



From neoliberal policy to neoliberal pedagogy: Racializing and historicizing classroom management

Zachary A. Casey, Brian D. Lozenski, Shannon K. McManimon

Abstract: In this article we first trace the history of “management,” particularly in the United States, from the plantation to the factory to the corporation, with the intention of understanding and contextualizing “classroom management” in today’s educational lexicon. To do so, we look at the intertwining history of racial knowledge and the management of enslaved persons; the subsequent development of scientific management; social efficiency educators’ application of scientific management to education; and conceptions of classroom management in today’s neoliberal environment, in which education is increasingly positioned as a consumer good subject to individual choice and competitive markets. We further look to examples from post-colonial Africa to demonstrate the ways in which neocolonial forms of scientific management comingle and entwine with neoliberal policies and procedures. The global phenomenon of scientific management, rife with neoliberalism and racism, is finally examined in the context of (so-called) Culturally Responsive Classroom Management, a neoliberal project that claims to advocate social justice through the process of managing bodies in classrooms.

Keywords: classroom management, neoliberalism, scientific management, racism, post-colonialism

Across Europe, research literature is rife with examples of the ways in which neoliberalism has seeped into schools and classrooms. As one of its (many) insidious side-effects, the work of critical educators is undermined. In the context of the United Kingdom, Hatcher (2007) has shown how the

Compulsion to transform the school system to align it with its economic objectives has led it to develop a powerful repertoire of strategies for change. The combination of government regulation, market relationships, financial incentives, technologies of school leadership and management generated by the school improvement industry, and the use of the private sector as an agent of change, has proved to be an effective policy toolkit for engineering neo-liberal [sic] educational reform. (p. 1)

Many other European scholars have demonstrated the neoliberal turn in education, from the Lisbon Strategy Initiatives and their impact on E.U. education policy (Pasiás & Roussakis, 2012) to the transformation of vocational education to place it more in line with the demands of global capitalism (Bulut, 2010). Yet these important and critical works rarely engage the particular phenomenon of classroom management in the European context, and while their critiques are intended to be inclusive of neoliberal pedagogies and practices, there is a need for more research on the particular manifestations of neoliberalism in classroom settings. Our analysis here is concerned with classroom management in the broadest possible context, and we will show why this concern has led us to focus our critique on classroom management scholarship from within the U.S. rather than anywhere else. Yet we believe this critique has value for educators everywhere facing the realities of neoliberal school policy and reform.

We must begin by asking a question with which very few in the research literature on classroom management seem ever to have wrestled: namely, from where does the need to *manage* students arise? Anti-oppressive education scholar and teacher educator Kumashiro (see Kumashiro, 2002; 2008; 2009; 2012) provides us with a starting place for answering this question. Kumashiro (2009) tells a story of a teacher education student he taught who was struggling with her “mixed ability” class and was hopeful that when she was teaching full-time she would be able to teach an advanced (or) honors class. For her this meant “a class of students who were mature and engaged enough to make classroom management a nonissue. Such a class, she believed, would be one in which she could really teach” (p. 122). This student teacher in Kumashiro’s story represents many teachers who, for instance, in a poll for *Phi Delta Kappa/Gallop* responded that their greatest request is for more assistance relating to behavior and classroom management (Rose & Gallop, 2005). Kumashiro (2009) troubles this student’s notion that one cannot teach unless students are behaving only in particular ways; instead, he “asked her whether ‘teaching’ was something that happened only when students behaved in certain ways...

Was it a problem, in other words, to think that good classroom management preceded real teaching?" (p. 122). We wish to extend this argument further: rather than good classroom management preceding real teaching, we argue that classroom management, in our present neoliberal world-order, has become synonymous with teaching.

In order to demonstrate this claim, we first trace the history of "management" from the plantation to the factory to the corporation, with the intention of understanding and contextualizing "classroom management" in today's educational lexicon. To do so, we look at the intertwining history of racial knowledge and the management of enslaved persons; the subsequent development of scientific management; social efficiency educators' application of scientific management to education; and conceptions of classroom management in today's neoliberal environment, in which education is increasingly positioned as a consumer good subject to individual choice and competitive markets. Further, we look to examples from post-colonial Africa to demonstrate the ways in which neocolonial forms of scientific management comingle and entwine with neoliberal policies and procedures. We employ a primarily Marxist (2010) framework to our analysis as well as elements of Foucault's (2004) conception of subjugation as the theoretical bases for our arguments. The global phenomenon of scientific management, rife with neoliberalism and racism, is finally examined in the context of (so-called) Culturally Responsive Classroom Management, a neoliberal project that claims to advocate social justice through the process of managing bodies in classrooms.

Plantation: Slave-Management and Racial-Knowledge

Cooke (2003) argues that U.S. slavery has been wrongfully excluded from histories of management; and that this exclusion serves to obscure management's racialized and class-based roots. Most historians situate modern management as emerging in the United States with the development of the railroad system in the mid-1800s. Yet by this time, 38,000 managers were already managing four million slaves in the United States. Along with the plantation system, slaveholders and managers developed a body of literature and practices specific to the role of "manager."

Such systems of management were explicitly racialized, stemming from what Esch and Roediger (2009) call "racial-knowledge," which in the United States began as people we now call white justified taking the land of Native Americans and enslaving people from Africa. As they did so, they (white people) cast themselves as "uniquely fit to manage land and labour" (Esch & Roediger, 2009, p. 8). Their racial-knowledge consisted of ideology (typi-

cally made up of biological determinism and religion), stereotype, and manufactured numbers to “explain” how different races produced (and under what labor conditions). Additionally, racial (and racist) hierarchies were left in flux so that individual managers could utilize them to pit workers against each other. Some, such as Dr. Samuel Cartwright (1793-1863), went so far as to assert that if managers did not have racial knowledge that described how Africans best produced and developed, they would have experienced more difficulty managing bodies for production. Importantly, managing enslaved persons required their absolute obedience: managers thought and planned while workers (slaves) implemented (Cooke, 2003).

Esch and Roediger (2009) assert that such racial-knowledge, (racialized) management, and management-science were articulated in imperial expansions before being used in factories in the United States. This includes the racialized capitalist project of European colonization in Africa, a subject to which we return later in this study. Through the plantation system and its subsequent export internationally and to domestic factories, management was conceived as a way to pit people socially constructed as different races against each other in the competition for cheap labor. Because the U.S. system of labor was racialized, racial knowledge and managerial knowledge intertwine from the inception of “management” (Esch & Roediger, 2009). Placing plantation management squarely in management history thus links management directly with oppression and exploitation, which thereby “would imply quite a different view of the social legitimacy of management in itself” (Cooke, 2003, p. 1896).

Factory: Scientific Management

In the United States, plantations provided models for factories. New ideas of management coalesced with Frederick Winslow Taylor, who is credited with first articulating scientific management (Esch & Roediger, 2009). A particularly important innovation in management, scientific management aims to increase production at lower costs while increasing order, efficiency, standardization, and social control. It applied the newly developed scientific method to carefully specify tasks and their order and to then select and monitor the performance (production) of the best person for each particular task. (Taylor did this through “task analysis,” dividing tasks up into their smallest increments to increase control over and the supervision of such tasks). Scientific management thus revolves around centralization, command, control, discipline, obedience, order, rules, and time. Gramsci (1971) writes that

Taylor is in fact expressing with brutal cynicism the purpose of American society—developing in the worker to the highest degree automatic and mechanical attitudes, breaking up the old psycho-physical nexus of qualified professional work, which demands a certain active participation of intelligence, fantasy and initiative on the part of the worker, and reducing productive operations exclusively to the mechanical, physical aspect. (p. 302)

Compulsory schooling in the United States began in this same era, with schools set up like factories, including bells to signal class (shift) changes, dividing students into manageable groups based on age and subject matter (task-analysis, and so on), and the physical layout of school buildings modeled after the factories in which students were later expected to work (Kliebard, 2002; 2004; Watkins, 2001).

Social Efficiency Educators

Principles of scientific management, coupled with newly emerging experimental psychology, gave rise to U.S. educational reform efforts that curricular historian and theorist Kliebard (2004) called social efficiency. Educational reformers such as John Franklin Bobbitt extolled industry and imported both industry techniques and their attendant language to school, e.g., calling a school a “plant,” using factory metaphors for curriculum, and using task analysis to develop curriculum (Kliebard, 2004). Bobbitt believed that industrialization meant a new kind of laborer (a specialized worker) in a new kind of workplace (a factory of a large corporation), necessitating a division of labor as well as management. Social efficiency educators aimed to eliminate waste and to properly prepare students for their place in the labor market. According to this view, social utility in schooling is primary: there should be a tight relationship between what is taught in schools and later adult activities, particularly although not solely preparation for the workplace. Such reforms would be supported by science (empirical data collection and interpretation), leading to standardization and efficiency in the curriculum, just as it led to standardization and efficiency in the factory. In short, social efficiency in the curriculum is akin to an assembly line in that it aims to produce citizens (and workers, as well as productivity and profits) through discipline and hard work (Kliebard, 2004). Further, we would be remiss if we did not also note that social efficiency education was also frequently racialized. Thomas Jesse Jones, for instance, founder of the Hampton Institute, believed that Blacks and Native Americans were in earlier developmental stages than were whites and thus instituted programs of skills training befitting these “stages.”

Kliebard (1993) argues that Joseph Mayer Rice, trained in pedagogy in Germany, initiated an educational tradition based in scientific management that to this day seeks to reform education through collecting and interpreting empirical data that aims to uncover outcome variables that can predict learning achievement through effective (synonymous with efficient) and generalizable yet specific practices (rules). Rice, for instance, wrote that school administration should be governed by “a scientific system of pedagogical management [that] would demand fundamentally the measurement of results in the light of fixed standards” (Rice, 1912, p. xiv, cited in Kliebard, 2004, p. 20). These early curriculum theorists defined the basis of how schools and curriculum have been set up. As Apple (2004) observes, “the critical social and economic issue that concerned these formative theorists of the field was that of industrialization and its accompanying division of labor” (p. 66).

Classroom Management

This remains true today. Kliebard (1993) argues that “Conceiving of the teaching process in terms of the ‘production’ of learning and then applying efficiency criteria to determine its efficacy apparently have, if anything, become more firmly entrenched since the days of Rice and Taylor” (p. 301). Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than the predominant discourse of classroom management.

Managing classrooms (often synonymous with discipline or order) has been a concern ever since education was formalized into schoolrooms in the nineteenth century (Freiberg, 1999). While the definition of classroom management, especially in the last twenty years, has shifted to include issues of classroom environment, communication, and planning, discipline and order—in other words, controlling or modifying student behavior—are still key, often echoed in public polling as one of or the top concern about education among teachers, parents, and the general public alike. (We note that differences in how classroom management is conceptualized, especially between the popular imagination/colloquial discourse and the sometimes more expansive educational research, echo ideological social constructions as expounded upon, for instance, in *Policing the Crisis*, which explicates how racially-based moral panics about crime created a crisis of ideology that the media and emerging right-wing politicians in the 1970s drew upon to change Britain’s discourse about law and order (Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Roberts, 1978) This can be seen in some key theorists’ definitions of classroom management:

Actions taken to create and maintain a learning environment conducive to successful instruction (arranging the physical environment in the classroom, establishing rules and procedures, maintaining attention to lessons and engagement in academic activities)". (Brophy, 1999, p. 43)

"Classroom management is the orchestration of classroom life: planning curriculum, organizing procedures and resources, arranging the environment to maximize efficiency, monitoring student progress, anticipating potential problems. (Lemlech, 1988, p. 3)

Classroom management includes the set of activities and strategies that teachers use to guide student behavior in the classroom. Its goals include fostering student engagement and securing cooperation so that teaching and learning can occur. Classroom management has both planning and interactive aspects. (Emmer & Evertson, 2013, p. 1)

In these definitions are some familiar terms—rules, procedures, efficiency, monitoring. Without such systems, classroom management discourses suggest, students would not be sufficiently motivated to learn—to produce—what teachers are attempting to instruct.

Classroom management thus aims to produce desirable student behavior; effective classroom managers (teachers) set up and maintain procedures, routines, rules, and standards to do so. Management works hand-in-hand with instruction, yet instruction cannot be effective without these management techniques, which involve organizing, planning, scheduling, and dividing practices that harken back to Taylor's scientific management¹. Further, while attempting direct comparisons carries much danger, it is worth noting that classroom management often involves language such as "mastering", language which seems to echo earlier arguments about how racialized groups produce and develop—and the

¹ For instance: "To set the stage for effective instruction, teachers need to apply the management principles involved in establishing a classroom as a successful learning environment. The room is divided into distinct areas equipped for specific activities. Frequently used equipment is stored where it can be accessed easily, and each item has its own place. Traffic patterns facilitate movement around the room and minimize crowding or bumping. Transitions between activities are accomplished efficiently following a brief signal or a few directions from the teacher, and students know where they are supposed to be, what they are supposed to be doing, and what equipment they will need. Students are attentive to presentations and responsive to questions. Lessons and other group activities are structured so that subparts are discernible and separated by clear transitions. When students are released to work on their own or with peers, they know what to do and settle quickly into the task. Usually, students continue the activity through to completion without difficulty and then turn to some new approved activity. If they need help, they can get it from the teacher or from some other source, and then resume working" (Brophy, 1999, p. 44).

need for their management. In other words, while classroom management is not an end in itself, ineffective classroom management “creates conditions that interfere with desirable educational outcomes” (Emmer & Evertson, 2013, p. 6).

Classroom management, of course, is inseparable from the material and ideological contexts of schools and societies. What teachers see as good or bad, appropriate or inappropriate behavior, knowledge, communication, etc., are related to economic and social conditions both within and outside the school and classroom. Apple (2004) argues,

These mental productions come from somewhere... to understand schools one must go beyond what educational practitioners and theorists think is going on, to see the connections between these thoughts and actions to the ideological and material conditions both in and outside the school that ‘determine’ what we think are our ‘real’ problems. The key to uncovering this is power. (p. 133)

Corporation: Neoliberalism

Today, neoliberalism has enormous power over both the ideological and material conditions of schooling, acclimating administrators, teachers, students, families, and communities to its norms regarding education. The neoliberal reframing of education is actualized through privatization and tax cuts, funding and spending restrictions, alternative teacher certification, censorship, and standards and testing (Kumashiro, 2008; 2012). Neoliberal educational policy and objectives function on the same principles as corporations: maximize profit, create links between performance objectives, and create competition in the “school marketplace.” In other words, replacing the factory as a model for schools and education is the corporation. Education, like everything else, has become a commodity (see, e.g., Harvey, 2005). Schools, like corporations, should function for the economy, taking labor needs into account (both literally and figuratively). Further, these policies have become prominent as the global economy is shifting into a new mode of capitalism (speculative or finance capitalism), digitalization is increasing, and commodity production is changing.

As the model for school (reform) has shifted from the factory to the corporation, social efficiency in the curriculum has also expanded to include harmonious human relationships (Pinar et al, 2008/1995). Yet much remains the same—or, as Watkins (2012) observes, “Authoritarianism

undergirds the neoliberal state in the globalized world” (p. 15). While social safety nets are withdrawn, national governments function to safeguard the world for economic growth and protect private property. Decision making is concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer and the lines between the military and the police blur. Corporations have the same—often, more—rights than people. In this neoliberal model, students are human capital who “as future workers—must be given the requisite skills and dispositions to compete efficiently and effectively. Further, any money spent on schools that is not directly related to these economic goals is suspect” (Apple, 2001, p. 38).

From Neocolonial to Neoliberal: A Parallel History of Management

This history of management is not limited to the United States, as the antecedents of management in education lie not only in the horrific realities of U.S. slavery, but also in the parallel history of European colonization in Africa. For example, speaking about her educational experience in a British-run school in Nigeria, a Nigerian-born co-worker recounted the mechanisms of management that school officials employed for the purpose of bodily restriction and cultural repression. She described being forced to sit and hold her body in certain positions while doing everything from writing to eating. Speaking with a British accent, she elaborated that her post-colonial education was focused “not on what we did, but rather how it was done.” She remembers feeling awkward and restricted in the school that her family was able to send her to. The practices and movements that to her felt “natural” (embedded in Nigerian culture) were replaced by forced alterations to her movement and language. In this brief anecdote, one can begin to see the mechanisms of physical and psychological management at work. These forms of management were common in colonial and post-colonial African education in multiple countries as a means for cultural repression and the physical and psychological domination of large numbers of African youth.

Certainly, European powers incorporated management practices in colonized African countries because the primary purpose of colonization is the control of natural and human resources for exploitation (Rodney, 1981; Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davis & Kalu-Nwivu, 2001). A post-colonial European presence in Africa was desirable for continued exploitation: “Neocolonial structures of commercial exploitation were often deepened rather than eradicated” (Harvey, 2005, p. 56). After African countries gained independence, European powers needed to move from what Gramsci (1971) described as repression to coercion. In other words, domination through

military power had to be replaced by a form of acquiescence by government officials, religious institutions, and educational institutions for the purpose of gaining the consent of the masses of citizens for further economic subservience. Education based upon scientific management was and continues to be essential for achieving neocolonial hegemony. With this understanding in mind as the goal of colonial and post-colonial education in Africa, we shall now briefly focus on specific examples and implications of this model.

The recent genocide in Rwanda provides context for the catastrophic results of using education for the purpose of sorting and managing bodies. As Bush and Saltarelli (2000) document, extreme methods of scientific management in Rwanda's colonial education system helped create a climate for the ethnic genocide between the Tutsi and Hutu ethnic groups

During the 1920s, the church set up 'special schools' to educate Tutsi as the future leaders of the country and state schools were also established to train Tutsi as support staff for the colonial government. This preferential treatment continued throughout the 1930s and 1940s. (p. 10)

The German and later the Belgian colonial state used educational management to divide ethnic groups and rule the entire population. They created an ethnic hierarchy, even going so far as establishing height requirements for admission to certain schools, which benefitted the Tutsi ethnic group, which was taller on average. Within certain schools, students were trained to take their places in the ethnic hierarchy by learning the skills to become managers and administrators in the case of the Tutsis, or menial laborers in the case of the Hutus. Rwanda's colonial rulers constructed and maintained an ethnic hierarchy that led directly to the genocide, which resulted in the slaughter of nearly one million Rwandans (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000).

The implementation of educational management across the African continent was so penetrating that it is nearly impossible to discuss colonial education without understanding it as a means of social control. Davis and Kalu-Nwivu (2001) focus specifically on the impact of British colonial education in Nigeria. "Education, like conquest, spread from the coast inland and from the south north-ward" (p. 4). They describe the challenge of England's attempt to control specific Nigerian ethnic groups through education as being dependent upon the centrality of ethnic governance and the extent to which cultural traditions were entrenched in the everyday practices of the peoples, often due to geographic isolation away from the coast.

Education in colonial Nigeria, as elsewhere in the colonial world, sought to suit indigenous peoples to serve colonialists' needs, not to fit them necessarily to live in profitable harmony with their fellow colonized peoples. Schools shifted students' attention away from their indigenous environment and toward the colonialist environment. Value derived less from education for living as from education for earning a position in the colonialist scheme.

The parallels of scientific management as education in industrial Europe and the United States and colonial Africa are quite apparent. As in Rwanda, colonial education in Nigeria created an ethnic hierarchy determined by which ethnic groups most adapted to British forms of education and cultural practice. The lingering impact of colonial management in Nigeria continues to fuel ethnic tensions today.

The logic of management in education has moved from something imposed on African peoples by European colonizers to a self-inflicted norm. As Ekeh (1975) suggests,

in every post-colonial African nation, Western educated Africans, that is the African bourgeoisie, have bent over backwards to show that their standards of education and administration are as good as those of their former colonizers. The point of reference in such demonstrations is to prove that they are the 'equals', but never the betters, of their former rulers. (p. 101)

The move to adopt an education system based on the ideals of scientific management by African elites demonstrates Esch and Roediger's (2009) contention that a racial logic moves in congruence with a managerial logic. However, this logic is not unique to the U.S. racial caste, but instead operates in the midst of global white supremacy.

Terms and Ideology: Neoliberalism Returns us to Scientific Management Returns us to Slave-Management

In various manifestations across the globe, from the plantation to the factory to the corporation and passing through schools, management means determining how to effectively compete in the marketplace, ensure order, eliminate waste, and define labor roles. "Management," we have argued here, can be historically, materially, and ideologically connected from slavery through scientific management in factories and social efficiency in education to today's neoliberal ideas of classroom management. While the differences are great, using the rhetoric of classroom management today

to talk about the regulation of student bodies has historical, material, and ideological links to the management of enslaved bodies. In the U.S., the conceiver and exporter of the ideas of management outlined here, race “has historically been a key relationship to the means of capitalist production” (Brodkin, 2000, p. 239) and “race making has become a key process by which the United States continues to organize and understand labor and national belonging” (Brodkin, 2000, p. 245). Examining the historical roots of “management” and its practices in colonial and neocolonial contexts makes this relationship ever more apparent.

Classroom management practices are also often motivated by “racial knowledge” as well as estimations of workplace destinations. In the classroom, production involves the control (management) of bodies with specific roles assigned to the managers (teachers). While many dehumanizing practices and ideologies have changed, some of the discourses remain: Southern masters viewed themselves as cultivating not only land, but people (slaves) as well (Esch & Roediger, 2009). Today this rhetoric is more likely couched as cultivating minds. But with today’s neoliberal emphasis on privatization, standardization, and high-stakes testing, cultivating minds for what? If the manager (or managerial personality) functions in the workplace as the daily representative of capital (Esch & Roediger, 2009), does teacher as “classroom manager” also function as capital’s representative?

We argue that the transformation from neocolonial practices to neoliberal policies promoting the asymmetrical power structure of globalization does not necessitate a substantial shift in educational policy. At the heart of neoliberal motives in education are the advancement of free market initiatives, both in terms of the literal encroachment of privatized education (Fabricant & Fine, 2012) and the socialization of young people into the neoliberal logic. The latter must be done through education, and particularly through a pedagogy of management. Students must not only come to understand the imperative of the free market as unavoidable, but they must also recognize their destiny within the “free human market,” which is presented as natural and just due to its dependence on meritocracy. In other words, youth are commodified through the mechanisms of schooling and are then assigned a use value, or practical worth (Marx, 2010). Their use value must then be seen as static so that they consent to their position in society as laborers or as managers who will in turn keep their fellow citizens in line according to their use value. This use value must be understood as accurate by youth in order to establish complicity in their own subjugation. The use of management in classrooms is part of the process for ensuring that students believe that their educational success is due to merit. For instance, scholars such as Anyon (1980; 1981) and Bowles and Gintis (1977) have elaborated upon how processes and practices in

classrooms and schools first track students/future workers within schools and then within the workplace, reproducing alienating and inequitable workplace divisions that serve the needs of capital, while Willis (1977) shows how students create their own practices that result in reproducing this system.

Further, the increasing prevalence of “standardization” in education rhetoric along with continual tracking and punitive forms of assessment maintains the model of an educational factory with corporate logic, which perpetually reproduces unequal relations of power and provides economic worth to each student. For this system of relations to function properly, a critical mass of teachers must submit to neoliberal logic. Through teacher education programs and student teaching experiences (Britzman, 2003), but even more so through what Lortie (1975) describes as the “apprenticeship of observation,” teachers learn to uphold the claims of educational meritocracy and the economic imperatives of education. Many teachers’ own experiences as students fed them these messages, and as teachers they continue to reproduce them. Thus, when students consciously or unconsciously reject mechanisms of scientific management in the classroom, teachers who ascribe to management become entrenched in their position as the student’s worth begins to decrease in their collective gaze.

Certainly the process of classroom management plays out differently depending on the context of the educational environment; however, the cultural misreading of student-teacher interactions is prevalent (Carter, 2005). As teachers interact with students, subconscious cultural messages are constantly communicated. As teachers attempt to make sense of these messages, some experience discomfort. In an educational environment based on management, discomfort is not an acceptable feeling; thus, management strategies take over in attempts to reconcile the discomfort. The student creating the discomfort and the discomfort itself must be managed as though defective items on an assembly line. This scenario positions the student as damaged and needing to be fixed, or simply to have their use devalued. We next turn our analytical gaze to the phenomenon of so-called “culturally responsive classroom management” to further explore the racial (and racist) implications of management in classroom contexts.

Classroom Management Contextualized: Culturally Responsive Classroom Management and its Impact on the Neoliberalization of European and U.S. Schooling

The Handbook of Classroom Management: Research, Practice, and Contemporary Issues (Evertson & Weinstein, 2006) represents the largest collection of scholarship on classroom management in a single volume. In the final

section, "International Perspectives on Classroom Management," are articles pertaining specifically to the UK (Miller, 2006), Israel (Ben-Peretz, Eilam, & Yankelevich, 2006), Sweden (Granstrom, 2006), the Netherlands (Wubbels, Brekelmans, den Brok, & van Tartwijk, 2006), Australia (Lewis, 2006), and Japan (Nishioka, 2006). In their chapter on the Netherlands, Wubbels, Brekelmans, den Brok, and van Tartwijk (2006) also state that research on classroom management has been carried out in "many other countries such as Australia, Canada, Israel, Slovenia, Turkey, Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and the US" (p. 1161). While much of this literature appears to be primarily found in languages other than English, for our purposes here it will suffice to say that classroom management is truly a global phenomenon, with roots in the United States, but practiced all over the world.

Van Tartwijk, den Brok, Veldman, and Wubbels' (2008) found in their video-simulated interview study of "successful" Dutch teachers of multicultural learners that while their participants "aimed at developing positive teacher-student relationships and adjusted their teaching methods anticipating students' responses," most seemed "reluctant to refer to the cultural and ethnic background of their students" (p. 453). The theoretical framework for this study stems directly from the aforementioned *Handbook*, drawing on the four themes in contemporary classroom management Evertson and Weinstein (2006) identify in the introductory chapter, namely, (1) "the importance of positive teacher-child relationships;" (2) "classroom management as a social and moral curriculum;" (3) "how classroom management strategies relying on punishment and external reward may negatively influence the classroom atmosphere;" (4) "the recognition that teachers must take into account students' characteristics" including age, cultural background, socio-economic status, and so on (p. 4). van Tartwijk et. al. use these to showcase how, while resisting identifying students whose cultural or ethnic backgrounds differed from the Dutch mainstream, the teachers in their study were still "providing and enforcing clear rules," concluding that this enforcement is what makes them successful teachers. They also found that their participants successfully employed all but the fourth theme in their practice, identifying the lone teacher in their study "with a non-Dutch background" as the only teacher who successfully exhibited all four themes (p. 459). The authors conclude, in relation to the literature on classroom management in the U.S. and its impact and import for teachers in the Netherlands that, "The strategies that teachers in the USA and in the Netherlands use may not differ so much as the way in which they talk about these strategies" (p. 460). The ways in which the authors use the theoretical foundation of Evertson and Weinstein (2006) to construct their arguments, coupled with this notion that the practice of classroom management appears consistent across at least two countries, points us back to

the classroom management literature in the United States in order to ascertain the occluded neoliberal influences that permeate the entire enterprise of classroom management. More specifically, it is important to understand the nuanced impact of neoliberal classroom management practices on pedagogy.

Pedagogically, management is an attempt to separate curriculum from human interaction. Like many educators, we too have experienced the forlorn pre-service teacher in our college courses asking for classroom management strategies. Many of our students, especially those looking to teach in low-income, urban schools with ethnically diverse populations, feel as though they must control unwieldy students before they can teach their lesson. They see content delivery as detached from the educational environment they negotiate with their students. Classroom management positions student behavior and motivation, or lack thereof, as factors that are irrelevant to pedagogy. However, the educational theorist Dewey (2008) problematizes this view of management. He argues,

subdivide each topic into studies; each study into lessons; each lesson into specific facts and formulae. Let the child proceed step by step to master each one of these separate parts.... Thus emphasis is put upon the logical subdivisions and consecutions of the subject-matter. Problems of instruction are problems of procuring texts giving logical parts and sequences.... The child is simply the immature being who is to be matured.... His part is fulfilled when he is ductile and docile. (p. 8)

Dewey's description of the flaw of separating students, with all of their complexity, from content demonstrates the dehumanizing characteristics of scientific management. Dewey goes on to describe the "evil" associated with educational models that do not "psychologize" the curriculum, or situate it in the lived worlds of students. Dewey likens the learning that takes place in management-based educational environments to students either choosing to find intellectual stimulation in the routine and process of schooling, or simply choosing to feign interest over the consequence of punishment. Both choices (not that they represent actual choice) promote anti-intellectualism and are akin to Freire's (1970) notion of "banking" education, where students are treated as ahistorical, empty receptacles into which any irrelevant information can be deposited. Such an environment also means that management is emphasized or placed first—behavior, not learning, becomes the primary aim for the production of the classroom. A teacher's role is thus as a "*technical-production manager* who has the responsibility for monitoring the efficiency with which learning is being accomplished" (Lampert, 1985,

p. 191); classroom management is this technical-production manager's "ability to control students' behavior and direct them in learning tasks" (Lampert, p. 193). Or, to return to Gramsci (1971), the mechanical and physical replace intelligence, fantasy, and initiative.

Scientific management strategies seeking to separate the student from the curriculum converge with institutional racism in education to produce a debilitating set of conditions for low-income students of color. This is true in urban areas of the United States and Europe as well as in post-colonial schools on the African continent (Anyon, 1981; Lipman, 2011; Watkins, 2012). The need for population control in the post-colonial, post-slavery, post-civil rights eras has not deteriorated; rather it has merely changed forms. A move from repression to coercion takes cunning, false generosity, and narratives of benevolence on the part of the dominant power structure. Scientific management has buttressed the wave of neoliberal globalization that has engulfed the globe, further marginalizing the most vulnerable populations. The ideological consequences of neoliberalism have gone so far in the particular domain of classroom management as to have produced a form of classroom management that claims to advocate social justice and cultural relevance: namely, Culturally Responsive Classroom Management.

Culturally Responsive Classroom Management: The Impossibility of Neoliberal Anti-Racism

We now turn to the literature on culturally responsive classroom management (CRCM) to highlight the ways in which culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000) are warped, in CRCM, from powerful pedagogical and political dispositions and classroom practices to no more than approaches for managing students. Here we rely on the four themes discussed above from Evertson and Weinstein (2006) and place them in relation to CRCM to demonstrate the underlying neoliberal ideology of even the most progressive approaches to classroom management. To be clear, requests that teachers cultivate positive relationships with their students, see teaching as a social and moral vocation, not punish students, and understand the unique identities and cultural backgrounds of their students are not, in and of themselves, neoliberal presuppositions. It is perfectly possible, on the contrary, to imagine all of these practices and dispositions in an anti-capitalist critical classroom. The neoliberal edge to these four themes is found not in the themes themselves, but rather in the overarching framework in which they coalesce and are given meaning: in the context of management. Once understanding one's students becomes a requirement to manage them, rather than a peda-

gological imperative for authentic learning, we are caught in the dehumanizing rhetoric and practice(s) of neoliberalism: of structuring classrooms for the purposes of better serving the needs and demands of global capitalism rather than the needs and demands of students (Casey, 2011).

Weinstein, Curran, and Tomlinson-Clarke (2003) begin their work to define CRCM from the frameworks of Ladson-Billings (1995) and Gay (2000) to first lay out the prerequisites of culturally relevant/responsive teachers. These practices include understanding one's self as a cultural being, understanding others as cultural beings, and recognizing the socio-political contexts of schools and society. Here teachers are asked to learn about their students in ways that are humanizing, in ways that see the cultural values and customs of students as a part of the learning-process and as present in classroom practice. Weinstein et al. (2003) provide six tasks for the culturally responsive classroom manager:

[C]reating a physical setting that supports academic and social goals, (b) establishing expectations for behavior, (c) communicating with students in culturally consistent ways, (d) developing a caring classroom environment, (e) working with families, and (f) using appropriate interventions to assist students with behavior problems. (p. 270)

Again, much like the four themes from Evertson and Weinstein (2006), we find little in the way of neoliberal rhetoric in the tasks themselves. In fact, Weinstein et. al. (2003) conclude that "In the final analysis, culturally responsive classroom management is classroom management that furthers the cause of social justice" (p. 275). For us, this is a clear example of a neoliberalizing discourse that makes social justice synonymous with effective management. Focusing in on one of the above tasks, "establishing expectations for behavior," will demonstrate this point.

In the literature on multicultural education, culturally relevant pedagogy, and other social justice efforts aimed at supporting students who do not attend school already possessing the underlying cultural expectations of the dominant society, we regularly find calls for teachers to teach "mainstream" (in the context of both the United States and Europe this often means white-stream, neo-liberal, individualism) culture explicitly. This call is most often associated with Delpit (2006) and her critique that "To provide schooling for everyone's children that reflects liberal, middle-class values and aspirations is to ensure the maintenance of the status quo..." (p. 28). She argues instead for teachers to explicitly teach the "culture of power" to those students who do not attend school already possessing this cultural capital. But so often, researchers stop at this

point and do not take account of the *purpose* for making the “culture of power” and its rules visible to students from historically marginalized backgrounds. The purpose of learning the codes and culture of power is *not* to enable students who do not possess either to successfully navigate the oppressive system of schooling and move on to gainful employment in the neoliberal order. The purpose is rather to make the codes and culture of power explicit to support students’ efforts to overturn and transform the culture of power.

We now arrive at the paradox of neoliberal rhetoric for social justice: of culturally responsive classroom management. In Weinstein et. al. (2003) the second task for teachers is that they “establish expectations for behavior.” The authors’ justification for this task stems from classroom management literature that is not grounded in a social justice or anti-oppressive framework, but rather in the positivistic and psychological notion of “effective management” (Emmer, Evertson, & Anderson, 1980). We can then see a contradiction, for if teachers are tasked both with struggling with their students toward social justice and in managing them (and specifically their behavior) effectively, how can they ever authentically engage in both tasks? Further, if “effective” implies its commonsense meaning (Kumashiro, 2008), it means proficient test scores and traditionally banking pedagogical practices, in the Freirean (1970) sense described above. How does one bank in humanizing ways? Even more, if a classroom were actually to be a site of engaged praxis and social justice transformation, wouldn’t it then also be *intentionally* ineffective according to dominant notions of the purpose of schooling: for uncritical participation in the global capitalist order?

Thus, with the permission of scholars of color, Weinstein et. al. (2003; see also Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke, & Curran, 2004) insist on teaching students the culture of power as a part of best practice, as a part of their classroom management strategy, rather than as the means to working with students to overturn our oppressive order. It is as though culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching can be collapsed under the umbrella term of classroom management, despite both standing in immediate opposition to the traditional ways in which schools have served to manage the bodies and lives of people of color and working class people in order to maintain the existing social order. Further, in an approach to classroom teaching that specifically calls on teachers to examine themselves as cultural beings, we find no mention of the cultural and historical construction of management itself. The term and its history, as we have shown earlier, are clearly products of the successful maintenance of capitalism and racism. Thus the work of culturally responsive classroom management serves to undermine teachers working in direct antithesis to the prevailing oppressive order, reducing their work to merely engaging students in an effectively managed classroom.

As educators ourselves, we do not ever manage our students. We support them in their inquiry into their lived experiences, we connect them to materials and ideas, we scaffold concepts, we facilitate dialogue, we engage them on their own terms, we understand them as political subjects and teaching as a political act. And of course, at times we interrupt important conversations to shift the class or the discussion, we ask them to arrive and stay for certain amounts of time, and so on. But these practices are not a part of managing them, as if they were merely pawns to be pushed and moved in certain ways, but rather pedagogical efforts to better understand our reality and society in the struggle to transform it. As Freire (2000) tells us, we “cannot utilize the banking method as an interim measure, justified on grounds of expediency, with the intention of *later* behaving in a genuinely revolutionary fashion” (p. 86). Yet this is precisely what culturally responsive classroom management asks of us. Banking the rules, so that *later* we can transform them, is not a social justice project. It is a neoliberal one.

Final Thoughts

The potency and power of neoliberal ideology to override and undermine even critical educational projects such as culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching are indicative of the global marketization of virtually every element of the public sphere. As we have shown in this analysis, emerging from plantation management of enslaved Africans and continuing today across the globe in classrooms, scientific management maintains its historically dehumanizing and alienating character. Imagining schools as nothing more than publicly funded private enterprises, to be understood and governed in accordance with best (business) practices, renders any attempt at challenging and transforming the oppressive realities of schools limited. We contend that alternatives to management, and classroom management in particular, must be articulated and critically analyzed in order for critical educators to have viable alternatives to management as the primary task of teachers. We must answer Bourdieu’s (1998) critique and finally articulate an oppositional vision to neoliberal global capitalism. This is a pedagogical project, and it is our sincere hope that our work here opens up new terrains for more critical educators and scholars to rid their practices and discourses of neoliberalism in the hopes of enabling a more humanizing, just classroom and schooling experience for all teachers and learners.

References

- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67-92.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Elementary schooling and distinctions of social class. *Interchange*, 12(2-3), 118-132.
- Apple, M. W. (2001). *Educating the "Right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd Ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Ben-Peretz, M., Eilam, B., & Yankelevich, E. (2006). Classroom management in multicultural classes in an immigrant country: The case of Israel (C. S. Weinstein, Ed.). In C. M. Evertson (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 1121-1140). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1977). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Brophy, J. (1999). Perspectives on classroom management: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp. 43-56). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bulut, E. (2008). Transformation of the Turkish vocational training system: Capitalization, modularization and learning unto death. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 8(1), 361-388.
- Bush, K. & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Casey, Z. A. (2011). Toward a reconceptualization of needs in classrooms: Baudrillard, critical pedagogy, and schooling in the United States. *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 9(2), 77-90.
- Cooke, B. (2003). The denial of slavery in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(8), 1895-1918.
- Davis, T., & Kali-Nwiwu, A. (2001). Education, Ethnicity and National Integration in the History of Nigeria: Continuing Problems of Africa's Colonial Legacy. *The Journal of Negro History*, 86(1), 1-11.
- Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Dewey, J. (2008/1902). *The Child and the Curriculum Including, The School and Society*. New York: Cosimo, Inc.
- Ekeh, P. (1975). "Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 17(1), 91-112.
- Emmer, E. T., & Evertson, C. M. (2013). *Classroom management for middle and high school teachers* (9th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Esch, E., & Roediger, D. (2009). One symptom of originality: Race and the management of labour in the history of the United States. *Historical Materialsim* 17, 3-43.
- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. M. Evertson, & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 3-16). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fabricant, M., & Fine, M. (2012). *Charter Schools and the Corporate Makeover of Public Education: What's at Stake?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Freiberg, H. J. (1999). Beyond behaviorism. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp. 3-20). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *Society must be defended*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Hoare, Q., & Smith, G. (Eds.). New York: International Publishers.
- Granstrom, K. (2006). Group phenomena and classroom management in Sweden (C. S. Weinstein, Ed.). In C. M. Evertson (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state and law and order*. London: Macmillan.
- Harvey, David. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatcher, R. (2007). 'Yes, but how do we get there?' Alternative visions and the problem of strategy. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(2).
- Kliebard, H. M. (1993). What is a knowledge base, and who would use it if we had one? *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 295-303.
- Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958* (3rd Ed). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive education*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2008). *The seduction of common sense: How the right has framed the debate on America's schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2009). *Against common sense: Teaching and learning toward social justice*. New York: Routledge.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2012). *Bad teacher!: How blaming teachers distorts the bigger picture*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 55(2), 178-194.
- Lemlech, J. K. (1988). *Classroom management: Methods and techniques for elementary and secondary teachers* (2nd Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Lewis, R. (2006). Classroom discipline in Australia. In C. M. Evertson, & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 1193-1214). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Marx, K. (2010). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Lexington, KY: Pacific Publishing Studio.
- Miller, A. (2006). Contexts and attributions for difficult behavior in English classrooms. In C. M. Evertson, & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 1093-1120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nishioka, K. (2006). Classroom management in postwar Japan: The life guidance approach. In C. M. Evertson, & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 1215-1238). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pace, J. L., & Hemmings, A. (2006). Understanding classroom authority as a social construction. In J. L. Pace, & A. Hemmings (Eds.), *Classroom authority: Theory, research, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations.
- Pasias, G., & Roussakis, Y. (2012). "Who marks the bench?" A critical review of the neo-European "paradigm shift" through higher education policies and discourses. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10(1), 127-141.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (2008/1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Rodney, W. (1981). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
- Van Tartwijk, J., Den Brok, P., Veldman, I., & Wubbels, T. (2009). Teachers' practical knowledge about classroom management in multicultural classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(3), 453-460.
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 249-294.
- Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The White architects of Black education: Ideology and power in America, 1865-1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Watkins, W. H. (2012). The new social order: An educator looks at economics, politics, and race. In W. H. Watkins (Ed.), *The assault on public education: Confronting the politics of corporate school reform* (pp. 7-32). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Weinstein, C., Curran, M., & Tomlinson-Clarke, S. (2003). Culturally responsive classroom management: Awareness into action. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(4), 269-276.
- Weinstein, C. S., Tomlinson-Clarke, S., & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(1), 25-38.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wubbels, T., Brekelmans, M., Don Brok, P., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. M. Evertson, & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Authors:

Zachary A. Casey, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Minnesota
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Peik Hall
159 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis
MN 55455
USA
email: casey268@umn.edu

Brian D. Lozenski, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Minnesota
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Peik Hall
159 Pillsbury SE
Minneapolis
MN 55455
USA
email: lozen002@umn.edu

Shannon K. McManimon, Ph.D. Candidate
University of Minnesota
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Peik Hall
159 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis
MN 55455
USA
email: mcman093@umn.edu