
Education Management in India- the Need for Caution

Sthabir Khora

Associate Professor

School of Education

Tata Institute of Social Sciences

Deonar

(Abstract- It is the contention of this paper that one has to take a cautious approach in case of India towards ‘education management’ coming from the west for the following reasons- (a) management has always been subject to critique which is worth recalling (b) education management has arisen in the context of the New Public Management ideology which pushes a universal presentist Anglo-Saxon management as a panacea (c) management theories are imported from non-education context to education without considering the compatibility (d) education management practice of one socio political context is proposed for another context without recognizing the specificity of the context. It is proposed that education management should take into account the specificity and diversity of the Indian context)

Introduction

‘Management’ is increasingly visible in the sphere of education in India (Mukhopadhyay 2001, 2005; Sapre 2002). It is not the case that teachers in India do not need to manage. They were managing before and they will continue to do so. But the meaning of ‘management’ and ‘education management’ has changed because of the rise of the ideology of ‘neo liberalism’ (see Harvey 2005) which has given rise to the New Public Management (NPM) as the paradigm to govern the Public Service Organisations (PSO) like education and health. ‘Governance’ itself has become a discourse imbued with the NPM ideology (see Chakrabarty and Bhattacharya (Ed.) 2008). The concern with ‘management’ in school education is not innocent endogenous development of felt needs but has come to education through the NPM (Hoyle and Wallace 2009; Gunter 2000). It is the contention of this paper that one has to take a cautious approach, in case of India, towards the universal presentist version of ‘education management’ coming from the west for the following reasons as discussed: (a) management has always been subject to critique; (b) education management has arisen in the context of the NPM ideology which pushes a universal presentist Anglo-Saxon management as a cure all; (c) management theories are imported from non-education context to

education without considering the compatibility– the example of Total Quality Management (TQM) framework in education; (d) education management practice of one socio political context is proposed for another context without recognizing the specificity of the context- the example of the SBM (School Based Management). In the end, a cautious management approach is speculated in case of India.

(a) A Critique of Management- the MBA (Master of Business Administration), the 'bestsellers' and the CMP (Critical Management Perspective)

The field of education management has been heavily influenced by business management.

The fact that educational leadership has been thoroughly infused with business management concepts has not been recognized in many circles. The intellectual founders of *business, industrial, public* and *educational* management were often the same authors. Highly influential thinkers such as Frederick Taylor, Henry Fayol, Henry Grant, Mary Parker Follett, Ralph Davis, Elton Mayo, Chester Bernard, Douglas McGregor, Herbert Simon, and W. Edwards Deming were not professors of education, nor even educators concerned with problems of school life. Yet their thinking, ideas, assumptions, and mental models have exercised a pervasive and continuing influence in *educational, business, industrial, and public* spheres of management (English 2005 : x; italics mine).

While theoretically management should trace its origin to economics, practically it has originated from engineering/manufacturing and instrumental/practical concern. Management now is no more limited to only manufacturing and has entered virtually all domains of practice. It is important to remember in this context that management has always been accompanied by its critiques. Marx's concept of 'alienation' and Weber's 'disenchantment' can be seen as one of the earliest critique of modern management. Neo Marxists have criticized management as alienating and 'deskilling' (Reed 1989). Management has also been critiqued by the academic scholars of management (Garratt 1972).

There are two conceptions of management- the academic conception manifest in the Master of Business Administration (MBA) and the popular conception manifest in the 'bestseller' management books and gurus. The academic conception of management is predominantly conceptualized in the popular MBA program which arose in America and then spread to the rest of the world (Üsdiken 2004). The American version has colonized management education to a great extent. But, in spite of decades of American export of 'management', it is only in the UK that it finds its most fertile ground (Tiratsoo 2004) and not so much in the continental Europe (Ramirez 2004).

This is perhaps because of the difference between Coordinated Market Economies (CMEs- northern Europe and Japan) from uncoordinated market economies or Liberal Market Economies (LMEs) that would be more descriptive of the United Kingdom and Ireland in Europe (Hall and Soskice cited in Ramirez 2004). There is a debate now on whether there can be a single effective management style- because globalization is supposed to efface national cultures- or management is still 'path dependent' (Ramirez 2004; Ferlie et al 2008). Though periodically its death is announced, the MBA survives. 'For the time being, despite periodic, including contemporary, claims of its approaching demise, the MBA and management continue to retain their prestige (Sturdy et al 2006 : 856). MBA is flourishing rather than dying. Why this is so?

Management education is also education. It can be seen as a social ritual (Meyer and Rowan 1977), credentialising (Collins, 1979) and cultural capital (Bourdieu 1997). Meyer and Rowan (1977) point out that the formal aspects of a formal organization are rituals. Society grants large resources to education because education has social currency. Education will look like a costly waste from a cost-benefit analysis. But society does not stop granting it resources on this consideration. Though management schools are supposed to produce better graduates every year, the job placement depends on the prevailing business environment. But the lack of association of jobs with the MBA does not delegitimise the MBA because it's a social ritual and credentialising to some extent. That's why they teach in management the likes of Plato and Gandhi which does not appear to have much relation with business management. 'That leading managers might have some management insights to learn from the Chinese General of 500 BC , Sun Tzu, or from the Renaissance civil servant, Machiavelli, could be surprising to some in the public sector' (McAlpine cited in Chater 2005:14). The MBA continues to hold sway in the face of the evidence of people establishing and managing big business without any formal management qualification. The rapid growth of the MBA in India is partly because of the 'credentialising' nature of the MBA.

'It is associated with status and power with some achieving or sustaining the symbolic capital of an elite group in distinction with other identities (Bourdieu 1986). The MBA therefore provides the appropriate (e.g. strategic) language as well as the existential condition (self confidence) for material and social privilege (senior management) (Sturdy et al 2006: 846).

Attempt to salvage management from the MBA includes distinguishing management from the MBA. Mintzberg's (2004) book is titled 'Managers not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development'. But Buffington (2009) says that the 'management' after 1990 is not management but financial engineering in casino capitalism. He yearns for the classical management and the covenant between the manager and workers exemplified by Henry Ford. Paton et al

(2007:148) say with regard to the non-profit sector that ‘the future of Non-profit Management Education (NME) is past’. They propose a type of ‘post rational’ management, the sort Buffington will call management of the disorganization man in an environment of chaos. This chaos is not really a chaos of post modern variety giving voice to the marginalized but a ‘managed chaos’ which suits the consumerist ethos of late capitalism (Hartley 1998).

The popular conception of management looks at the MBA with scepticism. Management as one of the paradigm is beset with the tensions between the academic conception and the practical conception from the start itself. ‘There are always counter-discourses which stigmatize it as ‘bullshit’ or as no replacement for confidence founded on ‘down to earth’ or ‘seat of the pants’ management’ (Blanchard and Johnson cited in Sturdy et al 2006: 853). The practical world view of management represented by the ‘bestsellers’ and the ‘Gurus’ portrays a simplistic view of management.

The events of the story always take place in office settings (never on the shop-floor) and whilst the characters include managers, a secretary and an official, we never get the merest hint of the existence of a blue-collar labour force (Thomas 1989: 24).

Critical Management Perspective (CMP) has arisen in this context within management discourses to put management in a proper social and moral perspective. CMP sees management as a social practice influenced by the social structure.

Critical management studies has since developed into a well established interdisciplinary approach in management studies underpinned by a number of sociological assumptions, in particular the proposition that the concept of management is intimately entwined with social and political power and should therefore be critically analyzed. It draws on a plurality of intellectual traditions from the social sciences, including the Frankfurt School, labour process theory, cultural studies, social linguistics, literary criticism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism, environmentalism, feminist theory, and psychoanalysis (Fernanda 2009 :7-8).

While the Neo-Marxist critique can be seen as the critique from without, the CMP can be seen as a critique from within questioning one of its central premise- accept the society rather than critique it.

Remember that the professor, the teacher, is paid to be suspicious, sceptical, and argumentative. That’s our job ... And so when a businessman meets a professor, you can see the shutters go down over their eyes and their jaws tighten as each faces his mortal antagonist; the man whose life depends on accepting assumptions up against the man whose life depends on questioning them (Gurney cited in Thomas 1989:24).

It's not the business of management to look critically at society. That's why Charles Perrow, a leading organization theorist, called critical management an oxymoron (cited in Zald 2002). Instead of being overwhelmed by management, CMP challenges some of the orthodoxies of 'current' management in academics as well as the 'bestsellers' and gurus by bringing out some critical issues like 'the cult of the customer' (Gay and Salaman 1992), 'the accountability fetish' (Power 1994; Broadbent and Laughlin 2002), 'management fashion' (Abrahamson 1996), 'power' (Jackal 1988), gender (Kanter 1977) (see also Warwick Organizational Behavior Staff 2001).

Critical management perspective not only sees management from within, it also sees the wider implication of 'management'. It points out that management has risen above particular conceptions and has become an overarching religion (Chater 2005), ideology (Deem and Kevin 2005), a Baudrillardian 'hyper reality' in this age of late capitalism. It is Management with a capital M ruling our life, influencing our selves. It is a religion and ideology 'of, b(u)y and for the market'. The 'enterprising self' possessed by management is ever in search of 'efficiency', 'excellence' and so on (Simons 2002). Hammered constantly by the late capitalism the self has lost its ability to discern. Management has transcended from one of the world views to a totalizing world view, a 'self-paradigm', a 'life-paradigm' (Chater 2005). Management religion has its gurus, sects, sect conflicts. Ruthven Malice (1989) in her book '*The Divine Supermarket: Shopping For God in America*' analyzed religious cults using a market framework about how cults like Bhagwan Rajnish and Mahesh Yogi rise and fall depending on the degree of people's acceptance of their religious products and services. As if an inverted image to this, management shows the sign of a religion with its market worship.

(b) Education management has arisen in the context of the NPM ideology which pushes a universal presentist anglo-saxon version of management as a panacea

Usually administration is used for state organizations and management is used for business. Therefore traditionally 'management' has meant 'business management' (Sapre 2002). Government schools were bureaucratic, public service organization and still are to a great extent. Therefore school organization and management had to draw from public administration rather than 'management'. Underlying this was an acceptance that the nature of Public Service Organizations (PSO) like education is different from private for-profit service organizations.

The NPM has been trying since 1980 to replace the paradigm of Public Administration which was the basis of managing and administering the state organizations. The traditional paradigm of public administration maintained that the nature of public service organizations is distinct from other state organizations and private organizations. It is important to recapitulate these

distinctions as NPM would like to blur the distinctions. It is also important to underscore the distinctiveness of education organizations compared to other state organizations and private organizations. Organizations of the state in the past could be divided into three categories:

- *Those related to the survival of the state*-the army, police and the revenue department. There would not be its equivalent in the private sector. These are the 'eminent' organizations (in the manner of 'eminent domain') which can override any other organization including some of the state's own organizations.
- Those related to the public services like education, health and a host of welfare services. These are basic to life. These can be called *public service organizations* (PSO).
- Those which are established to make profit- the *public enterprises*. These cannot claim to be very different from the private for-profit organizations. Neo liberalism does not consider this as an appropriate domain of the state. These can be called the *public enterprises*.

Thus, Public Service Organizations (PSO) are a class of their own even within the state organizations. It is important to remember that school education shares some of the features with other PSOs like health, but may also differ in some other important respects as well.

The management approach that is followed in private enterprises is not suitable for public service organizations for the following reasons. Some of the PSOs' *goal* is diffuse and not clear. For example, the PSOs associated with education, health, social welfare. The aim of education department ranges from increasing achievement to building a new nation. Some of the state organizations' goal may be relatively clearer like the army, and the tax department. Compared to this, the goal of a diversity of private enterprises is more clear- the bottom line. They can have a host of other goals like market share or even social responsibility but the top priority remains the bottom line.

The society pays for the service on behalf of the clients in the case of the PSOs. That's why one cannot give discount or special favour to a loyal customer in PSOs. While special favour to somebody is accepted in for-profit organizations, it is morally reprehensible in PSOs. 'Private enterprises have great freedom to be *arbitrary*. They can charge different customers different prices, they can refuse to deal with them, they can ignore normal procedures' (Hughes 1994:274). This is also applicable to some extent to a private non-profit service organization. A school cannot discriminate between a student who is regular and who is not.

While the same individual may come again and again for the same ailments to a PSO like health, the same student does not come again for the same education to a school. There is no repeat customer in a school system (Cornesky et al cited in Kwan 1996).

One cannot run the way one likes in PSOs as one cannot use just any means to achieve the end. Teachers cannot use physical punishment to force pupil learn. Somebody can be given a free hand in a for-profit organization. But there are rules and regulations that can limit the freedom of operation in a PSO. On balance, it will appear that there will be much more congruence between the action and the formal framework governing the action in the public sector than a private sector.

The direct customers are adults in most of the PSOs and private organizations. In contrast to this the direct customers in schools are not adults and may not be demanding because they are children. Individuals either alone or in group do not own PSOs. It is owned by the society at large. So, individuals, either alone or in group, can't close the PSOs. The business of public service is traditionally protected against failure. A for-profit organization usually expands when it succeeds. But this cannot happen to a public service organization as the scope and extent of demand for public service is nearly unlimited. Finally the PSOs were traditionally considered the arms of the state creating a monopoly situation. The state is an 'eminent organization', primus inter pares among organizations. From this point of view there could not have been a comparison between a PSO and a private enterprise. Can somebody choose a different state? Table 1 summarizes the difference between school organization and other service organizations.

The preceding discussion and Table 1 point out the reasons why the management approach followed in the private for-profit or even non-profit organizations is not fully relevant to the PSOs. Profit and market are key guides in the management approach followed in the private for profit organizations. But the public administration paradigm maintains that they are poor guides in the operation of the PSOs.

Public administration slowly lost ground since the ascendancy of NPM as a corollary to neo liberalism. Neo liberalism was given the political legitimacy since the 1980 after coming to power of Thatcher in UK in 1979 and Reagan in USA in 1980 (Harvey 2005). It got ascendancy after 1990 due to the collapse of the USSR. Under the influence of neo-liberalism, New Public Management (NPM) was promoted as a superior paradigm than public administration to govern the public enterprises and public service organizations. An attempt was made to make the state itself as lean and thin by a focus on 'governance' (see Chakrabarty and Bhattacharya (Ed.) 2008). The key feature of NPM is its espousal of application of management practices of business sector to the sphere of government.

NPM thus borrows “how” from business management and blends it in the “what” of public administration. What this implies is that New Public Management is dressed up in the language of management referring as it does to the methods and techniques imported from the commercial sector’ (Maheswari 2002 : 327).

In the fashion of business sector, it proposes a ‘customer driven government’, ‘enterprising government’ (earning rather than spending) and ‘market oriented government’ (leveraging change through market) (Osborne and Gaebler cited in Maheswari, 2002: 328). After dismissing the *public enterprises* as lacking any *raison d’être* NPM attacked the PSOs questioning their distinctiveness:

‘we have been told that the NHS is different from business in management terms, not least because the NHS is not concerned with the profit motive and must be judged by wider social standards which cannot be measured. These differences can be overstated. The clear similarities between NHS management and business management are much more important. In many organizations in the private sector, profit does not impinge on large numbers of people below board level. They are concerned with levels of service, quality of product, meeting budgets, cost improvement, productivity, motivating and rewarding staff, research and development, and the long-term viability of the undertaking. All these things parliament is urging on the NHS.’ (Sir Roy Griffiths cited in Lawton and Rose, 1991:142)

This may seem to be a convincing argument against a *public enterprise* but not a PSO. Even in a *public enterprise* monetary profit may not be a governing factor at all levels as in a private enterprise. But NPM moved ahead because of the political support. Each of the traditional criteria of the PSOs was questioned.

While earlier the goal of a PSO was diffuse, now the goal was artificially made specific in the form of standards, benchmarks and targets. In the new era of ‘audit culture’, quality was attempted to be benchmarked and standardized (Power 1994; Broadbent and Laughlin 2002). The implication for education is that while the relation of teacher-student has been diffuse so far, the NPM would like to make it specific- just related to the curriculum delivery. The society still pays for the service, but it increasingly expects the immediate client also to pay. Earlier it was morally reprehensible to discriminate. Now a difference is made between those who can pay *user fee* and those who cannot. Earlier, the public customers were not so demanding. Now in an environment of the ‘cult of customer’ (Gay and Salaman 1992) the direct and indirect customers in the PSOs are becoming more demanding. The state takes the lead by behaving like a customer. The immunity against failure for the PSOs is not assured in the new era. The PSOs that fail the tests of economy, efficiency

and effectiveness face the danger of privatization. Increasingly the state is withdrawing from maintaining the PSOs as its arms. The PSOs are moving from a monopoly situation to a quasi-market situation. In the new era of quasi-market, the state has to maintain arms-length distance from its own PSOs. It creates regulators who in turn regulate the PSOs who are legally at par with the private organizations. The state has now two faces- the regulator and the customer.

'Management' was ushered in education in this context as *deu ex machina* (see Figure 1). Education management as a distinct academic field has started post 1980 but grown rapidly after 1990 in the UK (Bush 2003). Its precursors were 'school improvement', 'school effectiveness' and its contemporary are 'professionalism', 'leadership'.

(c) Management theories are imported from non-education context to education without considering the compatibility- the example of Total Quality Management (TQM) framework in education

It was seen in section (a) that education management has been heavily influenced by business management ideas. Section (b) underscored that the NPM paradigm tries to apply business management techniques to the sphere of public services. The TQM is an important example of the application of the ideas from business management to education. However, it has not succeeded so far in establishing its credential in its applicability to education.

W. Deming, who is considered the father of TQM, used to write on the blackboard before the top management of Japanese companies –

'improve quality → costs decreases because less *rework*, fewer mistakes, etc
→ Productivity improves → capture the *market* w/better quality & price → stay in *business*
→ provide jobs and more jobs' (Buffington 2009 : 39; italics mine).

This was a different paradigm in America at that time because increasing quality was seen as increasing cost. But nobody visualized the loss of market share in the long term which eventually happened. Japan made a strong foothold in America in auto industry by adopting TQM. Therefore, this can be considered as a better paradigm in manufacturing. But one can focus on the italics and visualize how difficult it will be to import this into education. Sometimes TQM is defended as a philosophy rather than a set of techniques (West-Burnham 1997). 'Deming had almost completely stopped using TQM or TQ because he believed it had become a superficial label for tools and techniques' (Senge 2006: xii). Nobody can argue against total quality as a philosophy. But as a

management tool it cannot avoid being translated into some formula like statistical control of measuring the number of defective outputs. This works well in manufacturing but becomes problematic for education. As discussed earlier, education as a *public service* is different from private for-profit and non-profit services.

Mukhopadhyay (2005) has applied the TQM principles to education in India. But it includes in the ambit of education all types/levels of education – liberal, professional, higher, and school education. While a greater customer focus may be applicable to professional and higher education, its application to school education is questionable. It is not easy to determine who the *customers* of school education are and what they *want*. Society is construed as the ultimate customer of school education though it is questionable whether one can know about ‘customer satisfaction’ from a collective phenomenon like society. There can be disagreement within even the proximate customers (parents) on what they want from the school education. What the mother of a child wants from the school may be different from what the father of a child wants. There are multiple stakeholders rather than customers who influence school education. Professional-client relationship or relationship of state-citizen cannot be governed by the simple maxim of caveat emptor applied to consumers. These relationships are not merely instrumental but moral. Education is a moral enterprise while business is not. Business can prosper at the cost of society-for example tobacco, junk foods etc. Putting together public education along with other private services like telecom, banking and the entertainment industry is not useful. Paula Kwan (1996) points out the following problems of bringing the TQM perspective from manufacturing into education. The ‘total’ in TQM involves the objectives, the input, output and the process.

- Objectives- the mission of education is relatively long term as compared to a business firm.
- Process- Teaching and learning processes are not the same as assembly lines. They are interactive processes between teachers and students which are not amenable to quality control like that in manufacturing.
- Inputs – Students, as the inputs to educational settings -even if they can at all be called as ‘inputs’- are subject to enormous variability. School education is supposed not to control the inputs.
- Output - Kwan doubts whether Deming’s ‘zero defect’ products be produced in education? Can any educator claim that her student has achieved perfect standard?

The customer is the ultimate arbiter of quality in TQM. But the direct customer of a school may not be able to say what is good for her. The indirect customer (the parent) or the ultimate customer of the state too cannot be trusted entirely (Sykes 1991). The parents or the state may want to

indoctrinate the children perpetuating an oppressive social stratification, but education is a venture to overcome the oppressive features. This is one of the *raison d'être* of teacher autonomy who can act as a check against the state and the parents. Its importance can be seen in the context of caste in India. Parents may not want the education to focus on caste or gender inequality. But teacher autonomy can act as a check against such aims of education of parents.

In reality, consumer sovereignty is exaggerated in business (Gay and Salaman 1992). Corporates shape the taste of the consumer and define good quality via the consumer. How are you accountable to the customers who have fallen a victim to your creation of the 'needs'? This supposed party of 'freedom' and 'choice' exclude those who are not customers. The perverted freedom create a situation where 'the constitutive dimensions of the self— time and space, health and sickness, sex and age, birth and death, reproduction and love — are no longer a datum but a problem' (Melucci cited in Hartley 1998:157).

(d) Education management practice of one socio political context is proposed for another context without recognizing the difference between the contexts- the example of School Based Management (SBM).

SBM has been a development from School effectiveness research and an application of the market paradigm in the sphere of school education (Abu-duhou 1999). It advocates devolving authority, finance and responsibility from central to the school level in return for greater performance through market framework. Parents can choose schools and school funding is linked to student enrolment. Schools have to 'attract' students and submit to greater control by the parents. Starting as 'Schools of the Future' in the Victoria province of Australia SBM has spread to Europe, North America and many developing countries in different names - the school management initiative (SMI) in Hongkong, Site Based Management and Charter Schools in USA, Local School Management and Grant Maintained School in UK (ibid).

SBM has not been accepted uncritically in UK (Power et al 1997). The reasons for its introduction are more financial and managerial (Grauwe 2005). It has been introduced in the name of freedom and choice which has little meaning to the poor and the most disadvantaged. They need more support than freedom and choice. The freedom and choice of schools and parents in combination will create alliance between the well endowed schools and parents leaving the disadvantaged spiralling downwards (ibid). It is precisely to check such abuse of freedom that bureaucracy and centralization derive their *raison d'être*.

Devolution of power and decentralization requires continuous checks and balances to ensure quality and equity of education provision. This means that the system at both the school and system level should be held accountable through a well-structured accountability framework (Abu-duhou 1999:118)

Equity remains an issue with the market paradigm. Economy, efficiency and effectiveness may be achieved, but for whom? It is also not the case that SBM automatically ensures performance. Both Abu-duhou (1999) and Caldwell (2005) opine that the SBM in itself is not likely to increase achievement outcome without a constant focus on it.

(e) A cautious education management in case of India

Bush (2003) discusses different models of school management. School is considered not only a bureaucratic entity but a political and cultural entity. It is also a reality constructed differently by different actor-participants. One can see in Bush (2003) a stance close to sociology that is far from the certainty proposed by management discourses like TQM. Such cautious approach is advocated by many. Grauwe (2005) calls for *any system of management* that is supportive to schools rather than SBM as such. Hoyle and Wallace (2009) calls for a *re-description* of management. Abu duhou, (1999) and Caldwell (2005) both opine that a 'balance' of centralization and decentralization is required for a successful SBM. Both emphasize capacity building at the lower echelon for success of decentralization of management. This stance is supported in case of India by Govinda and Diwan (2003). They point out that the major issue in case of decentralization in India is the willingness to give power from the upper echelon and ability and willingness to take responsibility on part of the lower echelon. All these suggest that we should avoid falling into any kind of management orthodoxy like a single version of management or SBM.

A sociological approach to management should take into account the specificity and the diversity of the Indian context (see Mukhopadhyay and Tyagi, (Ed.) 2001 for the diversity of the Indian situation). The education system in the Anglo Saxon world has a different history and located in a different socio-political and economic environment. The environment in which education system is located in the USA and UK is characterized by more teachers per school, real decentralization and more power of the head teacher. Schools in America differ in terms of resources across rich or poor locality. The local education board is more active in America. The superintendent is appointed and answerable to the education board of the school district. In India, the BEO (Block Education Officer) is appointed not by the community but by the bureaucracy and

has to report to a bureaucracy. In UK, the head teacher has substantial financial and personnel power. In India, there is hardly any financial and personnel discretion available at the school level. The headmaster tradition of UK, from which India has inherited its education system, is now more applicable to the so called 'public schools' than government schools of India. What a bureaucratic framework does in India with respect to promotion and transfer policy is assured in the USA context by collective agreements with teacher unions. The decentralization in India is more de jure than de facto. The BEO (Block Education Officer) and DEO (District Education Officer) are part of bureaucracy in India in spite of the decentralization. The market flavour was absent in the Indian government's move towards decentralization. It was community oriented rather than customer oriented. The significantly lower degree of a culture of consumerism in India compared to the west will make it less likely for parents to pose as customers in rural areas. Teachers in India have only realistic opportunity in the form of BEO as we do not have 'subject leaders', 'department heads' etc in a school. The focus is more on administrative leadership rather than instructional leadership in India.

If one tries to adapt education management to India then one has to take into accounts the following diverse contexts:

1. Management in different type of schools – management in small government schools may be more of administration. Majority of government schools do not have much infrastructure or personnel to manage. Thus, the SBM framework may not be applicable to a great extent. These schools require more academic and infrastructure support from above. Some of the large government schools in urban area may resemble bureaucracy to some extent. On the other hand the SBM framework may be applicable to the private schools. In fact, they may already be operating in a SBM framework.
2. Management in an NGO (Non Government Organization) engaged in educational activities- Many NGOs are engaged in educational activities like research and extension in education. Management of such activities will be different from management of government schools. More discretion and freedom may be available in this sphere.
3. Lastly, management in a project of education like SSA (Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan) involves the various models mentioned in Bush (2003) i.e. the political, cultural etc. Management in such projects will be significantly different from management of a school.

One can not apply an education management practice of the west to the Indian context without taking into account the above diversity. Further research is needed before appropriate education management framework suitable for the Indian context emerges.

Conclusion

People practice both management and sociology in their day to day lives though they may not be giving such names. Management should be a means to serve education goals in 'education management'. It is not conservative or radical so long it is a means. But the means becomes an end in 'managerialism' where management replaces education goals with managerial goals like 'economy', 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness' without considering to what end. There is a dangerous possibility of marriage between management orthodoxy and conservative version of sociology of education like functionalism. However, a critical version of management, where means are as important as ends, can co-exist with a critical version of sociology of education. The means are no less important than the ends in education. 'Management' will put a premium on efficiency (output per input) while equality and justice may or may not be attained. Sociology of education will put a premium on equality and justice rather than efficiency. In this context it is better to see management as a double edged sword rather than unmixed blessing or curse. It becomes a Frankenstein when it overturns the sociological and philosophical aims of education. The trinity of economy, efficiency and effectiveness per se is not bad so long they do not become fetish and override equality and justice.

References

Abrahamson, E (1996): "Management Fashion", *Academy of Management Review*. 21(1): 254-285.

Abu-Duhou, Ibtisam (1999): *School Based Management* (Paris: UNESCO).

Bourdieu, Pierre (1997): "The Forms of Capital" in Halsey A H, Hugh Lauder, Philip Brown, Amy Stuart Wells (Ed.) *Education, Culture, Economy And Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 46-58.

Broadbent, J and Richard Laughlin (2002): "Public Service Professional and the New Public Management: Control of the Professions in the Public Service" in Mclaughlin Kate, Stephen P Osborne and Ewan Ferlie (Ed.) *New Public Management: Current Trends and Future Perspectives* (London: Routledge) 95-108.

Buffington, Jack (2009): *The Death of Management* (Santa Barbara. California: ABC-CLIO).

Bush, Tony (2003): *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (London: Sage).

Caldwell, Brian J (2005): *School-Based Management* (Paris: The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)/ The International Academy of Education (IAE)/UNESCO).

Chakrabarty, Bidyut and Mohit Bhattacharya, Ed. (2008): *The Governance Discourse: A Reader* (Delhi: Oxford University Press).

Chater, Mark (2005): "Archetypes of Destruction: Notes on the Impact of Distorted Management Theory on Education Communities", *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8(1): 3 – 19.

Collins, Randall(1979): *The Credential Society* (New York: Academic Press).

Deem Rosemary and Brehony Kevin J (2005): "Management as Ideology: The Case of 'New Managerialism' In Higher Education", *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2): 217 - 235.

English Fenwick W (2005): "Introduction: A Metadiscursive Perspective on the Landscape of Educational Leadership in The 21st Century" in English Fenwick W (Ed.) *The Sage Handbook of Educational Leadership: Advances in Theory Research and Practice* (London: Sage) IX-XVI.

Ferlie, Ewan, Christine Musselin and Gianluca Andresani (2008): "The Steering Of Higher Education Systems: A Public Management Perspective" *Higher Education*, 56 (3): 325-348.

Fernanda, Duarte (2009): "What Is A Sociologist Doing In A School of Management: Reflections on The Use of Sociological Concepts in Management Education", *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 6 (1): 2- 10.

GarrattR (1972): "Towards A Reform of Management Education", *Management Learning*, (3): 3-7.

Gay, Paul Du and Graeme Salaman (1992): The Cult(Ure) Of The Customer, *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(5): 615-633.

Govinda, R and Rashmi Diwan (2003): "Introduction: Emerging Issues and Practices" in Govinda R and Rashmi Diwan (Ed.) *Community Participation and Empowerment in Primary Education* (New Delhi: Sage)11-30.

Grauwe, Anton De (2005): "Improving the Quality of Education through School-Based Management: Learning From International Experiences", *Review of Education*, (51): 269–287.

Gunter, Helen M (2000): "Thinking Theory: The Field Of Education Management in England and Wales", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(4): 623 - 635.

Hartley, David (1998): "In Search Of Structure: Theory and Practice in the Management of Education", *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(1): 153 - 162.

Harvey, David (2005): *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (London: Oxford).

Hoyle, Eric and Wallace, Mike (2009): "Beyond Metaphors of Management: The Case for Metaphoric Re-Description in Education", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(4): 426 – 442.

Hughes, O E (1994): *Public Management & Administration: An Introduction* (London : St. Martin'S Press).

Jackal, Robert (1988): *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers* (London: Oxford University Press).

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (1977): *Men and Women of the Corporation* (New York: Basic Books).

Kwan, Paula Y K (1996): "Application of Total Quality Management in Education: Retrospect and Prospect", *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(5): 25–35.

Lawton, A and Rose A (1991): *Organisation and Management in the Public Sector* (London: Pitman).

Maheswari, S R (2002): "New Public Management" in Maheswari S. R., *A Dictionary of Public Administration* (Hyderabad: Orient Longman) 325-333.

Malice, Ruthven (1989): *The Divine Supermarket: Shopping For God in America* (New York: William Morrow And Company Inc).

Meyer, John J and Brian Rowan (1977): "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony", *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2): 340-363.

Mintzberg, Henry (2004): *Managers, Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development* (San Fransisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers).

Mukhopadhyay, Marmar (2001): "Governance of Indian Education: Proposed Reforms" in Mukhopahyay Marmar and R S Tyagi (Ed.) *Governance of School Education in India* (New Delhi: Sage Publishers) 295-336.

Mukhopadhyay, Marmar (2005): *Total Quality Management in Education* (New Delhi: Sage Publishers).

Mukhopadhyay, Marmar and R S Tyagi, Ed. (2001): *Governance of School Education in India* (New Delhi: Sage Publishers).

Paton, Rob, Jill Mordaunt and Chris Cornforth (2007): "Beyond Nonprofit Management Education: Leadership Development in A Time of Blurred Boundaries and Distributed Learning", *Nonprofit And Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36 (4): 148-162.

Power Michael (1994): "The Audit Society" in Hopwood A.G. & P. Miller (Ed.) *Accounting As Social and Institutional Practice* (London: Cambridge University Press) 299-316.

Power, Sally, David Halpin, and Geoff Whitty (1997): "Managing the State and the Market: 'New' Education Management in Five Countries", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 45 (4): 342-362.

Ramirez, Matias (2004): "Comparing European Approaches to Management Education, Training and Development", *Advances In Developing Human Resources*, 6(4): 428-450.

Reed M I (1989): *The Sociology of Management* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf).

Sapre, Padmakar (2002): "Realizing the Potential of Education Management in India", *Educational Management & Administration*, 30 (1): 101-108.

Senge, Peter M (2006): *Fifth Discipline: Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation* (New York: Doubleday and Company Inc).

Simons, Maarten (2002): "Governmentality, Education and Quality Management. Towards A Critique of the Permanent Quality Tribunal", *Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 5(4): 617-633.

Sturdy, Andrew, Michael Brocklehurst, Diana Winstanley and Margaret Littlejohns (2006): "Management as a (Self) Confidence Trick: Management Ideas, Education and Identity Work", *Organization*, 13 (6): 841-860.

Sykes, Gary (1991): "In Defense of Teacher Professionalism as a Policy Choice", *Educational Policy*, 5 (2): 137-149.

Thomas, Alan B (1989): "One-Minute Management Education: A Sign of the Times?", *Management Learning*, 20: 23-37.

Tiratsoo, Nick (2004): "The "Americanization" Of Management Education in Britain", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13 (2): 118-126.

Üsdiken, Behlül (2004): "Americanization of European Management Education in Historical and Comparative Perspective: A symposium", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13 (2): 87-89.

Warwick Organizational Behavior Staff (2001): *Critical Perspectives on Business and Management* (London: Routledge).

West-Burnham, John (1997): "Leading and Managing For Quality" in Brent Davies. Linda Ellision (Ed.) *School Leadership for the 21st Century A Competency and Knowledge Approach* (New York: Routledge) 118-134.

Zald,Mayer N (2002): "Spinning Disciplines: Critical Management Studies in The Context of The Transformation of Management Education", *Organization*, 9 (3): 365-385.

Table 1

Difference between school education and other service organizations

	<i>School Education</i>	<i>Other Public Service Organizations like health, social welfare</i>	<i>Private for-profit Service organizations like banking</i>	<i>Private non-profit Service organizations</i>
<i>Goal</i>	Diffuse	Diffuse	specific (the bottom line)	Freedom to be diffuse or specific
<i>Cost</i>	Society bears the cost	Society bears the cost	Individuals alone or in group bear the cost	Individuals alone or in group bear the cost
<i>Procedural justice</i>	Can't be arbitrary	Can't be arbitrary	Can be arbitrary	Can be arbitrary
<i>Nature of service</i>	service can't be repeated (a child can't go back again for schooling even if the schooling was bad)	service is repeated	Though bad service can't be reversed the customer is compensated	the customer may or may not be compensated as it has the latitude to be arbitrary
<i>Type of customer</i>	Young as direct customer	Both young or adult	Both young or adult	Both young or adult
<i>Voluntary or involuntary customer</i>	Involuntary customer	Involuntary customer	voluntary customer	voluntary customer
<i>Determining the customer</i>	Not easy to determine who is the customer (child, parent or the society?)	easy to determine	easy to determine	easy to determine
<i>Protection against failure</i>	protected against failure	protected against failure	Not protected against failure	Not protected against failure
<i>Whether considered as arms of the state</i>	traditionally considered the arms of the state	traditionally considered the arms of the state	Not considered the arms of the state	Not considered the arms of the state

Figure -1

The shift of paradigm regarding school education

