

CHAPTER 8: THE SOCIAL/INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Competing in the international market-place is a stimulus to quality and innovation in the interests of all students (DETYA, 2001, p. 1).

People are at once founded and legitimized to enter the field by their possessing a definite configuration of properties. One of the goals of research is to identify these active properties, these efficient characteristics, that is, these forms of *specific capital* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, pp. 107-108).

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reports on the analysis of the data gathered for the social/institutional perspective, the final perspective of the theoretical framework to be operationalised. It is argued that the findings of this analysis contribute to explaining the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation, and in doing so support the inclusion of Bourdieu's (1984, 1998a) account of contemporary society in the social-theoretical framework.

8.2 THE ANALYSIS AND CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

As explained in Chapter 4, three data sets are analysed in operationalising the social/institutional perspective: the EA Newsletters, the NEAS regulations and CELTA training materials. The analysis focuses on how the operations of macro actors evidenced in the three data sets shape the identities of, and relations between, managers, students and teachers. Consistent with the account of the social/institutional perspective developed in Chapter 3, the purpose of the analysis is to investigate how these relations contribute to the production and reproduction of contemporary society.

The account of contemporary society developed for and through this investigation combines Bourdieu's critique of neoliberalism (1998a)⁸⁸ and his analysis of consumer culture (1984). The decision to employ this account is based on its capacity – explained below – to account for the meso-micro relations already identified in the study. The analysis of the social/institutional data provides further support for this decision.

Bourdieu's critique⁸⁹ extends the social-theoretical account of commercialisation to include 'globalisation', 'neoliberalism' and 'consumer culture', the three constructs which emerge as central to explaining the relations between the macro, meso and micro actors. The following section introduces these constructs and explains Bourdieu's critique.

8.21 Globalisation, neoliberalism and consumer culture

8.211 Intersections and concerns

In a recent survey of the literature on 'globalisation', Brahm (op. cit., p. 1) has described it as a "highly contested" concept, which "at a basic level... refers to growing interconnectedness... a magnitude of global flows to a degree that all levels of human organization are interweaved into one system". As O'Neill (1997) explains, while the "vast and expanding literature" (p. 23) on globalisation may share this focus on interconnectedness, there is disagreement on the constituents of the system, the relationships between them, and their social implications (p. 19). Indeed, reflecting this diversity of views, Held et al. (1999, p. 12) have suggested that globalisation may best be conceived as a "highly differentiated process which finds expression in all the key domains of social activity".

⁸⁸ The use of Bourdieu's critique in the current study coincides with Fairclough's (2002) call on critical language researchers to draw on the critique in taking action against neoliberalism.

⁸⁹ For the remainder of the study, I use 'critique' to refer both to Bourdieu's critique of neoliberalism (1998a), and his analysis of consumer culture (1984). How these are combined in the study is explained below.

Notwithstanding these differences of opinion, Quiggin (1999) has observed that “the economic aspects of globalisation are dominant in most discussions” (para. 2), central to which, he argues, is “the swing towards neoliberal policies of market-oriented reform that has taken place throughout the world since 1970” (para. 3). These policies have been particularly associated with the privatisation of the public sector, market deregulation, and the rejection of policies based on Keynesian economics, a model of systematic intervention in the operations of the market adopted during the 1930s to counter market failures associated with the Great Depression (*ibid.*). Opposed to this, the ‘neoliberal’ – or ‘neoclassical’ – economic model, first associated with the policies of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s, draws on a ‘free market’ economic model which originated in the work of Adam Smith in the nineteenth century and was subsequently developed by Hayek and Friedman (*Fusfeld, op. cit.*, pp. 126, 144ff). Central to this model, according to Stiglitz (2002, p. 74), in his recent critique of globalisation, is the belief that “there is no need for government” because “free, unfettered, ‘liberal’ markets work perfectly”.

While a focus on economic factors is necessary for understanding globalisation, it is not, according to Held et al. (*loc. cit.*), sufficient, having “drawn substantial criticism” for being “far too reductionist” by failing to acknowledge that globalisation involves “a complex intersection between a multiplicity of driving forces, embracing economic, technological, cultural and political change”.

It is these “intersections” which have become the focus of growing concerns about the social consequences of globalisation. Prominent among these are fears that the culture of the dominant economies is emerging as the dominant global culture, manifesting in the spread of free market policies, and with it ‘consumer culture’. This has been explained in Chapter 5 in relation to shifts in power relations from producers to consumers, and in Chapter 7 in relation to the discourse of advertising. As a manifestation of the free market,

consumer culture, according to Leiss, Kline and Jhally (op. cit.), dominates those subject to it by reconstructing their lives according to the mechanisms and values of the market. As they explain,

To live according to the principles of a market economy is to be immersed in buying and selling transactions every day, where everything one has (especially one's mental skills and physical energies) and everything one wants or needs has a price. In other words, as a market-industrial economy expands, more and more elements of both the natural environment and human qualities are drawn into the orbit of exchanged things, into the realm of commodities. Everything has some use to someone (it is hoped), and likewise everything has a price at which it can be acquired (pp. 322-323).

The concern raised by consumer culture in relation to globalisation is that in becoming globally dominant, this culture represents a form of 'cultural globalisation' whose operations involve "processes of unequal power, which bring old practices and identities into question raising the potential for conflict" (Brahm. op. cit., p. 6). These concerns about the social impact of neoliberal policies and cultural globalisation are exemplified by George (op. cit.) who has argued that from being

a small, unpopular sect with virtually no influence, neo-liberalism has become the major world religion with its dogmatic doctrine, its priesthood, its law-giving institutions, and perhaps most important of all, its hell for heathen and sinners who dare to contest its revealed truth (p. 2).

Underpinning these concerns is the fear that the social costs of globalisation outweigh any gains which may accrue from the economic efficiencies of deregulated markets, creating a “new manifest destiny” (Popkewitz, 2000, p. 176) of social inequality for populations subject to free markets, including the national and international exacerbation of poverty through the reduction of employment security, and the erosion of welfare systems and other social support mechanisms. These are processes in which governments may have little authority to intervene because, in what Brecher and Costello (1994, p. 4) have called “a disastrous ‘race to the bottom’”, they are constrained by the need to compete for globally mobile capital, and thereby pressured to implement neoliberal economic policies at the expense of those which seek to redress social inequality. According to George (op. cit., p. 4), this shift of authority from government to the operations of the market is the inevitable outcome of neoliberal policies, according to which “the economy should dictate its rules to society and not the other way around”.

It is to this nexus of market expansion, cultural domination, and inequality that Bourdieu’s critique of contemporary society is addressed.

8.212 Bourdieu’s critique

The value of Bourdieu’s critique for this study is threefold: it combines an account of neoliberalism, globalisation and consumer culture; their social consequences; and an explanation of how they are produced and reproduced. Together, these features of the critique provide an account of contemporary society which is supported by the analysis of the diary, brochure and social/institutional data, and are consistent with the social-theoretical account of commercialisation developed through this study.

At the centre of Bourdieu’s critique is what he has termed “neo-liberal discourse” (1998a, pp. 95ff). This is the “dominant” global discourse, and as such it advances, on a global scale, not an economic theory, but a “*political programme*” (ibid. p. 94) which

serves the interests of those classes, in Bourdieu's (1994a, p. 113) sense, who stand to gain from neoliberal policies at the expense of weaker classes. From the perspective of the theory of practice, then, neoliberal discourse is a means of advancing the "unification of the market", the "process of unification of both the production and circulation of economic and cultural goods" which "entails the progressive obsolescence of the earlier mode of production of the habitus and its products" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 50).

Driving this "progressive obsolescence" is the neoliberal construction of "individual rationality" (1998a, p. 94) – a construction which, as explained in Chapter 3, excludes the economic and social conditions which shape and are shaped by the habitus. In doing so, it promotes an 'asocial' construction of individuals, in which they are exclusively responsible for their own success or failure, irrespective of the conditions in which their habitus evolved and with which it is synchronised.

In advancing this construction of freedom, neoliberal discourse does violence to those whose habitus is not synchronised with the economic field, in which the capital of greatest value circulates. It exercises this violence by legitimating free market policies as an "inevitability" (ibid., p. 30) and as "common sense" (Bourdieu 1994a, p. 117), thereby endowing them with the "social power" (ibid.) to enlist those who stand to lose by them in their own subordination. To achieve this legitimacy, argues Bourdieu (1998a, pp. 30ff), neoliberal discourse imposes "a whole set of presuppositions as self-evident" (p. 30), which include the assumption that "maximum growth, and therefore productivity and competitiveness, are the ultimate and sole goal of human actions" (pp. 30-31); a "radical separation... between the economic and the social" (p. 30); and the language of the free market itself, which, in appearing self-evident, "invades us" (p. 31) with notions such as "globalization" (p. 34).

Bourdieu thus explains 'globalisation' not as a phenomenon *related* to neoliberalism, but – in so far as it is used to justify neoliberal policies as inevitable – as a

form of “symbolic violence” (1991., p. 51) exercised through the discourse of neoliberalism itself. The exception to this “justificatory myth” (1998a., p. 38) is the “unification of financial markets” (ibid., p. 97), in which dominant groups determine the “rules of the game” to their own advantage, facilitated by “progress in information technology”. ‘Globalisation’, according to Bourdieu, then, is not a matter of “homogenization” (ibid., p. 38), but a means of both legitimating and bringing about subordination to dominant classes on a global scale.

Within the discourse of neoliberalism, this process is constructed as an inevitable outcome of what Bourdieu has called the “law of the market” (ibid., p. 35), according to which “the economic world abandoned to its own logic” becomes “the norm of all practices” (ibid.). Subjected to this norm, established social practices – such as those providing security of employment – have been devalued in a process legitimised by notions such as “flexibility” (ibid., pp. 37, 97) and “competence” (pp. 42, 99). The former legitimates as necessary changes in working conditions which advantage those classes which stand to gain from neoliberal policies; the latter involves the commodification of the habitus itself, constructing as necessary a job market in which, Bourdieu (ibid., pp. 42ff, 99ff) argues, there are “winners”, whose competencies are in demand, and “losers”, whose competencies are oversupplied in the market. In justifying this “intensification of insecurity” (ibid., p. 84) for those who do not have saleable competencies and the privileging of those who do, the discourse of neoliberalism also legitimates inequality and disadvantage, casting those who fail to succeed as lacking what Bourdieu (1991, p. 55) has termed the “legitimate competence”. This is a condition which cannot be rectified within the economic field and which is – with the connection between the economic and the social severed – therefore constructed within neoliberal discourse as irredeemable and inevitable (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp. 42ff).

Bourdieu's account of the "economic order" (ibid., p. 98) which results from these processes focuses on the social consequences of "flexploitation" (ibid., pp. 85ff), the term he uses to describe "the rational management of insecurity" (ibid.) – exemplified by the casualisation of work – in which perpetual fear of unemployment induces people to yield to the pressures of the market. In this climate of "structural violence" (p. 98), the more easily a person can be replaced by others with similar competencies, the more precarious their "life chances" (Postone et al., loc. cit.) and dependence on decisions which lie beyond their control – on the "arbitrary decision of a power responsible for the 'continued creation' of their existence" (Bourdieu, op. cit., p. 99).

In the workplace, this dependency results in a ranking of employees based on their "*academically guaranteed competence*" (ibid.), competence which is continually appraised and reappraised in the light of changing market demands, thereby creating and legitimising a "hierarchy of academically guaranteed competencies" (ibid.) in which fear dominates the motives of employees and in which the most easily replaceable have the least security. Through this constant need to "*prove themselves*" (ibid., p. 100) in terms of competencies whose content and value are determined by the market, and therefore beyond their control, people are isolated from the dispositions and values which accrue from the past and, by implication, the aspirations to which they give rise (ibid.). In terms of the theory of practice, then, this destabilisation of their habitus further devalues the capital associated with weaker classes, thereby compounding their capacity to be subordinated to the interests of dominant classes.

The basis, then, of the "economic order" implemented by the policies which neoliberal discourse legitimises "under the banner of freedom" is the "*structural violence* of unemployment, of insecure employment, and of the *fear* provoked by the threat of losing employment" (ibid., p. 98). Those subjected to this violence are thereby isolated not only from their own pasts and futures, but from each other by the need to compete for the

little job security that is available. In attempting to improve their conditions, then, they cannot unite to exert their class interests as a “*collective*” (ibid., p. 96), but succumb to the need to advance their “life chances” (Postone et al., loc. cit.) by complying with the dominant discourse(s), a process which further enhances the freedom of the market to determine their conditions and determines the value of discourses and their hierarchy of value. It is because of this capacity to fragment collectives which may hinder its operations, such as unions and families, that Bourdieu terms neoliberalism “*a programme of methodological destruction of collectives*” (op. cit., pp. 95-96).

Pushing this process to the “limit of its economic efficacy” are the “techniques of manipulation” associated with the consumer culture, including “market research and advertising” (ibid., p. 35). It is by these means that consumption is constructed as advancing the “life chances” (Postone et al., loc. cit.) of consumers. This process mirrors the commodification of the habitus of workers, but, instead of the market-driven construction of people in terms of competence for work, the consumer’s habitus is valued only in so far as it leads them to consume products.

Consistent with this account of neoliberalism, Bourdieu’s (1984) analysis of consumption focuses on how it produces and is reproduced by the tastes and consumption patterns of different classes in their efforts to acquire cultural capital. The analysis is drawn on here because Bourdieu’s (ibid., p. 101) account of “distinction” and “lifestyle” extends the account of consumer culture developed through this study to include its contribution to the production and reproduction of contemporary society. In Chapter 7, the desire to achieve lifestyles through the consumption of goods was explained as a desire for the social status, which is both drawn on and promoted by advertising discourse, in which potential consumers are offered products which claim to provide lifestyles customised to meet their aspirations. Bourdieu’s account of “distinction” reinterprets this process within the theory of practice, according to which “social status” is not a property of lifestyles.

but, understood as “distinction”, refers to relations which are produced by and differentiate between classes: it is “nothing more than a difference, a gap, a distinctive feature, in short a relational property existing in and through its relation with other properties” (1998b, p. 6).

Interpreted in these terms, then, it is consumers themselves who produce and reproduce these relations of distinction between classes through their own consumption choices. Thus, in selecting and consuming products, they assert the desirability of capital which has a greater value than their own: that associated with the fields drawn on in the construction of the lifestyles to which they aspire – the “other properties” in the quote above. Within this account, “lifestyle” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101) refers to the full complexity of social and cultural practices which combine to produce the habitus associated with a particular class: it is the “unity hidden under the diversity and multiplicity of the set of practices in fields governed by different logics and therefore including different forms of realization”. In attempting to attain the most valued lifestyles through consumption, consumers, then, reproduce the dominance of those fields with which they desire their habitus to be synchronised – those associated with the classes with greater authority in the market.

The desire for distinction is therefore inseparable from the assertion of the interests of particular classes over those of others – and the “techniques” (Bourdieu 1998a., p. 35). of consumer culture, such as advertising, are, to the extent that they devalue the capital of weaker classes, revealed as forms of “symbolic violence” (Bourdieu, 1991., p. 51). Hence, in their efforts to acquire for themselves the dominant forms of cultural capital, consumers’ tastes are revealed “as markers of ‘class’” (Bourdieu 1984., p. 2). and consumption itself as “legitimizing social difference” (p. 7). Consumption, then, in Bourdieu’s critique, “comes to represent more than merely the disinterested objectification

of cultural practice, but rather it becomes the very site of a class struggle conducted through culture” (Lee, 2000, p. xv).

8.213 Explaining meso and micro relations

This section traces the ways in which Bourdieu’s account of the economic order advanced by the discourse of neoliberalism explains the meso and micro identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. The subsequent sections extend this explanation to include the operations of macro actors which shape these identities and relationships, and locates the argument within the context of this study.

8.2131 Teachers

The starting point for the explanation is the “progressive obsolescence” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 50) of established practices which Bourdieu identifies as characteristic of neoliberalism. In the discourse of commercialisation, this obsolescence is reflected in the devaluation of ‘teachers’ practices’, central to which are appraisal practices, in which teachers – as in Bourdieu’s account of replaceable employees – are continuously obliged to “*prove themselves*” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 100). Further, the appraisal of teachers reflects market demands, thus legitimising as inevitable redundancy criteria which lie beyond the control or knowledge of teachers – as evidenced in D8’s (for example, 69-107) account of her sacking. In addressing these market-driven demands, the appraisal of teachers rewards both the ability to create student ‘happiness’, and to conduct teaching as a set of supervised ‘procedures’ without questioning their purposes. In Bourdieu’s terms, these abilities correspond to the “*academically guaranteed competence*” (ibid., p. 99) – the “legitimate competence” (1991, p. 55) which advances the interests of the dominant classes by simultaneously increasing the value of their economic capital and devaluing the social capital of those appraised.

As evidenced in the operation of the discourse of commercialisation, this process erodes teachers' motivation for work based on commitment to, and control of, professional standards. These are replaced by motivation based on each teacher's self-interest: specifically, on the need to calculate how to manage their behaviour so as to minimise the risk of unemployment. These effects resonate with Bourdieu's account, explained in Chapter 3, of the separation of the social – teachers' professional knowledge and standards – from the economic in the legitimisation of "individual rationality" (1998a., p. 94), the competition and isolation between individuals which results, and the perpetual fear of redundancy created by the "structural violence" (ibid., p. 98) of "flexploitation" (pp. 85ff). As Bourdieu's critique predicts, the resulting "intensification of insecurity" (ibid., p. 84) among teachers acts as a disincentive to joins unions. Indeed, any such attempts to enable the 'social' to intervene in the 'economic' are undermined by the pervasiveness of market-driven appraisal and the threat of redundancy. The result, as in the *'methodological destruction of collectives'* (ibid., p. 95-96), is the reduction in teachers' ability to unite in improving their employment security and defending their understanding of professional practice against the interests of managers and students.

8.2132 Students

In terms of the identification of students as consumers, Bourdieu's critique offers an explanation both of the attraction of the 'international lifestyle', and the construction of students as not responsible for learning.

The 'international lifestyle' is attractive because it offers students access to a world of financial and social success, security and leisure – a "lifestyle", in Bourdieu's (1984, p. 101) sense, which exemplifies the rewards of "distinction" (ibid.) promoted by the discourse of advertising. This is precisely the aspect of consumer culture through which it exerts symbolic violence by increasing the demand for, and therefore the value of, the

capital held by the dominant classes – the “winners” (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp. 42ff), in neoliberal terms – and devaluing that of the rest. Consistent with this, the discourse of commercialisation advances a construction of consumers according to which they are valued only in terms of attributes which lead them to consume products: their aspirations, needs and skills. By including only these market-driven attributes, those associated with effort, responsibility and the management of risk are systematically excluded, constructing a habitus for consumers which, while it can be precisely matched to learning-as-products and allows the unmediated freedom to consume required for the operation of “individual rationality” (ibid., p. 94), lacks precisely the dispositions necessary for an agent in learning.

Viewed from this perspective, then, students – like teachers – are revealed to be contradictorily constructed, and to possess, like teachers, what Bourdieu’s has termed a “divided or even torn habitus” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, op. cit., p. 127)⁹⁰. As with teachers, this condition arises at the “intersection” (ibid.) between the economic and pedagogic fields. Here, students are commercially advantaged by being assured of the provision of the ‘learning’ they have purchased, but are simultaneously disadvantaged because – mirroring the removal of teachers’ capacity to teach – the process of consumption advanced by the discourse of commercialisation denies them the capacity to learn.

The ‘freedom’ of the student as consumer within this discourse is thus revealed as illusory in so far as it revalues – as in Bourdieu’s critique – social in terms of economic capital. In the economic exchange between students and the college, the ability to learn to communicate in English is valued as the habitus required to attain the ‘international lifestyle’. It is on the assurance of being provided with this habitus in the form of ‘English

⁹⁰ This finding also supports Fairclough (1992, p. 208), who has argued precisely this point – that the contradictory construction of learners is a consequence of the commodification of educational discourse, and is an example of how “commodified educational discourse” can be “self-contradictory”.

language learning' that students acquiesce in the devaluation of their own capital as learners by seeking to secure the value of their economic capital. This is a process which reproduces the value of economic capital as dominant in the market and therefore students' authority as "enterprising consumers" (Abercrombie, loc. cit.), but simultaneously reduces the value of capital associated with both teaching *and* learning.

This argument finds support in a finding in the diary analysis which has not yet been explained: the struggles between students over the need for 'hard' work in language learning – in which some students complained that others thought this unnecessary, a difference which can be explained within Bourdieu's critique as the former resisting and the latter acquiescing to the devaluation of their capital as learners. Though a full explanation of these differences would inevitably draw in complex cross-cultural and teaching-methodological issues, the fact that Bourdieu's critique offers an explanation which is consistent with this study as whole suggests that the contradictory construction of the student may contribute to this struggle, thereby lending further support for the inclusion of his critique within the social theoretical framework⁹¹.

8.2133 *Managers*

The question, then, arises as to the identity of the class whose capital dominates the market, and whose members, in terms of Bourdieu's critique, stand to gain from the economic order advanced by the discourse of neoliberalism.

As explained in Chapter 6, the diarists drew a clear line between the interests of teachers and those of managers, identified as a meso class whose commercial priorities are met and careers advanced through their devaluation of teachers' practices. The exception was D1, who observed differences between managers' motivations, distinguishing

⁹¹ The notions of 'cross-cultural' and 'teaching methodology' have already been problematised in Chapter 6. The participants' perspective. Their relationship to the contradictory construction of students and teachers is taken up below.

between those who move from teaching to management positions to gain “status”, and those whose concern is “profit” (for example, 334-336). My own narratives also attest that managers are not a homogenous class united by a common interest in maximising the value of their economic capital, but may be subject to conflicting interests and stand in different lines of authority to each other. It is these differences between managers which are brought into focus when viewed from the perspective of Bourdieu’s critique.

While managers are a meso class in relation to teachers, Bourdieu’s critique highlights the need to differentiate between macro, meso and micro actors *within* this class. Managers, in this sense, are a ‘fractal’ class, organised in a hierarchy of sub-classes determined by their interest in and influence on increasing the value of economic capital generated by the operations of the college. Thus, as explained in previous chapters, owners are positioned at the top; then come directors, who, as explained in Chapter 7, are often owners and typically include the ‘Principal administrator’; managers in marketing and finance typically come next, followed by directors of studies, head teachers and senior teachers – who have typically moved from teaching into management.

Within Bourdieu’s critique, this hierarchy is significant because the ranking of the sub-classes in terms of the value of their habitus in generating economic capital exemplifies the “hierarchy of academically guaranteed competencies” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 99), which differentiates between “winners” and “losers” (ibid.) according to the extent to which people hold the “legitimate competence” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 55). Teachers, then, while subordinate to this hierarchy because their habitus – *qua* teachers - is not synchronised with the economic field, potentially share interests with those managers whose habitus is also not fully synchronised with it. Such managers include those who – as in my own experience – are recruited from the ranks of teachers and, as a result, are potentially subject to the intra- and interpersonal tension produced by a habitus “divided

or even torn" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, loc. cit.) between the fields of economics and pedagogy.

In terms, then, of which class stands to gain most in the hierarchy from the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse, it is those, such as owners/directors and those involved in marketing and finance, whose habitus is best synchronised with the field of economics *and* whose capital is thereby enhanced.⁹²

8.2134 Meso and micro relations as class struggle

Drawing these points together, then, Bourdieu's critique offers an explanation of the social-theoretical significance of the meso and micro identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. In this, teachers, managers and students are valued to the extent that their habitus is synchronised with the economic field, against which any habitus synchronised with the social field – represented by teachers' 'expertise' and students' capacity to learn – is devalued in the advancement of teaching and learning English as consumption processes. The struggles, then, which result within and between these classes and sub-classes of meso and micro actors caught in the "intersection" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, loc. cit.) of these two fields reflect Bourdieu's analysis of consumption as "the very site of a class struggle" (Lee, loc. cit.).

There remains the question of whether Bourdieu's critique accounts for how macro actors shape these meso and micro relations, and whether, therefore, their operations support the inclusion of Bourdieu's critique within the social-theoretical account of commercialisation developed through this study.

⁹² This point marks a difference between members of the dominant class and teachers because, even if a teacher's habitus were synchronised with the economic field, the value of their economic capital would not thereby increase because their class does not dominate the market in this form of capital. Rather, the

8.3 THE INFLUENCE OF MACRO ACTORS

8.31 The data sets

This section describes each of the data sets and explains their significance for the study, previously explained in Chapter 4 in relation to the rationale for the design of the study, in the light of the emergent need to investigate the relationship between the discourses of commercialisation and neoliberalism.

The major consideration in selecting the three data sets was their significance as social resources which both reflect the operations of macro actors and enter discursive practices which shape the identities of and relationships between the meso and micro actors in the study. Consistent with the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 3, then, each of the data sets stands in a different *interdiscursive* relationship to the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation, and thereby provides evidence of a different ‘line of influence’ between the operations of macro actors and these micro and meso relations. The value of these lines of influence for the study is that they represent potential links between the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse and the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. This focus on the influence of macro actors is not, however, meant to deny the possibility of reciprocal influence; rather, it points to the fact that – in line with Mouzelis’s distinctions (loc. cit.) – the dominant influence lies with the macro actors.

8.311 EA News

The EA News is the two-monthly newsletter produced and distributed to colleges by the peak body of the ELICOS sector, the ELICOS Association, of which the majority of ELICOS colleges are members. It is a twelve-sided A4-sized document of around 1,500

value of the capital of the dominant class would be enhanced at the expense of pedagogic capital. This point is developed further in relation to the construction of teachers’ habitus through the CELTA training, below.

words, and includes short articles, statistical information, tables, diagrams and a small number of black and white photographs of people and events. The seven issues gathered for this study, and included in Appendix 7, cover April-December 1997, the year in which the data for the participants' perspective was gathered.

The newsletter is produced to inform those managers whose interests and influence lie in the commercial operations of ELICOS colleges of national and international developments which are relevant to their decision making. In terms of the discourse of commercialisation, then, the EA News serves the interests of these classes by enhancing their ability to maintain the competitiveness of their colleges in the national and international education market.

The value of the EA News for the investigation of the relationship between the discourse of commercialisation and neoliberal discourse is that it represents a line of influence between the national and international operations of macro actors on which it reports and the interests and policies of managers which advance and are advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. This line of influence, then, provides an opportunity to investigate whether the macro operations reported in the newsletter evidence the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse, and therefore whether it is this discourse which legitimises the discourse of commercialisation.

8.312 NEAS regulations

Like the EA News, the NEAS regulations represent a line of influence between the operations of macro actors – in this case, NEAS and the federal government – and the managerial interests and policies which shape the meso and micro relations. However, whereas the EA News provides information selected to enhance their competitiveness, the NEAS regulations are designed to place controls on the commercial and educational practices of colleges.

The controls are textualised as “Standards and criteria” (NEAS, loc. cit.) which colleges must meet in order to be accredited to promote and provide ELICOS courses, and in accordance with which they are subject to a yearly inspection conducted by NEAS. The pressure on managers to meet the standards arises because failure to do so can result in the removal of accreditation, without which the college cannot conduct its business. The “Standards and criteria” are contained in the ‘ELICOS Accreditation handbook’ (NEAS, 2001) a bound, seventy-sided A4 document produced by NEAS and available to colleges on request, and which constitutes the data set employed in this study.

The purpose of the standards, criteria and regulatory practices into which they enter is to ensure that students receive a quality of education defined by the standards and criteria contained in the regulations, and that promotional materials produced by colleges provide an accurate account of the educational products offered. The regulations, then, are designed to influence both the kinds of products which are offered and to specify the information that colleges must provide about them. In terms of the meso and micro relations, the regulations advance the interests of students by intervening to their advantage in the construction of identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation.

As argued above, however, the ‘interests of students’ is itself problematic – a source of struggle between students, and between them and teachers, over social and *economic* constructions of learning. The value of this line of influence for the study, then, is that it provides an opportunity to investigate the relationship between the macro operations which produce and are reproduced by this intervention, and the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse.

8.313 CELTA training materials

The CELTA course represents the final line of influence to be investigated between macro actors and the micro and meso identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. UCLES, together with the colleges which run the CELTA course, shapes the construction of teachers' practices by influencing both teachers' and managers' understandings of what teaching is, and what constitutes 'good teaching'. This influence arises because the CELTA training sector both produces graduates with competencies which match the employment preferences of managers, and, through their dominance of the market in training, advances these as the competencies which managers – and prospective trainees – should prefer.

The data set for the CELTA training materials comprises promotional information produced by UCLES (2002a), and 'The practice of English language teaching' (Harmer, op. cit.), the first edition of which was published in 1983, and which has been commonly used in Australia as the basis of CELTA training programs.

The value of these materials for investigating the relationship between the discourses of neoliberalism and commercialisation is that they evidence the construction of teaching and learning advanced by the CELTA training sector. This construction reflects the priorities of the teacher training sector as a macro actor and therefore provides a further potential link between the economic order advanced by the discourse of neoliberalism and the identities and relationships advanced by that of commercialisation.

8.32 Analysis: from discovery to search

As explained in Chapter 4, the analysis of the social/institutional data involves a shift from the investigation of emergent patterns generated through "inductive" (Miles & Huberman, op. cit., p. 61) coding procedures to a more selective approach in which the methodological emphasis shifts from "discovery" to "search" (Sarangi & Candlin, op. cit.,

p. 371). In Miles and Huberman's (op. cit., p. 17) terms, this is a shift from a "loose" to a "tight" research design, which is "confirmatory" in seeking to "further explicate a conceptualization", in this case the explanatory relevance of Bourdieu's critique to this study.

In the absence of grounded coding procedures, the challenge in taking this "tight" approach is to avoid "plastering a ready made explanation on phenomena that could be construed in more interesting ways" (ibid., p. 38). To acknowledge this risk, I have sought to remain open to 'surprises' in analysing the data, and the findings which result are tentative – pointing to relevant themes in the data which are explained through selected text segments.

The purpose of the search, then, is to confirm whether the operations of macro actors support the inclusion of Bourdieu's critique within the social-theoretical account of commercialisation. In order to do this, evidence is sought for the central feature of Bourdieu's critique, that the discourse of neoliberalism advances an economic order in which the value of "social capital" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) is determined within the economic field, and, therefore in terms of "economic capital" (p. 243). The search, then, is guided by the questions 'Who are the macro actors who produce and are represented in the data sets?', and 'Do their operations evidence the subordination of social to economic capital?'.

8.4 THE FINDINGS: THE ECONOMIC AND THE SOCIAL

8.41 EA News

The next section identifies how the EA News constructs the world of macro actors in which ELICOS managers operate. The following sections explain how this construction evidences a line of influence by which the EA News reflects and legitimises the economic order advanced by the discourse of neoliberalism.

The references to the EA News in this section, and to the ‘ELICOS Accreditation handbook’ in section 8.42, below, cite line numbers in, respectively, Appendices 7 and 8. In section 8.43, the references to Harmer (op. cit.) and UCLES (op. cit.) follow the citation style used to refer to published materials.

8.411 The premise of subordination

Through the EA News, the EA collates and distributes information to its members on the relationships between the operations of the ELICOS sector and those of national and international macro actors such as markets, governments and related industries. The significance of these relationships for Australia’s economic interests are monitored by Australian government departments, agencies and industry bodies who produce the texts on which the EA News draws.

These texts reflect and construct a global web of interlocking and competing economic interests and activities which shape those of the ELICOS sector. The construction of this world exemplifies the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse in being premised on the inevitability of the subordination of social to economic capital in accordance with the “law of the market” (Bourdieu 1998a, p. 35). This is the ‘globalised’ world of economic interdependencies which Bourdieu identifies as the “justificatory myth” (ibid., p. 38) constructed by neoliberal discourse, in which the value placed on regions, countries, institutions and individuals is determined by the operations of international markets, and their inclusion in this world is decided by their significance for Australia’s economic interests: specifically, those of the ELICOS sector.

Among the macro actors in this world, then, are countries, whose identities and operations are constructed in economic terms. Thus, in addition to “Australia”, the countries included are of two types: “target” (1169) – or “mature” (1527) – markets, and “competitors” (2655). These countries, like the products constructed in the brochures, are

animated within the texts and provided with identities in the form of nominalised attributes based on their economic value, typically percentages or other measurements of “growth” (1972). These measurements are based on units such as “student visas” (228), “enrolments” (1071) and “student weeks” (1084), nominalisations which construct students solely in terms of their economic value to Australia, an interpretation supported by the use of these “statistics” as the “leading indicator of trends in our offshore markets” (1510-1511).

These “trends” are shaped by shifts in the demand for products in the global education market, which is itself shaped by national and international social, political and economic developments such as the “demand for skilled labour” (2668). It is these developments which macro actors associated with Australian government and industry seek to manipulate in order to shape demand in “target” (1169) markets to serve the economic interests of the Australian “education export industry” (2649), a form of self-interested intervention in ‘free’ markets which supports Bourdieu’s (op. cit., p. 94) argument that neoliberalism follows not an economic theory but is a “*political programme*”. This programme is evidenced more generally by the construction and evaluation of all social developments in economic terms – exemplified by a report “that the murder of Japanese tourist... in Cairns ‘had not affected bookings’” (2294-2295). The construction of national and international developments in the EA News, then, reflects not only their economic significance for ELICOS and related industries, such as tourism, but the degree to which these developments can be influenced by government and industry bodies – and the extent to which these share the economic interests of, and can be influenced by, the EA and its members.

The construction of ‘Australia’, then, is itself fractal, comprising macro, meso and micro actors who struggle to maximise their economic advantage in the market. In this process, some developments, such as “currency movements” (2653-2654), lie beyond their

influence; some, such as the federal government's tightening of "visa controls" (218-219), create conflicts between them; while others, such as the promotion of an international "image" (902) of Australia, draw them together because it is their common interest to manipulate this image in order to maximise Australia's attraction as a destination for international capital – including that provided by international students. The following example of the construction and promotion of this image as a 'strategy' exemplifies the subordination of social to economic capital in the world constructed in the EA News.

8.412 Taiwan and the race debate

8.4121 Social division and market decline

During 1997, there was a decline in the number of students coming to study in Australia from Taiwan, while the number of students coming from other countries in the region remained steady or increased. For this reason, Taiwan was the focus of a number of articles in the EA News which provided statistics on the decline, offered explanations for it, and reported on initiatives being taken to raise the demand for Australian education in Taiwan. One of the reasons given for the decline was the actions of a member of the federal parliament, Pauline Hanson, who had developed a social/political stance which was widely interpreted, both nationally and internationally, to be racist. In Australia, though her policies were condemned by many, they gained support among some sections of the population – to the point where her party, the 'One Nation Party', won a number of seats from both major parties. The political authority she thereby gained transformed her into a macro actor who threatened the political base of the major parties, was widely reported in the media in South East Asia, brought into sharp focus the question of Australia's attitude to people in the region, and exacerbated divisions within Australian political and social life.

In the diary analysis, evidence of these divisions has already emerged in the control by managers of teaching materials on Ms Hanson in order to protect the image of their colleges (see for, example, D6: 216-221). In terms of the discourse of commercialisation, this control of materials was an example of the pressure on teachers to become ‘operatives’ in ‘consumption processes’, qualified only to carry out procedures whose purposes are supervised by managers to meet economic interests.

However, viewed from the social/institutional perspective, a line of influence emerges between the actions of these managers and those of macro actors – a line which traces the subordination of the social to the economic from the discourse of neoliberalism to that of commercialisation. Thus, while the teachers selected these materials for their value as authentic stimuli for language learning – a value determined within the field of pedagogy, their control by managers reflected the subordination of the social to the economic evaluation of Ms Hanson on a national and international scale by macro actors attempting to protect Australia’s economic interests. It is this subordination of the social to the economic by both meso and macro actors which is evidenced as a line of influence by the construction of Taiwan in the EA News, a construction which, as in Bourdieu’s account of neoliberal discourse (op. cit.), naturalises the inevitability of this subordination according to the “law of the market” (p. 35). It is this construction, then, which evidences that the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation are legitimated by that of neoliberalism.

This legitimisation starts in an article in the June issue of EA News entitled “Taiwan: market changes addressed” (859-933). Through this and a subsequent article, “Where the slowdown has occurred” (1518-1587), Taiwan is constructed as a “market” (868ff). This nominalisation subordinates in a single lexico-grammatical move the social complexities of the country to the operation of economic forces. In the following example, this economic construction is extended to students as well.

In the 1997 March Quarter 23,488 student visas were issued by offshore posts, an increase of 6 percent on the corresponding quarter in 1996. Taiwan, however, showed an 18 percent decline over the same period (865-868).

Here, “students” are constructed as “student visas” (865), a nominalisation which – as explained above – further legitimates the subordination of social to economic value. Thus, the number of “students visas” issued in Taiwan becomes the measure of its declining value. This identity is developed through the attribution of further nominalisations drawn from the discourse of economics, such as “negative growth” (869), “turnaround” (876), and “slowdown” (1518); and the construction of the “Taiwanese market” as an agent, as in “The Taiwanese market has recorded negative growth for the last three consecutive quarters and is clearly a market that has turned against Australia” (1523-1525). Through these lexico-grammatical operations, then, a relationship between “Taiwan” and “Australia” is constructed in which the Taiwanese market, as a macro actor, is capable of acting against the economic interests of Australia. The questions, then, addressed in the EA News are what has caused this change in Taiwan’s behaviour, and how Australia – as a macro actor – can intervene.

8.4122 Social division as economic intervention

Intervention is advanced as necessary through the construction of the Taiwanese ‘market’ as serving Australia’s ‘interests’, and its ‘decline’ as a threat to Australia’s status as a macro actor, a construction in which, for example, Taiwan is “a market that requires immediate and longer term attention if Australia is to maintain its position and redress the decline” (870-872). Unquestioned, and therefore advanced as self evident, is the *legitimacy* of intervening in the decisions of Taiwanese people in order to maximise Australia’s economic advantage. Here again, then, the construction of Taiwan and

Australia as macro actors advances the subordination of the social to the economic, in this case, drawing on and legitimising a further assumption of neoliberal discourse, that “individual rationality” (Bourdieu, op. cit., p. 94) – in this case that of macro actors – is the legitimate basis of action, and that “maximum growth, and therefore productivity and competitiveness, are the ultimate and sole goal” of such action (p. 30-31).

Similarly, the construction of the causes of the Taiwan’s declining performance draws on and thereby reinforces the more general construction of Australia’s relations with other countries as either “target” (1169) markets or “competitors” (2655). These causes are presented as a list of nominalisations (876-893) which, by excluding all social interests, processes and the modalities associated with them, construct the causes as asocial ‘givens’, valued only for their significance to the calculation of Australia’s economic advantage.

The causes are of three types: the ‘economic’, the ‘promotional’ and the ‘social’. The first focuses on the operations of markets, the second on the manipulation of the perceptions which shape these operations, and the third on social developments which shape the perceptions. In terms of Australia’s capacity to influence market operations, then, these distinctions generate two types of market activity: that which Australia cannot influence by manipulating perceptions and social developments, and that which it can. The former includes the operations of international currency markets, as in “the appreciation of the Australian dollar” (882); and the actions of other macro actors, as in “increased promotional activity by the USA and other competitor countries” (885); and economic causes within Australia, such as “Increased student visa fees” (893) and “Increases in the cost of Australian courses relative to other competitor countries” (890).

It is international perceptions of social developments in Australia, specifically the “fallout from the racism debate” (878) and Australia’s “low profile relative to the USA” (885) which are identified as the focus of intervention in redressing the declining

economic relationship with Taiwan; and it is this manipulation of the social to intervene in the economic which exemplifies the subordination advanced by neoliberal discourse.

The first move in this process is the nominalisation “racism debate” itself. This construction transforms the social divisions which resulted from widespread support for Ms Hanson’s stance into a ‘topic’, insulated from any implication of social conflict by the bipartisan agreement necessary for the ritualised disagreement of a ‘debate’. This de-socialisation is taken further as the “short term” strategy to counter the “fallout” is explained as “seeking to counter recent negative publicity with good news stories supplied by institutions” (896), moves which are part of a “multi-faceted strategy to improve Australia’s performance in Taiwan” (899-900), a strategy which “builds on the theme of promoting Australia’s image as a technologically advanced country with outstanding research excellence” (901-903).

In the shift from the “racism debate” to “negative publicity” to “Australia’s image”, then, the last vestiges of social division, along with questions of truth and falsity, are excluded from the construction of Australia, a process which reconstructs and legitimates the social as an “image” to be manipulated by using ‘counter’ images in the form of “good news stories”, focused, presumably, on presenting Australia “as a technologically advanced country with outstanding research excellence” – and provided by those “institutions” whose economic interests it is which are at stake in “Australia’s performance in Taiwan”.

Finally, these constructions, and the subordination they advance, are further legitimised by the decision of the federal government to establish a “task force specifically designed to counter the impact of the racism debate in Asia” (1578-1580), a task force which has produced a “strategy document” which “is now being considered by the Prime Minister” (1582).

8.413 Summary

In summary, then, the construction of macro actors advanced through the EA News supports Bourdieu's (op. cit.) argument that neoliberalism is not an economic theory but a "*political programme*" (p. 94) legitimised by the "justificatory myth" (p. 38) of economic globalisation. Specifically, the construction of Taiwan and the race debate provide evidence that reports collated in the EA News construct as legitimate and inevitable the subordination of the social to the economic according to the "law of the market" (ibid., p. 35), and in doing so legitimates the propositions that "individual rationality" (p. 94) is the basis of "maximum growth, and therefore productivity and competition..." and the "...ultimate and sole goal of human actions" (p. 31). As characteristic of neoliberal discourse, then, these constructions provide evidence that it is this discourse which, through the EA News, stands in a line of influence in which it legitimates as necessary the policies of managers which advance and are advanced by the discourse of commercialisation.

8.42 NEAS

The following section explains the interests of the macro actors and meso actors whose operations shape and are shaped by NEAS's regulation of ELICOS colleges; the remaining sections explain the evidence for a line of influence between these macro actors and meso actors through which the NEAS regulations legitimate – through their construction of 'quality' – the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse.

8.421 The regulation and reproduction of interests

Through the NEAS regulations and the discursive practices into which they enter in ELICOS colleges, NEAS intervenes in the operations of the market – the economic order legitimised through the EA News – to protect the interests of consumers in their economic

relationship with producers. In this process, the operations of NEAS contribute to the production and reproduction of the operations of the EA, and federal and state governments. The relations between NEAS and the interests of these actors can be traced through its history and the sources of its authority.

8.4211 The interests of NEAS, the EA and ELICOS managers

NEAS was established in 1990 on the initiative of the EA. This followed a period in which the international reputation of the ELICOS sector had been threatened by the exploitation of students by the management of hitherto unregulated colleges. Through this period, it became apparent to the EA, as the body responsible for developing and promoting the image of the ELICOS sector in the collective interest⁹³ of its members, that regulation would be required if ELICOS students were to be protected from these excesses of the market, and the sector's international reputation thereby redeemed. The EA's aim, then, in establishing NEAS, was to secure the economic interests of the ELICOS sector by ensuring that the colleges within it offered products which satisfied consumers. As evidenced in Chapter 7, this aim is reflected in the use of NEAS in ELICOS promotional materials as a guarantor of 'quality'.

These links between the EA and NEAS are evident in that fact that the council of the EA comprises its company members, and one representative sits on its board to represent the interests of the ELICOS sector. However, NEAS's independence in developing and implementing the regulations is protected by a constitution and organisational structure designed to ensure its legal and practical autonomy – and it is self-funding. Though its operations are independent in this sense, then, they contribute to the

⁹³ The collective interest represented by the EA as an industry 'peak body' contrasts with the "destruction of collectives" (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp. 95-96) evidenced above in the weakening of teachers' union membership brought about by the casualisation of work.

production and reproduction of those of the EA by denying accreditation to colleges which fall below its standards and might otherwise endanger the sector's international image.

While NEAS holds this value for the EA, this is not be the case with managers of colleges whose economic interests do not coincide with the collective interests represented by the EA. As meso actors in relation to NEAS, these managers' relations with NEAS involve struggle over the requirement to align their practices with the regulations, albeit one sided because of the regulatory authority exercised by NEAS. In Bourdieu's (1994a, p. 113) terms, then, NEAS and these managers represent different "classes", and the struggle to secure their competing interests is played out through the inter-institutional reflexivity of the regulatory cycle of inspections, feedback, and re-inspections.

Likewise, NEAS and the EA are not members of the same class. This is because, though regulation serves the EA's interest in maintaining the international reputation of the sector, NEAS's primary interest lies in developing and implementing the regulatory framework, an interest which derives from the source of its authority: the state and federal governments, who are macro actors to whom the EA and NEAS stand as meso actors.

8.4212 NEAS and the interests of government

NEAS holds this authority because state and federal governments acknowledge it as the sole regulator and accreditor of ELICOS colleges. This acknowledgment is based on legislation in some states, and in all states draws on federal legislation – notably the ESOS⁹⁴ Act, which provides for legal sanctions against educational providers which do not comply with its requirements. Also reflected in the "Standards and criteria" (NEAS, op. cit., pp. 19-53) are requirements established by federal immigration legislation on the visa types under which students may study, and on their attendance requirements. Likewise included is a requirement that all ELICOS courses themselves must be

accredited and listed on a national register, the CRICOS⁹⁵ code, before they can be marketed internationally. Again, NEAS is the accrediting authority – and its “Standards and criteria” therefore include requirements covering courses.

This line of authority from government through the operations of NEAS to the management of ELICOS colleges raises two questions for this study. The first concerns whether the dominant interests of government in providing NEAS with this authority are economic or social; the second whether the operations of NEAS contribute to the production and reproduction of operations which serve these interests.

An answer to the first question can be found in the introduction to the federal government’s regulatory guidelines for all providers of education to overseas students, the ‘National Code’ (DETYA, op. cit.), where the need for regulation is explained as follows:

Australia’s Federal and State and Territory Governments recognise the benefits which our education and training export industry brings to the nation. It strengthens our relations with the countries and regions from which students come, and yields valuable financial revenue. The internationalisation of education enriches the life of educational institutions and benefits domestic students by promoting the cross-fertilisation of ideas and cultures. Competing in the international market-place is a stimulus to quality and innovation in the interests of all students (p. 1).

Here, the social is constructed as a series of “benefits” (line 1) associated with the “internationalisation of education” (line 4): specifically, the strengthening of “our relations with countries and regions” (line 2), enrichment in “the life of educational institutions”

⁹⁴ Education Services for Overseas Students Act

⁹⁵ Commonwealth Register of Institutions and Courses for Overseas Students

(line 5), and promotion of “the cross fertilisation of ideas and cultures” (line 6). The combination of these nominalisations constructs a notion of social ‘globalisation’ as an attraction which can only be achieved by, and therefore legitimates, the neoliberal economic order – exemplified by the operations of “our education and training export industry” (lines 1-2) in “the international market-place” (line 6). This subordination of the social to the economic, then, provides further support for Bourdieu’s account of “globalisation” (1998a, p. 34ff) as, in so far as it is used to justify neoliberal policies, a construct of neoliberal discourse itself.

This interpretation is both consistent with the dominance of economic interests evidenced in the EA News, and provides an answer to the question of how to explain how students’ “interests” (line 8) are constructed here. As explained above, the construction of students as consumers in consumption processes subordinates their ability to learn – in Bourdieu’s (1986, p. 243) terms, their “social capital” as learners. In the light of the economic interest of the government, then, the unqualified assertion that international competition “is a stimulus to quality and innovation in the interests of all students” (line 7-8) suggests that the “interests” here are those of students as consumers rather than learners.

Further evidence for this interpretation is provided by the construction of ‘consumer protection’, the focus of the next sections.

8.422 The federal construction of ‘consumer protection’

The following explanation of ‘consumer protection’ is provided in the ‘National Code’:

Consumer protection must cater for the fact that students who travel to Australia cannot usually see before they purchase, and, if there is reason for discontent with the services they have obtained, they may not be able to remain in Australia

to pursue the consumer protection remedies provided through the courts
(DETYA, loc. cit.).

The discourse here constructs identities and relationships which resonate with those advanced by the discourse of commercialisation – specifically, in the construction of learning as a product which students “cannot usually see before they purchase” (line 2) and which is “obtained” (line 3). Like the discourse of commercialisation, this construction implies an unmediated relationship between the product and the consumer in consumption processes. Complementing this construction is the identification of students as consumers, who, if they do not benefit to their satisfaction from the consumption process, may experience “discontent” (line 2), a word which connotes no critical engagement in learning – an example of the “social capital” (Bourdieu, loc. cit.) of the student-as-learner – but instead constructs students in terms of their feelings as a “consumer” (line 1). As argued above, it is these feelings which are the measure of ‘quality’ in the consumption community, and therefore the “reason for discontent” (line 2) advanced by the discourse of commercialisation.

The construction in the ‘National Code’, then, of the “benefits” of international competition, “quality”, students’ “interests” and “consumer protection” suggests that the discourse employed here – in its legitimisation of the subordination of the social to the economic – is a manifestation of neoliberal discourse. This subordination, in turn, raises the second question posed above: whether there is a line of influence from the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse – through regulation – to the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation.

8.423 The NEAS construction of 'quality'

8.4231 Teaching 'quality' and the perceptions of participants

As in the 'National Code', the answer to this question depends on the construction of 'quality', the maintenance of which is identified by NEAS as its "primary goal" (157-159). In explicating this construction, it lies beyond the scope of this section to detail how the individual standards and criteria construct teachers' practices. Rather, their significance for the argument developed here lies in which aspects of institutional life are included as relevant to the regulation of 'quality' and which are not. Specifically, the focus is on how the 'quality' of teachers practices is regulated – and how the identity thereby advanced for teachers compares with that to which they are pressured to conform by the discourse of commercialisation.

Through the "Standards and criteria" (NEAS, loc. cit.), then, teachers practices are shaped by controls which include the design of premises and facilities (1199ff); the qualifications of teachers (1410ff); their professional development (1434ff); the qualifications and responsibilities of directors of studies (1387ff); curriculum design and management (887ff); teaching materials and resources (2142ff); student assessment (2030ff); and timetables and class sizes (1859). The construction of 'quality' which emerges here does not evidence the construction of teaching and learning as consumption processes; indeed, it broadly aligns with the pedagogic understanding expressed by the diarists. The following two examples illustrate this, each being drawn from a practice in which teachers' professional standards are reported in the diaries to be compromised.

First, in relation to professional development, the criteria include the requirement that "The institution provides for the ongoing professional development of teaching staff to ensure teachers are kept up to date with current knowledge, theory and practice in the field." (1436-1438), and that "Teachers receive ongoing guidance and support from the Director of Studies on course design and lesson planning, with particular attention to the

less experienced teachers” (1444-1446). Here, NEAS as the absent, though implied, regulator of compliance, not only replaces the ‘college’ as the omniscient supervisor, but subordinates it in a construction of relations between NEAS and teachers in which their professional expertise is the beneficiary of regulation. In this relationship, the ‘college’ is – in a construction which parallels that of teachers in the brochures – transformed into a ‘supervised operative’ whose actions are dependent on and accountable to the authority and expertise of NEAS. In this relationship, “professional development” (1436-1437) reflects the value placed on it by the diarists. Thus, the use of “current knowledge, theory and practice in the field” (1438) constructs teachers as members of a broader professional collective in which expertise is developed, distributed and evaluated: the antithesis of the ‘qualified operative’ in a consumption community. Indeed, it is precisely the conflict between the institution’s obligation to provide professional development in this sense and its use of professional development for appraisal which is the focus of teachers’ concerns in the diaries.

In the second example, the standard covering student assessment (2030ff) requires that “The institution’s practices and procedures for the assessment of students are appropriate, fair and equitable and operate at all times in the best interests of the students” (2035-2038) Here again, the value of the practice is measured in pedagogic terms, through the conditions of ‘appropriacy’, ‘fairness’ and ‘equity’. Here, however, the interpretation of “best interests” (2038) is critical: that it advances a pedagogic, rather than an economic, construction of ‘interest’ is supported by further criteria which, for example, link assessment to students’ “language level, maturity and the objectives of the course” (2058-2059).

8.4232 Exclusions from the construction of the workplace

On this evidence, then, the construction of teachers and their practices in the “Standards and criteria” does not legitimate the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. This, however, leaves unanswered the question of how the regulations allow teachers to be pressured to conform to this identity, as evidenced by the analysis of the diaries. The explanation lies in the exclusion from the regulations of performance appraisal and employment security, and the minimisation of “social capital” (Bourdieu, loc. cit.), in the form of teaching expertise, in employment criteria. This exclusion and minimisation are significant because they disconnect the ‘quality’ of teaching from the ‘quality’ of the workplace, specifically from the fears of redundancy which drive teachers to comply with pressures to commercialise their teaching⁹⁶. Combined with the absence of criteria by which to judge the ‘quality’ of employment security, the lack of a measure of the ‘quality’ of appraisal allows it – as evidenced by the diary analysis – to be used to pressure teachers to “consent” (Gramsci, loc. cit.) to the role of operatives in consumption processes, “consent” which is bought by the threat of redundancy ensured by the use of short term, casual employment contracts. Thus the regulations allow the ‘quality’ of teachers’ practices to be mediated – through the commercialisation of appraisal – by the actions of the meso class of managers. Moreover, the minimisation of the “social capital” (Bourdieu, loc. cit.), in the form of teaching expertise, required for employment as a teacher allows this capital to be subordinated to

⁹⁶ Though the explanation for these exclusions lies beyond the scope of this study, it may be connected to a division between the ‘quality’ of products and the ‘quality’ of workplace conditions, in which the former have traditionally been the focus of safety and other consumer ‘standards’, and the latter matters for state arbitration, and of struggle between management and unions. With the reduction in union membership wrought by casualisation, and the state having withdrawn from “its role of arbiter between labour and capital, allying itself with capital and pushing labour into a defensive position” (Burbules & Torres, 2000, p. 5), only the protection of consumer ‘standards’ remains – standards which are themselves jeopardised by the absence of protection for the ‘quality’ of the workplace.

“economic capital” (p. 243) through the manipulation of teachers’ habitus itself – the process addressed in relation to the CELTA in the next section.

It is these exclusions, then, which point to a line of influence between the discourse of neoliberalism and that of commercialisation because they allow, and thereby legitimise, the “progressive obsolescence” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 50) of established practices through the continual need for teachers to “*prove themselves*” (Bourdieu 1998a, p. 100) according to market-determined criteria which lie beyond their control. In this process, the exclusions from the regulations facilitate the “intensification of insecurity” (ibid., p. 84) among teachers, contributing to the production and reproduction of the “structural violence” (p. 98) of “flexploitation” (pp. 85ff), further characteristics of the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse. Consistent with this explanation, appraisal and employment security are absent from the construction of the workplace under the two criteria in which teaching *is* connected to the ‘quality’ of the workplace.

The first criteria stipulates that teachers should receive a “signed statement containing a job description and the terms and conditions of employment” (1425-1426). The only condition placed on this requirement concerns ownership by the college of materials created by directors of studies and teachers: namely, that “it is advisable to make explicit the arrangements relating to the ownership of any curriculum and/or instructional materials created or developed by the employee while in the employ of the institution” (1611-1614). The workplace in its relationship to the ‘quality’ of teaching, then, is here constructed as a – potential – site of struggle between managers and teachers over the control of teaching materials, but with no indication whether it is managers or teachers who should – in the interests of ‘quality’ – own these. The lack of regulation here, combined with the fact that the “Standards and criteria” are addressed to managers, not teachers, suggests that the question of ownership advances the economic interests of managers, an interpretation supported by the absence of regulation covering the primary

means by which teachers are brought to compromise their practices: the combination of employment appraisal and insecurity.

This construction of the workplace is complicated, though not compromised, by the second criterion, in which the college is required to ensure “that teachers’ working conditions and rates of pay compare favourably with similar teaching systems, to promote equitable and harmonious employment arrangements which enhance the quality of education offered” (1428-1431). Here, then, the workplace is constructed as capable of promoting the “quality of education” (1431) through measures which, though relevant to teachers’ interests *while* they are employed, exclude those practices which threaten their employment security – the prime means by which the commercialisation of teachers’ practices is advanced.

Finally, the “Standards and criteria” allow the subordination of the social by minimising the “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) required in teaching. As in previous chapters, “social capital” here refers to the ‘expertise’ teachers draw on in teaching students as learners – a form of capital which teachers acquire through the combination of qualifying to practise as teachers, teaching experience, and membership of the profession, and whose value is produced and reproduced through the synchronisation of their habitus with the field of pedagogy. In the “Standards and criteria”, two combinations of qualifications and experience are acceptable. The first is a pre-service teacher training qualification resulting from a course which is “at least three years full-time”, confers “‘trained teachers’ status” (1553-1555), and includes a specialisation in English language teaching (1510). Such a qualification would be acceptable within the mainstream school education sector and represents a higher level of expertise than the second minimum, which is the most common employment requirement in ELICOS. This is a degree or diploma in any field, 800 hours’ English language teaching experience, and an English language teaching qualification resulting from a course which includes at least

100 hours' tuition, with a "content focus on English language, language learning, TESOL teaching" and "a practical component including at least six hours supervised and assessed practice teaching in TESOL" (1564-1567).

This description of the minimum qualification matches the CELTA, which, as noted above, is the dominant teaching qualification in ELICOS. Anticipating the argument in the next section, then, by reducing the "social capital" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) required for teaching to the CELTA qualification, the "Standards and criteria" legitimise the construction of 'good teaching' advanced by the CELTA, a construction which subordinates the social to the economic by meeting the economic imperative to construct teachers' practices as consumption processes.

8.424 Summary

Drawing these points together, then, government operations in advancing export education exemplify the subordination of the social to the economic through their construction of social 'globalisation' to justify neoliberal policies which construct students as consumers. On the other hand, the NEAS regulations contribute to the production and reproduction of the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse through their construction of teaching as a workplace practice. Excluded from this construction, and thereby legitimising their disconnection from the 'quality' of teaching, are those practices which enable the subordination of "social capital" (Bourdieu, loc. cit.) to "economic capital" (p. 243) through the "the rational management of insecurity" (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp. 85ff): namely, market-driven performance appraisal and employment on casual work contracts. It is this subordination which characterises the neoliberal economic order of "structural violence" (ibid., p. 98), in which workers' "life chances" (Postone et al., loc. cit.) depend on the "arbitrary decision of a power responsible for the 'continued creation' of their existence" (Bourdieu, op. cit., p. 99). Further legitimising the implementation of this

356

economic order is the minimisation of the “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) required for, and acquired through, teaching to that provided by the CELTA – the focus of the next section.

8.43 CELTA

This section explains the operations of the CELTA sector and its interconnections with other macro actors; how they, together, meet and shape the global demand for teachers; and the line of influence these operations evidence through their promotion and legitimisation of ‘good teaching’.

8.431 The CELTA sector as a macro actor

The CELTA sector’s status as a macro actor derives from the international scale of its operations and its influence on teachers’ and managers’ understandings of what language is, and what language teaching and learning involve. Reflecting this dominance of the market in training, the CELTA is “probably the most widely recognised and respected TEFL certification world-wide” (Ginsberg, 1997, p. 13). The success of the CELTA sector reflects its ability to meet, and itself shape, the increasing demand from ELT institutions, such as ELICOS colleges, for teachers to supply their products to the global market for English. As Littlejohn (2000, para. 10), has explained, in this “expanding market for language instruction, the teacher certification business has expanded accordingly”. By “certification” is meant qualifications which result from courses of approximately a hundred hours of tuition designed for people with no previous teaching experience. In this form, the CELTA was started in the 1970s by the Royal Society for Arts (RSA) as the ‘CTEFLA’⁹⁷. According to UCLES (2002a, p. 2), in 1988 it “took over” the running of the

⁹⁷ Certificate in Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Adults

certificate from the RSA, after which it was produced as the CELTA. As the dominant course of its kind internationally, the CELTA is, in its full-time version, a four-week program which is now run at “over 200 approved centres in 38 countries”, conducting 600 courses each year, and producing more than 7,000 graduates annually” (ibid., p. 1).

While the CELTA is described by UCLES as an “initial” (ibid.) qualification and an “introductory course” (UCLES, 2002b, p. 2), it has nevertheless become the minimum, sufficient and dominant teaching qualification in ELICOS – as reflected in the “Standards and criteria” (NEAS, loc. cit.). Indeed, the demand for CELTA graduates internationally is such that it has become “widely recognised as the premier initial TEFL qualification” (Rowe, 2002). This expansion in the demand for graduates has paralleled growth in the operations and influence of publishers of English language teaching materials (Gray, 2002, pp. 153ff), macro actors whose publications both draw on the construction of teaching advanced by the CELTA, and are drawn on in CELTA courses – a relationship which adds to their joint capacity to shape understandings of teaching and learning, and thereby increase demand for their products in the market. In the case of the CELTA sector, these products include the graduates it produces and the CELTA course itself.

The strength of demand for its graduates depends on the CELTA sector’s capacity to produce teachers who meets the requirements of managers in ELT institutions. Here, the dominance of the sector in the training market enables it to shape these requirements, evidenced, for example, by the fact that UCLES “works with international ELT organisations to ensure the acceptance of CELTA globally (UCLES, loc. cit.). The CELTA, then, is a product promoted to potential trainees as enabling them to promote themselves to managers whose understanding of English language teaching and learning is itself shaped by the CELTA.

The strength of this demand is, in turn, used in the promotion of the CELTA course to potential trainees, to whom it is offered as a lifestyle in which, for example,

graduates are in a “very strong position to get a job in any country where English is widely taught” (Griffith, 1999, cited in University of Santiago de Compostela, 2000) and in which the CELTA “is your passport to work around the world” (St. Giles English Teaching Center in San Francisco, 2002). With its implications of financial rewards and international mobility, this lifestyle simultaneously suggests the ‘freedom’ to combine work and travel, while matching trainees aspirations to the need for short-term workers in the internationally-casualised English language teaching job market.

The line of influence this suggests, then, starts with the construction of the lifestyle of ‘global opportunities’ as the reward for potential trainees. This is a further example – following the ‘international lifestyle’ offered to students, and the ‘social benefits’ of neoliberal policies advanced by the federal government – of ‘globalisation’ constructed as an attraction for those who stand to lose from neoliberal policies. Thus, it combines both the “lifestyle” (Bourdieu 1984, pp. 101ff) which, through consumers’ efforts to achieve it, increases the value of the economic capital of the dominant classes, and a construction of ‘globalisation’ which legitimates the neoliberal economic order (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp. 34ff). It is on the promise of this lifestyle, then, that the CELTA sector, while increasing the value of its own economic capital and dominance in the training market, trains a labour force which is prepared (in both senses) to comply with the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. In doing so, it subordinates the “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) – the ‘expertise’ – associated with teaching to a construction which serves the economic interests of both the CELTA and ELICOS sectors: namely, the teacher as ‘operative’. It is this line of influence which is the focus of the following sections.

8.432 The global construction of 'good teaching'

In its global operations and influence, the CELTA exemplifies what Littlejohn (loc. cit.) has described as a trend towards "global standardised conceptions of what a 'good teacher' is"⁹⁸, a process which involves the "standardisation of routines and interactions" which prevents "the students and the teacher recognising each other as *individuals*". According to Littlejohn, (ibid.) this standardised construction of the "good teacher" is based on the trainee's ability to conduct "'model lessons'" based on the "presentation-practice-production" teaching methodology, known as "PPP", a methodology which is "probably still the commonest teaching approach when judged on a world wide basis" (Skehan, 1998, p. 94). By reducing teaching to lesson-sized units of repeatable procedures, the expertise required of the teacher is reduced to "a script to be unfolded regardless of context, to be acted out with adults and children alike, rendering schools detached from any wider educational goals in the pursuit of an efficient, predictable means towards language proficiency" (Littlejohn, loc. cit.). According to the head of the TEFL unit at UCLES, L. Murphy-O'Dwyer, it is this PPP approach which has been used "on most courses... as the model that introduces candidates to their professional skills" (Willis, 1996b, p. 150).

Consistent with Littlejohn's critique, the CELTA course materials gathered for this study (Harmer, op. cit.) provide evidence that, through its employment of PPP, the CELTA course constructs and legitimises 'good teaching' as standardised and repeatable procedures, a construction which reflects the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation. The starting point for this construction is the distinction

⁹⁸ Similarly, Block (2002) has argued that the main rival to PPP in the global market for teaching methodologies, 'task-based' learning, involves what he has termed "McCommunication", a global tendency to standardise the teaching of communication "as a rational activity devoted to the transfer of information between and among individuals in an efficient, calculable, predictable and controllable manner via the use of language, understood in strictly linguistic terms" (pp. 121ff). Both Littlejohn's and Block's observations are in turn consistent with Canagarajah's (1999, p. 103) observation that "ELT pedagogic thinking has been

between “input” and “output”, a sequence of teaching designed to *lead* students to language proficiency. In ‘The practice of English Language Teaching’, Harmer (op. cit.) explains that

We can divide the classroom into two main categories: those that give students language *input*, and those which encourage them to produce *output*. Whether acquisition or conscious learning takes place, there will be stages at which students are receiving language – language is somehow ‘put into’ the students (though they will decide whether or not they want to receive it). But exposing students to language input is not enough: we also need to provide opportunities for them to activate this knowledge, for it is only when students are producing language that they can select from the input they have received (p. 40).

This division of the “classroom” (line 1) into “input” and “output” (line 2) facilitates the construction of teaching, learning and language itself as products in consumption processes. Thus, the language which is “put into” (line 4) students is constructed as divisible into standardised – and therefore ‘commodity-friendly’ – ‘skills’ and ‘items’. These include “the four major language skills” (ibid., p. 17), “receptive” and “productive” skills (ibid.), “sub-skills” (ibid.), “macro” and “micro” skills (ibid., p. 18), “new language” (ibid., pp. 56ff) and “grammatical items” (ibid., p. 23). It is these skills and items for which the student is the repository and beneficiary; and it is the teacher who “puts” them “into” the student as language “input”.

This construction of language as divisible units, and learning as a sequence of input and output stages gives rise to and legitimates a hierarchy of procedures which

together constitute and constrain the options available in teaching. These procedures, like the skills and items of language, are “eminently trainable” (Skehan, loc. cit.), being themselves divisible and standardised, thereby facilitating the construction of teacher training itself as a product and the teacher’s role as that of an ‘operative’, qualified to select and conduct, but not to establish or question, teaching procedures. Thus, input involves “presentation”; and output “practice” and “communication”⁹⁹ (Harmer, op. cit., pp. 40-41), and each of these stages is itself constructed from different sequences of “components” (p. 55): for example, in the presentation stage, these are “*lead-in, elicitation, explanation, accurate reproduction, and immediate creativity*” (p. 60). Each of these components is in turn constructed from different kinds of “activities” ranged on a cline between “non-communicative” and “communicative” (ibid., p. 50). To conduct these activities, teachers follow different “procedures” or “techniques” (ibid., p. 62), which in turn imply different “roles” for the teacher: specifically, those of “controller”, “assessor”, “organiser”, “prompter”, “participant”, “resource”, and “tutor” (pp. 235ff).

Notwithstanding the fact that “ultimately a students’ success or failure is in their own hands” (ibid., p. 7), this is a model of teaching in which, as in the consumer identity advanced by the discourse of commercialisation, students’ responsibility for learning is minimised - reduced to deciding “whether or not they want to receive it” (p. 40) in a process of consumption in which procedures bring about learning. In this process, “the teacher is at the centre of what is happening at all times” (Wright, 1987, cited in Skehan, loc. cit.). Thus, by engaging in “communicative activities...” students “...will be forced to access the language they have in their language store, and will gradually develop strategies of communication” (Harmer, op. cit., p. 40). Here, mirroring the construction of consumers in the ELICOS brochures, students are not responsible for learning –

⁹⁹ This “communication” stage is otherwise known as ‘production’, thus creating the acronym ‘PPP’ by which the methodology is otherwise known.

participating as the goal of “forced” and the “medium” (Halliday, op. cit., p. 146) which undergoes the ergative process “develop”, a process not brought about by students but the implied result of the first clause. Similarly, in the following example, the nominalised procedures “language production” and “receiving feedback” participate as the “initiators” (ibid., p. 263) of the causative verbal groups which enable the students’ rehearsal of “language use” and the changes in the their “perceptions”.

Language production allows students to rehearse language use in classroom conditions whilst receiving feedback (from the teachers, from other students and from themselves) which allows them to adjust their perceptions of the language input they have received (Harmer, op. cit., p. 40).

Here, then, as in the consumption community, learning does not involve an imposition of responsibility on students because the causative relationship between the two processes in the verbal group ensures that human participants do not act “directly” (Halliday, loc. cit.), on them: rather, their learning is delivered through procedures for which others – namely teachers – are responsible.

Furthermore, this construction of teachers as the responsible agents in learning extends beyond their conduct of procedures to the creation of student motivation itself. Thus, “teachers need to do everything possible to create a good rapport with students” (Harmer, op. cit., p. 6), including conducting lessons which are “interesting and motivating”. This overriding need to create a “good rapport” places the onus of responsibility for students’ experience of learning on teachers, thus providing a link to the managerial priority to create and maintain students’ ‘happiness’ – identified in this study as a characteristic of the consumer identity advanced by the discourse of commercialisation and a market-driven criterion in the appraisal of teachers.

The account of the CELTA developed here gains support from its capacity to explain shortcomings identified in PPP as a teaching methodology. From this perspective, PPP has been criticised for making unwarranted assumptions about language learning. These include the assumption that the required simplification of language is conducive to language learning (Willis, 1990, p. 44); that the production stage involves genuine communication (p. 4-5); that learners retain what they may appear to have learnt (Willis, 1996a, p. 47); and that learners learn in sequences “from zero to mastery” (Long & Crookes, 1992, p. 31). Together, these assumptions reflect closely the construction of learning required by the discourse of commercialisation, according to which language is reduced to simplified, and therefore commodifiable, units, and successful learning, through the consumption of standardised products, is assured. That these are assumptions of PPP, then, is, according to the argument developed here, the predictable pedagogic cost of constructing learning in accordance with the dictates of the discourse of commercialisation.

Consistent with Littlejohn’s (op. cit.) analysis, then, and in line with the construction of teaching advanced by the discourse of commercialisation, ‘The practice of English Language Teaching’ provides evidence that the CELTA constructs ‘good teaching’ in terms of standardised, reproducible procedures – thereby excluding from it the ‘expertise’ required to manage and evaluate the purposes of teaching practices. The question remains as to how this construction contributes to the production and reproduction of the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse. This is the focus of the next section.

8.433 ‘Good teaching’ as the legitimate competence

The CELTA’s construction of the ‘good teacher’ contributes to the economic order of neoliberalism by advancing as inevitable and legitimate a habitus for teachers which is

synchronised with the economic field. It does so by constructing teachers as ‘operatives’, and students as consumers, in consumption processes. As argued above, this capacity to conduct procedures without questioning their purposes corresponds to Bourdieu’s “legitimate competence” (1991, p. 55): that is, to the “*academically guaranteed competence*” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 99) whose content and value are determined by the needs of the market. However, as argued above, unlike managers whose habitus is synchronised with the economic field, having this competence does not increase the value of teachers’ capital; rather, it enhances the “economic capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 243) held by the dominant class at the expense of the “social capital” (p. 248) held by teachers – their ‘expertise’ *as* teachers.

Viewed from this perspective, then, the CELTA’s construction of teaching as a hierarchy of standardised procedures shapes the habitus of teachers and managers. It shapes teachers’ understanding of what teaching is and what constitutes ‘good teaching’, constructing teachers as low status ‘operatives’, without an ‘expert’ role in establishing and evaluating the purposes of teaching. Trainees’ efforts to obtain the CELTA qualification thus reflect what Bourdieu (1981, p. 314) has described as “a whole process of investment” which “leads workers to contribute to their own exploitation through their efforts to appropriate their work and their working conditions”. On the other hand, the CELTA course shapes managers’ understanding of what ‘teachers’ and ‘teachers’ practices’ are and legitimises a standardised measure of ‘good teaching’ which advances the construction of teaching and learning as products. As Skehan (*loc. cit.*) has explained, the PPP methodology “lends itself very neatly to accountability, since it generates clear and tangible outcomes, precise syllabuses and a comfortably itemized basis for evaluation of effectiveness”. In doing so, then, the CELTA produces teachers with a habitus which produces and reproduces the economic value of the dominant teaching resources published, and the products offered by colleges.

As well as constructing teachers as ‘operatives’, the CELTA also provides, in Skehan’s (ibid.) terms, a “comfortably itemized basis” for the construction of students as consumers, and in doing so provides a link with Bourdieu’s (1984) critique of consumption. The basis of this construction is the rendering of language as standardised skills and items¹⁰⁰. This enables the construction of students’ ‘needs’ in these same terms – thereby enabling needs to be matched to the attributes of products such as the “precise syllabuses” identified by Skehan (loc. cit.). This mutually legitimating relationship between needs and products in turn justifies the PPP methodology itself – as a set of procedures designed to match language skills and items to needs. In this process, students are subject to procedures choreographed by the teacher to meet their learning needs, a process which both requires and legitimates a ‘consenting’ student, in Gramsci’s (loc. cit.) sense: one whose habitus, as a consumer, is itself synchronised with the economic field.

As argued above in relation to meso and micro relations, this is a construction of students which, mirroring the construction of teachers, subordinates their “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) as learners to their economic value as consumers, and increases the value of the “economic capital” (p. 243) of the dominant class through their efforts to achieve the “lifestyle” (Bourdieu, 1984, pp. 101ff) promoted as the reward for consumption. This subordination of the social to the economic in the construction of both teachers and students, then, provides further evidence for a line of influence, through the operations of the CELTA, between the economic order advanced by neoliberal discourse and the consumption community advanced by the discourse of commercialisation.

While this line of influence may explain how the CELTA sector contributes, through teacher training, to the production and reproduction of contemporary society, it

¹⁰⁰ Also consistent with the argument developed here, Cameron (2002, pp. 71-74) has argued that the division, and teaching, of language as “communication skills” meets the requirement of the “new work order” (Gee et al. loc. cit.) for workers who can demonstrate – and therefore be appraised in terms of – standardised ways of communicating.

does not explain the reports in the diaries of tensions experienced by teachers *between* pedagogic and economic interests. While it is not within the scope of this section to address this question in detail, it can perhaps be explained by the fact that, though the CELTA may prepare teachers to comply with the construction of teaching and learning as consumption processes, it produces only part of the habitus which teachers bring to and develop through teaching. They are, therefore, not *only* CELTA graduates but have and develop ‘multiple memberships’ which, in shaping their evolving habitus, have the potential, as explained in Chapter 5, to create a “divided or even torn habitus” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, loc. cit.). For example, their other experiences – including their own experience as students – may mitigate against uncritical compliance. Moreover, their experience of teaching itself typically includes the struggles – explained above – between students, and between teachers and students, over teaching methodology itself, struggles which may raise awareness of tensions in the relationship between teaching methodology, consumption and learning. Further examples of influences against compliance include more advanced qualifications in teaching English, which tend to advance less procedural, more reflective, approaches to teaching (Crichton, 1999).

8.434 Summary

Finally, then, through its global interconnections with the economic interests of other macro actors and its penetration of teachers’ practices through the habitus of teachers, the CELTA sector exemplifies the “unification of the market” (Bourdieu 1991, p. 50) on a global scale. Operating through its dominance of the teacher training market, it constructs teachers as ‘consenting’, in Gramsci’s (loc. cit.) sense, operatives, matching their habitus to the identity advanced for them by the discourse of commercialisation and a job market based on insecure, casual employment – while constructing these conditions as a desirable lifestyle of global opportunities. It is this subordination of the social value of trainees and

pedagogy to the economic value of training and teaching as a products which identifies the CELTA training materials as a form of “symbolic violence” (Bourdieu, op. cit., p. 51) which enlists the habitus of teachers in the devaluation of their own capital and thereby advances the interests of the dominant, economic class on a global scale.

8.5 SUMMARY OF THE SOCIAL/INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The capacity of Bourdieu’s critique to explain how these three lines of influence shape the identities of and relationships between micro and meso actors supports its inclusion within the social-theoretical account of commercialisation developed for this study.

Specifically, the analysis of the three data sets supports the argument that each advances and legitimises the subordination of “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) to “economic capital” (p. 248) through a line of influence between neoliberal discourse and that of commercialisation. Together, these lines of influence advance the interests of those macro actors who, as members of the dominant, economic class, benefit from the neoliberal economic order by supporting each other in a web of interrelations which exemplifies Bourdieu’s notion of the “unification of the market” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 50).

The question remains as to how these lines of influence contribute to the production and reproduction of neoliberal discourse as the globally “official” language (ibid., p. 51) – the language which, by being accepted as “legitimate” (ibid.), induces other classes to raise the value of the capital of the dominant classes while devaluing their own in efforts to improve their “life chances” (Postone et al., loc. cit.). Here, Gramsci’s (loc. cit.) distinction between “consent” and “coercion”, first introduced in the diary analysis to explain how the authority of managers and students is exercised over teachers, again provides an explanation. Viewed in Gramsci’s terms, then, macro actors, operating through these lines of influence, produce and reproduce “consent” to the neoliberal economic order by advancing as necessary and legitimate the “flexploitation” (1998a, pp.

85ff) which both coerces teachers to comply with, and justifies their “consent” to, the identities and relationships advanced by the discourse of commercialisation.

Thus, by constructing the world according to the “law of the market” (ibid., p. 35), the reports in the EA News legitimate the “logic” of “the economic world” as “the norm of all practices” (ibid.) – the norm which justifies the Gramscian “coercion” of and “consent” by teachers to subordinate their “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) to the “economic capital” (p. 243) of those who benefit from the neoliberal economic order. On the other hand, the exclusions and minimisation identified in the NEAS regulations legitimise the *means* by which this pressure is exerted. Specifically, the exclusions weaken the capacity of teachers to defend their standards of teaching by disconnecting teaching ‘quality’ from practices of “flexexploitation” (Bourdieu, 1998a, pp. 85ff), thereby increasing the pressure of “coercion” and the motivation to “consent”. At the same time, the minimisation of the “social capital” – the ‘expertise’ – required for teaching legitimises and advances the final line of influence, evidenced by the CELTA materials. Here, the CELTA course, promoted through the construction of ‘globalisation’ as a “lifestyle” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101ff) manipulates the habitus itself in an exercise of “symbolic violence” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 51) in which teachers are matched to the identity advanced for them by the discourse of commercialisation; and, if their “consent” wavers because of a “divided... habitus” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, loc. cit.), they are coerced into compliance by the “structural violence” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 98) of the neoliberal workplace.

The next, and final, chapter draws together the findings of the analyst’s perspective, the participants’ perspective, the social resource perspective, and the social-institutional perspective to present the conclusions of the study.