

## **Academies in Context: politics, business and philanthropy and heterarchical governance**

**Stephen J Ball**

Published in *Management in Education* 2009 23 (3), pp. 100-103

The English Academies programme has become one of the most controversial aspects of the New Labour strategy for education and public sector reform. And in many ways, given the significance of the programme, that controversy is understandable and appropriate. Particularly because, as I argue here, Academies are indicative of and contribute to a set of more general and highly significant experimental and evolutionary policy 'moves' which involve the re-invention of public sector institutions and a reformation of the overall institutional architecture of the state and its scales of operation. That is to say, Academies are one small part of a more general shift from government to governance (Rhodes and Marsh, 1992) (Marinetti, 2005); a shift from the 'hierarchy of command' to a new form of 'polycentric' and 'strategic' governance that is based upon network relations within and across new policy communities designed to generate new governing capacity and enhance legitimacy. These new policy communities bring new kinds of actors into the policy process, validate new policy discourses – discourses flow through them - and enable new forms of policy influence and enactment and in some respects disable or disenfranchise or circumvent some of the established policy actors and agencies. These new forces are able to colonise the spaces opened up by the critique of existing state

organisations, actions and actors. All of this involves an increased reliance on subsidiarity and 'regulated self-regulation', and it drastically blurs the already fuzzy divide between the public and the private sector 'reallocating tasks, and rearticulating the relationship between organisations and tasks across this divide' (Jessop 2002 p. 199). All in all it replaces hierarchy with *heterarchy*. That is, it replaces bureaucracy and administrative structures and relationships with a system of organization replete with overlap, multiplicity, mixed ascendancy, and/or divergent-but-coexistent patterns of relation.

The Academies programme is a good example of the complexity and instability and the experimental nature of these governance reforms, the programme has gone through at least three iterations, in response to lack of sponsors, rising costs, inefficiencies and opposition. This highlights that within the general logic of reform there is a great deal of muddling through and trial and error.

Tony Blair indicated the role and nature of these changes and the general logic of New Labour's public sector reforms in his speech in 2005 introducing the Labour government's White on secondary education:

In our schools ... the system will be finally opened up to real parent power. All schools will be able to have academy style freedoms. All schools will be able to take on external partners. No one will be able to veto parents starting new schools or new providers coming in, simply on the basis that there are local surplus places. The role of the LEA will

change fundamentally ... Where business, the voluntary sector, philanthropy, which in every other field is a part of our national life, wants to play a key role in education and schools want them to, they can.

I am not suggesting that this involves a giving up by the state of its capacity to steer policy (see below), this is not a 'hollowing out' of the state rather it is a new modality of state power, agency and social action and indeed a new form of state. That is, the achievement of political ends by different means: 'States play a major and increasing role in metagovernance' (Jessop 2002 p. 242). The 'methods' and relations of heterarchy do not totally displace other forms of policy formation and policy action but: 'the state, although not impotent, is now dependent upon a vast array of state and non-state policy actors' (Marinetto, 2005).

In England (and there are similar developments in many other national systems around the globe (see Nambissan and Ball 2010) these heterarchies form 'new kinds of educational alliance' (Jones, 2003 p. 160), which 'New Labour seeks to create' around 'its project of transformation' (p. 160) and which mobilise various resources in the borderland between the public, private and voluntary sectors. They are a policy device, a way of trying things out, getting things done, changing things, and a means of interjecting practical innovations and new sensibilities into areas of education policy that are seen as change-resistant and risk-averse. In general terms they 'pilot' moves towards a public service system in which increasingly the state contracts and monitors rather than directly deliver education services, using 'performance'

measurement, benchmarking and targeting to manage a diversity of provisions. In business literature heterarchical organisations are better at coping with ‘rugged fitness landscapes’ and with the demands of ‘simultaneous engineering’ – that is when innovation and production overlap and the pace of design and implementation are speeded up, such organisations are ‘decompartmentalised’ and denoted by ‘distributed authority’ (Stark, 1999).

Academies are one ‘move’ in a more general process of ‘destatization’ - tasks and services previous undertaken by the state are now being done by various ‘others’ in various kinds of relationships among themselves and to the state and to the remaining more traditional organisations of the public sector, although in many cases the working methods of these public sector organisations have also been fundamentally reworked typically by the deployment of market forms (competition, choice and performance-related funding). In education other specific policy moves in this loosely-scripted process of ‘modernisation’ and ‘transformation’ include specialist schools, Trust schools, ‘tendered’<sup>1</sup> and ‘contracted-out’ schools; although the latter two forms are currently small in scale. Only four schools have been fully contracted out to private management companies: one to Edison (Enfield), two to 3Es (GEMS) and one to Nord-Anglia (all three in Surrey)(see (Ball, 2007) for more detail on these). There have been 7 competitions for the establishment of new schools; in Haringey (won by the LA), Southampton (Oasis Trust – a Baptist group), Northamptonshire (Woodnewton – A Learning Community

<sup>1</sup> The 2006 Education and Inspections Act extended The requirement for a competition for new schools to cover special and primary schools. New schools must be subject to an Invitation for proposals for their establishment by alternative providers, which can include the LA.

and The Brooke Weston Partnership), Kent (The Homewood Trust – another local school), Lincolnshire (British EduTrust [an Academy Sponsor] and the Gainsborough Educational Village Trust), West Sussex (The Bolnore School Group – a parent/community group), and Gloucestershire (still in process). The Brooke Weston Partnership also runs an Academy in Northamptonshire and part of the partnership, the Garfield Weston Foundation (a charity of Associated British Foods and the Garfield Weston Family) donated over a period of 12 years £10.2m to the SSAT [Specialist Schools and Academies Trust] for the sponsorship of Specialist Schools. Garfield Weston through its investment company Wittington Investments is a co-funder of Explore Learning (with the Peter Lampl (Sutton Trust) and Peter Ogden (Ogden Trust)), which operates storefront Learning shops in larger branches of Sainsbury's. Garfield Weston, among many other things, offers bursaries for private school places (as does the Ogden Trust) and has supported the School for Social Entrepreneurs. The Foundation is also a 'founding supporter' of the Teach First programme which is funded mainly by business (although other founding supporters include the DCSF, the Trainign and Development Agency, The National Association of Headteachers and Manchester City Council). Teach First is 'an independent charity founded to encourage top graduates, who would not normally enter teaching, to teach for at least two years in challenging secondary schools in London, North West and the Midlands. With tailored leadership training developed with over 100 employers, Teach First aims to develop the leaders of the future'. (Website). Academies are strongly represented among the participating schools in the Teach First programme.

As of January 2009 the total number of planned Trust Schools is 444, with 124 Trust Schools already open. To give one example:

Pensans Community Primary School, in Cornwall will partnering: Falmouth University, Penwith / Truro College, Digital Peninsula Network, Virutal Schools, Cornish Pirates Rugby Club, The Co-operative Group. The Trust will focus on raising attainment and aspiration in the West Penwith area, fostering creativity and innovation through curricular development. The Trust aims to replace a culture of low expectation with one of excellence and high achievement. There will be a specific focus on raising measurable levels of attainment in Literacy and Numeracy, alongside creating awareness of local and global responsibilities via a focus on the issues of sustainability and ecological degradation. This will provide a platform for the promotion of co-operative values within the Trust. (Dcsf website)

The range and variety of Academy sponsors are indicated in the other papers in this issue but include entrepreneurs, charities, businesses, faith groups, universities, local government and parastatal organisations. (Specialist School and Trust sponsors are equally diverse). Academies are somewhat distinct in as much that they have an 'independent' status within the state school system and are contracted directly to their sponsors by the DCSF. They are also forms of **partnership**. Academies come into being via 'partnerships between sponsors and local education partners to enable them and the DfES to assess their individual circumstances and decide if a new Academy is the right solution for their needs'

(DfES Standards Site). A good deal of this partnership activity is behind the scenes and goes on between the DfES, SSAT, the Cabinet Office and LEA officers and councilors – a re-spatialisation of education policy.

The point here is to offer a glimpse of the complexity and inter-relatedness of participation in state education, education discourses and education policy conversations by philanthropic, voluntary and private interests (both organisations and individuals), as well as to indicate the blurring between them. We can also see the role of link and lead organizations within this particular heterarchy – the SSAT specifically. There is a variety of asymmetrical and diverse power relations involved in this complex of reciprocal, multi-level, interdependencies ‘some happening spontaneously, others created deliberately through public policy and institutional engineering’ (Davies, 2005 p. 313) but overall heterarchies such as this remain political constructs. Within the processes of modernisation and transformation the boundaries and spatial horizons and flows of influence and engagement around education are being stretched and reconfigured in a whole variety of ways. To achieve some kind of coherence and functionality these heterarchies rely on trust and reciprocity and in some of their aspects they draw upon social relations established elsewhere, in business for example (see (Ball, 2008) or between charities and their lead and link organisations (CAF, NCVO, NPC etc.).

Business is integrated in a number of ways here in the governance and provision of state education, in driving innovations and, in effect, disrupting other traditional social relations. This is part of what

(Pollack, 2004) p. vii) calls the 'dismantling process' and asserts to be 'profoundly anti-democratic and opaque'. So for example, Academies have the opportunity to set aside existing national agreements on the pay, conditions and certification of teachers – the flexibilization of the workforce. This is a radical move in a more general push for the 'modernisation' of the school workforce – 'workforce re-modelling' – which is now the responsibility of the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) one of an increasing number of new 'lead organizations' in the transformation of state education.

Within and through this heterarchy and many others like it and linked to it, new organisational sensibilities, values, perspectives, interests and policy narratives are brought into play and given legitimacy. In particular the discourse of enterprise, in various forms, is ubiquitous (Woods et al., 2007). The opinions and voices of heroes of enterprise are granted a special legitimacy. The Academies also demonstrate 'corporate responsibility' and the caring face of capitalism and of 'self-made men' (sic) who want to 'give something back'. These hero entrepreneurs embody some of the key values of New Labour; the possibilities of meritocracy, of achieving individual success from modest beginnings and wealth creation from innovation and knowledge.

## Conclusion

Heterarchies 'enlarge the range of actors involved in shaping and delivering policy' (Newman, 2001) p. 125). Such a mode of governance involves a 'catalyzing of all sectors - public, private and voluntary – into action to solve their community' problems'



(Osborne and Gaebler, 1992 p. 20) it is achieved on 'the changing boundary between state and civil society' (Bevir and Rhodes, 2003 p. 42) – and between state and the economy. In general terms this is the move towards a 'polycentric state' and 'a shift in the centre of gravity around which policy cycles move' (Jessop, 1998 p. 32). All of this suggests that both the form and modalities of the state are changing – forms of 'direct' control are being foregone (where they existed) in favour of 'effective' control through calibration and other steering mechanisms but nonetheless, also, through the marginalisation or re-working of local government, professional organisations and Trades Unions direct relations are established between the DCSF and schools and school providers e.g. Academies. (Fairclough, 2000 p. 119) argues that the 'dispersal' of government, which is a key feature of New Labour modernisation of the public sector, does not signal an abandonment of close control by the centre and that this deconcentration rather than devolution is 'not an irrational contradiction, but a predictable consequence of the overall logic' of reform (p. 122). In effect the current state of governance, at each level, is a mix between hierarchy, heterarchy and market. The government will intervene in heterarchical relations at points of conflict or instability as well as regulating them – Academies are a case in point.

## References

- Ball, S. J. (2007) *Education Plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*, Routledge, London.
- Ball, S. J. (2008) New Philanthropy, New Networks and New Governance in Education., *Political Studies*, **Published Online: Apr 29 2008 12:00AM**.
- Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003) Searching for Civil Society: Changing Patterns of Governance in Britain, *Public Administration*, **81**, 41-62.

- Davies, J. S. (2005) Local Governance and the Dialectics of Hierarchy, Market and Network, *Policy Studies*, **26**, 311-335.
- Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language*, Routledge, London.
- Jessop, B. (1998) The Narrative of Enterprise and the Enterprise of Narrative: Place Marketing and the Entrepreneurial City, In *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*(Eds, Hall, T. and Hubbard, P.) John Wiley, Chichester.
- Jones, K. (2003) *Education in Britian: 1944 to the Present*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Marinetto, M. (2005) Governing beyond the Centre: A Critique of the Anglo-Governance School, *Political Studies*, **2003**, 592-608.
- Newman, J. (2001) *Modernising Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*, Sage, London.
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992) *Re-inventing Government*, Addison-Wesley, Reading: Mass.
- Pollack, A. (2004) *NHS plc: The Privatisation of Our Health Care*, Verso, London.
- Rhodes, R. and Marsh, D. (Eds.) (1992) *Policy Networks in British Government*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Stark, D. (1999) Heterarchy: Distributing Authority and Organzing Diversity, In *The Biology of Business: Decoding the Natural Laws of Enterprise*(Ed, Clippinger, J. H.) Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco.
- Woods, P. A., Woods, G. J. and Gunter, H. (2007) Academies Schools: Sponsors, Specialisms and Varieties of Entrepreneurial Leadership, *Journal of Education Policy*.