DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 860 TM 011 257

AUTHOR Elliott, John
TITLE Knowledge, Power, and Teacher Appraisal.
PUB DATE Sep 87
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented to the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference (Manchester, England, September 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; *Educational Research; Foreign Countries; *Knowledge Level; *Power Structure; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The relationship between teacher appraisal and educational research in the United Kingdom is illustrated by the personal and professional experiences of an educator. An autobiographical analysis of this relationship, in light of M. Foucault's analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge, is presented. A clear relationship between teacher training and application of that training in the classroom is lacking. A similar lack of relevance characterizes school curricula in relation to student experience. Avoiding an over-disciplinary stance by the teacher, and preventing a loss of teacher authority over students are best achieved by action-research based curriculum development. Participation in the approach developed by L. Stenhouse, through the Schools Council/Nuffield Humanities Project (SCNHP), increased the level of action-research based development. The position of teacher appraisal within these systems is as part of a much broader strategy for transforming power relations in the educational system. In the SCNHP, the transition was made from developing school curriculum to developing teacher curriculum, and from a first-order action research to a second-order action research. The current situation, based on an agreement between the government, employers, and teachers' associations, is critiqued. (TJH)

PAPER PRESENTED TO THE BRITISH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE AS PART OF A SYMPOSIUM ON TEACHER APPRAISAL

MANCHESTER

SEPTEMBER 1987

Professor John Elliott
Centre for Applied Research in Education
School of Education
University of East Anglia
Norwich NR4 7TJ

KNOWLEDGE, POWER, AND TEACHER APPRAISAL, John Elliott, University of East Anglia.

'power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another: that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations'. (Michel Foucault in Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison p.27).

'the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification of those who are subjected... (I)n this slender technique are to be found a whole domain of knowledge, a whole domain of power' (Michel Foucault in The History of Sexuality, Vol.1, p.95.)

'power is not an institution, nor a structure, nor a possession. It is the name we give to a complex strategic situation in a particular society' (Michel Foucault in The History of Sexuality, vol 1, An Introduction; p.93).

'No science can create its own conditions of possibility: these are to be found in the transformation of power relations.----Knowledge is not so much true or false as legitimate or illegitimate for a particular set of power relations.' (Alan Sheridan's exposition of the relationship between science and power in Foucault's thought. See his concluding chapter in Michel Foucault: The Will To Truth p.220).

Prologue: an autobiographical excursion into questions of knowledge and power.

The relationship between teacher appraisal and educational research is a matter of personal and professional concern for me; a concern which has its roots in my own biography. The relation between knowledge and power constitutes a major theme in that biography and accounts for my continuing concern with the relationship between educational research (the creation of educational knowledge) and practice (the exercise of educative power). The phenomenon of teacher appraisal impinges upon those concerns because it raises fundamental issues about the relationship between knowledge and power in the educational process. I went to the work of Michel Foucault in my attempts to clarify these issues.

For better or worse, I have decided to approach the issues I want to discuss indirectly, by way of a reflection on my own professional biography in the light of Foucault's analysis of the relationship between Knowledge and power. The quotations cited above provided me with an initial structure of ideas around which to weave my story, and the reflections about knowledge and power it might stimulate. In this way I hope to establish a framework for discussing the relationship between teacher appraisal and educational research.

For reasons which are still obscure to me I have always fancied myself as both action-man and contemplative-man; as someone who makes a powerful impact on events and as someone who contemplates their meaning and significance from a position of detachment. One aspect of this divided self has never completely overshadowed the other aspect. Between the ages of 18 and 21 I was a horticultural researcher contemplating the mysteries of magnesium and iron deficiency in apple trees through the lense of the agricultural-botany paradigm, which unknown to me at the time, had been adopted by educational researchers as the model for studying educational processes. I was not aware that familiar terms to me like 'deficiencies', 'treatments', 'gross yields', were being used to describe aspects of education; namely, the

states of pupils,curricular and methods,and pupils learning.If I had been so aware,perhaps I would have reflected more about my own motivation for becoming a horticultural researcher.

I had contemplated becoming a farmer(action-man) but chose research into farming instead.A victory for contemplative man?The research techniques I employed were techniques of control.The agricultural-botany paradigm yielded knowledge by establisning a power relationship between the researcher and his/her subject.I was not simply contemplating nature but changing and shaping it to serve the human purpose of maximising its marketability.My'power-motivation'(friends prefer the more psycho-analytic term of'power-complex') was an integral,if unacknowledged, aspect of my career as a horticultural researcher.In doing this kind of research one is not simply engaged in applied research-yielding knowledge which practising farmers can use-one is doing farming;albeit,'scientifically'.

Of course,there is a sense in which those action-men and women who base their farming on research knowledge are engaged in'scientific farming'.But perhaps we should make a distinction between this sort of farming and 'farming scientifically'.It is the latter which generates knowledge and we cannot have all farmers doing it.'Farming scientifically' isn't an effective strategy for maximising the market value of the produce.Experiment necessarily restricts productivity.It is 'scientific farming' which maximises the productive value of nature in the market place.This is the strategy which subjugates nature to the requirements of'the market' and constitutes a particular form of power relation between the farmer and nature.But the techniques of 'scientific farming' are constructed by those who'farm scientifically'.It is agricultural/horticultural research which creates power.

'Farming scientifically' is the source of 'scientific farming's' power.The knowledge it produces is not neutral with respect to power,something which can be used or not used to establish power relations.Inasmuch as it is knowledge it establishes a power relation.It is the achievement of a certain form of power relation to nature's produce which constitutes the test for truth.Both the methods and the outcomes of the agricultural-botany paradigm are conditioned by the possibility of this achievement;a possibility which emerges as market values increasingly shape the process of social change.

I left horticultural research to train as a teacher.It hadn't been entirely satisfying.I couldn't put enough of me into it.The contemplative part of me was'nt satisfied by the subject matter.Evenings and weekends had been spent reading books on philosophy,religion,and psychology exploring idea's about human beings and the nature and meaning of their existence.Action-man hadn't been satisfied either.I wanted to make an impact on peoples lives rather than plants.Teaching offered a better possibility of bringing these two aspects of myself together.Education I felt was about 'elping people to realise their human capacities and potential and therefore presupposed a theory of human nature.

My teacher training was a partial success in satisfying contemplative-man,but it didn't give me a clue about how to reconcile him with action-man in real classrooms and schools.The theories of human nature we discussed in the college didn't exactly match human nature as it appeared in the secondary modern classrooms I did my teaching practice in.This didn't present me with too much of a problem in an instrumental sense.Action-man always saved the day.I coped reasonably well.If contemplative-man held an optimistic and idealistic view of human nature this was countered in practice by the pessimism and realism of action-man.From the perspective of the former education

was about giving children opportunities to discover and develop their natural powers and capacities.Children may be wicked and destructive at times but this is caused by the frustration of their natural powers.Remove the frustrating conditions and you unlock their potential for good.GIVE CONTROL and don't TAKE CONTROL.From the perspective of my action-man human destructiveness has its roots in nature rather than nurture.It must be contained and suppressed through externally imposed discipline.Therefore TAKE CONTROL and don't GIVE CONTROL.My contemplative-man treated children as he wanted them to become;as self-actualising individuals.But he had no way of coping with them as they were.For the coping strategies he had from time to time to hand over to action-man.

If the two aspects of myself were not exactly reconciled in the teacher role they were at least both operating in it to counterbalance each other.And so it remained for sometime as I entered a full-time teaching career in a secondary modern school at the age of twenty four.I was lucky in the point of entry.It was 1962.Kids in the secondary modern schools were no longer passively conforming to the schooling on offer to those who had failed the entrance examination for a Grammar School Education.They were generally switched off and out and rebelling.Teachers,many previously sound action-types among them, were finding it difficult to cope.Some survived by turning their schools into'concentration camps'devoted exclusively to solving a problem they had defined as one of containment and control.Others created what David Hargreaves described as the 'Innovatory Secondary Modern'.I started my teaching career in one.They had a clearly defined ethos and were easily identified.In our school we knew where the other Innovatory Secondary Mods were in the L.E.A.And we knew many of the teachers in them.We attended the same conferences and sometimes set them up for each other.The L.E.A. was not simply tolerant but positively supportive.The problem of 'pupil disaffection' was difficult to ignore and any teachers who felt their was an educational response to it were to be welcomed.It was widely acknowledged to be a very urgent,immediate and practical problem.If a Head and his/her staff wanted resources from the L.E.A.they got them.

There was very little abstract discussion about the aims of education.The Heads of these schools, and the key staff they gathered around them,were action men and women (but of a different species to the traditional disciplinarian).They had a broad vision of the direction they wanted to move in,but there was no blue-print,no detailed list of objectives specifying desireable learning outcomes.The vision was of the educational process rather than its outcomes.It was of a process which helped children to make sense of their lives in the here and now ,of themselves,their relationships,and their society.Its central elements were the curriculum and the manner of its transmission(Teaching).The key words in the discourse were those of 'relevance','integration','interest' and 'responsibility'.The vision was vague.Few sat back and contemplated it in abstract form.It was clarified in action and reflection on action in the context of practical discourse.

No teacher in the Innovatory Secondary Modern could escape this context.You couldn't make the curriculum more relevant to childrens lives by respecting the traditional subject boundaries and without raising controversial issues about where the content boundaries should and should not be drawn.You couldn't make the curriculum more interesting without raising controversial issues about teaching methods.I saw ancient battles being loudly refought along the corridors,cardboard boxes sliding out of the drama room with children inside them,a metal waste bin on fire in the classroom as pupils wrote poems about it,'love comics'being discussed in R.E.'Gimmicks',said

some.And you couln't foster in pupils a sense of responsibility for their own learning in classrooms without raising controversial issues about school rules in general.

Controversy stimulates self-reflection.The alternative interpretations of actions expressed in the sort of practical discourse I describe provides the context in which one renders ones own problematic and searches for evidence to legitimate them to colleagues.And the evidence was to be found in the pupils perceptions of the curriculum and teaching strategies.No curriculum could be justified as relevant unless it was experienced as such by pupils or justifiably claim to integrate knowledge and understanding if pupils couldn't perceive relationships between its contents.No teaching method could be justified as stimulating an interest in the subject-matter if pupils could'nt perceive anything of interest in it,or as helping them to take responsibility for their own learning if they didn't perceive it as helpful in this respect.Teachers legitimated their actions to each other on the basis of subjective data elicited from pupils.They were also drawn into a practical discourse in which their education was continuously constructed,critiqued,and reconstructed. Faced with alternative accounts of our actions from our colleagues and pupils we not only reassed them but refined and modified our understanding of the process values which underpinned them:namely of concepts like 'relevance','integration','interests', etc.If we evaluated our actions in the light of our vision we also clarified the vision in the light of the actions we took to realise it.In practical discourse focussed on curriculum processes,aims and methods were objects of joint reflection.The tension in me between contemplative-man and action-man was largely resolved by my experience in an Innovatory Secondary Mod (very relevant, but not very recent, CATE),and with it my problem of linking educational practice to educational theory.

It was in the innovatory project of a now nearly dead institution that a new paradigm of educational research-a form of COLLEGIAL DELIBERATION about PRACTICAL ISSUES-emerged.It is now known as Action Research.What we now recognise as the methodology of Action Research-the focus on processes rather than products:the study of a practical problem in relation to its context (case study):looking at the problem from different points of view (triangulation methods):monitoring the effects of action-strategies on pupils experience of classrooms and schools:deliberating about problems,actions,and consequences with peers and pupils-was all part and parcel of the Curriculum Development enterprise in the Innovatory Secondary Modern (albeit in embryo and not yet 'dignified' by the title of Action-Research).This enterprise defied any Job Description or Division of Labour.Individual teachers were researcners,theorists,pedagogues,policy-makers.Our role was a multi-facited one.Some contributed more to one aspect than others,but all had opportunities to contribute to each according to his/her particular talents and abilities.The enterprise required an open-system.It allowed a creative interaction between person and role.The multi-facited professional role enabled teachers to develop as persons,and in doing so enabled them to develop the professional role.Personal and professional development were inseperable.It was a never to be forgotten educative experience for me and my colleagues.It empowered us as persons and as teachers and in doing so educated us both personally and professionally,and it taught us that their can be no empowerment(education) of pupils.without the empowerment of teachers.And so I return to the theme of Power and Knowledge.

In the early part of my teaching career the contemplative-man in me couldn't cope with the discrepancy between his educational ideals and classroom reality.He GAVE CONTROL to pupils and LOST CONTROL OVER HIMSELF.And so I had tended in practice to rely on the action-man part of me to exercise the kind of disciplinary power which enabled me to TAKE CONTROL of the situation and thereby stay in control within it.What I learned in my Innovatory Secondary Modern,through action-research based Curriculum Development,was how to BE-IN-CONTROL in the situation without TAKING CONTROL.I came to a tacit understanding of the way in which educational ideals and aims link to practice.They provide criteria for assessing the EDUCATIONAL QUALITY of the learning environment rather than states of the pupils.Since this environment is mediated and often constituted by teachers,educational aims focus their reflection on their own actions and conduct.By self-monitoring the educational quality of their actions teachers take control of the learning environment and (by implication) of themselves rather than of their pupils.Like all forms of educational knowledge this kind of professional self-knowledge creates a particular form of power and presupposes a certain power relation between teachers and pupils.The form of power it creates is EDUCATIVE POWER,which is an enabling rather than constraining power.Through Educational Action Research teachers transform the learning environment (curricular,teaching methods,and school ethos) into one which enables pupils to discover and develop their powers and capacities themselves.In creating educative power Action-Research not only professionally empowers teachers;it empowers pupils.

The Curriculum Development enterprise I have depicted was a response to a situation in which pupils were increasingly hostile to their schooling.Teachers were finding it difficult to cope.A sense of powerlessness pervaded staffrooms.The enterprise was about giving teachers the power to cope again.But so was the transformation of some Secondary Moderns into 'concentration camps'.(I exaggerate,of course,and will apologise later).In the Innovatory School teachers coped by creating educative power in the learning environment,and since they were part of it,in themselves.In the 'concentration camps' they coped by creating systems of domination.Before I explain this alternative coping strategy let me describe the departure point of both.

Traditionally the power of the teacher was legitimated by the authority invested in his/her role.It was because (s)he was perceived as a legitmate authority on the subject-matter that (s)he was obeyed.And even when (s)he was disobeyed the resulting punishment was accepted as the exercise of legitimate power.What might be called disciplinary power was traditionaly mediated by the authority pupils invested in the teachers' role.It was an aspect of the individual teacher's relationship to his/her pupils.The teacher who sent a pupil elsewhere to be disciplined (e.g.to the head or deputy) tacitly acknowledged a breakdown in his authority.The crisis in the Secondary Modern School stemmed from the widespread refusal of pupils in these schools to invest authority in their teachers.

My metaphor of the 'concentration camp'indicates some of the features of one response to this situation.First,the exercise of disciplinary power is transformed.It is no longer mediated by the investment of rights of authority on the part of those subject to it.It therefore lacks the quality of voluntariness present in the traditional power-relation between teachers and pupils in schools.It is a relation of the DOMINATION of the will of one group by the will of another group.The exercise of disciplinary power became a form of coercion.

This transformation of teacher-pupil power relations opened up new possibilities for the use of strategies and techniques of social control on a scale not previously witnessed in state schools before. Relations of domination need a system of surveillance covering as many aspects of the lives to be dominated as possible. Such a system is necessary to exert the kind of control over every detail of individual behaviour which domination requires. Its main features are techniques for observing that behaviour and thereby rendering it visible; for recording, collating, and reporting information about it; for assessing it and deciding whether and what 'remedial' action is necessary. Disciplinary power which takes the form of domination is mediated by a system rather than authority invested in individuals.

Many Secondary Modern Schools began to develope systems of surveillance and control as they reestablished disciplinary power by transforming its mode of operation. Discipline was decreasingly the responsibility of individual teachers but of the system. Some individuals were given special roles in maintaining the system. It was in such Secondary Modern Schools that the so-called 'pastoral care system' was soawned, and that hierarchical system of specialist roles we now dignify with the title of management. In the Innovatory Secondary Modern there were 'leadership' but not 'management' roles.

Implicit in the development of hierarchical systems of control in schools is a particular view of human nature; namely, it is infinitely 'plastic'. Traditional authority presupposed the possibility of resistance by a fixed human nature whose destructive manifestations could be contained and suppressed but not eliminated. When it broke down the 'progressive' teacher in the Innovatory Secondary Modern also presupposed a fixed human nature but its destructive manifestations were regarded as frustrated expressions of intrinsically good powers. They could be eliminated by transforming the frustrating conditions into enabling ones. This is what innovation in schools was all about. However, the systems of domination and control which evolved in schools aimed to eliminate destructive behaviour, not by transforming its context, but by moulding and reshaping it at will. Such behaviour was not so much interpreted as the manifestation of a 'wicked', 'wilful', 'obstinate', 'irresponsible', or 'uncaring' subject of consciousness, but as a 'deficiency in the material' (how often I have heard this expression in schools). Such an interpretation assumed an infinitely 'plastic' human nature.

The transformation of traditional power-relations into systems of domination, which began in some Secondary Modern Schools during the '50's and '60's, continued after reorganisation in the larger comprehensive schools with the development of even more sophisticated management techniques of surveillance and control. Of course, this particular transformation must be seen against a much broader social process; the transformation of individuals into 'plastic men and women' who are adaptable, flexible, and compliant enough to meet the requirements of a constantly changing labour market. Schools are now in the business of producing marketable commodities.

It is in this context that we should understand the large scale transfer of the Agricutural-Botany paradigm of research to the study of educational processes and programmes during the last three decades. Its employment in educational settings presupposes the possibility of transforming power relations in schools into a perfect system of technical control over human nature in the service of market forces.

Such research is neither unbiased with respect to the aims and values of education, nor is the knowledge it aspires to unbiased about the uses of disciplinary power. A research paradigm which necessarily views the aims of education as quantifiable products, educational

programmes and processes as treatments, and the educational needs of pupils as deficient performances, is hardly unbiased. And knowledge which is only valid if it creates new possibilities of technical control over behaviour is hardly unbiased about the nature and uses of power in educational settings. Such research necessarily creates the power to extend and refine systems of surveillance and control in schools. It is the basis of scientific management not only with respect to the application of the knowledge it generates but with respect to the application of the techniques of observation and analysis it employs as instruments of surveillance and assessment.

The 'concentration camp' metaphor I have used greatly exaggerates the ethos of schooling today, and the influence of the agricultural-botany paradigm on it. Schools are not perfect systems of domination, and never were. Their ethos was and remains mixed with a tendency for one sort of climate to dominate. Traditional Authority still permeates the power relations between teachers and pupils as does the kind of climate generated in the Innovatory Secondary Modern. Both provide teachers with 'cultures of resistance' to the pressures from the Market Place for schools to perfect their systems of domination and control. The crisis of authority I referred to was itself a necessary stage in the transformation of schooling into a manufacturing process. Traditional uses of disciplinary power were ill equipped to meet the economic requirements of a late 20th Cent. Capitalist society. But they still persist. And what of the Innovatory climate transmitted into comprehensive schools from the Innovatory Secondary Moderns?

The crisis of authority in the late 50's and 60's created the possibility of truly educative power relations between teachers and pupils. But humanist ideals are not without utility in a free-market economy. The ideals of 'self-realisation' and 'self-direction', which referred to the realisation of, and direction by, a substantial self, can easily be distorted by reinterpreting them in the categories of a liberal individualism which defines human beings as 'Marketing Man'. 'Self-direction' comes to mean being directed by ones wants and desires, while 'self-realisation' means having them satisfied. Wants and desires, unlike innate powers and capacities, can be products of human condioning; of the exercise of coercive power. If selves are simply the sum totals of their wants and desires then their nature is infinately 'plastic. The manufacture of 'autonomous beings' is not an inconceivable enterprise for a power-coercive educational system, when viewed from the standpoint of liberal individualism.

The 'New Right' has in government appropriated and in the process distorted those progressive educational ideas it raved against in opposition. Witness, for example, the M.S.C's support for progressive rather than traditional methods in its T.V.E.I. scheme. The scheme not only further undermines traditional authority in schools but, in its deceptive appearance, threatens to disarm that other pocket of resistance to the growth of coercive power in schools i.e. the climate emanating from the Innovatory Secondary Modern. Not all innovatory teachers are deceived but prefer a strategy of creative conformity to one of outright rebellion. They comply with the official rhetoric in accounting for their actions while resisting its distorting influence on their practice, and in so doing continue to create and maintain educative power relations with pupils.

Teacher Appraisal:the pathology or the triumph of educational research?

And so to my concerns about teacher appraisal and its relationship to educational research.The appraisal of teachers could be interpreted as another strategy in the exercise of coercive power over the lives of pupils.Does a form of appraisal which creates a sub-system of surveillance and control over teachers constitute a strategy for eliminating those pockets of professional culture which still resist the transformation of schooling into a manufacturing process?I believe it does because it is essentially a strategy for controlling the conditions under which the practical knowledge of teachers is constructed.Let me explain.

In the craft tradition of teaching disciplinary power operates through the authority teachers' possess by virtue of tacit knowledge they acquire through experience.Practice based on craft knowledge is highly resistant to the bureacratic tendency towards the standardisation of performance, because such knowledge is not only largely tacit,but also bound to particular contexts of experience.It cannot be used as a basis for defining general performance standards.The criteria of good practice vary according to the context (See Bridges,Elliott,and Klass 1986,and Brown and McIntyre 1986:a careful explication of the structural characteristics of such criteria).This is why appraisal from the point of view of the craft culture is largely construed as an informal self-appraisal process.

The resistance to bureacratic standardisation ,which the possession of craft knowledge generates in teachers, can only be overcome by eliminating the conditions under which this knowledge is constructed and transmitted i.e.professional privacy and freedom from extern regulation.Any form of teacher appraisal which changes these conditions by establishing a system of hiearchical surveillance and control over teachers' activities constitutes a strategy for eliminating the craft culture.

The practical knowledge,of which the innovatory progressive culture consists,is generated through a process in which teachers reflect about their own,and each others,actions in situations where tacit craft knowledge is too problematic to serve as a basis for action.This action-research process develops teachers' conscious awareness of what constitues educative teaching in particular contexts:an awareness which empowers them as educators.

The innovatory progressive culture is also resistant to bureaucratic standardisation.The practical insights it consists of,although not tacit,are grounded in the experience and reflection of teachers in particular contexts.What constitutes educative practice in one context may not apply to another.This has to be determined afresh as contexts of action change,although insights developed in one context can serve as fruitful sources of action-hypotheses to be tested in others.Generalisations can be developed across contexts,but only through reflective comparisons of a finite number of experiences.As a basis for future action such general insights provide intimations of possibilities rather than predictions.Moreover,even judgements of what constitutes educative practice in a particular context are intrinsically problematic because the meanings of the concepts/criteria of educational quality they employ are never unambiguously fixed and settled by attempts to define them.Within the innovatory progressive culture criteria of good teaching are not only context bound but infinitely contestable.For both these reasons the insights it consists of are always provisional,controversial,and changing.

The innovatory progressive culture, like the traditional craft culture, can only be eliminated by changing the conditions under which it is constructed i.e. those which enable teachers to participate in reflective discourse about their own and each others practices. Any for of appraisal which restricts teachers opportunities to reflect abo . and develop their practices, in free and open discourse with each other, constitutes a strategy for eliminating the innovatory progressive culture in schools.

We can, therefore, assess the extent to which appraisal schemes are power strategies for eliminating resistant professional cultures by considering the ways in which they shape the creation and construction of teachers' practical knowledge. And if they transfer responsibility for generating practical knowledge from teachers to outsiders then they undermine that paradigm of educational research spawned in the Innovatory Secondary Modern; namely, Action Research. It is in this sense that teacher appraisal may constitute the pathology of educational research. But it may also constitute the triumph of that other paradigm I referred to; the agricultural-botany model.

This will have implications for the future development of educational research and teacher education in universities and other institutions of higher education. Teacher Appraisal is a matter of personal as well as professional concern. In order to explain why I need to resort to a little more autobiography.

I left teaching in 1967 to join the Schools Council/Nuffield Humanities Project led by Lawrence Stenhouse. The project's brief was to support innovation in an area where teachers experienced the full strength of pupil disaffection; in the humanities subjects in secondary schools with young adolescents. The raising of the school leaving age to 16 had been planned for 1970. Many teachers felt it might be the last straw. The Schools Council, through its early working papers, had already begun to support and disseminate ideas and curricula coming out of the Innovatory Secondary Moderns. The Humanities Project developed, refined, and articulated the progressive professional culture which had emerged in these schools, and attempted to disseminate it more widely. It gave progressive innovators an explicit curriculum theory in the form of 'the process model' and an explicit theory of teacher development centred around the idea of 'teachers as researchers'. (See Stenhouse, 1975).

In 1967 I thought I would be continuing a career as a curriculum developer. In one sense I assumed correctly and in another wrongly. At the time the Schools Council refused to prescribe curricular or methods for teachers since prescription was perceived to undermine professionalism. Some projects responded by designing a curriculum, and then attempting to sell it to teachers on the basis of its demonstrable merits. A division of labour was established between outsiders (designers/disseminators) and insiders (adopters).

Stenhouse's strategy was different and highly original. Teachers were not viewed as targets in a curriculum sales campaign. It was their professional responsibility to realise a worthwhile curriculum process for their particular pupils. The outsiders task was to enable teachers to reflect about what constituted such a process and how it might be realised in their situation. Here we have a distinction between the curriculum development role of the insider and the teacher development role of the outsider. In the Humanities Project I made the transition between being a developer of a curriculum for schools and becoming a developer of a curriculum for teachers. But it was a very different sort of curriculum from the traditional courses on offer to teachers. It focussed on the curriculum problems and issues which arise in particular educational settings, rather than on general theories

about educational practice.And its methods aimed,not to transmit information,but to establish conditions which enabled teachers to reflectively develop solutions to the curriculum problems they identified.This conception of teacher education as the facilitation of teachers' based action research was entirely consistent with the culture of progressive innovation which had emerged in the Innovatory Secondary Modern.Indeed this conception presupposed such a culture.

In the context of the Humanities Project the roles of curriculum developers in schools and teacher developers overlapped.The latter designed a curriculum project.But we viewed it as a vehicle for helping teachers to reflect about the relationship between educational values and practice.The project was designed as a set of action-hypotheses,about how to realise an educationally worthwhile humanities curriculum,for teachers to test in practice.From our point of view the success of the project rested not so much on its widespread adoption in pure form as on its power to foster reflective practice.Although it embodied curriculum strategies for teachers to test,the project as a whole constituted a teacher development strategy for the project team to test.It involved two levels of action research;the first-order level of facilitating a worthwhile educational process in schools and the second-order level of facilitating a worthwhile process of teacher education.The first level was primarily the responsibility of teachers,while the second level was primarily the responsibility of the project team.

In the Humanities Project I made the transition from a first-order action researcher to a second-order action researcher.In my subsequent 'academic' career I have attempted, through a number of projects (See Elliott 1976 and 198),to integrate the 'outsider' roles of teacher educator and educational researcher in a form of second-order action research;aimed at facilitating teachers' based action research in schools.Indeed I would claim that the growth of this integrated conception of educational research and teacher education in universities,and other institutions of higher education,has in no small measure supported and sustained the innovatory progressive culture amongst schoolteachers.But the relationship is a reciprocal one.Teacher education as a form of educational action research,aimed at fostering reflective curriculum development, presuposes the continuing existence of the innovatory progressive culture in schools.If teacher appraisal constitutes a strategy for eliminating this culture ,then it also constitutes a strategy which threatens the continuing integration of teacher education and educational research in the form of the action-research paradigm.

If the formal appraisal system is a strategy for standardising teachers practices then it will control the nature of inservice training and who has access to it.The inservice curriculum will tend to focus on the acquisition of specific competencies and skills, defined as measurable perfomances.Only those who are assessed as deficient in,or in need of,such skills will be given access to this curriculum.Under these conditions the action-research paradigm of teacher development and educational research would be unable to operate.The future of teacher training on this scenario belongs to the'skill trainers',and the future of educational research to the 'agricultural-botanists'whose process-product studies will discover the skills(treatments).Academics in education will have a 'choice' of two careers;as part of an elite core of educational researchers or as humble technologists manufacturing skills in teachers.

So how is the development of a national system of teacher appraisal shaping up,and what are its implications for the relationship between power and knowledge in our educational system?

FROM 'TEACHING QUALITY' TO ACAS:the negotiation of relations between knowledge and power in education.

Proposals to establish a formal system of appraisal for teachers in England and Wales have met with considerable opposition from teachers their unions.At the heart of the controversy there are obviously ndamental issues about power at stake.But I do not see the power issue in quite the same way as some teachers and their representatives have;as another strategy in central government's bid for more power over education.Like them I see appraisal as part of a much broader strategy for transforming power relations in our educational system.This is why I have used so much space trying to clarify the general issues of power and knowledge at stake in this broader process.Any appraisal of teacher appraisal schemes should consider them in the light of such issues.However,I do not see this broader process,or appraisal as a specific aspect of it,as simply an attempt on the part of central government to possess more power over educational processes.Power strategies are constructed in complex social networks of organisations and groups, which operate at a variety of levels and locations in the social order.Central government is perhaps best viewed as a facilitator of power strategies already operating within our society.

This is important because a simple treatment of appraisal issues focusses attention on the wrong enemy.The enemy,if there is one,is not central government but the form of power at work in the educational system generally,and the form of educational research which helps to create that power.Such an enemy can be fought at a variety of levels and in a variety of locations.Teachers don't have to leave their unions to fight the battle for them at the national level alone.The problem about seeing the issues in terms of government power ,and defining the battle as a fight between the government enemy and the teachers' unions,is that it blinds ordinary teachers to the little ways in which the foundations of formal appraisal are being laid in the subtle transformations of power relations taking place day by day in their own classroom,school,and L.E.A.

I remember feeling furious with one major union's advice to its members;that they should not get involved in the development of appraisal schemes at the local level until the national pilots had been evaluated.Some L.E.A,s had wanted to involve teachers in the development of a 'professional' form of appraisal.The advice was probably well intentioned.Don't get involved in appraisal until we have learned from the national pilots.But it was based on a false diagnosis of the power issue.The advice assumed that teachers at the local level are unable to influence the future of appraisal because it is a power strategy of central government and can therefore only be modified and changed by negotiation at the national level.Following Foucault's concept of power I would see appraisal as part of a complex strategic situation operating at different levels and locations in society.On this view a particular form of teacher appraisal is emerging and permeating the educational system and the interventions of central government on its behalf are simply one aspect of the phenomenon which has to be addressed.Teachers at every level need to reflect about and respond to the operations of the broad strategy as it impinge upon their professional practices.

I am optimistic enough about human nature to believe that if formal appraisal is part of a broad strategy for transforming schools into systems of coercive-power it can be successfully resisted.This optimism is, of course,based on the view that neither pupils or teachers have infinitely plastic natures;that their need to develop themselves in action,both personally and professionally, will always

impose limits on the extent to which they will conform to coercive power-strategies.

Outright rebellion and obstructionism is not necessarily the most effective form of resistance,particulary in a society which still requires policies to be legitimated in terms of democratic rhetoric.This rhetoric gives considerable leverage to 'creative conformists',who are able to negotiate sufficient trade offs from the proponents of a power-coercive policy to protect their own values and interests.In the process of democratic legitimation policies become transformed.

The government's attempts to legitimate teacher appraisal provide an excellent illustration of this process.Sir Keith Joseph's 1983 White Paper on 'Teaching Quality' quite unambiguously proposes appraisal as a strategy of hierarchical surveil.ance and control over the activities of teachers.The paper contrasts the desired form of appraisal with self-appraisal,and damns the latter with faint praise.So much for the future of action-research as the appropriate form of professional appraisal!

"The government welcome recent moves towards self-assessment by schools and teachers,and believe these should help to improve school standards and curricula.But employers can manage their teacher force effectively only if they have accurate knowledge of each teacher's performance.The government believe that for this purpose formal assessment of teacher performance is necessary and should be based on classroom visiting by the teacher's head or head of department; and an appraisal of both pupils work and of the teacher's contribution to the life of the school."

Note the objectification of persons in this appraisal scenario.The human subject of appraisal is reduced to an object of scrutiny.The focus is on observable performances,rather than the subjective and personal qualities teachers bring to them.When teaching competence is construed as performance rather than the exercise of personal qualities it can be standardised.A teacher's personal being can't.But as Doll (1984) argued this understanding of'competence' is a departure from customary useage:

"Competence refers essentially to a state of being or to a capacity.---performance is the outward and public manifestation of underlying and internal powers."

Understood in these terms teaching competence refers to the quality of being teachers manifest in their performances;to the realisation of their powers as educators to translate educational values into educative forms of practice.This sort of competence is developed and assessed through practical deliberation and discourse with professional peers(action research).

The passage cited from the White Paper also suggests that appraisal should attempt to assess teacher performance against learning outcomes. Hence the reference to pupils work.It implies the possibility of standardising performance against desired learning outcomes.As I argued in an earlier analysis of the White Paper (See Elliott 1985) the form of appraisal proposed construes teaching as a technology,applying standardised treatments in a manufacturing process.It is certainly not construed as either a craft or the reflective practice of translating values into educational processes.

And what are the functions of the form of appraisal proposed in the White Paper?These are clearly stated as those of guiding management decisions about the deployment,training,and dismissal of teachers?If appraisal fulfilled such functions it would effectively leave teachers with very little professional control over their

practices,professional development,and careers.In effect it would deprofessionalise them and eliminate their professional cultures.

But the whole enterprise depends upon the ability of the agricultural-botany paradigm of educational research to discover the performance indicators of competence,and develop the instruments for measuring them.Many claims to discoveries have been made.The D.E.S. evidently constantly reviews the research evidence (See David Hancocks address to "Education for Industrial Society" on Feb 25 1985).It will not be long before a consensus is distilled from this kind of 'educational' research.The search for demonstrable performance indicators of teaching competence is not necessarily in vain,if teaching is construed as a form of technical control over learning construed as behaviour.It is always possible to discover standard techniques for controlling performance.But one cannot control the development of innate and fixed human powers.One can only establish the conditions which enable these states of being to develop and grow.This is the task of the educator as opposed to the technologist.The rest is up to the pupils;to take responsibility for their own development.

The reaction of teachers to Sir Keith's proposals brought a gradual shift in government rhetoric.In the address referred to earlier,we find Permanent Secretary Hancock making the following scatements while continuing to affirm the general direction of the White Paper's proposals:

"The assessor must possess the range and quality of teaching knowledge towards which the (assessed) teacher is working and will thus be a senior colleague--"

"It must be an open,two-way,process--"

"The (assessed) teacher---will have the opportunity to add any comment or reservation(to the assessors report) considered necessary."

"The purpose of assessment is to encourage and monitor the professional development of the teacher"

"No one has ever suggested that a school should be run exactly like a business.The idea of appraisal is to identify the qualities that make a good teacher."

"--we have in mind the achievement of consensus as the basis for any regulations and not the imposition of ideas nurtured in Elizabeth House.The Department is not power-crazed."

The speech acknowledged no significant changes in the original proposal.But there is a marked shift in the way it is legitimated and described.The emphasis is now placed on "professional development"(although what is meant by it is not explained) as the aim of appraisal,in contrast to management functions which could be interpreted in a less positive light.Hierarchical appraisal is toned down by talk of "senior colleagues" and a "two-way process".The significance of context for appraisal is also acknowledged in a shift of focus from performance to the qualities of the teacher.The intention that teachers will have a major say in how they will be assessed and the denial of power-coercive motives are stressed.The rhetoric,if not the substance,of the proposals goes some way to accomodating the professional cultures of teachers.

Over a year later the current Secretary of State's speech to the

Industrial Society (April 1986) elaborated the rhetoric of professional development and teacher participation in the operationalisation of appraisal. The hierarchical control over the process is reaffirmed but softened. Appraisal will operate at all levels of the hierarchy, and in the "personal opinion" of Mr Baker, "a measure of peer review and reciprocity should be involved". The head is no longer seen as a classroom observer. This task is simply described as one for senior colleagues (even possibly more than one), rather than as a management task. In this speech it is not only the rhetoric which shifts in the direction of a collegial and reflective form of appraisal, but procedures are now proposed (albeit as a matter of personal opinion) to match the shift.

And so we come to the ACAS agreement of 1986, between government, employers and teacher associations. This agreement is now the framework for the national pilots in selected L.E.A's. It incorporates most of Mr. Baker's anticipatory rhetoric and proposed procedures. It accomodates possibilities for developing collegial forms of appraisal, involving self-appraisal, peer observation, and safeguards to appraisee's with respect to access to, and use of, appraisal records.

The agreement doesn't prescribe a form of appraisal which is equally balanced between managerial and professional cultures. It allows for different emphases. On the one hand it allows for a strong element of hierarchical surveillance with some restrictions on the process and outcomes e.g. that a formal appraisal should be preceded and informed by self-appraisal, and that appraisee's should have a right to appeal over both substantive judgements and procedures. On the other hand it allows for a strong element of self and peer appraisal in the process with some concessions to hierarchical access to, and use of, records.

What we witnessed during the period between White Paper and ACAS was the transformation of a coercive model of teacher appraisal into a model which accomodates elements of existing professional cultures. The framework as it stands leaves plenty of space in which to develop appraisal in schools as a form of classroom action research, and for people like myself to participate in this development as a second-order action research enterprise. If the opportunity is not grasped by reflective teachers and teacher educators, if we shrink from creative compromise, then we have no cause to moan when the spaces provided by ACAS are filled with managerialism, skill training, and techniques of control supplied by the 'agricultural-botany' paradigm.

REFERENCES

ACAS Independent Panel (1986) Report of the Appraisal and Training Working Group. Mimeo.

D. Bridges, J. Elliott & C. Klass (1986) 'Performance Appraisal as Naturalistic Inquiry', Cambridge Journal of Education, Vol. 16 No.3

S. Brown and D. McIntyre (1986) 'The Qualities of Teachers: Building on Professional Craft Knowledge,' Mimeo, Scottish Council for Research in Education.

DES (1983) Teaching Quality, White Paper

DES (1985) Text of Mr D. Hancock's speech on 'Appraisal: Opportunities, not a threat'. Press Notice 34/85 . 25 February

DES (1986) Text of Secretary of State's speech to the Industrial Society Conference on the Education Bill. 14 April

W. E. Doll Jr. 'Developing Competence', in Competence, Ed. E.C. Short, Univ. Press of America, 1984

J. Elliott (1976) 'Developing hypotheses from teachers' practical constructs', Interchange, 72

J. Elliott (1985) 'Facilitating Educational Action-Research in Schools: some dilemmas, Field Methods in the Study of Education, R. G. Burgess (ed.) Falmer Press.

J. Elliott, C. Hunter, D. Marland, E. Wormald (1985) 'Teacher Education and Teaching Quality' in British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 6, No.1

M. Foucault (1977) Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison, Allen Lane, Penguin Press, London

M. Foucault (1979) The History of Sexuality, Vol.1: An Introduction, Allen Lane, Penguin Press, London

A. Sheridan (1980) Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth, Tavistock Publications, London and New York.

L. Stenhouse (1975) An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development, Heinemann Educational, London

* * *