



BELMAS

British Educational Leadership, Management & Administration Society

BELMAS: perspectives on origins and development

Helen M Gunter

University of Manchester, UK

Correspondence:

Professor Helen M Gunter

University of Manchester

Oxford Road

Manchester

M13 9PL

Helen.gunter@manchester.ac.uk

Preface

As part of its 40th Anniversary celebrations the British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society commissioned Professor Helen Gunter of the University of Manchester to write a paper which considered the foundation of BELMAS (then BEAS) as an association and its relation to the field of educational leadership, management and administration as it emerged over the following years. Professor Gunter is eminently suited to this task, having undertaken her doctoral studies on this topic and published a number of highly regarded books and articles which locate the field both historically and philosophically. The paper represents Professor Gunter's own views, but it is significant for a number of reasons. It enables the Society's members to understand the factors that motivated its founders; it reminds us of the principles that underlay that foundation and of the debates that have surrounded these principles in the years that have followed; it provides a basis for on-going discussion about our values and purposes in a rapidly changing policy environment; and, not least, it is an important contribution to the history of the field. I commend the paper to readers.

Dr Colin Russell

Chair

BELMAS.

PART I The Society and its Origins

Introduction

The British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society (BELMAS) is an internationally recognised network of people who are interested in educational organisations as sites for the doing and study of practice. BELMAS has international reach and significance through the formality of the annual conference, Journal publication, and association with, for example, UCEA (University Council for Educational Administration) in North America and CCEAM (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management), and the informality of networks and personal friendships that have grown over time. In this anniversary year it is worthwhile looking back to the origins of this organisation, not only because this is worthwhile in itself but also because it enables the people who are currently members of BELMAS consider the historical roots of current issues and debates.

In this essay I examine the origins of BELMAS and in doing so I draw on (a) empirical data and conceptual analysis; and (b) the conceptualisation of intellectual histories (Gunter 1999a, b, 2006, 2012a,b). I intend enabling the voices of participants to speak loudly so that in their words the purposes, rationales and narratives about and for the Society are heard. While important anniversaries have been recognised as a means of taking stock in field development, there are few secondary sources that actually engage with the history of the Society (e.g. Strain 1999). This essay is a small contribution to filling this gap and enabling the Society to reflect on its antecedence and future direction.

Origins

On 15th January 1971 a meeting took place in London at which George Baron of the University of London and William Taylor of the University of Bristol brought together interested people “to consider the establishment of a United Kingdom group concerned with research and teaching in educational administration” (Taylor 1971 p1). It was agreed to help form and support such a group, and so plans were made for a larger gathering to “include heads of schools, local authority administrators, and others interested in research and teaching in this field, as well as staff from universities, polytechnics, colleges of education and other institutions of post secondary education” (Taylor 1971 p1). This Foundation meeting took place on the 23rd October 1971, and a year later the first meeting of the Executive Committee of the British Educational Administration Society (BEAS) took place, with the first AGM in 1973. BEAS became BEAS Limited and was formally incorporated on 26th October 1973. A Council of Management was formed to replace the Executive Committee. Forty years on BEAS remains a vibrant network in the field both in the UK and internationally, it is now BELMAS or the British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society, where management was introduced in 1980 (to form BEMAS, British Educational Management and Administration Society) and leadership in 2000.

The motivation for and realisation of the formation of BEAS lies within formal and informal networks that developed nationally and internationally during the 1960s. Specifically Baron (1967) provides an account of events in his report to the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) in Atlantic City in 1967, where he notes the agenda resulting from the 1966 International Intervisitation Programme (IIP):

“At the Edmonton meeting that concluded the Programme in 1966 it was suggested that participants, on return to their own countries, should organise conferences or meetings to further develop study, research and preparation programmes. It fell to Bill Taylor of Bristol and myself to consider what first steps should be taken in Britain. We are conscious of the many thousands of people in schools, colleges, local authorities and all kinds of agencies concerned with the administration of education in the widest sense and concerned also in studying its operation in committees, producing reports and developing plans and projects. We came to the conclusion that it would be unwise to dissipate our limited energies in organising large events, but rather to identify, bring together and work with a nucleus of people who were already contributing to the *study*, as distinct from the *practice* of educational administration. Above all, we wanted to produce something that would serve to identify and define the tasks that lay ahead in the development of a new field of study” (p1-2, emphasis in original).

This first IIP meeting in 1966 was held at various universities in the USA and Canada, and was sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation and the UCEA. The participants came from Australia, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand, and the USA, and Baron (1974) provides a background account:

“By the mid-sixties the University Council for Educational Administration was looking further afield and decided to launch a first International Intervisitation Programme in 1966. The aim was above all to bring together university teachers with interest in this field in English speaking countries. But the British contingent included two practising administrators among its number, Bernard Braithwaite, Chief Education Officer for East Sussex and Joslyn Owen, then of the Schools Council and now Chief Education Officer for Devon. The Programme, which took place in the autumn of that year involved not only ten days spent in discussing papers, but also some two weeks visiting university institutions and school systems in which there was keen interest in the systematic study of educational administration and the preparation of administrators.”

The American initiative was certainly a great success in arousing the enthusiasm of those who took part. One of the Australian participants, William Walker, now Dean of Faculty of Education at the University of New England, who had played a leading part

in building up this first venture, undertook to organise a second Programme in Australia. This was held early in 1970 and this time representatives from some fifteen Commonwealth countries attended, including several from developing countries. On the final day of this Programme there was set up the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, with the help of a grant of £20,000 from the Commonwealth Foundation and £7,500 from the University of New England where the headquarters of the Council are located. The meeting also decided to press the British contingent, which included Eric Briault, William Taylor and myself to organise the third International Intervisitation Programme in Britain in 1974” (p1).

While international connections had been facilitated by private visits and the creation in 1963 of the *Journal of Educational Administration*, the real initiative for the IIP was William Walker of the University of New England in Australia (Culbertson 1969). Indeed, Baron has given his account of meeting Walker in 1966:

“And there I met Bill Walker and I'd put a star opposite him. He was the chap who really created the drive. One story which isn't relevant but I'll slip it in quickly... We had arranged a committee meeting in I think Columbus, Ohio and I arrived very early... well 6 o'clock in the evening, and it was timed for 9 o'clock. They didn't arrive, the rest of them, who were coming from the West including Bill Walker, and I went to bed at 3 o'clock. I said I mean they won't be coming. He arrived shortly after and said 'My God, George, why are you in bed - we're in committee!' We were in committee at 7 o'clock the next morning. I'd snatched an hour or two's sleep. He arrived with the minutes typed” (Gunter 1999b, unpagged).

Baron goes on to say how the plan to have an IIP in the UK came about:

I want to say Bill Walker really fired me. I think he said that ... the Americans have got UCEA - we are going to have a Commonwealth body, and you're doing it in Britain George. Well that was the line. Now Bill Taylor was very prominent as well. He was the person I worked with very closely. But I mean that's just the anecdote of how ... Bill Walker arrived on the scene. And after that it was decided that there'd be a meeting in Australia in 1970... he said 'Now George you're going to have one in Britain'. Now Eric Briault was there, Bill Taylor was there at that meeting and I said 'well we can only do it if we have a committee or an organisation. I mean I can't do it. Bill Taylor can't do it, you know individually'. So BEAS was founded and I'm quite certain about this as a means of setting up this thing. But it also, I mean in the minds of other people as well, was founded in its own right, but I mean my first reaction to Bill's suggestion was we must have something to organise it from. And therefore BEAS, an association or a committee in London or Bristol was the obvious answer” (Gunter 1999b, unpagged).

So in preparation for the IIP in the UK in 1974 the first meeting that led to BEAS took place on 15th January 1971 with sixteen people attending¹. The meeting considered the plans for the IIP and the setting up of an association that was to be linked with the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration (CCEA)². It was agreed that a broader base was needed and the next meeting took place in October 1971 with 90 people in attendance³.

Baron (1971) noted in his opening address to this meeting that what was important was that for the first time people from all parts of the education system and from all four nations were brought together. From this BEAS was set up with Eric Briault as the first Chair, and in giving an account of this meeting he confirms that: "there was a determination at the meeting not to follow the pattern set elsewhere of creating a separate association composed solely of people concerned with research and teaching in educational administration. It was felt that this would tend only to produce a gulf between the study of educational administration and its practice" (BELMAS archive, code: BEAS/EC/15).

Purposes

The purposes of BEAS can be understood through examining the espoused aims and the activities devised to deliver on those aims. The Memorandum of Association (26th October 1973) states that the overall aim is "to promote, maintain, improve and advance education of the public by the advancement of the practice, teaching, and study of, and research into, educational administration...". The MoA then goes on to present the official substantive aims of BEAS and these are presented in Table 1.

¹ In addition to George Baron, Reader in Educational Administration, University of London, and Bill Taylor, Professor of Education, University of Bristol, those present: Mr RA Becher, Assistant Director Nuffield Foundation; Mr W. Murray White, HMI; Dr T.R. Bone, Head of Department of Education at Jordanhill College of Education; Dr E.W.H. Briault, Deputy Education Officer ILEA; Mr D.A.Fiske, Chief Education Officer, Manchester; Mr R. Glatter, Lecturer in Educational Administration, University of London; Mr M.G. Hughes, Lecturer in Education, University College Cardiff; Dr A.M. Little, Director of Research and Statistics, ILEA; Mr M.L. Mackenzie, Lecturer in Education in the University of Glasgow; Mr S.A.J. Pratt, Lecturer in Education, University of Bristol; Mr L.E.Watson, Principal Lecturer in Education Management, Department of Management Studies, Sheffield Polytechnic; and Mr G. Wheeler, Deputy Director, Further Education Staff College, Coombe Lodge (Baron 1974 p 10, Taylor 1971, p1).

² The IIP took place in the UK in 1974 with sessions in London, Bristol and Glasgow. The IIP is famous for the Greenfield paper that challenged the Theory Movement. It is out of the scope of this paper to engage with this here, and for reference see Gunter 1999a.

³ Baron (1974) gives the figure of 90, but the 1972 BEAS membership enrolment form explains the formation of BEAS and gives the number of 73 participants.

Table 1: Aims of BEAS

- (a) To conduct research into educational administration and to publish the results thereof and to promote high standards in the teaching thereof.
 - (b) To provide a forum for the discussion of new approaches to the preparation and development of administrators and new developments in research.
 - (c) To facilitate the dissemination of knowledge about research, training and practice in educational administration.
 - (d) To link theory and practice in educational administration by encouraging fruitful collaboration between those engaged in teaching and research in educational administration and practising administrators working in educational institutions and authorities.
 - (e) To maintain close contact with other national associations concerned with education in the British Isles, and elsewhere, particularly those representing practising administrators and public authorities.
 - (f) To encourage the formation of local groups of those actively interested in the aims of the Society.
 - (g) To maintain close contact with international organisations and with national organisations in other countries, which are concerned with the development of educational administration, and to facilitate appropriate international activities and exchanges.
- Aims h-r are concerned with the legal aspects e.g. Charitable status, and financial management.

Over the next forty years BEAS then BEMAS then BELMAS has engaged in a variety of activities to deliver these aims.

Networking: As already identified the Society grew out of links with UCEA and CCEA, and the Society helped to found *The European Forum on Educational Administration* (EFEA) in 1976 (<http://www.efea-network.org/History>). Over the decades links were made with other societies such as the British Educational Research Association (BERA), and the archive shows other connections. For example, the Local Government Training Board invited BEAS to make comments on a document on management development in education departments; the Royal

Institute of Public Administration invited a BEAS member to a sub-committee to consider the implications of findings on its Report into the Teaching of Public Administration (BELMAS archive: 1974 AGM/75/2 Minutes); and links were made with the Society of Education Officers (SEO) (BELMAS archive: 1977 AGM/78/2. C/77/14 Minutes).

The Society has encouraged active links with the four home nations, for example, through the Scottish Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society (SELMAS). An emphasis has been put at different times on local or regional groups in the UK (BELMAS archive: 1972 AGM/BEAS/BM/5 Minutes), whereby Society members could come together within a locality and hold meetings. In addition to this special interest groups have been formed at different times in order to network around a particular issue, and in the early days attention was given to the processes by which professionals engaged with the field, and so the 1973 AGM minutes acknowledge the work of a "Teaching of Educational Administration" special interest group (BELMAS archive: 1973 AGM/74/2 Minutes).

Communicating: The Society set up an annual conference (and for a time a biennial research conference) which is an important part of the life of the network, not least through the increased involvement of international speakers and researchers. Emphasis has also been put on publications, and the first title of the Society's journal from 1972 was the *Educational Administration Bulletin* (EAB), and from 1976 it was called *Educational Administration* (EA). In 1982 it was called *Educational Management and Administration* (EMA) and from 2004 Leadership was added to the title: *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* (EMAL). EAB and EA were edited by Meredydd Hughes, followed by Ray Bolam from 1979, the journal becoming EMA during his term of office (1979-1983). Later editors were Michael Locke (1984-1991), Peter Ribbins (1994-2002) and Tony Bush, the current editor, who oversaw the addition of 'leadership' to the title.

The 1986 AGM/uncoded minutes contain a report by the Chair of the Publications Committee (BELMAS archive: uncoded) to the AGM about the establishment of a new publication described as: "a new popular - style magazine focusing on the needs of managers in the school/college contexts", and the "content would focus not only on the process of managing but also on the context within which managers operate". The benefits were seen as: "the society would received regular high profile publicity which would help promote growth through increased membership and given added recognition to BEMAS as the leading national organisation in the field of Educational Management and Administration." This publication became known as *Management in Education*.

In the 1980s and 1990s the Society sponsored a series of books in collaboration with Paul Chapman Publishing, whereby field members communicated research and debates within the field. For example, Strain et al. (1999) published an edited collection of papers from EMA in celebration of the Society's 25th anniversary, where a thematic analysis enabled the reported research and conceptualisations to be located in time and context. In the same year Harry

Tomlinson et al. (1999) published an edited collection of chapters by headteachers reporting on their research submitted in master's dissertations. Both of these books illustrate the Society's focus on the inter-relationship between research, practice and theory, and the democratisation of knowledge production through professionals in schools and higher education being involved in projects and dissemination.

Membership: The Society has been concerned to enable a pluralistic interpretation of the field with representation from schools, colleges, local authorities, national government and higher education. Concerns have been raised over time regarding the ability of busy professionals to be involved, not least from schools, colleges and LEAs. The Society had to grow membership as well as monitor composition, and so a number of strategies have been developed to improve membership from schools, colleges and LEAs. For example, institutional membership was introduced in 1985 but with limited success and other activities were explored to meet the needs of institutional leaders. For example, incentives were offered, and so BEMAS gave bursaries 2 x £200 towards costs of school practitioners to go to the European Forum Intervisitation in France Nov 1982 (BELMAS archive: 1982 AGM C/82/27 minutes). However, meeting such needs remains an on-going challenge for the Society.

Professionalisation: By the late 1970s the organisation had developed all the symbols of a formal organisation. For example, the 1975 AGM/76/2 Minutes are reported for the first time on letter headed paper; the 1976 AGM/77/2 Minutes contain the reporting of finance in line with company rather than local government practice; and the 1982 AGM/C/82/27 Minutes use a logo for the first time. The professionalisation of the Society by the development of a dedicated administrative staff has been an ongoing issue within the documentation. This is seen as important in enabling BEMAS to be noticed and to have an impact as well as to provide the most appropriate administrative service for its members. Debates revolved around the kinds of experience and skills the Society's professional staff needed and a number of solutions were experimented with. The administrative role was initially carried out by the Treasurer, then, on a voluntary basis by a senior member of the Society (Len Watson). Later part-time staff were appointed on a paid basis but various solutions were explored to the problem of balancing the need to provide voice and visibility for the Society with that of ensuring that membership, financial and other administrative functions were carried out smoothly. Eventually the current model emerged: a full time business manager, supported by a membership and communications and administrator, together with a part-time professional officer to undertake wider roles of representation and activity development.

Recognition: The Society has also noted external and internal recognition of achievement by leading people within the Society: the 1976 AGM.77/2 Minutes report that Eric Briault and A. R. Barnes have been awarded the CBE; the 1977 AGM/78/2. C/77/14 Minutes report the promotion of Glatter to a chair at the OU and Hughes to a chair at Birmingham. Gordon Wheeler's appointment to the directorship of the FE Staff College at Coombe Lodge is reported. Internally the Society has honoured the contributions made by its own leaders, and

the 1986 AGM (uncoded) Minutes recorded that William Walker and William Taylor had been made Honorary Vice Presidents of the Society. More recently Ron Glatter, Tony Bush, Rene Saran and Barbara Vann have been similarly honoured. From 2005 the Distinguished Service Award was given to Society members in recognition of their contribution to the Society and the field. The first recipients were Rene Saran and Harry Tomlinson.

Part II: The Field

The establishment and ongoing development of the Society is directly located within the work of early leaders in their campaign to proactively create and legitimise a field of study and practice. This involved the location of field members in higher education as well as how those who came into and located within this field identified with BEAS as a network 'home' for knowledge exchange and for the establishment of professional friendships.

During the 1970s and into the 1980s the Council of Management had representatives from LEAs, Schools, and FE, but the major grouping was from HEIs and included leading names: Baron and Glatter (The Institute of Education, University of London), Taylor and Bolam (Bristol), Bone (Jordanhill College of HE, Glasgow), Hughes (Cardiff), and Watson (Sheffield Polytechnic). Importantly leaders within BEAS were leading field development within their own institutions. Baron's (1974) and Hughes' (1977) 'stock check' studies of the field in the Society archive shows the importance of particular types of activity, with the development of:

Courses: Hughes (1977) identifies the significance of this: "over the last ten years there has been an increasing interest in the contribution which teaching can make to the improvement of practice in the administration of education in this country". There were short courses, for example, London Institute of Education (see Glatter 1972), and award bearing courses, with Diplomas, Masters and Doctorates in Bristol, Cardiff, Glasgow (Jordanhill), London Institute of Education, Manchester, Open University, and Sheffield (Polytechnic). Such postgraduate studies are located in Departments with staff and the growth of appointments with the title of educational administration, where Hughes (1977) states: "...the creations of chairs at the Open University and more recently at Birmingham University in addition to the original chair of educational administration at the University of London Institute of Education suggests that progress has been made in the academic recognition of educational administration as a field of study" (BELMAS archive: unpagged).

Literatures: Hughes (1977) noted that there had been a reliance on non-educational and North American sources, but he argues that there had recently been more use made of case study material and research from a British context. Importantly he identifies the significance of the Open University in the development of research and the literatures. This growth in home literatures was recognised by Baron (1974) who

states “educational administration is now developing its own literature, based on research studies, such as the recent book by Dr Saran (1973), the work being done by Peston at Queen Mary College (see David and Fiske 1973), the analysis of university administration carried out by Fielden and Lockwood, and the study which Howell and I undertook into school management and government (Baron and Howell 1974). In addition to this there is a growing body of work being done in relation to school organisation, of which the most recent example is Elizabeth Richardson’s *The Teacher, the School and the Task of Management* (1972)” (p4)

The establishment of the field through professional development/training programmes and by producing home grown research texts and analysis meant that BEAS became the site where crucial field issues and tensions were addressed and worked on. Specifically these issues are inter-related: (a) the entry and security of the field in the academy and in professional settings; and (b) the relationship between professional practice, research and field labels. These are matters that are still relevant to BELMAS, and I intend examining them in their historical location; from this current field members can inter-relate this to current debates.

I will begin with the first issue. Importantly field members sought entry into the HEI academy, as was clearly expressed by Bone (1992) in reminiscing about the early days of the field:

"It is a long time ago now, but I refer to it because what we wanted then, more than anything else, was to see the establishment of full length, degree level courses in educational administration all over the country. We admired and envied the position in the United States and Canada, and looked forward to the day when we would have masters' degree courses in most of our universities, and perhaps too in some of the new polytechnics which were just appearing. And we assumed, or at least I think we assumed, that when these courses had been in existence for a while, and had been taken by a fairly large number of students, a marked improvement in the practice of educational administration would follow throughout the country" (p2).

Courses were set up in the 1960s and this furthered the debate about training and the process by which practitioners were prepared for their administrative role (Glatter, 1972, Taylor 1969). Glatter (1972) raised the issue of the impact of training and preparation on the professional practice of the lecturer in an HEI, and in particular the intellectual and practical demands of drawing on a range of theory from different settings and integrating this in a meaningful way for the practitioner. It seems that the field member in an HEI was being simultaneously created and conceptualised as a generalist in drawing on the range of social sciences, and also as a trainer in the sense of working with and valuing the experience of the course member.

A significant text that established and described the concerns of educational administration in the late 1960s and dominated thinking and practice through the 1970s, was Baron and Taylor's *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences* (1969). The aim of this edited collection was to explore theory and its connection to the meaning and practice of educational administration. Baron (1980) also later argued that the writing of this book was connected to claims for recognition within the academy:

"I sought to show how the latter (i.e. *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences*) could contribute to our field of study. My thinking was very much influenced by my contacts with American and Canadian scholars and with the work of Professor William Walker in Australia; and it was motivated by the political need to legitimate the study of educational administration in the university world in this country" (p18).

The book was the product of contact with the more mature educational administration field in North America and its relevance to understanding what was required in England and Wales. Baron (1969) characterises educational administration as:

"Viewed in the widest sense, as all that makes possible the educative process, the administration of education embraces the activities of Parliament at one end of the scale and the activities of any home with children or students at the other. Indeed, for its effective functioning an educational system must and does rely on parents performing both legally prescribed and generally understood functions. It is important to make this point, as otherwise there is a danger that 'administration' may be interpreted solely as the concern of officials of the Department of Education and Science and of officers of local education authorities. Indeed, the use of the term in England has been so limited that in popular usage it refers only to the latter category and is not applied to heads and others who are responsible for the organisation and running of the schools. Nevertheless, there is general recognition of the administrative nature of the headmaster's [sic] position, if still some unease at his being described as an administrator" (p6).

While the administrative imperative is identified (Stenhouse 1969), there is a strong link with policy processes through debates about democratic values and the cultural/traditional context in which schools and practitioners are located.

The setting out of field purposes and boundaries was crucial to the Society as this not only gave BEAS an organisational location in relation to higher education but also connections with professionals who were creating, accessing and using emerging field knowledge. There was a clear attempt to see educational administration as a field of study and application which embraces all participants within the structure, tasks, and systems of the educational process. This manifested itself in a number of trends. First, education was seen as an important part of the government and social processes in England and Wales, and as Baron (1969) argued, "there will thus be an increasingly urgent need to review the relationships between teachers,

administrators, elected representatives, parents and the general public. Policy-making, administration and teaching are tending to become ever more closely linked..." (p4). Secondly, the growth of larger schools and colleges meant that there were issues to do with internal and external organisation and communication. Baron stressed "the variety of links that they (schools and colleges) must establish with industry and other educational institutions, and their need to explain their purposes to the wider public all underline the scope for the challenges they have to face" (Baron 1969 p4). Thirdly, changes in all aspects of the education world meant that the administrator could no longer rely on trial and error but there was an education and training imperative: "...the necessity increasingly emerges for practice to be studied, assessed, and ultimately reduced to a form in which it can be taught to those outside the immediate situation" (Baron 1969 p4)., Finally, developments in the social sciences meant that academics from economics, political science and sociology were both interested in and were undertaking interesting research in the application of relevant concepts and methodologies.

Baron and other writers acknowledged the debt to the USA for a number of reasons. In particular, the high status there of educational administration both in the universities and in schools and colleges meant that as a field of study it had legitimacy which supported the efforts of those in the UK. The debt also lay in the opportunity to tap into the wealth of material from the USA that could be imported and utilised in the early development of the domestic field, and the main activists had an international stage on which to celebrate achievement. However, Baron (1969) is mindful of the complexity of the inter-relationship as illustrated by the theory-practice divide as an issue of relevance, purpose, and culture when he states:

"In England much American writing on educational administration is of absorbing interest to the social scientist who is seeking avenues of approach to the study of school organisation and policy formation in this country. At its best it is charged with imaginative insights that throw new light on problems of leadership, structure and innovation. To the practitioner in England, however, writing of this kind can appear highly remote from his concerns, since the urgent needs at the moment are to translate into teachable form the managerial aspect of the headmaster's role, and to develop the mastery of administrative techniques that characterised the first stages in educational administration as a field of study in the United States. It is, therefore, of the first importance that there should be full and rapid development of short practical courses... But it is important also that awareness will develop of the wider issues that face those who are concerned with the shaping of the educational system and its institutions at a time when accepted custom has ceased to be a useful guide" (p12-13).

What the Baron and Taylor description and presentation of the agenda to support field development illustrates is that educational administration was seen as being: firstly, a unified continuum in embracing national, local and school involvement in the policy process;

secondly, something more than technical tools and procedures concerned with 'how to do it' but firmly rooted in the social sciences; and, thirdly, theory and practice must be directly connected through case study research, and effective teaching and learning through both short and long courses for practitioners. Furthermore, other writings illustrate the importance of educational administration as a field that has a sense of itself and how it is located in the ongoing policy construction and development of the education system. For example, the publication from the first IIP in 1966 (Baron *et al.* 1969) puts emphasis on developing an understanding of the historical, cultural, and structural aspects to education and educational administration in particular.

Taylor (1968) endorsed the maturity in the field in North America and argued that the lack of interest at home in training and the preparation of headteachers was related to a number of factors. First, the class system in English society meant that those who held high office didn't need to be trained as they were born into it, while non-elite members who led and managed, undertook training, and experienced socialisation processes into acceptable behaviours. Secondly, the generalist approach to administration meant that specialist expertise was not allowed to develop and so administration lacked status. Thirdly, status in education came from being an academic rather than an administrator, and the culture prevented someone from expressing an interest in administrative matters for fear of being labelled a "power seeker". Taylor went on to argue that changes in society meant that practitioners were working in a more complex set of relationships in which their role was being challenged and opened up to public scrutiny. Baron (1968) described changes in schools with a shift "away from the concept of the Headmaster as possessing authority by virtue of his personal qualities, towards the Head deriving authority from professional competence and a lively understanding of the environment of which his school forms part" (p3). Interest in the preparation of headteachers is connected to these changes, and Taylor (1968) makes a strong connection with the importance of theory:

"When schools were relatively small, and the role of the teacher limited to providing fairly well defined competencies within an accepted framework of authority and expectation, then the possibilities for the development of specific skills and knowledge appropriate to school administration and management were minimal. The possibility of professionalising an activity is dependent upon the existence of a recognised body of knowledge and a set of skills and processes in connection with which appropriate training and induction procedures can be devised. It is a misnomer to refer, as is often done, to an individual as an 'amateur' because he has to function in an area of activity in which such knowledge and skills are undeveloped or unarticulated" (p142).

The main educational change in the 1960s and 1970s that led practitioners to seek support was comprehensivisation. Taylor (1973) argued that a larger sized school had implications for people and structure, in particular the need for more specialised departments and different types of communication systems. While educational administration had been developed as an

inclusive concept, it was increasingly recognised that headteachers were uneasy at being called administrators (Baron and Taylor 1969). These changes meant that headteachers needed training, and Taylor worked with headteachers to develop in-tray exercises and simulations through which to investigate management issues and, in particular, planned change. A worry expressed at the time was the danger of too much pragmatism, and the possibility that practitioners would not see the relevance of theory.

From the mid 1970s the traditions of educational administration became overlain with new trends in which the work of practitioners became increasingly defined and labelled as management. The field gained in status as legitimate area of activity for field members in HEIs, but this was based more on the adoption and use of management theory from outside education than from the tradition of the social sciences. What this illustrates are emerging strains between representing the professional interests of those who work in educational organisations with the policy reform imperative of successive governments from the 1970s onwards. This is manifest in demands for the Society to support and enable professional practice that is rooted in research and theorisations but at the same time give recognition to the modernisation of the school system through business models and cultures. Illustrative of this is how BEAS shifted to BEMAS in 1980.

The tensions in seeking legitimacy within the academic establishment and with the practitioner in schools and colleges was played out in the 1970s in the debate over identity and labelling within BEAS. While Lord Morris (1974), the Hon. President of BEAS, argued that the growth in democracy endorsed the immediacy of a creative administration, this was soon overtaken by the modernism of management. Bolam (1981) illustrates this:

"The 1980 Annual Conference brought about a highly significant change for the Society: it has been re-named The British Educational Management and Administration Society, or BEMAS for short. The decision to change was an almost unanimous one and the reasons given were convincing. The term 'Administrator' is a reasonably familiar one to academics and to anyone with experience of North American educational systems but in a UK context it undoubtedly conjures up images of Education Department Offices, County Hall and Elizabeth House. Yet, as was argued in the Editorial in the last issue, the majority of the Society's members work in schools and for them the term management, I believe, conveys much more quickly and accurately the kinds of concerns which they hope to see stressed in the Society and in the Journal" (pi).

Early field leaders favoured the term 'administration'. For example, and Baron (1969) argued that educational administration is a function of all from Parliament to parent, and that the headteacher is an *administrator*. He articulated his concerns about the adoption of management:

"In the essence of my thinking was that the administration and the study of administration and its practice springs out of the activity not out of borrowings from something else, and not out of generalised theory... With the result that much of the stuff written about education administration at the present time as far as I can judge still hardly mentions schools at all. It mentions relationships between people and structures and bureaucracy but it doesn't start from the essential thing which is the institutions and its purposes. So that you can generalise about maintaining roofs of the schools and prisons but when it comes to the essence of the school or the prison, they're dealing with different relationships. And one result is that some theories tend to neglect the people in the institutions... Do you see what I mean? And that came from my early work with the overseas people you see who visited nursery schools and that kind of thing... And the thing which I had to point out to them about nursery schools, they're different from other schools because the inmates are on the floor! And therefore the heating has got to be different. The teacher's chair has got to be lower. And these are all intensely important. So if you're administering anything look at it. You see, who are in it. Otherwise you might confuse a convict with an infant. And they're different. Although at one level they're not. I mean if you're talking about ... how you deal with the drainage, well you've got to beware because the drainage system may prove an escape hatch for convicts or it may, if it's defective, be particularly dangerous to nursery kids because they're on the floor! But anyway I've rather let myself go on that one but I did feel very keenly that (you should) begin by looking at the nature of the inmates and the task rather than from the top filtering downwards" (Gunter 1999b).

Consequently, Taylor (1969) described the work of the educational administrator as being:

"concerned with the acquisition, control and distribution within a social system of scarce educational resources, a term that includes status and rewards as well as buildings and books. The processes involved - decision-making, communicating, evaluating, supervising, and so on - are characteristic of administrative behaviour in organizations of all kinds and at all levels; and as such they require description, analysis, and conceptual refinement in terms of the formal and informal structures within which they operate, the procedures that they utilize, and, not least, the extent to which they are congruent with system values and goals" (p207).

Taylor argued that administrative work is undertaken by headteachers, deans and heads of department in universities and colleges, and by HMI, local authority advisers and inspectors, and he developed materials linked to TV programmes for Harlech TV called *Heading for Change* (Taylor 1973). His approach was:

“...those series of programmes worked again on the same principle that I tried to stick to from the beginning, that was you don't tell people how to do things, you work with them in using their experience in the context of social science and what we know about how schools work, and several hundred groups were set up in schools in Wales and the west of England from about 1967/68 when this started. By that time I was Professor of Education at the University of Bristol, having moved on there from Oxford in 1966. And those series of programmes brought together heads and their staffs to watch a half hour programme put out at 4 o'clock or 4.30 and then to have an hour or more discussion based upon the inbasket simulation that had been included in the course materials and which was later published in the three books to which I've referred” (Gunter 1999b).

The change to 'management' took place around an emerging reluctance by school professionals to be called administrators. Field leaders had been professionally socialised into seeing management as an activity which historically was connected to the lay governance of Board Schools and then primary schools (Baron and Howell 1974). However, by the early 1970s the term management was increasingly accepted as more applicable to the practitioner at home, with educational administration reserved for international networking. Management was seen as a distinct activity (Bennett, 1974), and increasingly a superior form of activity (Morgan 1979), and this was a significant break with the earlier generation. For example, Taylor (1973) argues that while a headteacher must learn to delegate and to develop management skills this should not dominate educational objectives and the primacy of children. Within a plenary session at a BEAS conference McHugh (1979) described Baron's answer to a question on the issue:

"In answer Professor Baron referred to the development of two traditions. Historically the term 'administration' had been used in the university sphere and the local education authorities and followed closely the patterns developed in the United States of America, Canada, and Australia. The term 'management' was much more the tradition of the British Polytechnics and Management Centres and was increasingly being used in the schools sector, particularly in relation to the role of headteachers and deputy heads. Although he felt it was important to clearly define the concepts used he saw no real benefits to be gained from trying to differentiate 'educational administration' from 'educational management' in any absolute sense. In his view there was a great degree of overlap between the two terms and the only benefits he saw for preferring the use of the term 'administration', particularly in publications, was to facilitate communication at an international level" (p44).

What these debates seem to suggest is that there was a trend for field members within HEIs to have their professional practice labelled and shaped by other field members located in schools and colleges. Headteachers were increasingly describing their professional practice in management terms (see Barry and Tye 1975, Peters 1976, Poster 1976), and the

emphasis was on developing a more conscious approach to what might be done better (Richardson 1973). Importantly, Len Watson led a team at Sheffield Polytechnic that was not in a School of Education, and the courses they ran were located in the management tradition. Watson tells the story:

“So you still had administration on one side, and this was the local authority world and the university world. Eric Briault representing the local authority world and you got the the Poly world of these rather grubby handed practitioners. Now what was interesting then was that you had a backlash amongst the practitioners. And you got fairly influential head teachers Alan Barnes, Ruffwood School (Kirby), who was treasurer of the SHA (Secondary Heads Association) while he was chair or secretary or something of the BEAS. There was (Mark) Hewlett and there was a group of fairly senior heads who objected vigorously to being called administrators. As far as they were concerned, administrators were the people in the LEA office or were the school bursars. Previously these guys would have said 'I am a head and not an administrator', but increasingly they were saying 'I am a manager' and they were using the Poly use of manager - the managing director, rather than the university meaning of manager which was simply an engineer or a technician. Now it didn't happen earlier because of the dominance of the universities and the local authorities within the BEAS, but increasingly we went for recruitment of heads and we were increasingly successful. The price of that success was heads saying 'It's just not on' and so I claim very little direct influence here. I had been pushing quietly, because given our status I was only in the Poly, even when I became head of department in 1976, that didn't mean a thing in the universities. To be a head of a department, for lots of these people, at the Poly was rather equivalent to being head of department in a rather small technical college you know. A non job compared to being a lecturer in a university. And of course there were the salary differentials as well. So I had very little influence over directly. I argued in the Council once or twice for it, but it was met by a general, not hostility, administration is the word. But when the heads came in, they came with a lot more clout because there was a group that were being actively recruited and BEAS had to listen to them. So the only virtue I would claim in this is that I was part of a much larger movement which changed the climate” (Gunter 1999b).

What seems to be at the centre of this debate is a struggle over status regarding Universities and Polytechnics, and how they understood their purposes and relationships with the wider field. In retrospect those involved in the debates regard them as a bit 'dotty', and when the decision was made at BEAS it was seen as “grotestically overdue” (Gunter 1999b). Indeed Taylor presents his own thinking on the change:

"I was always a little doubtful about the inclusion of the term management. I've of course now caught up with the times and accept that that's appropriate and right. But at that time I distinguished between administration and management, ..., the study of the first to be rooted more widely in the social sciences than the second, than management. It seemed to me that the study of administration was a study that applied of course to organisations of all kinds, but which if it was to be useful and successful needed to be rooted in sociology, social psychology, statistics, economics, politics and others of the social sciences. That of course had been expressed in the collection to which I referred that I edited with George Baron and to which I made a contribution. I've come to see that that was perhaps a rather, although it was a broad position, it was failing to keep up with the manner in which things developed. And perhaps if we'd stayed with administration and not picked up the growing interest there was in management, which of course had to do with effectiveness and efficiency and economy, and all the other things that in the late 70s from 76 the Ruskin speech probably, onwards and up to today had been so prominent, we would never have got the degree of support within the system and interest that the use of ... the terms administration and management has produced" (Gunter 1999b).

The debates that went on within BEAS focused on management as a more applicable descriptor of professional practice, whereby the Society was failing to reach out to the profession:

"There is good reason to believe that BEAS is failing to reach a large potential clientele especially school teachers who associate educational administration almost exclusively with activities carried on in local education authority offices, in the DES, and perhaps in the running of large institutions of higher education." (BELMAS archive: 1980 Note, C/80/8).

Forty three members were present at the Extraordinary General Meeting in 1980, and the Minutes record that on the subject of a change of name. Mark Hewlett, a secondary head, spoke in favour of the change of name "referring to the reactions of teachers who assumed that the Society was concerned with administrators (in LEA offices) and not with schools". The outcome was that "the motion was PASSED by a large majority with one dissenting vote". The change that took place was that Management was inserted rather than Administration replaced, and the term 'Management' was introduced into title of the Journal.

In 2000 BEMAS became BELMAS and the insertion of the word leadership is located in a trend towards viewing the Society as a business that had to attract and retain members. In a Strategic Marketing paper (February 2000) it was argued that leadership was increasingly important and that "our title gives a dated image". Notably the field was shifting with chairs in educational leadership, and government interventions through investment in the design and delivery of training programmes within the National College for School Leadership, making a

clear statement about professional practice as leadership. Arguments for the inclusion of leadership within the title are noted in a range of papers from 2000, and in the consultation process it is clear that more people agreed with the change than raised concerns and/or were against. The general positive view stresses the relationship between the Society and up to date thinking about professional practice. Those who raised questions and/or opposed inclusion argued that leadership is a current fashion and so the Society needed to be wary of making such an important change and find itself quickly out of date. By June 2000 the National Council was told that “the email consultation shows general support for inclusion of leadership in the name and perhaps also in the title of the Society. At its meeting on 23rd May, the Executive recommended to Council that the name should be changed to include ‘leadership’ but at the moment to retain ‘British’”. At the AGM in September 2000 the insertion of leadership into the title to form BELMAS was agreed.

Part III: Summary

The formation and development of the Society is located in the drive to create a field of study and practice in the UK and within a wider modernising context in which the actuality of study and practice was increasingly controlled through education policy changes. While BEAS was formed within the wider context of an Anglo-Saxon educational administration field which rooted study and practice within and interplayed between professional cultures and social science conceptualisations and methodologies, the shifts within the Society regarding management and leadership were related to different traditions. Specifically, the wider political and cultural shifts known as modernisation regarded business approaches to organisational practices to be more relevant to public service delivery. Hence the field adopted management by objectives and strategic planning from the 1970s, and then adopted the business forms of transformational leadership from the 1980s. The Society sought to remain relevant to the field through the adoption of management and then leadership within its title, and so it can be seen to embrace, and is a site for, debates and interplay between different traditions within the intellectual origins and development of the field.

What BELMAS can learn from these debates and events is how field activity such as training, research and professional practice are politically, socially and economically located. BELMAS will continue to consider how its membership can be sustained and developed, and how members in different institutions relate and are inter-related. This is particularly the case in regard to how professional practice by professional researchers and researching professionals can be shared and developed. No doubt the name of the Society will be the subject of scrutiny and debate once again, and what this short review illustrates is that the agenda for this needs to embrace the historical location of such a decision. Much can be learned from the processes through which management and then leadership were included in the Society's title, and so the adoption of any new future descriptor label will need to recognise how the setting in which this takes place is both connected to the past but is also distinctive in relation to the moment in time when it takes place.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Tim Simkins and Richard Davis for commissioning this essay and for their help and useful edits. In addition I would like to acknowledge the people who supported my PhD through their involvement in the interviews, and Dr Lesley Anderson who gave me access to the archive. I would like to thank Professor Sir William Taylor for giving me permission to use quotations from the interview transcript.

References

- Baron, G. (1967) *Recent Developments in the Study of Educational Administration*. Report to UCEA, Atlantic City.
- Baron, G. (1968) An Overview, in: Allen, B. (ed.) (1968) *Headship in the 1970's* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Baron, G. (1969) The Study of Educational Administration in England, in Baron, G. and Taylor, W. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences* London: The Athlone Press.
- Baron, G. (1971) *Opening address to the Foundation Meeting of BEAS*. Unpublished.
- Baron, G. (1974) *Educational Administration: a question of identity and definition*. Unpublished paper.
- Baron, G. (1980) Research in Educational Administration in Britain, *Educational Administration* 8 (1), pp1-33.
- Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Baron, G. and Howell, D.A. (1974) *The Government and Management of Schools* London: The Athlone Press.
- Baron, G. and Taylor, W. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration and the Social Sciences* London: The Athlone Press.
- Barry, C.H. and Tye, E. (1975) *Running a School* London: Temple Smith.
- Bennett, S.J. (1974) *The School: An Organizational Analysis* Glasgow: Blackie.
- Bolam, R. (1981) Editorial, *Educational Administration* Vol.9 No.3 ppi-ii.
- Bone, T.R. (1992) Changing Circumstances in the United Kingdom, in Miklos, E. and Ratsoy, E. *Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change*. Alberta, Canada: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.
- Culbertson, J.A. (1969) A New Initiative in Educational Administration, in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Glatter, R. (1972) *Management Development for the Education Profession* London: Harrap.
- Gunter, H.M. (1999a) An intellectual history of the field of educational management from 1960. Unpublished PhD thesis, Keele University.
- Gunter, H.M. (1999b) *PhD Interview Archive*. Unpublished.

- Gunter, H.M. (2006) Knowledge production in the field of educational leadership: a place for intellectual histories. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. 38 (2), 201-215.
- Gunter, H.M. (2012a) *Leadership and the Reform of Education*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Gunter, H.M. (2012b) The Field of Educational Administration. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 60 (4), 337-356.
- Hughes, M. (1977) *Educational Administration as a field of research in the United Kingdom*. Unpublished paper.
- McHugh, R. (1979) Notes from Discussions in the Plenary Sessions *Educational Administration* Vol.7. pp43-47.
- Morgan, C. (1979) Management education - dissimilar or congruent? *Open University Course 321, Management in Education Unit 1*. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Morris. Lord Morris of Grasmere (1974) The administrator today *Educational Administration Bulletin* Vol.2 No.2 pp25-31.
- Peters, R.S. (ed.) (1976) *The Role of the Head* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Poster, C. (1976) *School Decision-Making: Education Management in Secondary Schools* London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Richardson, E. (1973) *The Teacher, the School and the Task of Management* London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Stenhouse, L. (1969) Trends and Issues in Education in the United Kingdom, in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Strain, M. (1999) Records of achievement: a critical and historical review. In: Strain, M., Dennison, B., Ouston, J. and Hall, V. (eds) *Policy, Leadership & Professional Knowledge in Education*. London: PCP.
- Strain, M., Dennison, B., Ouston, J. and Hall, V. (eds) (1999) *Policy, Leadership & Professional Knowledge in Education*. London: PCP.
- Taylor, W. (1968) Training the Head, in Allen, B. (ed.) (1968) *Headship in the 1970's* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Taylor, W. (1969) Simulation and the Comparative Study of Educational Administration, in Baron, G., Cooper, D.H. and Walker, W. G. (eds.) (1969) *Educational Administration: International Perspectives* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Taylor, W. (1971) *Research and teaching in educational administration in the United Kingdom*. Unpublished paper.
- Taylor, W. (1973) *Heading for Change* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Tomlinson, H., Gunter, H.M. and Smith, P. (eds.) (1999) *Living Headship: Voices, Values and Vision* Paul Chapman/Sage in association with the British Educational Management and Administration Society.