

Maarten Simons

Governmentality, Education and Quality Management

Towards a Critique of the Permanent Quality Tribunal

Summary

We will focus on the recent concern – and even ‘obsession’ – with quality in education from the perspective of changes in how we are governed and governing ourselves. Therefore, we will explore advanced liberalism as a form of ‘governmentality’ and point out that (political) government has to submit itself to a ‘permanent economic tribunal’, i.e. judge everything constantly by the principles of entrepreneurship and competition. Furthermore, not only political government, but foremost self-government should be understood in relation to the tribunal: free people objectify within their skills and competencies, which are valuable in a (market) environment. Moreover we argue that management rationality and technology try to establish a double bond within the organization by regarding the worker as an enterprising self. Having pointed out the relationship between entrepreneurship and (self-)management, it is possible to describe how quality becomes a permanent obsession to those managing their life or an organization as an enterprise. After describing management and quality (and their relation) as a ‘function’ of entrepreneurship it is possible to understand how learning is part of it, and how quality management and schooling become entwined at all levels.

Zusammenfassung

„Gouvernementalität“, Bildung und Qualitätsmanagement – Versuch einer Kritik des Konzepts der ständigen Qualitätskontrolle. Im vorliegenden Text wird die neuerliche – fast obsessive – Beschäftigung mit ‚Qualität‘ im Bildungssystem in den Blick genommen, und zwar vor dem Hintergrund der sich verändernden Formen, in denen wir bestimmt (regiert) werden und uns selbst bestimmen. Dazu wird der fortgeschrittene Liberalismus als Form von ‚Gouvernementalität‘ (FOUCAULT) untersucht und herausgestellt, dass (politische) Kontrolle sich einem „ständigen wirtschaftlichen Tribunal“ unterziehen muss, d.h. alles kontinuierlich an Prinzipien von Unternehmertum (Entrepreneurship) und Wettbewerb auszurichten hat. Dieses wirtschaftliche Tribunal wird darüber hinaus nicht nur in Bezug auf das politische Regieren verstanden, sondern vor allem auf die individuelle Selbst-Regierung; denn freie Menschen zeigen in sich selbst Begabungen und Kompetenzen, die in einer marktwirtschaftlichen Umwelt wertvoll sind. Ferner wird argumentiert, dass Managementrationalität und -technologie versuchen, eine doppelte Bindung innerhalb der Organisation zu etablieren, indem sie den Arbeiter als ein unternehmerisches Selbst betrachten. Nach einer Darstellung der Beziehung zwischen Unternehmertum und (Selbst-)Management lässt sich im Weiteren beschreiben, wie Qualität zur Obsession für diejenigen wird, die ihr Leben oder eine Organisation als Unternehmen managen. Im Anschluss an die Erörterung von Management und Qualität (und deren Beziehung) als Funktion des Unternehmer-

tums lässt sich verstehen, welchen Part das Lernen in diesem Zusammenhang spielt und wie Qualitätsmanagement und Schulwesen auf allen Ebenen miteinander verflochten sind.

1 Introduction

In Belgium and the Netherlands as well as in other countries quality management in education is a hot topic. Quality is used as a point of reference for the development and the implementation of fairly new instruments, techniques and procedures in order to optimize education: the development of attainment targets, techniques for self-evaluation (for schools as well as teachers), rules redefining the function of inspection from the viewpoint of auditing, procedures for strategic management and quality control. Of course, this development did not happen without caution or criticism. Opponents have tried and still try to reveal that what has been happening during the last decades is a subtle colonization of education. As quality management is imported from industry, it is arguable that the process could be described as a dangerous penetration of the logic of the system in what was and should be an independent part of society. Without questioning the value and necessity of a critical analysis itself, we doubt whether this critical framework is useful in understanding the actual success of quality management in education.

However, we do not want to discuss the philosophical assumptions of this framework here, but only refer to a revealing footnote in an article on Quality Management Plus in education: "Some educators object to calling learners, parents, and community members 'clients' or 'customers'. Regardless of the terms one finds comfortable, educators do have clients and customers" (KAUFMAN 1995, p. 6). Indeed, we think the starting-point for a critical analysis must be that parents and learners *are* clients nowadays, and therefore *have a willingness* to strive for quality. Following READINGS in his interesting book on the 'University of Excellence', the problem is not that schools could become corporation-like and parents or students customer-like; in a certain sense they *are* corporations, and *are* customers (see READINGS 1996, p. 22). Exactly because quality (management) is desired by a lot of people involved in education, the critical framework of colonization or economical imperialism is not useful to gain an understanding of actual developments in education. Hence, the starting-point for our analysis is the understanding of the *form* of individuality and subjectivity, which is obsessed with this 'will to (strive for) quality'.

In order to frame this obsession with quality we will focus on changes in governmental relations and related discourses.¹ The notion of 'governmentality' – a neologism combining government and mentality – helps us to describe forms of government in a specific way. It enables us to analyze their rationality (how reality is objectified and problematized in order to govern), their technology (which techniques are used to govern according to this rationality), and the way in which people, through forms of government, are 'interpellated' to govern themselves (or establish a specific relation to the self) in order to be governable.² Within the scope of this article we have to limit ourselves to a few fragments of the actual discursive horizon and related technologies. These fragments, nevertheless, should enable us to understand how people are governed through their obsession with quality, i.e. how our concern about quality is part of a rather specific governmental

framework. In order to understand quality management in education at this level, in the first section we explore some important features of the framework: advanced liberalism, the permanent economic tribunal and the enterprising self. This helps us in a second section to focus on management within organizations, and to point out how management and quality (and their relation) are 'functions' of entrepreneurship, and especially of the enterprising self. The last sections discuss the importance of learning at the level of these governmental relations, and how quality management, entrepreneurship and schooling are entwined.

2 The enterprising self and advanced liberalism

In the second part of the twentieth century, government from a social perspective was being regarded increasingly as problematic.³ According to a neo-liberal mentality and referring to different forms of totalitarianism the social state is considered to destroy freedom and thereby also the social body. From a reactivation of a liberal attitude, government has been trying to redefine the domain of freedom – the economic – in a radical way. HAYEK for example defines "competition as the principle of social organisation", and argues: "One of the main arguments in favour of competition is that it dispenses of the need for 'conscious social control' and that it gives the individuals the chance to decide whether the prospects of a particular occupation are sufficient to compensate for the disadvantages and risks connected with it" (HAYEK 1944, p. 27). On this view, government is deleterious to the fundamental principle of competition. In order to create and maintain competition a specific kind of government and of governmental planning is necessary, with special attention to an adequate legal system, 'designed both to preserve competition and to make it operate as beneficially as possible' (loc. cit., p. 28). Every social government refusing to start from the principle of competition, and wanting to replace it, opens up 'the road to serfdom'.

However, a critical attitude towards governing from a social point of view is not only a feature of neo-liberalism. During the sixties and seventies of the 20th century various (progressive) cultural and political movements questioned the oppressive and paternalistic dimension of the social state, and the role of social expertise in various institutions (see ROSE 1996a, p. 51ff.; DEAN 1999, p. 153ff.). What is at stake here is a new idea of freedom (and emancipation), and a whole range of techniques to practice this freedom. Discourses on self-development, self-actualization and the ability to direct (as a person or collective) one's own life and future are functioning as a compelling horizon in diverse settings. Without ignoring differences, ideas about learning in freedom (ROGERS), effective programs on parenting (GORDON) and emancipatory education (FREIRE) introduce displacements with regard to the position of the learner and the teacher. In other words, as learning is thought of as a central dimension of human beings, the educational relation (as well as educational technologies) and the position of the teacher change. As with social expertise, the educational expertise of teachers (or parents) should focus on supporting and facilitating the process and project of self-development and self-actualization, rather than defining the needs and acting upon them.

Both political and cultural movements are mentioned here because they play – each in their own way – a major role in the 'assemblage' of a new form of governmentality at the

end of the twentieth century. Advanced liberalism is seeking to govern through freedom (and competition), and is trying to introduce the discourses and technologies concerning self-actualization in its project (see DEAN 1999, p. 155). Looking at the self from the perspective of actualization, development, a personal project and governing ourselves accordingly, is the main condition for governing in an advanced liberal way. In order to have a more clear understanding of this new relation between government and self-government, and the involved rationality, technology and subjectivity, some general characteristics of advanced liberalism will be explored. However, we have to be aware that the new configuration of governmentality is not implemented by clever politicians or invented by scientists at a certain moment in time, but is instead constructed in a complex of different discourses and practices operational in daily life.

In order to have a clear point of departure for further analysis, we will start with a rather general description of how people are interpellated, i.e. as an “*entrepreneur de lui-même*” (see GORDON 1991, p. 44; ROSE 1996b, pp. 150ff.; LEMKE 1997, p. 250). Behaving as an enterprising self implies that people are and will be the result of the (informed) choices they make and of the commodities they produce in order to meet their needs. These discourses on freedom as entrepreneurship (and human capital) are able to reintroduce the ideas of self-actualization and self-development as one of the many needs and aspirations of the enterprising self. In order to actualize and develop the self an entrepreneurial relation is indispensable. From this perspective, skills and knowledge have to be regarded as capital, in need of an investment, having a value to gain money, which in turn can function as an input for the production of a commodity or satisfaction.⁴ Life, here, is about making choices everyday and everywhere, turning oneself into a project, improving oneself, one’s relations and professional life and about choosing ‘lifestyles’ (see ROSE 1996b, p. 157). People are responsible for the ‘production’ of their own well-being and self-actualization and therefore, a specific kind of self-knowledge (‘experts of the self’, e.g. therapists, can sell their expertise) and self-mastery is required. In a rather general way we could characterize the freedom and autonomy of the enterprising self as a subjection to a ‘permanent economic tribunal’, i.e. the judgment and characterization of one’s life as a producer-consumer with needs and human capital in a (market) environment where everything has an (economic) value.⁵

Of course, the enterprising self is not an empirical subject. Rather, its characteristics refer to the type of self-government required in advanced liberalism. Hence, it is important to stress that entrepreneurship is not only the condition for individual freedom and self-actualization. The ‘autonomization’ and ‘responsabilization’ of the self is at the same time a guarantee for economic growth and social welfare (see ROSE 1996b, p. 157). In other words, entrepreneurship as a correlate of advanced liberal government, makes the ‘old’ distinction between ‘the economic’ and ‘the social’ obsolete: “The idea of one’s life as the enterprise of oneself implies that there is a sense in which one remains always continuously employed in (at least) that one enterprise, and that it is part of the continuous business of living to make adequate provision for the preservation, reproduction and reconstruction of one’s own human capital” (GORDON 1991, p. 44). Thus, government is not positioned against the social individual within a global society, but understands itself with reference to a multitude of enterprises (individuals, organizations, services etc.) positioned in a (market) environment. From this perspective, social relations are the result of an enterprising choice or investment. They last as long as gains are assured or, in other words, until the contract finishes. Furthermore, the social itself could be regarded as a

capital in need of permanent investment and important for individual and collective well-being.⁶

Government with this reality as its correlate is able to claim that the state is not only responsible for (social) security or healthcare (these services remain important, but only as 'products' produced by public enterprises), as these concerns are and should be to a large extent part of the enterprising life of citizens (see OSBORNE/GAEBLER 1993). Governing one's life as an enterprise means that investment in health and security is a major concern. Political government is obliged to create the conditions, which enable everyone to behave as an enterprise. It is obliged to problematize competition, mobility, access to information, efficiency of administration, autonomy and responsibility of institutions and services, employability, control by audit etc. Therefore, advanced liberal governmentality does not understand the state as a 'social state', but as an 'enabling state' (see ROSE 1999, p. 142). It does not relate to a politics of *laissez-faire*, but rather to the subjection of government and its services to a permanent economic tribunal, thereby creating and defending an environment in which people and organizations can behave as enterprises. Furthermore, it is not only about an active and ongoing creation of conditions and control of entrepreneurial behavior, but it also assures and controls the willingness of individuals to establish an entrepreneurial relation to the self, that they are willing to invest in their own life, willing to offer their own capital, willing to sell these competencies and knowledge at a large profit and willing to invest in learning, health and security.

The description of the enterprising self finally brings us to a specific double bond of individualization and totalization (see FOUCAULT 1982). What makes people with certain needs and positioned in an environment different is their 'capacity' to produce satisfaction and develop or actualize themselves. From the perspective of productivity, differences could be understood as the result of a choice to invest in the light of environmental information and changes. Hence, 'an enterprising relation to needs' could be regarded as an individualizing principle. What turns us into an individual, however, is at the same time rendering us governable and is, as such, functioning as the condition for totalization. Acting upon a variable in an environment (e.g. augmenting the cost for breaking a law) makes it possible for people to invest in a certain behavior (crime does not pay anymore). At the same time influencing the environment enables a government to turn investment or production into a valuable or even necessary activity (for example, schooling, training, publication etc.). In a more general sense, an entrepreneurial relation to one's needs is not in contradiction with the interest of society as a whole. On the contrary, entrepreneurship is exactly the condition for social relations, general welfare and economic growth. Advanced liberal governmentality at a political level is governing through an entrepreneurial relation to the self, and this relation is both its effect and instrument.

3 Towards a quality apparatus

In this section we focus on government in working organizations, in order to develop a more clear understanding of the enterprising self and of its relation to (quality) management. A population has to be rendered governable for a corporation in order to be productive. Economic factors, thereby, do not suffice to determine *how* people are objectified within a corporation, *how* they are transformed into a workforce and *how* they are ren-

dered governable (see FOUCAULT 1984, p. 597; TOWNLEY 1994, pp. 18f.). Our overview of recent discourses on management indicates how (personnel) management understands itself with regard to (organizational and individual) entrepreneurship.⁷

Management rationality increasingly starts objectifying the organization as a system, made up of different parts and positioned within an environment. The correlate of management is no longer described as a machine, but as an organism in an environment, whereby 'equilibrium', 'entropy and homeostasis', 'information process and feedback' etc. should be problematized. The objectification of an enterprise in and with regard to its environment is related to new domains of problematization. The 'business process re-engineering movement' (BPR) claims that a radical restructuring of processes is needed in order to face continuous change (see BRATTON 1999, p. 117). The point of reference, therefore, is the turbulent environment and more precisely the needs of the customer. Management installs a permanent economic tribunal and stresses entrepreneurship. The installation of entrepreneurship is linked with a change in how workers are interpellated in the enterprise. As HAMMER argues: "When customers are kings, mere hard work – work without understanding, flexibility, and enthusiasm – leads nowhere. Work must be smart [...] loyalty and hard work are by themselves quaint relics [...] organizations must now urge employees to put loyalty to the customer over loyalty to the company – because that is the only way the company will survive." (HAMMER in BRATTON/GOLD 1999, p. 18) Of course, smart work is no longer achieved by using a scientific method to reveal the 'single best way' to do the task and by bringing worker and management together in the name of truths about productivity. A permanent bond between the worker and the truth of the customer (of course, also often revealed by scientific methods) guarantees smart work, a bond which is also, as we will see later, linked up with quality. Problematizing the worker by referring to her relation with the customer's needs, is the condition for management to interpellate individual workers (or a team within the organization) as enterprises.

Furthermore, as DU GAY/SALAMAN (see 1992) have analyzed, it is possible to objectify the relations within the working organization as a market and to consider colleagues as internal customers. This implies a problematization of the relation between workers, and between worker and department using the model enterprise-customer. Similar to the previous conclusion concerning advanced liberalism, the relation between the social/personal and the organizational/economic as well as the traditional techniques of control and subjection become obsolete. However, that does not imply that management is becoming more 'human' or 'free'. We can illustrate this by using a formulation from management literature: "the focus on the outside, the external perspective, the attention to the customer, is one of the tightest properties of all. In the excellent companies, it is perhaps the most stringent means of self-discipline." (PETERS/WATERMAN 1982, p. 509) Regarding the worker as an enterprise and positioning her in an environment of customers, inevitably influences the establishment of an individual management 'function'. Referring to FOUCAULT, we could define actual 'managementality' as management of self-management, with the constitution of an economic tribunal as the permanent point of reference.

Finally, it is important to specify how the relation between entrepreneurship and management not only contributes to the success or excellence of the organization. At the same time it is a condition for self-development or self-actualization. Behaving as an entrepreneur in an organization does not simply imply a relation to clients outside oneself, but

also a relation towards one's own life. Understanding life as an enterprise renders self-management (but also investment and self-marketing) necessary and creates a will to produce and deliver commodities to one's self as a customer. Furthermore, as an entrepreneur of herself, a worker can look at work as a means of meeting her needs and actualizing herself – "fulfill ourselves not *in spite of* work but *by means of* work." (ROSE 1996b, p. 158) In other words, as long as the relation to the self is a relation to the self-as-customer, the worker herself is a customer of what is produced and, hence, a subject of satisfaction and self-actualization. What is useful for the organization, for example training and learning, is what is also useful for self-actualization. Or, as BRÖCKLING (2000, p. 131) subtly remarks in his critical analysis: "Persönliches Wachstum und Firmenerfolg bedingen einander; Arbeit an sich selbst und *training for the job* fallen zusammen." This relation between the enterprising self and management clarifies the actual interest in quality management, by relating the customer to the permanent economic tribunal, thereby installing a permanent obsession with quality.

In the beginning of the fifties of the 20th century, JURAN (see 1951, pp. 5f.) claimed that because of changes in the 'make-up' of our society a scientific approach to quality control would be necessary. He stated that mass production was an important reason why the old concept of craftsmanship, relying on a close relation between producer and consumer, was losing its importance. The relation between producer and consumer remains crucial, but new tools are necessary to guarantee the quality of a product. At the level of management rationality quality signifies "fitness for purpose", implying that the product has characteristics meeting the needs of the customer (JURAN 1989, p. 28). This means that knowledge about the needs of the customer, and derived knowledge about the quality of the product itself, enable management to optimize the production process. Or, as DEMING – the other pioneer and guru of quality management – writes: "The consumer is the most important part of the production line." (DEMING 1982, p. 174) This is closely related to management's understanding of the organization as positioned in a (market) environment, and subjecting oneself to a permanent economic tribunal. Of course, the tribunal has a specific meaning, as it is the customer, or rather her needs, which are offering the law by which one will be judged. It is important to note how exactly the scheme producer-quality-consumer is used to objectify and problematize the processes and subjects within the organization in order to render them manageable. *Total Quality Management* (TQM) offers an illustrative case.

Supported by principles such as 'quality first' and 'consumer orientation', employees in the next step of a process are considered as 'customers': The "next process is your customer" (ISHIKAWA 1985, p. 104). TQM not only problematizes the relation between enterprise and environment, but also the entrepreneurship of the employee, as she has to relate herself to colleagues as customers, thereby subjecting her production process to a permanent quality tribunal. The needs of the fellow workers as customers have to be met. The point is made strongly emphasized in the following statement on public sector TQM: "TQM does not, however, only give primacy to the *external customer* who buys the product and service. It also conceives there to be a whole range of *internal customers* within the organization, whatever its type. [...] The intent of TQM is that all internal customers are to be equally well satisfied with the service or product they are supplied with as are the external or end-user customers to be" (MORGAN/MURGATROYD 1994, p. 7). As we pointed out before, the employee as an entrepreneur not only relates to other workers as 'internal customers' but, as an entrepreneur of her own life, she also relates to

herself as a customer. An obsession with quality is, therefore, not only useful for the organization and its relation to the environment but also for the employee in her production of self-actualization.

Before demonstrating how the learning-process relates to the previous point in the next chapter, we would like to describe the overall interest in quality. Where an organization (or individual) is objectified (or subjected) and problematized as an enterprise operating in a changing environment and, thus, within a changed configuration of management, quality appears as a permanent concern. The general notion of 'quality management', in this sense, indicates a governmental strategy offering a historical and contingent answer to this problematization. FOUCAULT's notion of apparatus ('dispositif') is useful to point at the historical, contingent and intentional (without being subjective) character of the strategy (see FOUCAULT 1976, pp. 124f.). In accordance with the Foucauldian account of apparatus, the notion of quality apparatus refers to an 'assemblage' of heterogeneous components (instruments, techniques, procedures, knowledge etc.) which, to a certain extent, all have their own history and which are linked up together in a more or less stable whole. Starting from this characterization of an apparatus, some specific characteristics can be mentioned.

Understanding an organization and life itself in terms of entrepreneurship first of all implies that they are both about using goods as an input for the process of production and about trying to meet the needs (of oneself or others) with the output. Not only the efficiency and effectiveness of these input-output processes are important, but also the connection, i.e. the quality of input, process and finally output. As a consequence, when lacking quality – and, hence, customers – all care for productivity is pointless. Therefore, the '*will to (strive for) quality*' is inextricably bound up with entrepreneurship. It is a characteristic of the enterprising producer and customer. The enterprising self wants quality. As the subjectivity and 'will' is constructed within the quality apparatus, it is not its foundation, but – to use a Foucauldian expression – both its effect and instrument.

Secondly, the Foucauldian account helps us to understand why the question '*what is quality?*' is part of the apparatus. However, not the answer to this question constructs the apparatus, but the question itself has a strategic function within the apparatus. To ask what quality is about, means subjecting oneself to the tribunal and positioning oneself in relation to oneself and to others in a (market) environment. This question is the first thing coming into the mind of the enterprising self. Furthermore, since the '*will to strive for quality*' and '*the will to strive for knowledge concerning quality*' is part of entrepreneurship and is functioning as effect and instrument of actual governmentality, it is not exaggerated to understand 'quality' as a *strategic notion*. Dealing with needs in an entrepreneurial way and submitting oneself to the law of the quality tribunal is both an individualizing and totalizing strategy in actual forms of government and management.

To conclude, we will say something about the performance of the quality apparatus in the configuration of advanced liberal government. Political government understands itself in relation to enterprises (individuals and organizations) in a market environment. With regard to the public sector, the problem-space is opened up to install the quality apparatus. It is possible to question the goals of the public sector ('setting standards'), and to relate financing to how these goals are achieved ('value for money', 'efficiency') (see KIRKPATRICK/MARTINEZ-LUCIO 1995, p. 16ff.). By setting these standards and defining values, we could say that central government is understanding itself as managing the public sector as an enterprise. The concepts of decentralization, autonomization, respon-

sabilization and accountability could be understood in a specific way within the management of the public sector: it is about the autonomy and responsibility of the enterprise, i.e. subjecting oneself to the 'nomos' of the economic and quality tribunal, being responsive to the environment, or taking into account the customer's needs (in her direct environment, or as translated and expressed by central government). Here, the quality apparatus is able to do its strategic job. The implication for education is discussed in the next sections.

4 The strategy of the school apparatus and advanced liberalism

It is tempting to approach education in a principled way by trying to point out whether actual educational systems are successful in realizing some underlying principles (see HUNTER 1994). The liberal idea is one example inspiring an education principle, regarding education as a means for society to enable self-development and self-realization for all people. Marxian inspired theories, as another example, aim at revealing the reproduction mechanisms in the educational system. At the same time, however, they present an outline of education functioning as a blueprint to bring about an equal society. Following FOUCAULT and HUNTER as well as our foregoing analysis, we think these principled approaches are "simply too 'profound' for their object", as education is and could not be the realization of an underlying principle (HUNTER 1994, pp. 28f.). Hence, parallel to our previous approach on quality and management, we take the assemblage of the modern school as a starting point for further analysis. It implies the adoption of the notion of school apparatus ('dispositif') and approaching it at the level of a strategy (see PONGRATZ 1989, pp. 150ff.). In order to describe the relation between the strategy of the school apparatus and the strategy of the quality apparatus, we explore two main components in the assemblage of the modern school.

The first component, according to HUNTER, is what FOUCAULT has termed pastoral power. This power, rooted in Christianity, is individualising, as it constitutes a particular relation to the self as subjectivity, thereby using particular techniques and procedures such as the examination of conscience or confession. The subject as a form of subjectivity is a result of these practices, implying that we can consider a history of the self. Pastoral guidance and discipline inspire us to subject ourselves in order to be free, to understand what we are doing in terms of responsibility, identity or normality, and to look at ourselves as members of a community, as part of a divine order or as individuals within a society. These spiritual disciplines are operational in the setting which we refer to as the school. Besides, however, we also have to mention a second component in order to understand the assemblage of the school apparatus. The second component concerns the modern state or rather the "governmentalisation of the state" (FOUCAULT 1978, p. 656). A main feature of our modern state is a growing centralization and rationalization of governmental relations, oriented towards governing people. The modern state, therefore, understands itself not only as related to 'citizens' (and legal subjects), but also in relation to a population. In this respect, the disciplinarian-pedagogical milieu is considered to be of major importance to govern a population. Arguing that 'the school' is functioning as a technology within modern, political governmentality oriented towards the government of the population, does not mean that the school was initially invented to act upon people in

this way. What government does, is use the disciplinarian milieu, with its pastoral relations, in order to render the population governable. The modern disciplinarian milieu of the school constitutes subjectivity and influences forms of self-government in order to act upon them.

This sketch of the components of the school apparatus points not only out that the 'governmentalisation of the state' is at stake, but also the 'governmentalisation of education'. The governmentalisation of education is expressed in the major task and mission of the school to produce and deliver an individuality upon which government can act. The strategy of the school apparatus, oriented towards the provision of a certain individuality, can be described as a double bond of individualization and totalization. In as far as the apparatus intends to bring about a certain kind of individuality, this individuality is at the same time subsumed under a totality of individuals and, as such, also made governable. Notions such as 'Bildung' or 'liberal education' are, in this respect, not to be regarded as principles *underlying* the school, but as strategic notions, functioning *within* the apparatus, and articulating the ongoing process of reconciling the pastoral and governmental or moral perfection and civic comportment (see HUNTER 1994). In the same sense, the notion of 'learning to learn' can be considered nowadays of carrying the same strategic dimension. In the second part of the 20th century, as indicated in previous chapters, a transformation occurred in government, but also in the school apparatus. Before pointing out how the quality apparatus and management can become important strategic notions within the setting of the school, we argue how 'the learning process' is objectified and problematized in advanced liberal governmentality as an important characteristic of entrepreneurship.

In the end of the sixties of the 20th century DRUCKER (1968, p. 320) mentioned the development of a knowledge economy, i.e. an economy applying knowledge to work, giving knowledge a productive meaning and turning workers into 'knowledge workers'. In order to develop the knowledge economy and society, education has a particular task towards pupils: The "most important thing they will have to learn is not this or that subject matter. The most important thing they will have to learn is how to learn." The 'universal skill' of 'learning to learn' and of learning learning strategies and skills for problem solving, is objectified as a fundamental base for living and learning in a knowledge society. 'Learning to learn' enables people to deal – in an entrepreneurial sense – with learning needs in a changing environment. Living and learning, therefore, become related and lifelong learning becomes a necessity: "In a knowledge society, school and life can no longer be separated. They have to be linked in an organic process in which the one feeds back to the other. And this continuing education attempts to do" (loc. cit., p. 324). An economy and society based on knowledge and learning need an education which is not confined to traditional schools.

As DONZELOT and ROSE have stressed in their genealogy of lifelong learning, with the disappearance of the traditional distinction between schooling and (adult) life, the distinctions between 'the social' and 'the economic', and between 'the individual' and 'the economic' (correlates of governing from a social point of view) are above all losing their meaning (see DONZELOT 1991, p. 273; ROSE 1999, p. 160ff.). Lifelong learning must enable people to become individuals who can autonomously adapt to changes in society. Continuous retraining is, at the same time, understood as a necessary condition to link people with the changing needs of the production process. As the learning process is fundamental for both working and for living, it is possible to reintroduce the enterprising self. To live an entrepreneurial life is to be positioned in an environment with changing

needs, and to be responsible for the production and learning process in order to meet different needs and in order to achieve a better quality of life. Investment in learning not only contributes to self-actualization but, at the same time, delivers competencies enabling people to operate in labor organizations and in society as a whole. In this respect, RANSON (1992, p. 78) states that “the good (learning) person is a good citizen”. Seen from this angle, the idea of an ongoing learning process and the technology of lifelong learning correlate with governmental relations trying to act upon the enterprising self.⁸ Both the obsession with quality and learning are the result of being interpellated as an enterprising self in a changed governmental configuration.

The objectification of the learning process as a fundamental characteristic of the enterprising self in a changing environment enables us to understand why ‘learning to learn’ is important within the school apparatus. As learning is a main quality, students should ‘learn to learn’ or they should “learn learning skills and strategies” (MASSCHELEIN 2001, p. 12). The teacher, therefore, must objectify the learning process of the student, think of the class as a learning environment and manage it in such a way that it allows the student to manage the learning process by herself and to behave as an “active learner” (ENGLISH/HILL 1994, p. 89). In a certain sense, this implies that the teacher is still in a position of ‘moral superiority’. Of course, the superiority is not derived from the learning contents nor from the teacher’s privileged access to it. It is, instead, related to the teacher’s expertise concerning the learning processes and concerning the production of an effective and quality learning environment. Learning to learn also gets a ‘moral’ weight, since it implies the shaping of a particular relation to the self, which consists in understanding the learning process as a crucial dimension of life in order to meet needs, in choosing goals and adequate learning activities and strategies, in making use of tools, in controlling one’s own concentration and motivation and in assessing one’s own progress and results. In this sense, the enterprising school is a reconfiguration of governmental relations and technologies, enabling subjects to become enterprising selves and to manage their own life and learning processes. In other words, it delivers individuals who see themselves as positioned in an environment, who objectify life as a collection of different needs and who try to meet these needs in managing the production and the learning process. This general description of the relation between entrepreneurship, management, quality and learning in the previous sections gives us the opportunity to deal with quality management in education from the perspective of an interpellation.

5 The permanent quality tribunal and education

The idea that schools produce something, and that there are differences regarding productivity, is not only a point of departure for scientific discourse (school effectiveness research), but is also part of the governmental rationality and its idea of the public enterprise as producing services in order to meet the customer’s needs. The ‘enabling state’ understands itself in relation to schools as enterprises producing or offering human capital as their product. As government relates itself to enterprising schools in an environment, government is obliged to objectify the standards in a specific way – a problematization of what the enterprising self and the entrepreneurial and learning society needs. Or as MORGAN/MURGATROYED (1994, p. 79) define ‘service standards’: A “customer-driven

agreed level of performance appropriate to the population addressed, which is observable, achievable, measurable and desirable". Within this configuration, the technology of 'auditing' and 'self-evaluation' can be used as a governmental technology, interpellating a school as an enterprise and rendering visible the relation between input, process and output (see ROSE 1999, pp. 153-155). Advanced liberal governmentality, thus, seeks to create and protect the conditions for enterprising schools, and the corresponding relations between entrepreneurial students/parents and schools. We do not further elaborate these general strategies of advanced liberalism with regard to education, but deal with some recent discourses at the level of school.

Part of the discourses on the entrepreneurial school is a change in the relation to government (proving performance, efficiency, effectiveness and quality or conformance to standards) and society or people (as entrepreneurs themselves they need 'information' about the quality of a school in order to choose, they are asked to participate in order to manage schools, customers are 'empowered'). The enterprise of education, or rather the entrepreneurial school, is directed to its product, resources, choices and customers and is confronted with the permanent problem of quality. The enterprising school, moreover has a management function and has to take into account an 'ecological' dimension (see SNYDER/ANDERSON 1986). To think of a school is to think of it as positioned in an environment, i.e. look upon others as 'stakeholders', and – with help of various instruments and procedures – to take into account or be responsive to their needs.

The enterprising school is subjecting itself to the permanent economic tribunal, and opens up the space to think of (quality-)management. The subjection does not mean schools are now part of 'the market' and functioning as a business enterprise. The tribunal refers to a form of self-government and a specific rationality to think about itself, others and the world: the relation with the environment, processes, procedures and resources within the school, products of schooling, mission and evaluation etc. In this sense, for the enterprising school the space is opened up for management and quality. However, the subjection to the tribunal does not mean the discussion about how to manage and what quality is about is finished, rather it is the starting point for an explosion of discourses on (quality) management. A short overview of some fragments of these discourses shows how schools and teachers are interpellated to look at themselves and others.⁹

With regard to discourses on TQM in education the definition of quality is clear: "Quality is determined by the client." (BRADLEY 1993, p. 65) In order to function in a proper way schools should look at themselves as positioned in an environment, govern themselves by taking into account the needs of the customers and try to establish an organisation and culture that is able to deal with environmental changes and evaluate its performance. Thus, to take care of quality is not only about achieving standards, but an ongoing process of improvement as "the absence of dissatisfaction is not necessarily proof of positive customer satisfaction: it says nothing about the levels of quality and customer satisfaction which might be achieved" (MORGAN/MURGATROYED 1994, pp. 101f.). For schools to be obsessed with quality does not only imply a different relation to the outside world, but also towards what is going on in the school. They have to look at teachers and students as 'frontline workers' and leave behind "the philosophy and practice of Taylorism" (BONSTINGL 1992, pp. 67f.). Smart work is only possible by acting upon the needs of the customers, at all levels and by each one.

Therefore, a specific management of the local school is necessary and involves a particular objectification and problematization: "TQM requires a leadership which creates a

system or environment that makes every person a process manager, presiding over the transformation of inputs to outputs of greater achievement and value to the customer" (MORGAN/MURGATROYED 1994, p. 102). Management creates the conditions for teachers to govern themselves as enterprising selves. And being submitted to a permanent quality tribunal they recognize the value of continuous evaluation and ongoing learning in order to keep in touch with the environment and their own needs. Furthermore, teachers must 'recognise they have customers' at different levels: "Customers are internal as well as external (students and parents) stakeholders; each school employee is a customer of other employees, by receiving those services and support which, for instance, the second grade teacher gives to the third grade teacher" (HERMAN/HERMAN 1995, p. 15). Thus teachers have to install a quality tribunal, i.e. to look at what they are doing as a production process and to subject this process and its output to expectations of other teachers and students.

Quality management is not restricted to an organizational level, but foremost transforming what is happening in the class: If "you want to improve the product of education, namely learning, attention must also be given to the process whereby the product is made" (MORGAN/MURGATROYED 1994, p. 116). An entrepreneurial teacher is able to objectify these processes, to manage them and to produce an 'effective learning environment' in order for the learning process to be as effective and efficient as possible. But what is central here is the creation of conditions for students to behave as 'empowered customers'. Teachers can behave as entrepreneurs only in relation to students who are able to reflect about themselves as having needs and to articulate what is satisfying these needs and what is quality education for them. In the 'Total Quality Classroom' the teacher is positioned in front of a learner who is responsible for the learning process and for its direction (see BONSTINGL 1992, pp. 67f.). With regard to the specific autonomy of the entrepreneurial student the teacher should become an 'enabling teacher': "Rather than requiring individuals to adapt to means of instruction, it is said that, the desired objective is to adapt the conditions of instruction to individuals to maximize their potential for success." (DOCHY/MOERKERKE 1997, p. 424) The objectification of the classroom as an environment for the promotion of self-directed learning expresses very well what entrepreneurship in teaching is about, i.e. judging what one is doing as a teacher by the quality tribunal.

To conclude, positioning the school apparatus (and its components) in the advanced liberal form of governmentality, and linking it with the quality apparatus and the management of self-management, articulates the strategy of the actual school apparatus. As the learning process is a major characteristic of the entrepreneurial self, the total quality classroom of the enterprising teacher focused on 'learning to learn' shapes the relation to the self, others and the world of the entrepreneurial self and self-managing subject. Furthermore, the individualizing part of the strategy articulated in the school apparatus, is at the same time linked up with a totalization as it delivers the subjectivity upon which government or management can act. In other words, the school apparatus not only constitutes a self-managing subject and enterprising self, but at the same time a governable or manageable subject.

6 Conclusion: towards a critique of the permanent economic and quality tribunal

Regarding the common liberal or Marxian-inspired approaches to education, it is tempting to place oneself as a researcher in a position of 'hypercritical and prophetic intellectual fundamentalism'. However, people "can conduct themselves as principled persons", as HUNTER (1996, p. 146) argues further, "*because* no actual system has ever been governed by this principle". With regard to our analysis, it is tempting to criticize the permanent economic and quality tribunal in a principled way, arguing for the installation of a more valuable or human tribunal, which makes the complete development of the person possible. I think we should not do this because the tribunal is not a *principle* of our actual system of education, government and self-government. People are *interpellated* to submit themselves to the tribunal by governmental technologies and discourses, and to practice freedom by submitting themselves to its laws. Moreover, investigating what is going on in a principled way could be described itself as an interpellation, i.e. an interpellation of a 'universal critical intellectual' guiding people as a pastor and learning people to install a 'permanent critical tribunal' and submit themselves to what are and should become the moral laws of humanity. Therefore, we have tried to describe the components of the assemblage of actual governmentality, and this is at the same time part of the genealogy of the critical intellectual and the assemblage of his milieu, or rather 'school'. The latter is somehow implied in our analysis, however not discussed in detail. To conclude, we would like to mention a starting point for a discussion.

According to FOUCAULT (see 1982, p. 232), critique is about not being governed in a certain way, or to translate it to our analysis: not to be governed and governing oneself by submitting oneself to a permanent economic or quality tribunal. And as he argues elsewhere, it is about promoting new forms of subjectivity by refusing the type of individuality imposed on us for several centuries and abolishes the 'double bond' of individualization and totalization. He does not define what kind of subjectivity and individuality, and therefore does not describe a valuable or universal tribunal, which we should submit to. However, he does say what the tribunal should not be – if indeed it should be a tribunal at all: one which enables self-government and at the same time renders us governable, such as implied in entrepreneurship and management. But how should we think of an individualization without totalization or governing oneself without being at the same time part of a totality and rendered governable? Maybe it would be fruitful to look at those people and relations lacking entrepreneurial qualities, indifferent to this kind of interpellation and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the permanent economic and quality tribunal.

Notes

- 1 The possibility, desirability and limits of the introduction of market-mechanisms (competition, consumer, quality etc.) in education is hotly discussed (see JONATHAN 1990; WINCH 1996; MARGINSON 1997; FEND 2000; HOFFMANN/MAACK-RHEINLÄNDER 2001). Although we agree with a lot of the arguments, our analysis is limited to a description of fragments of discourses and technologies functioning as a sort of horizon and, as such, interpellating us. We introduce the concept of 'permanent economic tribunal' to have a rather specific understanding of the 'economization of education'.
- 2 For the notion 'governmentality' and this type of analysis we draw on the later FOUCAULT, as well as the further elaboration of this perspective and attitude in the so-called 'governmentality-studies' (see

- FOUCAULT 1978; ROSE 1999; DEAN 1999; BRÖCKLING/KRASMANN/LEMKE 2000). For the notion 'interpellation' we draw on the work of BRÖCKLING and his interpretation of ALTHUSSER and BUTLER. This interpretation helps us to understand the process of subjectification as a process of constituting subjectivity in an appeal and prescription (see BRÖCKLING 2001, p. 3).
- 3 For our analysis we draw on FOUCAULT's colleges at the Collège de France, more particularly on *Sécurité, Territoire et Population* (1977-1978) and *Naissance de biopolitique* (1978-1979), courses that are not (yet) published, but which are accessible in the *Centre Michel Foucault* at IMEC in Paris. In this chapter we limit ourselves to a general description. For a more extended and detailed analysis see FOUCAULT 1979, 1981; GORDON 1991; ROSE 1996a (for the notion 'advanced liberalism'), 1999; LEMKE 1997; DEAN 1999; BRÖCKLING/KRASMANN/LEMKE 2000.
 - 4 At this point the discourse on human capital is revealing. BECKER (see 1976, p. 14), for example, tries to analyse 'all human behaviour' (schooling, marriage and divorce, 'producing' children and investment in children, illegal behaviour, voting, migration and mobility, healthcare, genetic manipulation etc.) from the perspective of entrepreneurship and economic calculation, i.e. choosing scarce resources (time, goods, services) to produce a commodity in order to maximize the satisfaction of preferences or to produce satisfaction.
 - 5 The expression 'permanent economic tribunal' is used by FOUCAULT in his lecture on 1979, march 21st (see also GORDON 1991, pp. 41ff.; LEMKE/KRASMANN/BRÖCKLING 2000, p. 17; BRÖCKLING 2001, p. 4).
 - 6 Part of the reformulation of 'the social' along with the capitalization of life is the notion of 'social capital'. To have an idea of how the notion of 'social capital' is being used, a recent report of the OECD is very instructive. It examines the effects of both human and social capital on the well-being of nations, and defines social capital as "networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups." (OECD 2001, p. 41) From this perspective, social life, relations of trust and civic participation are regarded as a kind of capital in need of investment.
 - 7 It is not possible to offer a detailed genealogy of management (or maybe 'managementality') within the framework of this article (see BALL 1990; TOWNLEY 1994; MCKINLAY/STARKEY 1998). We limit ourselves to some recent discourses.
 - 8 Furthermore, also at the level of the 'enterprising enterprise' and the 'enterprising society', the learning process is fundamental. From our perspective of governmentality, the learning organisation and the learning society should be regarded as strategic notions, as they refer to governmental technologies which seek to govern through acting upon an entrepreneurial relation towards different needs in an environment. For a critical analysis see MASSCHELEIN 2001.
 - 9 It is not possible to deal in detail with the literature on quality management in education. We limit ourselves to the rather specific discourse on TQM and education. For a more general introduction, description of (research) topics and critical reviews see SCHEERENS 1996; HART 1997; SLEE/WEINER/TOMLINSON 1998; HELMKE/HORNSTEIN/TERHART 2000; TERHART 2000.

References

- BALL, S. (1990): Management as a moral technology. A Luddite analysis. In: BALL, S. (Ed.): Foucault and Education. Disciplines and Knowledge. – London, pp. 153-166.
- BECKER, G. S. (1976): The Economic Approach to Human Behavior. – Chicago.
- BONSTINGL, J. J. (1992): The Total Quality Classroom. In: Educational Leadership, Vol. 49, Nr. 6, pp. 66-70.
- BRADLEY, L. H. (1993): Total Quality Management for Schools. – Lancaster.
- BRATTON, J./GOLD, J. (1999): Human Resource Management. Theory and Practice. – 2nd ed. – Basingstoke.
- BRÖCKLING, U. (2000): Totale Mobilmachung. Menschenführung im Qualitäts- und Selbstmanagement. In: BRÖCKLING, U./KRASSMANN, S./LEMKE, T. (Hrsg.): Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen. – Frankfurt a. M, S. 131-167.
- BRÖCKLING, U. (2001): Gendering the Enterprising Self. Subjectification Programs and Gendering Differences in Guides to Success. Lecture at the international symposium 'Welcome to the Revolution', College of Design and Art, Zurich; November 9-11, 2001.
- BRÖCKLING, U./KRASSMANN, S./LEMKE, T. (Hrsg.) (2000): Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen. – Frankfurt a. M.

- DEAN, M. (1999): *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. – New Delhi.
- DEMING, W. E. (1982): *Out of the Crisis*. – Boston.
- DOCHY, F./MOERKERKE, G. (1997): Assessment as a major influence on learning and instruction. In: ANDERSON, L. W. (Ed.): *Educational testing and assessment: lessons from the past, directions for the future*. *International Journal of Educational Research*. Special Issue, Vol. 27, pp. 415-431.
- DONZELOT, J. (1991): *Pleasure in work*. In: BURCHELL, G./GORDON, C./MILLER, P. (Eds.): *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality*. – London, pp. 251-280.
- DRUCKER, P. (1968): *The Age of Discontinuity. Guidelines to our Changing Society*. – New York.
- DU GAY, P./SALAMAN, G. (1992): *The Cult(ure) of the Customer*. In: *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 29, Nr. 5, pp. 615-633.
- ENGLISH, F. W./HILL, J. C. (1994): *Total Quality Education. Transforming Schools into Learning Places*. – Thousand Oaks.
- FEND, H. (2000): *Qualität und Qualitätssicherung im Bildungswesen*. In: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 41. Beiheft, S. 55-72.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1976): *Histoire de la sexualité*. – Vol. 1: *La volonté de savoir*. – Paris.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1978/1994): *La "gouvernementalité"*. In: FOUCAULT, M.: *Dits et écrits*, éd. à D. DEFERT, F. EWALD et J. LAGRANGE. – Vol. III: 1976-1979. – Paris, pp. 635-657.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1979/1994): *Naissance de la biopolitique*. In: FOUCAULT, M.: *Dits et écrits*, éd. à D. DEFERT, F. EWALD et J. LAGRANGE. – Vol. III: 1976-1979. – Paris, pp. 818-825.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1981/1994): *"Omnes et singulatum": vers une critique de la raison politique*. In: FOUCAULT, M.: *Dits et écrits*, éd. à D. DEFERT, F. EWALD et J. LAGRANGE. – Vol. IV: 1980-1988. – Paris, pp. 134-161.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1982/1994): *Le sujet et le pouvoir*. In: FOUCAULT, M.: *Dits et écrits*, éd. à D. DEFERT, F. EWALD et J. LAGRANGE. – Vol. IV: 1980-1988. – Paris, pp. 222-243.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1984/1994): *Polemique, politique et problématisations*. In: FOUCAULT, M.: *Dits et écrits*, éd. à D. DEFERT, F. EWALD et J. LAGRANGE. – Vol. IV: 1980-1988. – Paris, pp. 591-598.
- GORDON, C. (1991): *Governmental rationality: an introduction*. In: BURCHELL, G./GORDON, C./MILLER, P. (Eds.): *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality*. – London, pp. 1-51.
- HART, W. A. (1999): *The Qualitymongers*. In: *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 31, pp. 295-308.
- HAYEK, F. A. von (1944): *The road to Serfdom*. – London.
- HELMKE, A./HORNSTEIN, W./TERHART, E. (Hrsg.) (2000): *Qualität und Qualitätssicherung im Bildungsbereich: Schule, Sozialpädagogik, Hochschule*. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 41. Beiheft. – Weinheim.
- HERMAN, J. L./HERMAN, J. J. (1995): *Total Quality Management (TQM) for Education*. In: *Educational Technology*, Vol. 35, Nr. 3, pp. 14-18.
- HOFFMAN, D./MAACK-RHEINLÄNDER, K. (Hrsg.) (2001): *Ökonomisierung der Bildung. Die Pädagogik unter den Zwängen des 'Marktes'*. – Weinheim.
- HUNTER, I. (1994): *Rethinking the School. Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism*. – St. Leonards.
- HUNTER, I. (1996): *Assembling the school*. In: BARRY, A./OSBORNE T./ROSE, N. (Eds.): *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. – London, pp. 143-166.
- ISHIKAWA, K. (1985): *What is Total Quality Control? The Japanese Way*. – Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- JONATHAN, R. (1990): *State Education Service or Prisoner's Dilemma: The 'Hidden Hand' as Source of Education Policy*. In: *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 38,2, pp. 116-132.
- JURAN, J. M. (1951): *Economics of Quality*. In: JURAN, J. M. (Ed.): *Quality-Control Handbook*. – New York, pp. 1-41.
- JURAN, J. M. (1992): *Kwaliteitsmanagement. Plannen – Besturen – Verbeteren*. – Deventer.
- KAUFMAN, R. (1995): *Quality Management Plus: Beyond Standard Approaches to Quality*. In: *Educational Technology*, Vol. 3, pp. 6-10.
- KIRKPATRICK, I./MARTINEZ-LUCIO, M. M. (1995): *The uses of 'quality' in the British government's reform of the public sector*. In: KIRKPATRICK, I./MARTINEZ-LUCIO, M. (Eds.): *The Politics of Quality in the Public Sector. The Management of Change*. – London, pp. 16-43.
- LEMKE, T. (1997): *Eine Kritik der politischen Vernunft – Foucault's Analyse der modernen Gouvernementalität*. – Berlin.
- LEMKE, T./KRASSMANN, S./BRÖCKLING, U. (2000): *Gouvernementalität, Neoliberalismus und Selbsttechnologien. Eine Einleitung*. In: BRÖCKLING, U./KRASSMANN, S./LEMKE, T. (Eds.): *Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen*. – Frankfurt a. M., S. 7-40.

- MARGINSON, S. (1997): *Markets in Education*. – St. Leonards.
- MASSCHELEIN, J. (2001): *The Discourse of the Learning Society and the Loss of Childhood*. In: *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 35,1, pp. 1-20.
- MCKINLAY, A./STARKEY, K. (Eds.) (1998): *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory*. – London.
- MORGAN, C./MURGATROYD, S. (1994): *Total Quality Management in the Public Sector. An international perspective*. – Buckingham.
- OECD (2001): *The Well-being of Nations. The Role of Human and Social Capital*. – Paris.
- OSBORNE, D./GAEBLER, T. (1992): *Reinventing Government: how the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. – New York.
- PETERS, T./WATERMAN, R. (1982/1996): *In Search of Excellence: Simultaneous Loose-tight Properties*. In: SHAFRITZ, J. M./OTT, J. S. (Eds.): *Classics of Organization Theory*. – 4th ed. – Fort Worth, pp. 508-512.
- PONGRATZ, L. A. (1989): *Pädagogik im Prozess der Moderne. Studien zur Sozial- und Theoriegeschichte der Schule*. – Weinheim.
- RANSON, S. (1992): *Towards the Learning Society*. In: *Educational Management and Administration*, Vol. 20,2, pp. 68-79.
- READINGS, B. (1996): *The University in Ruins*. – Cambridge.
- ROSE, N. (1996a): *Governing 'advanced' liberal Democracies*. In: BARRY, A./OSBORNE, T./ROSE, N. (Eds.): *Foucault and the Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*. – London, pp. 37-64.
- ROSE, N. (1996b): *Inventing our selves. Psychology, power, and personhood*. – Cambridge.
- ROSE, N. (1999): *The Powers of Freedom. Reframing Political Thought*. – Cambridge.
- SCHEERENS, J. (1996): *Kwaliteitszorg in het onderwijs*. In: *Onderwijskundig Lexicon, Deel Centrale Onderwijsthema's*. – Alphen a. d. Rijn.
- SLEE, R./WEINER, G./TOMLINSON, S. (Eds.) (1998): *School Effectiveness for Whom? Challenges to the School Effectiveness and School Improvement Movements*. – London.
- SNYDER, K. J./ANDERSON, R. H. (1986): *Managing Productive Schools. Toward an Ecology*. – Orlando.
- TERHART, E. (2000): *Qualität und Qualitätssicherung im Schulsystem. Hintergründe – Konzepte – Probleme*. In: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, 46. Jg., Nr. 6, S. 809-829.
- TOWNLEY, B. (1994): *Reframing Human Resource Management. Power, Ethics and the Subject at Work*. – London.
- WINCH, C. (1996): *Quality and Education*. In: *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 30,1, pp. 1-152.

Anschrift des Autors: Maarten Simons, Afd. Fund. & Comp. Pedagogiek, KU Leuven, Dekenstraat 2, B-3000 Leuven, e-mail: Maarten.Simons@ped.kuleuven.ac.be