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INTRODUCTION

This book is a response to one of the most significant challenges to the development of effective teaching and learning: the reshaping of professionals to support knowledge economies while recognising increasing diversity and sustaining social solidarity. Across the globe, teachers and other public sector professionals are being asked to subject their work to public scrutiny through measures of performance, while simultaneously taking on more and more responsibility for maintaining social relations and developing responsible, participating citizens. Furthermore, teachers are encountering greater diversity among the school population, arising from changes in patterns of inner-city living, immigration and shifting employment opportunities and from policies of including children with special needs in mainstream schools. Increasingly teachers are being urged to work collaboratively with other professionals in order to pursue these goals, but there is little shared understanding across the academic and professional communities about how, for example, tensions between increased pressures for examination success and for social inclusion might be managed. Lipton (2003) observes how in the US these tensions have led to a crisis in urban education and an “economizing of education” (p. 179), in which policies “impose standardization and enforce language and cultural assimilation to mold the children of the increasingly linguistically and culturally diverse workforce into a most malleable and governable source of future labor” (p. 179). There is little evidence of “joined up working” (Milne, 2005, p. 2) across the key professions and their academic disciplines and some indication that teachers are reacting negatively to some aspects of diversity, for example special needs and ethnicity (Harvey-Kolpein, 2006; Netto et al, 2001).

This book is the product of an ESRC seminar series, Social Capital, Professionalism and Diversity (RES-451-25-4012). The seminar series took the concept of social capital as both a topic for examination and a resource for development in facing the issue of re-forming professionalism in the context of enhanced competition and individualisation (Gewirtz, 2000; Lindblad, Ozga & Zambeta, 2003). The book draws on work that brings together performance management and measurement with a recognition of social capital in order to support learner, professional and academic responses to diversity. It considers professionals’ encounters with diversity within schools in different contexts, including urban settings serving socially excluded children and their families (Maguire, Woolridge & Pratt-Adams, 2006). Social capital is used both as a means of understanding the complexity of these contexts and for exploring alternative forms of engagement. The purpose of the book is to enable the re-formation of professionalism through scrutiny of the operationalisation of social capital across the education and related professional landscape, with particular attention to its
impact in promoting social inclusion and recognising diversity. It also seeks to
generate new forms of professional practice which are inter-professional and are
part of collaborative cultures in diverse settings.

SOCIAL CAPITAL IN EDUCATION

The concept of social capital, “social networks, the reciprocities that arise from
them and the value of these for achieving mutual goals” (Schuller et al, 2000, p. 1),
has been identified as having significant potential for reducing disadvantage,
improving educational outcomes and enhancing health and wellbeing (Cohen et al,
1997; Uslaner and Dekker, 2001). In education, it could have a role in reducing
failure by forging a greater commitment to the other: “relationships matter” (Field,
2005, p. 2) and there is an obvious implication that better recognition of, and
responsiveness to, the other could lead to a more effective engagement with
diversity. There is a difficulty with operationalising social capital, however, and
even the concept itself has been considered under-theorised (Schuller, 2000).
Nevertheless, it is an attractive concept which offers a framework for thinking
about the various connections between people and the values – or ties – that bind
them. It is possible to distinguish different types of social capital, on an
incremental scale, towards the kind of social capital which could facilitate change.
Bonding social capital is evident in the connections between individuals with
similar characteristics and has value in the promotion of solidarity between people
sharing values. Bonding social capital may, for example, be seen within families,
school classes and ethnic groups. Bridging social capital occurs when people from
different groups come together and may emerge in associations between people of
different ethnicities, or between disabled and non-disabled groups. Linking social
capital, arguably the most profitable kind (Woolcock, 1998), is established when
individuals, who have different amounts of power, connect. This can be seen in, for
example, representations by disabled people to Parliament or student led initiatives
in schools.

The concept of social capital has been deployed by policy makers and
academics as a possible resource through which diversity may be recognised and
supported, while also enabling community and social solidarity (Lehning, 1998;
Grootaert, 2001). There has, however, been little attention to how it might be
operationalised within schools and classrooms and some frustration with its limited
analytical potential in educational contexts (Morrow, 1999; Levi, 1996; McGonigal
et al, 2007), although Schuller (2000) has suggested it is most useful as an heuristic
device, provoking questions and reflection rather than providing answers or
demonstrating impact.

Participants in the seminar series included eminent academics, leading professionals
from the public and the voluntary sector and children and young people. Some
were invited to consider the existing knowledge about social capital in education.
Others provided commentaries on teachers’ and other professionals’ responses to
diversity and a third group reported on social capital and diversity among children,
young people and families. The papers in the collection have been further
developed to incorporate the dialogue which they stimulated in the seminar series. A key feature of the dialogue was the recognition of the significance of context, or ‘field,’ which, as Bourdieu (1998) contends, “observes its own laws” (p. 39), and the specific elements of social capital arising from different patterns of urbanization, including the impact of technology on the networks of children and young people. The book is innovative in involving children and young people in generating outcomes for diversity for teachers and other professionals. Connections: A conference for children and young people elicited their experiences of learning and teaching and of teachers’ responses to diversity. It also explored how their own social capital and that of teachers and other professionals could be mobilised in positive ways to improve their experiences in and out of school.

### OUTLINE OF THE BOOK

The first part of the book is concerned with what is known about social capital and about its usefulness for education. Eva Gamarnakov and Anthony Green provide a cautionary note in their attempt to chart the policy vocabulary of education and social policy in England, into which social capital has been recruited. Privileging a concern with social justice and social differentiation, they argue that the appropriation of social capital into policy discourses has produced a number of paradoxes and that social capital is as at least as much part of the problem it has been recruited to address. They argue that whilst the appeal of social capital lies in its democratic potential, its operationalisation fails to materialise this potential and leaves little room for challenge or transformation.

John Field considers schools as organisations and the role that social capital has within them. He reviews the research on organisational issues in business and management and considers some of the key lessons from this work. He challenges us to think about the potential of schools to be reworked in ways that take account of both positive and negative social capital and, in this vein, the ‘toolkit’ he offers for measuring social capital in schools attempts to weave a path between the transparency required of performance management and trust, the oil which enables people to work together.

Ralph Catts considers the complex issue of measuring social capital within school contexts and, given the increasing importance accorded to social capital by educational policymakers, attempts to define how it might be quantified and rendered useful. He analyses existing research which has grappled with issues of measurement and draws on work within the Schools and Social Capital Network within the Applied Educational Research Scheme in Scotland. Ralph Catts, as the Senior Research Fellow within the Schools and Social Capital Network, argues that there is much work to be done before social capital can be operationalised as a quantitative variable, but that it is work which is of the utmost importance.

Colin Campbell reflects, from his position as a founder and Executive Director of Assist Social Capital, an organisation concerned with promoting social capital and applying it in practice, on the potential for developing social capital within
schools. He highlights some success stories that he has encountered so far and describes the Social Capital Profiling tool, developed within Social Capital Assist. This tool provides a means of benchmarking a community or organisation’s social capital, thus enabling it to plan strategically the means of enhancing it.

Chapters 5-9 consider responses to diversity by teachers and other professionals. Walter Humes, like Eva Gamarnikow and Anthony Green, strikes a cautionary note about the extensive use of social capital as both a measurement tool and a resource for its development. In his analysis of professionalism, he highlights tensions between the ethical element of social capital – the social – and the economic dimension of the capital, and between the altruism and self interest of professionals. These tensions, he argues, make any efforts to promote social capital in schools problematic and he argues that a more radical reform of schools, in response to wider social trends and expectations, is necessary.

Children’s participation workers are the focus of Kay Tisdall’s chapter and she considers the extent to which they represent a new profession, with novel forms of social capital because of their relative youthfulness and closeness, in age and status, to the children and young people they work with. Tisdall contrasts this group with the aspirations associated with the ‘activist profession’ to reflect on the extent of their agency and her analysis raises many questions about this emerging group and their identities, status and capacity to create change.

Joan Forbes reports on a major review of literature on social capital and professionalism, undertaken by participants within HEIs and educational organisations. The review had a particular emphasis on inter-professional practice, considering the ways in which social capital might be enhanced through collaborative working. Forbes argues for greater opportunities for building professionals’ knowledge of their own knowledge base, knowledge about professional practice and skills and knowledge about professional learning, and suggests that enhanced social capital may afford these opportunities.

Carl Bagley reports on the findings from research on Sure Start, a programme of partnership working with parents and families aimed at addressing social disadvantage, social exclusion and child poverty. He describes how working class parents came to access bridging and linking social capital through this initiative, gaining in self growth and self esteem. By gradually becoming part of the organisational context, Bagley argues, parents were better placed to challenge structures and barriers but their effectiveness in this regard remained at a local level and they still lacked little power to shape the wider policy context and this is an important consideration for future attempts at partnership working.

Dora Bjarnason, writing as both a professional and a parent of a child labelled with a severe disability, explores the nature of parent-professional partnerships and reports on ‘stories from the home.’ The significance of these stories for understanding partnerships and why they can be so problematic is underlined by Bjarnason. She argues that there is great potential for developing and strengthening social capital among parents and improving networks between parents and professionals.

Chapters 10-13 explore social capital and diversity among children, young people and families and offer some striking insights from children and young people. Irene
INTRODUCTION

Breugel considers children’s friendships and social cohesion in English schools and, in so doing, reveals considerable tensions within the UK Government’s policy aims, on the one hand, of pursuing diversity through school choice and, on the other hand, of maintaining a commitment to community cohesion and social capital. Her findings illustrate the extent to which the Government fails children – in the sense of heightening ethnic segregation – by its excessive reliance on highly managed social encounters and divisive forms of schooling.

Rose Malone reports on work conducted in schools in Ireland designated as ‘disadvantaged’ and highlights the potential of social capital as a resource within schools. The significance of relationships between teachers and students – more than just the teacher’s personality or teaching competence, but their capacity to connect at an emotional level and to communicate positive regard – is abundantly clear from the young people’s accounts.

The youngsters in Susie Weller’s chapter provide further important insights into friendship patterns during transition within community, faith and selective schools in England. The study reported provides strong evidence of children and young people engaging with diversity and actively producing bonding and bridging social capital through highly complex, multiple and dynamic identities and networks. This work, and that of Irene Breugel, redresses the significant neglect of friendship patterns and social relationships that there has been within both social capital theorising and educational policy and highlights the possibilities for schools to be more socially and relationally proactive in this regard.

Julie Allan and Geri Smyth report on a Connections conference with children and young people where they were invited to talk about diversity. The event made use of the children’s existing bonding social capital and attempted to build bridging and linking social capital. The insights from the children and young people, they argue, are an important resource for opening teachers to new connections with difference, discrimination and social capital. Like those in Susie Weller’s chapter, these children and young people relished the opportunity to engage with diversity and demonstrated their capacity to heighten their sensitivity to the language of difference.

In the final chapter we reflect on the contributions to this volume and consider the usefulness of social capital in education, the critical issues for professionals and the capacity for engagement with diversity. We offer some thoughts on the prospects and potential for reforming professionalism in ways which enable a more satisfactory – and satisfying – engagement with diversity.

This book will, we hope, appeal to teacher educators and policymakers with concerns about the challenges faced by teachers and other public sector professionals encountering an increasingly diverse population at the same time as they are experiencing increased accountability. The book is also likely to be of particular interest and use to student and beginning teachers in engaging with diversity in their own classroom as they develop their own professional identities and to practising teachers with an interest in pursuing new forms of professional renewal.
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This chapter emerges from our attempts to understand and chart the development of a policy vocabulary in relation to recent education and social policy in England, particularly the key elements which draw upon social capital theory (Gamarnikow and Green, Forthcoming). The background is our concerns with:

- social justice, namely inequity in the face of social tendencies to consolidate social inequalities: of power; wealth; status; recognition, etc.
- social differentiation as polarisation in complex, organic, modern/post/late-modern societies.

In social and educational analysis social capital vocabulary, as such, refers to something that is neither intrinsically good nor intrinsically bad; as a collection of analytical tools it is simply a way of conceptually and communicating about aspects of the social as, on the one hand, benign, and, on the other, as fraught with problems, and where problematic, to signify emergent resources to deal with them. Thus, social capital vocabulary is referring to ways of conceptualising such problems, and for policy frameworks, ways of identifying mechanisms for dealing with those very problems. This does not mean to indicate that social capital ideas are all of a piece, and differential social, moral and political complexions are indicated in the analysis to follow.

However, in the context of trying to address social justice issues through education policy, we argue that the social capital vocabulary and its invocation of helpful practices as professionalised mechanisms have the ideological and material effects of both obscuring and reinforcing patterns of inequality and social injustice. In addition, we suspect there is a good deal of nonsense talked about social capital and much of it enunciated through this vocabulary of social capital, or even the vocabulary of social capitalism. Of course, this may be where we part company with some of our friends when we wish to argue that both of the above outcomes are endemic to the institutional application of social capital concepts and forms of practices for treating social and educational problems unless socially and politically contextualised and constantly scrutinised for their democratic credentials and implications. What we are particularly focusing upon is linking social capital, as our title suggests, not least because it appears to be specifically taken up with enthusiasm in the AERS context of teacher professionalism and social capital (Ozga & Catts,
In effect, this chapter is a contribution to that dialogue. A key element of this analysis is to make sense of the new forms of social regulation embedded in New Labour education policy as articulated ideologically through a vocabulary of a social capital(ism), legitimating complex but opaque and stratified networks of power, partnerships and influences connected with and through professionalised and corporate institutional forms. This emerges from our opening with critical reflection on Blairite New Labour’s education policy and its promise to secure social justice through ‘education, education, education,’ in the process of establishing firmer and fairer democratic modes as well as human capital development for the post-modernising ‘knowledge society.’ This chapter was finalised following the Blair/Brown leadership shift, and does not take into account subsequent policy changes. Indeed, time will tell how the complexion of education policy is altered following this change of leadership.

Part of our case is that the concepts of social capital theory tend to be used loosely and rhetorically in Third Way policy discourse. We are using the term ‘Third Way’ loosely, referring to post communist/socialist radical social progressivisms in general (see Giddens, 2001); Blairism is one instantiation of this political phenomenon. In essence, from the perspective of social analysis, social capital is about the emergent value and power of participation in social networks. As a policy idea its attractiveness lies in its appeal to common-sense about the good society of responsible and decent individuals, families and communities, of social cohesion and security, and of the democratic engagement of the citizenry in the communities of civil society and in local and national polities (Commission on Integration and Cohesion, 2007). A closer look at social capital theories indicates different formulations which, when taken up in policy contexts with particular emphases, give rise to the possibility of significant policy tensions and paradoxes. It is essential to explore these in order to develop an understanding of conflicts and dilemmas (for us) at the heart of Third Way policy and to make sense of changing conceptualisations of social capital ideas as articulating forms of social regulation through education policy. Essentially, we are arguing that, so far as deployment of social capital ideas is concerned, education policy is caught in an over-riding tension between idealised bottom-up, participatory forms, where the emphasis is on democratic networking for individual and collective benefit, and actual material forms, which entail top-down, authoritarian and including communitarian modes of management of social problems. These are manifested in relation to problems which are conceptualised as expressions of poor social cohesion arising from social capital deficits. In this context the generation of teachers’ professional social capital may not be unproblematically benign.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND NEW LABOUR SOCIAL POLICY

There is a congruence between social capital theories and policy discourses of the late modern state which attempts to balance the conflicting imperatives of global “turbo-capitalism” (Giddens and Hutton, 2000, pp. 8–9; Luttwack, 1998) with a concern for democracy and social justice (Gamarnikow and Green, 1999a; 1999b).
Social capital promises a great deal which is most attractive to progressive leaning government, thus, as Hargreaves puts it with respect to social cohesion:

Treat social capital as close to civic virtue, both as a private good that helps individuals to succeed in life and a public good that builds communities. Social capital serves as a bridge, the ‘connections’ or networks that help folk get ahead; it serves as a bond that attaches people to groups. If groups are strong in social capital, they resolve collective problems more easily, the wheels of communal life turn more smoothly, and people become more tolerant and empathic in their social relationships (Hargreaves, 2001, p. 498).

And for Fukuyama, social capital identifies social virtues as the focal site of policy attention:

Social capital is a capability that arises from the prevalence of trust in a society or in certain parts of it. It can be embodied in the smallest and most basic social group, the family, as well as the largest of all groups, the nation, and in all the other groups in between. Social capital differs from other forms of human capital in so far as it is usually created and transmitted through cultural mechanisms like religion, tradition or historical habit … Acquisition of social capital requires habituation to the moral norms of a community and, in its context, the acquisition of virtues like loyalty, honesty and dependability … Social capital cannot be acquired simply by individuals acting on their own. It is based upon the prevalence of social, rather than individual virtues (Fukuyama, 1995, pp. 26–27).

These ideas of social capital have become prominent in policy discourses in post-socialist, post-welfarist, late modern societies (Giddens, 1998; 2000; 2001; Giddens and Hutton, 2000), with powerful supports at several levels of power and influence, including being promoted by organic state intellectuals (eg, Halpern, 2005; Woolcock & Narayan, 2000; Mulgan, 2000), disseminated to politicians by organic global intellectuals in high-level seminars, such as Putnam and the Saguaro Seminars at Harvard, or his seminar held in 2001 in Downing Street (Butler, 2001), Woolcock’s (2002) contribution to the Cabinet Office’s Performance and Innovation Unit seminar on social capital (UK Cabinet Office, 2002a) and embedded in knowledge production for the state such the Office of National Statistics (ONS, 2001) and government policy formulation processes (UK Cabinet Office, 2002b; Aldridge, Halpern & Fitzpatrick, 2002), as well as externally validated by powerful transnational agencies of policy formulation and evaluation such as the World Bank and the OECD (Healy & Côté, 2001).

So social capital appears to be pretty good stuff, has considerable intellectual support and seems to be really effective for connections and trust as well as, possibly, being vital for democratic social and political aspirations. Social capital has friends in high places, too. In this context, social and educational policy has drawn heavily on the vocabulary associated with social capital theory to develop ideas about progressive practices in the context of democratisation. However, it is complex stuff, too. In Fukuyama’s terms (above), social capital is cultural and
historical in form, and its prevalence for social capability has something to do with trust. Our argument, however, is that there are problems which we see as key paradoxes which become apparent in contemporary social capital policy making. We have explored these and the ways they map onto New Labour’s education policy.

These paradoxes are, firstly, related to the asocial abstraction of society which lies at the base of so much of social capital thinking. What makes social capital theory attractive as a policy technology is its focus on the social as the source of both problem and solution. However, the social capital aspects of the social, especially networks, are constructed as essentially equally effective for all and productive of positive social outcomes, rather than as embedded in, and constitutive of, unequal social structures. Thus the social of social capital theory is invoked as a beneficent ‘inequality-free’ zone. Secondly, social capital inspired policy draws on theoretical formulations derived from assumptions concerning abundance of social capital which is correlated with a wide range of socially beneficial outcomes, not least educational achievement. However, social policy interventions take place because there is deemed to be a deficit of social capital. These are precisely the contexts where the mechanisms of social capital, as bottom-up, participatory networks of influence, are rendered absent in the policy vision. These contexts of social capital deficit are also the sites where we can see the constitution and realisation of significant aspects of social policy as such. And because social policy is aimed at contexts of social capital deficit, it is here, we would argue, that there is a tendency to undermine the fundamental precepts of progressive and democratic social capital forms by reconfiguring and re-inserting them as top-down mechanisms.

This leads to the third paradox in social capital policy formulation and, indeed, enactment. The emphasis in social capital thinking is on benefits of horizontal associations and networks, on relationships between social equals. However, social contexts of disadvantage, which are identified as deficient in social capital, and where social capital building becomes a managed, top-down process, rely, by contrast, on associations and networks which are vertical in form. It is here that the fourth paradox emerges, namely a realisation of democratic deficit, deeply embedded in the apparent democratic promise of social capitalism. We proceed to suggest below that this articulates with post-democratic social and cultural political arrangements and elaborate on each of these paradoxes.


The theory and conceptualisation of social capital, as it is currently being deployed, is most commonly associated with Coleman’s (1990; 1997) sociology of education, Putnam et al’s (1993) work on Italian politics, and Putnam’s (2000) research on the decline of American associational life. In spite of their different emphases, what these perspectives share is the causal links they postulate between successful social outcomes in education, employment, family relationships, health and so on and the presence of social capital. In these respects social capital theory is fundamentally
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cconcerned with two aspects of the social. Firstly, there are benefits accruing to individuals from being located in social networks. In this context, social capital theory views social structures and social relations as tactical and strategic resources at the personal level. Secondly, collective benefits also derive as significant emergents from such social networks.

However, there are many ambiguities in mainstream social capital theory and complexity and tensions in its institutional application in policy frameworks. Firstly, there are difficulties with the ways in which the idea and the significance of trust and of networks are abstracted from both social context and social structure, including economic inequalities. Benefits appear to accrue unproblematically to individuals, families, communities or nations by deploying social capital. Thus, while social capital theory appears to abstract and prioritise the social as the foundation of a well-functioning society, often it thereby abstracts and builds upon an assumed pre-social, de-contextualised sphere of equality of efficacy and effectiveness of trust and participation in networks, as such. The rhetorical significance of this assumed equivalence of networks is that it magically underpins and realises the political delusion that social capital must constitute a public good from which everyone in the society is a beneficiary.

Thus, social capital theory constructs networks as unproblematic forms of inclusion and fails, in the main, to recognise their potentially and, we would argue, usually, exclusionary and hierarchically socially reproductive aspects in competitive and even more so in polarised conflict situations. It is vital to keep in mind the long history of social analysis of boundary maintenance/exclusionary practices as deliberate strategies for competing for and/or controlling social, cultural and material assets. In this regard, by contrast with mainstream social capital perspectives, Bourdieu’s (1997) approach connects the social capital of networks as a vital mechanism by and through which other unequally distributed capitals, cultural, symbolic and, of course, economic capital are articulated. Here the social capital of networks plays its part in the complex constitution of institutionalising social inequalities, particularly so in relation to competitive struggles for positional goods and even deeper tensions.

Paradox 2: Social Capital Abundance and Deficit: A Reworking of Social Inequality?

Above, we have argued that, as policy technology, mainstream social capital theory fails to address the origins and reproduction of social inequalities. In this respect it is abstracted theory. However, these enter the discourse and come to be seen as symptoms of social capital deficits, constructed in juxtaposition to social capital abundance. While policy appears to operate within this simplistic ‘presence/absence’ dichotomous model, where the problems of social inequality become transmuted into social capital deficit, a closer examination of tensions within social capital formulations reveals ambiguities at work in mainstream social capital theory as it oscillates between end points on a continuum of approaches.
Modelling this in a little more detail (Figure 1), we find rather divergent theoretical approaches to abundance and deficit of social capital. At one end of the continuum, where social capital is abundant, social capital theory embraces progressive, liberal and civic notions of co-operation, empowerment, participation, community action and democratisation in the construction of needs and priorities. Here there is space for an active, confident and empowered citizenry, and thus civic engagement and political participation thrive. At the other extreme social capital may be realised in a normative order of tightly bounded traditional, communitarian institutional forms, for instance, favouring two-parent nuclear families; locating the ‘parenting deficit’ in women’s increased labour market activity and linking this to educational failure; and arguing for a collective non-relativist moral regime of duties and responsibilities to which all are expected to conform, particularly those least well placed in the system. This may be reinforced by much hardened sanctions, for ‘tough love,’ ‘tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime,’ ‘three strikes and you’re out,’ ‘naming and shaming’ and ‘workfare not welfare’ to put metal into the normative ordering of these social capital processes. At this end of the continuum, traditional hierarchical forms of political, economic and cultural power relations, although invisible in these accounts, constitute essential background supports for social capital formation, rendering modes of citizenship ambiguous in relation to responsible and ‘decent’ subjecthood, and thus potentially undermining the project of developing critical civic engagement and revitalising civil society.

Thus, by treating social capital, abstractly and ahistorically, as a fundamentally uniform resource, untainted by social inequalities, abundance or deficit of social capital is constituted as a trigger for a set of differentiated regulative policy mechanisms. Where social capital is low or absent, networks are viewed through a communitarian lens, where social capital is to be generated through subordination to community norms and values of trust, and, importantly, sanctions. Where social capital is abundantly present, networks are viewed through the prism of civic engagement and community involvement, constituting a communitarian perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressive Collectivist</th>
<th>Communitarian consensualist/populist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative consensus around a social and moral regime of responsibilities and effective sanctions</td>
<td>Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent families investing in children’s social and human capital</td>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive communities as social control/sanctions</td>
<td>Transformative democratisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= the passive, dutiful, responsible citizen</td>
<td>= the “empowered citizen” = democratic/participatory citizenship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Continuum of approaches to abundance and deficit of social capital
engagement and participatory democracy, where the inflexibility of community values may be, and frequently is, challenged. So, as a body of ideas about social relations and social structures, social capital theory embodies tensions and ambiguities between the (potentially) authoritarian uniformity of communitarian universality, on one side, and deliberative forms of democratic working, on the other, with procedural mechanisms, for constantly re-designing regulative institutions through and for participation/inclusion (Young, 2000).

**Paradox 3: Horizontal or Vertical Networks? Social Capital and Social Policy**

In order to develop the argument further, we must first return briefly to social capital theory to clarify the range of emergent networks which are regarded as emblematic forms of social capital. The first two sets of network forms, *bonding* and *bridging* social capital (Putnam, 2000), are probably most familiar. They refer respectively to tight exclusive social groups, such as families or identity communities, and to looser social networks which are inclusive of diversity. This distinction between bonding and bridging networks has a long and venerable place in the sociological tradition, such as Durkheim’s mechanical and organic solidarity, or more recently, Granovetter’s (1973) strong and weak ties. The third type of social capital form, *linking* social capital, is perhaps less well-known. Linking networks have their origins in Woolcock’s (1998; 2002) attempts to bring together two (we would argue, contradictory) perspectives, namely, development theory which argued for participatory bottom-up approaches and top-down accountability approaches linked to making development aid effective. Linking social capital emerges in the processes of professionals’ work with the relatively disadvantaged by *helping them up* stratified networked social and economic ladders (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000; Woolcock, 2002). The significance of the concept of linking social capital is that it displaces the democratic, more egalitarian, promise of social capital, and constitutes professionality and, thus, apparently expertise-based hierarchy, as vital reservoirs of social capital.

This theoretical shift, and ensuing ambiguities around bottom-up/top-down approaches to generating social capital, has significant implications for social policy. The ambiguous outcomes of the re-workings of social inequalities as the tensions of social capital absence/presence do sterling work as rhetorical resources in the politics of social capitalism. Here social capital policy is formulated as concerned to realise horizontal, democratic, and inclusive relations where it explicitly or implicitly invokes *bonding* and *bridging*. However, in reality, such policy tends to operate vertically, non-democratically, especially through the forms of professionalist *linking* social capital, as will be discussed later in the context of English education policy.

Looking at this in more detail, from the perspective of critical policy analysis, social capital theory draws attention to the social as both a *topic for* policy concern and development and a *resource deployable in* policy implementation strategies. A key problem which arises for policy developments for deploying social capital to address/redress unequal outcomes is that levels of social capital are taken to be
high in cohesive, inclusive, well-functioning societies, and low, negative or absent in disadvantaged groups or communities, as we have previously argued. Social capital policy discourse thus constructs poverty and social exclusion as exemplifications of not just material, but also social capital deficits. If social capital is lacking within the community, and if social policy promotes social capital solutions to social problems, then the issue becomes one of addressing this deficit and building or even generating new social capital.

Here research evidence about the relationship between social inequality and social capital seems to suggest that societies which have relatively lower levels of income inequality are those which have relatively higher levels of social capital (Bowles & Gintis, 2002; Green & Preston, 2001; Green, Preston & Janmaat, 2006; Wilkinson, 1996; Uslaner, 2003). This key finding would suggest that government policies which are successful in bringing about greater distributive social justice are thereby more likely to generate higher levels of social capital. Conversely, societies which have high levels of economic inequality also have an unequal distribution of ‘effective’ social capital, with higher levels of generalised trust and civic engagement among the ‘winners,’ and significantly lower levels of trust and participation among the disadvantaged (Li, Savage & Pickles, 2003). The vital problem for social policy formulation and presentation remains (i) the direction of causality in these processes, for (ii) addressing social and political dynamics of equity for losers’ opportunity structures. The issues are: Do government policies which produce greater social justice generate social capital? Or do government policies which promote social capital building generate social justice? And, in what respects are these connected with democratic political forms for ‘progressive’ or regressive effects?

Additionally, while the aim of social capital policy making becomes state intervention to build social capital through hierarchical linking networks, research evidence suggests that generating social capital is itself problematic (Hooghe & Stolle, 2003). Studies tend to focus on either cross-sectional measurement of existing social capital, whether in terms of membership of civil society organisations or, in relation to values and attitudes, most notably trust (see, for instance, the research priorities of the Office of National Statistics (Harper, 2002). There has been less concern for exploring how membership of autonomous civil society organisations, or civic engagement, generates social capital, or how social policy can generate the community norms of trust and generalised reciprocity, with positive institutional effects in schools, hospitals, housing and so on (Coare & Johnston, 2003; Seddon, Billet, & Clemans, 2005; Silverman, Lupton & Fenton, 2005). Partly, no doubt, this reflects the complexity of the issues involved and theoretical modelling by synthesisers such as Woolcock (1998) seems, inadvertently perhaps, to suggest intractability of this problem.

The mainstream of social capital theory, as deployed in policy formulation (Halpern, 2005; Healy and Côté, 2001) would suggest that social capital building can be viewed either as society-centred, spontaneously arising from social interactions in civil society, bonding and bridging social capital, or as more formalised institution-centred, arising from government policies and related institutional
frameworks and relationships which embed linking social capital in their operations (Hooghe and Stolle, 2003). Drawing on the work of Leonardi (1995), we have followed a similar argument (Gamarnikow and Green, 1999b), adapting it to suggest that the form of social capital policy-making embodies policy calculations regarding the availability and circuitry of social capital. Where social capital is abundant, policy makers confidently draw on the generalised trust and reciprocity of citizens to engage collectively with institutions to ensure reinforcement of favourable outcomes, which in turn multiplies social capital (see Figure 2, Model 1, below). This echoes Putnam’s model of the role and benefits of horizontal bridging networks in underpinning and improving collective outcomes.

![Figure 2. Model 1: Circuits of social capital: Individual integrity for collective goods](image)

(Adapted from Leonardi, 1995, p. 171)

However, a difficulty which arises here, as we have hinted at above, with respect to our key foci, equity, democracy and participation, in the context of addressing the social construction of social justice issues in education, is that this society-centred perspective assumes the theoretically derived claim that the social injustice of social inequality is itself indicative of social capital deficits. We argue that this stimulates a policy model based primarily on the efficacy of institutional professionalism (Figure 3, Model 2, below) in which social capital becomes the problem and thus the topic to be addressed, while nevertheless paradoxically assuming social capital to be a generalisable resource for policy design and implementation and progressive transformation.
In the context of low stocks of social capital, as might, for instance, be evidenced by the experiences of the educationally disadvantaged, the focus of policy shifts to developing institutions to produce positive outcomes in order to generate social capital, generally worked upon in the form of building social trust. Thus where bonding and bridging social capital is perceived as absent or deficient, the sites par excellence of social policy intervention, linking social capital becomes the modus operandi of progressive social policy.

Thus the main tendencies of social capital policy formulation and implementation create a paradox. Communities with high levels of bonding and bridging social capital (the relatively well off) generate even higher levels through networks which produce democratic, bottom-up approaches to policy making (Figure 2, Model 1). By contrast, disadvantaged communities (the relatively less well off), apparently deficient in social capital resources, become the objects of hierarchical, top-down institutional action for improvement, namely the deployment of linking social capital (Figure 3, Model 2). In the latter context, it is the social capital of joined-up, federated, extended, professionalist networks, and not the social capital of the disadvantaged citizens themselves, which generates and improves institutional provision for disadvantaged, relatively excluded participants. Thus social policy, which builds on the presence/absence dilemma outlined above, develops differential social capital strategies for advantaged and disadvantaged communities, thereby reconceptualising social inequalities as competence/incompetence in the use or

Figure 3. Model 2: Circuit of social capital: Professionalist institutional action for collective goods
consumption of current institutional provision. Here advantaged communities appear to be constituted as competent social capitalists, with the capacity for self-determination in the sites of social welfare as consumption. Meanwhile, disadvantaged communities are welfare clients of professionalised opportunity providers. Such providers are embedded in and reproduce the hierarchical relations of linking social capital (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000; Woolcock, 2002) as they fulfil their social differentiating function of providing a helping hand up from their position of being above in the hierarchy. The non-democratic and inegalitarian nature of these ‘linking’ forms are, as we argue below, overlooked and/or assumed as the benign provision of ‘opportunity’ for the disadvantaged.

Paradox 4: Social Capital and the Democratic Deficit: Professionals and Clients

We have argued thus far that social capital policy formulation and rhetorics deploy and embed a number of different discursive logics: abstraction of social networks from social structure; location of positive social outcomes in a causal trajectory which views these as emerging out of social capital deployment; and legitimation of the social capital policy ensemble by invoking bottom-up, democratic participation in institutions. We will now turn to tracing, in general terms, how these logics are played out in relation to the democratic promise of social capital.

In the first instance, the rhetorical focus is on social cohesion and equality of opportunity, particularly for the disadvantaged and excluded, rather than equality of outcome or redistribution, as such. Primary attention is paid to social capital deficit, and policy initiatives regard social capital as essential for enhancement of democratic participation by citizens, as part of the wider inclusion agenda. The reality of deficit, however, shifts the impact of the main thrust of policy formulation from bonding (local level trust) and bridging (connecting between different groups of trusted locals) to linking social capital. The latter constitutes hierarchical trust in opportunities for sponsorship up vertical networks, thus reflecting and implicitly reinforcing the inevitability of a hierarchical ‘order’ of deficit, winners and losers, with the latter needing to be provided with a hand up to bring them into viable positions in the game. Thus, there is a tension and ambiguity for linking social capital as professional work on/with ‘losers.’ This tension is between: (i) instilling/inserting (making new social capital) or (ii) repairing ‘bad’ social capital, including repairing individual self image as ongoing ambiguities of professionalised work. Both aspects constitute potential capitalisable resources for the professionalised upsiders in the knowledge economy and opportunity structures for social sponsorship of downsiders. However, in the context of trying to address social justice issues, this framework of the social capital vocabulary-in-use and its invocation of helpful practices as professionalised mechanisms may well have the ideological effect of both obscuring and reinforcing patterns of inequality and social injustice. Indeed, this obscuring articulates with the obfuscation of structural inequalities more generally by the application of the social capital vocabulary invocation of beneficence.
Thus, we argue that so much of social capital inspired policy operates for education with the assumption that the positive elements of social capital can be harnessed to improve the outcomes of individuals’ schooling. In these policy contexts, social capital is said to provide potential benefits to membership in networks and to be characterised by relations of interpersonal and institutional trust. Furthermore, within educational contexts social capital draws on the vocabulary of democracy, where schools operate as and within communities, and where social capital takes the form of the community expressing educational needs, and working with formal institutions to realise upward spirals of educational benefits (Figure 2, Model 1, above).

However, if family/community or intra-institutional (eg school) bonding and bridging social capital are in deficit and/or bad, in contexts of social problems, then social capital building has to rely on linking social capital. This is where professionalism and linking social capital come into their own, namely through the professionalised work of identification of the good bonding and bridging forms of local networking to work against the bad. Social capital formulated policy thus charges professionals with social capital generation, as identified in Figure 3, Model 2, above, by drawing on their own expertise and professional social capital networks in order to help up those in social capital deficit, and supporting those self-excluded by bad social capital. Teachers and educational professionals are not only, therefore, in loco parentis but also, perhaps paradoxically, in loco cives. In other words, clients who are deficient in social capital are constituted as non-citizen ‘subjects’ in the context of the social capital continuum (Figure 1). Thus, the paradox of linking social capital and its articulation with the democratic deficit in policy making and implementation throws into relief the discursive social disenfranchisement of members of disadvantaged communities. The policy logic may well be that they are deemed to be deficient in social capital and that, therefore, their citizenship has to be performed by proxy.

Once we shift into the realm of professionalist social capital networks, we enter the highly ambiguous arenas of social control and management, ie, power/knowledge and governmentality of social problems through discourses and discursive practices of professionalism, and start to displace the apparently democratic and participatory social capital frameworks with professionalised, hierarchical networks for improvement. This anti-democratic moment in the context of education enables professionalised power/knowledge and governmentality to constitute what counts as education, educational achievement etc. What is made invisible in this manoeuvre is the location of education as a state-regulated field which is constructed and run by licensed professionals, with very little genuine space for alternative configurations. Furthermore, another form of ‘socially abstracted’ misrecognition occurs through silence about the educational field as also constructed by hierarchies of knowledge, achievement, institutions, professionals, etc. Identifying education as a universal public good (of course, nobody is opposed to education), equally available to all via linking social capital ignores the role of education as a social machine for credentialing, for differentiation, and for normalisation, not least in these very processes of linking.
It is this complex educational field, rather than that of democratically produced service improvement of Figure 2, Model 1, that constitutes contexts of networking and social capital opportunities and challenges, especially around legitimacy and equity. What this means is that the social capital of professionals, located in Figure 3, Model 2 service provision, is essentially problematic in terms of democracy. The linking social capital of apparently benign trust and networks arising from the bonding and bridging horizontal associations of teachers (teachers’ professional social capital) working with and in the best interests of students, their families and communities construct an idealised model and definition of what key ingredients of education are. Moreover, while professional linking social capital assumes hierarchy in the professional/client relationship, this is exacerbated when clients are deemed to be deficient in bonding and bridging social capital and thereby demonstrating their need for the linking form of social capital teachers are thought to have, and/or need. The latter is well exemplified by innumerable reports by former pupils of teachers who ‘make a difference’ to their life-chances, as indeed they no doubt do.

In contexts of social and cultural diversity, this becomes even more challenging in social justice terms. When there is an assumed background unitary model of education and educational excellence, client diversity is constructed as problematic, particularly where that diversity operates in relation to what education creates: namely underachievement, resistance to schooling itself, etc. Here, in the operation of linking social capital, professionals possess their own social capital as a resource used to sustain their professional power over clients; this is in the nature of linking, where the relatively powerful assist the less powerful and do so by disrupting, and/or working on problematic (non-) social capital of the needy and underachieving, disaffected, feckless, etc, all done with the best will in the world, of course.

Adding to the paradox of the democratic deficit of linking social capital, as represented by the unequal power relations of professional/client relationships in education, is a further dimension of complexity, namely inter-professional inequalities. The asocial abstractionism of social capital thinking, discussed earlier as the first paradox of social capital policy, implies equality among the professional ‘linkers,’ intra-professional equality. The notion of linking constructs inequality in the verticality of linking. However, the institutional configuration of the sites of linking, schools, is itself stratified, as are professional relations in school. Linking social capital is thus embedded in, and deployed through, unequal inter-professional relations. Therefore the professional practices which construct the field of education are at the same time practices of both inter-institutional and inter-professional hierarchy-making: of production and reproduction of educational inequalities of outcomes and institutions.

Marketised, reproductive education, therefore, adds to this immanent hierarchisation through competition between institutions. It is here that inter-professional power relations emerge and potentially undermine various forms of trust. In other words, in contrast to the discursively produced professional egalitarianism of socially capitalised ‘linkers,’ the professionals are themselves hierarchically positioned in
relation to each other. This throws in to question the possibility of genuinely egalitarian networks and trust so essential for making the educational field a site of greater social equality/equity. In this context the term of choice in the education policy vocabulary is *partnership* between professionals, schools in federations and networks. However, in the English context, hierarchies between schools, league tables of student achievement and the like become celebrated as products of fair competition, while almost certainly becoming entrenched and consolidated as hierarchies between different groups of professionals and schools. Here inter-professional partnerships as *linking* social capital (providing a helping hand up for failing schools) are about implementing reproductive, unequal education. However, the expressed ideology is not about reproduction, but is about educational logics, and rhetorics such as *hard work, merit, achievement, standards not structures, excellence for all, equity*, and so on, to explain or rationalise success/failure and differentiation. Naturally, that is to say ideologically, all of this resonates with intra-professional socially capitalised practices of what constitutes education whilst networking to professional advantages.

The professional work of linking is thus multiply constituted through that aspect of the democratic deficit embedded in linking social capital. In educational contexts, there are hierarchies between professionals and clients and hierarchies between professionals and schools. The linking social capital of Figure 3, Model 2 obfuscates the possible inequalities of professionality.

**ENTRENCHING THE DEMOCRATIC DEFICIT: EDUCATION AND POST-DEMOCRACY**

In this section we briefly explore some of these paradoxes in English Third Way education policy. Here there are further ambiguities and tensions for democracy. Indeed, taken together, what these policies appear to signify are some features of the role being played by education in the broader field of emergent forms of post-democracy. It may seem paradoxical to speak about post-democracy in the context of the vocabulary of social capitalism, especially as the current origins of social capital conceptualisation lie in the field of (republican) democratic perspectives of political science (Putnam, 2000; Arniel, 2006). Nonetheless, education policy making under New Labour, which advocates social capital building as a resource for educational achievement, appears to be moving away from traditional/classical, forms of representative local democracy, constituted by elected local government control of education through LEAs, via a flirtation with deliberative direct, stakeholder democracy in the EAZs, towards new forms of governance constituted by non-elected, *ad hoc*, function-specific networks, spanning the public/private divide. Indeed, in this context social capital policy making and implementation for professionalist *linking* social capital appear to be undermining or hollowing out the social democratic post World War II settlement aspect of power in educational institutions and governance, to the extent that local representative democracy played a part in these.
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This post-democratic political hollowing out is, according to Crouch (2004), the result of post-industrialism and resulting fragmentation and dispersal of class identity as a source of party allegiance and voting behaviour. These changes in social class formation and representation constitute vital ingredients of the current international political and economic regulation of post-socialist globalisation of ‘markets and democracy.’ The emptying of democratic forms thus provides the discursive space for the articulation of the power and influence of corporate capital as pressure groups for policy strategies and options and as a variety of elements and representations of successful techniques and strategies for getting things done: management and/through flexible professionalist networks. It is these networks which, quite literally, bypass democratic institutions, making them increasingly less significant in the public arena of service provision.

Relying on highly capitalised networks fundamentally alters the social democratic compromise, so well-articulated by Marshall (1950) as consisting of capitalism-democracy-welfare, with social citizenship finessing key political tensions between equalities of citizenship and inequalities of markets. The post-democratic, post-welfare enabling state prioritises employment-orientated education in the context of the TINA (‘There Is No Alternative’) of globalisation. It also represents a shift from the old style universalism and bureaucracy of democratic forms to targeted particularisms of specific deficits, such as educational disadvantage, to be remedied in the context of diversity. Thus post-democratic institutional forms and governance of welfare provision and organisation coalesce around a reconfiguration of welfare for post-democratic governance mechanisms. Here, we see the reconfiguration of social capital from democratic bottom-up to top-down policy practices, via bonding/bridging networks of post-democratic elites/cliques, and to the salience of linking social capital in educational institutions and its encouragement and growth in the relations between schools.

Thus, we are arguing that there is growing material and symbolic power and influence of capital as pressure groups for ‘liberal’ social policy options (pro-capital, ie equalising opportunity rather than equality). The policy technologies arising from these are mimicking forms of governance and control of the private sector, ie modernisation through commercialisation and concomitant reduction of participative/deliberative democratic forms. Reconfiguration of welfare occurs around post-democratic forms of governance – networks of multi-disciplinary professionals fashioning and controlling welfare institutions outside traditional democratic institutions of decision-making and accountability, and all connected to/through the private and voluntary sectors, thus further shifting from traditional social democracy. This means more displacement of localist forms of self and occupational identities to self-capitalisation as flexible self, human capital development in the personalisation agenda for the ‘knowledge economy.’

We have tried to illustrate this post-democratic shift in English education policy in its current welfare moment in Table 1.
Table 1. Social capital and education policy: post-democracy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social capital</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAZs</strong></td>
<td>Stakeholder deliberative democracy: EAZ Forum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding and bridging networks of network-rich</td>
<td>local NGOs, business, local government, parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linking social capital for schooling disadvantaged</td>
<td>representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialisation/beaconisation</strong></td>
<td>Traditional forms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalist bridging: horizontal networks</td>
<td>LEA oversight of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between specialisms vertical linking networks</td>
<td>development &amp; improvement parent representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of improvement: beacons and ‘failing’ schools</td>
<td>on governing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academies and Trusts</strong></td>
<td>Post-democracy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded networks of non-education elites responsible</td>
<td>‘cliques of courtiers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for rolling out new systems of governance ‘synergy’</td>
<td>hollowed out LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of bridging social networks for linking with</td>
<td>‘champions’ of parental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disadvantaged clients</td>
<td>choice parents lose legal rights of representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on school governing bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in education post-democratic forms for producing universal services/entitlements are articulated through social capital policy vocabulary. This is an expression in education of what Castells (2000) calls ‘Network Society,’ where, rather than things being worked out through deliberative democracy, they work through networks of the well-connected, and what Crouch (2007, p. 49) refers to, for the higher echelons, as “cliques of courtiers.” The knowledge and information which flow through these networks express their power and control. Apart from increasingly ‘light touch’ regulation of successful schools by quasi-autonomous governmental regulatory organisations, eg Ofsted (DfES, 2005; Harris & Ranson, 2005; Lepkowska, 2008; Curtis, 2008), education is now no longer amenable to representative democratic regulation. We are not suggesting a golden age of democratic education; this never existed. The short moment of the appearance of perhaps even direct forms of deliberative democracy (EAZ Forum) was quickly overtaken and has been replaced by the social capital networks of corporate power as the emerging new post-democratic governance of education. Finally, this movement also represents a re-embedding of professionalist (both public and private) power, namely, that of ‘experts’ as the reconsolidation of the class power of the network-rich, the time-rich, the expertise-rich, especially in the most recent manifestations of the polices for academies/trusts.

The above analysis traces New Labour’s shifting modes of educational democracy from a state sponsored communitarian/deliberative form (the EAZ ideal) (Gamarnikow & Green, 1999a, 1999b), via the beaconisation/specialist mode (re-emphasised professionalisation) (DfEE, 2001; DfES, 2001; 2002; 2003; 2005;
Gamarnikow & Green, 2003), to state sponsored civic and social/educational corporate capitalism (Ball, 2007; Beckett, 2007; Hill, 2006; Green, 2005). In social capital terms, it moves from bonding and bridging social capital modes in the EAZ ideal, through reprofessionalisation for linking, articulated in part by the agenda for personalisation and self capitalisation for the knowledge economy; to linking/sponsorship modes of socialisation for corporate power, with Academies/trusts articulating new institutional mechanisms for human capital production for the corporate capitalist knowledge economy. It seems very unlikely that this educational social capitalism, operationalised rhetorically in the ‘redemptive’ linking social capital of networked professionals, will be able to deliver its original progressive promise of social justice and equity. Indeed, the trajectory we have traced signals the withering of the democratic (collectivist) promise, which has been replaced by post-democratic forms of socially capitalised educational provision, namely, education within a TINA (“There Is No Alternative”) welfare framework, of linking social capital, and institutions/forms of governance as bonding/bridging social capital in networks of “cliques of courtiers.” Thus, what is withering is democracy as the mechanism for regulating educational aspects of capitalism in the interests of social citizenship/social justice as equalisation (Smithers, 2007). Indeed, the moves in this direction are ceding more and more power to capital: commercialisation (multiple and diverse capital/welfare links) and insertion of business habitus/capitalist labour process into welfare institutions. It is interesting that Marshall’s capitalism-democracy-welfare compromise for the social justice of social citizenship appears to be giving way to a new capitalism-welfare compromise finessed by social capital rhetorics for policy changes.

CONCLUSION
There are broader issues for the heuristics of social capital analysis. Have we already been here for a very long time, and is there anything significant being added to our understanding of the nature and forms of social and educational problems by analysis which is paying specific attention to deployment of the social capital vocabulary in policy formulation and practice? Social capital ideas may, of course, be a valuable resource for social capitalisation for professional intellectuals concerned with viewing social problems through a new vocabulary/rhetoric or indeed a form of re-branding for selling their intellectual wares, as well as encouraging us to talk to one another – which may be no bad thing in the Network Society. Nevertheless, we continue to recognise some heuristic properties of social capital concepts and frameworks for critical policy analysis in relation to network analysis and networking of power. And in this context we would conclude that excavating the multi-layered networks of social capital as a policy technology of the moment brings into sight some of the complex articulations of education with post-democratic forms of regulation and governance, as well as offering some connections for complex class analysis. The legitimacy of the vocabulary of social capitalism lies in its democratic promise, but its contemporary operationalisation as a resource for democratic renewal and social amelioration appears to simultaneously break this
promise in line with re-imaging the dominant political economy and doing little to challenge or transform it. Indeed, the main effect we would suggest is to consolidate the dominant structures of social class and elite powers.

Thus, during the course of this analysis we have found ourselves increasingly convinced that whatever social capital is, as an education policy focus in relation to social justice and democracy, it is at least as much, maybe even more, part of the problem as it is part of the solution to whatever the problems are in education and the structure of social relations more broadly. Overall, we have developed a degree of scepticism about social capital thinking and policy influence, and would probably wish to urge caution, to say the least, in relation to the extraordinary surge of enthusiasm for social capital perspectives which have emerged in the last twenty years, globally, and in the UK, particularly in this context, where social justice is at stake.
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It seems that there is no limit to the expectations and aspirations that are placed upon education. These desires are interwoven through the dominant policy discourses of lifelong learning and the knowledge economy, with their many manifestations in such ideas as the learning city or learning region (Florida, 1995; Huang & Boshier, 2006; Osborne, Sankey & Wilson, 2007). In such discourses, schools are simultaneously depicted as sources of highly skilled labour, mechanisms for improving social inclusion, and incubators for tomorrow’s citizens, and potentially as providers of self-directed lifelong learners. Schools are also seen as important actors and potential partners in broader processes of urban renewal and development.

This is of course challenging. Richard Florida describes schools as caught in the legacy of a mass production system, which used to require a Taylorist workforce accustomed to routinized work regimes. In a learning region, he argues, the “education and training system must be a learning system that can facilitate lifelong learning and provide the high levels of group orientation and teaming required for knowledge-intensive knowledge organization” (Florida, 1995, pp. 532–3). While this broadly neo-liberal approach may well be contested, those who write from a social justice perspective are also keen to engage schools with other actors to achieve sustainable community social and economic development (Field, 2006).

Schools are therefore increasingly at the centre of complex networks involving a range of institutions with a variety of specific and sometimes contested goals, but which are nevertheless supposedly working towards the same goals. The concept of social capital has become one way in which some academics and policy makers are trying to think about the ways in which schools relate to their wider communities and adjust to these more extensive roles. As the introductory chapter shows, many of the new roles of schools are in tension with one another, and can sit uncomfortably with increasing demands for schools to demonstrate formally their success in traditional fields, particularly in the form of examinations outcomes. Other chapters develop existing debates about social capital and education, and consider the ways in which the social capital of teachers, students and parents can influence the outcomes of schooling, as well as help to promote equity and social justice through schooling processes. This chapter specifically considers the role of social capital in schools as organisations. In particular, it considers the nature of the
social capital assets that are built around organisations like schools, as well as the consequences of their differing stocks of social capital. It then goes on to consider the potential and prospects for schools as mechanisms for building social capital, both at the level of the individual school and within the broader community. Given the significance of performance measurement in education, this leads on to a discussion of toolkits for measuring social capital for schools. It also suggests ways of taking the debate forward in the future.

SOCIAL CAPITAL DEBATES

Three features of the contemporary social capital debate place limits on its current applicability to education. First, much of the academic and policy debate on social capital has focused either on the individual or the community. Far less is known about the social capital of organisations, including urban schools. Second, in so far as a body of literature does exist on organisational social capital, it comes, to date, largely from the discipline of management and business studies (eg Adler and Kwon, 2002; Bolino, Turnley & Bloodgood, 2002; Edelman et al, 2004; Napahiet and Goshal, 1998) and reflects their characteristic preoccupations. Although management and business texts share a highly normative account with much educational research, which is similarly inspired by prescriptive guidance on how practice should be conducted, it is unlike educational research in almost never considering power, conflict or alternative views of organisational goals (see Webb, 2006). Its direct value for and relevance to the concerns of educators are nevertheless uncertain. Third, much of the literature adopts a benign view of social capital, leading proponents to assume that more of it is a good thing, and less of it a bad thing. In this, the majority literature follows James Coleman and Robert Putnam, both of whom took an almost entirely positive view of social capital and its influence, including its influence upon education (Coleman, 1988-89; Putnam, 2000). These three limitations can be seen throughout the recent research into social capital.

Much existing research into social capital’s influence on education takes either an individual or a community perspective. In so far as institutions play a part in the analysis, most scholars either follow Coleman in emphasising the role of the family (Coleman, 1988-89; Dika & Singh, 2002; Stanton-Salazar & Dornbusch, 1995) or follow Putnam’s approach in analysing education at population-level, usually operationalised in terms of the nation or the region/state (Putnam, 2000; Dika & Singh, 2002; Jensen & Turmo, 2003).

These studies are of considerable value. With few exceptions, they have generally confirmed both Coleman’s initial insight into the positive influence of family and community on educational attainment among students, as well as supporting Putnam’s evidence on the positive association between level of civic engagement and level of educational attainment. Ties among community members appear in general to reinforce social controls on students, promoting educational achievement, while civic activity seems on the whole to go hand in hand with positive attitudes towards education. These findings are well known, prompting
one group of economists to conclude that the association between social capital and educational attainment is “one of the most robust empirical regularities in the social capital literature” (Glaeser, Laibson & Sacerdote, 2002, p. 455). In this literature, though, the school is generally a black box. Institutional influences on education, and on social capital formation, are only analysed in so far as they are external to the school.

Although much of the educational research on social capital neglects the institutional dimensions, a growing body of empirical and conceptual work in business and management studies does focus on organisational issues. These studies have explored social capital across a variety of organisations, and have examined a number of different themes. First, a number of studies focus on aspects of human resource management, including recruitment and career development. These studies are generally concerned with the role of networks in job search by applicants and appointment and selection decisions by companies. They tend to confirm the importance of ‘weak ties’ – broadly equivalent to what Woolcock (1998) describes as ‘bridging’ social capital – in enabling workers to find jobs, and some have shown that network-based recruitment based on ‘weak ties’ can produce significant economic returns, partly because it results in a closer match between candidate and position (both sides know more about each other) and partly because it leads to increased loyalty (Bates, 1994; Fernandez, Castilla & Moore, 2000).

A second body of work in this area relates to success and performance. Particularly during the start-up stage, it is widely accepted that networks function as an important information resource, which can be critical in identifying and exploiting business opportunities (Mulholland, 1997). They can also help provide access to finance (Bates, 1994), as well as to workers, as noted above. In the international hotel industry in Sydney, it was estimated in the late 1990s that each friendship between managers of competing hotels in Sydney made a contribution to annual revenue of some Aus$268,000 (Ingram & Roberts, 2000).

Closely related is an interest in social capital’s role in processes of innovation and technological change. Recent developments in so-called ‘new growth economics’ have emphasised the centrality of place in facilitating the exchange of skills, information and knowledge. In part, this is presented as a matter of proximity; the existence of business clusters, for example, is seen as a pre-requisite of economic dynamism, since it allows key business actors to interact with one another, building up sufficient trust to overcome the inherent reluctance to share ideas and knowledge with potential competitors (Porter, 2000). Knowledge is notorious among economists for its fragility as a commodity, since sellers have little protection from unscrupulous behaviour by buyers, other than the high cost option of legal action, and therefore have no incentive to pass on potentially valuable information. Knowledge therefore tends to be exchanged far less freely than is optimal for business performance. Trust-based relations between entrepreneurs may help compensate against these risks, and can reduce a variety of transaction costs such as the legal costs of patent protection, as well as the search costs of identifying relevant techniques and technologies, and of converting them into usable forms (Le Bas, Picard &
Suchecki, 1998). Nevertheless, this does not explain why people may share new ideas and information with potential competitors.

Proximity may explain how ideas and information are exchanged, but institutions are needed in order to sustain trust-based relationships over time. A series of studies of innovation in Nordic countries has shown that intermediary institutions play a critical role in promoting innovation. The small Nordic economies combine comparatively high labour costs with a capacity to compete in globalized markets, even in labour intensive manufacturing industries. On the basis of a series of case studies across the Nordic region, it has been convincingly argued that close interpersonal relations between owner-managers, supplemented by more formal cooperation in sectoral representative associations, have created conditions where trust flourishes and information sharing is the norm (Maskell et al, 1998). In the case of the Danish furniture industry, which is typically a highly competitive sector of small firms that are low on technological innovation and high on labour costs, it has been suggested that “it is perhaps impossible to overstate the importance” of the social community of managers, particularly in the solution of day to day problems (Henriksen, 1999, p. 256). However, formal associations are not apparently a *sine qua non* of successful innovation. An econometric study of Australian hotel managers, for example, showed that less formal friendship-based networks appear to produce similar benefits to those found among Nordic entrepreneurs (Ingram & Roberts, 2000). What is clear is that networks of managers and workers can facilitate the transmission and exchange of skills, ideas, practices and knowledge – in particular, the type of socially-embedded knowledge that is often described as ‘know-how’ and ‘know-who’ (Maskell, 2000, p. 118). The question therefore is whether network development can be deliberately managed so as to produce a social context favourable to innovation and resilience.

Maskell’s Nordic analysis bears some similarities to recent work on ‘communities of practice,’ a concept which appears to have a number of implications for schools as organisations. In the hands of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, the idea of communities of practice grew out of Vygotsky’s studies of learning as a social practice, a notion which they developed into the argument that learning consists of social participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). More precisely, they defined learning as taking place through “legitimate peripheral participation” in a “community of practice,” for example among apprentices joining a craft, or scholars joining their discipline. This approach has resurfaced in the management and business studies literature; the transition has not been without its problems, including a blurring of the distinction between Lave and Wenger’s original account of how learning takes place on the one hand, and managerial theories of how learning ought to be on the other hand (Hughes, 2007). Nevertheless, the theory has won support among education researchers in part because it offers a convincing means of moving beyond individualist theories of learning, and avoiding simplistic dualisms of teacher and (or) learner. It shares these features with the theories of social economists such as Maskell and his colleagues, who similarly suggest that inter-firm learning – based on networks – has an important collective quality.
In an interesting development of ideas about networks and learning, there is a small body of literature that explores ideas of collective knowledge (Larsson, et al, 1998; Antonelli, 2000) and collective competence (Sandberg, 2000). While some of this literature comes from management perspectives, particularly those concerned with knowledge management, some go beyond instrumental rationalism. In his seminar discussion of collective competence, Jörgen Sandberg argues that collective competence is characterised not solely by collaborative work practices, but rather by on-going processes of sense-making that lead to shared understandings – often tacit – of work as a social practice (Sandberg, 2000).

This idea has been taken further in recent discussions of collective intelligence. Like Sandberg, Philip Brown and Hugh Lauder argue that cooperation on its own is insufficient to meet the economic and social challenges of late modernity. They go on to suggest that, rather, “cooperation which leads to profitability depends on the development of collective intelligence,” an idea which they define as the “development and pooling of intelligence to attain common goals or resolve common problems” (Brown & Lauder, 2001, pp. 234–6). Capabilities for collective intelligence in turn require high trust relationships, which Brown and Lauder see as arising from individual worker discretion, and a shared belief in the organisation’s purposes; they also point to the importance of breaking down barriers to free communication and interaction between employees, since these undermine the potential for collective intelligence (Brown & Lauder, 2001).

Finally, a small body of literature has examined the negative impact of certain business patterns on social capital. To take one example, Stephan Goetz and Anil Rupasingha have studied the impact of Wal-Mart’s retail superstores on local social capital; based on a county-level analysis of data on associational membership, numbers of not-for-profit organisations, church adherence, voter turn-out and census participation, they show that on all indicators bar church adherence social capital stocks were lower in communities in which new Wal-Mart stores were built, as well as in communities that already had a Wal-Mart at the start of the 1990s (Goetz & Rupasingha, 2006). This pattern, they suggest, arises because big-box stores drive small locally owned shops out of business, which in turn affects the viability of other local enterprises including transport, wholesaling, advertising, local newspapers, financial services and legal services. “In the process, the social capital they embody is destroyed, and their entrepreneurial skills and other forms of location-specific human capital are forever lost to the community” (Goetz & Rupasingha 2006, p. 1305). In similar vein a study of high-tech firms in Silicon Valley found a “significant negative effect of turnover on revenue growth” (Baron, Hannan & Burton, 2001, p. 1006). Rather than leading to innovation and flexibility, turnover was removing firm-specific knowledge and disrupting the “organizational blueprint” which had been preserved by old guard workers (Baron, Hannan & Burton, 2001, p. 1002).

The literature on organisational social capital, it seems, is overwhelmingly rooted in business and management studies. Its main concerns lie in the impact of social capital on competitive advantage and sustainable growth. While some writers such as Maskell rest their analysis on detailed case studies, and others such
as Goetz and Rupasingha draw on cross-sectional survey data at population level, much of the evidence base in business and management studies is frankly anecdotal. Large numbers of studies are entirely conceptual, and are concerned with developing abstract models of organisational social capital (eg Ratten & Suseno, 2006). A great deal of this work is highly normative, being concerned less with analysing the way things are than developing strategies for how they should be. Yet it would be premature to reject all the business and management literature on organisational social capital. Some of it is clearly evidence based, including much of the analysis of innovation in the Nordic nations, and it offers important analytical pointers for those concerned with conditions in public service organisations such as schools. Furthermore, Brown and Lauder’s approach is a broad one, which sees social capital as a prerequisite for developing collective intelligence which can be applied to a range of shared problems, up to and including the imagining of alternative futures. They conclude from their analysis that, if collective intelligence is a desirable set of capacities, then it is necessary to inquire into those social structures – including workplace relationships – that can either enhance or erode capabilities for collective intelligent action.

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND THE SCHOOL

Social network assets constitute a resource for business organisations, as well as playing an important role in regional economic performance. The business and management literature has explored the role of internal network assets, based on relationships within organisations, as well as looking at networks between organisations. Similarly, we need to recognise that schools already have a marked impact on people’s networks, and that networks shape the fate of schools. Schools inevitably play a part in creating social capital, and they arguably play a part in destroying it as well. Many features of schools play a part in these processes of social capital creation and destruction. This chapter singles out some of the most important.

First, schools are themselves communities of interest and of practice. They bring people together from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, and from a variety of ages; and they do so around a shared set of practices – learning and teaching – that are valued, and deemed legitimate, to a greater or lesser extent by all the parties concerned. As well as those who work or study within the school, those involved usually include parents, students’ siblings (particularly if they have studied or will study at the same school), local politicians, and sometimes the wider community, who may be granted access to facilities such as playing fields and meeting spaces. Sometimes schools also relate to professionals from other fields (social workers, youth workers, police officers, the clergy and so on). In this sense, the everyday existence of the school leads to the creation of new ties and linkages, most obviously among students or staff, but also stretching way beyond the school. So the creation of this school-based social capital is potentially an important asset for members of all these groups, if particularly significant to students and teachers.
As communities of practice, schools’ own practices frequently rest on tacit knowledge and embedded skills. Although policy makers often seek to identify standardised measures of performance and codified bodies of appropriate knowledge, teachers and students almost invariably have to engage actively with these if they are to construct meanings and develop practices that are appropriate to the local and organisational contexts. Newly qualified teachers, and those who move from one school to another, engage in learning through legitimate peripheral participation, and indeed often find that their fellow professionals, with whom they have social connections, serve as informal mentors and coaches who help newcomers to make sense of their new surroundings and work out ‘how things work around here.’ Parents similarly rely on their own sources of informal information about school in order to negotiate their way through various professional and bureaucratic procedures, using social networks to supplement and check information from more official sources such as league tables or a prospectus.

Second, schools bring together groups of workers as members of a single organisation. Once more, this workforce is highly divided, and differentiated by status, prestige, salary, and non-financial rewards: as well as teachers (who themselves may include head teachers, heads of department, and curriculum specialists) the typical school also employs classroom assistants, secretaries and janitors, and possibly other types of worker (cooks, drivers, child minders in an ancillary creche, and so on).

All organisations require people’s active, meaningful engagement if they are to function; mindless compliance can be far more dysfunctional than focussed resistance. Yet organisations also require coordinated, regulated forms of behaviour that comply with institutional routines and rituals of various kinds (Webb, 2006). This produces continuous co-operation over time, as well as leading inevitably to conflicts and the forging of alliances. As in any workplace, some employees will choose to socialise with one another outside the workplace and in their own time. Work-place social capital is a valuable resource to workers, including teachers, as it provides them with access to insider information, shared knowledge and skills, and even to material assets such as lifts to work and the loan of teaching materials. Again, then, school-based social capital is created simply by the everyday existence of the school, with its rich inner life.

Third, education in general tends to be highly relationally intensive. And schools in particular function primarily through direct and unmediated interaction between different people: between teachers and students, among students, and between teachers and parents. Even educational activities that rely on mediated communication, such as the internet or print materials, are often said to benefit from phases of face-to-face interaction. And although teachers usually work on their own when they are in the classroom, or at most with one or two classroom assistants, they nevertheless meet face-to-face to plan the curriculum, think about new ideas, work out how to deal with forthcoming inspections, and hear reports on the school’s various activities. This inherently relational character of education means that it is experienced by students and staff alike as a highly sociable environment, in which they are required to exercise social competences and
develop new affective and social skills (including the confidence required to make use of those skills). For young children, school is usually the first place in which you are required to interact continually with groups of people whom you do not already know and who are not directly known to members of your family. And this interaction occurs within a highly regulated and hierarchical setting, in which there are usually clear ground rules about behaviour. So schools therefore generate social capital indirectly, by requiring all their members to spend a great deal of time interacting with one another, and therefore ensuring that they continually develop skills of social interaction.

Finally, schools are a very particular type of physical space. Their architecture brings people together in determinate ways, and their physical organisation is designed to create processes of aggregating and disaggregating at the same time, for example sorting students into year groups, sports teams or lunch tables. They offer space for association which can potentially be accessed by local people who otherwise have no formal connection with the school, for example by hosting evening classes for adults. They also offer space for concealment (famously, all sorts of transgressions occur behind the bicycle shed). But they also act as symbolic spaces, in which the wider community places a collective cultural investment. Sports performances and academic achievement are reported in the local press, often in detail. Teachers are routinely ranked in opinion polls along with doctors as the most trusted of all professional occupations (see for example Harris, 2006). The very presence of a school confirms the symbolic standing of a particular neighbourhood or town; proposals to close schools – which may well be justified from a policy perspective because of falling rolls – routinely evoke highly emotive language, as when people protest at the damage being done to ‘the heart of our community.’ So schools can provide a focus for symbolic or imagined communities, with people feeling emotional ties to one another through the value that they attach to this particular type of physical space. These ties too can translate into an asset, fostering resilience and pride in a collective – but imagined – identity (Quinn, 2005).

So far, it seems as though all is well. The story has a happy ending written into its introduction – apparently. But of course social capital is not necessarily positive, and social networks are also highly differentiated resources that take a variety of forms. School-based connections are such a frequent source of privilege that the phrase ‘old school tie’ has become an almost ritualistic cliché. Stephen Ball’s account of middle class parents, seeking informational advantages through their network assets, shows how people can deploy social capital to manipulate the school system to their own and their children’s benefit (Ball, 2003). Equally, some types of social capital – usually close, bonding ties – can work to the disadvantage of some parents and their children, for example by giving access only to narrow ‘common sense’ information which may serve to hold back aspirations and misdirect students’ energies. And schools are not communes, where all are equal; they are powerfully structured hierarchies, with a tendency to squander the network assets of their members. Indeed, those in the most privileged positions within schools tend to develop and deploy social networks that will serve to reinforce their
position, and will tend to devalue the network assets of the least privileged employees (such as cleaners, cooks and janitors).

Moreover, not only does social capital have its dark side. As well as creating social capital, schools may destroy it. In one sense, this is precisely what the education system in a meritocratic society is intended to do – namely, remove personal connections as a basis of social selection, and replace them with educational credentials. Education serves more broadly as what Anthony Giddens calls a ‘disembedding’ mechanism, involved in “the ‘lifting out’ of social relations from local contexts and their rearticulation across indefinite tracts of time-space” (Giddens, 1991, p. 18). To take a rather obvious example, credentials are symbolic tokens of achievement that are administered, regulated and recognised at national – and increasingly international – level, and not at a local level. One primary purpose of gaining credentials is to enable social mobility, particularly in the transition into working life or higher education, both of which may remove people from specific local contexts where they are known and trusted, and place them in new environments where they must earn a reputation and create the conditions for trust. In the longer term, this involves the destruction, or at least a diminution of importance of certain types of social capital (close, homogeneous bonding ties) which tend to be particularly important for the well-being of disadvantaged communities, and it is for this reason that some social groups may resist credentialisation, whether actively or passively (Field, 2005). Conversely, providing people gain the social competences required to build new ties, it can involve the creation of new types of social capital (looser, more heterogeneous bridging and linking ties).

As yet, relatively little is known about how to develop schools as nurseries of positive social capital. It is commonly suggested that school ethos and organisation play a critical role, for example in modelling the kinds of open and participatory behaviour that they wish to foster in young people. For example, it is claimed that the school ethos should promote learning of responsibility, fairness, justice and conflict resolution. This is an intuitively persuasive suggestion, but remains an act of faith, as to date there is relatively little evidence in favour of the argument. In so far as it has been tested empirically, the effects of school ethos on socio-political values and behaviour appear to be rather minimal. Thus one German study based on a follow up of participants in a longitudinal study, with the original sample in secondary education between 1979 and 1983, found that in 2002 there was only limited evidence that school ethos had made any difference to people’s views (Grob, 2007). Nevertheless, the findings were encouraging in so far as an open and trusting ethos which was participatory and respectful of diversity did have a small but significant negative impact on intolerance towards foreigners; otherwise, the impact of school ethos on attitudes towards socio-political participation was neutral, and the author concluded that these appeared to be learned elsewhere than in school (Grob, 2007). Similarly, the social competences that are required to build resource-rich networks of informal loose and heterogeneous ties may be acquired in a range of settings such as sports clubs, youth associations or faith-based groups; it is not at all clear what role schools play in this process.
Measurement of performance raises many questions. In recent years, performance measurement has come to symbolise the worst features of a managerialist audit culture. As a result, heat and hyperbole steam up the lenses of even the most clear-sighted critics. One highly respected British academic, for instance, writes of “the tyranny of targets” and “target mania” (Fielding 2001, p. 145), language that has become so habitual among critics as to lose much of its bite. Yet alternative ideas of measurement can still be achieved, based less on the desire to micro-manage teachers’ everyday labour (even less than serve as a ‘manic tyrant’ over an apparently meek and submissive body of teachers), and more on the rather simple aim of finding out whether we are achieving the goals that we wish to achieve.

In an analysis of schools and social capital, Catts and Ozga (2005) identified eight potential indicators that schools might use to measure the extent to which they created positive social capital. Their indicators were broad categories that were consciously designed to shape behaviour as much as measure it:

- Community and family contacts
- Attitudes to school among communities and families
- Friendship networks among staff and students and with communities
- Participation in school governance by staff, students, parents and communities
- Relationships with and among teachers and other school staff members
- Teachers’ relationships with other professionals
- Communication and information within schools and with communities
- Responsiveness to particular issues, including diversity

While this is a helpful initial list, it suggests a rather one-dimensional view of social capital, and may be too respectful of the professional sensitivities of heads and other teachers. It also identifies a number of relational qualities that are likely to be highly important, but which cannot easily be turned into the sort of indicators that allow teachers to measure change over time, or to compare one school with another.

A rather more instrumental approach has been developed in Austria, in the form of an online questionnaire for use with schools. Supported by the Federal Ministry for Education, Art and Culture, and designed by Prof. Ernst Gehmacher of the Büro für die Organisation angewandter Sozialforschung (BOAS, or Office for the Organisation of Applied Social Research), the questionnaire is designed for teachers to use with their pupils in the classroom (Sozialkapital Online, undated). The online survey is completed by pupils, who respond to questions on such topics as the number of people they feel able to call on for personal support, or the number of sporting or voluntary activities and organisations that they belong to. The results are presented in tabular form, showing the distribution of social capital for the responding pupils, at a number of levels (micro-level, meso-level and macro-level), and in terms of different types (bonding and bridging). Pupils’ responses are weighted and aggregated, and the findings claim to show how many pupils have the ‘optimal’ number of ties in each category, how many are ‘deficient’ (defizitär), and even how many are ‘over-optimal.’ The primary purposes of this online survey tool are firstly pedagogical, in that teachers are able to choose to
show the findings to the pupils, with a view to exploring their implications; and
secondly didactic, in that teachers can link the results to specific additional questions
concerning future activities, in order to find out whether their plans are likely to be
supported by the best-connected pupils. While this is certainly an interesting
development, it is not without serious problems. The questions themselves are
often adapted from standard instruments, and lend themselves to use in other
contexts; the pedagogic and didactic applications are also potentially interesting for
teachers elsewhere. However, the findings are analysed and presented in a highly
normative way that is likely to be highly unhelpful in educational contexts, and the
categorisation of responses tends towards the mechanistic. So this approach is
probably best treated as an interesting classroom exercise, which allows teachers to
place the findings in the context of a whole range of knowledge about pupils’
social connections, rather than as a toolkit for analysing the organisational social
capital of the school.

We therefore need to develop further indicators that are intended to reflect a
more differentiated and relational view of social capital, and which recognise that
teachers sometimes take a very territorial view of education in general and of their
school in particular. Such a perspective suggests inclusion of the following:

- Influence of sponsoring bodies (eg faith based schools)
- Access to power and the decision makers
- Power relations and the control of resources and assets
- Homogeneity of the catchment area and the extent of shared norms/values
- Levels of trust and of (learned) mistrust within the school
- Levels of trust and mistrust between school and external actors such as parents,
  business leaders, faith groups or community activists
- Quality of relationships between pupils, and between pupils and teachers
- Quality of relationships between teachers and parents
- Openness to non-professional actors in the community (third sector, business)

Even this may be insufficiently robust to deal with the ‘dark arts’ of network
management as practised by experienced professionals.

As with Ozga and Catt’s initial listing, the intention is equally to shape behaviour
as much as to measure it, but with the proviso that professionals are adept at
subverting the intentions of those who would draft indicators for measuring their
performance. Some of these indicators will be perceived by teachers and school
heads as another threat to their professional autonomy, and to some extent this is
true. But what matters in negotiating the trust-performance dichotomy is who is
invited to join the conversation, and with what results. So at this stage, it is offered
simply to provide an initial basis for further development, and to draw attention to
key features of constructive social capital as they relate to schools.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOLS

The wider debate around social capital has drawn attention to the important resources
that arise from people’s social networks. Further, it has shown that people co-operate
more often and more effectively when they trust one another, and have high
expectations of reciprocity – not necessarily in the here and now, but over time. This raises important questions for schools and those who work in them. Above all, it suggests that there may be significant tensions between the benefits of trust-based development and the demands of a pervasive audit culture. Constant audit corrodes trust; conversely, trust based relations often appear to outsiders to lack transparency. There is therefore a set of choices about whether to proceed down one road or another.

The route taken in this chapter is to sup with the devil of performance measurement, using the long spoons of qualitative indicators and direction signals rather than quantitative indices of goals achieved. But the identification of a neat measurement toolkit cannot answer all the problems. There is an inherent bias in any performance measurement system towards the assessment of the visible, the bounded and the known. Whatever is tacit, fuzzy or unfamiliar is therefore likely to be neglected or ignored. In particular, informal networks and informal learning are likely to be discounted; institutionalised associations and educational credentials are likely to form the backbone of any indicators. Again, the primary purpose of performance measurement should be to indicate the direction of travel, and provide a compass to confirm the trajectory, rather than to provide a summative final judgement.

In this instance, the direction of travel is towards a socially just school that contributes responsibly to, and benefits from, its external communities. While this does not imply that schools should simply collapse all the borders between themselves and the outside world, it does require a willingness to work openly with other professions and with lay actors, and to develop bonds that facilitate co-operation, trust and reciprocity. This cuts against the grain of professional status and identity, both of which are designed to emphasise the distinctive and difficult expertise of the profession and its members. This occupational apartheid is reinforced by the ubiquity of different and separate training pathways for professional service workers, combined with powerful interprofessional rivalries and huge vested interests in the training industries that service the professions. While professional identity and status may help to guarantee standards and commitment, they also serve as barriers to trust and reciprocity between members of different professions. In the long term this is a challenge for those who train the professionals, but in the short term it means building alliances and coalitions that provide a context for meaningful interprofessional co-operation.

Even greater boundaries sometimes separate schools from those who live in their catchment areas. Suspicion and mistrust (often well-founded) are deeply embedded in the values of the most disenfranchised communities; this extends to all professionals, particularly those who commute in from more affluent suburbs and leave every evening. Well-established community development strategies exist in many disadvantaged urban neighbourhoods, and if schools are to plug into these strategies then they will have to accept that they are only one actor among many. Again, this is unlikely to be a short term strategy with an immediate pay-off; trust evolves slowly over time, and policy horizons – as well as the plans of some very ambitious school principals and teachers – can be very short term.
Internationally, teachers and other public sector professionals are asked to subject their work to public scrutiny through measures of performance, while simultaneously taking on greater responsibilities for promoting social cohesion and developing active citizenship. At the same time, teachers encounter ever more diverse school populations, particularly in urban areas. Increasingly teachers are being urged to work collaboratively with other professionals in order to pursue these goals, but there is little shared understanding across the academic and professional communities about how, for example, tensions between increased pressures for examination success and for social inclusion might be managed. This chapter suggests that schools might develop approaches to positive social capital that will help them negotiate these tensions in a constructive manner. If they are to do so, then appropriate approaches to performance measurement can provide an asset rather than a hindrance, by promoting transparency and allowing for open and constructive dialogue internally as well as with other actors in the community. Social capital indicators can help enable professionals to engage more inclusively with an increasingly diverse urban context.
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