What is a Gunterian approach to research? Helen M. Gunter's contributions to critical education leadership.

Steven J. Courtney, University of Manchester (Orcid 0000-0003-2379-7035)

Ruth McGinity, UCL (Orcid 0000-0002-1776-2912)

Abstract

Helen M. Gunter's research disrupts the field of educational leadership, management and administration (ELMA); by this, we mean that her work supplies distinctive new ways of and/or tools for understanding or theorising the field that challenge existing perspectives, including functionalist ones. However, these disruptions themselves follow an intellectual tradition of critical scholarship, and she has left intellectual resources that others have taken up in their treatments of, and dispositions towards educational leadership. Our aim and distinctive contribution is to think with these aims to define what it means to adopt a Gunterian approach to research. We trace three strands to Gunter's contributions to educational leadership and policy—which we see as mutually constitutive —and demonstrate how these contributions constitute a tradition of disruption and enable its continuation in a distinctively Gunterian manner. The three strands are Gunter's theorising and use of theory; her typologising and mapping of the ELMA field; and her illuminating and problematising its features through the use of metaphor. We see all these as contributing towards Gunter's overarching intellectual project concerning the investigation and problematisation of knowledge production, which, following Blackmore, she achieves through her willingness to investigate diverse areas of focus.

Key words: Gunterian, theory, metaphor, disruption, tradition, mapping

Introduction

Helen M. Gunter does not simply innovate within the field of educational leadership, management and administration (ELMA); rather, she disrupts it productively. For example, she has decried the managerialism of what she called 'Jurassic Management' (1995); challenged the orthodoxy of teacher leadership (Fitzgerald and Gunter 2008); and located contemporaneous practices constructed as 'leadership' within a paradigm of totalitarianism (Courtney and Gunter, 2015); and of eugenics (Gunter, 2018a). However, the ways in which she troubles the field themselves follow an intellectual tradition of critical scholarship, and she has left tools and intellectual resources that

others in the field have taken up in their treatments of, and dispositions towards educational leadership. These constitute three distinctive achievements.

In this chapter, we first attempt to locate Gunter's research and scholarship in the context of the field of education leadership and policy, and justify our interpretation of that field as singular. Next, we construct and define for the first time what it means to be a Gunterian, or to adopt a Gunterian approach to research. We do this by tracing three strands to Gunter's contributions to educational leadership, and sketch out how these contributions continue a tradition of disruption and also enable its continuation. The three strands are Gunter's theorising and use of theory; her typologising and mapping of the ELMA field; and finally, her illuminating and problematising its features through the use of metaphor.

Gunter's canon and approach disrupt dominant functionalist ways of knowing in educational leadership, which misconstruct social reality, misdiagnose and hence mis-solve its problems (Courtney, Gunter, Niesche and Trujillo, 2021). Functionalist research is unhelpful to those working towards more ethical and social-justice oriented practices and dispositions in ELMA, since its findings are used to underpin what Gunter has called the transnational leadership package, or TLP (Courtney, McGinity and Gunter, 2017). This TLP is a commodified product, enabled through a) consultant-derived and contractually located policy prescriptions; b) school effectiveness (i.e., functionalist) findings that reproduce and reify the conflation of the standards agenda with notions of a good education; and c) the deprofessionalisation of teachers and educational leaders, which locates improvement beyond the school and specifically within the ambit of business. Nonetheless, Gunter's pioneering contributions build on others in the critical part of the field. That is, her own scholarship and praxis may be located within important scholarly traditions of disruption. Key scholars here include Greenfield, the importance of whose contributions Gunter has reminded the field (Gunter, 2020).

The three strands investigated and genealogically traced in this chapter are part of Gunter's broader intellectual project concerning knowledge production and politics in education and its leadership (e.g., Gunter 2006; Gunter et al. 2013; Gunter 2016). Gunter theorises to illuminate how knowledge is produced and deployed; her mapping and typologising are interpretations of knowledge produced by, about and for the field; and her use of metaphor locates her scholarship within a particular, critical knowledge-production domain. This permeation of knowledge production throughout her work leads us to integrate it into the three strands that we have identified rather than treat it discretely.

The evidence presented through this chapter supports our argument that Gunter has followed from, and has agentically contributed to the continuation of a series of

significant traditions for the field. Each comprises a distinct disruption to, or troubling of taken-for-granted thinking about educational leadership; each places power at the centre of thinking about educational leadership, and questions the source, motives, values and traditions of knowledge about and for educational leadership. This chapter itself constitutes a contribution to ELMA through its unique genealogical examination of the contributions and approaches of one of the field's titans, which we begin to sketch out here as Gunterian.

We do not wish to argue or imply that mapping, theorising data or using metaphors have been undertaken by Gunter uniquely (although we maintain that in many instances, her distinctive efforts have transformed the field—see the section on mapping below). For this reason, we are keen to show the intellectual genealogy to which Gunter's contributions in these areas belong. Instead, we are exemplifying what we are identifying as a Gunterian approach through analysing how she has gone about these activities and what this reveals of her intellectual project. They reveal, rather than constitute a Gunterian approach to research, and therefore do so more powerfully when considered cumulatively rather than individually. At the heart of each is Gunter's analytical focus on typologising, theorising, problematising and explaining power relations in education and its leadership, particularly in relation to knowledge production. Gunter's commitment to public education suffuses her outputs and hence distinguishes her approach, underpinning her rejection of functionalist approaches that passively or actively enable education privatisation. Importantly, we consider it vital to begin to elucidate a Gunterian approach precisely because such an approach is being taken up repeatedly in the field, wholly or in part, except in ways that are unsatisfactorily attributed owing to definitional imprecision. A word on this; all scholars would have an associated adjective if its only function were to describe their approach; we suggest instead that what merits the adjective is the significance of that approach in the wider field. We insist that Gunter holds such significance and aim to demonstrate it through our genealogical treatment of her work. The product of our analysis is a sketch rather than a schema; it is as much dispositional and axiological as methodological. We suggest that it should mark a point of departure for the field's subsequent analyses, rather than a summative statement.

Locating Gunter

Before we discuss the three strands of theorising, mapping, and using metaphors, we want to address the issue of how we locate Gunter's field position. As a professor of education policy who (sometimes) researches education leadership, Gunter embodies Glatter's (1980) rejection of a dichotomy between these two fields. As Glatter argues,

"Educational institutions are up to their necks in policy-making and politics (Morgan, 1979) and if the term 'policy studies' has any meaning at all it must apply to them no less than to the levels above them…If politics are concerned with value-setting, then they are likely to be especially significant in a situation in which, as Kogan notes, each of the of the heads of 30,000 educational institutions 'is allowed to develop organizational and educational styles of his (sic) own …' (Kogan, 1975, p. 56)." (Glatter, 1980, pp. 28–29)

This view has received renewed intellectual support with the *policy enactment* turn (see Braun, Maguire and Ball, 2010), which recognises the multiple actors involved in policy formulation and normalises the messiness of its expression; policy enactment includes, but does not necessarily privilege education leaders. In this framing, educational leadership is a lens through which policy may be examined and a site through which it is both expressed and created. It is meaningless to argue that educational leadership is discrete: such an illusory construct is an underpinning assumption of the policy-science-inflected *performance leadership for school effectiveness*. However, even taking all that into account, Gunter's oeuvre is remarkably wide-ranging. Gunter has made substantive contributions in recent years concerning, *inter alia*, gender (Bradbury and Gunter, 2006), eugenics (Jones et al. 2021), socio-economic class (Gunter and Courtney, 2021b); public education (Gunter and Courtney, 2020); depoliticisation (Gunter, 2018a) and consultancy (Gunter and Mills, 2017). These contributions constitute a disruption to the wider, functionalist field of ELMA in reflecting the way in which Gunter takes seriously the gamut of structural, political, ideological and historical features that co-construct the education-policy arena; the dispositions, practices and identities of those constructed as 'educational leaders' within it; and the way in which knowledge production about and within ELMA is located at the intersection of all these elements. This troubling is nonetheless a tradition, one that is exemplified most strongly before Gunter by Jill Blackmore, whose contributions collectively reveal a vast and varied oeuvre of her own. A very incomplete sampling must acknowledge Blackmore's work on gender (1989, 1999); the relationship between architecture and pupil outcomes (2011); globalisation (2000); quality assurance and improvement (2004) and contractualism in higher education (2017). Gunter, like Blackmore, captures the field from multiple perspectives in order to say something broader about what is going on, set within an intellectual project which, whilst empirically located, makes contributions that are abstract and conceptual, enabling the ideas and insights to resonate internationally. This approach has been taken up since: Courtney, for instance, has investigated structure, agency and identity in education leadership through the lenses of, *inter alia*, heteronormativity (2014); post-panoptic hyper-performativity in inspection regimes (2016); and school-type diversification (2015). Collectively, scholars working in this way

offer a corrective to the positivist construction of education leadership as a discrete variable that interacts with context only in measurable ways, and that is largely reducible to the traits of the people at key organisational points and how these contribute to delivering outcomes. Attempts to write methodologically about the holistic approach used by Gunter usually ascribe it to policy scholarship (see Grace, 1995), yet there is little recognition of it in the critical educational leadership studies methodological literature. We follow Glatter (1980) and Gunter in seeing no conceptual dichotomy, yet note that a practical effect of this is to liberate functionalist educational-leadership researchers, who may consider their work to have an entirely different, and perhaps somewhat removed relationship with policy, from having to consciously reject this manner of thinking and researching. Critical education-leadership researchers risk giving the impression to those unaccustomed to the debate that we are obliged to leave the field to locate our methodologies; that ELMA lacks the intellectual resources to accommodate us. We call, then, for more explicit statements in educational-leadership scholarship that argue for the necessity of treating diverse objects of study within an overarching intellectual project, since the debate seems to have slipped recently into the realms of the implicit.

In summary, Gunter's research output encompasses a variety of structures, issues and sites that for her, give meaning to educational leadership as praxis, which we interpret as practice oriented towards social justice and informed by critical theory. Without a theorised consideration of such intersecting contextual, historical, political and structural matters, educational leadership, for Gunter, is reduced unacceptably to a psychologised, functionalist focus on the individual traits and so-called behaviours of certain post-holders in education organisations and institutions, and the expression and reception of these traits and behaviours.

Theory and theorising

As we mention above, the distinction of Gunter's contributions are not located in the fact of her theorising *per se*. However, it is true that beyond the critical part of the field of ELMA, theorising has not been well or consistently undertaken: Gunter herself has contributed to the significance of the debates in relation to the role of theory and quality of scholarship within the field (Courtney, McGinity and Gunter, 2017). Despite this, for those carrying out critically informed scholarship, theory and theorising is definitionally integral to such approaches and analyses (Thomson and Heffernan, 2021) and can be traced as such over time (McGinity et al, 2022). We locate Gunter's contribution within this tradition with regards to her use and deployment of theory, where her treatment of diverse structures, issues and sites coalesces with a similarly diverse set of conceptualisation-enabling 'tools' to produce scholarship which simultaneously elevates

and integrates theory and theorising throughout her body of work (e.g., Gunter, 2000, 2012, 2013a, 2015).

What theory specifically enables Gunter to do is to illuminate and explain the relationship between professional practice and power, which in turn characterises Gunter's commitment to knowledge production as an analytical means through which the complexities of practice might be better understood. This enables socio-historical, structural, political and ideological influences to be identified, interrogated and exposed. Gunter has particularly and effectively utilised this approach through thinking with Bourdieu (e.g., Gunter, 2012) and Arendt (e.g., Gunter, 2015). In the field of critical leadership scholarship, through using the theoretical tools bequeathed by these immense figures within political sociology, Gunter has developed a vital oeuvre for those inclined to explore and develop analyses within the broader field of educational leadership and policy, alongside the role of social and critical theory.

As with the other dimensions that contribute towards the constitution of a Gunterian approach, it is not the singular use that makes this a distinctive contribution. What is necessarily disruptive about the centrality of theory within Gunter's work is that she, with others, uses theory and does theorising as a way to demonstrate methodological rigour, where various factions of the field not only omit but actively reject theory as a useful or meaningful way to make sense of professional practice (Courtney et al., 2017).

What characterises Gunter's contributions here, and arguably enables a distinctive reading across her body of work, is her consistent rejection that theory is arcane, and that the production of theoretically informed scholarship is useful only in and for a rarefied academy, and not for the practising professional working, teaching and leading in schools. Gunter's scholarship challenges the notion that everyone in education should be viewed as consumers of leadership models and ideas, that is, that the demand is solely for off-the-shelf, pre-packaged, digestible and easily implemented 'how to' manuals. Instead, Gunter argues for alternatives which clearly distinguish between the functionalist default in this regard and the theoretically rich frameworks which challenge these taken-for-granted (and dominant) positions. In doing so, she demonstrates how theory and the disposition to theorise are intellectual resources that are held in common for the public good, and that they can both reveal how knowledge production operates, and disrupt claims that are produced by particular 'knowers' in order to reproduce particular 'knowledgeabilities' (Gunter, 2016, p. 17).

Also disruptive is Gunter's continued insistence that theory-informed knowledge-production approaches enable critical questions to be asked with regards to whose interests are being served and how this may be understood historically, socio-politically

and ideologically. The deployment of theory within such an approach provides the intellectual resources to ask these important questions of the past as well as the present, providing insightful suggestions for an improved, truly *educative* future (Gunter and Courtney, 2021a). The object of disruption continues to be the functionalist part of the field, which, Greenfield's intervention notwithstanding, persists in privileging a-theoretical or even anti-theoretical analyses (Gunter, 2020; Courtney et al., 2017). Gunter's disruptive work is consequently more of a project than an event, and will require generations of scholars.

Greenfield's (1974) conference paper regarding the failure of the Theory Movement is recognised as having provoked 'intellectual turmoil' (Gunter, 2020, p. 42) within the ELMA field, where he identified significant limitations within field-members' knowledge claims owing to the misapplication to ELMA of a positivist epistemology. He instead argued for values to be integral to how organisations are researched and understood (see Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993). Importantly, this contribution demonstrated the necessity of linking ideas with the intellectual work of the individual knowledge worker, as the producer of knowledge, and the claims made as a result.

The Theory Movement had developed a scientific approach to administration, drawing on a Taylorist and behaviourist ontology and epistemology in which facts and values are separated. Greenfield's critique argued for analysis of decision-making to be connected to values as a necessary precursor to theorising leadership, management and administration. Greenfield argued that such an approach reveals the complexity of the relationship between professional practice, organisational context and the significance of knowledge production as a method for uncovering how structures create and recreate legitimacy around what claims can be made, by whom and for what purposes. In this regard, Greenfield (1974; Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993) considered that positivist-influenced attempts to codify knowledge about leadership and management in schools were necessarily limited and partial because of the privileging of reductive behaviourist interpretations of practice presented as neutral and decontextualised from the complexity of organisational reality (signifying a rejection of humanist interpretations of social organisations).

The influence of Greenfield's clarion call to centre values and the importance of critique in how knowledge is both produced and subsequently theorised is clearly identifiable in Gunter's work (e.g., 2016, 2018a). Of course, such a call is not only attributable to Greenfield—his own influences (and, in part, those of Gunter) are rooted in classical sociology, encompassed in the work of the likes of Mannheim (ideas should not be studied separately from society) and of course, Bourdieu (enabling a theory of practice).

Gunter is not alone in responding to Greenfield's critique; contemporaries whose work has equally been influenced by Greenfield in the tradition of theoretically informed humanist sociology include Gerald Grace (1995). He called for context, values and questions about legitimacy and power to be integrated into scholarship into leading, leadership, and the professional practices and realities of those at the helm of complex social educational organisations. Peter Gronn (2009) also argues that a hybrid approach based not only on recognising structure and hierarchy but also on the reality of practice within professional habits and relationships is enabled by an attention to and commitment for theory-informed scholarship, the antecedents of which can be traced directly back to Greenfield.

The notion that theoretical approaches trouble taken-for-granted assumptions and positions is an important tradition within the field of critical leadership and policy studies; Gunter's treatment of knowledge production here is distinctive within her prolific and diverse contributions. Gunter (2016) argues that 'exchange relationships are located in micropolitics and so power needs to be a starting point for any investigation for school leadership' and that theories of power are integral to 'critical science research' (p. 53), which is the tradition in which she herself locates her contribution. The deployment of theorists (in particular Bourdieu and Arendt) is not a point of departure within this tradition, but rather an integral part of it. We haven't privileged the specificity of Gunter's use and deployment of these theorists, but rather aimed to demonstrate that their far-reaching inclusion in Gunter's oeuvre is indicative of how serious the troubling of power relations and structures are to her contributions. Others have in turn been inspired and influenced by Gunter's approach in this regard, and so we turn next to consider the tools and intellectual resources she has bestowed upon the field through her engagements with theory and theorising.

Gunter locates the significance of 'kneading theory' (2013a) through engaging and thinking with theorists in her research, where she has produced novel contributions and insights into theorising professional practice (2000, 2013b) providing critical tools for practitioners and scholars alike to make sense of leading and leadership during periods of rapid modernisation (Gunter and McGinity, 2014). In addition, Gunter has illuminated the centrality of theory and theorising in knowledge production as both a methodological and conceptual imperative for the field (Gunter, 2001a; Gunter and Ribbins, 2003). Knowledge production is used and advanced in her work as a heuristic for developing complex, multifaceted and longitudinal investigations about and claims for what is known, by whom and for what purposes. She states that:

> "... in outlining ideas, people and practices, I am presenting an intellectual history as a contribution to field members in homes, schools and higher education who

are working against the neoliberal *doxa*, and for the reconstruction of educational leadership" (Gunter, 2016, p. 40).

The centrality of offering a reader (practitioner, student, leader, policy maker) the tools with which to question, challenge and critique the conditions in which praxis is experienced and understood is a large part of Gunter's contribution to the field. Gunter herself wrote:

> "While our engagement with sociological theories has been the target of political attack on educational research, it is argued that such inquiries enable us to gain new insights into the complexities and creativity of knowledge production within the choices we make as a part of our lives and work. Thinking with habitus and field opens up possibilities for field development through conceptualizing position, and enables us to see the traps located in accepting positioning" (Gunter, 2002).

Gunter's sustained commitment means that critical scholars working in ELMA are obliged to cite her. Importantly, Gunter also spans knowledge traditions and geographies in her influence on those working with theory, particularly Bourdieusian and Arendtian approaches: her work has been cited by scholars from Australia (Eacott, 2010, Niesche, 2011, Wilkinson and Eacott, 2013, Blackmore 2016), the States (English, 2012, Trujillio, 2014), Europe (Bezes et al., 2012; Moller 2017) and beyond (Oplatka, 2009; Wiza and Hlanganipai, 2014).

Mapping the field

Gunter has confronted critical questions relating to knowledge and knowing through her meticulous mapping and typologising of intellectual histories and traditions; these form a significant strand of her career-spanning work (e.g., 1999, 2006, 2012a, 2016).

A pragmatic distinction might helpfully be made concerning the codification and hence construction of the field of ELMA *practice* and mappings of the field of *research* into that practice. Regarding the former, for instance, Gunter (2012a) considers Baron and Taylor's (1969) education collection, *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences* as 'crucial to the identification and framing of a knowledge base' (p. 337). Of course, the two foci are not completely discrete; the field originated in, or rather coalesced from diverse practically oriented programmes for training professionals in school organisation. Later, the elements became mutually constitutive; for example, the Transformational Leadership model was located more or less strongly at different times in journal articles and policy texts, and was variously internalised into practitioners' identities, or resisted. Gunter's attention has been primarily on knowledge production,

so her own mapping has concentrated on how the field knows itself through its research outputs (which, of course, both draw on and structure the field of practice); how the ELMA field may be known or conceptualised; what theories inform and what processes and power relations underpin these forms of knowing.

It is not our intention here to attempt to represent these issues fully now; this is precisely what has occupied Gunter throughout her career, so it would be hubristic to try. Instead, we will make our argument through exemplification rather than exhaustiveness. We begin with a focus on our three questions: first, in what ways have Gunter's contributions disrupted the broad state of play regarding field mappings; second, what intellectual traditions is Gunter continuing, and how; and third, what intellectual resources has Gunter passed on to the field?

First, we want to define our terms regarding field mappings. We suggest that to qualify as such, these need to attempt at least to describe, and preferably to conceptualise positions within or outputs of a field, or a significant part thereof. We see the product of this work as primarily typological, whether these types be 'tight' or 'loose' (Gunter and Ribbins 2003). What immediately becomes clear is that once these criteria are applied, few attempt or achieve it before Gunter, first in her work with Peter Ribbins and then alone. Notable pioneers in this respect are Bell and Bolam (2001) and Ouston (2001). This enables us to make our first claim; the objects of disruption in Gunter's mapping scholarship primarily concern form, i.e., her work is systematised, typologised and published as journal articles. Second, the manner of Gunter's disruption concerns scope, i.e., it is comprehensive. Gunter's application of these principles to her mapping work signals a shift in rigour for the field of ELMA, but also in focus; the act of mapping as a scholarly undertaking becomes significant in its own right and an important intellectual resource for others. From her PhD (Gunter 1999) to *An intellectual history of school leadership practice and research* (Gunter 2016), Gunter disaggregates the features of knowledge production to conceptualise field positions regarding epistemologies, knowledge domains and research traditions. No other field mapping is so exhaustive.

Regarding content, Gunter's mappings have an intellectual history. The debates that led to her decision to typologise in a certain way, or at all, had been taking place in the field for many years. The traditions on which Gunter draws are consequently intellectual; one of her distinctive contributions to them for the purposes of this section is to render them typologically. We exemplify this by drawing on an important, very early field survey conducted by Glatter (1972), who had been engaged for this purpose by George Baron at the then Institute of Education, University of London. In his foreword, Baron described the result as 'a rationale of management as applied to education' that serves 'the dual purpose of presenting a first analysis of what has already taken shape in management studies in education in Britain and of indicating the lines on which further growth should

be encouraged' (Baron, in Glatter 1972, p. iv). It is not typological and does not conceptualise the field, although it is conceptually engaged. Structurally, Glatter's (1972) book focuses on foundations (i.e., terms and premises), people, methods, content and recommendations. He scopes the debates within it that have persisted in ELMA in the same or evolved form over the next fifty years; this permits us methodologically to use his contribution as a comparator and intellectual point of departure. Importantly, he takes a position on these issues (although he may well have changed his views since). We see continuities between many of these debates and positionings and those that Helen Gunter has adopted as foundational in her subsequent work. This is not to claim a causal relationship, of course, nor that there is perfect harmony of outlook. For instance, even in 1972, Glatter gives his support to calls (e.g., Taylor 1970) to promote the contemporaneous iteration of teacher leadership:

> The concept of the teacher's role as that of a manager of a set of learning resources, including other more or less skilled staff, pupils' time, ability and motivation, furniture and software and hardware of all kinds, is increasingly being put forward as a more appropriate model for the present and future than that of the class-based instructor and discipline-enforcer. (Glatter 1972, p. 6)

Since Glatter was writing before the advent of the Global Education Reform Movement (Sahlberg 2015), his position then is not directly comparable with that of Gunter, writing with Fitzgerald (2008). They reject teacher leadership as 'a seductively functionalist way in which teacher commitment to neo-liberal reform has been secured' (p. 331). Nonetheless, we suggest that such points of putative disagreement notwithstanding, significant continuities are evident, some of which we will describe and explain below by way of illumination.

First is the argument for a discretely educative form of management, rather than for a suite of generalist management skills that may be applied throughout the public and private sphere. On this, Glatter (1972) argues that 'educational institutions differ along crucial dimensions from other kinds of organizations' (p. 7), notwithstanding some superficial commonalities with other public services. These differences include the 'satisfactory evaluation of outputs', the diversity of actors constructed as potential managers or administrators, and the relatively distinctive nature of the so-called 'professional/client contract' in education (p. 8). Glatter was writing at a time when education as a public good was not being challenged through successive policy agendas focusing on privatisation through, *inter alia*, academisation and corporatisation (Gunter and McGinity 2014). In this new context, in which the discreteness of educational management and leadership is no longer just a matter of process and structure, but touches rather on ethics, purposes and power, Gunter has continued and developed this intellectual tradition in arguing for a distinctively 'educative leadership' that is 'communal and shared', an 'inclusive exercise of power [which] can expose,

name and make contributions to resolving social injustices within the educational services' (Gunter and Courtney 2021a, p. 194). Gunter has incorporated this focus into her mapping work. For instance, her typologising of knowledge purposes includes 'activism' as one of four knowledge purposes in ELMA, alongside situational, functional and realist (Gunter 2016, p. 60). In other outputs, Gunter uses activism's homologue, the socially critical, in abjection of functionalism to map areas of focus ranging from New Labour's social inclusion policy agenda (Raffo and Gunter 2008) to distributed leadership (Gunter, Hall and Bragg 2013). There is an intellectual genealogy here, too; Gunter's use of socially critical is analogous to the conceptualisation of the critical knowledge domain that she developed with Peter Ribbins (Ribbins and Gunter, 2002).

A second area of continuity and development concerns the empirical tension between the managerial and educational aspects of the job. The precise nature of this tension has unavoidably changed since 1972, when Glatter observed that 'there is an increasing number of claims, and growing evidence, that *many administrators see the 'managerial' and the 'educational' sides of their work as in opposition to each other*, and that they much prefer the 'educational' side with its air of professional purity' (Glatter 1972, pp. 12–13, emphasis in original). Gunter has tracked the development of this trend keenly in her mappings of the field, reflecting her argument made elsewhere (Gunter 2012b) that state intervention into the identities and practices of headteachers from 1997 has complicated this picture. The managerial field has hugely encroached upon the educational, to the conceptual and material impoverishment of the latter; this, however, enables many leaders to claim that they have a laser-like focus on education whilst almost completely disregarding all that is truly educative about schooling in favour of delivering the state's reform, or standards agenda. This delivery foregrounds such managerialist features as teacher—*and leader*—accountability for ever-improving pupil outcomes, operationalised as children's attainment in examinations and standardised tests, through staff performance management. The final area of continuity to which we wish to draw attention is what Glatter (1972) called 'the view of education as a business to be controlled and dehumanized' (p. 15). He was making a point about the implications for 'training (sic) in educational administration' (p. 15) in such a framing, yet Gunter has taken up the wider issue of the wholesale privatisation of educational leadership (McGinity and Gunter, 2014; Courtney and Gunter 2017; Gunter 2018a). These two areas—the binary of educative and managerial; and the privatisation of education and its leadership— are mutually constitutive and figure variously in Gunter's mappings as research that she typologises as functionalist (e.g., Gunter et al. 2013), instrumental (e.g., Gunter 2001b) or evaluative (e.g., Ribbins and Gunter 2002).

No scholar has (yet) taken up single-mindedly Gunter's intellectual project to map the field of ELMA; indeed, it is too soon to write of successors, for Gunter still bestrides the field. Nonetheless, elements of her approach, and various of her tools and methods

have been used in subsequent contributions, some of which we adumbrate here. First, Gunter's argument that epistemic positions are pertinent to field mappings is itself indicative of a critical epistemic position, and so features in the literature accordingly. Critical scholars who have incorporated epistemology, and particularly the broad distinction between functionalist and (socially) critical research into their typologies, mappings and sometimes partial surveys of the literature include McGinity et al. (2022), Courtney and McGinity (2020b), Niesche (2018) and Eacott (2017a); we characterise all these as indicative of a Gunterian approach to mapping. More widely, the question of how the field knows itself has become a matter of scholarly interest beyond the critical field. Therefore, arguably, even functionalist mappings that disregard epistemology in favour of bibliometric analyses owe their existence in part to Gunter's attention to the genre.

Use of metaphor

Gunter announced herself to the field of ELMA with an article (1995), then a book (1997), that used a powerful metaphor to illuminate and explain her interpretation of the problems with educational leadership then and arguably still. This metaphor was 'Jurassic Management', by which she means the techno-rational management paradigm employed by those in charge of the dinosaur-themed Jurassic Park. This paradigm had much to recommend it, including 'the concept of a common purpose; teams empowered to live the vision based on a consensus value system; planning and organisational effectiveness; a skilled marketing strategy based on sound boundary management; and meeting the needs of the customer by adapting to the environment' (Gunter, 1995, p. 8). What a surprise, then, when this seemingly watertight apparatus failed, such that dinosaurs went on to consume the consumers! As Gunter puts it, wryly, 'Has [the company's leader] Hammond's MBA let him down?' (1995, p. 8).

The Jurassic Management metaphor works so wonderfully because it invokes not only the smug righteousness of those peddling NPM, but also the sense of catastrophe that Gunter sees facing public education in countries in thrall to GERM-produced knowledge. This can be seen later in her co-authored blog for BERA, 'Don't look up: Ignoring the looming crisis in public education' (Innes et al., 2022), which draws on the Netflix film of the same name. A deadly comet threatens to destroy life on Earth, but is ignored by politicians and the media. For Gunter, the destruction and privatisation of the education "system" in England is a catastrophe whose magnitude can be expressed most aptly through such metaphors. But Gunter employs more subtle metaphors, too, to elucidate how education leadership presently functions, and who gains and loses through that. In this, she has worked with other pioneering scholars who share her disposition. For instance, with Pat Thomson (Gunter and Thomson, 2009), she

developed the metaphor of the television makeover to show how the state intervenes into school leaders' identities and practice. She collaborated again with Thomson (Gunter and Thomson, 2010) to undertake a chronological comparative study of headteachers, using the television drama 'Life on Mars' as a metaphorical device to enable analytical time travel. In an editorial (Fitzgerald and Gunter, 2017), Gunter and Fitzgerald use the metaphor of 'uberisation' to explain how casualisation, risk-delegation and 'spiralling competition' (p. 258) now characterise education.

Gunter produces new knowledge through metaphor in order to connect and cohere diverse features of education (leadership) policy and practice, such that the field perceives them and their significance in a new way. Often, as in the previous examples, this is through an appeal to popular culture that enables wider recognition. Sometimes, the metaphor is located in specific literatures rather than popular culture and aims not to simplify, but to complicate social phenomena. An example of this is Gunter's (2018) 'luxury leadership' metaphor, developed with Courtney, McGinity and Hall, in which education leadership is positioned 'first, as an elite project designed to segregate the leader from the led; second, as an elite practice that requires recognition and consent from "others" as the led; third, as dynamic and contextually located, and so while the "on the pedestal" location of the elite leader remains intact, it is open to reimagining and rebranding' (Gunter et al., 2018, p. 114). This metaphor constitutes an elevation, rather than a simplification of the conceptualisation regarding the interplay between leaders' agency and their environment.

Now, we are perfectly content to be corrected, but we cannot identify any significant scholarship in the field of ELMA before Gunter where metaphor is used to such an extent or to such effect. This makes Gunter's approach and contributions in this area particularly disruptive to how the field previously expressed itself and understood its object of study. It is arguable, therefore, that Gunter has led a new turn in the field regarding the power and use of imagination and imaginaries, and which we suggest is indicative of a Gunterian approach. We are not claiming that she invented the practice; instead, and noting the longstanding use of metaphor in ELMA's cognate field, organisation studies, we go back to the two fields' common ancestor in the wider social sciences, where we find important, progenerative contributions by Black (1962), for example, and in contributions from Arendt (e.g., 2017). Gunter has always located her work firmly in the social and political sciences, motivated by an intellectual background that took in *en route* political science, history and educational leadership and policy.

What is clear is the relative abundance of metaphorical scholarship in ELMA since Gunter popularised it. Important examples include several published in a special issue of *Journal of Educational Administration and History*: Heffernan's (2019) 'punk rock

principal'; Netolicky et al.'s (2018) 'Buffy, Alice and Frankenstein's creature'; Grice's (2019) '007'; Netolicky's (2018) 'Cheshire Cat'; and MacDonald's (2019) 'Robinson Crusoe'. Eacott's (2017b) contribution regarding the 'cult of the guru' is also notable. Others have followed Gunter in developing metaphors from the field's intellectual resources; these include the 'parvenu' school leader, drawn from Arendt (Hughes et al., 2019; Hughes and Courtney, 2022). Importantly, the imaginative turn has created the possibility for field members to employ creative, even dramatic methods to present and analyse their data, which had not been attempted before. Key examples here include Mifsud's (2017, 2021) and Courtney and McGinity's (2021) representations of their data as scripted drama, where in the latter, messianic leadership is conveyed through representing the MAT CEO explicitly as Jesus, in a Brechtian-inspired piece of theatre. This imaginative turn goes beyond presentation; as with Gunter's use of metaphor, seemingly alternative methods in fact capture a deeper truth about the field and open new possibilities for knowledge production.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have attempted a brief intellectual genealogy which centres three major domains of Gunter's contributions to the field of ELMA. In doing so, we have argued throughout that her scholarship in these areas marks in some respects an important rupture with much of what had gone before, and yet in others, it signifies a continuation of vital critical traditions and approaches that we demonstrate she has handed on as intellectual resources for the field. The precise balance of these two, alongside the scope of her endeavours, reveals in part what is Gunterian about her approach; we insist that we could not make the same argument about any other critical scholar in educational leadership and management.

Specifically, through Gunter's research in and using theory and theorising, mapping and typologising and illuminating through metaphor, new traditions have been established in critical educational leadership studies as a discrete and significant field. Each of these has antecedents in the field that Gunter has drawn upon and developed. Concerning theory and theorising, Gunter has played the vital role of steward regarding field knowledge and usage of thinking tools and theories from the social sciences. Focusing upon her disposition to theorise rather than her use of specific theorists, we have located antecedents in, for example, Greenfield (e.g., Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993), who identified the intellectual poverty of the a-theoretical Theory Movement. Concerning typologising and mapping, Gunter with Ribbins undertook the first serious mapping of the ELMA field, which built on initial scholarly work in the area by Bell and Bolam (2001) and Ouston (2001). Finally, concerning the use of metaphor, Gunter is drawing an

estimable tradition that is particularly located in the social sciences (see e.g., Black, 1962). Concerning Gunter's use of metaphor, we show how she has employed it as an illuminating mechanism to reveal important insights into how we might understand and explain professional practices and identities (Gunter and Thomson, 2009, 2010; Gunter et al, 2018); her scholarship comments on the role of culture and society in how leading and leadership is debated, understood and framed at an individual and systemic level.

Her treatments, usages and deployments in turn have inspired the field to continue these traditions in novel, useful and insightful ways. Educational leadership has been effectively and helpfully theorised using Bourdieu by several scholars in Gunter's networks, including Thomson (2005, 2017); Courtney (2017); and McGinity (2017). Hughes et al. (2019) are amongst several to have followed Gunter in thinking about educational leadership with Arendt. Typologising educational leaders has been productively undertaken by Courtney (2015; 2017) in his characterisations of leaders in and of diversified, marketised and corporatised provision, by Hughes (2020) in her framework for understanding MAT CEO practices and roles; and by Courtney and McGinity (2020a) in their six-part conceptualisation of educational-leader identities. Finally, using metaphor has underpinned novel contributions by, *inter alia*, Heffernan (2019), who conceptualised educational leadership through the 'punk rock principal' metaphor.

The sum of our engagements with Gunter's approaches, intellectual antecedents and inheritors is an initial attempt to sketch what it means to be a Gunterian, or to adopt a Gunterian approach. As we have shown, many in the field currently do so, but have not named it so. Part of our contribution in this chapter is to give the field the language and tools to be able to correct this.

References

Arendt H. (2017). *The Origins of totalitarianism*. Penguin.

Baron, G., and Taylor, W. (Eds.), (1969). *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences*. The Athlone Press.

Bell, L. and Bolam, R. (2001) *'Mapping the Field'*, paper given at SCRELM EPPI-Centre Seminar on Mapping the Field of School Leadership, at Reading University, 13 Dec.

Bezes, P., Demazière, D., Le Bianic, T., Paradeise, C., Normand, R., Benamouzig, D. Pierru, F., Evetts, J., (2012). New public management and professionals in the public

sector. What new patterns beyond opposition? *Sociologie du Travail*, 54(1), pp. e1-e52, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soctra.2012.07.001.

Black, M. (1962). *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Cornell University Press.

Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. *Critical perspectives on educational leadership, 27*(56), 93–129.

Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership and educational change*. Open University Press.

Blackmore, J. (2000). Globalization: A useful concept for feministis rethinking theory and strategies in education? In Burbules, N. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and education: critical perspectives*, Routledge, pp.133–156.

Blackmore, J. (2004). Quality assurance rather than quality improvement in higher education? *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 25*(3), 383–394.

Blackmore, J. (2017). The implications of contractualism for the responsibilisation of higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 38*(1), 109–122.

Blackmore, J., Bateman, D., Loughlin, J., O'Mara, J. and Aranda, G. (2011). *Research into the connection between built learning spaces and student outcomes*, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, East Melbourne, Vic.

Bradbury, L. and Gunter, H.M. (2006). Dialogic identities: the experiences of women who are headteachers and mothers in English Primary Schools. *School Leadership and Management*. 26(5), 489–504.

Braun, A., Maguire, M., and Ball, S. (2010). Policy enactments in the UK secondary school: examining policy, practice and school positioning. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(4), 547–560.

Courtney, S.J. (2014). Inadvertently queer school leadership amongst lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) school leaders. *Organization, 21*(3), 383–399.

Courtney, S.J. (2015). *Investigating school leadership at a time of system diversity, competition and flux.* Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

Courtney, S.J. (2016). Post-panopticism and school inspection in England. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 37*(4), 623–642.

Courtney, S.J. (2017). The courtier's empire: A case study of providers and provision. In: H.M. Gunter, D. Hall, and M.W. Apple (Eds.), *Corporate elites and the reform of public education.*

Policy Press, pp. 177–189.

Courtney, S.J., and Gunter, H.M. (2015). *Get off my bus!* School leaders, vision work and the elimination of teachers, *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 18*(4), 395–417.

Courtney, S.J., and Gunter, H.M. (2017). Privatizing leadership in education in England: The multiple meanings of school principal agency. In: D. Waite and I. Bogotch (Eds.), *The Wiley International Handbook of Educational Leadership*. Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 295–310.

Courtney, S.J., Gunter, H.M., Niesche, R., and Trujillo, T. (2021). Introduction: Taking critical perspectives and using critical approaches in educational leadership. In: Courtney, S.J., Gunter, H.M., Niesche, R., and Trujillo, T. (Eds.), (2021). *Understanding educational leadership: Critical perspectives and approaches.* Bloomsbury, pp. 1–11.

Courtney, S.J., and McGinity, R. (2020a). Conceptualising constructions of educational-leader identity. In: A. Heffernan and R. Niesche (Eds.). *Researching identity and subjectivity in educational leadership*. Routledge, pp. 8–23.

Courtney, S.J., and McGinity, R., (2020b). System leadership as depoliticisation: Reconceptualising educational leadership in a new Multi-Academy Trust. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/1741143220962101

Courtney, S.J., and McGinity, R. (2021). Turning Water into Wine: Scripting Multi-Academisation through Messianic Educational Leadership. In: D. Mifsud (Ed.), (2021). *Narratives of Educational Leadership: Representing Research via Creative Analytic Practices*. Springer, ch. 3, pp. 35–71.

Courtney, S.J., McGinity, R., and Gunter, H.M. (Eds.), (2017). *Educational leadership: Theorising professional practice in neoliberal times*. Routledge.

Eacott, S. (2010). Bourdieu's strategies and the challenge for educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *13*(3), pp.265-281.

Eacott, S. (2017a). A social epistemology for educational administration and leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History 49*(3): 196–214.

Eacott, S. (2017b). School leadership and the cult of the guru: the neo-Taylorism of Hattie, *School Leadership & Management, 37*(4), 413–426.

English, F.W. (2012). Bourdieu's misrecognition: why educational leadership standards will not reform schools or leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *44*(2), pp.155-170.

Fitzgerald, T., and Gunter, H.M. (2008). Contesting the orthodoxy of teacher leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11*(4), 331–340.

Fitzgerald, T., and Gunter, H.M. (2017). Debating the agenda: the incremental uberisation of the field. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 49*(4), 257–263.

Glatter, R. (1972). *Management Development for the Education Profession*. University of London Institute of Education. George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd.

Glatter, R. (1980). Educational 'Policy' and 'Management': One field or two? In T. Bush, Glatter, R., Goodey, J. and Riches, C. (Eds.), *Approaches to school management*. Harper Education Series, pp. 26–37.

Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership: Beyond education management*. Routledge.

Greenfield, T.B. (1974). *Theory in the study of organizations and administrative structures: a new perspective*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the international Intervisitation Programme on educational administration (Bristol, England, July 1974).

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

Grice, C. (2019). 007 Spies, surveillance and pedagogical middle leadership: for the good of the empire of education, *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 51*(2), 165–181.

Gunter, H.M. (1995). Jurassic Management: Chaos Theory and Management Development in Educational Institutions, *Journal of Educational Administration*, *33*(4), 5–20.

Gunter, H. (1997). *Rethinking education: The consequences of Jurassic management*. Burns & Oates.

Gunter, H.M. (1999). *An Intellectual History of the Field of Education Management from 1960*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Keele University, UK.

Gunter, H.M. (2000). Thinking theory: The field of education management in England and Wales, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *21*(4), 622–635.

Gunter, H.M. (2001a). Knowledge production and the field of leadership studies from 1960, *Teachers and Teachers' Work*, 9(3), 1–8.

Gunter, H.M. (2001b). Critical approaches to leadership in education. *The Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*(2), 94–108.

Gunter, H.M. (2006). Knowledge Production in the Field of Educational Leadership: A Place for Intellectual Histories, J*ournal of Educational Administration and History, 38*(2), 201–215.

Gunter, H.M. (2012a). The Field of Educational Administration in England. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 60*(4): 337–356.

Gunter, H.M. (2012b). *Leadership and the Reform of Education*. Policy Press.

Gunter H.M. (2013a). Why we 'knead' theory. *Management in Education*, 27(1), 4–6.

Gunter, H.M. (2013b). Researching and conceptualising the field, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *45*(2), 201–212.

Gunter, H.M. (2015). *Educational Leadership and Hannah Arendt*. Routledge.

Gunter, H.M. (2016). *An intellectual history of school leadership practice and research.* Bloomsbury.

Gunter, H.M. (2018a). *The Politics of Public Education*. Policy Press.

Gunter, H.M. (2018b). Depoliticisation and education policy. In: J. Wilkinson, Niesche, R., and Eacott, S. (Eds.), *Challenges for Public Education*. Routledge, pp. 87–100.

Gunter, H.M. (2020). Forgetting our Intellectual Histories and the Implications for Education Professionals. In: Moos, L., Nihlfors, E., Paulsen, J.M. (eds.), *Re-centering the Critical Potential of Nordic School Leadership Research. Educational Governance Research*, vol 14. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-55027-1_2

Gunter, H.M., and Courtney, S.J. (2020). School segregation in England and the logic of exiting from the public education system. In: Hudson, B., Leask, M. and Younie, S. (Eds.). *Education System Design: Foundation, Policy Options and Consequences*. RoutledgeTaylorFrancis, pp. 108–113.

Gunter, H.M., and Courtney, S.J., (2021a). A new public educative leadership? *Management in Education*, *35*(4), 194–198.

Gunter, H.M., and Courtney, S.J. (2021b). Socio-economic class and educational leadership. In: Courtney, S.J., Gunter, H.M., Niesche, R., and Trujillo, T., (Eds.). *Understanding educational leadership: critical perspectives and approaches*. Bloomsbury, pp. 295–308.

Gunter, H.M., Courtney, S., Hall, D., and McGinity, R. (2018). School Principals in Neoliberal Times: A Case of Luxury Leadership? in K Saltman & A Means (eds), *The Wiley Handbook of Global Educational Reform.* John Wiley & Sons Ltd, pp. 113–130.

Gunter, H.M., and Fitzgerald, T. (2008). 'The future of leadership research?', *School Leadership and Management*, *28*(3), 261–279.

Gunter, H.M., Hall, D., and Bragg, J. (2013). Distributed Leadership: A study in knowledge production. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership, 41*(5), 555–580.

Gunter, H.M., and McGinity, R. (2014). 'The Politics of the Academies Programme: natality and plurality in education policymaking', *Research Papers in Education*, *29*(3), 300–314.

Gunter, H.M. and Mills, C. (2017). *Consultants and Consultancy: The case of education*. Springer.

Gunter, H.M., and Ribbins, P. (2003). 'The field of educational leadership: Studying maps and mapping studies', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *51*(3), 254–281.

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

Gunter H.M., and Thomson, P. (2010). Life on Mars: headteachers before the National College. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 42*(3), 203–222.

Heffernan, A. (2019). The 'punk rock principal': a metaphor for rethinking educational leadership, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *51*(2), 117–132.

Hughes, B. (2020). Investigating the realist networks of the Chief Executive Officer of a multi-academy trust. *Educational Review*, *74*(2), 243–262.

Hughes, B.C., and Courtney, S.J., (2022). An analysis of resistance in parvenu educational leaders' biographies: Thinking with Arendt about identities, academies and public schooling. In: Heffernan, A., Blackmore, J., and Thomson, P. (Eds.), *Resistance and Educational Leaders.* London: Routledge.

Hughes, B., Gunter, H.M., & Courtney, S. (2019). Researching professional biographies of educational professionals in new dark times. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *68*(3), 275–293.

Innes, M., Hughes, B., Courtney, S.J., Armstrong, P., Gardner-McTaggart, A., Rayner, S., and Gunter, H.M. (2022). *Don't look up: Ignoring the looming crisis in public education*. Available at: https://www.bera.ac.uk/blog/dont-look-up-ignoring-the-looming-crisis-in-public-education

Jones, S., Courtney, S.J., and Gunter, H.M. (2021). Leading in a genetics-informed education market. In: Courtney, S.J., Gunter, H.M., Niesche, R., and Trujillo, T., (Eds.). *Understanding educational leadership: critical perspectives and approaches*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 355–369.

MacDonald, K. (2019). Robinson Crusoe and the Island of Despair: heroic metaphors and contradiction in leading for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 51*(2), 133–148.

McGinity, R. (2017). Political and corporate elites and localised educational policy-making: the case of Kingswood Academy. In Gunter, H., Hall, D., Apple, M. (Eds.), *Corporate Elites and the Reform of Public Education.*

McGinity, R., Heffernan, A. and Courtney, S.J. (2022). Mapping trends in educational-leadership research: A longitudinal examination of knowledge production, approaches, and locations. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership, 50*(2), 217–232.

Mifsud, D. (2017). *Foucault and School Leadership Research: Bridging Theory and Method*. Bloomsbury.

Mifsud, D. (2021). (Mis)leading for Social (in)justice and (in)equity…(Un)Following a Script? In: D. Mifsud (Ed.), (2021). *Narratives of Educational Leadership: Representing Research via Creative Analytic Practices.* Springer, ch. 3, pp. 73–114.

Møller, J. (2017). Leading education beyond what works. *European Educational Research Journal*, 16(4), 375–385.

Netolicky, D. (2019). Redefining leadership in schools: the Cheshire Cat as unconventional metaphor. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 51*(2), 149–164.

Niesche, R. (2018). Critical perspectives in educational leadership: a new 'theory turn'? *Journal of Educational Administration and History 50*(3), 145–158.

Oplatka, I. (2009). The field of educational administration: A historical overview of scholarly attempts to recognize epistemological identities, meanings and boundaries from the 1960s onwards. *Journal of Educational Administration.*

Ouston, J. (2001) Paper given at SCRELM EPPI-Centre Seminar on Mapping the Field of School Leadership, at Reading University, 13 Dec.

Raffo, C., and Gunter, H.M. (2008). Leading schools to promote social inclusion: developing a conceptual framework for analysing research, policy and practice. *Journal of Education Policy, 23*(4), 397–414.

Ribbins, P., and Gunter, H.M. (2002). Mapping Leadership Studies in Education: Towards a Typology of Knowledge Domains. *Educational Management & Administration, 30*(4), 359–385.

Taylor, G. (Ed.), (1970). *The Teacher as Manager.* Councils and Education Press.

Thomson, P. (2005). Bringing Bourdieu to policy sociology: codification, misrecognition and exchange value in the UK context. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(6), 741–758.

Thomson, P. (2017). *Educational Leadership and Pierre Bourdieu.* Routledge.

Thomson, P., and Heffernan, A. (2021). Using theory in educational leadership, management and administration research. In: Courtney, S., Gunter, H.M., Niesche, R., and Trujillo, T. (Eds.), *Understanding Educational Leadership: Critical Perspectives and Approaches.* Bloomsbury, pp. 155–169.

Trujillo, T., (2014). The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management. *Educational Policy*, *28*(2), pp.207-232.

Wiza, M., and Hlanganipai, N. (2014). The impact of leadership styles on employee organisational commitment in higher learning institutions. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(4), 135–135.

Biographies

Steven J. Courtney is Professor of Sociology of Education Leadership at the Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, and co-convenor of its research and scholarship group, Critical Education Leadership and Policy. He is Co-Editor-in-Chief of the journal, *Critical Studies in Education*. Steven's research focuses on education leaders and leadership to interrogate and theorise notions of agency, identity, policy, structure and power. He has researched issues including education leadership in a multi-academy trust; privatisation in education globally; and the policy enactment of internationalisation by HE leaders. Steven's publications include 'Understanding Educational Leadership: Critical Perspectives and Approaches'. His articles and book chapters have focused on aspects of educational leadership including charisma, totalitarianism, performativity, corporatisation and, with Ruth McGinity, system and messianic leadership.

Ruth McGinity is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy at UCL Institute of Education. She is Associate Editor of the journal, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*. Her research uses critical approaches to make contributions to the fields of the sociology of educational leadership and policy studies and is organised around three principal themes. Ruth's research seeks first, to critically investigate new models and structures of schooling; second, to theorise professional identities and practice in interplay with new models and diverse structures; and third, to explore the politics of knowledge production within and for the field of educational leadership through theories of power. Ruth's publications include her 2022 co-edited collection, 'Inside the English Education Lab: Critical Qualitative and Ethnographic Perspectives on the Academies Experiment'.