradition in philosophy by engaging with issues of power, control and the ways in which they impinge upon people's lived experiences and the organisation of the school, while also linking the 'analytic' reading of collegiality with a 'continental' understanding.

Chapter Four

The discourse of collegiality

From concept to discourse

In considering the concept of collegiality and its use as a term in varying contexts, I have adopted an analytical approach, examining the use of the term collegiality in particular contexts to illustrate its complexity and internal tensions. In particular I have looked at collegiality as it has become manifest in the contexts of the school, the university and the Church. Additionally, I have explored collegiality in the context of power and control in the political scene, by examining the historical example of Cartland and his colleagues. In summary, Chapter Three sought to look at collegiality from a conceptual viewpoint; what has been understood by collegiality in the various contexts, and what tensions have arisen from the meanings assumed and adopted? Chapter Three has highlighted that there is a variety of understandings of what collegiality might mean, and how it might be defined, in the minds of those seeking to exploit it as an approach to engaging professional colleagues. Having approached the idea of collegiality as a concept, drawing on its use in both the literature and related institutional contexts, I now explore collegiality in terms of its effects on those it influences, by drawing on a different philosophical tradition, i.e. the continental tradition. At this stage, I seek to engage with the understanding of collegiality as discourse and practice rather than as concept. Inevitably, there is an iterative relationship between the two approaches. Collegiality as a concept allows me to engage with use, definition and meaning. Understanding collegiality as a discourse, and as an entity which impacts upon the actual experiences of those under its influence, allows me to further develop my argument that collegiality requires considerable scrutiny prior to being interpolated into the field of management in schools.

When I think of collegiality as a discourse, I think of it as a prevailing set of practices which have an influence on behaviour. As well as ‘meaning’ something, as in the analytic tradition, collegiality, as viewed from the continental tradition, also ‘does’ something which has an effect on the practice of educational management. In saying this I am claiming for collegiality the identity of a discourse, and this itself will require definition

and clarification. The term discourse, in relation to educational policy and practice, has taken on particular significances, as it has across the social sciences. A discourse can be conceived of as “an institutionalised way of thinking, a social boundary defining what can be said about a specific topic”³⁷. “To develop a culture, particularly an educational one, a common discourse needs to be used”³⁸.

In this chapter I also claim that collegiality can be categorised as a technology. I understand that collegiality, and the ‘terms of collegiality’- collegiality, collegiate and collegially - can be classified as both discourse and technology (technology in the sense of techniques or devices to be appropriated in order to assist us in a process). The ways in which I use the terms discourse and technology are explained presently.

There are many ways in which discourses, and discourse analysis, can be understood, and, to be clear from the outset, it is my intention in this work to discuss collegiality as a discourse and to undertake a limited discourse analysis of collegiality. In Chapters Five and Six, I develop an analysis of the effects of the discourse of collegiality by drawing attention to the source, promotion and interests served by the discourse; this might approximate to a more accepted understanding of discourse analysis.

Although I introduce these distinctions here, discussions of collegiality as ‘discourse,’ and as ‘technology’ will emerge in the course of the discussion. In one account of these categories it is well argued that discourse and technology are related ideas, and that it is uncommon to have one without the other. The discourse/technology distinction is one usefully identified by Quaghebeur and Masschelein (2005), and relies on the idea that in order to sustain and deliver a discourse, certain technologies have to be in place. In turn, the discourse itself offers technological advantage to the development of the means by which power is exercised and control is developed, in relation to a particular pursuit or policy priority. The prevailing application of these technologies reinforces the form and lived experience of the discourse, which in turn demands technological solutions for its continued effect and existence; thus the relationship can be seen to become cyclical.

Having discussed these two categories, I will reflect on Foucault’s understanding of ‘Governmentality’ to further understand the power dimensions which emerge when we properly interrogate collegiality as a very complex idea, rather than as a word which can

³⁷ This description is attributed in some literature to Judith Butler. A precise reference has proved difficult to locate.

³⁸ I found this definition to be of particular interest. It appears in a website of a school in Sydney. Available at: <http://www.sydneyboyshigh.com/welfare/school-within-a-school?start=1> (last accessed 16.7.10).

attach unproblematically and cursorily to the field of (school) management. Foucault's notion of 'Governmentality' - the "conduct of conduct" (Gordon in Burchell, Gordon, and Miller, (1991: 48) - is described by Foucault himself as "an art of government" (Foucault in Burchell et al., 1991: 89). I see this as highly relevant to the developing understanding of the control and power-laden capacity of collegiality, as it is becoming manifest in school leadership and organisation. The discussion then develops by incorporating the idea of Bentham's 'Panopticon'³⁹, as a frame through which we might view the less benign operation of collegiate practices. I will explain the idea of the 'Panopticon' presently, but for the moment my concern is to confront the possibility that collegiality could serve as an instrument of internal and self-fulfilling control exercised by community members over one another.

Discourse, technology and biopower

Collegiality has been described as a discourse⁴⁰. It represents a very influential discursive shift within Scottish educational policy in recent times, particularly in the years following the McCrone settlement on teachers' pay and conditions. When we consider the growing presence of collegiality in the discourse of school management we can see traces of previous typologies of management directed towards managerialism, rather than towards more democratic approaches. Collegiality can be considered as both a discourse and a technology (Simons and Masschelein, 2006: 52) through which language and practices, could transform the role of teachers, their perception of themselves and the management context within which they work. Quaghebeur and Masschelein (2005) relate these two terms one to the other. For them, discourses are "certain ways of speaking and writing", while technologies are "certain procedures, instruments and techniques that are proposed, and developed, in different places and spaces" (2005: 51). They question the extent to which 'discourses' and 'technologies' of (their specific example) participation, 'free people by involving them,' or whether, in Foucauldian terms, they "mobilise[s] a particular

³⁹'Panopticon', was a model for the prison proposed by Jeremy Bentham. Panopticism is the potential and the effect of the Panopticon. A fuller description including a quote by Foucault, (1995: 195-228) is available at: <http://cartome.org/panopticon1.htm> (last accessed 11.7.10). The panoptic prison allowed maximum control from minimum supervision. Panopticism has associations with covert surveillance; a modern instantiation is the CCTV camera.

⁴⁰ Although Humes refers to collegiality as a discourse, I had appropriated this description prior to reading Humes' account(s) as my thinking about this dissertation was developing. In 'The Discourses of Educational Management, Humes had identified other key discourses - for example - 'learning communities', 'transformational leadership' and 'participation' (Humes, 2000).

type of individuality that is not natural” (2005: 53). Embraced by this idea is an iterative relationship between what is said or sought after, and what is done or ‘lived’. Discourse, understood in Foucault’s terms as “the limits and forms of the sayable” (Foucault in Burchell et al: 58) is understood by Harvey as a device or devices which “codify techniques and practices for the exercise of social control and domination within particular contexts” (Harvey, 1990:45).

In a Foucauldian understanding:

Discourses are practices that form the objects of which they speak....
Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention (Foucault, 1977: 49).

Via a set of rhetorical questions Foucault describes discourses in terms of not only what is sayable, but in terms of their influence on behaviour and practice:

“Conservation”

Which utterances are destined to enter into human memory through ritual, recitation, pedagogy, amusement, festival, publicity? Which are marked down as reusable, and to what ends? Which utterances are put into circulation and among what groups? Which are repressed and censored?

“Memory”

Which utterances do everyone recognize as valid or debatable or definitely invalid? Which have been abandoned as negligible and which have been excluded as foreign?

“Reactivation”

...which are retained, which are valued, which are imported, which are attempts made to reconstitute? And what is done with them, what transformations are worked upon them (commentary, exegesis, analysis), what system of appreciation are applied to them, what role are they given to play?

“Appropriation”

What individuals, what groups or classes have access to a particular kind of discourse? How is the relationship institutionalised between the discourse speakers and its destined audience? How is the relation of the discourse to its author indicated and defined? How is the struggle for

the control of discourses conducted? (Foucault in Burchell et al. 1991: 60).

These quotations illuminate aspects of collegiality as a discourse, and I will revisit them in Chapters Five and Six as I begin to address directly key questions about the source, promotion and effects of the discourse in the educational context. Foucault's reference to "Conservation" suggests that collegiality is an idea which has been conserved from previous times and other contexts. To this extent, collegiality is not new. Rather it exists in "Memory" from circumstances and sites of application; it is regarded as 'valid' rather than 'debatable or definitely invalid'. 'Reactivation' points to the reconstitution of an idea rather than merely its re-adoption as collegiality has been re-shaped as well as re-applied from its traditional higher education context to that of the school. In relation to "Appropriation", Foucault calls attention to destined audiences and constituencies within which discourses exert their influences, and to who controls the discourse of collegiality in education. Part of my project is to understand the uses to which collegiality is put, and the varying ways in which it has been appropriated by different audiences, with different aims and purposes in mind, for example the contexts discussed in Chapter Three.

Discourse, at its most basic understanding, refers to what is said – whether orated, written or even expressed as an image⁴¹. However postmodernist and poststructuralist approaches to discourse attach contextuality to the 'word' (spoken or otherwise), and suggest that what can be said is dependent upon the context within which it is said. There are limits to what can be said in current educational contexts if the speaker wishes to remain within the orthodoxy (Humes, 2007b), i.e. 'inside the tent' rather than outside⁴². To the postmodernist, discourse is about more than speech, and postmodernist research reflects on, and deconstructs, discourses which encompass not only texts, but nuances of language, images and style. Critical discourse analysis is as much about what is not said (in a kind of Pinteresque understanding)⁴³ as it is about what is expressed. Fairclough's commitment to

⁴¹ Policy documentation has moved on in phase with the development of desktop publishing. The Munn Report for example was all typed text. By contrast, Curriculum for Excellence conveys its message and its discourse by relying on images. I am struck by examples of policy and practice documents in CPD materials which portray happy, smiling and agreeing teachers engaged in professional exchange. The visual text is most influential, I would argue, in offering the observer a pre-determined script about the topic in question. Would the image of a frowning, pensive group of teachers not have more to say about teachers analysing problems and engaging in serious professional reflection. In summary, the written or spoken text are nowadays heavily supplemented and strengthened by pictures and images.

⁴² An expression attributed to Lyndon B. Johnson taken to mean 'being on the same side as.....' 'not causing trouble for...' The full quote was by Johnson of J. Edgar Hoover: "Better to have him inside the tent pissing out, than outside pissing in".

⁴³ Pinteresque is a term describing the prose of Nobel Laureate in Literature, Harold Pinter. Harold Pinter's work has drawn the attention of critics who are as interested in the silences in his plays as they are in what is spoken. Pinter recognised the importance of what was not said.

Critical Discourse Analysis, (CDA) is rooted in his observation that “consciousness is the first step towards emancipation” (Fairclough, 2001: 1). From these positions, discourses are seen as devices which can conceal and facilitate power imbalances and influences, and, in the interests of proper critical understanding, they invite analysis. I am exploring ‘collegiality’ as a discourse and claim that the discourse of collegiality, although a discourse in its own right, is also a technology in Quaghebeur and Masschelein’s (2004) sense for advancing a further and more significant discourse; I suggest that collegiality is a discourse within a discourse, the discourse of collegiality acting as a conduit for the discourse of leadership, which in turn acts as a conduit for a discourse of educational management and control.

While the language of school governance may be changing, the reality of the managerialist project has not changed much. This is evident in management behaviour just as much as it is in management pronouncements. Although Foucault always resisted being labelled either as a postmodernist or a poststructuralist, his understanding of discourse is deeper, richer and more problematic than simple text, and it has come to have a considerable influence in the field of social science research, including education. Lessa (2006: 29) summarizes Foucault's definition of discourse as “systems of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, beliefs and practices that, systematically, construct the subjects, and the worlds, of which they speak”. Thinking about collegiality in this way, collegiality as a discourse has the potential to construct the teacher to whom it is addressed. It is in this understanding that I view collegiality-as-discourse; collegiality consists in ideas (conceptual entities), but these are influenced by (and influence) attitudes, actions, beliefs and practices which shape people in particular ways, and exercise subtle yet significant control over them.

The explanation that “Language is a mix of words and body, and bodies can alter the meaning of a spoken word” is attributed to Butler (1997),⁴⁴ and according to Cookson:

Decoding the power discourse requires a series of understandings about the nature of language as a verbal expression of social relations. Words do not exist in a disembodied form; they have meaning within a social context that is class bound, conflictual and power driven. Those who

⁴⁴ Cited in Butler (1997) *Encyclopaedia II* - Judith Butler - *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the performative*.

control this symbolic world are able to shape and manipulate the market-place of educational ideas (Cookson, 1994: 116).

Thus, in the examples discussed in Chapter Three, collegiality was highlighted as something ‘inevitably’ good in most cases. In each of the contexts discussed however, I sought to challenge this assumed inevitability, by drawing attention to some key tensions. In the context of the Church collegiality’s emphasis on democracy emerged as in conflict with infallibility as another understanding of power and authority, thus establishing a concerning tension. In the context of the university and the school, I suggested that there was obvious antagonism evident between structural, legal and constitutional demands, and the professional voice and autonomy associated with collegiality. While collegiality and more democratic approaches have an obvious appeal, they do not always sit easily in a context which is governed by tradition and legislation. The relationship between words and bodies is central to Foucault’s notion of biopower by which he means that discourses actually have discernible impact on people, on what they are and what they become. Foucault’s understanding of biopower relates to the exercise of power over populations; essentially, biopower in the Foucauldian understanding is about the control of bodies. For Foucault, biopower is a technology of power, and is a departure from traditional forms of control. By contrast with the threat of punishment, technologies of biopower exercise control by more subtle, less crude, and less obvious approaches. Collegiality can be seen as a device by which control is exerted, and to this extent can be uncovered as a technology of biopower.

The inhabitation of the discourse has the effect of continuing to legitimise and sustain the discourse itself. The exercise of power and the sustenance of a preferred agenda and set of technologies of control are effective as the result of it being non-punitive, non-threatening, and ultimately attractive to those being governed. As I will show in Chapters Five and Six, a considered analysis of the emergence of the discourse of collegiality, the way in which it has been promoted, and considerations surrounding its perceived benefits to particular stakeholders, attests to the reality of technologies geared towards its sustenance. Through biopower (by which a discourse and the technologies attending it exercise power and control in much shrouded ways) collegiality can be an effective and powerful instrument of panoptic gaze. For example, it was not unusual in the 1980s and 1990s to encounter the language of business in schools. In the 1980s the ‘Audit Unit’ of HMIe emerged and we entered an agenda of performativity which is eloquently described by Ball as:

...a new mode of state regulation which makes it possible to govern in an ‘advanced liberal’ way. It

requires individual practitioners to organize themselves as a response to targets, indicators and evaluations. *To set aside personal beliefs and commitments* (my emphasis) and live an existence of calculation. The new performative worker is a promiscuous self, an enterprising self, with a passion for excellence. For some, this is an opportunity to make a success of themselves, for others it portends inner conflicts, in authenticity and resistance. It is also suggested that performativity produces opacity rather than transparency as individuals and organizations take ever greater care in the construction and maintenance of fabrications (Ball, 2003: 215).

What Ball points to here is a set of circumstances whereby processes can lead to control. This can be understood as a form of biopower. Human constructions targeting performativity have the effect of altering human behaviour and forcing a teacher to re-evaluate priorities and values. The shift towards the performative climate in education has drawn widespread attention. There is now a discourse of accountability and a discourse which explicitly links economic effectiveness with educational efficiency. Escorting these discourses have been technologies which can be seen to have their roots in the business community.

We have evidence of a discourse which, originating in the business context, has come to impose itself on the management of schools requiring “individual practitioners to organize themselves as a response to “targets, indicators and evaluations,” as Ball puts it. It is not uncommon for teachers to be heard talking of inputs and outputs, performance indicators, audit trails, cost and effect etc. This is not simply a matter of language, however. As the language is spoken, the practice develops and changes. Pring argues:

By gradually enlisting the language of the business world—the language of audits and performance indicators, of efficiency gains and investment, of inputs related to outputs, of effectiveness and productivity, of curriculum delivery and of consumers of that which is to be delivered—so our understanding of education is changed (Pring, 2007).

This change in understanding comes to shape the identity of those involved in education to the extent that their behaviour is altered as they come to inhabit cultures they may once have found objectionable⁴⁵. Not only do those involved inhabit the culture (in the sense of

⁴⁵ I am always intrigued as I look at policy pronouncements from, for example, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EiS). In the 1970s and 1980s this teachers union was vociferous in its opposition to the emerging ‘market culture’ in education. I describe below, in response to Humes’ question ‘How has it been promoted?’ how the EiS are more and more frequently in phase with the language of, for example HMIe,

occupying it), the culture inhabits them. Discourse consists in the intricate relationship between language and behaviour, between immersions in a culture so that those immersed in it contribute to its perpetuation. The language of business has the effect of changing the behaviour and, in many cases, the value set held by teachers. Teachers can be seen to be making increasing use of language and practices which, in a previous discursive epoch, may have been thoroughly alien to an educational context. The power of the discourse and the technologies trammelled to it is such that the discourse becomes invisible and natural. It is the very invisibility and naturalness of discourse which interest and concern both Foucault and Fairclough. The legitimacy of a discourse is further reinforced through the appropriation of procedural devices (technologies) and instruments of practice serving as conduits of the discourse itself. Examples in relation to business-speak imposing itself on schooling include development plans and shared planning for professional development. Planning thus becomes a corporate, rather than an individual concern, and teachers' individuality is upstaged by their role as corporate players within an organisation.

Fairclough makes the point that awareness of the discourse is an early step towards emancipation from its more negative controlling effects, while Foucault draws attention to the possibility of thwarting the discourse by exposing it. My argument is not against collegiality *per se*, but is rather in opposition to a discursive formation that deploys collegiality in ways which are at once potentially harmful to a liberal tradition in education, and ignorant of the more creative potential of collegiality. As such my project is to expose and uncover these more questionable and problematic manifestations of collegiality, and to bring to the fore understandings which genuinely elicit and encourage opinions and contributions, which feature in my normative understanding of genuine collegiality.

Understanding the discourse leads to the opportunity to be emancipated from its effects according to Fairclough (1995). I have suggested above that there is evidence that immersion in a discourse can have transformative effects, on those immersed, to the extent that they unwittingly fuel the discourse. To this extent, full understanding of a discourse requires knowledge of discourse theory, the capacity to undertake a particular form of discourse analysis, and the critical will and capacity to apply discourse theory to the understanding of the discourse. It may be discourse and discourse theory which is required to rescue and reinvent the current discourse of collegiality, in a way which will help it to

work better for a more effective, and normatively collegiate, education management system in schools.

In making these suggestions, I am claiming that there is a relationship between collegiality (the concept) and collegiality (the discourse). Thus the apparently discrete philosophical traditions applied to their analysis in this dissertation are complementary. This is to say that it is our conceptions which can shape discourses. However, it can be argued that discourses become so powerful that they create our understanding of conceptual matters; there is at least an iterative process at play. If I have a clear understanding of what collegiality is, I can use it and apply it, and through time and effort develop a discourse. On the other hand, if I practise in particular ways I can create a concept based on my practice. Ball (1990) has summarised this by questioning which comes first. He settles on the latter explanation, suggesting his view that, if I am immersed in a discourse, I will eventually become part of the very sustenance of the discourse.

Central to this dissertation is the exploration of a particular ‘discourse of collegiality’, one which has come to inhabit post-McCrone school management and leadership. In Chapter Three, I suggested that it was necessary to apply a particular philosophical tradition to engage in conceptual analysis of collegiality. Referring now to ‘collegiality as discourse’, I am being explicit in saying that ‘collegiality’, ‘collegiate’ and ‘collegial’ are legitimate targets for the label ‘discourse’. However, as I will show, the discourse which prevails at present does not reflect the more normative account which I described earlier. My project in the dissertation is to conceptualise the more normative understanding of collegiality, and to suggest how discourse can be influenced in ways which also impact upon our behaviour, and on our bodies, as they govern our schools, but in such ways as to release the more normative potential which collegiate approaches can be seen to promise. My aim is to capitalise on what is best about collegiality, while at the same time drawing attention to the more negative potential of prevailing discursive formations, with a view to rendering them transparent and thus ‘thwarting’ them (Foucault 1981: 101).

Humes (2007b) has identified collegiality as a relatively new element in a ‘discourse’ of educational management; he has identified other terms as also part of this discourse (‘learning communities’, ‘transformational leadership’ and ‘participation’). Hargreaves (1991) chooses the term ‘orthodoxy’ and this may or may not mean the same thing(s). What Humes and Hargreaves both recognise is that collegiality has an *effect* when it is applied and internalised, and when the discursive space it occupies merges with the organisational spaces within our schools; collegiality, as a discourse, *does something* to

people, or as Ball (1990) puts it, “we do not speak the discourse; the discourse speaks us”⁴⁶. Foucault argues however that an awareness of discourse is important, arguing “[D]iscourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart” (Foucault, 1981: 101).

Taking the view that collegiality is manifest as an influential discourse within education, I identify the most subtle infiltration of the terms of collegiality into the day-to-day practice of school administration, in particular, in the wake of the Scottish teachers' pay and conditions settlement of 2001. I suggest that this infiltration of the language is testimony to the reality of the discourse. I have been unable to locate a particular paper or policy document which deals specifically, exclusively and intellectually with the collegiate approaches which nonetheless have come to be so influential in the life of the teacher, and the changes in her identity and practice. Neither have I been able to assert confidently, as MacDonald, for example, does (MacDonald, 2003: 413) that it is from the teachers' pay and conditions settlement that the ‘clarion’ (Cunningham, 2004) call for collegiate working practice emerges. It appears that, almost by stealth, the language and terms of collegiality have become adopted by the communities of practice in our schools. Hargreaves' choice of ‘orthodoxy’ as a descriptor for collegiate working in schools is at one with Humes' who has referred to the tendency for Scottish policy making as having a forceful potential to trammel its teachers and inveigle them into ways of thinking which fall within the prevailing orthodoxy, discourse or as Foucault would have it, the limits of what is ‘sayable’. In a relatively recent article, Humes bemoans the tendency towards ‘groupthink’ on the part of the Scottish teacher, arguing that there is an institutionalised reluctance on the part of teachers to step out of the orthodoxy or the parameters of what is ‘sayable’.

Reflecting on Harvey's understanding of discourses as the codifying of techniques of control, I argue that the increasing incidence of reference to collegiality in schools is often associated with attempts to govern behaviour and control the actions and attitudes of others. Collegiality has become the thing of its time. It is orthodox to accept collegiality and its associated terms as normative features in the administration of schools, and objections to collegiate practices and ways of working place those who object beyond the limits of what is acceptable and professional. Extending this argument even further, it is worth considering whether the discourse of collegiality is being used to facilitate the implementation of policies and practices which are non- and even anti-collegiate.

⁴⁶ A frivolous way of putting this is: ‘If I sit in a barber's shop long enough – I'll eventually get my hair cut’.

Governmentality and panopticism

There have been distinctive discursive shifts in the language associated with the governance of schools in Scotland over recent decades, and particularly during the current one. These shifts reflect the spirit of the time, and the reaction of the educational policy community towards that spirit. There is evidence that a focus on school ‘management’ - previously administration - became a focus on school ‘leadership’. This discursive shift continued with the emphasis on leadership being further refined to include concepts of ‘distributed’ or ‘distributive’⁴⁷ leadership. I feel intellectually uncomfortable with ‘distributive leadership’ at a most basic level, and suggest that what is labelled ‘distributed’ or ‘distributive’ leadership actually means distributed or distributive ‘responsibility’ or ‘accountability’. It has been suggested that the McCrone settlement was the moment when the spirit of the time shifted yet again from an emphasis on leadership to one on collegiality (MacDonald, 2003).

In now exploring the genealogy of school governance, I show firstly that Foucault had a specific understanding of genealogy. Secondly, his understanding, definition and application of genealogy lend themselves to my explanation of how the discourse of school management and governance has come to develop and shift over the past three decades. As Chapter Five will show, these shifts can be shown be rooted in administrative and economic expediency, rather than in educational desirability, or from any concern to promote liberal approaches to education, or democratic concerns, for educational policy processes and practices.

When defining his understanding of genealogy Foucault was keen to point out that “changes in thought [the systems of thought] are not themselves the product of thought” and:

[He] proposed instead accounts based on many specific ‘little’ causes operating independently of one another (...) that would in turn have a wide and disparate range of social, economic and political effects (Gutting, 2005: 46).

⁴⁷ No amount of conversation with professional or academic colleagues has convinced me of the meaning, usefulness or value of this description. If it is intended as that which is capable of being distributed then surely ‘distributable’ would be a better choice of word.

My own argument is that the discursive shifts described in this dissertation have come about as the ‘tectonic plates’⁴⁸ (Thurow, 1996: 68) underlying the education system have shifted, not in response to a grand educational plan, but to a series of smaller but significant socio-economic and political priorities. This said the combined effect of these smaller influences may be construed as the emergence of a newer grander narrative which has at its heart the need to harness the education system to economic prowess.

Gutting (2005: 47) further attributes to Foucault the discovery that forces for change operate not so much on our institutions as on our bodies (this has been referred to earlier as biopower). This suggests that as the impetus for governing and managing schools changes over time, the target is the person, not the institution. Combining Foucault’s understanding with my argument, I suggest that terms such as management and leadership (distributed, distributive or otherwise) are targeted at individuals, and groups of individuals, and the ways in which shifts in nomenclature are ‘sold’ to people is crucial to the success of the ‘art of government’ i.e. governmentality (Foucault in Burchell et al: 1991: 90).

In discussing Foucault’s notion of governmentality, I have three aims. Firstly, I will outline the arguments advanced by Foucault in a lecture given to the Collège de France in February 1978, entitled ‘Governmentality’ (Foucault in Burchell et al: 1991). Secondly, I apply these ideas by recontextualising them in the situation of the school. Thirdly, I appropriate further ideas identified by Foucault in the work of Machiavelli, and highlight a third idea, which is akin to a collegiate culture.

In his lecture Foucault analyses what he describes as the ‘problematic of government in general’ (Burchell et al: 88). Drawing on Machiavelli’s ‘The Prince,’ Foucault argues for the existence of a 16th century preoccupation with the mechanisms by which a sovereign maintains social control over those in his spectrum of influence. Foucault concludes that in the context of the sixteenth century, the relationship of the Prince to the subject was in fact a ‘relation of singularity and externality, and thus transcendence to his principality’ (Foucault in Burchell et al: 1991: 90).

[The] link in any event remains a purely synthetic one and there is no fundamental, essential, natural and juridical connection between the prince and his principality. As a corollary of this, given that this link is external, it will be

⁴⁸Thurow (1996: 68) suggests that: “a technological shift to an era dominated by man-made brainpower industries is one of five economic tectonic plates, which constitute a new game with new rules”: “Today knowledge and skills now stand alone as the only source of comparative advantage. They have become the key ingredient in the late twentieth century’s location of economic activity [and education]”.

fragile and continually under threat (...) Schematically, one can say that Machiavelli's *The Prince* (...) is essentially a treatise about the prince's ability to keep his principality (...) [A]nti-Machiavellian literature wants to replace [this] with something else and new, namely the art of government. Having the ability to retain one's principality is not at all the same thing as possessing the art of governing.

Foucault identifies four key issues of concern for government in the sixteenth century. Firstly, there is the issue of self-governance – the problem of personal conduct. Secondly, there is the government of 'souls and lives' – a pastoral form of government. Thirdly, there is the issue relating to children and education, and finally, on the grander scale, there is the problem of the government of the state by the Prince. In summary, the concerns for government are: how to govern ourselves, how to be governed, how to educate for governance and how to govern others. Foucault argues that those reacting against Machiavelli and the nineteenth century reading of him were concerned more about the art of governing and for Foucault:

[...] they attempted to articulate a kind of rationality which was intrinsic to the art of government, without subordinating it to the problematic of the prince and of his relationship to the principality of which he is lord and master (Foucault in Burchell et al: 1991: 89).

Foucault explains that there is a relationship of continuity between the issues of government described above. Proper government of oneself lends itself to the development of the capacity to be governed, and hence to govern others. A self-disciplined father (moral) will, it could be argued, be an effective head of house (economic) and consequently a good citizen/subject (political). Reversing this, a good citizen, by dint of a sense of political savvy, sees the merit in being a good householder / economic family head, and consequently a responsible, compliant individual (self).

... the art of government is always characterized by the essential continuity of one type with the other, and of a second type with a third [...] in the art of government the task is to establish a continuity, in both an upwards and a downwards direction (Foucault in Burchell et al: 1991: 91).

The upward continuity expects that the person wishing to govern (at large) must first govern himself (small picture to big picture). In the downward direction, (big picture to little picture) in a state which is well run, the individual will have at his disposal a

demonstration of prudence and behaviour which he can superimpose on his own affairs and practices at the most individual of levels.

This downward line, which transmits to individual behaviour and the running of the family the same principles as the good running of the state, is just at this time beginning to be called *police*. The prince's pedagogical formation ensures the upward continuity of the forms of government and the police the downward one. The central term of this continuity is the government of the family, termed *economy* [....]. The art of government, as becomes apparent in this literature, is essentially concerned with answering the question of how to introduce economy – that is to say, the correct manner of managing people (Foucault in Burchell et al: 1991: 92).

There is simplicity in these descriptions of continuity in the context of management, whether bottom-up or top-down. The downward 'policing model' can be understood as a traditional authoritarian model. The upward model can be understood more as a democratic and constructivist model. To give names to the roles within a school, with the above distinctions in mind, we can think of the good 'professional' teacher conducting herself in such a way as to influence the 'economy' of the school for the better. The benefit of this productive economy comes to have bearing on the overall government and ethos of the school as bottom-up continuity. The top to bottom continuity implies that well considered policy, leadership, and practice at the upper level (traditional formal, management approaches) will influence how individuals behave at the level of the moral, professional individual so as to foster self-governing citizens.

Evident in Foucault's lecture is a third pattern of influence, which is different from either of these two - a lateral continuity through which peers influence each other. This type of influence is sufficiently different from the top-down or a bottom-up model already described, and has features that we now associate with collegiate and democratic models of management. This lateral continuity is characterised by a sideways influence, where peers on the same level are attracted into adopting principles of good government by dint of their membership of a community. By applying discourse (language and text) and technologies, (mechanisms and techniques) subjects can be acted upon so that they govern themselves, and each other, in a climate that becomes self-regulating and essentially compliant with the prevailing orthodoxy. This lateral influence is full of promise and threat at one-and-the-same time. From a positive reading, we can see a community having positive effects on its members, one to the other. However, the effects need not always be positive and constructive. Indeed a context in which a sphere of practice becomes self-regulating and

self-policing might shut itself off from critique and new ideas. The current instantiation of collegiality in schools sees much of merit in peers influencing each other. This in itself is no bad thing, but the degree and type of influence is crucial, and the potential for the influence to block off critical scrutiny is a likely harmful consequence of something which on the face of things is an attractive idea. To illustrate the problematic nature of this, it is perhaps useful to note the Cartland example discussed in Chapter Three which exposes the perplexing and far from simple binary, of collegiality and collaboration.

‘Distributive’ and ‘distributed’ leadership are, in the above understanding, examples of lateral influence. Language and text are used to create an idea (distribution) in the minds of subjects. When we tell people – hitherto not at the level of leadership as it is commonly conceived – that they too are leaders we impart a kudos to them. By applying technologies such as self-evaluation and accountability, we reinforce in individuals the sense of need and, indeed, of duty to manage, to govern themselves along certain lines, and within certain parameters. When we create the subject (genuinely or otherwise) as someone who has autonomy, influence, control and power, we can naturally and legitimately expect that they accept the responsibility and accountability which come with these.

By contrast with the top-down model of government described above, and by contrast with the bottom-up model, the lateral continuity model suggests subject ‘watching’ subject, colleague watching colleague. Watching in order to learn is no bad thing, in fact it is at the heart of education, and it can be seen to be a normative understanding of collegiality. However, watching in order to guard orthodoxy, and to identify conflict with orthodoxy, can be dangerous in an environment where it may be beneficial to have critique (distinguished from criticism). This type of watching – i.e. policing - can be read as a technology of panopticism. I earlier mentioned that the Panopticon was designed by Jeremy Bentham as his vision of a ‘model prison’⁴⁹. The panoptic gaze surrounds us in very obvious ways in day-to-day life e.g. in the form of CCTV cameras, which may or may not work, and is essentially the management of containment in such a way that the subject polices her or his own conduct. Bentham’s prison was essentially circular in shape. The guard was positioned in a tower in the middle of the circle, and the prisoners’ cells were arranged on the perimeter and were lit from behind the prisoner, while the prisoner remained in full view. The architecture ensured that the guard could see the prisoner, but the prisoner could not see the guard. Unaware of whether or not he was being ‘watched’ the prisoner ‘policed’ his own behaviour. The idea of the panoptic gaze is also evident in

⁴⁹ See <http://cartome.org/panopticon1.htm> (last accessed 1.9.10).

school architecture in the 19th century. High windows onto the corridor allowed the teacher to see in, but prevented the pupil from seeing out. The common design of a central hall with classrooms on the perimeter made it possible for a few teachers to have a view of large numbers of pupils. The panoptic gaze ensured that people were conscious of ‘perhaps’ being watched, and, in consequence, their behaviour altered and compliance followed; it was the impression of being watched which was the controlling influence. The psychological panoptic effect is as strong as the physical effect. Examination results, degrees of cooperation among colleagues, a lack of willingness to critique the latest ‘fad’ in education for fear of being exposed as subversive, or even unprofessional, all have the potential to keep people ‘in line’.

The discourse of collegiality introduces a subtlety into the mix, whereby the individual feels not only accountable to their masters, but also to their peers. The linguistic device attaches conveniently to the idea of professionalism to the extent that to be non-collegiate is to be non-professional. In one sense, in an organisational context which remains hierarchical, peer accountability can be an extremely powerful force, and one which, if harnessed by traditional management technologies, could be extremely effective in sustaining a prevailing hegemony. The context becomes one in which panopticism flourishes, where colleague manages and watches colleague, and adherence to the prevailing orthodoxy is assured through a fear of placing one’s head too far above the parapet or letting the collective collegium down (Humes, 2000). In this reading of collegiality, the individual professional voice is silenced by an expected respect for the louder and stronger voice of the collegium, which draws its breath from the spaces and limits of acceptable speech – the prevailing orthodoxy or discourse.

In its current form collegiality presents itself as a device supposedly aimed at sustaining democratic conditions, in which professionals can function and contribute i.e. normative understandings and principles which I set up in my working definition earlier. It promises the norms outlined earlier, i.e. those of participation, consultation and voice in the development of the enterprise of education. Underneath however, and from a more critical, deconstructive reading, we should be alert to the relationship between collegiality and the technologies of power and control discussed above. Collegiality can be uncovered as a device by which control is very subtly exercised in a way which has individual subjects believing that they have a voice when in fact they do not. This control has the twin effect of managing the prevailing agenda, and as I will show in Chapter 5, acting as a human resource management device. Despite its appeals to democracy, participation,

voice, autonomy, professional license and contribution on the part of constituent subjects within a system, collegiality can also be seen to be both a discourse and a technology which can have a powerful controlling influence over what is accepted, acceptable, permitted or permissible. Considered from these angles we encounter a concept which emerges less as a conduit for democratic practice and social justice and more as a technique or art of government or control - the conduct of conduct. Is this redeemable in the interests of truly democratic and shared views on what schools can, and should, do.

Collegiality, viewed as a discourse, is a technology by which a teaching force is Managed. The nature of this Management is focussed more on the relationship of the teacher to a pre-existing agenda than on control visibly exercised. Collegiality on this reading is more about the teacher acceding to what is in place, rather than about their right and duty to play a part in creating the agenda along with other stakeholders and collegium members. The upshot of this is that collegiality is not being 'managed' – in the sense of being 'achieved' - but it is being Managed in the sense that it is being controlled, and directed by a discourse, and by the way discourses behave.

This last assertion is a strong one, and one which will require some argument. My view is that collegiality is being understood and applied in particular ways to school management. In the following Chapter, I move on from conceptual and theoretical groundwork to look at evidence to support my assertion. Chapter Five will discuss the origins of collegiality and how it has been promoted. It will seek to draw on evidence from policy documentation, and from texts which are influencing the practice of education, certainly at the level of the school, but also at the levels of policy direction.

Chapter Five

The origins and promotion of the discourse of collegiality

An idea whose time has come

Collegiality is an idea whose time has come. But where has it come from in recent times? I am interested in uncovering the source of the idea given its influence as a discourse on the practice of teachers and on educational policy more widely. As I approach this chapter, it may be helpful to remind the reader of its purpose. The chapter comes at a stage in the dissertation where, having considered the issues arising from collegiality as a concept and a discourse, I now confront the research questions which I set up in Chapter Two namely: where has the discourse of collegiality come from and how has it been promoted?

I have discussed collegiality as a concept (Chapter Three); collegiality can also be understood as a discourse (Chapter Four). Thus I have drawn on two distinct but complementary traditions in philosophy i.e. the analytic tradition and the continental tradition. I accept that concepts invoke understandings and meanings and, at one level, tempt us towards a belief in something which is absolute, but I acknowledge that discourses have effects on people; discourses shape practices and behaviours and they emerge as a result of change – often a combination of small changes rather than ‘big’ change – if we are to understand Foucault’s position correctly. However, by re-conceptualising concepts, and by engaging with them with the benefit of philosophical tools, we can expose problems relating to the possibility of a fuller account. Similarly, by positioning collegiality as a discourse rather than as a concept, and by engaging with it through continental approaches to philosophy, we can come to understand what it *does* as distinguished from what it *is* and what it might claim to be. I now intend to explore the question: from where has the current prevailing and influential discourse of collegiality come, (the first part of my first research question as described in Chapter Two) recognising that it is currently being offered to, and promoted within, the educational community as a modernising solution and a key to a climate of success and improvement in our schools.

Where has the discourse of collegiality come from?

I now focus on the source of the discourse of collegiality, the drivers behind it, and the motivation for developing a collegiate mindset in schools. I have already referred to what appears to be a level of academic interest in collegiality in the 1980s and 1990s.

Collegiality, during this period, features as an area of interest in many 'university' or 'college' texts, and as a key idea in the academic study of educational management and administration. Now back on the educational scene, collegiality is again drawing the attention of the policy community and the community of practice, more than the academic community. As it is manifest today, its relationship with other processes relating to the direction of schools and teachers' work cannot be ignored. Collegiality is now on the lips of practitioners rather than in the writings of theorists, and this in itself is, as I have suggested, an area worthy of serious attention. It would be best not to have one without the other; collegiality undertheorised may be ineffective, if not harmful, while theory which does not impact on practice in a positive way may be pointless and open to the criticisms of those who see educational research as nothing more than academic or theoretical self-indulgence.

The relatively recent re-emergence of collegiality as an issue for educational administration and management of schools has been located by some within the pay and conditions settlement known in Scotland as McCrone, but it has its roots elsewhere. McCrone and post McCrone developments acted as a conduit by which collegiality came to be more easily advanced and more attractive to a profession which was being subjected to the pressures and processes of modernisation. Collegiality (and its current effects) is both pre-McCrone in one sense and neo-McCrone in another, for collegiality as an impetus for school management has been around for some time. For example, writing in 1991 Smyth suggested that:

Few educators will disagree that the issue of collegiality is squarely back on the educational agenda again (...) albeit in the company of terms like 'school-based management', (...). There will be much less agreement on why. What we *can* say is that this reincarnation of an educational concept that has been around for a long time is that it is enjoying its new-found popularity at precisely a time of massive international reform and re-structuring of schools aimed at ensuring that schools more efficiently and effectively satisfy national economic priorities (Smyth, 1991: 324).

Although Smyth does not elaborate upon the question of with whom the ‘issue’ or ‘educational concept’ has become popular, his extended comment locates collegiality somewhere in a relationship with the educational management agenda, efficiency, effectiveness and the economy. This complements Little’s observation that research “points consistently to the potential *educational* [my emphasis] benefit of vigorous collegial communities” (1990b: 917). Little points to the importance of “professional community” being directly related to key aspects of the school improvement agenda. For her the teaching process should include, and would benefit from, efforts to “question ineffective teaching routines, examine new conceptions of teaching and learning, find generative means to acknowledge and respond to difference and conflict, and engage actively in supporting professional growth” (Little, 1990b: 917).

Smyth’s observation locates collegiality in the mix of approaches to modernisation and to the alignment of education and ‘economic priorities’, while Little’s view leaves some space for a more normative understanding as an approach to school management, her view being that such an impetus is in the interests of teacher development and improvement in school performance for the right reasons. Her claim regarding the influence of the collective questioning of teachers as having the potential to influence improvements in pedagogy is attractive to a critical reflective teacher, but the question of whether her understanding of collegiality of this nature actually matches lived collegiality in the current Scottish school context is one which begs examination and will feature more in Chapter Six. In contrast to Little’s view, one senses in Smyth’s a suspicion that collegiality is being aligned with a performative imperative emerging in educational policy and planning over the last three decades - policy and planning emanating from political concerns. Whatever the case, collegiate approaches are the idea of the time. Reinken (1998) further agrees that “in the last two decades [...] professional collegial relationships [have been] suggested as one way to reduce teacher isolation presently found in schools, and to improve the *image* [my emphasis] of the profession as a whole (Reinken, 1998: 3). Reinken argues (drawing on Little, 1990b) that:

(....) these relationships help teachers cope with the complex, non-routine work that requires them to adapt flexibly and quickly to varied and specific demands (....)
 In general, collegiality is thought to enhance the combined capacity of groups and organisations. In other words, advocates have imbued collegiality with a sense of virtue (Little, 1990: 509 quoted in Reinken, 1998: 4).

In Reinken's view there are a variety of reasons for adopting collegiate approaches in schools. Firstly (and confusingly) she claims to be concerned for 'image'. This is interesting, in that we live in an age where image and spin are becoming all important – perhaps more important than substance and truth. Secondly, Reinken sees collegiate approaches as 'facilitating flexibility' and adaptability to demand and, thirdly, and perhaps more in tune with the normative understandings of collegiality, she recognises that collegiality has the potential to enhance 'combined capacity' and serve as a 'virtue'⁵⁰.

These contributions recognise the association of collegiality with a climate within which education came under the eye of policy-makers who sought to identify and argue for the relationship between educational inputs and outputs in the interests of contribution to economic success. It emerged in a time when education was coming under the influence of a climate of performativity and was becoming overtly politicised.

Few educators in Scotland would deny that collegiality understood in such terms is a prominent feature of management discussion at school, school cluster and local and central government levels. In Scotland, such popular and sustained reference to collegiality is a relatively new phenomenon, but Hargreaves (as well as those others cited above) recognises that collegiality has been influential for much longer than this. Writing in the same period of time as Smyth, Hargreaves notes:

Collegiality is rapidly becoming one of the new orthodoxies of educational change and school improvement [...] (It) forms a significant plank of policies to restructure schools from without and reform them from within [...] While collegiality is not itself the subject of any national, state, or provincial mandates, its successful development is viewed as essential to the effective delivery of reforms that are mandated at national or local levels. Among many reformers and administrators, collegiality has become the key to change (Hargreaves, 1991: 48).

Hargreaves' observation that collegiality is not itself the subject of any national, state, or provincial mandates is interesting in itself when we are looking at the source of the discourse. Collegiality has not been legislated for - it has emerged, and there almost appears to be a degree of spontaneity associated with it. His reference to collegiality being

⁵⁰ Ihara has also positioned collegiality as a 'professional virtue'.

‘orthodoxy’ implies that it is the only true show-in-town and its relationship to policy, from without and within, is relevant to the developing discussion of the source of the discourse. Although these observations are now dated⁵¹, they are most pertinent to educational management today, in the sense that they sum up a spirit of the age which is influencing policy and practice. The idea of community, referred to by Little (2001: 917), has become prominent in its own right in schools - in different ways and in different contexts – and the capacity of the school to develop community is regarded as a measure of the effectiveness of the leadership of the Head Teacher, which in turn is linked to the effectiveness of the school. According to Little, “when teachers collectively question ineffective teaching routines, examine new conceptions of teaching and learning, find generative means to acknowledge and respond to difference and conflict, and engage actively in supporting professional growth” (Little (2001: 917), conditions for improvement in teaching fall in to place. This assertion, and assertions like it, have been appropriated to respond to the “urgency associated with contemporary reform movements, especially those targeted at persistent achievement disparities, [it] has intensified pressures on teachers and fuelled policy interest in the collective capacity of schools for improvement” (Little (2001: 917)). I will now show how the discourse of collegiality is associated with the school reform and improvement agenda in Scotland.

A Teaching Profession for the Twenty-first Century: McCrone

There is a popularly accepted but under-critiqued assumption that collegiality is a “central element” (MacDonald, 2003: 413) in the McCrone settlement (Scottish Executive, 2000a, Scottish Executive, 2000b) and the subsequent agreement (Scottish Executive 2001) reached on teachers’ pay and conditions in Scotland (hereinafter McCrone). This episode of reform of teachers’ conditions of service was a significant one in central and local government negotiations with the teaching workforce in Scotland. A key aspect was its reconsideration of the management structures in schools as well as remuneration and conditions of employment for Scotland’s teachers. Over and above this normal outcome of ‘industrial’ unrest, the McCrone settlement took matters further by re-envisaging the negotiating relationship and machinery between teachers and local authorities, and resulted

⁵¹ Much of the literature referring to collegiality in schools is dated from the 1980s and 1990s. There is a less than expected availability of contemporary reference to collegiality as a practice in educational management even in recent texts and journals. Searches of library databases do not come up with much in recent years. From 2000 onwards there are important comments which seek to take a more critical view of collegiality, challenging some of the more positive presumptions about its potential as an impetus for good school governance. It is as if the policy community in schools is embracing an idea which has receded to some extent in the academic community.

in local authorities restructuring school management processes along lines very different from those in the past⁵². The previous significant settlement for teachers – resulting from the Main Enquiry⁵³ (Main, 1986) had introduced the position of Senior Teacher (ST). McCrone sought to remove tiers of management (in particular the posts of Assistant Principal Teacher (APT), Assistant Head Teacher, and Senior Teacher, and introduced the post of Chartered Teacher, as a way of properly remunerating teachers who wished to stay in the classroom and develop as high quality, and exemplary, chalk-face practitioners. The post of Chartered Teacher has attached to it a requirement for rigorous professional development up to the level of Masters Degree standard. It had been recognised that while Main had envisaged that the senior teacher post would fulfil this function, it was often appropriated in schools by Head Teachers to create a quasi-management position; Senior Teachers had, in many cases, acquired a management role⁵⁴. Alternative routes into management posts, as career moves, were a cause for concern in that such pathways often took the best teachers from the classroom and also perpetuated a situation in which schools were becoming top heavy with managers - a financial issue, as much as an organisational one. There is no doubt that McCrone sought to ‘flatten’⁵⁵ management structures in schools, keep good teachers in the classroom, and in so doing force local authorities (under pressure from fiscal scrutiny from within their own administrations and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) to restructure the management of, in particular, secondary schools. The subsequent restructuring which took place in the vast majority⁵⁶ of Scottish local authorities, radically altered the department-centred structure of the school and paved the way for subject specialities to be grouped (sometimes on the basis of a dubious rationale), and to come under the management of one, rather than several departmental managers, becoming ‘faculties’⁵⁷. There was clearly an implication here in terms of cost-cutting, but MacDonald suggests further:

⁵² This has been particularly true of management arrangements in secondary schools.

⁵³ The Main Enquiry was a review of teacher pay and conditions in Scotland in 1986 undertaken by Sir Peter Main and his committee. Elsewhere in this dissertation I refer to another ‘main’ report by which I mean the principal and original McCrone report document. Where **M**ain is capitalised I refer to the 1986 document. Reference to the McCrone document will use the word ‘main’ (un-capitalised) as an adjective.

⁵⁴ One of the early criticisms of the position of Senior Teacher was that it was immediately seen by Head Teachers as an opportunity to introduce another layer of management into the school. This was not how Main had imagined it; the purpose of the post was to encourage accomplished teachers to pursue an enhanced remuneration in the context of class teaching.

⁵⁵ I am not sure if McCrone used this word, but it certainly features in the day-to-day discussions of teachers when McCrone is discussed.

⁵⁶ Not all Scottish Local Authorities have undertaken such restructuring although the majority have.

⁵⁷ Some Councils adopted the term faculty to refer to the grouping of hitherto discrete subject departments. Other resiled from using this work opting instead for ‘curriculum groupings’.

Collegiality was cited in the post-McCrone Agreement as a vital quality for a professional teaching force in Scotland in the twenty-first century. The Agreement *directed* [my emphasis] schools to henceforth operate more collegially and it was anticipated that this recommendation, alongside the new two-tier promotion system, would facilitate the transformation of the currently hierarchical school culture into a more collegiate one (MacDonald, 2003: 413).

MacDonald's association of McCrone with the call for collegiality is contestable, since the term 'collegiality' appears in a surprisingly limited number of occasions in either the Report or the Agreement, and not at all in the Appendices. This notwithstanding, there is a received view that collegiality is heavily implied in the approaches suggested by the McCrone Report and documentation emanating from the implementation of its recommendations. It can be read, from the reduction in management posts in secondary schools and from the emergence of the new level of Principal Teacher within the primary sector, that there may have been an expectation that colleagues would begin to reconsider their responsibilities and come to work in collegiate ways (in the cooperative understanding of collegiate); to claim that McCrone 'directed' this is overstated. It would be more accurate to observe that McCrone prepared the way for (and encouraged) what is now termed 'collegiality', and that collegiality has indeed become a pervasive discourse which has emerged following the Report, in ways which are likely to affect the lives and the work of teachers. By indeed 'flattening' the management structures, and redefining the role of the teacher required for the new context of the twenty first century, McCrone put in place the necessary conditions for the emergence of a climate conducive to collegiality - but collegiality conceived of in a technical sense, rather than in the more normative understandings I have highlighted earlier. Whether directly or indirectly, the use of the terms of collegiality has increased enormously; collegiality has become a 'professional' buzzword in education. To this extent, the McCrone episode paved the way for 'collegiate-speak' to feature; the sufficient conditions for collegiality (in a managerialist sense) came from other key sources.

The conditions for the successful deployment of the discourse of collegiality came firstly, I suggest, from teachers themselves who became persuaded by the language of collegiality. I am suggesting (without seeking to be insulting) that this acceptance was as the result of a lack of critical scrutiny of the kind this dissertation seeks to undertake. Teachers have been attracted to the terms of collegiality, which are emotionally appealing and thought to be sufficiently distanced from the management speak of the 1980s and 1990s. Collegiality

strikes some accord with professional identity in a way that management, administration and leadership did not.

Secondly, the discourse and influence of collegiality has come from teacher trade unions. The attraction of collegiality was further enhanced by the extent to which it was embraced by those who represented the teachers' interests - the professional organisations – the Educational Institute of Scotland, (EiS) and (perhaps to a lesser extent) the Scottish Secondary Teachers Association (SSTA). The detail of 'The Agreement' (Scottish Executive, 2001) has much to do with non-pedagogical issues such as the limitations of power on both unions and management 'sides.' It reconceived the negotiation processes for future agreement, disagreement, or formal dispute, and it introduced a plethora of 'collegiate conditions' which have much to do with power-relations and less (in my view) to do with professional behaviour insofar as it has the potential to develop the climate for genuine collegiate engagement in schools.

Thirdly, collegiality is an idea which seems to have captured the imagination of local government in Scotland. There has been a considerable degree of pressure on local authorities to reduce the number of managers - particularly in secondary schools. The willingness with which most local authorities promoted management restructuring was indicative of an inherent attraction whether for financial benefit, or for power and control reasons. Interestingly, the flattening of the hierarchical model within schools was not always matched by a similar restructuring exercise in education services within local government, where, some argue, the number of Quality Improvement Officers (QIOs) remains disproportionately high, and therefore expensive. Education services within local government remain bureaucratic, and the re-labelling of 'Advisers' as 'Quality Improvement Officers' in most councils, is of interest in itself. There is a paradox in that at the school level where collegiality is being encouraged, a language rooted in non-educational contexts has emerged. At the centre, we have the Inspectorate inspecting not only the detail of the school experience, but also the extent to which schools are managed collegially.

Fourthly, there is evidence of a grander discursive shift and management narrative, influencing the educational policy community at macro level (national and international). The discourse can probably only function if it is understood at the grander (macro) level. The potency of this, and indeed of any discourse, is that it achieves recognition and acceptance by all within its sphere of influence. This is to say that the teachers, the unions and the other policy players, have to inhabit the discourse if it is to be effective. Implied in

this is my view that the discourse of collegiality has been highly effective in both its promotion, and its influence, since discourses can fail when they are uncovered as forces which not only exist as texts, but as devices which change people and their behaviours.

The emergence of the discourse of collegiality is evidenced by the extent to which it has come to occupy the minds, speech and actions of teachers (more about this in Chapter Six). It is more speculative to suggest that the discourse has been ‘Managed in’, but the creation and living of the discourse are iterative processes. The more collegiality is talked and lived, its discursive formation matures, and the more it is inhabited and lived by those under its influence. Whether it has been deliberately manufactured by those in the position to influence “the inputs, processes and outputs of education” (Archer 1979: 1) is one question, but there is no doubt that it is now recognised as being a key discourse in the educational policy, practice and management community. However, those governing and practising education have to be alert to the traps into which they, and the vogue for collegiality, might fall. There has been a history of disagreement between educational management and teacher interest groups in Scotland which has often thwarted government ambition in relation to school policy, and politicians and administrators are alert to the need to keep teachers and their unions ‘on side’. Smyth (1991) discusses the relationship between the purposes of education from an economic perspective and the control of teachers’ work. He highlights collegiality as having some relevance to these by asserting that:

... collegiality which is becoming something of a new orthodoxy so far as educational policymakers are concerned.... [is founded on an] implicit presumption [that it has] the potential to *unleash* (my emphasis) the kind of teacher creativity necessary to produce the kinds of educated labour required for economic recovery” (Smyth, 1991: 323).

This is implied in Smyth’s comment, that the re-emergence of collegiality coincides with “massive international reform and re-structuring of schools, aimed at ensuring that schools more efficiently, and effectively, satisfy national economic priorities” (Smyth, 1991: 324). Smyth worries further about the “forms of contrivance and the shallow participative pretence being suggested”, and claims that such approaches fall “far short of being the effective mechanism being touted, in some quarters, for educational and economic revitalisation” (Smyth, 1991: 323).

The relationship between economic prowess and education is not new. It is widely recognised that education has become significantly politicised in the past three decades. This association has become very real in the eyes of politicians, economists, and policymakers in education, at the macro level. The period since (approximately) the seventies has witnessed increased political interest in education, (Apple 1989, Bash and Coulby 1989, Dale 1989) and this has been a feature in many developed democracies (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1992). This political attention also reflects a climate of performativity and accountability which can be seen to link to the grander narrative which attaches education to economic success. The second chapter in the McCrone Report is called 'Education and the Economy' (Scottish Executive, 2000a: 4). This linkage has implications for education at all levels; at the level of the curriculum, it has implications which relate to content and emphases, at the level of management are issues relating to cost/benefit and a consequential demand for tiers of accountability, and at the level of the teacher the implication is that the teacher's role has to be re-conceptualised. This itself generates a discourse, that of the 'Teacher for the 21st century', which itself is a concept under-analysed, and a discursive device that shrouds an attempt to construct a teacher for a specific educational context, and for an agenda established remotely from the views and professional engagement of the teacher. My understanding of the emergence of the discourse of collegiality is that it is at once a discourse and a technology for the reform of the teacher and the control of teacher work aligned with the context (social, political, cultural) within which it operates. Analysts of educational policy have recognised that policy rarely develops in isolation from its broader contextual space. I agree with Archer's observation that:

Education has the characteristics it does because of the goals pursued by those who control it [...] change occurs because new goals are pursued by those who have power to modify education's previous structural form [...] education is fundamentally about what people have wanted of it and have been able to do to it (Archer, 1979: 1).

In its current formation as a discursive device, collegiality is best understood when viewed against a backdrop of educational policy development and increased political involvement in policy and practice. This perspective is necessary in order to trace the genesis of the current constructions of collegiality, given that other managerial impetuses can be associated with prevailing discourses and policy emphases, and that these come to dominate and influence the discursive and operational context.

In the 1980s and 1990s the educational community witnessed a specific emphasis in schools which privileged ‘management’ as a device by which the educational ills of society could be eradicated. This approach was typical in other public (and private) sector enterprises, (Pignatelli, 1994) but in relation to education it came to inveigle itself upon the teaching profession. This uncritical approach to school management found no favour with the profession, and in the nineties we saw ‘leadership’ emerging in the popular discourse. Leadership seems can be considered a softer, apparently more ‘humane’⁵⁸, term and one lacking the pejorative associations of ‘management’; while it is commonly a compliment to be deemed a leader, it may be less so to be labelled a manager). Towards the end of the 1990s a further discursive shift occurred, with this leadership emphasis changing to that of ‘distributed’, ‘shared’ and ‘distributive’ leadership - these qualifying adjectives being associated with a move towards a climate of participation and democracy in schools. However, as I have argued, it is since the turn of the millennium that an increasing emphasis on the need for collegial approaches to schools has emerged. Again, this shift is advanced on the back of assumptions about the value of participative approaches, professional emancipation, and recognition of the contribution of individual teachers to the educational agenda: this prospectus for collegiality is written in much the same terms already offered in my provisional description of a normative understanding of collegiality. The application of concepts such as management, leadership and distributed leadership has been subjected to some detailed scholarly scrutiny (Barker 1997, Glatter 1999, Wright 2001 and Leithwood and Riehl 2003) which has revealed a discernible emphasis on their use as discursive devices. Often we can see these concepts advanced on the back of an argument which seems benign at worst, and utterly supportive and emancipatory at best. When we dig deeper, we see inconsistencies and problems alongside evidence of the very concepts being appropriated for the exercise of power and control, and the management of a specific educational agenda.

At the more local level, this agenda has been introduced to teachers by specific discourses of educational management (Humes, 2000) which, as I have suggested in Chapter Four,

⁵⁸ Greenfield’s and Ribbins’ book (1993) - drawing on his (Greenfield’s) lectures in the early 1970s is entitled “Educational Administration: towards a Humane Science”. Greenfield was one of the scholars to give early attention to the phenomenology of the organisation and an early contributor to discussion of subjective models of management. Bush (1986, 1995) makes reference to Greenfield when he refers to subjective models of educational management. Greenfield drew our attention to something ‘unexpectedly human’ within what we call the organisation. Greenfield’s contribution to the debate was delivered in a paper given at the International Intervisitation Programme conference hosted by the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and the British Educational Administration Society (BEAS), held in Bristol in July 1974. The second stage of the conference took place in Glasgow and the third in London all during the same month and year.

enact themselves on people and take control over them, often in very subtle ways. These discourses include the discourse of management which claims that any problem can be managed away; the discourse of leadership which suggests leadership is at the heart of all good schools and every teacher is a leader; leadership is an unquestionable force for good, and the discourse of excellence, whereby excellence is positioned as the elixir of all that is worth aiming for in education. Seeing collegiality in this light Smyth (1991: 324)

propose[s] that the widespread rekindled interest in teacher collaboration⁵⁹ is neither incidental nor accidental, but that it is part of a broader strategy (deliberate or otherwise), to harness teachers more effectively to the work of economic reconstruction.

Thus, to recognise the workings of the discourse of collegiality we need to recognise two complementary strands. There are socio-economic pressures for modernisation and control, and there are currents of resistance. In order to overcome the current of resistance, discursive devices in the form of language (or texts in the more generous sense) have a role to play in promoting, advancing and sustaining a discursive shift, by which the preferred discursive turn surfaces and floats. In short, the discourse of collegiality has been managed by players in the educational policy arena. These players have drawn on the normative claims made for collegiality, but have contributed to the bastardisation of the term, in order to align its influence and effect with the purposes of those who control the inputs, processes and outputs of the education system. The discourse has come not so much directly from McCrone, but from yet another shift in the discourse of educational management. As I write, a recent change of Government at Westminster might imply further discursive shifts if trends towards the New Right and post Thatcherism emerge again.

The manifestation of the discourse of collegiality is evidenced in the ways in which teachers have come to inhabit the discourse, speak the discourse, embrace the language of the discourse and are 'lived by' (Ball, 1994: 49) the discourse. As Foucault put it:

Discourses are practices that form the objects of which they speak.... Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention (Foucault, 1977: 49).

⁵⁹ This is one example of many in which writers use the terms 'collaboration' and 'collegiality' almost interchangeably. Michael Fielding (1999) has a real 'swipe' at Little (various) when she does this. It highlights two things. Firstly the lack of conceptual clarity about what collegiality is and, secondly the convenience of a specific definition of engagement which suggests consensus rather than debate. See Humes (2009) on Collaboration at <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6011360>, last accessed 21.9.09.

Or as Ball (1994: 49) has put it: “[Discourse is] irreducible to language and to speech” it is 'more' than that. “*We do not speak a discourse, it speaks us....*” The concealment of “their own invention” is a fascinating aspect of discourses and one which is highly relevant to this present discussion.

Through discursive techniques there appears to be emerging an acceptance that collegiality in schools is a good thing, and a subsidiary point in this dissertation suggests that it is a perception which, for many teachers, has no critical, theoretical or intellectual foundation. This observation accords with the last of Humes’ questions, (“Are approaches to it anti-intellectual?”) and with several of the strands in the questions posed by Smyth. One can understand how, to teachers, the notion of collegiality is an appealing one. Teachers can be sold on the definition that collegiality equals participation, which equals a concession on the part of management that teachers have some say in how their schools are run; this is true up to a point. The confidence which teachers may enjoy in the idea of collegiality is bolstered by a confidence which teacher trade unions have in the notion. As a term, collegiality enjoys a ‘softness’; it is sufficiently less pejorative than leadership, (distributed or otherwise) and significantly less pejorative than management. There is an emotional appeal to it and it seems in some way more humane and respectful to professionally staffed contexts (Hughes, 1988). By contrast, ‘management’ and ‘leadership’ smack, respectively, of being told-what-to-do, or of taking a degree of ‘formal’ responsibility for something. ‘Administration,’ in the Scottish context, has remained sufficiently distinct from its understanding in the USA, by remaining more concerned with things rather than people – although there was, at one stage, a professional organisation called The British Educational Administration Society. In Scotland, key discursive shifts relating to the direction and control of teachers’ work and schools moved from management (1970s/1980s) to leadership (distributed/distributive) (1990s) and then to collegiate approaches⁶⁰.

⁶⁰ Attendant to this, and perhaps worthy of analysis at another time, is the rebranding of an organisation concerned with academic research into the field of school governance. What was the British Educational Administration Society (BEAS) became The British Education Management and Administration Society (BEMAS) before becoming the British Educational Leadership and Management Association (BELMAS). This rebranding, I argue, is not insignificant any more than is the decision (at conference 2008) by the Head Teachers’ Association of Scotland (HAS) to rename itself School Leaders Scotland (SLS). The relabelling, I suggest, reflected a preference on the part of Head Teachers to elevate their leadership role, (in light of the significant and current discourse of leadership) but it was more than this; the constitution of the organisation was altered to recognise that membership should be open to school leaders at all levels, in particular P.T.s. DHTs were already entitled to membership, non-teaching school managers (for example quasi-bursars) and indeed anyone who could argue for membership before a dedicated committee; but this is to digress. In both these cases we see the elevation of the idea of leadership – this in phase with policy development. Would it be too much to suggest a further renaming (perhaps BELCMS) the British Educational Leadership and Collegiate Management Society to reflect the ongoing discursive shifts?

Returning to McCrone, it must be (continually) recognised that the pay and conditions settlement of the early years of the new millennium was a sensitive and difficult negotiation. It was carried out in times of fiscal stress, and when New Labour, in the person of Tony Blair in particular, was seeking to engage educational policy and processes in reforming the economic prosperity of the nation, advancing the legitimacy and credibility of his new Third Way⁶¹, and in reforming public sector services. My earlier references to the effectiveness of the management of discourses can be illustrated by recalling the discourses and technologies advanced by the Thatcher administration and by Thatcher's acolyte in Scotland, Michael Forsyth⁶². The Thatcherite approach to policy was altogether different from what had gone before, and from what now pertains. The moves were altogether blunter, and there was a demand for (rather than an appeal for) reform. It was the Conservative (New Right) government which took accountability to new levels, created a market model in education (Pignatelli, 1994), challenged the unfettered professional licence of teachers, and became directly involved in curriculum design⁶³. This said it was a Scottish Labour government which in 2000 passed an Education Act, (The Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000) which demanded, with legislative authority, teachers' fullest attention to the raising of educational standards (National Priorities & Standards and Quality Statements) and to this extent has continued with the drive for standards and accountability, both from schools and local authorities.

But, in Scotland at least, under New Labour then, and the Scottish National Party (SNP) at present, there has been no vehement resistance to reform of the 'soul of the teacher' (Ball 1999) and the on-going demand for reform and improvement in educational provision. There is a strong body of opinion that teachers are still being reformed in the interest of aligning the education (school) service with the economy, as they were under the previous Conservative government. The difference, I suggest, is in how this has been done. The language of consensus, cooperation, consultation and collegiality is now central to this; "words and magic [are] one and the same thing" (Freud, 1922:13), and the 'C' words - the terms of collegiality (collegiality, collegial and collegiate) - are significant in garnering acquiescence and support, performing magic, and in mobilising the teaching force along certain desirable pathways of policy and practice.

⁶¹ See Giddens 'The Third Way' and 'The Third Way and its Critics' for an accessible account of Blair's vision. Blair was known to refer to Giddens as his 'favourite academic'. Also <http://www.netnexus.org/library/papers/3way.html> Last accessed 8.7.09.

⁶² Thatcher refers to Forsyth in the most positive of terms in 'The Downing Street Years'. "The real powerhouse for Thatcherism at the Scottish Office was Michael Forsyth...." Thatcher (1993: 620).

⁶³ Reference the 5-14 curriculum reforms in Scotland and the Education Reform Act (1988) in the context of England and Wales.

I have already suggested that collegiality can be seen to contribute to the control of teachers, the control of their work and the ultimate control of the “inputs, processes and outputs of education” (Archer, 1979). While I disagree with MacDonald (2003) that the McCrone agreement “directed” schools and teachers to become more collegiate, I do accept that the conceptual/political/financial fabric of the settlement recognised that the partnership between teachers and the national educational priorities required renovation. Schön⁶⁴ (1983) has drawn our attention to declining confidence in professionals in general. There is a literature which builds on his work, further describing the reduction in public and political confidence in teachers, and a corpus of data and opinion which points to efforts on the part of government to ‘take hold’ of teachers. Concern for the harmful potential of teacher autonomy, and the unfettered professional identity and privileges which they demand and have enjoyed, are well documented (Lawn and Ozga, 1986: 225, Bash and Coulby 1989). Lawn and Ozga have made reference to a “limited or licensed professionalism”. In “Unequal partners: teachers under indirect rule” (Lawn and Ozga, 1986) the authors draw on the term ‘indirect rule’ from the context of British colonial administration (see Smyth, 1991: 337)

in which [there] was the appearance of decentralization and devolution, with a quasi-autonomous role for the 'natives' which ensured their co-option, while the major powers of government remained firmly in British hands (Lawn and Ozga, 1986: 226).

Elsewhere, Lawn draws attention to what he sees as, a “mock partnership” (Lawn and Ozga, (1988) in Smyth (1991: 337), within which cooperation, collaboration and teamwork are elevated to the identity of true professional practice, when in fact they represent nothing other than “an ideological form of control, over how teachers relate to each other in the course of their work” (Smyth, 1991: 337). Smyth sees a shift in the controlling mechanisms in education. Writing from an Australian position, he does claim that such trends are becoming apparent across the world. Lawn and Ozga (1986) specify a "rejection of direct prescriptive controls" (Lawn & Ozga 1986: 226) and see an alternative process that is much more reliant on engineering broad forms of consensus (Smyth, 1991: 337). Lawn & Ozga (1988) note that, as with the colonial experience, emancipation is only for parts of the system - it does not mean endangering "real tactical control" (Lawn & Ozga 1988: 88), but rather dispensing with some of the more burdensome aspects of unnecessary central power. There are some resonances here when we consider initiatives in Scotland

⁶⁴ Schön’s seminal text draws attention to the declining public confidence in professionals and has become a key text in developing professional reflection in teachers – and indeed – other professionals.

such as Devolved School Management (DSM). To some extent, DSM is a useful concession to a Head Teacher. However, there are rules of engagement in relation to DSM which can hamper a Head Teacher's, or collegiate community's, capacity to imagine and create a school. The constraints on Head Teachers in terms of DSM can be viewed in parallel with other aspects of policy. Schools are becoming freer to do 'certain things,' (curriculum structures, staff appointments, incidental spending, and virement across budget headings). But these 'certain things' are more often than not insubstantial, and certainly nothing too far 'out of the box' would be countenanced by Head Teachers who are conscious of directors of education, who are equally conscious of local politicians and parents, who are, in turn, alert to the gaze of Scottish Ministers and Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (HMIe). To this extent, I can understand Lawn and Ozga's observation that the drive towards participation and collegiality may mask an appeal to teacher professionalism which recasts professionalism as a means of "controlling teachers ideologically [...]by means of finely tuned tactical control, in a system which now need[s] guiding not directing" (Lawn & Ozga, 1988: 88).

According to Smyth:

The shift in emphasis from *direct* to more *participative* forms of control has been an extremely deft slip of the hand. [...] we have come to embrace another form of professionalism that involves collective school-wide responsibility based on narrowly defined though complex tasks within a context of shared management functions, clearly defined and appraised (Smyth 1991:340).

In decidedly candid terms for a senior educational bureaucrat, Angus (1990) puts it:

Underpinning the paradigm is the belief that better performance will result from *sharper focusing on systemic priorities*. What is being devolved to schools is the actual authority (and capacity) to determine the way in which the school will achieve the agreed outcomes.

(Angus, 1990: 5, quoted in Smyth, 1991: 340 (Smyth's emphases)

I am suggesting more than Angus in claiming that not only are the outcomes pre-agreed, but the authority and the capacity for influencing the outcomes are being guided by the discourse of collegiality, in ways which threaten to silence the dissenting voice in the face of a Managed collegium. There is little doubt that schools are being given (at least the

impression of) autonomy in areas hitherto retained at local government, or central government, levels. Devolved School Management (DSM) represents a particular example of how government has resiled from direct prescription of what schools do. More specifically, within the policy community in Scotland at present, we see the emergence of a major curriculum reform – Curriculum for Excellence. Alongside this we see an emerging framework for assessment, the details of which - at the time of writing - have yet to be fleshed out. The approaches taken to delivering these policies differ markedly from those adopted at the time of Five to Fourteen reforms in the 1990s, and the national testing and assessment regime which ran parallel to it. In relation to educational policy in Scotland then, there is a sense in which direct, almost autocratic ‘Forsythian’ approaches have given way to more consensual approaches, although recalling Lawn and Ozga’s observation, access to discussion by teachers is often restricted to less substantial aspects of education and the concept of participation is only notional and gestural.

Returning to the question of where the discourse of collegiality has come from, I have suggested that the discourse cannot be seen to be a purely benign aspect of a reappraisal of the working conditions of teachers and might more be seen as an attempt to take control of their work. The policy shift, which sees collegiality as being elevated as the modern approach to school governance, is on the face of things attractive. However, I am arguing that it is allied with an agenda in which teachers’ work is increasingly under the direct control of those in the policy arena with a grander agenda than simply the quality of learning and teaching and a liberal curriculum. The related question of the interests served by the discourse of collegiality is the topic for Chapter Six, and the remainder of this chapter seeks to discuss the methods deployed in the promotion of Management of the discourse of collegiality. I turn from the question of whence the origins of the discourse to the second part of my first question: “How has it (the discourse of collegiality) been promoted?”

How has the discourse of collegiality been promoted in Scotland?

As my discussion of the origins of the discourse of collegiality has suggested, the discourse of collegiality, its capacity and potential having both positive and negative understandings, has been promoted neither collegially nor coherently. It has been promoted by drawing on the inference that it can be used as an approach that liberates the profession, and takes account of the stakeholder in the educational process. Its promotion has relied on under-critiqued and untested views about the possibilities and potential of collegiality. This is of concern since, as I illustrated in Chapters Three and Four, collegiality is far from simple either as a concept or as a discourse. I have argued above that the very Management of collegiality implies that it can be, conceivably, understood as an instrument (technology) by which educational outputs, inputs and processes may be directed and controlled. Like management, and various re-inventions of management in the past, collegiality is the current discursive device by which cooperation and compliance in the teaching workforce is engendered. I now will consider a text which has escorted the discourse of collegiality into management discussions in Scottish secondary schools in the wake of McCrone. I have chosen what I believe to be a significant and influential intervention in the promotion of collegiality ‘School Leadership and Collegiality’ (hereinafter referred to as the Teachers’ Agreement Communication Team (TAC Team) paper, 2004). McPherson and Raab (1988) described what they saw as the existence of a “Policy Community” in educational policy-making in Scotland. In a seminal publication, Humes (1986) proposes the term ‘The Leadership Class in Scottish Education’. However, both views draw attention to a condition in policymaking whereby likeminded people come to occupy positions of influence in the arena of policy formulation and promotion. The discourse of collegiality can be attributed to a great extent to a ‘community,’ or ‘class,’ of educationalist in Scotland, and while this in itself need not be inherently harmful, what is of concern is that certain voices, in situations where policies emerge and eventually occupy the field of practice, might be excluded. What is interesting is that there prevails a consensus on the idea that collegiality is a necessary good. To bring about such a consensus is no easy feat in a public policy context, and would suggest that there is agreement in the political, civil service, professional and wider policy arena on what collegiality is and is capable of. Furthermore, there are groups and constituencies that are given the impression of being included, but who operate in a climate which effectively excludes them despite rhetoric to

the contrary. This idea links back to Lawn and Ozga's analogous idea of "the appearance of decentralization and devolution, with a quasi-autonomous role for the 'natives' which ensured their co-option, while the major powers of government remained firmly in British hands" (Lawn and Ozga, 1986: 226).

As the McCrone Enquiry evolved into 'The Agreement' reached between teachers' unions, local authorities and government, an additional layer of influence emerged in the form of the TAC Team⁶⁵ established in 2002 and active in the promotion of collegiality in the post-McCrone context. I have drawn on some of the work of the TAC Team to illustrate how collegiality has been promoted in the post (or neo) McCrone context.

The TAC Team described itself in a briefing paper:

[The] TAC Team was established last year as a partnership between Scottish local authorities and the Scottish Executive. The Team is based at COSLA's headquarters⁶⁶. All local authorities in Scotland, with the exception of Falkirk⁶⁷, have joined the Team and have made a contribution to the running of the Team based on teacher numbers in their area. The Scottish Executive has also committed £240,000 to the project (COSLA, 2003).

COSLA and Scottish Executive are two substantial members of the Scottish policy community, and their relationship to the Team promoting the fullness of the teachers' agreement is indeed of interest. COSLA describes itself as follows: "COSLA, is the representative voice of Scottish local government and also acts as the employers' association on behalf of all Scottish councils". It claims to operate in respect of a set of eight principles, three of which are to:

2. Represent the local authority interest.
3. Fully involve member Councils and individual elected members, as appropriate, to ensure that we are doing the things local government would wish to see us do and in the way it would wish to see us doing them.
4. Promote the local authority role/perspective; ensure that service delivery remains within a framework of local governance and protect against a centralising agenda.

⁶⁵ It would appear that this body had been 'reinvented' as the Teacher Capacity Team (TCT). Like the TAC Team this group had its own website (not always accessible), seemed to be based in COSLA and offered missives on matters relating to teacher contracts and relationships with the negotiating machinery arising out of McCrone. I would suggest that for a time this too became a part of the leadership class or policy community. Neither of these 'teams' (at point of submission of this dissertation) now exist (See note 67).

⁶⁶ Convention of Scottish Local Authorities.

⁶⁷ I am not sure what this says about Falkirk.

The Scottish Executive, the other member of the partnership, claims as its purpose: “To focus government and public services on creating a more successful country, with opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish, through increasing sustainable economic growth” (Scottish Government Website).

The authors therefore represent two very influential bodies in the policy community in Scottish education. Neither, however, represents teacher interest, nor do they seemingly draw too heavily on contributions from the academic community. The TAC Team paper does make the odd reference to literature but does so often in an apologetic manner, and as a gesture, rather than in a way which scaffolds its argument.

The aims of the Team are:

- to ensure a strategic focus remains on the overall aims of the Agreement *A Teaching Profession for the 21st Century*, in particular ensuring shared objectives of a world class education, which will fit all children well for the 21st Century, are met;
- ensure accurate, timely and consistent information on the Agreement is communicated to relevant interests, and good practice and the exchange of ideas is promoted;
- identify barriers to implementation and ensure appropriate action is being taken; and,
- review, monitor and report progress and implementation of the Agreement, at local authority and school level in particular (Teachers’ Agreement Communications Team – TAC (2003) – Briefing Paper 4).

One of the TAC Team’s early publications was a paper entitled, “School Leadership and Collegiality: Teachers’ Agreement Communication Team briefing paper 2004” (Hereinafter – TAC Team Paper). In this paper the following quotation from a working and influential secondary Head Teacher appeared: “[...] collegiality is not just a watchword taken from yet another official report but the clarion call that must lead us together further into this new millennium...” (Cunningham, 2004: 5).

Cunningham’s claim for the apparent inevitability of collegiality was made at the Head Teacher’s Association of Scotland (HAS) 2001 conference, but, thereafter, became the

opening quotation of the *'briefing paper* [emphasis added] 'School Leadership and Collegiality'. This document has 'no author,' and is one of several 'texts' uploaded to the Teachers' Agreement Communication Team (TAC Team) website⁶⁸ under a section specifically entitled 'Collegiality Toolkit'. Briefing is an interesting word. My day-to-day understanding of the term comes from viewing police or hospital dramas on television, and from films; in these contexts the 'briefing' is normally a delivery of a set of protocols or instructions, generally not up for negotiation; the police-room briefing is about telling the team how things stand - 'this is how it is folks!'

Cunningham's rather dramatic use of the word 'clarion' is a significant choice. Depending upon our dictionary, this can mean 'loud and clear', 'a shrill, narrow-tubed trumpet (used in war), or 'a rousing sound'. It may be that the notion of collegiality has come to inhabit Cunningham's school headship lexicon as a result of McCrone. I can trace a proliferation in references to collegiality since this time despite my previous observation that there was little specific reference to the term in the key McCrone documentation. For example, in a report intending to chart the progress and effectiveness of the McCrone agreement, HMIE (2006) produced 'Teaching Scotland's Children'⁶⁹ in 2006. In 2007 and 2008 there emerged a series of Guidance documents under the umbrella title of 'Journey to Excellence'⁷⁰. In each of these cases, the terms of collegiality feature more than they do in the original McCrone documentation.

Cunningham ought to have gone on to define collegiality. Popular views suggest, puzzlingly, that collegiality is the marrow of 'The Agreement'. However, there are only fourteen direct references to collegiality within the substantial McCrone Report of some 42,000 words. If collegiality is indeed central to the 'McCrone philosophy,' then it seems one has to look beyond the specific detailed nomenclature, and assume that collegiality is implied. However it is strange that such a substantial report, credited with heralding the epoch of collegiality in Scottish schools, makes very little direct use of the terms of collegiality. The author(s) of the TAC Team paper seem to have similar difficulty in terms of definition, despite the fact that the paper opens with an encouragingly assertive attempt

⁶⁸ There is now a group entitled the Teacher Capacity Team. Its website sometimes operates and sometimes does not. It is difficult to track down items and articles and that referred to above is now difficult to locate online (See note 65 on page 91).

⁶⁹ From 2002 to 2006 HMIE carried out a review of the implementation of the Agreement working in partnership with Audit Scotland to share research and findings. Audit Scotland produced a further report which accounted for the spending related to the Teachers' Agreement. "Teaching Scotland's Children" sets out the findings of the HMIE study which focused on the impact of the Teachers' Agreement on schools. Available at <http://www.hmie.gov.uk/documents/publication/hmietsc..html> last accessed 21.9.09.

⁷⁰ For more information on this significant plank of policy in Scottish schools see <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/journeytoexcellence/> last accessed 21.9.09.

at a clear interpretation. “Collegiality means a move away from an emphasis on all decision-making resting in the hands of one individual, towards a more shared and participative approach” (TAC Team Paper: 2).

Although not a particularly enlightening definition, and probably contestable, the paper at least attempts a working description. What emerges, however, is a clear sense that it too is lacking conceptual clarity, and it proceeds to wander aimlessly in a maze of positive descriptions of practices which call on popular, but not critically defined, understandings of collegiality. Of particular concern is the extent to which the paper develops a heavy reliance on the language of leadership (shared and otherwise) in advancing its case for enhanced and embedded collegiality.

The TAC Team paper (around six thousand words of it) makes five references to ‘collegiality’, sixteen to ‘collegial’, none to ‘collegiate’ and fifty-one references to leadership. It is clear that the writer is either deeply committed to a belief in the confluence of the concepts of leadership and collegiality, or conceptually confused. It is also clear from this paper, that ‘leadership,’ rather than ‘collegiality’, is of more central concern in the TAC Team’s discussion.

I have claimed that collegiality needs to be anchored in terms of its definition. This would allow for consistency in its interpretation, and the possibility of positioning it clearly on a spectrum of organisational theories as they apply to schools prior to it being interpolated into policy. I suggest that we could usefully perform a crude ‘search, find and replace’ operation on some key texts substituting ‘collegiality’ for ‘leadership’, and, I suggest, that the idea of collegiality, in the minds of those with responsibility for ‘briefing’ the profession is perhaps, worryingly, clouded.

The TAC Team papers have ‘no author’. Perhaps they have been prepared in the spirit of collegiality (by a particular collegium tasked with promoting collegiality) and represent an already determined collective position which is to be attributed to the TAC team, which, as we have seen, comes under the umbrella of COSLA, Local Authorities and central Scottish government.

‘School Leadership and Collegiality’ advises us that many schools in Scotland are engaging with the notion of collegiality and it draws attention to how it is aware of this:

... the TAC Team visited *fourteen* (my emphasis) very different primary and secondary schools⁷¹ that were identified by HMIE as being both successful and examples of what would be considered collegiate schools. *Head Teachers in each school were interviewed on how they develop or support collegial approaches and what they thought were the benefits of collegiality* (my emphases added) (TAC Team Paper: 7). In the process of these interviews [...] *limited to Head Teachers themselves, in two of the schools, one secondary and one primary, there was an opportunity to talk to a principal teacher.* Both gave perceptive and valuable insights into collegiality and future work [sic] would benefit from accessing the viewpoints and experiences of all those working in schools [my emphases added] (TAC Team Paper: 7).

In the 14 schools visited, only two principal teachers were spoken to. Furthermore, the paper does not elaborate upon the “valuable insights into collegiality” which these colleagues allegedly possessed; such insights might have been most helpful. Of further interest is that there emerges from this episode of ‘research’ the suggestion that HMIE are having their views on collegiality both considered, and incorporated, into developing ‘briefings’ and good practice guidelines.

Such engagement with the schools in the survey missed important opportunities to engage with teachers in exploring what collegiality really meant in a school. Either the group surveying the various instantiations of collegiality did not see the value of doing so, or for some reason avoided doing so. One is tempted to accuse the survey of a degree of stage management or contrivance. It is notable, for example, that it was promoted colleagues who were interviewed. The assumption seems to have been that it was the Head Teacher’s job to ‘develop’ collegiate approaches and then ‘support’ them. It was the perception of the Head Teachers which was sought in relation to the perceived benefits of collegiality, and, almost apologetically, it is acknowledged that an opportunity was taken to talk to ‘a principal teacher’. The schools selected for visits were schools previously identified by HMIE as examples of good practice in terms of the HMIE understandings of collegiality. There is more than a hint of constructed research and attempts at getting the answers required.

Elsewhere in the TAC Team paper is a reference to an observation by Day et al:

⁷¹ There are 2153 primary and 376 secondary schools and 193 Special schools in Scotland’s 32 local authorities, serving 681,573 pupils*. This does not include the independent sector. Available at: <http://scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/04/18170740/07412> (last accessed 16.7.10).

*Based on information on The Scottish Government Website on 16.10.10.

In a National Association of Head Teachers (NAS) study of 12 successful schools in England researchers found that there was:

[...] ample evidence that people were trusted to work as autonomous individuals, within clear collegial value frameworks which were common to all. There was a strong emphasis on teamwork and *participation* in decision making (*though heads reserved the right to be autocratic*). Goals were clear and agreed, communications were good and everyone had high expectations of themselves and others” (My emphases added). (Day et al, 2000, 162 quoted in School Leadership and Collegiality - TAC Team Paper: 3).

The term ‘autocratic’ jumps off the page. ‘Autocratic’ is an ‘old’ word, and probably one which would not even be used by ‘autocratic’ Head Teachers! Even in a managerialist climate, this word is most unusual in terms of its lack of place in ‘education-speak’ (or even management-speak). Furthermore, and confusingly, in purveying an argument for collegiality in the Scottish context, the anonymous author of the TAC Team paper draws heavily on another source which reports findings from research in England and Wales. The findings and publication of the TAC Team briefing paper hardly constitutes robust and persuasive research.

The TAC Team clearly associates collegiality with leadership - particularly leadership in its distributed constructions and understandings. Further scrutiny evidences an association with all that is good in the language of sound educational management practice: sharing, participation, involvement, contribution, empowerment and enablement, professional trust and so on. What is arguable is that these notions are not new, and should not appear to be new to any competent and reflective [Head] Teacher. They are, to use Foucault’s terminology, being reinvented, conserved, memorised, reactivated and re-appropriated and grouped under the cover of a new discursive shift – the discourse of collegiality. Is collegiality, as it is being promoted, really likely to make a worthwhile difference to the teacher, and the way the teacher has an influence over what they do in school? In the TAC Team paper one can identify constructions of collegiality which attach more readily to a pragmatic agenda, and an instrumental reading of the potential of collegiality as a model for engagement in a school, rather than to an aspiration by which schools might become attuned to the more normative understandings of collegiality which I established in my initial, normative definition.

In this chapter, I have argued that the origins of the influential discourse of collegiality in Scottish Education lay in large part in initiatives following the publication in April 2004 of the TAC Team paper ‘School Leadership and Collegiality’. I have given particular attention to this document given the unusual status it has as a ‘policy’ or ‘practice’ document. For example the front cover of this document bears the livery of the Scottish Executive⁷² and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities and both these key policy players claim full ownership thus⁷³:

This briefing note was prepared by the Teachers’ Agreement Communications Team (TAC Team). The Team is a partnership between Scottish local authorities, COSLA and the Scottish Executive. For further information or discussion, please contact....⁷⁴

‘School Leadership and Collegiality’ makes no mention of any involvement of teachers’ professional organisations, yet it seems unlikely that these bodies, as key members of the policy community, were not made aware of its detail prior to it being issued to schools and local authorities. I find it inconceivable that some kind of exchange has not taken place. My own view, drawn largely from direct personal experience, is that the unions have ‘bought into’ collegiality in a big way, but the motivations for so doing are attached to more popular and obvious understandings of union - management relations i.e. bargaining negotiation, conflict resolution and protection of conditions of service.

If indeed the teachers’ unions were not consulted in its development I would be concerned for two reasons. Firstly for an organisation using the term ‘partnership’ to describe its mode of operation, it seems odd that it would not consult ‘stakeholders’ and, secondly, in producing a paper on collegiality it has done so rather autocratically; its very development has not been undertaken at all in a collegiate manner.

However, a decade into the new millennium, I can discern a slight discursive shift which hints at the possibility of recognition of the more normative understandings of collegiality, in a more recent document. While I continue to argue that collegiality has, to some extent, been misappropriated by the motivations and purposes of Management

⁷² The devolved government for Scotland is responsible for most of the issues of day-to-day concern to the people of Scotland, including health, education, justice, rural affairs, and transport. The Scottish Government was known as the Scottish Executive when it was established in 1999 following the first elections to the Scottish Parliament. The current administration was formed after elections in May 2007 (Scottish Government Website).

⁷³ There has been a suggestion (in conversation only) that the paper was written by a former Divisional Education Officer (Glasgow) in Strathclyde Region.

⁷⁴ The names and contact details of two colleagues, both former Head Teachers, are given.

and human relations, a publication by HMIe⁷⁵ points to an awareness of the potential of collegiality as creative and potentially transformative (HMIe 2009).

In “Learning together: Improving teaching, improving learning: The roles of continuing professional development, collegiality and chartered teachers in implementing Curriculum for Excellence”, (hereafter ‘Learning Together’), inspectors point out that in an earlier review of McCrone and its implementation ‘*Teaching Scotland’s Children*’ (HMIe, 2007) they drew on work carried out between 2002 and 2006, which looked at the effectiveness of the McCrone settlement. HMIe recognised there that revised “career structures had broadened the opportunities for teachers in all sectors and at all levels to show collegiality” (HMIe, 2009: 5). While this paper (HMIe, 2007) made no real inroads into defining collegiality, the inspectorate seemed to recognise an underexploited potential dimension to collegiality, which could enhance learning, although they also noted that while there were signs of growing collegiality there had not yet been significant improvements in learning. In the 2007 paper HMIe recognised that other provisions emanating from McCrone also had the potential, often untapped, to enhance what they identified as emerging collegiate habits and practices.

In the publication from 2009, the inspectorate return to the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT) Code of Practice (hereafter Code of Practice) on collegiality to identify what they see as ‘good practice’. The SNCT Code specifies that evidence of collegiality includes instances where staff are able to contribute on a collegial basis to school activities and committees as well as policy and planning processes

While HMIe applaud the Code of Practice I am unconvinced that it seeks to focus more on the normative understandings of collegiality than it does on the professional organisation / management dimension. The language in the ‘Code’ is overly technical and is redolent of older times in teacher union / management relations. Reference is made to ‘trust’ but one reads this as being more concerned with manoeuvring by either side with the view to exploiting the other than as being related to professional trust at the level of the individual teacher. Collegiality is often related to the implementation of the agreement and the mechanical aspects of the conditions of service. Specific mention

⁷⁵ “Learning together: Improving teaching, improving learning: The roles of continuing professional development, collegiality and chartered teachers in implementing *Curriculum for Excellence*”.

is made of improved ‘industrial relations’ and ‘professional satisfaction’ for teachers and one can discern how these aspects of the teacher’s lifeworld might indeed evolve in such a climate. However the Code of Practice reads ultimately as more of a set of guidelines for trade union members than it does as a paper seeking to contribute to a reconceptualisation, indeed basic understanding, of collegiality in the more normative of senses. For example, references to ‘signed agreements’ and ‘joint secretaries’ suggest formality and technologies for managing relationships, legalities and contractual arrangements. Reference is made to consultation and participation which are, I would argue, meaningless unless they exist in a pre-existing climate where a different level of professional trust already exists. The Code of Practice concludes thus:

The collegiate school utilises and develops the skills, talents and interests of all staff and involves all staff in the key decisions affecting the life of the school as a whole. More broadly, the spirit of collegiality extends beyond teachers and support staff, and includes parents, pupils and partner agencies (SNCT).

Encouragingly, the reference to the spirit of collegiality gives cause to believe that there is a prevailing recognition that such a ‘spirit’ exists.

By-and-large a reading of this document implies that it is still being seen as an idea where involvement for involvement’s sake, and for ‘industrial relations’ purposes is being forestaged. As such it is failing to take full account of the very rich potential of collegiality as a new way of working to have an enhancing effect on the lives and learning experiences of teachers and pupils, which it underplays.

However, again encouragingly, the HMIe document goes on to flesh out its understanding of collegiality by describing what it sees as embedded examples in “all but a few schools” of collegiality working well. Examples of this include “good use being made of collegiate time” where “[t]ime is generally allocated⁷⁶ for whole staff activities, for example meetings, whole-school professional development events, and for departments, stage partners and working groups to meet”. HMIe see this as beneficial in not only promoting teamwork but in dismantling the barriers which have historically divided teaching and non-teaching colleagues.

⁷⁶ The allocation of this time is in most cases itself a collegiate activity that arises from the requirement for schools to have a Working Time Agreement (WTA). Unlike the post-Main developments the allocation of the balance of the contractual working week is no longer the business of the Head Teacher alone. This had been a major criticism of Planned Activity Time (PAT) which emerged post-Main. I would suggest however, that in practice in some schools there is the possibility that there remains very

HMIe go further to point out that they are now more attuned to a climate of collegiality that reaches beyond the human relations instantiation that I have highlighted. They point out that collegiality is about more than “just joint discussion and work which takes place during collegiate [activity] time” (HMIe, 2009: 24). Collegiality implies:

a climate of self-evaluation and a commitment to improving outcomes for learners [...] staff are more willing to share their strengths and do not find the identification of areas for development to be a daunting process. Staff [...] increasingly expect to be consulted and involved in decision-making. In [such] schools, staff are often fully involved in self-evaluation activities and in determining priorities for the improvement plan. This involvement has resulted in greater ownership of developments. Not all schools exhibit this practice, in which senior promoted staff have helped to create an ethos which is conducive to effective collegiate working, and some individuals find it difficult to enter fully into the spirit of collegiate working.

This suggests a more normative account of collegiality, which is beginning to emerge in practice. Interestingly, however, it is pointed out above that this operates in schools where “senior promoted staff have helped” create and maintain the ethos within which such practice can surface. Is this a suggestion that senior promoted staff have to Manage collegiality before collegiality features and is actually managed?

HMIe go on to describe how the schools they identified as exhibiting emerging good practice in collegiality are committed to communication and to shared learning between and amongst staff members. They talk of the importance of effective links between departments and managers and of the role of the local authority in ensuring teachers have the opportunity to meet to engage in pedagogical discussion as distinct from discussion focusing on power issues and conditions of service.

The evidence gathered in the lead up to this publication is based on visits to schools in every education authority in Scotland⁷⁷ and discussions with staff. We compare this with the visits to 14 schools by both the original McCrone committee and the TAC team and we get the sense of a collegiate approach to the investigation of collegiality which I claimed was lacking in the development of the TAC Team briefing.

⁷⁷ There are 32 Scottish Local Authorities. These replaced the 9 Regional and 3 Island Education authorities in Scotland which had existed from the 1970’s up until the 1996 Local Government (Scotland) Act.

Above and beyond this ‘collegiate approach’ to collegiality HMIE seem to begin to use the more normative type of language in their narrative. They refer to ‘atmosphere’, ‘ownership’, ‘collective problem and relate these qualities as having a bearing on learning and teaching. Collegiate approaches are cited as having the capacity to help teachers improve ‘children’s learning’, help teachers learn, and develop and improve and sustain levels of high professional self-esteem and morale and as such the normative understandings invoked by, for example Little (1982), are identified. Altogether the tone of the HMIE paper (2009) is more aligned with a normative, ‘attractive’ understanding of collegiality which belongs in a professional context where learning and development is at the heart of what everyone does.

The HMIE paper gives me some hope that there is an emerging recognition that collegiality has a very real potential to be something which will improve learning, teaching and education. The flavour of the document is quite different from others which seem to position collegiality as a technology for managing ‘niceness’ and conflict and more as a force for good in a professional educational space.

However, ‘Learning Together’ is a document that consists in 33 pages. Of these, 5 pages deal with matters of introduction and context. 18 pages deal with CPD, address collegiality and 4 deal with chartered teachers. Does this indicate that collegiality is yet an organisational dimension which is still less easy to talk about than others? HMIE say nicer and more encouraging things about its potential but they do I suggest fail to fully engage conceptually with the idea in a way which could even more fully encourage discussion within the profession. All this said, it is encouraging that by contrast with the discourse surrounding collegiality in the early years of the decade (specifically McCrone the TAC Team Paper and the SNCT pronouncements on collegiality), ‘Learning Together’ embraces the spirit of collegiality more satisfactorily and more in line with the normative attributes, I identify in Chapter One. It is a document which touches upon the crux of the more normative descriptions I discuss earlier and seems to illustrate an awareness that collegiality is about more than ‘consultation’ and ‘participation’ which although ‘magical’ words can be counter to true collegiality. We can be hopeful that as this paper stimulates discussion a philosophy and a more creative and genuinely collegiate climate may emerge.

Having discussed the origins of the discourse of collegiality and how it has been promoted, I now progress in the next chapter to the second of my own questions: Whose interests does the discourse of collegiality serve? In Chapter Seven I will then consider what interests it should serve in a rehabilitated conception of collegiality.

Chapter Six

Whose interests does the discourse of collegiality serve?

Whose interests are claimed to be served?

Having examined both the source and promotion of collegiality as a discourse impacting on Scottish schools, I now focus on the purpose of such promotion. Regarding the consideration of interests the promotion of collegiality might serve, three possibilities present themselves: whose interests are claimed to be served; whose are likely to be served, by collegiality as currently perceived in policy and relevant literature; and whose interests should be served? In this chapter I will focus on the first two possibilities, with Chapter Seven addressing the third in discussing a rehabilitated form of collegiality.

Reflecting on the North Lanarkshire in-service event discussed in Chapter Two, I recall that Humes was seeking to uncover the ‘whys’ of collegiality, as well as the ‘hows’. The ‘whys’ of collegiality featured in reflections on the issues raised by both Humes and Smyth, which in turn led into my own research concerns. Asking ‘why collegiality?’ we address motivation and are prompted to consider whose interests the discourse of collegiality actually serves. By considering the constituencies and processes which it is claimed will benefit from collegiality as promoted, I will now address this question.

Proponents of collegiality claim it will benefit the interests of teachers as follows:

- teacher relationships
- improved professional status and morale
- the quality of learning and teaching

Firstly, it is argued that collegiality should define the relationships aspired to by teachers in schools; not just between teacher and teacher, but between teachers and the management structure within which they work. Secondly, it is claimed that, albeit indirectly, collegiality impacts positively on their professional image and standing, by identifying teachers as a professional group with genuine input into the detail of their practice. Thirdly, it is claimed that as a result of the above two, learning and teaching and the

“inputs, processes and outputs” (Archer, 1979: 1) of schools will improve (Brundrett, 1998). The significant claim made for the incorporation of collegiality into schooling is that it will directly improve the teachers’ ‘lot’ and thus improve learning and teaching for pupils. None of these claims are at odds with the normative account I set out earlier and they are *prima facie* difficult to contest. Membership of an esteemed profession allows members a right to shape their contribution and exercise their professional expertise free from micro-management. Modern management approaches are alert to the potential of employee cooperation in enhancing effectiveness in an organisation. The argued benefits are that teachers will respond well when the relationships in their schools are open and transparent.

Bush (1995: 54) observes that in a collegium decisions are reached by consensus rather than by conflict as is common in autocratic or formal situations. This generally fosters sound relationships and sits at odds with a community of ‘employees’ having ‘things done to them’. Brundrett claims that “Collegiality contains within it a moral dimension which has, perhaps, been one of the reasons why it has been pursued with a fervour so great that, at times, it suggests a moral campaign” (Brundrett, 1998: 308) before quoting Williams (1989):

The moral character of an exercise of authority is based on the presence of consent on the part of those subject to its jurisdiction [...] the consent of the obligated is necessary for authority to assure moral status [...]. Where consent is not made a condition of authority, then we are not speaking of moral authority, but of the exercise of power, or purely formal or legal authority (Williams, 1989: 80, quoted in Brundrett, 1998: 309).

Williams’ fascinating observation comes as he argues a case for democratic management in schools. There is a standard association of democracy with collegiality in the literature, in my departing account and as discussed in Chapter Three. This democratic characteristic of collegiality is both one of its most appealing as well as one of its most complex aspects, and one which demands reappraisal of Management in relationship to collegiality.

Collegiality has readily captured the imaginations of teachers and so become prevalent in the area of school governance. In fact, according to Brundrett:

....collegiality, or at least collaborative management, has become part of one of the ubiquitous megatrends in education of recent years. Such ubiquity must, therefore,

be based on perceived benefits of the highest order (Brundrett, 1998: 307).

My discussion seeks to uncover what these high order benefits are. Generally, the argument for collegiality contributing to enhanced relationships between teachers is a key, and unobjectionable, claim.

A strong claim made for collegiality is that a collegiate culture is more professionally appropriate. Teachers have long claimed professional status and are generally open to working contexts which align themselves with the more popular understandings of professionalism. As Smyth puts it:

The implicit presumption behind such schemes as those of the 'lead teacher'⁷⁸ programmes in the USA (and its derivatives in other countries) is that the team concept has the potential to unleash the kind of teacher creativity necessary to produce the kinds of educated labour required for economic recovery (Smyth, 1991: 323).

It has been argued that collegiality is more suitable to professionally staffed organisations (Hughes 1988: 3-27) where authority is based on expertise, training and intellect. However the demarcation between professional and non-professional has become blurry, perhaps even "old" and "outmoded", (Humes, 2004) and in any case there is a prevailing effort in schools to further breach the divide between teachers and other partner groups working in the interests of young people. I will later suggest that the emphasis on increased partnership working is itself a motivator for the pursuit of collegiality. Because of the assumed professional expertise in a profession such as teaching, the authority which one individual has over another must be based on something other than professional expertise i.e. that based on formal or technical authority. We can assume that a Head Teacher who is an English teacher has equivalence of expertise as a teacher of English, but has a different claim to authority over the teacher in an indispensable sense. The professional Head Teacher is *primus inter pares*, but at the technical and administrative level, he or she is clearly superior in the hierarchical sense; he or she has an authority derived from organisational position. This claim of professionalism is frequently obstructive, and in secondary schools the prospect of 'fragmenting', or generating what Bush (1986, 1995) has labelled a 'political model' of management based on narrow and specific group interests, can be a real one. In secondary schools therefore, collegiality can

⁷⁸ Smyth aligns 'lead teacher' programmes with one facet of collegiality in his extended discussion.

seem attractive in helping to diminish ‘balkanisation’ (Hargreaves, 1994: 212-240), but paradoxically there is a concern that collegiate models are notoriously difficult to implement in larger organisations (Bush, 1995: 59).

Brundrett (1998) endorses Hughes’ claim that collegiality is suited to professionally populated organisations since it is proper to recognise the professional expertise of the staff, which includes the right, and capacity, to be involved in the shape and direction which their work, and workplace, takes. Extant understandings of collegiality offer credence to the claim that:

... determination in the exercise of professional functions was extended beyond areas of strictly professional competence into the sphere of general organisational planning and its detailed executions. The extension of the dominant professional ethos to the administration of a large organisation implied the right of status equals to be respected and consulted (Noble and Pym, 1970: 433)

Collegiality is clearly suited to professionally staffed organisations. It can be seen to be in the interest of organisations and individuals to conduct their business collegiately, given that the ‘collective’ is what is important.

Collegiality can be seen to afford a coveted degree of respect and status, and contributes to morale. It is perhaps unthinkable that professionals could find any objection to collegiality. Therefore, there is a convenient and obvious association of collegiality and professionalism, one to which the professional should be alert.

There are also arguments promoting collegiality, which associate it with better teaching and thus improved learning. There is a tacit assumption that improvement in teacher-to-teacher cooperation, in combination with an overt professional profile, will create better pedagogues. Appeals for collegiality are often linked to the improvement and quality agenda of education; it is about more than simply improving the circumstances of teachers. An important strand in my developing discussion aligns collegiality with performance, but it is important to note that continuous improvement is seen by most professionals in Ihara’s terms, i.e. as a professional duty. In approaching collegiality from this avenue, Smyth (like Brundrett) draws attention to “the increased interest coming to surround the phenomenon of collegiality in teaching” (1991: 323), and to a view that collegiate practices are in the interests of teachers and others in the terms described earlier in this chapter. However, he

digs deeper into what I have referred to immediately above as the consequences of these benefits in relation to learning and teaching and the more popularly understood task of the teacher.

It is claimed that if collegiality is a feature in a school it will impact on the “creativity” of staff, in turn filtering down to the pupils, and there exists “an either open or tacit acceptance of collegial management styles as one of the keys to enhanced school development” (Brundrett, 1998). In support of this creative facet of collegiality, Brundrett cites the work of others who consider the possible impact of collegiate working on improvement. A collegiate style of management in a school has, it is claimed, an effect on school improvement, and the climate which prevails. In current educational policy and practice there are some strands which are considered inextricable from the improvement agenda. I will highlight three of these, since they have regularly featured large in teachers’ contracts and conditions of service, but have come to loom even more significantly in the wake of the McCrone settlement. These are: continuing professional development, curriculum development and standards and quality⁷⁹.

There is a recurring argument in the policy literature which identifies a valuable link between collegiality and the three aspects of teachers’ work noted immediately above. By definition, collegiality sits opposed to isolation and individualism and thus creates a context within which teachers can engage in order to develop the learning experiences for pupils. There is a contractual expectation that teachers do this, but there is also a professional expectation that they are permitted so to do. A more collegiate climate is claimed to better promote this, thus assisting teachers in their contractual obligation and facilitating their professional entitlements and duties. Thus “[...] collaboration and collegiality can be seen to bring together teacher development and curriculum change” (Brundrett, 1998:306). This confronts a problem which has been remarked upon by Zoul and Link (2007: 138) among others.

Teacher isolation is a phenomenon all too common in schools today, particularly at the high school level where teachers typically focus almost exclusively on what occurs within their own classroom setting, paying little heed to the overall school or department practices.

⁷⁹ The demand for increased and more fully ‘policed’ forms of standards and monitoring arrived more significantly in the form of the Standards in Scotland’s Schools etc. Act 2000.

Brundrett claims that “Concerns about professional isolation have led some commentators to articulate a belief in shared management procedures as part of the building of a professional culture which is more receptive to change” (Brundrett, 1998: 305). The change implied by Brundrett applies (I shall assume) to progress and developments in pedagogy and content. A collegiate context reduces ‘isolation’, encouraging a sense of sharing of educational materiel⁸⁰. The collegium offers a space where teachers can engage in professional work and partake of the shared wisdom and experience resulting from involvement in, and reflection on, such approaches to work. The interaction between teachers, it is claimed, is a model full of potential for interactive continuing professional development⁸¹. By confronting isolation, teachers discuss more and learn from each other. The collegiate climate offers an opportunity for such knowledge transfer. Zoul and Link (2007) have also claimed that a good school is often one in which teachers teach each other, evaluate teaching together and watch each other teach, all with the view to improvement. Certainly, two of the more popular instantiations of collegiality in schools at present are those that encourage teachers to observe one another in the process of teaching and to come together in the development of lessons. It has become an increasingly common approach promoted by many Head Teachers in order to disseminate ‘the best’ across the community of the school. This facet of creative collegiate working is generally welcomed and is certainly a practice which is looked for by external quality assurance processes. The potential of collegiality, if understood as incorporating the opportunity to watch, listen and learn from each other is obvious, given that even the observation of poor practice can have a positive effect on both the observer and the observed; it is central to Little’s normative account of collegiality (Little, 1982).

The idea of a collegiate involvement, within which teachers can experience a genuinely collegiate culture, pays attention to the teachers’ professional capacity in ways in which other managerial approaches may not. For Brundrett one of the reasons for an interest in and appeal for collegiate approaches:

... lies in the fact that the importance of teachers’ knowledge and their contribution to educational organisations has gradually gained credibility particularly in relation to classroom knowledge and

⁸⁰ A term for resources both ‘human’ and ‘material’.

⁸¹ Continuing Professional Development (CPD) is a term relatively new to education (late 1990s -). Previously referred to as INSET (In-service education for teachers) or as ‘In-service’, there has been a recent shift to CPD. Recently I attended a conference where the language had shifted further by referring to Professional Learning (PL?). This, I believe, is a further example of the use of language to appeal to the emotions and the moods of teachers; it represents a shift away from more ‘technically’ loaded language.

pedagogical content knowledge. Concepts connected with another educational archetype that of the reflective practitioner, bring together principles of practicality, collegiality and reflection as a basis for professional development (Brundrett, 1998:305).

The collegium, as a community where teachers are involved in the detail of their work, is an attractive notion, and one which reclaims teaching for teachers who, in a climate of performativity, are '*Struggling for their Souls*' (Ball, 1999). Collegiality, it is claimed, offers the potential for improvement both in relation to professional development and curriculum development, two dimensions of the teachers' contractual and moral obligations which are generally considered normative.

This potential of collegiality is relevant to the current educational debate in Scotland, as the policy community, and individual schools within it, wrestle with the implications of a new curricular departure, Curriculum for Excellence (CfE),⁸² which it is claimed is distinct from previous approaches to curriculum development in Scotland since the 1970s. In the CfE model, it is argued that the *principles* of a curriculum are articulated at the policy centre, in the confidence that the dedicated *detail* of these can be developed, and delivered, at the level of the institution by a more collegiate climate among teachers and the partners in the policy community. The nature of CfE is such that schools are being encouraged to look for ways of breaching traditional subject boundaries, and merging discrete 'forms',⁸³ &⁸⁴ of knowledge and subjects in a way which delivers on the principles of CfE. The claims made in promoting Curriculum for Excellence are that it is a new approach to curriculum design whereby teachers are set parameters within which they can create a curriculum, suitable to local need, and delivered by preferred approaches and styles of teaching. This departure from the historical centralised 'top-down' approach in Scotland is, on the face of things, an attractive development, but there are implications for the ways in which teachers work. No longer can teachers work in isolation, it is claimed. Approaches to CfE are premised on a model of collegiality and an assumption that

⁸² The Curriculum for Excellence website describes the wider CfE project thus: "The curriculum includes the totality of experiences which are planned for children and young people through their education, wherever they are being educated. It is underpinned by the values inscribed on the mace of the Scottish Parliament – wisdom, justice, compassion and integrity. The purpose of Curriculum for Excellence is encapsulated in the four capacities – to enable each child or young person to be a successful learner, a confident individual, a responsible citizen and an effective contributor. [...] Curriculum for Excellence aims to achieve a transformation in education in Scotland by providing a coherent, more flexible and enriched curriculum from 3 to 18.

⁸³ One of the criticisms of CfE is that unlike its predecessor in the secondary school, it has no substantial theoretical scaffold. By contrast the curriculum it replaced was based on Hirst's 'forms' of knowledge (Hirst: 1974).

⁸⁴ See Priestley and Humes (2009).

teachers attend to the detail of curriculum development. Such a new approach requires a far more flexible approach from teachers. Collegiality, it is claimed, exemplifies flexibility and is in phase with developments in the wider educational arena not least CfE.

I am of the view that a properly constructed model of collegiality is capable of enhancing productive professional relationships, contributing to the public image and self image of teachers as professionals and, as a result, contributing to improvement in learning and teaching if it is firstly, understood correctly, and, secondly, managed properly. In such a genuinely participative relationship, where teacher development takes place alongside curricular development, and the collegiate approach to this ensures interaction of ideas and practices (Stenhouse, 1975, Hargreaves, 1994), there is the promise of improvement in the round.

The discussion on the claims made for collegiality in relation to improvement in learning and teaching so far has considered two key areas likely to be served by collegiality as it is currently understood, and purveyed, in the school system: professional development and curriculum development.

But for Schulman:

Teacher collegiality and collaboration are not merely important for the improvement of morale and teacher satisfaction [...] but are absolutely necessary if we wish teaching to be of the highest order [...] Collegiality and collaboration are also needed to ensure that teachers benefit from their experience and continue to grow during their careers (Shulman in Hargreaves, 1994: 187).

The Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act (Scottish Government, 2000) placed on schools and local authorities the requirement to 'assure' quality, but the language of quality assurance has featured large in day-to-day conversations at both formal and informal levels in schools both before and after the Act. There is a claim that a collegial climate lends itself to the promotion of standards and quality in schools. The terms of collegiality which I have touched upon i.e. professional agreement, shared values, a sense of community and purpose, are elements in a drive for standards and quality in relation to what schools do. So it is claimed that a collegiate organisation will have both direct and indirect impact on standards and quality. The collegiate climate (which frees and respects professional voice, earns loyalty and respect from teachers, creates a common vision and

has collegium members seeking to ‘cut-the-same-patch-of-grass’) will automatically (so it is claimed) release intangibles which will result in continuous improvement of the school.

Influential academics in the field of educational management have lent some well developed arguments to the debate. For example, Fullan (1985: 400) claims collaboration and collegiality to be two of the central factors in school improvement. Collegiate and collaborative approaches apply not only to the practices of those being managed, but to the style of management itself.

However the appeals for collegiate approaches can be deconstructed to expose elements of managerialism which often go unnoticed by the profession. If collegiality is a discourse in the sense of an accepted and promoted orthodoxy as discussed in Chapter Four, then some weighty reflection might be useful. Discourses emerge rarely by accident; discourses have antecedents and are usually mobilised to respond to particular needs and agendas. I go on now to describe a relationship between professional learning, curriculum detail and appropriateness, standards and quality and the bigger political purpose, and possibilities, of the macro educational agenda. This agenda has come to depend upon education as a key public service. This grander aim demands that attention is given not only to the content of the curriculum, but to the way in which it is delivered.

Whose interests are likely to be served? Collegiality and the interests of the grander political agenda

It is generally accepted that there is a significant relationship between schools and the economic well being of nations. I think it is significant that Chapter Two of the McCrone report on teachers’ pay and conditions is entitled ‘Education and the Economy’. This economic driver for educational efficiency represents one key position on the purpose, of schools, which draws its sustenance from a neoliberal grand narrative. This has been a feature of New Right doctrine, and has long been reflected in modernising approaches to the political involvement in educational policy processes across developed, western democracies (Hartley, 1989: 211). “Education has moved up the political agenda [and] is seen as the key to unlocking, not just social, but also economic problems” (OECD, 2001: 48). I will now add flesh to this relationship as it represents for me an aspect to which teachers must become alert in order to recognise the constraints under which they work and, consequently, the limitations placed on their freedom to teach according to their

professional judgement. Recognition of such agendas is for Fairclough and Foucault pre-requisite to emancipation from power and control. The purpose of this section is to identify a far greater context for educational policy, and to highlight a set of requirements for the powerbrokers in education which can be delivered by one understanding of collegiality, one quite different from the more normative understanding to which I have made several references.

On becoming Prime Minister in 1997 Tony Blair made the claim that national success would be predicated on “Education, Education, Education” (Smithers, 2001: 1). This was not a new departure. An earlier Prime Minister, James Callaghan, in his 1976 speech to Ruskin College, alleged that “There is nothing wrong with non-educationalists, even a prime minister, talking about education again” (Callaghan, 1976). Almost twenty years later Blair was heard to say that, “...the Prime Minister must maintain an interest, and I will, to ensure that when strategic decisions need to be taken, it is not just the Education Secretary speaking for education”(Blair, 1996a).

Callaghan encouraged his successors to take a more assertive stance towards the politicisation of schooling. According to Damian Green MP, this contribution to the debate by Callaghan “marked the start of an era of increasing centralisation in education” (Green, 2003). This degree of centralisation has increased over the course of successive governments to such an extent that education in the UK has been described as:

... among the most centralised of the advanced industrialised countries. Th(is) trend appears, if anything, to have intensified since the coming to office of the Labour government in May 1997 (Glatter, 1999: 254).

The intense interest of politicians in education continued. It would be wrong to attribute political interference in educational policy solely to Thatcher and the New Right, but the successive Thatcher education ministers did up the stakes considerably. ‘Leadership’ was a term more in vogue in the 1990s and, (like collegiality) was constructed by policymakers very much in terms of professionalism and professional rights, engagement and autonomy. But there exists a welter of literature⁸⁵ which deconstructs ‘leadership’ to reveal themes and biases more at home within the equally current discourses of managerialism and performativity, satisfying the abiding concerns of politicians for school management. The emotional appeal of the term ‘leadership’, as distinguished from ‘management’, nods to

⁸⁵ Examples of this line of discussion are available widely but the following are worthy of attention: Ball, 1990, Ball, 1999, Ball, 2003, Gronn, 2003 and Wright, 2001.

Fairclough's claims regarding the use of language as a tool of persuasion and control (Fairclough, 2000: 6). I am interested, in this dissertation, in similarly scrutinising the language of collegiality, suspecting that it might also serve rhetorical and controlling purposes.

The influx of managerialist policies into schooling, the emergence of the educational marketplace, the emphases on accountability and standards, the increasing regulation of, and competency based approaches to teacher training, the publication of league performance tables and not least the increasing central intervention in the curriculum were reflections of a neo-liberal government and an ideological embrace of free market principles for schools. The effects of these developments have been felt in essence, if not in detail, in Scotland too. Central to much of this is the idea of management, and its potential for improvement and reform. However, a nuanced form of management – managerialism - has ideological associations, and, when deployed effectively, has the potential to manage a process in ideologically defined directions. Thus the managerialism approaches to education under discussion, have the effect of advancing targeted educational policy reforms in keeping with the general trend of policy reform of those in power.

Consequently, schools began to experience encroachment of terms (efficiency, quality assurance, accountability even customer) hitherto alien to the sector. Education became more and more influenced by the discourse of managerialism in phase with other areas of public policy as the Thatcher government pursued its agenda. This was challenged on the grounds that Education, as a public service, should not become a utility to be treated as a market commodity. Focusing on the period 1979 to 1989 (essentially the Thatcher Years), points to how managerialist and market emphases have been advanced on the education service, without intellectual and critical interrogation, on the back of broader ideological and political stances:

When a long-established government, wedded to economic liberalism, sets out to structure its education system, it will do so in order to promote that economic policy. And given the current British government's large majority, it may believe it can dispense with the substance of a consultative exercise and retain only its trappings. With Samuel Smiles and Adam Smith as its mentors, the New Right has revived the managerial style of entrepreneurial capitalism. This implies that 'workers' would have minimal discretion and power in the face of management's direction [. . . .] Teachers

would be stripped of their professional discretion, and thereafter be overseen by ‘line managers’⁸⁶ (Hartley, 1989: 219-220).

Under the Blair Government (1997) it became clear that the belief persisted in Labour policy that education was a key area of social policy central to the modernising agenda, and there has since been no obvious effort made to extirpate managerialism from educational policy. Indeed the Government was on record as committed to developing much of the impetus in educational reform and modernisation begun by Margaret Thatcher, (Mandelson and Liddle, 1996).

Blair’s conviction of the importance of education for the economy became attached to the discourse of leadership. In other words, education was the solution, and, if education was failing, educational leadership was the problem. Blair made some significant claims for leadership, and it became the growth area (Bush, 2002) provoking Gronn’s (2003: 269) claim that, “There is now a vast leadership industry out there of truly staggering proportions (in which governments, corporations, academics, schools, and school systems have a huge material vested interest) such that the discourse of leadership has become ‘ubiquitous’”. Leadership became the cure for all in education and policy texts, (Gronn, 2003: 271) claimed an explicit and undeniable relationship between leadership and standards. In addition to policy statements, considerable effort was put into technologies which escorted the discourse. Training for aspiring Head Teachers became formalised for the first time given that Head Teachers were being identified as the defining ingredient in successful schools. My argument is that where leadership was the school improvement idea of the 90s it has now been displaced by collegiality. When Gronn, who wrote widely on leadership, was asked (2007) if he thought that collegiality may be the new Leadership, he replied, cautiously, in the affirmative⁸⁷. Is collegiality another discourse which seeks to make leaders of all teachers as the discourse of management in the past tried to do with management: are we all leaders? (Reid, I. Brain, K. and Boyes, L., 2004). I am of the view there remains a political priority to control the detail of education and the work of teachers. It remains in the political interest, however, to do so in a way which keeps teachers ‘on

⁸⁶ An irony and a paradox, one for empirical research, is that in the collegiate context in many schools, even today, it would neither be surprising nor unexpected to hear talk of ‘line-management’ and collegiality in the same discussion.

⁸⁷ Gronn presented a paper at the Educational Colloquium of the Universities of Glasgow and Strathclyde in November 2007. His focus was leadership but one academic present probed the issue of collegiality. Professor Gronn was kind enough to pass me a copy of his unpublished paper which, although it does not make this point, was nonetheless extremely useful.

side' and promotes their *sense* of professionalism. The considered use of the terms of collegiality/collegially can serve as a device which will at least create the illusion of an enhanced professional position. Collegiality is a different term, but one which, like leadership, has attractive connotations but, perhaps, power laden potential. It too is equally misunderstood or, perhaps, too diversely understood.

The general situation aligning education with economic prosperity has been widely bemoaned by some who have a concern for retaining a more liberal tradition. In an article on BBC online, Baker (2008) describes how Professor Richard Pring, when commenting on the Nuffield Review of 14-19 Education and Training, (Nuffield, 2008) "... raised a massive cheer from an audience at an education conference". Pring also focussed on the language of educational policy, but claimed that he "was not just being fussy about the use of language." His point was that education had been taken over by an 'Orwellian' Language which had started to control, "the way we think and act" (Baker, 2008, BBC News website). According to Baker, Pring claimed that:

....the values of education has [sic] become 'dominated by the Language of management. So when judging schools and universities now we talk about 'performance indicators' as a substitute for assessing the quality of their teaching. Learning has to be measured by an 'audit' of the qualifications achieved rather than a more qualitative judgement of what students have learned (Pring, 2008).

Pring made the claim that a look at educational policy documentation would quickly provide other examples of this management-speak and in so doing, made it clear that he was well aware of the powerful potential of words (one of my themes in various parts of this dissertation). He referred to the use of terms "new providers" instead of schools, "efficiency gains", "choice for customers" and "funding systems that respond to customer demand". Pring pointed to the use of terms like "inputs" and "outputs", complaining that this was more the language of industry. Baker is clearly alert to the need for fussiness about language, and, reflecting on Pring, goes on to comment:

... the authors of government documents are not attempting to do the same things as philosophers of education. Yet this matters because the language we use shapes the answer to the question: "what is education for?" And there is no doubt that it is the model of workforce preparation and employability that currently dominates the current education discourse[....] Taking us back to consider the big question, "what is education for?"- may seem like academic

frippery[....]but at a time when education [in England] is going through its biggest upheaval for over 50 years, it is an essential reminder of the need to keep an eye on the bigger picture (Pring quoted in Baker, 2008).

I draw attention to this example because words identified by Pring as having explicit industrial associations, have, in his view and my own, been incorporated into 'education-speak' to control teachers, working with a view to exercising power over them in order that educational priorities, such as those above, will be delivered by teachers. I suggest that collegiality as a word, seen in certain examples of usage and practice, is concerned with control of performance and output from schools, rather than as a potentially creative idea which helps colleagues to engage professionally in ways discussed above.

In view of this widely acknowledged grander political agenda (as well as the emphasis the dissertation has placed on reading collegiality as a discourse) we have to question claims made about collegiality as serving the professional interests of teachers, curriculum development and school improvement. It seems beyond contestation that a truly collegial workplace will be one within which strong teacher relationships will flourish. One might be suspicious of anyone who objected to a climate of camaraderie and teamwork within a group of colleagues. Collegiality then surely is something to be pursued? However, a sceptical instantiation of 'relationship' could be one in which all sing from the same sheet without paying proper attention to matters that should engage critical professional thinking. This more 'compliant' reading of collegiality is one which surfaced in the Cartland example where individuals made up their own minds in the face of a tacit expectation of compliance. By so doing they were being uncollegiate by a less healthy understanding. While 'cosy' relationships are pleasant, they counter a climate of serious critique and double-loop reflection. The relationships argued for in a collegiate school context can and should extend beyond the 'niceness' aspect of 'relationship'.

The attraction to collegiality stems from the fact that in operating in such a way a tendency towards isolation is obviated. I suggest that concern about isolation is not only related to individual teacher isolation within the school, but with school isolation from a national system. Schools which operate as communities are appealing to those who operate within them. However schools which operate within the orthodoxy of a wider policy community are attractive to those in the position to take control of broader priorities. To an extent, the school is similar to the university as described in Chapter Three. Increasingly there are fewer and fewer decisions for schools to make for themselves. By contrast, it is now a

general area of concern that universities and schools are, in terms of a more attractive and generous understanding of collegiality, becoming less collegiate, as they come increasingly under the control of government in terms of the contribution they make to the bigger economic project as opposed to the liberal tradition in education.

In advancing a grander agenda on schools, however, collegiality can be seen to be a potentially useful technological and discursive device. Policy makers rely on agreement and consensus, where consensus sometimes has to be manufactured. By taking control of relationships, such consensus might be successfully manufactured, and, by taking control of relationships via the use of such an attractive notion as collegiality, the bureaucratic sleight of hand becomes more easily missed by a less than fully reflective teaching force or a teaching force lacking confidence in the face of rapid change. A compliant 'professional' workforce is what a controlling and determined manager requires.

Questions can be levelled too at the cursory claim that collegiality will enhance professional status and morale. The terms professionalism and collegiality are often used with near synchronicity. Equally, although an uncontroversial and indeed a laudable objective, professionalism is often over-simplified. For me the abiding problem rests with what has been the coveted status of 'professional'. Writing some time ago Humes questioned the extent to which teachers had been served by the notion of professionalism. On the one hand he argued that it afforded teachers a status which was attractive. On the other he claimed that it could operate as a technique by which teachers could be controlled and kept contented (Humes, 1986). There is a parallel here with collegiality. If, by being professional, I stick to the codes of practice and the tenets of my professional membership, regardless of how far these differ from my ethical compass, then am I being truly professional? The literature is peppered with discussions on professionalism, partial professionalism and debates about whom and what has the right to invoke the description. The teachers' claim for professional status is something that has worked both for and against them. Popular instantiations of professionalism relate to notions of independence, expertise and freedom from direction. This position is one which sits in conflict with a more political position which sees professional teachers as conduits of dispensed educational policy. The professional context and professional behaviour will, by their nature, demand engagement, collaboration, discussion, communication, and interaction, but collegiality is different, according to Brundrett, in that it takes matters further than simply working together. Implicit in collegiality is an idea of the sharing of power and

influence. The arguments for collegiality which promote its iterative relationship with professionalism are unstable, given that definitions of neither collegiality nor professionalism have been finally settled at a conceptual level. As words they have a discursive capacity to which teachers must be alert, and to which policymakers seem more than alert already.

The Cartland example, again, highlighted this tension and the double-edged-sword aspect of collegiality and indeed of professional behaviour. We also saw in Chapter Three how there existed a potential for conflict between collegiate involvement in policy, and the legislative foundation for such policy (the Church example). It is overly simplistic to say that a professional context and a collegiate context are mutually compatible, or even that they should be. It is similarly over simplistic to suggest that even a highly normative understanding of collegiality within an organisation allows for the collegium to have root-and-branch influence on the detail of the context. This simplistic risk arises from a failure, to interrogate properly the meaning and implications of collegiality in relation to an endeavour, such as education, which has a legal framework. Professionalism, like collegiality, is conceptually complicated, and has a discursive capacity in that it can mean different things to different people, and can cause people to behave in different ways depending upon how it is sold to them. Neither of these two notions are licenses to unfettered influence over policy and procedures which are described and detailed in civil or Canon law. Professionalism itself is a magical word. Its association with collegiality is a magical association, and the discursive effect of the relationship might be to serve interests other than those of the profession or the collegium. It is too simple a reaction to assume that a collegiality enhances the professionalism and status of teachers. However, it is not too ambitious an aim to create a set of circumstances where it could. By reimagining collegiality, and by managing it differently, we might counter the more negative potentials of this seemingly attractive notion.

Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) is an important example of such conflict between professional scope and centralised control. Despite the rhetoric surrounding Curriculum for Excellence, the latitude afforded to teachers and indeed school managers is limited. Curriculum for Excellence, I have suggested, has been sold to teachers on the back of a claim that it offers the opportunities for connecting teachers in relation to each other, enhancing their professional autonomy and improving educational standards (for the

Twenty First Century no less!). Thus when teachers critique Curriculum for Excellence, (as many do) and do so in a way which challenges its premises, they are labelled as non-collegiate and subversive. The teacher who is unconvinced by appeals for more progressive approaches to teaching and learning is also to be considered outwith the orthodoxy. One of the key architects of CfE has himself become a fierce critic of its development⁸⁸ while proponents strain to claim that it represents a New Jerusalem of curriculum development in Scotland. Priestley and Humes (2009: 359) identify a potentially non-collegiate approach to curriculum development, which leads them to regret that “later developments in CfE have constrained this aspiration, potentially reducing the freedom and creativity of teachers and learners, and rendering classrooms predictable, limited and uncreative”. It is paradoxical that such significant curriculum reform, coinciding with a drive towards collegiality, leads some serious thinkers in educational policy and curriculum development, to detect a measure of centralisation and ‘the same old hat’. The question can be posed: who is behaving more collegially? Is it the policy community which is advancing what amounts to a curriculum directive on schools and teachers, or is it the few ‘dissenters’ who, supported by well-developed arguments, pose serious questions about it?

A careful analysis of the detail of Curriculum for Excellence reveals that not too much has changed. As well as this, and of particular interest, was a move made by the policy centre to remove the ‘A’ from ‘A Curriculum for Excellence’. This in itself seems insignificant until viewed from the lenses of structural linguistics. The removal of the definite or indefinite article represents what is termed an ‘elliptical deictic’⁸⁹, a linguistic device which implies ‘no alternative’. I suggest that, in the context of CfE, collegiality is being appropriated as an attractive model of engagement to help deliver a curriculum which has hardly been arrived at collegially.

Of course, it could be that a properly developed collegial climate can promise and deliver all the positive claims made for it, but it is important that some intellectual attention is paid to the construction and maintenance of such a climate. Humes (2007b) is concerned that

⁸⁸ Keir Bloomer has warned that the reform might be retreating from an originally more radical vision. He has described the ‘experiences and outcomes’ as “an attempt – albeit flawed – to do something [...] worthwhile. They seek to define the curriculum in a way that is purposeful, permissive rather than prescriptive and concerned with achievement more than content” See Bloomer (2009).

⁸⁹ I am not ‘*au fait*’ with structural linguistics. This claim is made in the wake of a conversation with an academic colleague who is. I did however address the issue to the officer responsible nationally for CfE (an Assistant Chief HMIe) who claimed that the removal of the ‘A’ was not significant. Her colleague advised her that there had been a “memo” issued by the “management committee” instructing the change.

the cosiness and the climate of niceness, (Humes, 2007b) created by the ‘magic’ of the word collegiality, creates a situation in which ‘soft’ collegiality surfaces while ‘tough’ collegiality sinks. For Humes collegiality can be counterproductive to healthy educational debate.

A soft version of collegiality might simply produce bland consensus that lacks intellectual bite and professional rigour. It might also serve to marginalise the teacher of independent spirit who is prepared to challenge orthodoxy (Humes, 2007b).

Teachers might be ‘sold’ collegiality on the grounds that it makes for good relations within the teaching force and between the teaching community and the bureaucratic context in which it operates, but an important consideration relates to how discourses work. Language can make us behave in certain ways and nurse us into a sense of security which serves the ends of others. Humes, writing specifically about collegiality, points out that:

...certain terms in education achieve prominence and become important elements in professional discourse. One such term is "collegiality", which has come to the fore following the teachers' agreement. Management and union sides on the Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers share the view that collegiality is at the heart of professionalism (Humes, 2007b).

In this very brief statement Humes makes important key points. Firstly he notes that collegiality came “to the fore *following* the teachers' agreement” [my emphasis] not from the McCrone report as MacDonald has claimed. Secondly, he reveals an association of collegiality with professionalism before thirdly, pointing to a consensus between both the Management and union ‘sides’ in the Scottish Teachers’ negotiating machinery.

In relation to the last of his points The Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers casts collegiality as a mechanism by which agreements are brokered in such a way as to avoid ‘industrial relations’ conflict. Although this is no bad thing in itself, what such a narrow conception fails to capitalise on is the potential for collegiality to be a creative force for good in schools. Under its current formation, the discourse of collegiality is more likely to serve the ends of those promoting an educational agenda which isn’t really up-for-grabs, is aligned with less liberal readings of educational purposes and possibilities, and is something of a ‘human relations’ tool as the ‘management side’ and the ‘teachers side’ try to achieve a degree of stability. To this extent, the current formation of the discourse of collegiality is narrowly instrumental and getting in the way of a more creative

understanding which should be directed at the genuine improvement of teaching and learning.

The third claim made for collegiality, but one which remains connected to the previous two, is the effect that it might have on learning and teaching. It seems that the improvements claimed as the result of more collegiate working arise out of the enhanced relationships within the learning community and the enhanced status of the teacher. It is difficult to see how else collegiality might directly impact upon learning and teaching. In saying this I am not denying that schools which have arrived at collegial approaches may prosper, but there is obvious space for empirical work which might establish better evidenced connections.

In the end it may be that we have to inhabit a paradox which accepts the principles of collegiality, but which also acknowledges the reality that the difference between collegiality, autocracy and anarchy is in fact Management itself. As an organisational impetus, collegiality is not an alternative to management, but neither can management be an alternative to collegiality. Writing on the theme of spirituality in educational leadership, Deal recognises what is quite literally a balancing act claiming that while “some leaders seek to tighten things up [...] others strive to set the spirit free. Too much influence in either direction means trouble” (Deal, 2009: 172). I suggest the same is true of the Management of collegiality.

The capacity for collegiate approaches to have any significant impact on the quality and standards in schools has yet to be tested. Bush has questioned the extent to which the ideal of collegiality can translate into reality. Research points to the view that collegiate approaches lend themselves more to primary schools (the smaller the better) than they do to secondary schools; this, however, is a matter for on-going empirical research.

MacDonald, (2003) however, points out that in the context of the post-McCrone primary school:

... such an assumption is problematical. The tendencies of teachers to adopt a subordinate persona, and to comply with the wishes of the hierarchy despite their own professional reservations, point towards the existence of a hegemonic system in which collegiality has little locus (MacDonald, 2003: 413).

Put more bluntly, MacDonald is pointing to the ‘just-tell-us-what-to-do’ mentality of some teachers, and she has interesting points to make on the masculinity of schools as organisations which may itself subliminally mitigate against cooperation and

interdependency. It may be the case that collegiality may never work in schools, nor be welcomed by teachers. But in spite of my own cautionary take on collegiality I am of the view that the professional has a duty to model it in such a way that it is both effectively manageable and Managed.

My aim in this chapter has been to explore the interests claimed to be served by the discourse of collegiality and then to examine the discourse more likely to be served. I believe that collegiality can be uncovered as a Management (Capital M) strategy that can be seen to act as a conduit of predetermined policy discursively promoted through technologies of power and the use of ‘magical’ language, thus serving the interests of the policy community. I hold the view that the ‘terms of collegiality’, when they appear in policy documentation, and when they are invoked in educational discussion, are rather glib and rhetorical. They are words targeted at the emotions, lacking respectable attempts at definition and serious scrutiny. Where invoked their use assumes a pre-existing definition and agreement that collegiality is an unquestionable good. As the result of all of this, an opportunity has been missed to properly explore and incorporate the essence of something approaching ‘true’ collegiality in a way which could transform educational management practice and open it to more genuinely democratic processes.

This Chapter has closed on a negative and sceptical note. This is because I am currently both negative and sceptical, not about collegiality *per se* but at the way in which it is being advanced on an under-critical community of teachers.

So whose interests does the discourse of collegiality claim to serve and which interests is it more likely to serve? I have contrasted views that collegiality serves the ends of teachers relationships in schools with the view that it serves the interests of an educational system intent on controlling education in the economic interest. Although collegiality is something appealing to most who reflect on its meaning, it can be uncovered as an idea which has the capacity to influence behaviour for both good and ill. I suggest that those who deploy and rely upon it have to exercise caution. In discussing the examples of the Church and the Cartland affair in Chapter Three I pointed to a panoptic effect which could be identified in a culture of collegiality. My view is that teachers should be alert to the dangerous potential of adopting an approach to their work where agreement and consensus prevails as a matter of principle, yet is illusory in terms of actual practice.

These arguments should not be read as a rejection of collegiality. Contained in my critique is an unqualified attraction to a qualified model of collegiality, and a view that collegiality will serve the interests of teachers by helping them relate to one another, and improve together, as well as affording them opportunities for professional learning, self esteem and improved morale. Furthermore, my view is that collegiality is not only something which will be useful to a school, but is essential to the operation of schools which claim to be committed to the central norms of collegiality discussed in Chapter One. Collegiality is a highly problematic construction, (concept and discourse) which is treated – all too often – as a simple idea. There is little doubt that it has an attraction attached to it, and that “people even say they are on the side of it”⁹⁰.

In my concluding chapter, I will claim that critical deconstruction of received views and policies of collegiality is not a subversive activity, but is in fact a key normative aspect of genuine collegiality. I will explore the opportunities and difficulties offered by one particularly radical view of collegiality, in order to highlight the considerations to be needed if we are to move towards a rehabilitation of collegiality as it operates in schools.

⁹⁰ A phrase taken from the poem ‘A consumer’s report’ by Peter Porter (1929).

Chapter Seven

Towards a rehabilitated conception of collegiality

Reviewing the argument

Collegiality in Scottish Secondary Schools is not being managed. It is being Managed in a particular way which is inattentive to its conceptual and discursive complexity. It is being Managed in a technical way, more aligned to managerialism, an abiding feature in educational policy and control in an epoch of neo-liberal concern for the economy at the expense of a liberal education tradition. I highlighted the connectedness of educational policy targets and management practices in Chapter Six; the means and the ends are significantly connected.

My initial definition of collegiality in Chapter One included the right to be heard (voice and democracy) and both the right and duty to influence - for the common good - the process in which one is involved (participation and consultation). Collegiality has presumed associations with loyalty and as my discussion developed I drew a close association between collegiality and professional contexts thus linking the complex notion of collegiality with the equally contested concept of professionalism. I pointed to the view that collegiality sits in opposition to individualism or narrow departmentalism (a feature of many secondary schools) The latter are characteristics associated by Bush (1985,1996), with a 'political' context where specific, often narrowly focussed, interest groups seek to be influentially represented. I have argued rather that collegiality positions the 'collegium' as the sole interest group. This collegiate 'unity' is frequently cited as a central norm of collegiality which features in a variety of different institutional contexts claiming a collegiate identity. My particular focus is Scottish education, in particular the Scottish secondary school.

The initial account I offered in Chapter One was one of collegiality imagined in a normative sense. This was a preliminary working definition. I described my project at that

stage as aspiring to address a fuller understanding of collegiality by reflecting upon two initial questions which gave rise to some subsidiary claims.

I asked at the outset

- From where has the discourse of collegiality come and how has it been promoted?
- Whose interest might the discourse of collegiality serve?

I went on to substantiate my argument that:

Collegiality has emerged as one approach to school leadership that seems to promise to allow the key voices in the educational partnership to come together and jointly shape professional policy and practice. But the discourse of collegiality reveals some crucial problems:

(1) The very notion of collegiality has not been clearly articulated, either conceptually or theoretically;

(2) The origins of the current vogue for collegiality in Scottish educational discourse are not clear and need to be understood.

I have claimed that the ways in which collegiality is being Managed in school policy in Scotland threatens to undermine the possibility of our managing collegiality, i.e. the achievement of collegiality in our schools.

Subsidiary claims attending these key questions were:

That the pursuit of collegiality in Scottish education is ultimately a Management (Capital M)⁹¹ strategy which can be seen to act as a conduit of predetermined policy. This strategic potential has been realised through the use of language and techniques of discourse. Linguistic shifts can be reflective of trends by which emotionally appealing language is replacing a coarser and less appealing language of management. Detailed consideration of the key documentation (Chapter Five) reveals more about teacher-manager relations and the particular socio-economic context within which they are currently emerging, than it does about innovative and creative approaches to participation and consultation or about any sustained attempt at creating a new approach to professional and ‘stakeholder’ engagement in educational policy making.

⁹¹ The capitalisation of Management was explained in Chapter Two.

Although the discourse of collegiality in Scotland has come to be associated with the McCrone settlement, the ‘terms of collegiality’ as I have called them (collegiate, collegial and collegiality), do not feature prominently in the original McCrone Report, the Agreement on pay and conditions which followed or in the associated Appendices. Where they do, they do so in rather glib and uninspiring rhetorical ways; they appear as terms targeted at the emotions, and their rhetorical purpose appears to be the encouragement of a ‘feel-good’ factor (Humes, 2007b). They appear in the McCrone Report, as words lacking respectable attempts at definition and serious scrutiny, and their occurrences assume a pre-existing understanding on the part of the reader; they also assume an agreement that collegiality is necessarily a productive and unobjectionable notion. Where reference is made to collegiality it is often followed by discussion which attends to ‘management’ and more particularly ‘leadership’, pointing to a degree of conceptual confusion. The terms of collegiality emerge more frequently in policy documentation after McCrone, and are features of what I have chosen to call a neo-McCrone policy context. Chapter Five discusses collegiality more as an idea in reports emerging from the key policy players, e.g. Scottish Government, local authorities and their representative body the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA), Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Education (HMIE) and from documents emanating from teacher trade unions negotiating machinery.

Close scrutiny of the documentation and effort at imbuing education with the terms and spirit of collegiality, exposes it as amounting to little more than a technical approach to Managing ‘teacher-Management’ relations. Because the spirit of collegiality, in its more normative and savoury definitions, has been relegated almost to unquestioned rhetoric, an opportunity has been missed to properly explore and incorporate a more truly rounded concept of collegiality in a way which could transform educational management practice and open it to more genuine democratic and dialogic (Fielding, 1999) processes.

In Chapter Three I explored examples of different institutional contexts, showing how collegiality as a concept is inherently problematic, far from simple and ultimately contestable. What these contexts of Higher Education, school education, the Roman Catholic (RC) Church and the example of the House of Commons had in common was a pre-existing set of ‘rules’ which demanded a respect for a level of authority which often sat uncomfortably with the normative understanding of collegiality which promotes individual right to opinion and influence. The normative dimensions of collegiality, in the context of the RC Church, meet barriers when we try to reconcile them with the canon principle of

papal infallibility. In Higher Education ‘true’ collegiality is limited more and more by legislative pressures which bear down both from sources in the political arena and the bureaucratic layers of the individual institutions; even academics are employees and there is often an established link between certain readings of collegiality and tenure. In relation to the example of the ‘Cartland’ episode I identified peculiar and far reaching complexities attending the meaning and the implications of collegiality. By being collegial in one sense Cartland was being uncollegiate in another. Furthermore in acting on his understanding of collegiality he had to collaborate in order to garner support for his collegial actions aligned with his own moral compass. By confronting the collaboration supporting the Chamberlain agenda Cartland had to step from one definition of collegiality into another conflicting definition and in order to do so he had to collaborate with others.

I explored these examples using philosophical tools to show that while collegiality and its associated terms ‘roll off the tongue’ easily the actual meaning of collegiality is very poorly understood as the result of lack of proper conceptual analysis and intellectual diligence. This dissertation is, on the whole, concerned with the other example I highlighted namely school education as it is affected and influenced by the concept and discourse of collegiality. Collegiality as a concept has a genealogy and pedigree and we should be aware of their significance in assisting us in understanding it as we progress towards a proper understanding.

Turning from collegiality as a concept to collegiality as a discourse, my discussion in Chapter Four took into account the need to understand that collegiality also has a tangible impact on conduct and the way subjects behave. This discussion drew on the continental tradition in philosophy as against the analytical approach taken in Chapter Three. I drew attention to the relevance of Foucault to understanding the history of ideas and on his reflections on how individuals are rendered subjects in an arena where power operates. Foucault’s work is useful in aiding understanding in that it illuminates the emergence of collegiality as possibly a reconstitution of an older idea (one redolent of previous approaches to power, management and control). Foucault’s recognition that subjects can be created managed and controlled by hidden yet powerful forces which are often invisible reveals how we often fail to recognise the subtle panoptic gaze and the manipulation which can result from the innocent use of language and appeals to emotions in relation to policy formulation and communication. The wider literature on discourse and its analysis also alerts us to the potential of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in unmasking such influences and underlying forces which shape our behaviours and responses. On the one

hand it is conceivable that subjects might create discourse but discourses can create subjects and the behaviour they exhibit too. Are we, in current educational policy, creating the discourse of collegiality or is the discourse of collegiality creating our behaviour and responses, which in turn fuel the hegemony and provide apparatuses which pave the way for naive responses to, and assumptions about, policy?

In Chapter Five I make claims regarding collegiality and its genesis. I take issue with the view that collegiality was a direct outcome of the McCrone settlement which “directed schools to henceforth operate more collegially” as MacDonald (2003: 413) has suggested. I do concede that adjustments to teacher deployment, management structures and conditions of service created a space for the narrowly conceived brand of collegiality which now influences the lifeworld of the teacher. I pointed to an extant literature of collegiality in the academic community (dating from the 1980s and 1990s), arguing that collegiality has resurfaced from earlier times when it was the emanation of the academic community rather than the policy community. Collegiality is by no means an idea purely related to the neo-McCrone context. I further claimed in Chapter Five, that collegiality has been promoted into the management agenda in schools by policymakers (not acting collegially with teachers) as a softer, more emotionally appealing and less pejorative model than was management; the shift to the terms of collegiality had behind it the purpose of comforting those Managed in the education service and in schools in particular.

The purpose of Chapter Six was threefold. Firstly, I explored the claims made on behalf of collegiality as an appealing and desirable model for educational management; what were the interests to be served through collegiality? I argued that rather than serving the ends so claimed collegiality could be read as a technology and a discourse promoting the ends of policy-makers intent on taking control of the work of teachers. I concluded Chapter Six by suggesting whose ends should be best served by a project targeting genuine collegiality. My purpose at this stage was to work towards an account of collegiality which is retrieved from the position which views it narrowly as an instrument and thus fails to harvest the richness available in a proper, full and intellectually rigorous analysis and understanding of collegiality in its more normative formations.

A radical conception of collegiality - Michael Fielding

There have been claims made for a set of interests to be served by a shift to collegiate approaches in schools. In the previous chapter I have considered these and following some discussion on grander educational policy objectives have done two things. Firstly I challenged the validity of some of these claims and secondly I proposed an altogether different constituency that might more likely be served, i.e. the interests of the policy arena in education which I claimed was seeking increasingly to take greater control of both teachers' work and schools. I added my view that the teacher unions and teacher membership, whilst attracted to the notion of collegiality for various reasons perhaps neither see the controlling potential of collegiality nor yet recognise its creative and invigorating potential if re-conceptualised and rehabilitated. I concluded by restating my support for collegial schools but only if the concept and the discursive effects are studied and renovated to embrace more genuinely the norms identified at an early stage in the dissertation. What I am now seeking to do is reflect on what a more radical revision of collegiality would look like and what its effects might be.

To this end I will draw on Fielding (1999) who proposes a 'Radical Collegiality'. Fielding envisages a reconceptualisation of collegiality, which I will now consider as I seek to uncover a more meaningful, normative account. He describes a more genuine collegium which is "radical" and affirms "teaching as an inclusive professional practice" (Fielding, 1999: 1). Fielding's vision is attractive and ambitious but is not without its own problems. This said his collegiality and the arguments supporting it serve as a foil for me as I seek to continue to critique approaches to both new and current workings of collegiality which can be seen to represent tokenism and fail to provide for a profession and a wider constituency and community of interest which wishes to engage seriously with educational policy and practice. I will proceed by giving an account of what he sees as a model of radical collegiality, I will highlight '*en passant*' the issues on which he and I could 'shake hands' but will then adopt my identity of a school Manager and describe some fundamental obstacles confronting his radical vision .

Fielding's stated intention is to retrieve the 'collegium', mindful of his concern to view teaching as a practice occupying a "communal, rather than an individualist framework" (Fielding, 1999: 3). He views his 'reconstruction' as rendering collegiality "commensurate with an inclusive professionalism and the development of a more authentic, more dialogic

form of democracy as we move into the 21st century” (Fielding, 1999: 3). Fielding and I share the same objective here in that we are equally concerned for the need to inject dialogue and democracy into school management processes. He is as committed as I am to participation, voice and consultation (not at any superficial or tokenistic level) to a significant degree whereby constituencies of interest in education are ‘inclusively included’ in relation to formulation and implementation of educational policy.

What is required is an account which acknowledges that collegiality is saturated with values (value rationality – a principle ‘for its own sake’), not limited to specific schools but something which transcends individual school boundaries, capable of drawing on the past and future, cognisant of the context of postmodernity and part of a participatory project in which the voices of “students, parents and community have an increasing resonance and legitimacy” (Fielding 1999: 17).

Fielding’s project is to establish a model of collegiality, sufficiently radical, which re-imagines educational decision making as being something not purely for the sake of education but for the contribution towards a ‘more dialogic’ form of engagement which contributes in turn to grander democratic processes and practices. He argues for a re-imagined profession which seeks not to bolster professional distinctions but which, paradoxically perhaps, seeks to weaken the fences surrounding a profession in the interests of including the voices and positions of those who are not professionals or who are located beyond the boundaries of the particular profession. Fielding seeks a redefined professionalism. This rehabilitation of teacher professionalism will demand, in his view, a redefined and radicalised model of collegiality in which he identifies three strands, differing in their degree of contentiousness.

The first and least contentious re-working of his ‘radical collegiality’ is one in which teachers learn from each other. In identifying the desirability of teachers learning from each other Fielding’s concern is to reach beyond the practical learning which might result from teacher to teacher engagements and to point to what for him is the real difference between collaboration and collegiality. For Fielding:

The collegial imperative is more inclusive than its collaborative counterpart because it transcends the instrumentalism and short-termism of activities and undertakings which bring teachers together within the rubric of an invasive managerialism or a merely prudential impulse (Fielding 1999: 21).

Fielding sees such a definition not only as a potentially practical good but as a reaction against trends which are deprofessionalising teachers and commonly disempowering them in terms of their influence over what they do in schools. There is more at stake in properly distinguishing collegiality from collaboration than merely arriving at the correct choice of terminology; for Fielding collegiality is a term which demonstrates and celebrates “the necessity of professional equality as a central dynamic in an authentic, inclusive collegiality” (Fielding, 1999: 22).

A second slightly more contentious view he holds is that teaching is a personal rather than a technical engagement (one could debate whether this is the case in medicine or law or indeed other professional encounters). As such there is to the fore his concern that the ‘mutuality’ of learning and teaching is amplified through an approach to collegiality which pays due regard to such a relationship. With this in mind Fielding argues that:

...students enter the collegium not as the object of professional endeavour, but as partners in the learning process, and, on occasions, as teachers of teachers, not solely, or merely as perpetual learners. Collegiality on this account is radical and inclusive not just because boundaries become less securely drawn, but also because the agents of the reconfiguration turn out to be those traditionally regarded as the least able and least *powerful* (my emphasis) members of the educational community (Fielding, 1999: 21).

This view of the pupil’s or carer’s role in the pedagogical relationship is one which is coming increasingly to the fore but is often faced with entrenched reactionary attitudes from within a profession which does not wish to weaken its boundaries. To say that we have not come some way in including the pupils’ voices in what we do in schools would be unfair and recent initiatives, again coming from the Scottish centre and influenced by European-Regional and International law, are increasingly demanding that schools pay much more than perfunctory attention to the views of learners not only in relation to matters such as the decor of the school toilets but to matters attending the very nature and substance of learning⁹². One gets the sense however that such appeal for pupils’ involvement in educational planning is on the surface rather than rooted in educational philosophy.

Fielding describes as ‘disgusting’ and ‘dishonest’ (Fielding, 1999: 23) talk of delivering the curriculum, claiming that true education cannot be, and never is, a one directional process.

⁹² This is a significant area of focus for HMIe now, in the course of their inspections.

The process for him is necessarily more dialogic; the relationship between teacher and learner can be nothing other than an expression of the kind of collegiate relationship he argues for. His radical collegiality recognises the spoken and unspoken exchanges in any pedagogic dynamic and his concern for current popular positions on collegiality denies this, promoting instead something which is more planned and contrived (collaboration?) in the name of collegiality. Fielding's distinction between his radical collegiality and traditional learner teacher relationships goes yet further when he draws attention to some of his own research which focuses on the issue of equality which sees teachers as learners and learners as teachers. This radical view of a collegiate relationship is not only right and proper; in Fielding's view it is pregnant with the potential to "embrace(s) difference as an important source of practical energy and intellectual creativity" (Fielding, 1999: 24).

He progresses to develop a third (this time considerably more contentious) argument for collegiality which "draws on arguments from democratic theory which set out the basis on which schools are both expressive of, and contributors to, the furtherance of a democratic way of life" (Fielding, 1999: 25). Firstly, he focuses on aspects of "democratic theory" and reminds his reader of the relevance of "Habermasian discourse ethics in which the heart of the democratic process lies in the dialogic encounter" (Fielding, 1999: 25); the ethics of learning and teaching in a democratic context demands nothing less than the kind of radical collegiality he argues for. Additionally, he explores the issue of the teacher's role in deciding in what education consists, claiming that although teachers do enjoy a professional privilege, this does not immunise them from the need to persuade and justify what they do. He claims that the persuasion and justification can only happen properly in a collegiate relationship in which voices are freed to be heard. For Fielding:

Both these points, the dialogic nature of democracy and the proper locus of educational aspiration residing in large measure in the public domain, shape the kind of professional ideals and collegial aspirations that are not only compatible with, but productive of, a democratic way of life (Fielding, 1999: 25).

Fielding is committed to a model of education which is directly related to the wider democratic process. For him this can only be fully realised if we extend the definition and limitations of the collegium to include the communities within which schools operate and to whom they are ultimately accountable; this includes an undertaking to "seriously rethink the nature of school and the nature of community". He envisages schools smaller than they are and more flexible in their purpose. He recognises the potential for a more

socially and educationally productive interface with their communities⁹³, by ensuring that their boundaries are more “porous and more fluid, their view of community members more optimistic, more imaginative and more generous, their structures and cultures more dynamic and more dialogic, and their intentions unremittingly inclusive” (Fielding, 1999: 26). His critique points to his view that this model is not one which currently prevails. Like me, Fielding recognises ‘excuses’ for collegiality and examples of collegiate practice which are ‘contrived’ (Hargreaves, 1994).

My argument is that collegiality is a convenient idea by which teachers’ work can be controlled and Managed. At present collegiality is offered as a device which will supposedly serve the interests of teacher professionalism. Fielding’s work provides useful complementary observations which accord with my own view that collegiality is an eminently desirable concept which is applicable in the most positive of ways to educational management. In its current instantiations, however, it is undertheorised and under-exploited.

Collegiality as a concept and a discourse has much to offer the teaching profession and those wishing to promote the development of education along democratic lines. Those interested in protecting and energising teacher professionalism and promoting the highest standards of learning and teaching should be interested in engaging in a discussion in which collegiality is re-imagined. However a reimagined collegiality has to be Managed differently if it is to be managed successfully and productively. Furthermore, collegiality has to be considered alongside and in relationship to professionalism; but professionalism, in order to assimilate and accommodate collegiality, itself has to undergo modernisation. Fielding’s radical collegiality offers a model which can point the way for development from current constructions of collegiality which might ultimately result in the most desirable of outcomes for a democratic and truly dialogic model of education. However just as freedom has to be both policed and planned, so too must collegiality be Managed in order that it is managed. The re-imagined collegiality which I seek will require not simply a reconceptualisation of collegiality along the lines argued by Fielding but a reconceptualisation of what we mean by management itself. It will require that we resile

⁹³ Fielding’s vision conjures up images of the New Community Schools model which has featured in the Scottish policy context in the late 1990s and early 2000s. The New Community School philosophy is an example of how the educational collegium can be expanded to embrace the range of personal social services. The initiative in Scotland met with varying degrees of success and as a distinctive educational policy move has receded - in name at least.

from traditional approaches which see management as control and the limited use of power and move towards a view of management which sees nothing incommensurate in the relationship of management with autonomy and power as dispersed across a system. At present such views of a desirable construction of collegiality are hampered by incompatible traditions in management and are thirled to older ideas relating to power and control in education. My concerns for current approaches to collegiality and the possible naivety of Fielding's aspirations arise from the need for a root and branch reappraisal of how educational processes are Managed. In my view until this happens we will fail to manage collegiality to its best effect.

There is an added complication. If the processes for the management of education are to be altered to permit a more radical form of collegiality to prevail, the reconstruction must not be left to the teaching or educational profession alone. There can be no formulaic approach to collegiality which is derived from an entirely professional educational context. Collegiality must be arrived at collegially if it is to be at all meaningful and sincere and the collegium creating the new radical approach must be as eclectic as possible including those popularly termed 'stakeholders' under current neo-liberal and market-based jargon. There are key players in the educational process including learners, teachers and constituencies in society all of whom have a view of what education is and what it should be for (O'Hear, 1984: 1-3).

Another understanding of 'radical' to which Fielding is less alert is that relating to the bureaucracy and processes attending a legally constituted education system. The radical ideal identified is simply not attainable under current educational law; indeed it would require radical change across the system. The nettle of the 'stakeholder' will have to be grasped. Issues relating to institutional autonomy will require addressing and perhaps even much of pre-existing educational legislation would require repeal. But just as it is not possible to be fully radical without root and branch reconsideration neither will it be possible to be genuinely collegiate without re-visiting the constituency of the collegium charged with re-inventing the collegiate processes implied by a more radical view of collegiality. Those who are to Manage collegiality with the view of managing it will have to be brave and radical managers who, from the outset, understand and are unperturbed by the complications thrown up when we use the terms of collegiality.

Collegiality can and should be manageable but its realisation will require Managers who are conceptually alert and prepared to struggle with discourses and concepts instead of adopting and adapting under-critiqued fads and fashions.

Conclusion and implications for professional practice: “The Glasgow Boys”

Recently Glasgow’s Kelvingrove Art Gallery hosted an exhibition of paintings by “The Glasgow Boys⁹⁴”, a ‘school’⁹⁵ of artists who flourished at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries and became ‘grouped’ in the eyes of the world of the art critics. An explanatory note provided by the exhibitors and included with associated merchandising (Appendix One) states that, “In breaking with convention, they showed Scotland an invigorating new way of seeing itself”. The following quotation from this explanatory note⁹⁶ is relevant to the subject and the conclusion of this dissertation, namely collegiality. With respect to the Glasgow Boys it states:

Their collective name arises as much from geographical happenstance as *close collegiality* (my emphasis), a formally articulated manifesto or a pronounced similarity of style. The Glasgow Boys did, however, share an aesthetic that opposed contemporary conventions of subject, style, and finish; their enthusiasm was for the real, the natural and the uncontrived - in subject matter - and the bold, immediate and unpremeditated - in the way they went about making art⁹⁷.

This reference to a shared aesthetic i.e. a shared ethos or a common set of normative assumptions as against a ‘formally articulated manifesto’ describes what I see as appropriate to collegiate schools. It welcomes voice, diversity, participation and individuality while at the same time recognising that there are rules of engagement which demand respect and adherence. It further suggests that collegiality is better viewed as a

⁹⁴ The Glasgow Boys were notably, Sir James Guthrie, Sir John Lavery, E.A. Hornel, George Henry, Joseph Crawhall, Thomas Corson Morton, Thomas Millie Dow, E.A. Walton, William Kennedy, David Gauld, Stuart Park, William Wells, Sir D.Y. Cameron, James Paterson, Alexander Roche, Arthur Melville, James McLachlan Nairn and J. Quinton Pringle.

⁹⁵ It would be interesting to consider whether the ‘school’ developed as the result of ‘The Glasgow Boys’ being rejected by the Art establishment (notably the Glasgow Art Club) much in the same way as Jack Vettriano has been excluded, or whether the rejection resulted from the over-radical and less conventional art which ‘The Boys’ were developing.

⁹⁶ Refer to Appendix A.

⁹⁷ In a documentary recently presented by Muriel Gray for the BBC ‘Artworks’ series. Gray describes how the ‘collegiality’ of the boys included ‘tough’ critique of each other’s creations sometimes to the extent that they painted on one another’s work. I was unable to track down the script for this programme which was screened on 2.6.2010. There is a reference and a link in the references to the dissertation.

tacit force involving changes in perception, motivation, action, even spirituality⁹⁸ than as a policy to be imposed on the collegium. As painters, the group operated as individuals, professionals going their own way yet without doubt operating as part of a collegium. Collegiality in its more attractive formations is redolent of such unspoken but underlying assumptions operating within a group and influencing the output of the group. Again akin to ethos, a collegiate spirit in a school might be difficult to express or identify but its force might, nonetheless be a significant element in creating the ‘social reality’⁹⁹ of the school for better or worse. The reference to the ‘natural’ (a term central to the etymology of ‘ethos’) and the ‘uncontrived’ (an issue of interest to Hargreaves’ reflections on collegiality), also jump off the page at me. It may be that, as in the above example, collegiality is a tacit force but whether conscious or not, its potential and influence must remain the focus of those charged with managing it and keeping it under control.

Collegiality offers to schools a new way of seeing themselves but this will only be the case if those with responsibility for shaping and promoting the new (radical) collegiality see it in a new (radical) way. School policy makers must manage collegiality by Managing it, and must not allow collegiality to Manage schools. It is with this in mind that Management must never be vilified as something not belonging in social activity or in domains in which we encounter ‘something unexpectedly human’ (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993). Management yet has a place where managerialism may not.

Schools have “geographical happenstances” yet they too can have a collegium and be part of a collegiality involving art, individuality, identity, spirituality and “an invigorating new way of seeing” themselves and their communities. In Deal’s (1995) words, in describing the building of the *Polaris* submarine (of all things!) they too can learn to “dance and dream” provided collegiality is properly created, and understood. This is one of the conclusions of this dissertation. The danger, as previously stated, is that this ‘spiritual’ collegium will be thrown out with the ‘managerial’ bath water or drowned in a sea of conflict, resulting from bland intellectual scrutiny and uncritical consensus. The collegiality which might help to create the normative model I seek will sit somewhere between these two extremes.

⁹⁸ Spirituality in management and educational management may mark a new departure for theory. See Houston, et al (2009).

⁹⁹ Greenfield has been mentioned in other pages of this dissertation. His view is that organisations do not in and of themselves exist. The social reality of the organisation derives from that which is ‘human’. Greenfield’s application of phenomenology to the field of organisational (educational) management is both refreshing and illuminating if controversial, complex and challenging.

The theory of collegiality must be eclectic, drawing not only on philosophical enquiry, but also on contemporary management theory and practice including the influences of Greenfield's work on subjective (even phenomenological) models of educational management. Deal's (1995) reflection on management and ritual, symbolism and spirituality, Houston et al's (2009) very recent and fascinating connection of spirituality with educational leadership, Ball and Fairclough (and the post-modernists) understandings and explications of discourse and Fielding's attempt (described above) to develop an "inclusive professional" if somewhat idealistic "model" of collegiality.

This need, indeed necessity, to venture into these fields means that this dissertation cannot be described as a purely philosophical thesis. It is both a theoretical and a practical dissertation (in the field of educational management) showing not only the interdependence but the mutual nourishment of one for the other, a mutuality I have referred to early on as being iterative. In this it faces the kind of criticisms all studies in education face, namely that education is neither a subject, nor a form of knowledge¹⁰⁰. The critic and writer Colm Brogan once described psychology and education as the two bastard disciplines of the (20th) century. Educational Studies is a field of study just like Politics. Both demand interdisciplinary approaches even, perhaps especially, when dealing with important difficult, even abstruse concepts such as collegiality; above all both are pre-eminently practical. Educational activity (practical or theoretical – or in combination) has huge implications for society, for committees, for families and for the life chances of children. It is now important to conclude the dissertation with some comment on its implications for professional practice.

There is no attempt here to start a new "Theory Movement" which will create a theory of collegiality as a clear and unchallenged prescription. Theory will change as it always has and may even be "reactivated" (Foucault, 1991) or go backwards to previous theories or typologies (English, 1994). The great paradox and challenge is that theory and practice must be sustained as interdependent activities. This has of course implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education and staff development. At a time when ideas are internationally important teachers must remain concerned less with immediate outcomes if this has the result of leading to the forgetting of the fundamentals of learning and teaching. The climate within which we operate is one which values what is measurable and relegates the intangible and the aesthetic. The liberal tradition of education has come under threat

¹⁰⁰ There has been a prevailing debate in the academy as to whether or not educational studies is a subject in its own right or an area requiring the attention of other areas of the social sciences.

from a tradition which, allied to a neo-liberal and economic grand narrative, has placed certain educationally problematic demands on schools, teachers, learners and educational policymakers. I have suggested that the models of management being inveigled into schools have both contributed and responded to this trend and I have included prevailing instantiations of collegiality among these. In saying this I am linking the retrieval of the liberal education tradition with the need to re-appraise the management approaches taken in schools; we might not be able to have one without the other. It is with this in mind that theory becomes important and it is with this in mind that the practice of teaching – in the classroom – and theory become inextricably associated. Are our current teachers professionals who contribute to the creation of education or technicians who deliver what is handed down from others with a more managerialist set of motivators? An understanding of the complexity of collegiality is crucial before we can understand not only the answer to this but the question in the first place. Teachers need to become more immersed in theory if they are to play a meaningful part in delivering a liberal education at the level of the classroom; a doctoral dissertation such as this is, I argue, eminently practical (with another nod to Lewin, 1954)¹⁰¹. Theory must not be abandoned because nothing could have a worse effect on successful practice in a changing world.

Collegiality has immense potential for the improvement of learning and teaching. It would be an interesting exercise to answer Humes' and Smyth's questions not in the historical sense at a future date, but with reference to what the answers would be in a future world where an 'ideal model' of collegiality existed. In such a world collegiality would come from the school, the community, the pupils and it would serve the interests of all these categories. Such a collegiality would be more in tune with what Fielding envisages.

The management implications are also colossal, not least in relation to the role of the Head Teacher. Communication is central to good management. This of course has always been the case and it is well known that the need is not only crucial to keep open lines of communication within schools and communities but with the wider world which is affected by (and affects) such institutions. Without international antennae what would the Glasgow Boys have become? What would have happened to the Glasgow Boys?

Collegiality will not necessarily reduce conflict – it may increase it. Reflecting on Humes' important distinction between 'soft' and 'tough' collegiality, it is perhaps the soft

¹⁰¹ **Note:** "There is nothing more practical than a good theory". *Disputed: Primarily attributed to Kurt Lewin, but also sometimes to Maxwell, Albert Einstein, and a few others. See: <http://www.quotesstar.com/quotes/t/there-is-nothing-more-practical-112468.html>.*

instantiation which is potentially of more concern. Reflecting again on the ‘Troublesome Young Men’ it seems they may have had a great deal in common with the Glasgow Boys (although they would have been astounded to discover it) in that both formed a collegium in conflict to a greater or lesser extent with the prevailing one which was to work to the benefit of, in one case British security and in the other Scottish culture. Both in their own way took a risk in order to advance their vision (political or artistic).

Collegiality does not mean that leadership and management are no longer necessary. On the contrary they are more necessary although different in nature and of a different kind. Here Mannheim’s concept of ‘Planning for Freedom’ is of relevance, as is Alderson’s recognition of the need to ‘Police Freedom’ in modern complex Western democracies. School heads and management teams must create the circumstances in which collegiality (properly understood) can flourish even, as in the case of the Glasgow Boys, tacitly. Management must focus not on ‘control’ but on ‘climate’ and in creating a ‘common culture’¹⁰² within which all others operate and communicate.

A great danger facing education is sentimentality. Perhaps in this context it is idealism. Hence my departure from, and dispute with, Fielding’s radical model which in important ways fails to recognise that there is a harsh world ‘out there’ where Head Teachers (quite rightly) are constrained by law, HMIe reports, social disadvantage and official reports such as (for example) McCrone. Political skills and a strong realisation of what is political are among the seemingly endless management skills required by a modern Head Teacher. Then there is political change; in England and Wales at present, Michael Gove is introducing academies and free schools. The Scottish government may have nothing to do with them but it is highly likely (if we read the history of the Thatcher years) that the Scottish context will react and respond and will come up with something new (the New Right has re-emerged in recent weeks as I write). The policy shifts already evident in the recently formed government conjure unpleasant memories of the educational market place. As the cynic might say, this is no time to pursue some romantic will o’ the wisp called collegiality when there are tough educational decisions – impinging upon economic reconstruction - to pursue. Yet without collegiality can successful change take place? The alternative is a truculent profession going through the motions of delivering change it does not believe in. Collegiality imagined in the most normative of senses would be attractive to both Foucault and Ball who, as I discussed in Chapter Four, recognised the awareness of

¹⁰² “The idea of culture describes our common inquiry but our conclusions are diverse, as our starting points were diverse. The word, culture, cannot automatically be pressed into service as any kind of social or personal directive” Williams, R. 1985: 285).

discourse and its effects and potential as the first step towards freedom from its worst excesses.

One of the most disturbing findings of this dissertation is that collegiality, at least in some of its more unsavoury aspects, has been a means of social control just as Arnold and other public school headmasters used the house system, the prefect system and the Chapel as more subtle and effective means of social control than the cane. Another even more subtle tool at these heads' disposal was "discourse" a term which has formed a most important part of this dissertation. When the great Lord Roseberry was dying he had the Eton boating song played to him; the loyalty to the college remained to the end. Language related to loyalty and respect for authority became central to the English public schools and their success. "The discourse speaks us" (Ball, 1990).

The discourse must no longer speak Scottish pupils, teachers, parents and communities. In a flourishing collegiate system they will understand the discourse and they will speak it; they may even help, we will hope, create it. They may even learn to "dance and dream" (Deal, 1995) freed from those structural, managerialist and political constraints which prevent them from doing so now.

The collegial Head Teacher

My departing explanation for undertaking this work was to explore what I believe to be a significant move in educational management, i.e. the turn to collegiality, and to hunt and confront assumptions (Brookfield, 1995) about collegiality. The doctoral student is expected to be an active producer of knowledge. I suggest that there is an important distinction to be made between 'knowledge' and 'thinking'. I concede that because my work has been non-empirical, there is less evidence of what I might now 'know' about collegiality than there might be about what I now think. However, I do suggest that the dissertation has allowed me to develop 'thinking' about collegiality in a way which I perceived at the outset to be lacking. My early criticism of the emerging and influential discourse of collegiality was that it had not been thought about very much at all.

Reflection on both the concept and discourse of collegiality and the application of the tools of the philosopher have allowed me to interrogate tensions and issues which caution the theorist of educational management to look more deeply beneath the surface

before attempting to move from theory into practice. Oscar Wilde¹⁰³ cautioned about reading both on and beneath the surface; what emerges leaves us feeling uncomfortable in either case. I suggest that if applied without the benefit of serious thought collegiality will be at best a passing fad and at worst a contrived exercise in managerialism.

However, I am not suggesting that such severe thought will lead to final solutions.

Chapters Three, Four and Five show the sheer complexity of what is often treated as a perfunctory idea of general interest and occasional use to educational managers; it is so much more than this.

However attractive the more normative understandings might seem and might be it is the case that the Head Teacher, at present, is constrained by a number of things. Firstly, the Head Teacher although a professional, normally with substantial educational experience and expertise in management, is also a managed servant of the local authority within which he or she operates¹⁰⁴. I have already discussed the conflict posed by varying identities and this is a significant one. While the attractiveness of some of the more liberal and normative understandings of collegiality are obvious, it is nonetheless the case that Head Teachers are immediately constrained by law, by local policy and, paradoxically, by the 'other' less imaginative understanding of collegiality embraced by influential professional organisations. However well a Head Teacher may theorise and reconceptualise collegiality, he or she is immediately faced with systemic obstacles. It is rare for any school Head to have the licence to step too far out of the box of traditional and conservative practise particularly in relation to school education which is in the main both traditional and conservative. The notion of collegiality in the Church presented its own problems showing clearly the tension between collegiality and raw authority. It was clear from this example that conflict and contradiction was inevitable where a historically authoritarian model of governance pertained. Similarly, in the example of higher education, Tapper and Palfreyman described how the normative understanding of collegiality was at once constrained within a system where the outputs were becoming increasingly determined and monitored by the paymaster and the legislator. The notion of collegiality in the university is limited more and more as universities become politicised. In both cases collegiality as imagined in the most

¹⁰³ "Those who go beneath the surface do so at their peril". "Those who read the symbol do so at their peril". Preface to 'The Picture of Dorian Gray' by Oscar Wilde (1890).

¹⁰⁴ In the case of independent schools management bodies and systems of governance will play a large part in determining the individual scope of the head teacher to adopt particular management styles.

normative of senses is illusory and this has been acknowledged by Little, Reinken, Brundrett and Bush as they have tackled the notion in their own reflections and writings, concluding that collegiality is idealistic and easier to imagine in theory than to deliver in practice. Ronald Cartland invoked his own understanding of collegiality to counter a more potentially dangerous interpretation. He was pilloried but in the parliamentary context was relatively safe. It is less likely that a Head Teacher so confronting his 'masters' would be dealt with sympathetically or leniently.

In the context of the school management, any departure along the lines of a more radical understanding could conflict with educational law, local government and professional organisation guidelines and ultimately contractual agreements. For the individual Head Teacher, the radical collegiality imagined and described in this dissertation is highly problematic. The possibility does not exist at present to extend the collegium too far beyond the school fence in anything other than a tokenistic way. This radical collegiality is something that may emerge in the future, but only I suggest, after the educational community has thought radically about radical collegiality. Likewise, the move to a spiritual paradigm in educational management sounds and seems an attractive opportunity for schools to take up Deal's (1995) invitation to 'dance and dream'. However, 'dancing and dreaming' might not deliver the political priorities for education envisaged by government, who see a clear association between education and economy as preferred to education in the liberal sense.

Contained within the concept and discourse of collegiality and lurking beneath the surface of the attractive terms of collegiality are seriously complex issues and tensions which offer as many problems as they solve. In the end, for the time being, there is no complete and workable theory of collegiality - this will have to develop, evolve and be refined using inputs from academia and working practitioners. Opportunities to open up the relationship between those who are Managed in the interest of the Managed context can be taken. It is very likely the case that, as HMIe claims to have identified, there are examples of good practice out there. We should remain cautioned however for two reasons. A narrowly conceived collegiality - one attuned to industrial relations - might not only be less than useful but potentially harmful. On the other hand, a radical collegiality, such as that imagined by Fielding and those attracted to the 'spiritual' paradigm might at this stage be too far, at odds with what the educational world is ready for.

None of these barriers should persuade the educational leaders to discontinue the search for the means of rendering school governance more collegial, but they should be alert to the need for more system wide acceptance and adjustment before any normative and creative instantiation of collegiality can be realised. For an effective discourse of collegiality to emerge and endure a widening of the field of debate is required and teachers will need to be educated and encouraged to look beneath the surface of management fads and fashions to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats these may pose. It is hoped that this dissertation has made a useful contribution to the connected field of knowledge and the evolving process of reflection and debate – all, of course, in an honest spirit of true collegiality!

Appendix A

The following is a reproduction of a leaflet which came with a box of greeting cards based on the work of The Glasgow Boys.

THE GLASGOW BOYS

PAINTING IN SCOTLAND

Their collective name arises from geographical happenstance as from close collegiality, a formally articulated manifesto, or a pronounced similarity of style. The Glasgow Boys did, however, share an aesthetic that opposed contemporary conventions of subject, style, and finish; their enthusiasm was for the real, the natural, and the uncontrived-in subject matter-and the bold, immediate, and unpremeditated-in the way they went about making art.

Initially, like the French Impressionists and other contemporaries whose art diverged from the mainstream, the Glasgow Boys were disparaged for expressing their views in oil paint. What we see now as fresh and forceful landscapes and figurative works, conservative Scottish artists and critics of the day saw as an affront to academic standards of subtlety and polish. But after they were well received by the larger European art world, the Boys-notably, James Guthrie, John Lavery, E.A. Hornel, and George Henry, the core group of four whose paintings are reproduced in this set-eventually saw their work accepted and then championed at home. In breaking with convention, they showed Scotland an invigorating new way of seeing itself.

NATIONAL GALLERIES OF SCOTLAND ©

Pomegranate

CATALOGUE NO. 364

References

- Abrams, P. (1982) *Historical Sociology*, Shepton Mallet, Open Books.
- Apple, M. (1989) Critical Introduction: Ideology and the State in Educational Policy, in Dale, R. (1989) *The State and Education Policy*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Archer, M. (1979) *The Social Origins of Educational Systems*, London, SAGE.
- Adoremus (1999) *Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Pastores Gregis of His Holiness Pope John Paul II on the Bishop, Servant of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for the Hope of the World*, Chapter 1 – The Mystery and Ministry of the Bishop, The collegial nature of the episcopal ministry, section 8, para 9, available at: <http://www.adoremus.org/pastoresgregis.html#anchor1580716> (last accessed 10.7.10)
- Alderson, J. (1979) *Policing Freedom: A commentary on the dilemmas of policing in Western democracies*, Plymouth, Macdonald and Evans.
- American Philosophical Association (APA) at: <http://www.apa.udel.edu/apa/governance/statements/research.html> (last accessed 31.7.09).
- Angus, M. (1990) *Making better schools: devolution the second time around. Paper to Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association*, Boston, in Smyth, J. (1991).
- Aoudjit, A. (2010) Political Philosophy After Metaphysics: Habermas and Lyotard, *Philosophy Now*, Issue 77, (February/March) pp. 10-14, London, Anja Publications Ltd.
- Argyris, C. and Schön, D. (1974) *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- BBC (2010, 3rd June) BBC Two Programmes - The Glasgow Boys, available at: www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b00sm21r/The_Glasgow_Boys/, (last accessed 5.6.10).
- Bacharach, S. and Mundell, B. (1995) *Images of Schools*, London SAGE.
- Baker, M. (2008) Lesson one: no Orwellian language, BBC News online, available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/7247160.stm>, (last accessed: 15.7.10).
- Ball, S. (1990) *Politics and Policy Making in Education*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Ball, S. (1994) *Education Reform: A critical and post-structural approach*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Ball, S. (1999) *Global Trends in Educational Reform and the Struggle for the Soul of the Teacher!* Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Sussex at Brighton, September 2nd – 5th, 1999 Centre for Public Policy Research, King's College London, available at: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001212.htm> (last accessed 15.7.10).

Ball, S. (2003) *The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity*, *Journal of Education Policy*, 2003, vol. 18, no. 2, London, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 215-228, available at: http://www.queensu.ca/ctl/programs/programworkshops/trc/winter2006/S_Ball.pdf (last accessed 14.7.10).

Baldrige, J., Curtis, D., Ecker, G. and Riley, G. (1978) *Policy-making and effective leadership*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Barker, R. (1997) How can we train leaders if we don't know what leadership is?, *Human Relations*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp 343 -362 quoted in Goepfinger (2002). The fallacies of our reality: a deconstructive look at community and leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp 77-83.

Barnett, R. (2003) *Beyond all Reason: Living with Ideology in the University*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Bash, L. and Coulby, D. (1989) *The Education Reform Act: Competition and Control*, London, Cassell.

Bentham, J. (1995) *The Panopticon Writings*. Ed. Bozovic, M. London, Verso.

Blair, T. (1996a) *Speech to Labour Party Conference*, London, October, available at: <http://philippalatimer.co.uk/home/?p=80> (last accessed 18.7.10).

Blair, T. (1996b) *Speech given at Ruskin College*, Oxford, December, available at: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/000000084.htm> (last Accessed 18.7.10).

Blair, T. (1997) Prime Minister's statement to the education summit at Downing Street, September, available at: <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page1051.asp> (last Accessed 18.7.10).

Bloomer, K. (2009) BBC learning Scotland, *Keir Bloomer on the Curriculum for Excellence*, available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/scotlandlearning/2009/08/keir-bloomer-on-the-curriculum.shtml> (last accessed 19.7.10).

Bridges, D. (2003) *Fiction written under Oath? Essays in Philosophy and Educational Research*, Dordrecht (NL) Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Brookfield, S. (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass Higher Inc and Adult Education.

Brundrett, M. (1998) What lies behind collegiality, Legitimation or Control? An analysis of the Purported Benefits of Collegial Management in Education, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, vol. 26, no. 3, London, SAGE, pp. 305-316.

- Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality, with two lectures and an interview with Michel Foucault*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Bush, T. (1986) *Theories of Educational Management*. London, Harper and Row Ltd.
- Bush, T. (ed.) (1989) *Managing education: theory and practice*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Bush, T. (1995) *Theories of Educational Management* (2nd edition) London, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Bush, T. (2003) *Research in Educational Leadership: Past Present and Future*, Paper presented at the Standing Conference for Research in Educational Leadership and Management, June, Milton Keynes.
- Bush, T. (2006) *Theories of Educational Management*, [online module 'Connections'], available at: <http://cnx.org/content/m13867/latest/>. (last accessed 11.7.10).
- Butler, J. (1997) Excitable Speech: a Politics of the Performative: Encyclopaedia II – Judith Butler, available at: http://www.experiencefestival.com/a/Judith_Butler_-_iExcitable_Speech_A_Politics_of_the_Performative_1997/id/1540504 (last accessed 15.7.10.).
- Callaghan, J. (1976) Ruskin College Speech, available at: <http://education.guardian.co.uk/thegreatdebate/story/0,9860,574645,00.html>, (last Accessed 30/6/05).
- Canetti, E (1935) *Auto-da-Fé*, (tr) Wedgewood, D. London, Macmillan.
- Coffield, F. Borrill, C. and Marshall, S. (1986) *Growing up at the Margins*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Cookson, P. (1994) The Power Discourse: Elite Narratives and Educational Policy Formation, in Walford, G. (ed.) *Researching the Powerful in Education*. London, University College London Press.
- Corbett, P. (1965) *Ideologies*, London, Hutchinson.
- COSLA (2003) Leaders Report No. 1 – 08.04.2003TACT/Leaders Report folder, available at: <http://www.cosla.gov.uk/%5Cattachments%5Cleaders%5C1250403item4.pdf> (last accessed 17.7.10).
- Cunningham, K. (2004) quoted in Scottish Executive (2004) *School Leadership and Collegiality*, Teachers Agreement Communication Team (TACT) paper, available at: http://www.scottishcouncils.org/tact/vti_bin/owssvr.dll?Using=TAC%20Team%20briefin%20papers%20 (last accessed 30/6/05).
- Dale, R. (1989) *The State and Education Policy*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolley, H. and Beresford, J. (2000) *Leading Schools in Times of Change*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

- Day, C. (2003) The UK Policy Environment for School Leadership: Uneasy Transitions. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 5-25
- Deal, T. (1995) Symbols and Symbolic Activity, in Bacharach, S. and Mundell, B. *Images of Schools*, London, SAGE.
- Deal, T. (2009) in Houston, P. Blankstein, K. And Cole, R. (eds.) (2009) *Spirituality in Educational Leadership*, The Soul of Educational Leadership, vol. 4, Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, SAGE.
- Diego, R. (2004) *What is Spin?*, from Roberto Diego, Incredibly Brilliant, Culturally Challenging and Stupendously Rational, available at: <http://www.insmkt.com/spin.htm>, (last accessed 8.7.10).
- English, F. (1994) *A Typology of Metanarratives in Educational Administration*, in English, F. (2004) *A Typology of Metanarratives in Educational Administration* New York: Harper Collins, reprinted in English, F. (2009) *Educational Leadership & Administration*, London, SAGE.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*, London, Longman
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language*, London, Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power*, Harlow, Pearson Education Ltd.
- Fielding, M. (1999) Radical Collegiality: Affirming Teaching as an Inclusive Professional Practice, *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1-34.
- Finlayson, J. (2005) *Habermas: A Very Short Introduction*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Flannery, A. (2007) *Vatican Council II: Constitutions Decrees Declarations*, The Basic Sixteen Documents, A Completely Revised Translation in Inclusive Language, Dublin, Dominican Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, [tr.] Sheridan-Smith, A. London, Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, (2nd Edition) [tr.] Sheridan-Smith, A. London, Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1978) 'Governmentality' in Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality, with two lectures and an interview with Michel Foucault*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 87-104.
- Foucault, M. (1981) *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, London, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1991) Politics and the Study of discourse, in Burchel, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 53-72.

- Fox, C. (1999) Whatever Happened to Collegiality, *National Catholic Reporter*, October, available at: http://www.natcath.com/NCR_Online/documents/TF10-8.htm (last accessed 9.5.09).
- Freud, S. (1922) Freud, Sigmund: 1856-1939, *Introductory lectures on psycho-analysis a course of twenty-eight lectures delivered at the University of Vienna* by Freud, S. [tr.] (1922) Riviere, J., London, Allen & Unwin.
- Fullan, M. (1985) Change processes and strategies at the local level, *Elementary School Journal*, vol. 85, no. 3, pp. 391-421.
- Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. (1992) *Teacher development and educational change*, London, Falmer Press.
- Gallie, W. (1956) Essentially Contested Concepts, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, vol. 56, pp. 167-198.
- Gallie, W. (1964) Essentially Contested Concepts, in Gallie, W., *Philosophy and the Historical Understanding*, London, Chatto and Windus, pp. 157-191.
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way and its Critics*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Gillies, D. (2006a) A Curriculum for Excellence: a question of values, *Scottish Educational Review*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 25-36.
- Gillies, D. (2006b) Excellence, improvement and the HMIE's new six point scale, *Education in the North*, vol. 14, pp. 15-22.
- Gillies, D. (2007) Excellence and Education: rhetoric and reality, *Education, Knowledge and Economy*, pp. 19-35.
- Ginott, H. (1995) *Teacher and child: A book for parents and teachers*, New York, Collier.
- Glatter, R., Preedy, M., Riches, C. and Masterton, M. (1988) *Understanding School Management*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Glatter, R. (1999) From Struggling to Juggling: Towards a redefinition of the field of Educational Leadership and Management, *Educational Management & administration*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 253-266
- Glock, H. (1997) *The Rise of Analytic Philosophy*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Goeppinger, A. (2002). The fallacies of our reality: a deconstructive look at community and leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp 77-83
- Gordon, C. (1991) in Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality, with two lectures and an interview with Michel Foucault*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-49.

Green, D. (2003) Why James Callaghan was wrong. *Guardian*, January, available at: <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sysimages/Education/Pix/columnists/2002/10/21/damiangreen>. (last Accessed 30/6/08).

Greenfield, T. (1975) *Theory about organisation: A new perspective and its implications for schools*, in Hughes, M. (ed.) (1975) *Administering Education: International challenges*. London, Athlone Press of the University of London, pp. 71-99, reprinted in *The management of organisations and individuals*, Morton, V., McHugh, R. and Morgan, C. (eds.) (1975) London, Ward Lock, pp. 59-84.

Greenfield, T. and Ribbins, P. (1993) *Greenfield on Educational Administration*, London, Routledge.

Gronn, P. (2003) Leadership: Who Needs It?, *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 23, no. 3, London, Routledge, pp. 267-290.

Gutting, G. (2005) *Foucault: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 1, [tr.] McCarthy, T. (1984) Cambridge, Polity Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1991) Contrived Collegiality: the micropolitics of teacher collaboration, in Blase, J. (ed), *The Politics of Life in Schools*, Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press Inc.

Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times*, London, Cassel.

Hartley, D. (1989) Beyond Collaboration: the management of professional development policy in Scotland, 1979-89, *Journal of Education for Teaching*, London, Routledge, pp. 211- 223, available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a746526229>, (last accessed 15.7.10).

Harvey, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Hatcher (2005) The distribution of leadership and power in Schools, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 253-267.

Hawley, W. (ed.), (2002), *The keys to effective schools: Educational reform as continuous improvement*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. pp. 43-55.

Hirst, P. (1974) *Knowledge and the curriculum: a collection of philosophical papers*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Houston, P., Blankstein, K. And Cole, R. (eds.) (2009) *Spirituality in Educational Leadership*, The Soul of Educational Leadership, vol. 4, Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, SAGE.

Hughes, M. (1988) Leadership in professionally staffed organisations, in Glatter, R., Preedy, M., Riches, C. and Masterton, M., *Understanding School Management*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, pp. 3-27.

Humes, W. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*, Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers Ltd.

- Humes, W. and MacKenzie, M. (1994) *The Management of Educational Policy*, Harlow, Longman Group Ltd.
- Humes, W. (2000) The Discourses of Educational Management, *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 35-53, available at: <http://www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/EDEQ/article/viewFile/570/440> (last accessed 11.7.10).
- Humes, W. (2004) Professionalism is not Worth the Candle, *Times Educational Supplement Scotland*, 17th December, 2004, available at: <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=2057977>.
- Humes, W. (2007a) in, North Lanarkshire Council, *Working Together: Collegiality in North Lanarkshire Schools*, Coatbridge, Scotland, Joint Negotiating Committee for Teachers, North Lanarkshire Council.
- Humes, W. (2007b) The meaning of collegiality, *Times Educational Supplement Scotland*, 9 March, available at: <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=2354456> (last accessed 14.7.10).
- Humes, W. (2009) What is the true meaning of collaboration? *Times Educational Supplement Scotland* 3rd April, available at: <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6011360> (last accessed 14.7.10).
- HMIe (2009) *Learning together: Improving teaching, improving learning: The roles of continuing professional development, collegiality and chartered teachers in implementing Curriculum for Excellence*, Livingston, HMIe
- Available at: <http://www.hmie.gov.uk/documents/publication/lcfe.pdf>, (last accessed 1.11.10).
- Ihara, C. (1988) Collegiality as a professional virtue, in Flores, A. (ed.) *Professional Ideals*, Belmont, California, Wadsworth, pp. 56-65.
- Jones, K. (2009) Analytic versus Continental Philosophy, *Philosophy Now*, Issue 74 (July/August) London, Anja Publications, pp. 8-11.
- Journey to Excellence at: <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/journeytoexcellence/> last accessed 21.9.09.
- Kirkpatrick, F. (2005) *John Macmurray: Community beyond Political Philosophy*, Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Lachs, J. (2009) Can Philosophy still produce public intellectuals? *Philosophy Now*, Issue 75 (September / October) London, Anja Publications, pp. 24-27.
- Lawn, D. (1996) *Modern Times? Work, Professionalism and Citizenship in Teaching*, Bristol, Falmer Press.
- Lawn, D. and Ozga, J. (1986) Unequal partners: teachers under indirect rule, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 225-238.

- Lawn, D. and Ozga, J. (1988) The educational worker? A reassessment of teachers, in Ozga, J.(ed.) (1988) *Schoolwork: Approaches to the Labour Process of Teaching*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K. and Riehl, C. (2003) What do we Already Know about Successful School Leadership?, paper for AERA, Chicago, April, quoted in Mulford, B. (2005) The International Context for Research in Educational Leadership, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 139-154.
- Lessa, I. (2006) Discursive struggles within social welfare: Restaging teen Motherhood, *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 36, pp. 283–298.
- Lester, S. (2004) Conceptualizing the practitioner doctorate, *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 757-770, London, Carfax Publishing, available at: (http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/237632_906484679_713719917.pdf (last accessed 9.7.10).
- Levy, N. (2003) ‘Analytic and Continental Philosophy: Explaining the Differences’, *Metaphilosophy*, vol. 34, no. 3, Malden (MA), Wiley-Blackwell.
- Little, J. (1982) Norms of collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success. *American Education Research Journal*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 325-340.
- Little, J. (1990a) The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers’ professional relations. *Teachers College Record*, vol. 91, no. 4, pp. 509–536.
- Little, J. (1990b) Teachers as colleagues, in A. Lieberman (ed.), *Building a Professional Culture in Schools*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp. 165- 193.
- Little, J. (2001) Teachers' work at the turn of the century, In Oelkers, J. (ed.) *Futures of Education: Essays from an interdisciplinary symposium*, Bern, Peter Lang, pp. 281-303
- Little, J. (2002) Professional communication and collaboration, In Hawley, W. (ed.), (2002), *The keys to effective schools: Educational reform as continuous improvement*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. pp. 43-55.
- Lortie, D. (1964) The teacher and team teaching: Suggestions for long-range research, in Shapin, J. and Olds, H. Jr. (eds.) (1964) *Team teaching*. New York, Harper & Row, pp. 270-305.
- MacDonald, A. (2003) Collegiate or compliant?, Primary teachers in post-McCrone Scotland, *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 30, no. 3, London, Carfax Publishing, pp. 413-433, available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a713613807>, (last accessed 9.7.10).
- Machiavelli, N. (1999) *The Prince*, (tr. with notes by Bull, G.) London, Penguin Classics,
- MacKenzie, M. (1994) in Humes, W. and MacKenzie, M. (1994) *The Management of Educational Policy*, Harlow, Longman Group Ltd.

- Main, P. (1986) (Chairman) *Report into the Pay and Conditions of Service of School Teachers in Scotland* (Cmnd. 9893) Edinburgh, HMSO.
- Mandelson, P. and Liddle, R. (1996) *The Blair Revolution*, London, Faber.
- Mannheim, K. (1931) On the Diagnosis of Our Time, in Wolff, K. (ed.) (1993) *From Karl Mannheim*, (2nd expanded edition), London, Transaction Publishers.
- Masschelein, J. and Quaghebeur, K. (2005) Participation for Better or for Worse?, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 51-65, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, pp. 51-65
- Mawdsley, R. (1999) Collegiality as a Factor in Tenure Decisions, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, June, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 167-177 available at: <http://www.springerlink.com/content/t134654517p1363t/> (last accessed 15.7.10).
- McPherson, A. and Raab, C. (1988) *Governing Education: A Sociology of Policy since 1945*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Munn Report (The), Munn, J. (1977) (Chairman) *The structure of the curriculum in the third and fourth years of the Scottish secondary school*, Scottish Education Department (1977), Edinburgh, HMSO.
- Noble, T. and Pym, B. (1970) Collegial authority and the receding locus of power, *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 431-45.
- Noble, T. and Pym, B. (1989) Collegial authority and the receding locus of power, in Bush, T. (ed.) (1989) *Managing education: theory and practice*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, pp. 28-42.
- North Lanarkshire Council, (2007) *Working Together: Collegiality in North Lanarkshire Schools*, Coatbridge, Scotland, Joint Negotiating Committee for Teachers, North Lanarkshire Council.
- Nuffield Report (2009) *Education for All: The Future of Education and Training for 14-19 year-olds*, available at: <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415547222/> (last accessed 1.11.10).
- O'Hear, A. (1984) *Education, Society and Human Nature: An Introduction to Philosophy of Education*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Olson, L. (2007) *Troublesome Young Men*, London, Bloomsbury.
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2001) *What Works in Innovation in Education: New School Management Approaches – Education and Skills*, OECD, available at: http://www.oecd.org/document/3/0,3343,en_21571361_44315115_1912259_1_1_1_1,00.html (last accessed 15.7.10).
- Pignatelli, F. (1994) Market models and managerialism in education, in Humes, W. and MacKenzie, M. (1994) *The Management of Educational Policy*, Harlow, Longman Group Ltd. pp. 83-93.
- Plant, R. (1978) Community: Concept, conception and ideology, *Politics & Society*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 79-107.

- Porter, P. '(1929) 'A Consumer's Report', available at: <http://toniabb.blogspot.com/2005/03/consumers-report-peter-porter-1929.html> (last accessed: 15.7.10).
- Prado, C. (2003) *A House Divided: Comparing Analytic and Continental Philosophy*, New York, Prometheus, Humanity Books.
- Priestley, M. and Humes, W. (2010) The development of Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence: amnesia and déjà vu, *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 345- 361.
- Pring, R. (2007) quoted in an interview with Baker, M. (16.2.08) Lesson one: no Orwellian language, BBC News online, available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/education/7247160.stm>, (last accessed: 15.7.10).
- Quaghebeur, K., Masschelein, J. and Nguyen, H. (2005) Paradox of Participation: Giving or Taking Part, *Journal of Community & Applied Psychology*, no. 14, available at: www.interscience.wiley.com, pp. 154-165.
- Readings, W. (1996) *The University in Ruins*, Harvard, Harvard University Press.
- Reid, I., Brain, K. and Boyes, L. (2004) Teachers or learning leaders?: Where have all the teachers gone? Gone to be leaders, everyone, *Educational Studies*, vol. 30, no. 3.
- Reinken, B. (1998) *System of Collegiality: Theory of Professional Collegial Relationships in Secondary Schools*, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, (CA) April 13th - 17th 1998, available at: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED419804.pdf> (last accessed 14.7.10).
- Rowan, B. (1990) Commitment and control: Alternative strategies for organizational design of schools. In Cazden, C. (ed.) (1990), *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 16, Washington DC, American Research Association,
- Richman, B. and Farmer, R. (1974) *Leadership, Goals and Power in Higher Education*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Schön, D. (1983) *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*, Aldershot, Arena Ashgate.
- The Scottish Government Website, formerly Scottish Executive Website (now no longer) available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Home>, (last accessed 17.7.10).
- Scottish Executive (2000a) *A teaching profession for the 21st century, (McCrone Report)*, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive (2000b) *A teaching profession for the 21st century: (McCrone Report)*. Appendices, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive (2001) *A teaching profession for the 21st century: agreement reached following recommendations made in the (McCrone Report)*, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive (2004) *School Leadership and Collegiality, TAC TEAM Paper (2004)*. available at:

[http://www.scottishcouncils.org/tact/vti_bin/owssvr.dll?Using=TAC%20Team%20briefin%20papers%](http://www.scottishcouncils.org/tact/vti_bin/owssvr.dll?Using=TAC%20Team%20briefin%20papers%20) (last accessed 30/6/05).

Scottish Executive (2004) School Leadership and Collegiality, available at: [http://www.scottishcouncils.org/tact/vti_bin/owssvr.dll?Using=TAC%20Team%20briefin%20papers%](http://www.scottishcouncils.org/tact/vti_bin/owssvr.dll?Using=TAC%20Team%20briefin%20papers%20) Last accessed 30/6/05

Scottish Government (2006) *Teaching Scotland's Children*, Her Majesty's Inspectors of Education (HMIe) Edinburgh, Scottish Executive,

The Scottish Government, (2000) Office of Public Sector Information (2000) *Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000*, Available at: http://www.opsi.gov.uk/legislation/scotland/acts2000/asp_20000006_en_1, (last accessed 15.7.10).

The Scottish Government, (2003, November) *Information About the Scottish Qualification for Headship*, available at:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2003/11/18433/28418>, (last accessed 8.7.10).

The Scottish Government, (2006, January) *Achieving the Standard for Headship – Providing Choice and Opportunity*, Scottish Government, (2006, January). *Achieving the Standard for Headship – Providing Choice and Opportunity*. Retrieved May 1, 2010, from The Scottish Government: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/01/31093326/10> <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/01/31093326/10>, (last accessed 8.7.10).

The Scottish Government, (2010) *Deprivation - Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation*, available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Social-Welfare/TrendSIMD>, (last accessed 8.7.10).

(SNCT) Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers, Part 1 Appendix 4: Code of Practice on Collegiality, available at:

http://www.snct.org.uk/wiki/index.php?title=Appendix_1.4 (last accessed 1.11.10).

Schulman, L. (1989) "Teaching alone, learning together": Needed agenda for the new reforms", A paper prepared for the conference on Restructuring Schooling for Quality Education, San Antonio, Trinity University, in Hargreaves, A. (1994) *Changing Teachers, Changing Times*, London, Cassel.

Simons, M. and Masschelein, J. (2006) The Learning Society and Governmentality: An Introduction, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, vol. 38, no. 4, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, pp. 418-430.

Smith, K. (2002) Mutually Contested Concepts and their Standard General Use, *Journal of Classical Sociology*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 329-343, available at: <http://jcs.sagepub.com/content/2/3/329.full.pdf> (last accessed 15.7.10).

Smithers, A. (2001) Education Policy, in Seldon, A. (ed.) (2001) *The Blair Effect*, London, Little, Brown, pp. 405-426.

- Smyth, J. (1991) International Perspectives on Teacher Collegiality: a labour process discussion based on the concept of teachers' work, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 323-346.
- Southworth, G. (1988) Primary Headship and Collegiality, in Glatter, R., Preedy, M., Riches, C. and Masterton, M., *Understanding School Management*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, pp. 45-57.
- Standish, P. (2007) Claims of philosophy, education and research, *Educational Review*, vol. 59, no. 3, London, Routledge, pp. 331–341, available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all?content=10.1080/00131910701427322> (last accessed 10.7.10).
- Starr, P. (1982) *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*, New York, Basic Books.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, London, Heinemann.
- Tapper, T. and Palfreyman, D. (2002) Understanding Collegiality: The Changing Oxbridge Model, *Tertiary Education and Management*, vol. 8, Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 47-63.
- Thatcher, M. (1993) *The Downing Street Years*, London Harper Collins.
- Thurow, L. (1996) *The Future of Capitalism*, New York, William Morrow and Company.
- Webb, R. and Vulliamy, G. (1996) A Deluge of Directives: conflict between collegiality and managerialism in the post-ERA primary schools, *British Educational Research Journal*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 441-458, available at: http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/488772_751319348_746318589.pdf, (last accessed 9.7.10).
- Wilde, O. (2003) *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, London, CRW Publishing.
- Williams, K. (1989) 'The Case for Democratic Management in Schools' in *Irish Education Studies*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 73-86 quoted in Brundrett, M. (1998) What lies behind collegiality, Legitimation or Control?: An analysis of the Purported Benefits of Collegial Management in Education, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 305-316.
- Williams, R. (1985) *Culture and Society*, London, Penguin.
- Wilson, J. (1963) *Thinking with Concepts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wolff, K. (ed.), (1993) *From Karl Mannheim*, (2nd expanded edition), London, Transaction Publishers.
- Wright, N. (2001) Leadership, 'Bastard Leadership' and Managerialism: Confronting Twin Paradoxes in the Blair Education Project, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, July, vol. 29, no. 3, SAGE Online Journals, pp. 275-290, available at: <http://ema.sagepub.com/content/29/3/275.full.pdf+html> (last accessed 14.7.10).

Zoul, J. and Link, L. (2007) *Cornerstones of Strong Schools: Practices for Purposeful Leadership*, New York, Eye on Education, available at: [http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Cornerstones+of+Strong+Schools.\(Brief+article\)\(Book+review\)-a0176562673](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Cornerstones+of+Strong+Schools.(Brief+article)(Book+review)-a0176562673) (last accessed 17.7.10).