

Assembling Schools as Organizations: On the Limits and Contradictions of Neoliberalism

Andrew Wilkins

INTRODUCTION

Neoliberalism has emerged as a broad descriptor or master narrative for situating education settings and processes within wider political and economic trends linked to the expansion of certain policy paradigms shaping public sector reform, namely marketization, privatization, competition, and de-democratization. The aim of this chapter is to explore a range of arguments and perspectives that make use of neoliberalism as a conceptual tool and normative description to theorizing schools as organizations and school systems more generally, while at the same time pointing to the complications and limitations inherent to such theorizing.

There is no doubt that neoliberalism is a seductive signifier. It provides researchers with a conceptual apparatus for tracing empirically the relationships between micro changes in the development of value systems and institutional orders and macro changes occurring nationally and globally.

But neoliberalism is more than a heuristic device for some – it is elevated to something normative, intuitive and ordinary ('we are all neoliberal now'). Some critics go so far as to declare neoliberalism a threat to 'common sense' itself (Hall & O'Shea, 2013: 11) since it functions not only as an economic (or 'restorative') project (see Harvey, 2005) but a social and cultural one shaping moral judgements about what it means to be 'good', 'fair' or 'just'. Therefore, the same critics warn of the dangers of certain species of and appeals to common-sense thinking about the economy, welfare and politics, and the need to reclaim 'common sense' from its neoliberal appropriation. Similarly, among researchers, neoliberalism is mobilized to signify a dominant discourse, and therefore suffers from 'omnipresence (treated as a universal or global phenomenon) and omnipotence (identified as the cause of a wide variety of social, political and economic changes)' (Clarke, 2008: 135). The effect is that neoliberalism is transformed from a potent analytic tool into a

To cite:

Wilkins, A. 2018. Assembling schools as organisations: On the limits and contradictions of neoliberalism. In M. Connolly, C. James, S. Kruse, and D.E. Spicer (eds) SAGE International Handbook on School Organization. Sage: London, pp. 509-523

detached signifier. This partly explains why neoliberalism is more often asserted than it is critiqued in education research.

Another reason why neoliberalism as a conceptual apparatus has not received sufficient critique in education research is perhaps because it operates as a powerful vehicle for mobilizing new political imaginaries and collectivities, including 'consolation' for researchers keen to align their 'professional roles with the activities of various actors "out there", who are always framed as engaging in resistance or contestation' (Barnett, 2005: 10). From the standpoint of social justice activists and those broadly on 'the Left', neoliberalism gives coherence to various grievances and discontents as well as specific objects, relations and processes to rage against (Davies, 2014). Some researchers therefore gravitate to neoliberalism for cognitive and practical reasons – to define objectively that which they are against. But neoliberalism loses some of its critical edge when it becomes a psychological mechanism for coping with complexity, including elements of 'the social'. Barnett (2005: 7), for example, is critical of the way neoliberalism is sometimes used to reduce 'the social' to a 'residual effect of hegemonic projects and/or governmental rationalities'. This is evident in some governmentality studies of neoliberalism where the social (those contingent, historically conditioned spaces in which subjects can be found answering back) is eclipsed by a rigid focus on the governmental techniques and practices that go into making-up ethical and economic selves. These studies appear to assume 'that governmental practice in a plurality of sites flows uniformly from the big transformations produced by neoliberalism' (Newman, 2007: 54), and therefore neglect the excess or surplus that often exceeds neoliberal capture. This does not mean we should abandon neoliberalism as a conceptual apparatus for modelling correlation or correspondence between what happens 'in here' and what occurs 'out there'. Rather, it means operationalizing neoliberalism as something

instrumental and tentative to capturing the 'in-between'. As Hall (2011: 9) argued, 'I think there are enough common features to warrant giving it a provisional conceptual identity, provided this is understood as a first approximation'.

In this chapter I present both a critique and defence of neoliberalism by way of drawing on relevant theories and literatures to present competing, sometimes conflicting and irreconcilable, viewpoints and perspectives. My aim is to use these various literatures and theories to work with and against dominant understandings of neoliberalism and to think through possibilities for its continued use in studies of schools as organizations. In particular, I draw on elements of 'assemblage thinking' (Higgins & Lerner, 2017b) as tools for addressing the importance of 'the social' in studies of schools as organizations. Here 'the social' can be used to reference an active, dynamic space framed by locally situated dilemmas, obligations, normative commitments, and dispositions. As I will demonstrate, assemblage thinking offers education researchers a useful set of tools for tracing empirically the myriad of forces through which schools as organizations are continually shaped and laboured over in the context of 'the social'. In what follows I make use of relevant literature to outline a general theory of neoliberalism from different theoretical perspectives, specifically Marxist and Foucauldian, and point to the multiplicity of conceptual approaches secreted within its meaning. This includes tackling some of the contradictory forces at work through neoliberalization and its relationship to statecraft or state transformation. Following this I outline two dominant approaches to theorizing and researching schools as organizations – positivist and 'critical' – as well as discuss the mediating structures and discourses that bear upon the development of schools as organizations – from New Public Management (NPM) and disintermediation to performativity and network governance. In the final section I outline a theory of assemblage thinking and demonstrate

its analytical significance to navigating the complex terrain on which schools as organizations emerge through fields of contestation where different interests and motives conflict, collide and sometimes converge to produce locally adapted translations and refusals of neoliberalism.

CONCEPTUALIZING NEOLIBERALISM

Like many popular '-isms' – feminism, spiritualism and universalism – neoliberalism is used as a shorthand to describe a movement or 'thought collective' (Mirowski, 2009: 428). While there is widespread agreement regarding some of the fundamental tenets of neoliberalism – key being marketization, privatization and possessive individualism or self-interest – neoliberalism can be differently conceptualized using specific theoretical lenses. Harvey (2005), for example, best exemplifies a Marxist and political economy approach to neoliberalism. Here neoliberalism is characterized as a class-based hegemonic project driven by the interests and actions of elite groups of transnational actors pursuing new means of capital accumulation and class power. Understood from this perspective, neoliberalism signifies various interrelated patterns thought to be endemic to the development of modern capitalism, namely the subordination of national economies to global patterns of deregulated labour, depleted trade union bargaining powers, deregulated markets, and decentralized authority. Similarly, Duménil and Lévy (2004) and others (Plehwe, Walpen, & Neunhoffer, 2006) have conceptualized neoliberalism as a class hegemony engineered to ensure concentration of wealth among the rich through sustaining patterns of consumption and debt as well as propping up corporate monopoly of industry. From a governmentality and Foucauldian perspective (Ong, 2006; Rose, 1999), neoliberalism represents a range of strategies or techniques

utilized by government and non-government authorities for the purpose of managing populations and political structures and decisions in the absence of direct control. For Foucault (1982: 790), the term 'government' should therefore be understood in the broadest sense to mean

legitimately constituted forms of political or economic subjection but also modes of action, more or less considered or calculated, which were destined to act upon the possibilities of action of other people. To govern, in this sense, is to control the possible field of action of others.

At the heart of neoliberalism is a commitment to certain economic and political theories and philosophical perspectives concerning the ontology of the subject (or 'subjectivity') and the relationship between the state and the economy. On the one hand, neoliberalism borrows from the moral philosophy of utilitarianism and elements of classical liberalism to advocate a view of the subject as a rational utility maximizer or 'homo economicus', and therefore strives for conditions in which the freedom of the individual to pursue their own self-interest is not impeded by 'externalities' such as the authority of the state. However, unlike classical liberalism, which held a strong belief in spontaneous order and the corrosive effects of state intervention on the naturally occurring formation of free, atomistic subjects, neoliberalism is not totally indifferent to the state and its capacity to help others realize and advance their private interests. It is certainly opposed to certain configurations or species of state intervention – such as top-down bureaucracy and welfarism in general. This includes government programmes designed to lower taxes, stabilize pensions, increase spending, and protect individuals and groups against some of the unintended consequences of the capitalism. But neoliberalism gives legitimacy to the state in so far as it performs the role of 'a market-maker, as initiator of opportunities, as remodeller and moderniser'

(Ball, 2007: 82). It therefore favours the creation of 'space[s] for a new conception of the role of government in the macroeconomy' (McNamara, 1998: 5).

A strategic focus of neoliberalism, therefore, is 'the active destruction and discreditation of Keynesian-welfarist and social-collectivist institutions' (Peck & Tickell, 2002: 384) and the privatization and depoliticization of public powers and utilities more generally, namely the transfer of ownership of publicly-owned services into private hands. Where wholesale privatization is not possible, a species of active government is necessary to facilitate the subordination of public services to the rationality of the market and the logic of Capital (of profitability, surplus extraction and exchange value). This occurs either through contracting out services to private providers or subsuming existing (publicly-run) services within an economic logic or enterprise form that compels service providers to behave as businesses and rewards individuals who act competitively and 'rationally', i.e., in their own self-interest and above or in contradistinction to the interests of others (Marquand, 2004). Under neoliberalism, therefore, 'the market produces legitimacy for the state, which in turn becomes its "guarantor"' (Gane, 2012: 626).

Here the term 'neoliberalism' can be used to condense a heterogeneity of complex forms and formations originating in the design of new technologies of government and governance introduced in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Western economies were gripped by high inflation and economic stagnation during this time, which many liberal economists and political conservatives attributed to Keynesian economics designed to artificially stabilize the economic cycle through cutting tax and increasing spending (Hirschman, 1991). Interventions from right-wing think tanks – namely the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) and the Adam Smith Institute (ASI) – would later successfully purge the government of its Keynesian-welfarist champions and lay the path for the rise of Thatcherism

in the UK (Hall, 1979) and Reaganism in the US (Brown, 2006). These 'diverse skirmishes were rationalized within a relatively coherent mentality of government that came to be termed neo-liberalism' (Miller & Rose, 2008: 211).

A genealogy of neoliberalism suggests that neoliberalism began as early as the 1920s and 1930s, when economists Friedrich Von Hayek and Ludwig Von Mises engaged in the 'intellectual project of reinventing liberalism' with the ambitious aim to 'replace political judgement with economic evaluation' (Davies, 2014: 3). For Hayek and Mises, a political economy that works to design or predict collective solutions to individual problems, namely state socialism, has dangerous consequences for the moral, intellectual and economic development of a nation and its peoples. Unlike classical liberals, however, Hayek and Mises did not fully embrace a view of the subject as spontaneously rational or a view of the economy as a natural entity that effortlessly and efficiently self-regulates. Hayek, Mises and other critics of socialism at the time (George Stigler and Henry Simons in particular) did share the classical liberal vision of the moral and ontological primacy of the individual as distinct from and superior to the moral status of 'society' and the construction of agreed public purpose. However, they were not committed to a vision of laissez-faire capitalism but instead developed a vision of advanced liberalism (or 'neoliberalism') in which government intervenes to determine agendas and priorities. This includes activating and compelling certain behaviours (market-ready, market-responsive or 'rational' behaviour, for example) where it does not exist or requires support (see Jones, Pykett, & Whitehead, 2013, on 'nudge' tactics). As Peck, Theodore, and Brenner (2009: 51) show:

While neoliberalism aspires to create a utopia of free markets, liberated from all forms of state interference, it has in practice entailed a dramatic intensification of coercive, disciplinary forms of state intervention in order to impose versions of market rule.

The rise of 'policy networks' (Rhodes, 2007: 1244) certainly undermines the notion of a sovereign government capable of exercising a monopoly of control over its various constituent parts. This is evident by the generation of new 'policy communities' and 'heterarchical relationships' (Ball & Junemann, 2012: 137), which are made possible by new philanthropic, charity and private sector actors replacing established policy actors and agencies. Yet, as Taylor (2000: 69) observes, 'government is being redefined and reshaped from the centre outwards rather than being hollowed out' (also see Holliday, 2000). Government under neoliberalism shifts responsibility towards citizens, communities and organizations to govern themselves, and therefore relinquishes some of its direct control. At the same time, government is no less active in 'setting rules and establishing an enforcement mechanism designed to control the operation of the system's constituent institutions, instruments and markets' (Spotton, 1999: 971). Thus, the regulation-deregulation dichotomy is a misleading one (Aalbers, 2016).

Take academies and free schools in England, for example. These schools are granted 'autonomy' (or, to be more precise, professional discretion) to govern themselves strategically, financially and operationally. Yet a condition of that autonomy is that school leaders, governors and trustees adopt certain risks, responsibilities and liabilities formerly managed by traditional structures of government. Under conditions of devolved management, schools are required to be active in their own government as consumer-responsive, market-conforming organizations. Hence regulation is not restricted to parastatal bodies like the school's inspectorate, the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted), calling to schools to make themselves publicly accountable. Regulation is exercised through agents themselves: parents are addressed as consumers (Wilkins, 2012); head teachers are activated as 'transformational leaders'

(Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005); and governors are activated as 'professionals' (Wilkins, 2016). What is specific to neoliberalism is 'the proliferation of mechanisms of self-regulation in the shadow of the state' (Levi-Faur, 2005: 13), taken to be essential to 'linking political objectives and person conduct' (Rose, 1999: 149) in the absence of direct government intervention. On this account, neoliberalism does not entail the 'hollowing out' of the state or 'institutional retreat' (Panitch & Konings, 2009: 68) since deregulation produces fragmentation and complexity that requires greater steering from the centre in terms of agenda and priority setting. According to Levi-Faur (2005: 12), 'Governance through regulation (that is, via rule making and rule enforcement) is at the same time both constraining and encouraging the spread of neoliberal reforms'.

POSITIVIST AND CRITICAL APPROACHES

Neoliberalism is one of the most cited and contested concepts in contemporary studies of education. It describes an analytical tool and policy strategy but is used more generally as a normative description for denoting specific trends in the development of Western economies and politics since the late 1970s. These trends include the rise of finance (or speculative) capitalism; the privatization and marketization of public welfare; the curtailment of trade union bargaining powers and the deregulation of labour; the entrenchment of national economies and political structures within the grip of global forces; the valorization of self-interest and competitive individualism; the shift from hierarchy to 'heterarchy' or self-organization as principles of government; and the intensification of risk, dispossession and insecurity as factors of everyday life. Various researchers (Hatcher, 2006; Papanastasiou, 2017; Saltman, 2014; Stahl, 2017; Wilkins, 2016) have sought to

understand the development of education through the lens of these wider political and economic trends, and therefore use neoliberalism as a conceptual apparatus for mapping the connections and disjunctions between micro relations, processes and structures and macro changes occurring nationally and globally.

Research on schools and school systems employs specific modes of critique to draw out these connections and disjunctions. They include, on the one hand, 'assessing the empirical validity of factual analysis or the technical-instrumental practicality of specific social arrangements' (Jessop & Sum, 2016: 105). This is typical of research commissioned by governments, private industry and some charities, where the preferred outcome is criticism leading to 'impact' and 'improvement' of system design and service delivery. These types of research – sometimes called 'school effectiveness' research – tend to operate under positivist assurances that there is unmediated access to 'truth' and reality can be grasped empirically at the level of 'representation' and 'meta-analyses', such as metrics and algorithms. Intervention is justified as neutral, value-free or 'non-ideological' since it is driven by evidence that is automatic and identical to reality. But measurements are not neutral descriptions of properties of reality. They are produced through normative assumptions, value systems and the identification of 'problems', and are therefore implicated in the very properties they claim to represent or capture (Beer, 2015). Data use and data production are a social creation and mode of politics (Johnson, 2015).

Positivist thinking is complementary to research that strives to bring about greater forms of system coherence and control, and therefore at odds with the idea that schools and school systems produce imaginaries that can only be grasped as partial and provisional. For Jessop and Sum (2016), a critical approach to research entails more than just criticism. It involves 'critiques of ideology and domination' (Jessop & Sum, 2016:

105), with a specific focus on semiosis and 'its articulation into specific imaginaries, discourses and discursive practices or with structuration in the form of specific sets of social relations, institutional orders or broader social arrangements' (2016: 106). Such an approach is useful to situating and analyzing schools and school systems as the socio-material effects of broader discursive patterns and mediating structures, including discourses and practices of neoliberalism. At the same time, it recognizes 'the scope for disjunctions between empirical evidence, actual events and processes' (2016: 106), and the importance of methodological reflexivity more generally. A critical approach to school organization entails documenting the different mediating structures and discourses guiding the development of schools and school systems as well as pointing to any theoretical inconsistencies and anomalies arising from the situated analysis of neoliberalism in practice ('neoliberalization').

MEDIATING STRUCTURES AND DISCOURSES

A useful starting point for thinking about schools and school systems more generally is to trace the mediating structures and discourses that bear upon their development. In England, for example, publicly-funded schools are required to fulfil certain contractual obligations to the government, namely funding agreements. This strictly applies to academies and free schools, which have responsibilities for the financial and educational performance of the school as well as responsibility for management overheads in the form of employment disputes, contractual issues and premises management. Academies and free schools therefore differ from other publicly-funded schools – local government 'maintained' schools, for example – in that they possess freedoms to determine their own budget spending, curriculum, admissions

(subject to the admissions code), staff pay and conditions, and length of school day and term. A condition of these freedoms and flexibilities is that academies and free schools are auditable and workable as 'high-reliability' organizations (Reynolds, 2010: 18) or businesses (Wilkins, 2016). Operationally and strategically, these freedoms and flexibilities demand schools adopt specific modes of co-ordination and their formal operations or activities to ensure continuous self-monitoring, compliance checking, risk assessment, performance evaluation, succession planning, and target setting.

Those responsible for ensuring the smooth functioning of the school as a 'high-reliability' organization – school leaders, school business managers and school governors, in particular – emerge as technicians of NPM. This is particularly striking in the case of head teachers and other school leaders, who face huge pressure from central government and the school's inspectorate, Ofsted (2001, 2011), to maximize delivery of quantifiable outcomes through effective and continuous monitoring and appraisal of staff and student performance (Gunter, 2012). This includes enhancing upward accountability to central government in the case of academies and free schools ('state-funded independent schools'), which are required to fulfil the obligations of their funding agreement with the Secretary of State. Algorithmic governance linked to the production and analysis of pupil attainment data, financial data and staff performance data therefore tends to dominate the everyday work performed by head teachers as well as school governors and trustees (those with responsibility for holding senior school leaders to account for the educational and financial performance of schools). Increasingly, school governors and trustees in England are harnessing the algorithmic power of digital data technologies (the Department for Education's school comparison tool, Analyse School Performance (ASP), and the FFT (Fischer Family Trust) Governor Dashboard, among others) to meet these expectations and

enhance their organizational preparedness and answerability (Wilkins, 2016).

Central to NPM as an organizing principle of public service organization is the idea that service providers share characteristics which can be evaluated, measured and compared to determine their effectiveness, efficiency and continuous improvement (Clarke & Newman, 1997). Although NPM tends to be confined to the school, it gives rise to wider systems of 'commensurability, equivalence and comparative performance' (Lingard, Martino, & Rezai-Rashti, 2016: 542). In effect, NPM helps to produce schools as navigable spaces of replicable and measurable 'quality' so that they are amenable to the scrutiny and statistical mapping of external regulators and funders, and therefore more visible or 'appropriable' as deliverers of a standardized product. NPM therefore signifies increased devolved management of education but also the marketization of education more generally and a shift from 'welfarism' to 'post-welfarism' (Gewirtz, 2002).

As Gewirtz (2002) observes, schools in England have undergone significant changes to their internal structures and practices due to a major shift in the politics of education policy making since the late 1970s. Since this time there has been a persistent derisive government rhetoric designed to undermine the relatively autonomous position of teachers and school leaders as 'professionals' and the role of local governments as administrators of school bureaucracy and oversight. These kinds of institutional orders and social arrangements were integral to the development of post-war social policy and the political settlement known as 'welfarism', but came under increased pressure to reform following interventions by economic liberals and political conservatives during the late 1970s – otherwise known as the 'New Right'. Borrowing from elements of public choice theory and neo-classical economics, the New Right excoriated state intervention in the economy and welfare as authoritarian, demoralizing and inefficient (Gamble, 1986),

and instead championed the role of market concepts of supply and demand, competition and choice to ensure 'allocative efficiency' (Boyne, 1996: 704) in the funding and delivery of education. Rate-capping on provision was introduced to ensure that school budget levels were linked to student intake, for example. This included summoning parents in the role of consumers to create structured incentives for schools to respond to parents as discriminating 'choosers' or 'rational utility maximisers' (Wilkins, 2012). Parents would also be supported in their choice-making by league tables, school visits and school brochures, thereby making service providers more responsive and transparent.

Gewirtz (2002: 3) refers to this paradigmatic shift in education policy as the 'post-welfarist education policy complex (PWEPC)'. The PWEPC points to a decisive break from post-war social policy, namely the administration of 'needs' through bureaucratic centralism and rationalist social planning, and the construction of agreed social purposes. For Ranson (2003: 460), the shift from a welfarist to a post-welfarist paradigm has not only intensified concerns with 'accountability' but reimagined and reoriented relations of accountability to 'strengthen corporate power at the expense of the public sphere'. Corporate power and private sector involvement in public sector organization is closely linked to NPM as it relies on the development of depoliticized systems of devolved management removed from traditional structures of government, including local government interference, union bargaining and forms of 'deliberative democracy' or stakeholder participation (Wilkins, 2016). Under these conditions governments appear to be more trustful of non-human agents and tools as arbitrators of educational excellence – digital data, real-time analytics and machine intelligence (Williamson, 2015) – than they are of teachers, head teachers and middle leaders as professionals. This includes auditing techniques, performance appraisals and standard evaluation frameworks – what Peck

and Tickell (2002: 384) call the 'technocratic embedding of routines of neoliberal governance'. Moreover, private sector takeover or sponsorship in public education is intimately linked to the proliferation of these technologies and techniques of government.

Ball (2008) argues that network governance and venture philanthropy are key to understanding the design and operation of contemporary schools and school systems. Network governance is used here to capture the emergence of new policy communities 'which "catalyses" business in the delivery of education services and reconfigures and disseminates education policy discourses' (Ball, 2008: 749). Related to this shift from government to governance is the expansion of public-private partnerships and private sector participation in education (Verger, Fontdevila, & Zancajo, 2016). The exponential rise of private sector actors and agencies as deliverers of public services points to a shift away from hierarchy and top-heavy bureaucracy as models for steering the organization of schools and school systems. A key consequence of this shift is the dispersal and disaggregation of state power facilitated by increased decentralization and 'disintermediation'. Disintermediation describes 'the withdrawal of power and influence from intermediate or "meso-level" educational authorities that operate between local schools and national entities' (Lubienski, 2014: 424), such as local government and municipal authorities.

As Gunter, Hall, and Mills (2015) observe, the active discreditation of the bureau-professionalism of local government has cultivated opportunities for private sector management of public services and expanded opportunities for the involvement of new knowledge actors and parastatal agencies in the business of monitoring and running schools. Specifically, they document the role and contribution of consultants 'who trade knowledge, expertise and experience, and through consultancy as a relational transfer process they impact on

structures, systems and organizational goals' (Gunter et al., 2015: 519). Other knowledge actors include school inspectors, who assist and compel schools to realize the ambitions of the state and therefore enhance the legitimacy of government. Similar to consultants and other 'experts' involved in practices of credentialing, mediation and monitoring, school inspectors constitute a community of policy actors or 'policy brokers' (Baxter, 2017: 3) with significant influence on the strategy and operation of schools and the ends and outcomes of school systems more generally. But the ends and outcomes of school systems are not only shaped by the professional judgements and evaluation criteria of school inspectors operating within a national framework of education governance. School organization is shaped by global testing regimes facilitated by international programmes conducted by big supra-organizations (Lingard et al., 2016), such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).

The purpose of the OECD's PISA and other related programmes is to collect and compare data on student achievement from different countries across the globe, to indicate the effectiveness of those national education systems in terms of supporting academic performance, and to use that data to generate a flattened comparison model that allows national governments to determine their international economic competitiveness. As Lingard, Martino, and Rezai-Rashti (2016: 540) observe, these global testing regimes constitute a new form of biopolitics and 'metapolicy, steering educational systems in particular directions with great effects in schools and on teacher practices, on curricula, as well as upon student learning and experiences of school'. More importantly, they compel the acceleration and expansion of new infrastructures of accountability in which 'human capital formation has become a central economic focus of national policy, resulting in the economisation of education policy' (Lingard et al., 2016: 541).

In this section I have outlined some of the mediating structures and discourses guiding the development of schools and school systems. In some cases, education researchers mobilize neoliberalism as a broad descriptor for linking these discursive practices and institutional orders to wider macro processes, specifically a hegemonic project or dominant social arrangement in which the ontology of the subject (or subjectivity, sometimes called 'the social'; see Barnett, 2005) is taken to be the residual effect of specific political and economic tendencies linked to processes of marketization, competition, de-democratization, and privatization. Here neoliberalism functions as an analytical framework for tracing interrelationships between school organization, statecraft (or state transformation) and the wider economy. However, some education researchers appear to be less discriminate in their use of neoliberalism compared to others, or at least do not engage sufficiently with the limits of neoliberalism as a normative description to capturing the complex terrain on which school organization is overlaid and aligned with local projects and politics. In what follows I draw on elements of 'assemblage thinking' (Higgins & Larner, 2017b) as tools and practices for thinking through the possibilities and implications of such work, namely situating schools as organizations within a 'matrix of dependencies, reciprocities, and obligations' (Trnka & Trundle, 2014: 150).

ASSEMBLAGE THINKING

Understood as a first approximation, neoliberalism is significant as a provisional starting point to making sense of the discourses, technologies and logics of domination/empowerment shaping the internal operation of schools. Schools and school systems in the grip of advanced liberalism tend to be defined by managerial deference, technocratic efficiency, upward accountability and performativity.

Yet despite the consistency of its economic objectives, neoliberalism remains, ideologically and logically, internally divided and contradictory (Hall, 2005). As Clarke (2008: 135) argues, 'Neoliberalism suffers from "promiscuity" (hanging out with various theoretical perspectives)'. But such promiscuity extends to political formations and politics itself (the ways in which actors labour to form new collectivities and counter-conducts). This is evident in the multiplicity of forms and expressions neoliberalism takes as it is co-articulated with other political movements and ideologies (from neo-conservatism and social rights activism to feminism and the Third Way) (see Higgens & Lerner, 2017a). This explains the unevenness, unpredictability and variegation or 'messy actualities' of neoliberalism across geo-political contexts (Brown, 2006: 14). As Ong (2006: 13) suggests:

It therefore seems appropriate to study neoliberalism not as a 'culture' or a 'structure' but as mobile calculative techniques of governing that can be decontextualized from their original sources and recontextualized in constellations of mutually constitutive and contingent relations.

On this account, the 'success' of neoliberalism is contingent on 'how these selectivities reproduce specific semiotic, social, institutional and spatiotemporal fixes that support the reproduction of economic, political and social domination' (Jessop & Sum, 2016: 108). From this perspective, neoliberalism does not only operate through 'accumulation by dispossession' (Harvey, 2007: 34), but also through strategies of reorientation, reculturing and 're-agenting' (Hatcher, 2006: 599) in order to rebuff local politics and local culture. Neoliberalism involves experimentation and adaption (Peck & Theodore, 2015). Such a view of neoliberalism means refusing 'reified and homogenous accounts of modern power' which portray 'forms of power/knowledge as monolithic, with state practices fitting seamlessly with practices of self-creation' (Bevir, 2010: 425). Moreover, it

means 'foregrounding processes of composition and the heterogeneous actants involved' (Higgens & Lerner, 2017a: 4) with a focus on the labour of socially situated actors engaged in everyday dilemmas of grafting and holding together disparate elements to forge new hegemonic alignments and forms of agency (Newman, 2017). As Li (2007: 13) observes, 'what appears to be rational landscape design or "management" is the serendipitous outcome of everyday practices that have quite disparate motives'.

'Assemblage thinking' (Higgens & Lerner, 2017a: 3) offers a useful set of analytical tools and perspectives for tracing empirically 'the complicated distribution of neo-liberal governmentality' (Clarke, 2008: 138) and grappling with the complexities of 'actually existing neoliberalism' through a focus on the 'mundane practices through which neoliberal spaces, states, and subjects are being constituted in particular forms' (Lerner, 2003: 511). Instead of focusing exclusively on the 'resultant formation' or sedimenting domination, assemblage thinking prioritizes the 'processes of assembly' (Higgens & Lerner, 2017a: 4) through which neoliberalism is grafted onto other elements and entities. This type of relational-processual thinking is critical to moving beyond a view of neoliberalism as naturally tending towards structural coherence and unity. More importantly, it sustains a critique of neoliberalism as always provisional, unfinished and partial given the 'contingent assembly work' involved (Higgens & Lerner 2017a: 5) and calls attention to the ways in which 'particular relations are held stable, fall apart, are contested and are reassembled' (Anderson et al., 2012: 180).

In terms of education research into schools as organizations, there is a growing body of literature that is attentive to the dynamic assembly work underpinning the formation of schools as organizations, even if the authors do not explicitly identify 'assembly thinking' as their primary analytical framework and theoretical orientation. What this literature shares with assembly thinking is a

'processual' or 'relational' perspective that focuses on context, materiality and socially situated performances to disrupt conventional 'synchronic', institutionalist' or 'structuralist' accounts of social change. In their research on policy enactments in schools, Ball, Maguire, and Braun (2012: 3) analyze the 'creative processes of interpretation and recontextualization' through which policy discourse is translated and implemented. The point here is that policy discourse is not the 'closed preserve of the formal government apparatus of policy making' (Ozga, 2000: 42), nor it is the preserve of policy implementers (school leaders, teachers and governors) and their strict traditions and value systems. Rather, policy discourse is a messy hotchpotch of disparate elements that are grafted together to produce situated, sometimes problematic, alignments between the demands of government and parastatal authorities and the interests and motives of school actors. On this account, the relationship between school organization and neoliberalism is not linear, predictable or deterministic since this carries the assumption that human action and response are the residual effects of rational consensus, perfect control and system design. As Mitchell and Lizotte (2016: 224) remind us, it is important to remain circumspect of the 'apparent seamlessness' with which policy is translated into the 'consciousness and practices of individuals and groups'.

Other education researchers (Johnson, 2004; Keddie, 2013; Prieto-Flores et al., 2017; Wilkins, forthcoming) have adopted similar approaches to unravel the micropolitics of policy enactments in schools and their subsumption or accommodation with neoliberalism. These accounts capture the entanglement of disparate elements that make up schools as organizations, including agendas or priorities, laws, socially circulating discourses, knowledges, and regulatory regimes. Moreover, they reveal moments of disjuncture, contestation, negotiation and repair – when meanings are transposed and

refracted through seemingly conflicting sets of interests and motives to produce contradictory practices and cross-cutting impulses and goals. Wilkins (forthcoming), for example, demonstrates the messy, complicated governance work entered into by school leaders and governors running co-operative academies. Like all publicly-funded schools in England, co-operative academies are accountable to central government and the school's inspectorate, Ofsted, among other stakeholders, but they have co-operative principles at the heart of their values system, namely 'mutual support through sharing good practice' and 'good governance through sound membership-based structures that guarantee involvement for all the key stakeholders' (The Schools Co-operative Society, 2016). Aptly described by Woodin (2015: 6) as 'hybrid' organizations, co-operative academies appear to work both with and against the grain of marketization, competition and individualization that saturates public education in England. Wilkins (forthcoming) details the ways in which co-operative academies appear to successfully resist certain elements of 'neoliberalism' (legal instruments and schemes of delegation designed to shift power away from students, parents and teachers as stakeholders in the school) in order to make themselves democratically accountable. At the same time, co-operative academies are compelled to accommodate certain elements of neoliberalism due to government pressure to remain economically sustainable and competitively viable in the local education market. Co-operative academies therefore engage simultaneously in upward accountability and downward accountability, competition and collaboration, in order to achieve partial congruence of multiple stakes, interests and objectives. What emerges from these accounts is the contingency and congruence of neoliberalism in the context of locally situated dilemmas, obligations, normative commitments, and dispositions.

In terms of conceptualizing schools as organizations, assemblage thinking brings

into focus the 'inherited institutional landscape' on which neoliberalism as the 'politically guided intensification of market rule and commodification' is always patterned and layered (Brenner, Peck, & Theodore, 2010: 3-4). Here, then, we are encouraged to think about the 'the different modes of insertion into "global" neo-liberalism that are experienced by different regions, nations, and more local places' (Clarke, 2008: 137). Thus, it is possible to identify a 'variety of neoliberalisms' (Plehwé, 2009: 3) rather than view neoliberalism-in-practice (or neo-liberalization) as 'always and everywhere in the same homogenous and singular outcome as the sequencing is predefined' (Springer, 2015: 7).

CONCLUSION

This chapter has made use of various theories and literatures to offer a comprehensive overview of some of the challenges and opportunities to theorizing schools as organizations in the neoliberal state. Despite the omnipresence of the term 'neoliberalism' both in popular and academic jargon, the literature reviewed in this chapter points to a lack of 'conceptual specification' (Castree, 2006: 1). This is due to the different ways neoliberalism has been translated and adapted within and across academic disciplines. From a Marxist and political economy perspective, neoliberalism is an ideological hegemonic project designed to maintain new means of capital accumulation and class power among groups of elite transnational actors (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism can also be viewed from a Foucauldian and governmentality perspective to denote a field of governmental power in which subjects are summoned and activated to behave in certain ways, normally concomitant with the political ends of government (Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999). In both cases, however, neoliberalism is in danger of becoming a detached signifier where there is

no focused attention on the interconnections between the whole (the abstraction we might provisionally term 'neoliberalism') and the part (the day-to-day organization of schools and school systems more generally). One of the ways in which this problem can be redressed without moving beyond neoliberalism as a normative description and analytical framework for our work is through thick description of the ground logics and deeper frames shaping the development of schools as organizations.

The aim of this chapter has been to sketch some of the limitations and contradictions of neoliberalism, especially the critical gap in our thinking about its application and utility to making sense of the complexities of school organization in the modern era. What is not being proposed here is a move beyond neoliberalism, although significant critical literature looking at 'after neoliberalism' and 'post-neoliberalism' (Springer, 2015) warrant further discussion and debate. Rather, what this chapter is calling for is a critical-reflexive space in which education researchers continually work with and against concepts of neoliberalism in order to confidently attest to their analytic value. Assemblage thinking offers a useful toolkit for doing this, as do other approaches no doubt. What is unique to assemblage thinking and is already pervasive in some of the education literature is a refusal to presuppose the effortless translation of policy into practice. This includes resisting binary language that comfortably bifurcates meanings (public/private, state/market, citizen/consumer, local/global, power/resistance) or privileges discourse over materiality and vice versa. Instead assemblage thinking is attentive to the blurred boundaries, inter-related vocabularies, cross-cutting impulses, and intersecting positions that characterize seemingly 'neoliberal' work. This means examining the tensions and struggles that arise when schools as organizations align themselves with the neoliberal work of marketization, commodification and privatization, rather than become subsumed by them.

REFERENCES

- Aalbers, M. B. (2016). Regulated deregulation. In S. Springer, K. Birch, & J. Macleavy (Eds.), *The handbook of neoliberalism* (pp. 563–573). London: Routledge.
- Anderson, B., Kearnes, M., McFarlane, C., & Swanton, D. (2012). On assemblages and geography. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 2(2), 171–189.
- Ball, S. J. (2007). *Education plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, S. J. (2008). New philanthropy, new networks and new governance in education. *Political Science*, 56(4), 747–765.
- Ball, S. J., & Junemann, C. (2012). *Networks, new governance and education*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barnett, C. (2005). The consolations of 'neoliberalism'. *Geoforum*, 36(1), 7–12.
- Baxter, J. (2017). School inspectors as policy implementers: Influences and activities. In J. Baxter (Ed.), *School inspectors: Policy implementers, policy shapers in national policy contexts* (pp. 1–24). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Beer, D. (2015). Systems of measurement have a productive power in our lives. LSE British Politics and Policy, 25 April. London: London School of Economics. Retrieved from <http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/the-productive-power-of-metrics/>
- Bevir, M. (2010). Rethinking governmentality: Towards genealogies of governance. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(4), 423–441.
- Boyne, G. A. (1996). Competition and local government: A public choice perspective. *Urban Studies*, 33(4–5), 703–721.
- Brenner, N., Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2010). Variegated neoliberalization: Geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks*, 10(2), 182–222.
- Brown, W. (2006). American nightmare: Neoliberalism, neoconservatism, and de-democratization. *Political Theory*, 34(6), 690–714.
- Castree, N. (2006). From neoliberalism to neoliberalisation: Consolations, confusions, and necessary illusions. *Environment and Planning A*, 38(1), 1–6.
- Clarke, J. (2008). Living with/in and without neo-liberalism. *Foccal*, 51, 135–147.
- Clarke, J., & Newman, J. (1997). *The managerial state: Power, politics and ideology in the remaking of social welfare*. London: Sage.
- Davies, W. (2014). *The limits of neoliberalism: Authority, sovereignty and the logic of competition*. London: Sage.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- Duménil, G., & Lévy, D. (2004). *Capital resurgent: Roots of the neoliberal revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795.
- Gamble, A. (1986). The political economy of freedom. In R. Levitas (Ed.), *The ideology of the New Right* (pp. 25–54). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Gane, N. (2012). The governmentalities of neoliberalism: Panopticism, post-panopticism and beyond. *The Sociological Review*, 60(4), 611–634.
- Gewirtz, S. (2002). *The managerial school: Post-welfarism and social justice in education*. London: Routledge.
- Gunter, H. (2012). *Leadership and the reform of education*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Gunter, H., Hall, D., & Mills, C. (2015). Consultants, consultancy and consultocracy in education policymaking in England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(4), 518–539.
- Hall, S. (1979). The Great Moving Right Show. *Marxism Today*, January, 14–20.
- Hall, S. (2005). New Labour's double-shuffle. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 27(3), 319–335.
- Hall, S. (2011). The neoliberal revolution. *Soundings*, 48, 9–27.
- Hall, S., & O'Shea, A. (2013). Common-sense neoliberalism. *Soundings*, 55(Winter), 8–24.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610(21), 22–44.
- Hatcher, R. (2006). Privatisation and sponsorship: The re-agenting of the school system in England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(5), 599–619.

- Higgins, V., & Larner, W. (2017a). Introduction: Assembling neoliberalism. In V. Higgins & W. Larner (Eds.), *Assembling neoliberalism: Expertise, practices, subjects* (pp. 1–19). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Higgins, V., & Larner, W. (2017b). Conclusion: Awkward assemblages. In V. Higgins & W. Larner (Eds.), *Assembling neoliberalism: Expertise, practices, subjects* (pp. 305–312). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1991). *The rhetoric of reaction: Perversity, futility, jeopardy*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Holliday, I. (2000). Is the British state hollowing out? *Political Quarterly*, 71(2), 167–176.
- Jessop, B., & Sum, N.-L. (2016). What is critical? *Critical Policy Studies*, 10(1), 105–109.
- Johnson, B. (2004). Local school micropolitical agency: An antidote to new managerialism. *School Leadership and Management*, 24(3), 267–286.
- Johnson, J. A. (2015). How data does political things: The processes of encoding and decoding data are never neutral. *The Impact Blog*, 7 October. Retrieved from <http://blogs.ise.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2015/10/07/how-data-does-political-things/>
- Jones, R., Pykett, J., & Whitehead, M. (2013). *Changing behaviours: On the rise of the psychological state*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Keddie, A. (2013). Thriving amid the performative demands of the contemporary audit culture: A matter of school context. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(6), 750–766.
- Larner, W. (2003). Neoliberalism? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 21(5), 509–512.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177–199.
- Levi-Faur, D. (2005). The global diffusion of regulatory capitalism. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 598(1), 12–32.
- Li, T. M. (2007). Practices of assemblage and community forest management. *Economy and Society*, 36(2), 263–293.
- Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Rezai-Rashti, G. (2016). Testing regimes, accountabilities and education policy: Commensurate global and national developments. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(5), 539–556.
- Lubienski, C. (2014). Re-making the middle: Dis-intermediation in international context. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(3), 423–440.
- Marquand, D. (2004). *The decline of the public: The hollowing out of citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- McNamara, K. (1998). *The currency of ideas: Monetary politics in the European Union*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the present: Administering economic, social and personal life*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Mirowski, P. (2009). Postface. In P. Mirowski & D. Plehwe (Eds.), *The road from Mont Pèlerin: The making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mitchell, K., & Lizotte, C. (2016). Governing through failure: Neoliberalism, philanthropy and education reform in Seattle. In M. Brady & R. Lippert (Eds.), *Governing practices: Neoliberal governmentalities and the ethnographic imaginary* (pp. 221–244). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Newman, J. (2007). Governance as cultural practice: Text, talk and the struggle for meaning. In M. Bevir & F. Trentmann (Eds.), *Governance, consumers and citizens: Agency and resistance in contemporary politics* (pp. 49–68). Basingstoke, UK, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Newman, J. (2017). The politics of expertise: Neoliberalism, governance and the practice of politics. In V. Higgins & W. Larner (Eds.), *Assembling neoliberalism: Expertise, practices, subjects*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Ofsted. (2001). *Making it better – improving school governance*. London: Ofsted.
- Ofsted. (2011). *School governance – learning from the best*. London: Ofsted.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ozga, J. (2000). *Policy research in educational settings: Contested terrain*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Panitch, L., & Konings, M. (2009). Myths of neoliberal deregulation. *New Left Review*, 57(II), 67–83.

- Papanastasiou, N. (2017). The practice of scalecraft: Scale, policy and the politics of the market in England's academy schools. *Environment and Planning A*, 49(5), 1060–1079.
- Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2015). *Fast policy: Experimental statecraft at the thresholds of neoliberalism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Peck, J., Theodore, N., & Brenner, N. (2009). Neoliberal urbanism: Models, moments, mutations. *SAIS Review*, 29(1), 49–66.
- Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380–404.
- Plehwe, D. (2009). Introduction. In P. Mirowski & D. Plehwe (Eds.), *The road from Mont Pèlerin: The making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective* (pp. 1–42). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Plehwe, D., Walpen, B., & Neunhoffer, G. (2006). Introduction: Reconsidering neoliberal hegemony. In D. Plehwe, B. Walpen, & G. Neunhoffer (Eds.), *Neoliberal hegemony: A global critique* (pp. 2–25). London: Routledge.
- Prieto-Flores, O., Feu, J., Serra, C., & Lázaro, L. (2017). Bringing democratic governance into practice: Policy enactments responding to neoliberal governance in Spanish public schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(2), 227–244.
- Ranson, S. (2003). Public Accountability in the Age of Neoliberalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18 (5), 459–480.
- Reynolds, D. (2010). *Failure free education? The past, present and future of school effectiveness and school improvement*. London: Routledge.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2007). Understanding governance: Tens years on. *Organisation Studies*, 28(8), 1243–1264.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Saltman, K. J. (2014). The austerity school: Grit, character, and the privatization of public education. *Symploke*, 22(1–2), 41–57.
- Spotton, B. (1999). Regulation and deregulation: Financial. In P. A. O'Hara (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of political economy* (pp. 971–974). London: Routledge.
- Springer, S. (2015). Postneoliberalism? *Review of Radical Political Economies*, 47(1), 5–17.
- Stahl, G. (2017). *Ethnography of a neoliberal school: Building cultures of success*. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, A. (2000). Hollowing out or filling in? Task forces and the management on cross-cutting issues in British government. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 2(1), 46–71.
- The Schools Co-operative Society. (2016). About: The Schools Co-operative Society. Available at <http://co-operativeschools.coop/about/>
- Trnka, S., & Trundle, C. (2014). Competing responsibilities: Moving beyond neoliberal responsabilisation. *Anthropological Forum*, 24(2), 136–153.
- Verger, A., Fontdevila, C., & Zancajo, A. (2016). *The privatization of education: A political economy of global education reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilkins, A. (2012). School choice and the commodification of education: A visual approach to school brochures and websites. *Critical Social Policy*, Special Issue: *Inequalities and Images: Insights for Policy and Practice*, 32(1), 70–87.
- Wilkins, A. (2016). *Modernising school governance: Corporate planning and expert handling in state education*. London: Routledge.
- Wilkins, A. (Forthcoming). Crafting neoliberalism: Politics, power and the co-operative school movement. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Special Issue: *Co-operative schools: Values and leadership in difficult times*.
- Williamson, B. (2015). Digital education governance: Data visualization, predictive analytics, and 'real-time' policy instrument. *Journal of Education Policy*, 31(2), 123–141.
- Woodin, T. (2015). An introduction to co-operative education in the past and present. In T. Woodin (Ed.), *Co-operation, learning and co-operative values: Contemporary issues in education* (pp. 1–14). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.