

Power, Subjectivity and Strategies of Resistance: *The Case of the Acme School*

by Mohammad A. Manki

ABSTRACT

The central aim of this study is to provide a critical analysis of oppositional practices in the workplace by exploring the role of worker subjectivity in shaping and articulating contemporary strategies of resistance. First, a theoretical analysis will be presented which seeks to challenge many of the dualistic assumptions that have underpinned traditional studies of resistance. It is argued that the re-entry of subjectivity into the analysis of resistance provides a means for escaping these dualisms and retrieving the analytical and empirical significance of oppositional practices. The argument suggests that although subjectivities are indeed effects of power, and that individuals are positioned in relation to dominant discourses – and therefore constituted as having certain interests – power is not fixed and thus cannot completely or permanently determine identity. This instability of power makes apparent certain fragilities within these dominant discourses and makes them liable to threats and seductions from subject positions within different or competing discourses. It is suggested that these fractures and competing subject positions afford small but important spaces for resistance. The second half of this essay presents a detailed case study of the Acme School. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and analysed to explore the subjective experiences of resistant members of Acme toward recent government reform initiatives. Two dominant strategies were identified: 'resistance through distance' and 'resistance through persistence' and it was demonstrated that an understanding of different subjectivities is vital to appreciating how these distinct strategies emerged.

INTRODUCTION

Despite the increasing attention paid to oppositional practices in the workplace, Collinson (1994) suggests that important analytical questions about the relationship between the nature of power, the human subject and resistance remain unexplored. The neglect of such questions, it may be argued, stems partly from the ascendancy of the managerialist agenda in organisation studies. Such a perspective has traditionally conceptualised resistance as a reactive process, one that is understood as an obstacle, or an irrational nuisance that needs to be overcome in the process of rational and prudent organisational change. A characteristic of this managerialist perspective has been the relegation of workplace resistance to a self-evident and secondary theme within the broader literature on the change process. Consider, for example, Lewin's Force Field Analysis (1951), which remains one of the most common theories of change and resistance employed in the management of the change process (Pinnington & Edwards, 2000: 222-229). Lewin's

model offers a normative description of workers' seemingly natural tendency to resist. This tendency or 'force' to resist, it is suggested, can be overcome if appropriate measures such as employee participation in the change process are taken (Coch and French, 1948). More significantly, Lewin's model implies a primary concern with individual factors that cause people to resist, and in doing so neglects to seriously consider the local, historical as well as the broader structural factors. To this end, Jeremier, Knights and Nord (1994) contend that the most widespread way of conceptualising resistance has been to understand it as 'a reactive process where agents embedded in power relations actively oppose initiatives by other agents'. Put more simply, resistance is generally seen as a group of seemingly homogenous blue-collared employees collectively opposing specific initiatives of management.

However, since Braverman's (1974) revival and reconstruction of Marx's original thesis, a large body of critical literature has developed

attempting to challenge the dominance of the managerialist agenda in organisation studies. In spite of this 'critical edge', Knights (1990: 297) has argued that the bulk of this literature, like the managerialist approach, has been based on relatively simplistic views of society and the human subject. As a result, these reductive assumptions have limited any truly critical inquiry into oppositional practices in the workplace. In light of the extensive criticisms levelled at Braverman[1] and others for their failure to consider the impact of worker subjectivity on acts of resistance, a few critics have sought to develop a theoretical or empirical analysis of oppositional practices that incorporates subjectivity (Collinson, 1992: 222). Following the lead of these critics who have attempted to retrieve the significance of workplace resistance (Austrin, 1994; Burrell, 1990; Clegg, 1994/1998; Collinson, 1992; 1994; Fournier, 1998; Jeremier et al. 1994; Knights, 1990, Knights and Willmot, 1990; Knights and Vurdubakis, 1994; O'Connell Davidson, 1994; Starkey and McKinlay; 1998; Willmot, 1990) the primary aim of this study is to provide a more considered analysis of oppositional practices in the workplace than has traditionally been advanced by organisational and industrial theorists. Specifically, this will be done by exploring the role of worker subjectivity in shaping and articulating particular strategies of resistance.

Structure of the Essay

To accomplish this objective, a number of theoretical issues must first be dealt with. If Knights (1990) is correct in suggesting that the difficulty with most treatments of resistance, or labour process theory more generally, is the reliance on overly simplistic assumptions of human nature and society, then these assumptions must be re-considered. The first half of this paper will devote itself to an inquiry into the theoretical foundations of resistance. Drawing heavily (and perhaps uncritically) on Foucault's ideas of power and subjectivity, this section will attempt to challenge a number of dualistic understandings that have worked to constrain a deeper analysis of resistance (Jeremier et al. 1994; Knights &

Vurdubakis, 1994: 168; Knights, 1990: 297). The primary value, for the purposes of this study, in drawing on the large body of Foucault's (1977, 1980, 1982) work is that he goes a long way toward deconstructing and transcending binary oppositions such as subject-object, agency-structure and power-resistance. An understanding and clarification of these dichotomies, Knights (1990: 298; Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994) argues, along with a more 'adequate concept of the subject', is necessary for a fuller understanding of resistance.

The second half of this essay will present a detailed case study that attempts to explore the subjective experiences of students, teachers and the headmaster toward recent government initiatives. The purpose of this examination is to demonstrate that an understanding of different subjective orientations toward power, knowledge and information is vital to appreciating how distinct strategies of resistance emerge. Furthermore, this discussion will seek to draw a link between how different subjectivities afford different resources to those attempting to resist. It will do this by demonstrating that the members of the school are *simultaneously* subjects of different discourses in society; that is, they are a complex composite of multiple subject positions. For example, a given 'teacher' may be a subject of a career discourse (Fournier, 1998), a religious discourse, and an educational discourse. The significance of this point is that subjectivities are multiple, shifting and always in process. Linstead and Grafton-Small (1992: 335) remind us that the organisation is not a site of unifying focus, but of activity, and that it needs to be appreciated that the cultural processes that are at work in society are also at work in the organisation. As such, though a teacher in the school may primarily be a subject of an educational discourse, and therefore be constituted as having certain interests and resources, it is possible that these interests and resources can be appropriated, re-articulated and subverted through a process of *bricolage* within multiple, and perhaps even seemingly contradictory discourses. Such a view appreciates that this given teacher is likely a member or participant in other social and cultural institutions.

RE-THINKING THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF RESISTANCE

The primary aim of this section is to provide a critical analysis of resistance that avoids the overly simplistic and reductionist assumptions of human subjects, their social reality and society. First, an effort will be made to provide an analysis that avoids collapsing or reducing the individual into either a pre-existing and essential subject, or merely a determined object of society. In doing so, this discussion will highlight the importance of subjectivity as a means of escaping the agency-structure, and subject-object dualism that constrains the traditional approaches to the study of workplace resistance. And second, the Foucauldian notion of power will be introduced as a means of challenging traditional thinking on resistance that has tended to posit resistance as something that stands outside of power. Such a conception highlights the irreducible inter-relationship between power, resistance and subjectivity, thus, undermining the power-resistance dichotomy. If it can be demonstrated that many of the assumptions that underpin the traditional literature on resistance are incorrect or incomplete, then the reconsideration of these assumptions is likely to have significant consequences for the study of resistance. Though, a detailed treatment of these consequences is beyond the scope of this paper, the central expectation is, that the following discussion will provide a possible avenue to escape 'the dangers of determinism, objectivism and dualism' (Knights, 1992) that have restricted deeper inquiry about how and why people resist.

De-centring the Individual

The notion of the individual as 'a bounded, unique more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic centre of awareness, emotion, judgment and action, organized into a distinctive whole and set contrastively against other such wholes and against a social and natural background ...' (Geertz, cited in Linstead & Grafton-Small, 1992: 343), has traditionally underpinned, not only the study of resistance, but organisation studies and the social sciences

more generally (Collinson, 1992; Giddens, 1979; Henriques et al., 1984; Knights 1990, Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994). Such an overly simplistic conception of the human subject has led to studies of resistance that have ascribed analytical primacy to individual psychological phenomenon, and in doing so, reduced worker subjectivity to statements of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Jeremier, et. al, 1994: 4). Critical literature (Marx, 1867/1972; Braverman, 1974), then, as a reaction or an attempt to re-think this voluntaristic perspective sought to find the resolution to social or organisational problems, such as the asymmetries of power, in analyses that addressed systemic difficulties in the structures of society (cf. Knights, 1990). However, as Thompson and McHugh (1990) rightly argue, such a deterministic perspective is limited by its ascription of primacy to organisational structures. Thus, with respect to resistance, the authors suggest that even when these deterministic approaches allow for human actions, they fail to get sufficiently inside the everyday routine experiences in which people react, comply adjust and modify work relations. By emphasising the inter-related nature of power and subjectivity, the following analysis will attempt to avoid reducing the study of resistance into either a voluntaristic or deterministic evaluation.

Both of these, approaches (voluntarism and determinism) to the study of resistance have come under heavy criticism in the last twenty or so years for their assumption of a fixed and universal human nature. One of the most damaging, and sustained critiques has come from the 'project' of postmodernism[2] (particularly the branch that grew out of French structuralism). In particular, the centrality of language and discourse within this approach allowed for 'a constructionism which denied the objectivist claim of certainty and objective truth and the humanists' reliance on essential claims which lead them to miss the social/linguistic politics of experience' (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996: 205). And, in its place it offered the view that

... the world is structured through the ways discourses lead one to attend to the world and provide particular unities and divisions.

As a person learns to speak these discourses, they more properly speak to him or her in that available discourses position the person in the world in a particular way prior to the individual having any sense of choice. As discourses structure the world they at the same time structure the person's subjectivity, providing him/her with a particular social identity and way of being in the world (ibid).

The consequence of such a perspective is the replacement of the Cartesian *cogito*, with the de-centred individual whose subjectivity is constituted in and through language (Giddens, 1979). To this end, Henriques et al (1984: 12), in their book *Changing the Subject*, have gone to great lengths to demonstrate 'that the individual is not a fixed or given entity, but rather, a particular product of historically specific practices of social regulation'. Thus, it is suggested that the constitution of the individual follows from the conception of discourse, and thus in Foucauldian terms can be seen as an 'effect of power'. The autonomous and self-determining individual with a secure unitary identity then, can be seen as a myth, one that Alvesson and Deetz (1996) suggest is used to suppress conflicts and privilege 'discourses of truth' such as masculinity, rationality and control. As such, it is important to recognise that power, control and subjectivity cannot be separated from one another, as has been assumed in the traditional literature on resistance.

Subjectivity: Escaping the 'All or Nothing'

The re-entry of subjectivity then, offers a valuable mechanism for destabilizing the agency-structure dichotomy that has been imported into organisational studies of resistance through the conventions of the social sciences. However, such a conception, as has been discussed above, runs the risk of escaping the problems of voluntarism only to fall into the trap of determinism. A clarification is necessary. Part of the challenge in discussing the notion of 'subjectivity' arises from the difficulties associated with translating a theoretical concept that was elaborated in the French language into English (Henriques et al., 1984: 3). *S'assujettir* has a double meaning; at the same time it means 'to produce subjectivity' and 'to make subject', whereas the con-

ventions of the English language do not allow for such meanings to exist simultaneously. It is this 'double' notion that allows for the destabilisation of the agency-structure dichotomy.

It is through the positioning within dominant discourses that the individual gains a sense of identity. However, in doing so, s/he also participates in the reproduction of her/his own domination which serves to marginalize other parts of the self. This false sense of autonomy, Willmot (1990: 368) argues, is necessary because it serves to cloak the subservience necessary in the normative practice of attributing social identities to humans (for example, gender roles). Willmot goes on to suggest that this attribution tends to promote 'a desire for the confirmation of these identities' in order to avoid the 'experience of tension when competing and contradictory social positions are occupied'. Henriques et al (1984) state the position succinctly:

We are produced as capable of assertive action, yet also fragile and acutely vulnerable ... Both the fear of this vulnerability and the search for what I have loosely called positions from which we may maximise our relative powers of assertion contribute to our ineffable tendency to adopt positions which are not in other ways advantageous, to seek security in what is familiar, to hark back to the past... (Henriques et al. 1984, 321)

Though Henriques et al. take care to stop short of implying that individuals can secure a stable identity and avoid the tensions that arise from fragilities within the dominant discourses and the seductions or threats offered by competing subject positions within different discourses. This view fully appreciates the fragmentary nature of discourses and society. The production and consumption of relatively stable identities may be possible in homogenous societies that are dominated by few, and relatively un-contradictory discourses. But, such stability of identity is exponentially more difficult in

contemporary, heterogeneous, global, teleconnected societies where the available discourses expand greatly. They also change rapidly. The individual comes to be spoken by so many discourses that fragmentation is inevitable (Gergen, 1991). As society becomes more fragmented and hyperreal or virtual (discourse is disconnected

from any world reference, images reference images) the identity-stabilizing forces are lost (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996: 206).

The subject then, is better understood

... as a site which emerges as an overcrossing of traces, society, the world, the psyche, other texts, other times. It is a weave, a texture, fragmented but intertwined rather than hierarchical and integrated, a process and a paradox: having neither beginning nor end (drawing on Derrida, Linstead & Grafton-Small, 1992).

Such a view allows for an appreciation of the artificial nature of the transcendental subject as well as allowing for the recognition that subjectivities, while creative, are also multiple, shifting and fragmentary (cf Kondo, 1990). In place of a secure retreat to a stable and entirely determined identity within a few dominant discourses, the individual is forced into an arena of existential angst where meaning and identity are at best fragmentary and shifting.

However, it is precisely within the small spaces afforded by these fragments and fractures, these multiple and shifting subject positions that marginalized groups, as well as marginalized aspects of the self can enter and mark out territory within and between subject positions in different discourses. To this end, Foucault (1982) reminds us that power can never fix meanings and subjectivities, rather they are always open to re-articulation. Thus, all discourses with their accompanying disciplinary mechanisms are like any other power regimes: they work 'on a terrain that is already occupied by a variety of other cultural relations and forms of subjectivity organized along lines of gender, ethnicity, class, organizational divisions just to mention a few' (Fournier, 1998; Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994) And, though the individual may indeed still be a subject of power, this power, Patton (1998: 65) suggests, 'is only realized in and through the diversity of human bodily capacities and forms of subjectivity'.

Power, then, does not directly determine identity but merely provides the conditions of possibility for its self-formation – a process involving perpetual tension between power and resistance, or subjectivity and identity. (Jeremier et al., 1994: 8)

Thus, the individual, it can be suggested, is not wholly produced from above, but rather, is a complex composite of different subject positions, the meanings of which are liable to being subverted, re-appropriated and re-consumed. The result being that the constitution of subjects, easily understood as an act of imposition, is also transformed into an act of production (through consumption) or creativity through the process of *bricolage*, whereby specific meanings from particular discourses are appropriated, and given new meanings – which, in many cases, can be subversive (O'Sullivan, et al. 1994: 33; Fournier, 1998). Such a conception of the subject eludes the agency-structure, as well as the individual-society dichotomies that have worked to constrain studies and literature on resistance. Furthermore, such a view hints at the importance of the role of subjectivity in understanding resistance.

Subjectivity and the Organisation

Before proceeding into a discussion on the relationship between power, subjectivity and resistance, it may be worthwhile narrowing the focus somewhat to the specific site of interest for this discussion: the operation of subjectivity within the organisation. While keeping in mind Linstead and Grafton-Small's (1992: 335) argument, that the organisation as it may be experienced is not a site of unifying focus but rather of activity, and that the forces which are at work in broader society are also at work in the organisation, it would be careless not to recognise that organisations seek to produce, secure, or achieve fixity in predictable and organised ways (Clegg, 1994). The most effective way to accomplish this is to constitute employees as subjects whose desires are intimately linked to the organisation's goals (Fournier, 1998). In doing so, organisations seek to suppress or marginalize other subjectivities (gender, ethnicity, or sexuality; to mention a few) which threaten the subject positions preferred by the organisation—positions such as those offered by the organisation's specific culture (Linstead & Grafton-Small, 1992) or even 'enterprise discourse' (Fournier, 1998) more broadly. This suppression of other subject positions can be achieved through the normalising mechanisms

that typically accompany the dominant discourses. Routines and administrative practices, for example, are common mechanisms of suppression. On this point, Lyotard (1986: 62) suggests that administrative procedures work best when they 'make individuals "want" what the system needs in order to perform well'. Another important tactic for the suppression of alternate subjectivities in the organisation, Clegg (1994: 275) suggests, is the deployment of occupational titles and responsibilities that produce 'stability through routine channelling of the shifting subjectivities of its members'. Control through the use of such titles and responsibilities, then, is especially forceful if, drawing on Lyotard, the individual's sense of self-worth or identity becomes bound up in the successful fulfilment of these responsibilities. This point is worth noting because, as will be shown in the case study, the occupational title of 'teacher' was a significant source of tension and served as a powerful force in defending against shifting between, or conflating different subjectivities. Put more clearly, organisational discourses of truth and their associated disciplinary mechanisms attempt to fix subject positions and meanings in such a way that the possibilities of shifting to other subjectivities, and thus opening up possibilities for resistance, are limited or seem beyond reason. And in doing so, the organisation minimises the threat posed by other subjectivities which, Clegg (1994) contends, are a key source of resistance to organisational power (Collinson, 1992/1994; Jeremier et al., 1994; Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994).

Power and Resistance: Intimate Relations

Traditional thinking on resistance has tended toward positing 'power' and 'resistance' on opposite ends of a spectrum where resistance is always conceived of as something that stands outside power. This section will challenge this perspective by drawing on the Foucauldian notion of power, and will seek to analyse the consequences of such a view for resistance. While a detailed analysis of power is beyond the scope of this essay, it is worth briefly describing the conception of power that will be employed. For Foucault,

Power is not an institution and not a structure. Neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation (Foucault, 1981: 93, cited in Humphreys & Kirstoglou 2001: 6).

To this end, power is better understood in terms of its specific socio-historical settings; it is not something that is central or possessed, but rather, dispersed and existing in capillary form (Clegg, 1994: 279; Knights and Vurdubakis, 1994: 172). Such a view steps back for the essentialist and totalising theories of Lewin, Marx or Braverman's treatments of power—as it stands in relation to resistance. As Foucault mentions:

I have tried to indicate the limits of what I wanted to achieve, that is, the analysis of a specific historical figure, of a precise technique of government of individuals and so forth. Consequently these analyses can in no way in my mind be equated with a general analytics of every possible power relation (Foucault, cited in Knights and Vurdubakis, 1994: 173).

Important in such a conception of power is the idea that everyone can operate it or be subjected to it, that is, so long as a given individual or group of individuals are in the right position (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). Power, therefore, as can be deduced is not monolithic or necessarily established but rather is a shifting and unstable expression in specific situations, networks and alliances.

Though briefly described, such a view of power has important implications for the study of resistance. First, in light of the abandonment of a grand and totalising theory of power, it would seem that efforts which seek to develop a general theory of resistance are misguided. While such a misguided emphasis has had the important consequence of highlighting the analytical significance of resistance as a phenomenon worthy of study, it needs to be appreciated that resistance is not something that simply exists 'out there'. Rather, like power, it is a socially constructed category that needs to be interpreted. Thus, studies that treat resistance as 'empirical data to be gathered and made available through value free enquiry' (Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994: 169) miss the point by treating resistance as

something that is self-evident, and by situating it in direct opposition to a generalised conception of power—with a capital 'P'. A second consequence for the study of resistance concerns the possession of power (the notion of sovereign power). If, as Foucault suggests, power is not something that can be possessed, nor is it an institution, analyses of power, or resistance to power, that imagine strict oppositions such as those who have power (capital) subjugating the powerless (labour), for example, overly simplify the processes involved in resistance.

There is not, on the one side, a discourse of power, and opposite it another discourse that runs counter to it. Discourses are tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can run different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can on the contrary circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy (Foucault, 1984: 101-2, in Clegg, 1994: 277).

Moreover, discourses are not necessarily fixed either in the service of power, or against it, but rather they are complex and shifting, that is, they can both be an instrument and effect of power, a tool or hindrance, or even a starting point for resistance (Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994). Overcoming this limitation and stimulating a deeper analysis of resistance, Jeremier et al. (1994) suggest, will result from researchers *investigating* rather than *imposing* the meaning that subjects themselves attribute to behaviour and acts. To this end, as will be discussed in detail later, this study attempts, through the use of semi-structured interviews, to access the meanings that the students, teachers and the headmaster attribute to their actions.

But perhaps the most important consequence of such a view of power for resistance is the challenge that it poses to the power-resistance dichotomy. Foucault's argument that there is no position exterior to a power/knowledge regime severely undermines theories that conceptualise resistance as a force, or phenomenon that exists outside, or as something that is in direct opposition to power. Rather, Foucault (1980) suggests that resistance is inscribed *within* the power/knowledge regime that it opposes and not out-

side it (Fournier, 1998; Knights, 1990), and as a result, resistance is 'constitutive and reproductive of the power regime it seeks to confront (Fournier, 1998: 71-2). There is then, a mutual interdependence between specific relations of power, and particular practices of resistance. Though consent, compliance and submission may be just as much a part of the power relations, Fournier (1998) argues that: to say that resistance may reproduce power does not imply that resistance does just that. Rather, power, that is, as a 'more or less stable or shifting network of alliances extended over a shifting terrain of practice and discursively constituted interests offers various points of resistance in the network 'whose effect will be to fracture alliances, constitute regroupings and re-posit strategies (drawing on Foucault, Clegg, 1994: 277). The implication being that acts of resistance operating from *within* are capable of not only reproducing power, but also exercising it through subversion.

Power, Resistance & Subjectivity

Despite the arguments that have been made so far regarding the multiple possibilities for points of resistance within Foucault's conception of power, many critics have remained sceptical about the extent to which any *true* forms of resistance are capable (Niemark, 1990; Habermas, 1986). Two of the more salient criticisms of the Foucauldian notion of resistance within the power/knowledge regime will be examined, and in doing so, the importance of subjectivity as a key mechanism for understanding how resistance is indeed capable will be highlighted. The two criticisms, Knights and Vurdubakis (1994) suggest, can be identified as the problems of location and agency. While these issues have been indirectly dealt with in other sections, they will be directly addressed here, drawing on the foundations that have been established.

The first criticism, the problem of location, arises from Foucault's claim that there is no position exterior to the power/knowledge regime. Such a view has led to criticisms which have been concerned to point out that if no such position exists outside power, then resistance, of the type

that challenges systems or leads to social change (Jeremier et al., 1994), cannot exist because the logic of power is all that there ever is. Thus, it has been suggested, one can only adopt a position that is already constituted within the regime, and is therefore incapable of any acts of real resistance (Fournier, 1998). While valid to some extent, Clegg (1994) suggests that such a view confuses the notion of resistance with a particularly dramatic form of it. Rather, resistances can be subtle and take on infinite forms. Resistances can be even more subtle than those traditionally identified: work slowdowns, absenteeism, pilferage sabotage, strikes etc. (Hodson, 1995). More subtle forms can include activities such as humour, excessive politeness or sarcasm. Thus, resistances take place on the very terrain of power/knowledge, they do not, as many critics have suggested, have to exist outside the regime of power. This leads to the second point, that such critiques of resistance, it can be discerned, are based on a dualistic understanding of power and resistance that the previous section went to length to challenge. In fact, Foucault himself alludes to such a point; a point it seems has failed to be carefully considered by his critics:

...there are no relations of power without resistance: the latter are all the more real and effective because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised: resistance to power does not have to come from somewhere else to be real, nor is it inexorably frustrated through being the compatriot of power. It exists all the more by being at the same place as power; hence like power, resistances are multiple and can be integrated into global strategies (Foucault, 1980: 142).

Resistance then, it can be argued, takes place within power relation(s) where the two are mutually constitutive of one another and *not* two ends of a spectrum, where one can exist outside the other. Discourses tactically deployed from 'above' or 'below', can be understood as both instruments and effects of power as well as resistance. Knights and Vurdubakis go on to suggest, that in the absence of such a binary conceptualisation of power-resistance and the lack of a totalising theory of power, there seems less reason to locate, or recover an external position or space for resistance to exist, and thus,

the problem of location dissolves.

The second criticism of Foucault's conception of resistance is the problem of agency. Critics have argued that if individuals are indeed positioned or constituted as subjects of dominant discourses, that is, if their subjectivities are the effects of power, then who are to be the agents of resistance. Such criticisms, though valid to some extent, rely heavily on overly deterministic assumptions that exaggerate the extent to which the Foucauldian notion of power constitutes individuals as fixed subjects. Giddens (1981) suggests that in Foucault's terms, individuals do not make history, but are swept along by it. He goes on to suggest that this view fails to acknowledge that individuals are themselves knowledgeable agents, who resist, adjust or alter the demands that others seek to thrust on them. Knights and Vurdubakis (1994: 183) take issue with Giddens, suggesting that although his conclusion has some merit, his argument 'emphasizes the abstract capacity of agents to secure transformations through mobilizing the agency of others rather than focusing upon the concrete struggles in which power relation are embedded...'. Moreover, such a view implies that there is a pre-given agent, one who possesses some abstract notion of capacity and resides at the centre of power and resistance (Knights & Vurdubakis, 1994). However, as demonstrated in previous sections such a view of the individual is overly simplistic and fails to consider the complex social processes involved in the positioning of subjects. Again, although subjectivities are indeed effects of power, and individuals are positioned in relation to dominant discourses – and thus constituted as having certain interests – power is not fixed, and therefore cannot completely or permanently determine identity (Jeremier et al., 1994). The individual rather, is a complex composite of different and even contradictory subject positions that may, at times, in certain sites, and/or at particular times, not necessarily contradict. On this point, Knights (1990) suggests that any given discourse is riddled with inconsistencies, and thus the subject position that it offers results in tension, fragmentation and discord. To compound this problem, there are multiple discourses si-

multaneously operating on the cultural terrain, and different subject positions are made available in competing discourses. Thus, to suggest that individuals are neatly or harmoniously constituted as subjects without any agency to act in a manner that is subversive to power grossly neglects to appreciate the shifting, contradictory, fragmented and fragile nature of the discourses through which individuals become subjects.

CASE STUDY: THE ACME SCHOOL

Before proceeding into the methodological particulars it is worthwhile describing the details of the environment and the local conditions in which the study was conducted. Such a description will focus and structure the methodological discussion by limiting the number of unnecessary abstractions and ensuring that the issues raised are of direct relevance.

The History and Development of the School

The school, henceforth referred to as the Acme School (in the interest of anonymity), was established in 1882 as a boys' school, and has since undergone many status changes as a result of its growth or new legislation. In 1919, with the election of its headmaster to the Headmasters' Conference, Acme became registered as a Public School, a status which, in 1958 was changed to a Direct Grant school because of financial difficulties. During this period, with the aid of government funds, regulations, and standards, the school improved greatly, not only in reputation, but also in its standards and finances. So much so, that in 1975 the governors of the school opted for outright independence and co-education; a status that it retains to this day. Furthermore, since its declaration as an Independent school, Acme has undertaken an aggressive programme of continuous development. For example, recent additions to its facilities include: a fully equipped sports hall, an indoor swimming pool, a technology complex and a music school. It is important to note, however, that these modern additions have been hidden from public view. That is, they have been added to the rear of the school buildings in order to protect 'the tradition and culture

of the Acme School' (Headmaster, interview). Thus, what dominates the landscape as one approaches the main entrance is the original (1882) red brick school building, with its symmetry and sprawling green ivy set in 26 acres of enclosed and well-maintained lawn. One notable consistency that has remained throughout its lengthy history, even during the times of financial hardship, is that the school has always been highly regarded for its academic excellence, its well-rounded pupils, as well as the high standards achieved by its students in government exams, and their record for entry and success in prestigious universities. Furthermore, the school boasts a number of very notable former pupils that have gone on to prominent positions in government, sport, and art. The result being that the Acme School is now regarded as one of the leading independent co-educational schools in the country (mentioned in *The Times League Tables*). With such a status, the school has had little difficulty attracting the best and the brightest students in Britain. Currently, the school has 920 students, 240 of which are at the Sixth Form level; the rest are mixed between the Lower School, years 7 & 8, and the Middle School, years 9 to 11. To attend to the educational needs of these children, the school has 86 full-time, and 10 part-time teachers (ratio of 10:1) who instruct not only traditional subjects such as arts, sciences, maths, English and history, but also a wide range of electives such as German, Classical Civilisations, Design Communications and Religious studies to mention a few.

Pressures for Educational Reform

Despite this success, however, the Acme School—though registered as an Independent school—has come under increasing pressure in recent years from government policies, as have other schools to reform and improve educational standards and curriculum. Such pressures on all schools, public, private and independent, many in the government have argued, is necessary to resolve the 'crisis' in British education (Blunkett, speech at the Social Market Foundation, 2000). The 'crisis', as it has been coined in numerous publications, includes declining levels of attain-

ment of pupils, a higher proportion of unsatisfactory teaching and increasingly ineffective leadership of schools (Ofsted Report: From Failure to Success, 1997). As a result, the government, headed by the Department for Education and Employment (DFEE), David Blunkett, Education Secretary, and Estelle Morris, Minister for School Standards[3], has undertaken a national and multi-levelled reform effort in order to improve the educational standards for *all* schools throughout the country. The plans to reform education are drawn from principles that were set out in the 'Excellence in Schools White Paper' which was developed in the 'Excellence in Cities' programme (the details of which will not be explored in depth here). As part of this effort, a number of regulating bodies and administrative procedures have been established to guide and monitor the performance of all schools. Most prominent or visible among these efforts has been the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted Inspections), Independent School Inspections (ISI), the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), and the introduction of AS Level exams. A primary goal of these efforts is an attempt to increase the accountability and transparency of schools in order to ensure that they are acting in accordance nationally established standards set out by the government.

The Impact of reforms on the Acme School

As an Independent school, Acme had found itself relatively free from government control for the past twenty or so years. Recently, however, under Blunkett's *Transforming Secondary Education* campaign, the Acme School began to experience a restriction of this freedom through increased direct regulation. Though still relatively free from many of the additional administrative procedures placed on state schools, the introduction of AS Level exams into the curriculum, and yearly Independent School Inspections which recently have been brought in line with the stricter Ofsted state school inspections framework (Ofsted website, June 14th, 2001), in particular, have resulted in significantly increased demands on the members of Acme—students, teachers and the headmaster alike. Many of these demands have been confronted with mistrust, suspicion and dis-

dain from the teachers and the headmaster. In particular, many of the teachers feel that this is an unnecessary intrusion because the Acme School has a lengthy track record of exceptional success, and believes that its quality of instruction and educational practices are of the highest standard, far beyond that which could be expected of other state schools. Importantly, as will be demonstrated later, it was not so much the increased administrative and instructional workload that caused concerns among the teachers, but rather, the way in which the new initiatives affected the manner in which pupils were taught, as well as their professional discretion as *teachers*.

Once a year, ISI inspectors entered various classrooms at Acme to assess the quality of teaching. There were a number of rationales given to the teachers: that such assessments were necessary to ensure that standards were being achieved; that they were necessary to provide evidence to inform decisions on accreditation and allocating student numbers; to provide a means of identifying strengths and weaknesses in teacher training; and to contribute to raising standards of attainment in schools (Government Publication: Framework for the Assessment of Quality and Standards in Initial Teacher Training). Such inspections caused a great deal of anxiety for the teachers and the school as a whole. In particular, it severely restricted any degree of discretion the teacher had about how particular subjects could be taught, the order of the topics and the means by which they would be taught (field trips, videos etc.). Teacher discretion was further limited by the introduction of AS Level exams, and the corresponding changes that these necessitated to the curriculum. Teachers found themselves struggling to keep pace with the now exam heavy curriculum. Further, these new demands caused concern among teachers and students because the heavy workloads required students to drop enrichment activities that Acme believes are necessary for the development of well-rounded young adults. This is particularly worrisome for the headmaster who believes that the Acme School is equally concerned with developing students' 'potential to become independent, responsible and self assured adults' this means

that both '...inside and outside the classroom we [Acme] provide a balanced curriculum and an exciting range of challenges and experiences' (Headmaster's Address, Acme School brochure: 2). In fact, the brochure goes on to articulate the school's confidence in its particular style of educating its students by asserting that it is 'the the proper and normal way to educate the next generation' (Acme School brochure: 4). Thus, such reforms were a direct threat to the Acme School's philosophy of educating its pupils.

However, while both the headmaster and the teachers at Acme disagreed with the government reforms, suggesting that the intentions of the reform efforts did not appreciate, nor understand what teaching or education truly was, they nonetheless overtly complied with the demands and administrative practices associated with the reforms. Part of this consent arose out a desire for the well-being of the students. Regardless of their personal feeling, the teachers felt an overwhelming responsibility to prepare the students for their exams, and to comply with the demands of the inspections in order to ensure that the school maintained its high reputation. Similarly, many of the students, upset at being forced to give up their extra-curricular activities, nonetheless complied with the new AS Levels, and cooperated, even excessively at times during the inspections. This consent arose, to a large degree, because students felt pressure to perform well on exams, and to safeguard the reputation of their school in order to gain entry into prestigious universities in the country. Though consent was visible, it served, in many instances as a mask for various subterranean acts of resistance toward the AS levels and inspections. It is these acts of resistance, in their multiple forms, that will be explored in detail in the 'discussion' section of this paper. In particular, it will be shown that the various strategies of resistance to the government reforms employed by the headmaster, the teachers and students depended significantly on the particular subjective orientations of these individuals to power, knowledge and information.

Methodology

I am a creature of habit and, as an ethnographer always collect data the same way. Yet I know, as a reviewer, there are many styles. So one of the things I look for is a systematic approach. When you are doing a history and a physical, you do it the same way. You do not start here on one patient and here on another; you work from the general to the specific. We develop the context, and then we place the problem within the context, so you look for those things when evaluating ethnography or grounded theory, or whatever. So my advice is, if you are not going to adhere to the standards for data collection, then at least say what you are going to do (Dreher, 1994: 281).

Methodological Preamble

Daudi (1986) suggests that there seems to be two principal approaches that social scientists subscribe to in describing their 'methodological deliberations'. The first approach entails an effort to provide a reasonably exhaustive epistemological discussion, one that reviews the major theories of science. The second approach reduces the problem of method to a practical description of the procedures involved in data collection, analysis and so forth. This section, will attempt to draw from these two approaches leaning more, perhaps neglectfully, toward the second. The reasons for this decision are twofold. First, the limitations of space prevent a detailed account of methodological approaches; though, as can be gleaned from section two of this paper, a proper exposition of the epistemological foundations would greatly facilitate a fuller understanding of the issues involved in studying the meanings of resistance. And second, as Daudi (1986) states, most attempts by 'ordinary' social scientists result in a superficial literature review of the various schools of thought. And, that the few who do succeed, only do so through a very good command of the subject, which 'almost amounts to an impossibility' (114). Thus, primarily for these two reasons, the emphasis of this section will be to describe the manner in which a case study of an independent school in south London was conducted, while highlighting some of the more salient theoretical concerns associated with these techniques. Such efforts are based on Dreher's (1994) suggestion that it

is incumbent on the investigator to explain why a particular design optimises the study of an identified problem.

Deciding on the Approach

In keeping with the nature of the Foucauldian notions of power and resistance, that is, as complex strategical situations that are rooted in historically and locally specific conditions, the case study approach was adopted because it emphasises the study of the particular (Stake, 1994). That is, it limits the field of analysis to a particular 'case' such as the Acme School, and allows for an in-depth exploration of the unique socio-historic conditions that have influenced or shaped, in this study, the subjectivities of its members, and how the interplay between these has resulted in, or afforded particular strategies of resistance. The focus on a specific case is especially important in this analysis because in seeking to challenge the traditional theoretical and empirical investigations of resistance, the case study draws attention to the details, the subtleties and the inconsistencies that do not fit the broad generalisations of prescriptive theories. And so, in keeping with this character, this study eschews any effort at contributing to the refinement of theories of resistance. In fact, as mentioned earlier, in light of Foucault's conception of power, efforts at formulating theories of resistance are misguided. Thus, the Acme School was not chosen because it represented other similar cases of resistance, or because it was illustrative of principles or problems that could be generalised, but, because it was an interesting story in its own right.

Case Selection & Entry

In choosing a particular case, Dr. Boivill of the LSE suggested that many of the local schools in London would be provide interesting instances within which to study resistance. Such a suggestion was based on her past research, experience and observations of schools in England. On her suggestion, 20 schools within the central London area were selected from the *Local Education Authority* website. Letters were then sent out to these schools detailing the aims of the re-

search and asking permission for entry. Initially, it should be mentioned, 10 'failing' and 10 'successful' schools were convenience sampled, based on location, from the 'assessment page' of the said website. The initial intent of the study was to select a case from each of these categories in order to compare the differences in strategies of resistance. Unfortunately, none of the 'failing' schools gave permission for entry. Many of these schools were wary of my intentions as a possible 'informant for the government', as one headmaster at a 'failing' school put it. Access was granted at three 'successful' schools and a visit was paid to each of these institutions. After these visits, a decision was made to make it an in-depth case study of the Acme School. This decision was made for two reasons. First, the Acme School seemed most cooperative and willing to provide relatively open access, and second, preliminary discussions with the headmaster revealed an interesting story. Briefly put, an Independent school, known for its excellence, required to adhere to government reforms which were viewed by many in the school as below the standards of Acme, and contrary to its philosophy of a well-rounded education.

Techniques of Data Collection

According to Silverman (1985), given the wide range of possible research topics, no hard-and-fast rules for conducting research can be provided. Rather, deciding on the techniques for gathering data must be grounded in the specific aims of the given study (Gaskell, 2000). Because the broad interest of this research is to explore issues of meaning, interpretation and subjectivity, a decision was made to employ the use of semi-structured interviews, as well as some observation. Collinson (1992) suggests that using interviews allows the researcher to gain access to many issues that questionnaires do not allow. In Collinson's study (234), he argues that questionnaires, though useful for producing large-scale aggregated data, did not, for example, aid in the study of the social significance of shop floor humour. Furthermore, he goes on to suggest that such positivist methods like questionnaires constrain research by imposing a particular struc-

ture or predefined categories on the research. Whereas more open ended research methods such as interviewing, allow, if not encourage respondents to define their own reality. On this point, Silverman (1985: 157) suggests that 'interview data display cultural realities which are neither biased nor accurate, but simply "real." Interview data... reproduce and rearticulate cultural particulars grounded in given patterns of social organisation'. Thus, consistent with the aims of this study, semi-structured interviews were selected because it provides the best and most practical means for beginning to explore the subjective experiences of the members of the Acme School.

Because the timing of the data collection stage was a few weeks before the end of term, many of the teachers' and students' time was limited. Through negotiations with the headmaster and the timetabling administrator, it was agreed that eight respondents would be interviewed: the headmaster, five teachers and two students. These preliminary meetings were very useful because they provided an opportunity to learn the 'language' that was used by the members of the school, and to re-structure the interview questions around these terms and definitions. Unfortunately, however, the selection of which teachers and students could be interviewed was to be decided by the timetabling administrator. In discussions with the administrator, two requests were granted. First, that in selecting the teachers, care be taken to ensure that various subjects and career stages be represented. And second, that the students who were selected be Sixth Formers currently preparing for the AS Level exams. It is important to note that although there was a reasonable representation of both men and women respondents, and that gender is an important subject position, one that is likely to influence strategies of resistance, this study will not focus on the influence of this subjectivity (cf Collinson, 1992). To this end the following group of teachers were selected:

- Newly Qualified History Teacher – 2 years
- Head of the Chemistry Department –

25+ years

- Geography Teacher – 18 years
- Head of the Physics Department – 32 years
- Maths Teacher – 3 years

Three day long visits were made to the Acme School during which formal interviews were conducted and observations were made. All interviewees were asked question about their backgrounds, about thoughts on the government's reform efforts, what affect these had on the everyday activities in the classroom, and how such challenges were dealt. The questions were broadly stated in the language used by members of the school, and interviewees were given time to tell stories about their personal experiences and thoughts. The headmaster and head of the physics department were interviewed twice, and one of the students was interviewed on multiple occasions, both inside and outside the school setting. This student was the daughter of one of the teachers at the school, and was very informative, especially as trust relations were allowed to develop. All respondents agreed that the interviews could be tape recorded on condition of strict anonymity. The interviews were subsequently transcribed. Furthermore, observations were made in classrooms, halls, staff lounges, and the dining hall. These observations proved useful in attempting to gain knowledge about the social organisation of the school, its routines and specific practices. Such information was crucial because as Collinson (1994: 60, Daudi, 1986) states, many acts of resistance draw on a thorough knowledge of the technical and social specificities embedded within the organisation. This presents a significant challenge to the research then, because much of this knowledge is very subtle and highly guarded. Thus, this serves as a limitation on truly understanding the significance of workplace resistance. This problem was severely compounded by the fact that such little time was spent in the Acme School observing and understanding these routines. As such, this constitutes a major limitation of this study.

Analysing the Data

Deciding on a method to analyse the interview transcripts proved problematic. Because the aim of this study sought to understand individual subjectivities, and how these positions worked to shaped certain strategies of resistance, a number of the more 'traditional' methods that imposed frameworks, or categories onto the data were discounted immediately. Furthermore, methods such as content analysis though of some use, neglected to fully appreciate the ironies, inconsistencies or nuances that resulted from the unique composition of the varied subjectivities of different individuals. Fractures within and between discourses, it seemed, were not something that could easily be coded, and applied across different texts. Rather, the identification or the creation of fractures, those involved in acts of resistance, it seemed were infinite and depended on countless nuances in the positioning of subjects. Efforts at triangulation were avoided outright because as Garfinkel (cited in Silverman, 1985: 19) suggests, putting the picture together is more problematic than proponents of 'triangulation' would propose ... 'what goes on in one setting is not a simple corrective to what happens elsewhere—each must be understood in its own terms'. The idea that the deployment of multiple methods in various settings will allow for a 'total picture' or help us get closer to an objective reality, is counter to the essence of this paper. Such efforts then, were avoided because they obscure, if not deny the problematic nature of describing/generating 'reality'.

If it is necessary to pin down an analytic approach to evaluating the interview transcripts, then it may be most appropriate to suggest that an interpretive reading, with elements of discourse analysis was conducted. Gill (2000: 172-3) suggests the term 'discourse analysis' is a name given to a variety of different approaches, but that broadly speaking, the key features of this perspective include:

- a critical stance towards taken-for-granted knowledge, and a scepticism towards the view that our observations of the world

unproblematically yield its true nature to us,

- a recognition that the ways in which we commonly understand the world are historically and culturally specific and relative,
- a conviction that knowledge is socially constructed – that is, that our current ways of understanding the world are determined not by the nature of the world itself, but by social processes, and
- a commitment to exploring the ways that knowledges – the social construction of people, phenomena or problems – are linked to action/practices.

More than anything else, this suggests an epistemological position, one that is consistent with the theoretical analysis set out in section two, which serves to guide the manner in which the data was analysed. Specifically, the interview transcripts were imported into the qualitative research software application ATLAS/ti and then broadly coded. This software application offers a 'work bench' that offers a variety of tools for organising large quantities of 'soft' data in meaningful ways. It is important to note that the codes were used as a technique to organise the data and highlight specific issues of interest. The application of codes was by no means an effort to develop a coherent coding frame, but rather to make the data more manageable. Each interview was approached as unique and categories which emerged from a given transcripts were not necessarily imposed on others transcripts. Similarities in broad strategies, however, did emerge. Also, because the body of data was relatively small (8 interviews, approximately 65 single-spaced pages), the ATLAS/ti analysis was supplemented by printouts of the interviews which were coded by highlighter. The primary focus of this analysis was to identify different subject positions taken by the interviewees when discussing particular themes, to identify strategies or acts of resistance, and to search for links between discourse and action. Importantly, this analysis does not attempt to identify any universal processes, and is grounded in an appreciation for the particular context in which it is situated.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to show, by way of the data gathered from the Acme School, that the actions of the headmaster, the teachers, and the students against certain aspects of the government's reforms manifested themselves in two distinct strategies of resistance. The two strategies, labelled by Collinson (1994) as 'resistance through distance' and 'resistance through persistence', it will be demonstrated, were largely shaped and articulated as a result of the differing subjectivities of the school members. It is important to note that these are by no means the only strategies of resistance that emerged in the course of the empirical analysis. However, these two strategies were the most prevalent and demonstrate adequately the aims of this study. 'Resistance through distance' refers to those groups of activities that seek to detach the school members from the demands of the government. The primary concern of this strategy is to outflank government initiatives through various distancing activities; for example, the restriction of information, the strategic deployment of particular knowledges, and the manipulation of social skills, to mention a few. These acts result in the withdrawal of interests from the processes of the educational institutions. 'Resistance through persistence' refers to those groups of activities that seek to extract, challenge or demand accountability from the government initiatives. The primary concern of this strategy is to amend, reform or critically analyse the details of the initiatives in order to create changes that are suitable to the school members. While Collinson's two categories are useful, his results tend to overestimate, or even romanticise the degree of agency that actors have as subjects. On this point, Clegg (1994: 308) suggests that in privileging subjectivity in this way, Collinson strays toward a subjectivist humanism. In keeping with the theoretical foundations established in the first half of this study, a concerted effort will be made to avoid this trap of subjectivity. It will be shown that, though primarily constituted as subjects of an educational discourse, that is, as teachers and students, the members of the Acme School subverted certain meanings within these positions to open up spaces for resistance. This

re-articulation was accomplished by drawing on other subject positions, and by exploiting the fragilities within discourses.

Fractured Identities within the Educational Discourse

To the extent that the discourse of education produced the 'teacher', a closer evaluation of the subjective experiences of this group within the Acme School revealed that this subject position was by no means a stable or secure source of identity. Rather, what exactly a 'teacher' was, was highly contested and an important site of conflict. Within the Acme School, this contestation over personal identity as a teacher, was of crucial significance for understanding the strategies of resistance that emerged.

...it is the formation and reformation of the self that is the aspect of subjectivity most important for understanding contemporary strategies of resistance. Self-formation is ordinarily a complex outcome of subjection or subjugation, and resistance to it. Although subjectivities are effects of power, subjectification and self-identities are always in process (Jeremier et al., 1994: 8).

Importantly, a recent shift in the educational discourse served to exacerbate the fractures within the social production of the 'teacher' in Britain. Roughly four years ago, as part of the government's market-led educational reform efforts, the *Teacher Training Agency* (TTA) was established. This agency was to play a crucial role in raising standards in all schools, and to attract people into teaching who were 'ambitious and forward looking with expectations both for their pupils and for themselves' (TTA website). In keeping with this way of thinking, initial teacher training positioned potential teachers through a wide range of courses, curriculum and exams in which the notion of teaching as a 'career' was stressed. Furthermore, the TTA recruitment brochure emphasised the point that 'you'll soon leave behind any old notions about teaching', and that such training will provide the teacher-in-training with skills to 'present, support, use modern multimedia tools, manage behaviour, work in teams'. To this end, potential teachers were instructed to set ambitious targets for continuous improvement.

The result of this new teacher-training program, was a division within the Acme School between, what will be called the 'old school' and 'new school' teachers. An awareness of this distinction was present in the consciousness of many of the members of the school. Consider, for example, the comments of one of the 'old school' teachers referring to the newer teachers at Acme who were graduates of the training program:

I've noticed in NQTs [newly qualified teachers] that they are coming in expecting numbers and boxes and they're using language that I think fundamentally prevents them from being good educators. They're using ... phrases such as "of course I've got to get my attainment targets right." I don't want them to use that language; it's a cop out. I want them to make sure that the children are actually understanding what they're teaching them' (Head of Geography).

In contrast to this view, the 'new school' teachers, that is, those positioned within the new market-led educational discourse, had considerably different views about their training.

I do think teacher training is necessary. I've said to friends—I have a friend who taught in a private school straight after university—I told him "you've got to do it. You need to have that time to reflect on what you're going to be doing." And genuinely, training will do that' (Maths Teacher).

This training, it seemed also shaped the 'new school' teachers' views about the inspection process and revealed how the newer teachers felt about the older ones:

'At the time of the inspections it's quite painful, but it can help your teaching if there's any weakness in your teaching you can't spot. It's a useful process. I mean, there are some bad teachers [alluding to 'old school' teachers] that are embarrassed by it because they know they're bad and don't want someone coming in to watch them, that's why they object to it... I mean, they're trying to help you in the long term... Just work more efficiently and stop moaning' (Maths Teacher).

Thus, as can be seen, within the educational discourse, there was not necessarily a coherent and well-defined subject position of teacher. Such a view is consistent with Knights' (1990) argument

that any given discourse is interrupted by numerous inconsistencies, and thus the subject positions that it offers results in tension, fragmentation and discord. These two groups of teachers, based on their particular positioning within the educational discourse, either as 'new school' or 'old school' teachers, had different subjective orientations toward knowledge, power, and information within the school. These orientations were instrumental in influencing and affording the differing strategies adopted by these groups in resisting certain demands of the government's reform efforts. The 'old school' teachers at Acme, it will be shown, re-articulated, and differentiated their subject position along lines of moral superiority. These teachers viewed themselves as 'idealists' trying to protect the students, and the institutions of education from the incursions of market and industry interests. This orientation is necessary to understand the strategies of resistance adopted by the 'old school' teachers.

I just wish some of these people actually realised that education is about the students and teachers, it's not about how many.03 of a child got a D in Sanskrit, I mean who cares. It's about how a child is developing, how their education, their subjects, their friends, their respect for other people ... it's all very moral, but we actually believe that ... the problem is, they (the government) see everything in market forces, and education is not about market forces' (Headmaster).

The 'new school' teachers on the other hand, viewed themselves as 'realists' who, through the establishment of improvement targets, through rigorous training programs and properly conducted inspections could best improve education for their students. Consider for example, a newly qualified history teacher's thoughts on the independent school inspections, as different from the Ofsted inspections at state schools:

I think they've got it right. I had an ISI inspection at my last school ... I thought they were quite rigorous, and they were prepared to be critical ... With the Ofsted inspections there was very much a feeling that they were coming in to catch people out ... they were looking for things that weren't working so that they could write a critical report... Whereas ISI, I would say is the other way, they've got a more positive slant, and they're coming in really, and

some people could say it's sort of "private school matey," but I don't think it is'.

Thus, within the Acme School, because of particular fragilities within the educational discourse, differences emerged in the way that newer teachers were constituted in relation to the older ones. The result being, as can be discerned from above, that both of these groups were positioned in such a way, that they had differing interests and resources. To this end, consideration of these interests and resources is necessary for a fuller appreciation of the diverging strategies of resistance adopted by the teachers. Before proceeding, it is important to note that though a clear distinction has been made between the 'old school' and 'new school' teachers, the boundaries between these two groups were by no means as clear or strict as has been suggested. Subjectivities are multiple and shifting, thus, both strategies of 'resistance through distance' and 'resistance through persistence' were adopted by both groups in relation to different demands. However, as will be shown, the instances of 'resistance through persistence' were more prominent among the 'old school' teachers.

Resistance through Distance

The strategy of 'resistance through distance' was the primary means through which the 'new school' teachers, and even the students of Acme resisted particular aspects of the government's reform efforts. Interestingly, though the newer teachers were constituted in such a way that they believed in the necessity and importance of the need to improve education through greater transparency and accountability, they nonetheless, resisted some of the extensions of these demands in their everyday classroom interactions. Though the 'new school' teachers at Acme approved of the idea of inspections, they disagreed with the manner in which the inspections were conducted. The conflict surfaced, to a large extent, because their experiences in the classroom challenged, and contradicted much of what they had learnt in the government training programs. This resulted in an elevation of the practical, and everyday class-

room knowledges, over the more theoretical and abstract knowledges that these teachers were taught in training.

'...well I think they've got it completely wrong... I don't think that they understand what a teacher's job involves, and I don't think they're very interested in finding that out. I think they're dealing with a lot of different areas, they think that more monitoring, more evaluation, that's not what teaching is about in real life. I don't think they want teachers to be good teachers, but to be administrators' (History Teacher).

The elevation of these knowledges served as a key resource in their oppositional practices. Importantly, the privileging of this practical knowledge, was done, in many instances at the expense of bureaucratic, or procedural knowledges associated with being administrators. As can be seen, the History teacher made an effort to distinguish the 'teacher' from the 'administrator'. The result of this was a distancing, and even a distrust of any of the formal processes within the school.

'...although you may be dictated to a certain extent: "you have to have your reports done by the end of next week, you must have this taught by the end of term"; but once you've shut the classroom door, you are actually your own boss' (Maths Teacher).

The privileging of this knowledge afforded a series of 'resistance through distance' practices. With respect to the independent school inspections, the 'new school' teachers employed their social skills in order to escape aspects of the inspections that they perceived as insensitive to the actual or 'real world' conditions of education. Because these teachers were educated in the government training programs, they were familiar with how the inspections were conducted. Moreover, they knew exactly what was necessary in order to orchestrate a successful inspection. As the Maths teacher put it:

'Look, I was trained by them; I know what they expect.... I don't use it (inspection framework) in practice. No one would. But when it comes time for inspection, we might quickly have a look at some of the inspection forms'.

'...and for that week (week of inspections) you have to plan the

lessons really carefully, write them down and pretend you do that for all your lessons, which you know obviously isn't the case. So I think inspections have to take everything with a slight pinch of salt' (History Teacher).

To this end, during inspections, the teachers deployed their dramaturgical skills, and restricted certain information as a means of outflanking the government initiatives and safeguarding their practical knowledges. In many instances, the 'new school' teachers, would put on a performance for the inspectors. Drawing on their special knowledge acquired through teacher training, they would give the inspectors exactly what they wanted. Importantly, the students of the school were also 'let in' on this performance, and were willing participants in the act.

'... luckily the students are very nice, so generally they are quite supportive in the sense that you are working with the students to present the school in the best possible light, which is good. In my last HMI (sic) inspection the kids were really nice during my lesson, they were deliberately making an effort to appear more helpful than they are generally' (History Teacher).

On this point, one of the students shared a similar view:

'We all played up to her (inspector) a bit. I remember trying to sound much more articulate than I really am. I didn't do it for the inspector, I don't care about the school. I did it for myself, and maybe the teacher because I like her...' (Student).

Relying on such actions reflected the sense of fatalism that permeated both the 'new school' teachers and the students of Acme. Any dependence on the formal channels of resistance for these two groups was seen as being incorporated into the system. The avoidance of these channels then, was not simply a rejection of their practical value, but also a re-articulation of their identity as 'realists'. Part of this knowledge derived from their subjective experiences as 'citizens' within the broader discourse of democracy.

'...I mean, I've got quite strong opinions about it, but my view is generally that the government is just not interested... it's one of those things that's beyond your control. It depends on the inspectors you have, what mood they're in, whether they like your particular

approach, whether you like them, there are a lot of additional factors that are beyond your control... I would say that I'm interested, but effectively quite apathetic because of my experience of the political process is that nothing you try and get done gets achieved. The process is hijacked by hidden agendas. It would make no difference, I mean what avenues are left' (History Teacher).

'I guess in a way it's very similar to religion in that I want to find something, but I'm quite aware that things are very futile. I guess perhaps I find, sometimes, I think that if I could work out what it is, then I could change things. Then the other part of me says be rational, people have thought that through out time. Look at all the revolutions, it's not going to change, it's not going to change' (Student).

Furthermore, because of their subjective experiences of the educational and democratic institutions, for this group the 'resistance through distance' strategy appeared to be the only available means for opposition in the school. The restriction of information, use of social skills, and the strategic deployment of particular knowledge, was in keeping with the manner in which 'new school' teachers' were positioned within the Acme School environment. Interestingly, both of the newer teachers interviewed suggested that:

'I think the culture here is that you don't have problems. And I think if people do have problems, they keep it pretty hushed up' (Maths Teacher).

'... whereas here, you're not supposed to have such problems, you get them, but you're made to feel like you shouldn't make a fuss because things are generally stable...' (History Teacher).

For the students, this fatalism, and 'resistance through distance' was an important source of identity because it subverted the logic of the dominant educational, as well as democratic discourses that attempted to position them within its frameworks. Through the process of 'bricolage' (Fournier, 1998), the students opened up spaces of resistance by re-appropriating the meanings of the dominant discourses. An identity of non-conformity developed among this group in which they felt they could distance themselves from the corruption of market-guided reforms:

'Probably they're looking to the future a lot. It seems that a lot of things today have to do with, everything and anything has to do with material things, it has to do with the economy. And they need a generation who can make Great Britain a strong country. Nobody really cares about anything, it's all about money, it's all about trade' (Student).

When discussing her friends, the student continues:

'I guess maybe it's the whole non-conformist thing, I don't want to classify it as anything... I know that with me and my friends that none of us can help each other because we're all going through the same thing, we're all at the same stage, no one has an outer knowledge, or foresight, everyone knows they're just kind of struggling through... I guess we can all see a pointlessness in it, but we're all feeling people'.

In this way, the students re-framed their subject positions and drew strength from this position in order to resist the demands of the government initiatives. In particular, this subversion served to create some degree of indifference toward the introduction of the AS Levels. Though the students were still concerned to perform well on their exams, in positioning themselves as non-conformists through the subversion of the dominant discourses, they recovered the value of extra-curricular activities that were marginalized by the introduction of the AS Levels. In this case, the students carried on with a theatrical production that was cancelled by the teachers because it took up too much of the Sixth Formers time. To resist such efforts, the students devoted their free time to continuing the production.

'...we all got a load of slack from our teachers because they were all so worried saying "oh my god," and it took up a hell of a lot of my time you know, nearly everyday after school I was rehearsing for maybe an hour or two and then I had to get the bus home... But it got in the way of schoolwork... You know, to have them (government) start to consider that that shouldn't be allowed, when that's so important for personal development' (Student).

While such actions, both by the students and the 'new school' teachers, constituted important acts of resistance, it is important to note that such a strategy of 'resistance through distance' simultaneously incorporated facets of con-

sent and compliance that seriously threatened the possibility of effective resistance (Collinson, 1992; 1994). Though the intention of this essay is not to evaluate the effectiveness or success of these strategies, it nonetheless requires mentioning. In distancing themselves from the processes of the educational institutions, these groups' actions failed to challenge any of the basic assumptions of the educational discourse. Such a strategy, then, only served to reinforce their voicelessness within the institutions of education, and to reinforce their subordinate status. The sense of fatalism and the feelings that improving the system was beyond their control confirmed their experiences within the educational and democratic institutions and in some instances intensified the feelings of anger that accompanied many of their acts of resistance.

Resistance through Persistence

The strategy of 'resistance through persistence' was the most frequent means by which the 'old school' teachers and the headmaster opposed aspects of the government's reform efforts. Unlike the newer teachers who shunned the bureaucratic and procedural elements of the job, the 'old school' teachers recognised the importance of these formal procedures. These members of Acme not only saw themselves as teachers, but also as administrators for whom a thorough understanding of bureaucratic knowledges was a vital resource for resistance. The 'old school' teachers extracted information, pushed for changes, and interrogated the system through the formal procedures available to them within the educational institutions. In most cases, this meant membership on certain committees, or boards, government elections, and the strategic use of personal contacts, to mention a few. The 'resistance through persistence' strategy was regarded by many of these teachers as the most effective process for amending the government's demands. Importantly, however, it was recognised that this was a long-term strategy and often such efforts were supplemented with more short-term 'resistance through distance' strategies. The use of 'resistance through distance' was, it should be mentioned, typically counter to,

and inconsistent with their formal efforts. However, it served to open up immediate space that the teachers felt was necessary.

The appreciation for the value of these bureaucratic and procedural knowledges facilitated a series of oppositional practices that sought to extract information, and demand changes from the government. Such a strategy, it is important to note, draws much of its strength from the use of the very same language and techniques—those of the new market-led educational discourse—which the teachers sought to oppose. The 'old school' teachers valued the efforts of the government to increase accountability, transparency, the need to improve educational standards, and so forth; however, they disagreed with the market logic and manner in which these outcomes were achieved. To this end, the 'old school' teachers appropriated the discourse and its mechanisms and re-articulated them in terms of moral or social logic, drawing it seems on a parental, even a religious discourse, in which the teachers and the headmaster were positioned as protectors, almost the guardians of the students, who were oftentimes referred to as 'our children', rather than students or pupils. In this discourse, the students' overall development, rather than just their academic progress, was emphasised:

'We had Anna Goodman, well you see, Anna's already got 4 A's at A-Level and she's sitting four more, and she'll end up 8 A's at A-Level... and probably make British record. I couldn't care less about that, but I do care that Anna was a very shy gancky little girl, who is now wonderfully relaxed, prepared with friends, and I think we've done a good job on her. Whereas Charlie was always a little sweetie pie, but was always hopeless at her work, and through just sheer praising her and making her feel good she's ending up doing well... I'm only going to say one thing today 'children', you've got to give teachers the chance to look after children. And everything comes back to making children feel good' (Headmaster).

'We were in a school that failed Ofsted at the time, and the school was "named and shamed" and I don't think that they ever thought for a moment what that would do to the children, who were absolutely incensed... the children were really upset by it, and I don't think the politicians gave a moments thought to that' (Physics Teacher).

'I know as a parent, my children are too heavily tested (Head of the Geography Department).

These sentiments were continually re-iterated by the teachers, who felt that, though improving educational standards is vitally important, the social development of children should not be neglected. Though not formally stated, it appears that much of the opposition and conflicts were based on differing interpretations of what exactly constituted education. For the government, the reform efforts were aimed at improving student scores, graduation levels, attainment targets and so forth. The focus, it appeared, was on that which could be quantitatively measured. Whereas the 'old school' teachers' notions of education were much broader and emphasised the moral and social aspects of well-rounded, well-mannered and well-adjusted people.

These sentiments, though quite similar to those of the 'new school' teachers, actually gained expression through the various formal channels that were open to teachers to express their opinions and influence the educational processes. These avenues, or resources, it is important to note, were open to this group because of the manner in which they were positioned. Each of the 'old school' teachers interviewed, as well as the headmaster, were all members on one or more committees and felt that they could exercise some degree of influence through these channels. Both the 'new school' teachers interviewed had no such memberships. Consider, for example the case of the headmaster. A member of the Headmaster's Conference (HMC), Chairman of the London Heads and Headmistresses, Chairmen of the Overseas Heads, and an inspector for Ofsted. Through these positions, multiple opportunities arose to meet, voice concerns and make recommendations to Prime Minister Tony Blair, Education Secretary David Blunkett, Secretary for the Secondary Heads Association, Head of Winchester Nick Tate and Nigel DeGucci; to mention a few. Importantly, these individuals, arguably decision and policy makers in the British government became, through various memberships and formal channels, accessible to the headmaster of Acme, and thus, were

made sensitive to the local conditions and experiences of the school, and its difficulties. Consider the recollection of the advice the headmaster gave to shadow minister of education:

'...he said "what should I do?", he'd only been in office for two days, and I said "do nothing for five years and you'd achieve far more than others have achieved by a different initiative everyday, because teachers are totally knackered..." (Headmaster).

Or the suggestion that he offered to the new chief inspector about the Acme School over dinner at the headmaster's house:

'I'd like a snapshot inspection of a particular category, it doesn't matter what, and if a school has passed as being very good, to leave them alone for 10 years and let them just get on with it'. (Headmaster).

Though not all of the 'old school' teachers were members of as many committees as the headmaster, nor did they have such an extensive network base, they nonetheless were all members of various committees and found these to be very effective channels for voicing their concerns about the educational process in the country, and how it should be improved. By drawing on, and re-articulating the meanings and practices of the market-led educational discourse within a moral framework, these teachers subverted the dominant meanings and created spaces, or positions, for resistance. Furthermore, these subverted meanings were expressed and justified through formal channels and worked to challenge and undermine the dominant discourses on education. What becomes evident, as Fournier (1998: 74) suggests is that the subject positions of teacher within the Acme School are not simply constituted from above, but rather, 'the subjectivities, meanings and positions created from above are likely to be re-appropriated and transformed; they are liable to tactical realignment in the process of being consumed from below'. Such realignments, it has been suggested, constitute important acts of resistance.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

By drawing attention to the subjective experiences

of the members of the Acme School, this study demonstrated that though these individuals were constituted as subjects of dominant educational discourses, fragilities within these discourses, and the subject positions offered by other discourses afforded small, but important spaces for resistance. The introduction of subjectivity into the study of resistance, then, provides a mechanism for appreciating how such spaces of resistance can be retrieved *within* the dominant discourses without overestimating or underestimating the agency of the human subject. It was shown that fractures within the educational discourse afforded two distinct subject positions: the 'new school' and 'old school teachers'. Interestingly, the manner in which these subjects were positioned within the educational discourse, constituted them as having different interests and resources. These differences, it was suggested, were partly responsible for the shaping the distinct strategies of resistance: 'resistance through distance', and 'resistance through persistence'. Furthermore, the case study demonstrated that by drawing on the resources afforded by subject position in different discourses (parental discourse, for example), spaces of resistance were also created through the appropriation, re-articulation and subversion of dominant meanings within different and, at times, competing frameworks.

By highlighting the subjective experiences of the members of the Acme School, this study goes some way toward retrieving the significance of workplace resistance. It is important to note, however, that in presenting this analysis, crucial questions and theoretical concerns related to power, resistance and subjectivity were neglected. This neglect, unfortunately, has served to significantly limit the critical exploration of resistance at the Acme School. Greater attention needed to be paid to the contradictory side of both strategies. That is, acts of resistance that simultaneously resulted in consent and compliance which served to undermine the efforts of resistance. Further, a greater understanding of the discourses and practices that constituted resistance is necessary for a more sensitive appreciation of how different discourses were strategically ma-

nipulated or employed in the service resistance. These limitations notwithstanding, this study of the Acme School, reveals many of the complexities, subtleties and nuances involved in members' efforts of resistance. But perhaps more than this, it points to the myriad of questions about the nature of resistance, the practices, strategies and resources that constitute it, and concerns about the effectiveness of resistance that remain unexplored—questions that deserve careful attention.

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (1996) 'Critical Theory and Postmodernism Approaches to Organizational Studies'. In Clegg, S.R. et al, Handbook of Organization Studies. London: Sage.
- Atkinson, P. & Hammersley, M. (1994) 'Ethnography and Participant Observation'. In N.K. Denzin & Lincoln Y.S., Handbook of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.
- Austrin, T. (1994) 'Positioning Resistance and Resisting Position: Human Resource Management and the Politics of Appraisal and Grievance Hearing'. In J. Jeremier et al. (eds) Resistance & Power in Organizations. London: Routledge.
- Bauer, M. (1995) 'Towards a Functional Analysis of Resistance'. In M. Bauer Resistance to New Technology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braverman, H. (1974) Labour and Monopoly Capitalism: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Clegg, S. (1998) 'Foucault, Power and Organizations'. In A. McKinlay and Starkey, K. (eds) Foucault, Management and Organization Theory. London: Sage.
- Clegg, S. (1994) 'Constitution of the Resistant Subject'. In J. Jeremier et al. (eds) Resistance & Power in Organizations. London: Routledge.
- Coch, L. and French, R.P. (1948) 'Overcoming Resistance to Change'. Human Relations: Towards the Integration of the Social Sciences1(4), 512 -532
- Collinson, D.L. (1994) 'Strategies of Resistance: Power, Knowledge and Subjectivity in the Workplace'. In J. Jeremier et al. (eds) Resistance & Power in Organizations. London: Routledge.
- Collinson, D.L. (1992) Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Daudi, P. (1986) Power in the Organisation: The Discourse of Power in Managerial Praxis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dreher, M. (1994) 'Qualitative Research Methods from the Reviewer's Perspective' In J. Morse (ed) Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1980) Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972 – 77. Edited by Colin Gordon. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, M. (1981) The History of Sexuality: Volume 1. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'The Subject and Power', in Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Fournier, V. (1998) Stories of Development and Exploitation: Militant Voices in an Enterprise Culture. Organisation, 5(1), 55-80.
- Gaskell, G. (2000) 'Individual and Group Interviewing'. In M.W. Bauer & Gaskell, G. Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook. London: Sage.
- Gill, R. (2000) 'Discourse Analysis'. In M.W. Bauer & Gaskell, G. Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook. London: Sage.
- Giddens, A. (1979) Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradictions in Social Analysis. London: The MacMillan Press.
- Giddens, A. (1981) A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism. London: The MacMillan Press.
- Habermas, J. (1986) The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. London: Heinemann.
- Henriques, J., W. Holloway, C. Unwin, c. Venn, V. Walkerdine (1984), Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity. London: Methuen.
- Hodson, R. (1995) Worker Resistance: An Underdeveloped Concept in the Sociology of Work. Economic and Industrial Democracy, 16, 79-110.

- Humphreys P. & Kirtsloglou, E. (2001) Violence within the Post-structural Economy of Shortage. Unpublished.
- Jeremier, J.M., D. Knights & W. R. Nord (eds.). (1994) Resistance and Power in Organisations. London: Routledge.
- Knights, D., & Vurdubakis, T. (1994) 'Foucault, Power, Resistance and all that'. In J. Jeremier et al. (eds) Resistance & Power in Organizations. London: Routledge.
- Knights, D., & Willmot, H (eds.) (1990) Labour Process Theory. London: The MacMillan Press.
- Knights, D. (1990) 'Subjectivity, Power and the Labour Process.' In D. Knights & Willmot, H. (eds) Labour Process Theory. London: The MacMillan Press.
- Kondo, D. (1990) Crafting Selves: Power, Discourse and Identity in a Japanese Factory. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Law, J. (1994) Organizing Modernity. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Lewin, K. (1951) Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper & Row.
- Linstead, S. & Grafton-Small, R. (1992) On Reading Organisational Culture. Organisation Studies, 13(3), 331-355.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1986) The Postmodern Condition. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Marx, K. (1867/1972) Capital, New York: Dutton.
- McGuigan, J. (1999) Modernity and Postmodern Culture. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McKinlay, A. & Starkey, K. (eds.) (1998) Foucault, Management and Organization Theory. London: Sage.
- Michael, M. and Still, A. (1992) A Resource for Resistance: Power-knowledge and Affordance. Theory & Society, 21(6), 869-888.
- Morse, J. (ed) (1994) Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods. London: Sage.
- Niemark, M. (1990) The King is Dead, Long Live the King. Critical Perspectives in Accounting, 1, 103-114.
- Office for Standards in Education. (1995) Governing Bodies and Effective Schools. London: Department for Education.
- Office for Standards in Education. (1997) From Failure to Success: How Special Measures are Helping Schools Improve. London: Department for Education.
- Office of her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools. (2001) Inspecting Independent Schools: A Framework for use by Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. London: Ofsted Publications.
- O'Sullivan, T, J. Hartley, D. Saunders, M. Montgomery & J. Fiske. (1994) Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies. London: Routledge.
- Patton, P. (1998) 'Foucault's Subject of Power'. In J. Moss, The Later Foucault. London: Sage.
- Pinnington, A. & Edwards, T. (2000) Introduction to Human Resource Management. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rabinow, P. (ed.) (1984) The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought. London: Penguin Books.
- Rose, N. (1989) Governing the Soul. London: Routledge.
- Silverman, D. (1985) Qualitative Methodology & Sociology: Describing the Social World. London: Gower.
- Stake, R.E. (1994) 'Case Studies' in N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) Handbook of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.
- Sturdy, A., Knights, D & H. Willmot (eds.). (1992) Skill and Consent: Contemporary Studies in the Labour Process. London: Routledge.
- Teacher Training Agency. (1997) Framework for the Assessment of quality and Standards in Initial Teacher Training. London: Ofsted Publications.
- Thompson, P, & McHugh, D (1990) Work Organizations. London: MacMillan Press.

FOOTNOTES

- [1] It is worth noting that Braverman, in Labour and Monopoly Capital, does mention that his goal is not to provide a detailed treatment of subjectivity. To this end, Knights acknowledges this point suggesting that Braverman's work is not so much wrong as it is incomplete. Collinson (1992) takes this point further suggesting that it is 'churlish' for theorists to criticise Braverman for an omission that he acknowledges and intended.
- [2] Other criticisms of the traditional Western notion of the autonomous and unitary individual can be seen in Behaviourist and Post-structuralist writings.
- [3] The research was conducted under the past Labour administration, and thus, it will still refer to David Blunkett as Education Secretary. Estelle Morris, who at

the time was Minister for School Standards, is now the Education Secretary.

Copyright of TAMARA: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science is the property of Tamaraland Publishing and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.