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INTRODUCTION

A COMMENT ON METHOD

There are teaching holograms in England.¹ They are not teachers. They look like teachers; they act like teachers; they talk like teachers. In many ways the holograms resemble teachers. But they are not teachers. The holograms are transmitted into mathematics classrooms. They dispense information. Holograms are able to circumvent the spatial limitations of schools and the spatial limitations of geography across districts. They are spatially efficient. Holograms also reduce costs associated with corporeal teachers. Holograms replace teachers. Hence, holograms are economically efficient. Curiously, this technology, intended to replace teachers, also resembles them. However, this is not a teacher.

THE TREACHERY OF IMAGES

In 1929 René Magritte created a painting titled The Treachery of Images (This Is Not a Pipe). Magritte’s painting renders an ordinary tobacco pipe. Just below the image, Magritte painted the words “Ceci n’est pas une pipe” (This is not a pipe). The painting challenged audiences to make sense of an apparent contradiction. One might ask, for instance, if not a pipe, then what? The straightforward answer to the conundrum elicited by Magritte is the affirmative – that is, of course this is not a pipe, it is a rendering of a pipe. Such a simple answer, while correct, circumvents a more fundamental question asked by Magritte: What constitutes identity?

Magritte often painted ordinary objects in his work, and he was able to give new life to objects by representing them in strange ways and odd contexts. Magritte’s paintings were simultaneously familiar and strange, immediately understood and immediately perplexing. Magritte commented frequently on the fact that identity was located in different spatial arrangements and that identity was produced over time and through a politics of space. In this way, Magritte expressed the many ways that identity was mutable and that contexts were malleable. This is also a way to describe teachers in the twenty-first century.

By extension, what is the relationship between the hologram and its referent, the teacher? What criteria constitute something as “real” and something as represented? Do teachers possess a fixed corporeal identity, and is this identity necessary for the pedagogical process? What effects will imaging have on teachers and teaching? Do teachers auto-represent, or self-represent, themselves and their pedagogy? How? Why?
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Figure 1. René Magritte. The Treachery of Images (This Is Not a Pipe). (1926). © Estate of René Magritte / SODRAC (2008)

This book documents how teachers image themselves in attempts to mediate educational conflicts in schools. It explores the costs associated with imaging pedagogy. Why represent pedagogy? What does it look like? How are representations of pedagogy created? What effects are produced in the subjectivity of teachers who self-image? Can the process of self-representation be controlled?

THIS IS NOT A BOOK

By introducing the book this way, my intent was twofold. First, I have introduced the book in broad strokes, introduced the kinds of issues that it will examine, and introduced how I discuss the strange realities of pedagogical self-representation. I use surrealist art throughout to explain the strange realities teachers inhabit and produce. Surrealist art often destabilizes what is taken for granted and provides powerful visual anecdotes about ideas of desire, subjectivity, and the unconscious. Surrealist art provides pointed commentary on what might be called a modernist way of thinking. Teachers, I will argue, work within the temporal distortions that exist between the modern and postmodern epochs of education.

Second, I introduce the book this way to describe the method used to narrate its story. This study is supported by my readings of both Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. Both Foucault and Deleuze were influenced by surrealism. In fact, it is impossible to read Foucault and Deleuze and not run into surrealist artists like

x
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Marcel Duchamp, Salvador Dali, Antonin Artaud, Georges Bataille, and Henry Miller, to name but a few.¹

Foucault and René Magritte were acquaintances and exchanged written correspondence in which they discussed their respective work. Foucault (1970) borrowed the title for one of his books – *The Order of Things* – from the title of one of Magritte’s art exhibitions in New York City. Later, Foucault (1983c) would write a small book about the ways identity can be represented and ultimately changed through repeated representations. Foucault (1983c) used Magritte’s painting – *This Is Not a Pipe* – as the foil of his text. In that text, Foucault (1983c) observed, “A day will come when, by means of similitude relayed indefinitely along the length of a series, the image itself, along with the name it bears, will lose its identity” (p. 54). In this book, I will argue with regard to teachers and teaching that that day is today.

NOTES

² I am less interested in the particular departure points of surrealism that Foucault and Deleuze used in their thinking. Such a project might be loosely considered a genealogy into surrealism and its influence on continental philosophy. Such a project would produce an entirely different project than the current one. My use of surrealist art attempts to represent visually some of the changes in teachers’ realities and to simultaneously identify some of the influences of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. Again, my goal of examining teachers’ fabrications is to also provide a richer understanding of the theories used to support this study.
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CHAPTER 1

TERRITORIALIZING WARS OVER TEACHERS' KNOWLEDGE

The Pleasures of Micropolitical Resistance

Schools are political environments, and teachers exercise considerable power regarding policy outcomes. External policies produce a maelstrom of micropolitical activity when definitions of teaching and learning are contested among teachers, parents, administrators, and state bureaucrats. Schools, consequently, are places of conflict where competing (and often incompatible) interests and understandings about education are negotiated.

One way to control teachers is to keep them ignorant about their power. Ineffective teacher preparation that ignores questions about power, for instance, is akin to keeping teachers in a cave (Plato, 2006). Another way to control teachers is to develop accountability schemes, including schemes to intimidate teachers for particular policy outcomes, that direct this power. As a result, teachers can be co-opted for political desires that have nothing to do with children, youth, or humanity (Fenstermacher & Amarel, 1983).

However, Maxcy (1991) argued that teachers should control their work by using a type of normative power:

Professionalism implies a kind of normative power. Educational professionals ought to have the power to form directives for action with regard to problems arising out of the exercise of their skills and expertise. Teaching professionals ought to have the power to make policy and policy decisions. By professionalism, I have in mind power being placed in the hands of educators such that they may possess leadership in policy and decision making affecting learning in schools. (p. 160)

Should teachers control the policy environments of schools? What are the criteria for the responsible use of teacher power? The answers to these kinds of questions rest upon understanding how power operates in education.

Lortie (1975) recognized the problem of teachers and power 30 years ago. He suggested that “important research could be done on the issue of power and teachers” (p. 102). Lortie observed that questions about teachers’ professional identity surfaced once discussions moved away from what should be taught (curricula) and how it should be taught (pedagogy) to discussions about who should make educational decisions. Moreover, Lortie documented how teachers found pleasure in directing the implementation of curricular and assessment policies in schools. Lortie stated that “teacher power [was traditionally] limited to specified
authority over students; teachers were not supposed to enjoy exercising power [over, or through policy]" (p. 102, italics in original).

I conducted this study because I wanted to add empirical evidence to debates about how teachers exercise power in schools. I agreed with Sirotnik (1989) when he stated, “It must not be forgotten where the ultimate power to change is and always has been – in the heads, hands, and hearts of the educators who work in our schools” (p. 109). I am interested in the nature of this power. How does it operate? Toward what goals? On what basis? What is desirable about teaching, and how is exercising power in schools pleasurable? Are there illusions about the use of power that perpetuates how power uses teachers?

I hoped to understand how teachers interacted with power as a way to negotiate the political nature of their work. That is, I was interested in teachers’ micropolitics, in their power. I was also interested in the effect power had on teachers.

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITIES AND DESIRING SUBJECTIVITIES

In this chapter I introduce how the problem of teacher power is rooted in historical tensions about teachers’ professional identity. On the one hand, teachers’ professional identity pivots on competing ideas about what their roles in the classroom should be and the kinds of knowledge they should have. Stated simply, some administrators and scholars believe that teachers should follow knowledge developed by others, while others believe that teachers should lead policy development based on an exclusive, or professional, knowledge base (Maxcy, 1991).

On the other hand, the idea of an endemic knowledge base for teachers has been increasingly disqualified. Specifically, the professional-identity discourse surrounding teachers is antiquated and reflects transnational attempts to control education for economic and labor purposes. If democratic education is even necessary – so goes the argument – it is only in relation to the economic, technological, and military needs of the twenty-first century. As many governments have stated, the stakes for state capital are too high to allow teachers to define what counts in education. In fact, governments are more interested in leveraging their control over teachers to maximize economic returns for nation-states than they are in connecting education to its rightful place in the larger democratic project (see, for instance, Psacharopoulos & Patrinos, 2004). And, as I will demonstrate, teachers incur psychic costs when they engage in micropolitics for democratic purposes. These psychic costs are too high when corporate states maintain a perspective that teachers simply represent “human capital stock” that is easily replaced (OECD, 2007, p. 26).

Evidence about what teachers have become has followed debates about the professional identity of teachers. Accountability policies have severely curtailed teacher power in the normative sense. The notion of a professional identity – core self, unique individual, professional autonomy, professional knowledge – is an idea that has slowly been disqualified as evidence of teachers’ multiple identities has
surfaced. Teachers have developed bifurcated identities as accountability policies have transmogrified their normative power into forms of state capital and utility. Nevertheless, questions about teachers’ normative power persist – either in (1) the production of spaces that assist teachers to resist macropolitical desires or (2) the assembling of teachers’ subjectivities into additional monitors for government control.

Chapter Organization

This chapter is organized into three sections. First, I discuss how scholars have tried to create a knowledge base as a strategy to professionalize teaching. I demonstrate how the idea of teachers’ knowledge is, at best, a vigorous debate within the scholarship on teaching. I argue that this debate has produced a knowledge crisis for and in teachers.

The second section presents the argument that the corporate state has interceded in this fractured epistemic territory. Governments now understand themselves as institutions that clean up the failures of teacher education through “soft” and “hard” forms of accountability. I examine how curricular policy has controlled teachers’ fractured knowledge and, in this sense, how curricular policy has acted as a soft form of teacher accountability (often through the guise of professional development). Evidence that teacher micropolitics have emerged within attempts to develop soft forms of accountability is important to this discussion. In these instances, teachers’ bifurcated identities surfaced when they enjoyed instructional problem solving that simultaneously resisted disingenuous attempts at school reform. I discuss this “schizophrenia” as the birth of the micropolitical pedagogue.

The third and final section examines the contemporary hard form of educational accountability. Once corporate states recognized how to harness teacher power through curricular policy, they noted the enormous economic, technological, and military benefits that could be accrued by controlling teachers’ cognitions. Unlike soft forms of accountability, hard forms were designed to colonize teachers’ souls, epistemologies, and subjectivities (Ball, 2003; Zembylas, 2003).

TERRITORIALIZING TEACHERS’ KNOWLEDGE: A STRATEGY TO PROFESSIONALIZE TEACHING

Teaching has been marked by an aura of conservatism that has been impervious to change since the mid-1960s (Lortie, 1975). This conservatism is rooted in debates about the nature of teachers’ knowledge and their roles in using this knowledge. On one side of these debates, people have argued that teaching is simply a matter of having a “firm grasp of subject matter and basic skill,” and that teacher professionalization models are “precisely the wrong direction” in which to move in order to improve education (MacDonald, 1998). These viewpoints on teaching have often been called “technical” because they prescribe what teachers should know and be able to do.
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Much of the technical perspective of teaching stems from the “process-product” research of the late 1960s and early 1970s. This research looked for causal links between teacher effectiveness and particular teaching practices. For instance, the Florida Performance Measurement System is an observation instrument that identifies teachers’ strengths and weaknesses according to items coded for specific teacher behaviors. Items such as “begins instruction promptly,” “orients/maintains focus,” “provides for practice” are easily observable behaviors and, when demonstrated by teachers, generate a purportedly “successful” teaching episode. Failure to execute a percentage of behaviors generates a purportedly “poor” teaching episode. In extreme cases, teachers are removed entirely from the process of student learning, as is illustrated by cases of “teacher-proof” curricula and certain digital technologies. It is believed that teachers impede learning because they act as inefficient middle managers during the transmission of subject matter to students.

Unfortunately, the process-product research reified teachers’ low status through at least two faulty assumptions about how students learn. First, students are not passive receivers of teaching treatments. Looking for one-way causal links between predetermined categories overlooks the fact that students are implicated in the learning process (Vygotsky, 1962). Second, much of this research based its idea of effectiveness on students’ test scores. Test scores, by themselves, are too narrowly defined to account for student learning and, thus, do not provide accurate descriptions of what students have learned (Kennedy, 1999).

Teacher Professionalism

There are three generally accepted ideas about what constitutes a professional in the educational literature (Timperley & Alton-Lee, 2008). First, a professional must possess a large degree of talent and skill. Second, professionals must use a body of knowledge that supports their work. And third, professionals must have the autonomy to make decisions that marry skills with knowledge to solve complex problems. Proponents of these conceptual arguments insist that teachers need to engage in complex thinking to be effective in their jobs. These arguments are based on the idea that teaching is far more complex than any list of predetermined categories could hope to capture.

Firstly, teaching categories do not account for the sophisticated content that needs to be taught to a variety of learners (Segall, 2004). There is simply too much subject matter complexity and student variability to use static teaching techniques. Secondly, the reduction of teaching to a set of techniques narrows the act of learning to acquiring a set of behaviors. Learning is much more than acquiring new behaviors (Vygotsky, 1962). Thirdly, teaching is a moral endeavor wherein teachers make frequent decisions about complex ethical issues (Ayers, 2004). Teachers who rely on teaching techniques that fail to consider the moral implications of their role in the classroom neglect the public mission of educating competent and caring citizens in a democracy. And, fourthly, teaching is essentially a political act (Costigan, Zumwalt, & Crocco, 2004). Failure to prepare
teachers for democratic engagement is professionally irresponsible (Oakes & Lipton, 2002).

In the last three decades, studies have attempted to describe teachers’ knowledge and cognition. Shulman (1986) argued that teachers make complex decisions about how best to combine teaching skills with subject matter depending on different students’ needs and classroom situations. This professional premise ushered in a research area that sought to create a teaching profession.

_Territorializing Teacher Knowledge: Provinces and Landscapes_

For nearly 30 years scholars have debated the source of teacher knowledge and the kinds of cognitive processes associated with such knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1996; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Elbaz, 1981; Putnam & Borko, 2000; Shulman, 1986). The debate pivots on whether and the extent to which teacher knowledge is an endemic form of knowledge – often referred to as practical, craft, situational, event-structured, episodic, context-determined, or context-dependent (Carter, 1990; Elbaz, 1983) – and the extent to which teacher knowledge can be codified and generalized (Grossman, 1989; Wilson & Wineburg, 1993; Shulman, 1986). Nowhere is this debate more evident than in exchanges between Diorio (1982), Tom (1983) and Elbaz and Elbaz (1983).

I identify epistemic fissures within each paradigm that result from inadequate accounts of power, and I describe teachers’ schizophrenia as the result of these bifurcated attempts at identity development. In the end, I argue that any conception of teacher knowledge must answer questions about teachers’ power within professionalization attempts.

_Codifiable and generalizable knowledge_

The debate over teacher knowledge is motivated, minimally, by preferences about the kinds of activities teachers ought to experience when learning to teach. The codifiable paradigm assumed that teacher knowledge was propositional and theoretical; thus, teacher learning occurred with knowledge transfer (of instruction, of curricula, etc.) and, subsequently, through knowledge application (in the field, in the laboratory, etc.). Shulman (1986) coined the phrase “pedagogical content knowledge” as an endemic territory or, in his words, a “unique province” within his larger framework of teacher knowledge. The idea of pedagogical content knowledge was Shulman’s (1986) attempt to territorialize teachers’ knowledge for purposes of professionalization. Challenges to the codifiable paradigm stemmed from problems of theory and practice as teachers wrestled with applying propositional knowledge to a multitude of contexts, indeed, for some scholars, to contexts of infinite complexity.

A limitation nested in the codifiable paradigm is the extent to which the paradigm recognized the political contexts in which teacher knowledge is developed, practiced, and contested. Gutmann (1999) argued that professionalization attempts that failed to identify power boundaries provided an entrée for nearly any macropolitical group to claim educational and pedagogical
sovereignty. Examples of strategies to minimize so-called contextual complications included pedagogical “tool kits” or “teacher-proof” curricula extrapolated from pedagogical propositions. In certain codifiable systems, teacher cognition was removed entirely, creating pedagogical technocrats who transmit corporate, government, and religious interests via the school curriculum. And perhaps in the penultimate achievement of educator skepticism and scorn, the holographic teacher was developed on principles of propositional knowledge.2

Event-structured and personal knowledge
Connelly and Clandinin (1995) described the situational view of teacher knowledge as personal and narrative in form. In this view, a teacher’s personal-practical knowledge was implicated within any conceptualization of their work and accounted for much of their actions. That is, teachers created knowledge instead of simply consuming it. Clandinin (1992) suggested that teacher knowledge “is a kind of knowledge, carved out of, and shaped by, situations; knowledge that is constructed and reconstructed as they live out their stories and retell and relive them through the process of reflection” (p. 125). Teacher knowledge was affected by, and through, the contexts in which such knowledge was situated – knowledge in situ. Clandinin and Connelly (1995) coined the metaphor “professional knowledge landscape” to map the cognitive geographies and territorial borders of teacher knowledge:

A landscape metaphor allows us to talk about space, place, and time. Furthermore, it has a sense of expansiveness and the possibility of being filled with diverse people, things, and events in different relationships … Because we see the professional knowledge landscape as composed of relationships among people, places, and things, we see it as both an intellectual and moral landscape. (p. 5)

The landscape metaphor described teaching as ethical action bound by conflicting contexts of schooling and by teachers’ own personal-practical knowledge – a territory assumed to be exclusively theirs. However, a limitation nested within a situational conception of teacher knowledge was the extent to which teachers were aware of power operating within their landscapes. For instance, Hyland (2005) demonstrated how unrecognized power elements within knowledge landscapes created situations in which teachers reproduced inequitable schooling practices. Webb (2001) noted how a teacher’s own racist biases, paradoxically, often directed attempts at antiracism. Scholars noted, then, that teacher knowledge, by itself, was necessary but insufficient to guide teachers’ work because of the probability of perpetuating injustice. Scholars argued that “practical wisdom” and phronesis were important forms of knowledge that could be used as signposts or map legends within deterritorialized knowledge borders (Coulter & Wiens, 2002).
DETERRITORIALIZING TEACHERS’ KNOWLEDGE: TEACHERS AS NOMADS

For (too) many, the perceived idiosyncrasies associated with teacher knowledge smacks of relativism, subjectivism, a cavalier disregard for “scientific” rigor, and an illegitimate basis for “evidence” in educational research (Feuer, Towne, & Shavelson, 2002). Hence, teacher knowledges were characterized as absent knowledges because people perceived little or no consistency among various teacher’s thinking. As a result, teachers were portrayed as lacking professional knowledge and, hence, as being unaccountable for their actions, a portrayal that challenged their claims to professional identity (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001). At best, teachers’ professional identities become schizophrenic, or assembled with multiple identities, as a result of their knowledge exterritorialization (Ball, 2003; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).
Both conceptions of teacher knowledge – codifiable and personal – use spatial metaphors to position teacher identity. Specifically, both conceptions of teacher knowledge link teacher identity to landscapes, territories, or provinces. However, teacher knowledge spaces have become untended or overgrown in the absence of articulations of teacher identity that take into account historical issues of power. Without references to teachers’ power, the idyllic landscapes presumed to be the sovereign territories of teachers have been deterritorialized by scholars and by governments: “Deterritorialization is a result of the territory itself being taken as an object, as a material to stratify” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 433). A 30-year war over teachers’ knowledge has terraformed teachers’ cognitive geographies. Teacher knowledge landscapes are now populated with strange creatures, secret gardens, and circular pathways. Artist Max Ernst created several paintings that depicted the less than idyllic representations of landscapes that emerged from the effects of war.4

Crucially, the act of terraforming knowledge territories figures teachers as
nomads. Teachers wander across desolate territories. Traditional borders of sovereign epistemes are transformed into political battles for the right to control teachers’ cognitions. Teachers’ epistemic land is malleable and provides opportunities for the new colonization, the next Manifest Destiny, the New World Order of capitalism and economic production. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) elaborate:

Nomads have no points, paths, or land, even though they do by all appearances … With the nomad … it is deterritorialization that constitutes the relation to earth, to such a degree that the nomad reterritorializes on deterritorialization itself. It is the earth that deterritorializes itself, in a way that provides the nomad with a territory. The land ceases to be land, tending to become simply ground (sol) or support. The earth does not become deterritorialized in its global and relative movement, but at specific locations, at the spot where the forest recedes, or where the steppe and the desert advance. (pp. 381-382)

Again, Max Ernst developed a series of paintings that illustrated the surrealist transmogrification of “nature,” or landscape, into haunting apocalypses that residents now traverse and from where their work is situated.
ACCOUNTING FOR TEACHERS’ KNOWLEDGE

Disagreements about who should direct school policy exacerbate teachers’ professional schizophrenia through knowledge atrophy. Discussions about accountability, then, are proxies for debates about the control of education. When these discussions are levied against teachers, the discussions attempt to control the production of schooling.

The next two sections begin with the assumption that discussions about teacher accountability are about power in relation to representative democracies that utilize contested notions of truth to guide education policy. To sharpen this assertion, I argue that discussions about teacher accountability rarely occur in totalitarian governments or in pseudodemocratic nations (Zakaria, 1997), where power and truth have been determined a priori – for example, by lineage, military force, or as the result of a theology that omits education in the liberal tradition (i.e., omits education for specific groups, e.g., females). Teachers simply transmit totalitarian ideology explicitly.

A corollary to the above thought is that totalitarian governments often discuss ways to hold indoctrination practices accountable to ideology. This assumption provides a counter-example to forms of teacher accountability that are sought after in representative democracies that hope to ensure something that can be described as educative (i.e., truth, knowledge, rights, equality, progress, emancipation, justice, enlightenment, and so on). It is here that distinctions between education and indoctrination exist. It is also in this political space that governments use various forms of accountability (power) to maintain control. Thus, discussions about holding teachers accountable (e.g., in the pursuit of Western truth) in totalitarian regimes remain largely nonsensical, but discussions about ensuring
knowledge indoctrination are completely plausible (and sometimes psychologically
and physically painful). Thus, accountability effects are material and real (but the
knowledges vary), and the ways these knowledges are held accountable are fluid.

Finally, given that representative democracies have survived through capitalist
structures, discussions about holding teachers accountable parallel discussions
about disciplining democracies economically. Given this implicit framework, an
analysis of teachers’ accountability can be pursued. More importantly, this
framework identifies forms of indoctrination articulated in capitalist democracies
that seek educational knowledges from specific research practices for continued
economic production. Consequently, this framework identifies the contemporary
(perhaps quintessential) agon about education as a contest between economic
production and democratic enlightenment. This agon is irritated when democratic
governments control teachers’ knowledge and its production through
accountability policies.

What remain in representative democracies are political responses to those
policies.

THE SOFT ACCOUNTABILITY OF CURRICULAR POLICY AND
TEACHERS’ MICROPOLITICS

Evidence of how teachers exercise power originated in research on curricular
policy implementation. It is here that teachers have most profoundly resisted
curricular objectives intended to hold them accountable. In other words, curricular
policy conflicts – forms of knowledge control – produce spaces for the
micropolitical pedagogue to operate. When policy objectives conflict with what
teachers believe – or threaten to remove the enjoyment of their work – the
micropolitical game commences. Teachers pursue their nomadic journeys in
knowledge landscapes that are constantly reterritorialized, or terraformed, and
through which teachers either resist macrodesires and/or compound their cognitive
deterritorialization.

The manner in which teachers have exercised power, not simply to resist
macropolicy for selfish reasons but also to influence the working conditions of
schools in ways they believe will assist students, is central to this discussion. I
consider this a legitimate form of microresistance and relate my discussion of it to
several research studies that examine teachers’ strong motivations to control the
teaching and learning practices in classrooms. I use empirical work from
micropolitics, policy implementation, and curriculum studies to illustrate these
points. I do examine studies to illustrate how teachers’ political actions have not
been motivated by educational concerns but rather by self-interest. In these studies,
the exercise of power is fragmented, confused, and epistemologically suicidal.

Accountability policies in K-12 education therefore both raise questions about
who should make educational decisions for students and perpetuate doubts that
teachers can or should be responsible (Maxcy, 1991). Difficult questions about
student learning pit teachers against curriculum developers, and these conflicts boil
down to questions about who has legitimate knowledge about students, teaching,
and learning and raise new questions about how this knowledge is legitimated (Pinar et al., 1995). Instead of developing teachers’ expertise and knowledge, enormous resources are spent to regulate schools and teachers through new penalties, increased oversight, and an overwhelming amount of curricular policy.

Curricular Policy

Curricular policy is the formal body of law and regulations that pertain to what should be taught in schools (Elmore & Sykes, 1992), including the values attached to this knowledge (Apple, 2004). Curricular policy research explores how official actions are determined, what these actions require of schools and teachers, and how these actions affect what is taught to students. Curricular policy was created to intervene in the so-called failure of teacher education and to mask the new economics of the corporate state. However, the continued failure of teacher education to recognize its political entanglements leaves practicing teachers ill-equipped for the inevitable political work ahead (Oakes & Lipton, 2006). In this sense, teacher education has failed its democratic purpose.

Curricular policy research is a mélange of interests that examine curricula from many different perspectives. For instance, this body of work has examined governments’ intentions for developing policy, coordination among agencies implementing curricular policy (state agencies, district offices, and schools), and teachers’ interpretations and implementation of new curricular policy. Policy implementation became a particularly important type of scholarship because policy researchers needed a “more refined conception of the type of problems that follow from particular courses of action” (Elmore & Sykes, 1992, p. 192). In other words, what policy developers intend is not always what occurs in schools and classrooms.

Curricular policies eventually arrive on teachers’ desks. What researchers observed was that teachers responded “in what often seemed quite idiosyncratic, frustratingly unpredictable, if not downright resistant ways” (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 172; see also Achinstein & Ogawa, 2006). Given these early findings, implementation studies noted that teachers

are better understood as political brokers than as [curriculum] implementers. They enjoy considerable discretion, being influenced by their own notions of what schooling ought to be as well as persuaded by external pressures. This view represents a middle ground in the classic sociological contrast between professional autonomy and bureaucratic subordination. It pictures teachers as more of less rational decision-makers who take higher-level policies and other pressures into consideration in their calculation of benefits and costs. (Schwille et al., 1986, p. 377)

Implementation researchers noted that curricular policies entered schools with unique political environments, and these policies produced a set of “unpredictable outcomes of autonomous actors, motivated by self-interest” (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 177). What became clear in early implementation research was that (1) teachers exercised considerable power concerning policy outcomes and (2) their
micropolitical resistance was conceptualized in the research as self-interested behavior rather than as a legitimate form of democratic resistance. Consequently, a significant area of micropolitical research examined the basis for teachers’ resistance and power (see Reed, 2000).

Indeed, teachers have willingly complied with new curricular directives. That is to say, teachers have not, historically, resisted every single policy handed to them. However, even in cases of policy acceptance, teachers often graft on additional curricular and pedagogical techniques that stem from the poor practices that the policy intended to change in the first place (Ball, 1990). Realizing this, scholars have examined how teachers make sense of curricular policy and the ways they appropriately, or legitimately, resist poor policy (Patterson & Marshall, 2001). To compound matters, researchers noted that teachers are too frequently faced with implementing multiple policies at one time. Multiple policies that are poorly coordinated place pressure on teachers’ limited time, reduce their opportunities to learn the curriculum, and increase their exposure to scrutiny and evaluation (Honig, 2006). In these circumstances, teachers resist policy to reduce the amount of work piled on in uncoordinated fashion and to reduce the intensification of surveillance brought about from that work.

Tightening up the coordination between schools and central agencies has been considered as one way to improve policy effectiveness and teacher compliance. However, calls to improve policy making (Whitty, 2006), policy implementation (Dumas & Anyon, 2006), and professional development opportunities (Borko, 2004) for teachers have replaced some emphasis on examining how central agencies and schools are “loosely coupled” (Weick, 1976) or how agencies coordinate curricular policy (Grossman & Thompson, 2004). This shift in research intent came about from the need to know about program outcomes rather than logistical coordination among agencies. Unfortunately, research that examines educators’ micropolitics as a legitimate, and necessary, form of resistance is fairly recent (Johnson, 2004; Solomon, 2002). This form of research might be characterized as nascent expressions of a new democratic sensibility that micropolitically resists the hegemony of governments’ desires. The spaces for democratic engagement are already in place.

The Birth of the (Micro)Political Pedagogue: Curricular Resistance

A new curriculum may threaten teachers if it challenges their beliefs about teaching and learning. Teachers construct many of their ideas about teaching and learning while they are students. Trying to change these beliefs has been a persistent problem in teacher education (Grossman, 1991). This problem, which is referred to as “the apprenticeship of observation,” creates additional problems for both teachers and policy-makers (Lortie, 1975). One problem is that teachers’ thoughts about teaching and learning that are based on their own experiences as students may perpetuate racist and sexist assumptions about how students learn. Another problem is that subject matter evolves (e.g., via technology), and teachers who rely on definitions of subject matter that were in use when they were students...
do a huge disservice to student learning. Finally, teachers have received less than adequate professional development opportunities to help them improve pedagogy or their understanding of subject matter. By definition, curricular policies contribute to a feeling of inadequacy among teachers (Borko, 2004).

Understanding why teachers resist or modify policy requires understanding the beliefs that guide their use of power. And, as I have argued, the power of teachers must be understood in relation to nomadism and the fractured landscapes they traverse. Simple characterizations of teachers’ micropolitics as self-interested behavior neglect the territorializing environments of teachers’ work, and the economic and military benefits that governments accrue by controlling this work. Teachers act politically in schools out of strong beliefs about the welfare of students. More importantly, teachers have exercised power to change how schools are organized so that they can maintain the pleasurable learning conditions they believe will benefit students.

Corbett’s (1991) findings probably resonate with many people’s experiences concerning how teachers respond to curricular policy:

Regardless of what the formal curriculum says should be taught, closed classroom doors and the ubiquitous posters covering glass panels in the doors enable teachers to teach what and how they want. Thus teachers can dissent in practice to that which they are expected to assent in policy. (p. 76)

Corbett noted that teachers who perceived threats to their classroom autonomy ignored instructional changes when they believed these changes would reduce their classroom effectiveness. This is an important theme. Thirty-three years ago, Lortie (1975) argued that teachers were strongly motivated to protect their power, or autonomy, because it created opportunities for them to heighten their enjoyment of work. Lortie believed that classroom effectiveness was the largest incentive for teachers to continue working. He also speculated that teachers would seek to increase their power to maximize their enjoyment of solving instructional problems.

The pleasure teachers generate when solving instructional problems is integral to understanding their micropolitics (Zembylas, 2007). How many times have teachers described their commitment to teaching as “passionate”? Foucault (1983b) asked, “How can and must desire deploy its forces within the political domain and grow more intense in the process of overturning the established order?” (p. xii).

Micropolitical Pleasure

Moore-Johnson (1990) observed teachers who refused to comply to policy mandates because they enjoyed solving instructional problems. In this research, teachers enjoyed thinking through instructional problems with specific students, and this pleasure motivated them to continue teaching. Moore-Johnson reported that teachers desired control over what was taught, and how it was taught, because this allowed them to target specific students’ needs. Moore-Johnson explained that teachers’ resistance to curricular policy stemmed from tensions between what
Teachers believed to be generic policy platitudes that apply to all students and the specific teaching and learning needs of individual students (p. 136). In her study, teachers resisted, ignored, and threatened to quit as ways to reclaim their professional autonomy – or professional pleasure.

Reed’s (2000) research on teacher power indicated further that teachers would engage in a number of political activities in schools to maintain preferred working conditions to assist students. Reed noted that the basis for teachers’ micropolitical actions stemmed from four instructional concerns: students with learning problems, students with behavior problems, students who were physically and emotionally abused, and students with cultural (ethnic and class) differences. In many ways, the macropolicies were incomplete and did not account for the complex situations that teachers needed to account for in student learning (see also Patterson & Marshall, 2001). The enjoyment and pleasure of solving individual learning challenges was a significant factor in teachers’ micropolitics.

Finally, Greenfield (1991) argued that teacher power was based “upon the beliefs of teachers … regarding their perceived duty to serve the best interests of children” (p. 161). Greenfield’s work indicated that teacher power is not simply relegated to classroom control – it affects school policy. In this case, teacher power can be thought of as an extremely influential force within schools. Greenfield claimed that teachers’ power directed not only their political actions but also, when recognized by principals, the political authority of principals and the educational direction of the school.

**Teachers’ Micropolitics as Resistance to Surveillance**

Teachers also resist curricular policies because of the attached assessment policies used to evaluate a policy’s effectiveness (Bushnell, 2003). This becomes the clearest evidence of a soft form of teacher accountability. Oftentimes, these evaluations take the shape of high-stakes assessments of student learning. These measures direct the kind of instruction and school organization (grouping and tracking). Although there is some evidence that suggests that high-stakes tests can lead to improved student learning by directing instruction (Airasian, 1988), the overwhelming majority of this learning is aimed at helping students acquire basic skills, a trend that dangerously reduces teaching to a technical framework. Teachers are wary of the increased scrutiny that follows assessment systems that try to track student learning in such minimalist ways. It is not surprising that teachers refract surveillance in the form of high-stakes assessments when these assessments are attached to curricula that teachers resisted in the first place. This is exactly what Hargreaves (1991) found when he traced a new policy aimed to promote teacher collaboration in schools:

Administrative systems … are less than fully serious about their rhetorical commitment to teacher [professionalization]. They are systems prepared to delegate to teachers and indeed hold them accountable for the collective, shared responsibility for [curriculum] implementation, while allocating to
themselves increasingly centralized responsibility for the development and imposition of educational purposes through curriculum and assessment mandates. They are systems of state regulation and control in which the business of conception and planning is increasingly separated from that of [teaching]. (p. 69)

*Teachers’ Micropolitics as Self-Interested Behavior*

Unfortunately, some teachers exercise power poorly. That is, teachers use their power to insulate themselves from constructive changes to avoid answering hard questions concerning student well-being. They simply close the classroom door. There are no prima facie claims that teachers know better than curriculum developers and policy-makers about the needs of students. And the fragmentation and discontinuities of teacher education contribute to too many teachers not being adequately prepared to answer hard questions about student well-being (Darling-Hammond, 2006). At worst, teachers remain ignorant of these questions.

The schizophrenia that hovers over teachers’ professional identity is exacerbated when teachers use their power to simply “survive” the political environment of schools instead of using their power to improve the conditions for themselves and their students (Blase & Anderson, 1995; Curry, Jaxon, Russell, Callahan, & Bicais, 2008; Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002). Some teachers have spent more time protecting their self-interests by conforming to conventional values of the local community rather than improving the conditions for schooling (Blase, 1987b). Additionally, teachers build coalitions to ingratiate themselves with their peers rather than to achieve any apparent educational, curricular, or school purpose (Blase, 1987a). Noblit, Berry, and Demsey (1991) witnessed teachers exercising power to insulate themselves at two schools:

The political power of teachers increased and negated the district’s intent, but neither school was able to fashion a discussion of what teaching ought to be about. Each created its own folk concept of the profession. Dialogue about the professional beliefs is essential if teachers are to be effective societal voices about education and if they are to be a potent force in the macropolitics of schooling. (pp. 393-394)

To help, scholars have argued that teacher educators need to help teachers understand the organizational skills, knowledge, and commitments they must have if they are to reconcile school practices that conflict with their vision for students (Curry et al., 2008). New teachers are often taught pedagogical practices that clash with current school practices, particularly when new practices are intended to improve pedagogy. Thus, teachers need to be better prepared to resolve conflicts about teaching and learning in schools, particularly if teacher educators are imparting innovative pedagogies that schools (i.e., governments) do not support.
Summary

Teacher power is like a double-edged sword. On the one side, teachers exercise power to dismiss what they believe will not benefit them or their students. In this case, teacher power may be the single most effective deterrent to poor reform efforts since the end of the Second World War (Cuban, 1990). On the other side, teacher power can reinforce poor pedagogy through the wholesale rejection of innovative ideas. In this case, teacher micropolitics cuts in two ways: it affirms teachers' powerful status in regard to policy outcomes, but it raises questions about their reasons for resistance.

THE HARD ACCOUNTABILITY OF PERFORMANCE

Parallel to arguments about teachers’ knowledge are disagreements about educators’ roles in democratic societies. Educators’ discretion could buffer, and perhaps ought to buffer, communities from government and corporate desires (Fenstermacher & Amarel, 1983). By inference, educational accountability ought to increase teachers’ discretion and judgment to ensure freedom of thought in democracies. Interestingly, educators have been engaged in professional development activities to help them publicly demonstrate their work for years—a kind of public presentation of their nomadic journeys. For instance, video- and audiotapes (Little, 2003), networks (McDonald & Klein 2003), teacher action research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993), study groups (Supovitz, 2002), and mentoring (Athanasas & Achinstein, 2003) are methods educators have used to visibly demonstrate their abilities.

However, calls for tighter educator accountability suggest that educators have done a poor job communicating the effects of these practices to policy-makers (Toll, 2002) and to themselves (Hiebert, Galimore, & Stigler, 2002). On the other hand, Wilcox and Finn (1999) dismissed professional development activities altogether because, they claimed, such territorializing attempts have no bearing on student performance. Finn and Wilcox (2000) argued that accountability systems that utilize student test scores provide the only kind of visibility that enables policymakers to hold educators accountable. This form of visibility—data surveillance—compels educators to comply with state and federal standards through the threat of sanction and the promise of rewards. States developed a “new accountability” (Fuhrman, 1999) and intended to make educators’ work more visible through inspections, observations, performances, and public reporting of test scores—surveillance. Surveillance, then, becomes the tool of choice to more efficiently terraform teachers’ knowledge landscapes and to economically track their nomadic journeys.

Territorialization Intent: Democratic Buffers or Bureaucratic Subordinates?

One axis of accountability research has tried to identify the purpose of educational accountability—who holds whom accountable for what. Early intent literature
distinguished professional from bureaucratic\textsuperscript{8} forms of accountability (Ingersoll, 2003), with the latter model closely related to models of market accountability (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003). Distinctions between these two broad forms of accountability rested on the clarification of roles and responsibilities for actors in the education drama. Because educational accountability was distributed across people and space (state agencies, district offices, classrooms, etc.), researchers argued that teachers held a role \textit{sui generis} among other education professionals because of their (supposed) exclusive knowledge (see earlier discussion on teachers’ displaced knowledges). This argument contended that educators’ special knowledge of pedagogy, subject matter, and students distinguished their professional duties from others in the education bureaucracy. Thus, researchers concluded that any accountability system must relate appropriately to the work of educators, not administrators.

Researchers noted that educators’ discretion simultaneously provided the material from which to evaluate educators and an important buffer to protect communities from state and corporate intrusion. Consequently, scholars argued that accountability frameworks should develop educators’ discretion and, by inference, increase their professional autonomy to ensure freedom of thought in the democracy. However, critics speculated that accountability systems controlled by educators would be ineffective because educators would likely protect their power rather than use it to regulate themselves (McGivney & Haught, 1972). O’Day (2002) developed a hybrid form of education accountability in an attempt to marry performance and bureaucratic forms of accountability. Initial evidence of hybrid systems documents an escalation of accountability politics as governments and corporations prey on knowledge fissures for political and economic opportunities (Smith & Miller-Kahn, 2003). Finally, some critics have simply stated that performance accountability systems were designed to restore a neoconservative social agenda and a neoliberal economic agenda (Apple, 2006).

As noted earlier, governments have not been persuaded by arguments that teachers should control education policy. Initial evidence of hybrid systems documents an escalation of accountability politics as educators confront an erosion of power from state governments (Ingersoll, 2003) and the corporate community (Hargreaves, 2003). More importantly, the goal of performance accountability is not simply to suppress the teacher, even if this is what is occurring, “but rather to retool her” into a more effective instrument in economic production (Fraser, 1989, p. 24). The intent of accountability schemes is to coerce economic production by co-opting teachers into disciplinary power relations (Foucault, 1980b).\textsuperscript{9}

\textit{Territorialization Effects: Capacity Building or Disciplining Technologies?}

A second axis of accountability research examined the effects of accountability. The effects literature analyzed accountability systems in order to build better policy mechanisms – mechanisms to develop teachers’ professional capacity (Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999) and/or mechanisms to punish and reward educators for their performances (Odden & Kelley, 2002). Recently, effects literature has
switched its analytic focus away from educational bureaucracies to schools and educators. A “new accountability” developed to some extent because policy-makers honored earlier arguments about educators’ unique roles (Fuhrman, 1999). That is, by focusing the accountability gaze onto schools and teachers (rather than the bureaucratic systems in which they were located), policy-makers were able to extract, or produce, schooling production more efficiently.

This so-called new performance accountability tried to make educators’ work more visible through inspections, observations, performances, and the public reporting of test scores. Critics of performance accountability generally accepted the premise that performance was a legitimate construct of accountability and instead challenged assumptions about the relationship between student achievement, educator performance, and test scores. For instance, some effects literature argued that test-driven accountability policies actually increased dropout rates for marginalized students (Whitford & Jones, 2000), perpetuated racist practices for language-minority students (Reyes & Rorrer, 2001), increased teacher demoralization (McNeil, 2000), and increased teachers’ knowledge schizophrenia (Ball, 2003) – developments that constituted an abuse of professional subjectivity (Smyth, 2002; Zembylas, 2003) and the birth of multiple identities (Sachs, 2001), which compounded problems of teacher retention and nomadism (Ingersoll, 2003).

Effects literature also documented the widespread tracking practices of schooling related to economic production. Far too often student subjectivities have been predetermined, ranked, tracked, and in many cases commodified a priori. Performance learning is not about learning possibilities, it is about achieving what the accountability system has already determined are students’ “realistic” identities and predetermined economic futures (DeLissovoy & McLaren, 2003). This has been particularly true for students who are systematically segregated through sorting practices such as (dis)ability (Baker, 2002), sexism (Kelly, 2003), and classism and racism (Kozol, 2005).

Critics of high-stake testing argued that such accountability systems only measured fiscal inequities between schools, not student achievement or educator effort. Even though school-funding formulas remain unequal and unconstitutional in several states in the United States (Wong, 1999), scholars noted that accountability decisions must be fair and equitable (Sirotnik, 2004). Thus, important legal questions have been raised concerning the responsibilities that states, governments, and districts have to support educators to fulfill accountability demands (Sirotnik & Kimball, 1999). In the end, avowed conservatives believe that market economics (e.g., vouchers, choice programs) should settle the complexity of educational accountability (Wilcox & Finn, 1999).

Cultural Accountability: Who’s in Control?

A third axis of accountability research is underway. This research examines educational accountability from the perspective of schools rather than the perspective of external mechanisms that expect to influence schools (Newmann, King, & Rigdon, 1997). The cultural literature assumed that schools have
accountability systems already in place, albeit systems that may be unstated, ill-coordinated, and altogether different than what policy-makers and government bureaucrats desire. This literature examined how schools utilize local concepts of accountability and how educators make sense of accountability issues (Spillane et al., 2002).

Researchers noted how the cultural literature differed from both the effects literature and intent literature:

Instead of asking how schools respond to policies designed to make them accountable to external authorities, we have asked how schools come to formulate their own conceptions of accountability and what role, if any, external policies play in these conceptions. Our working theory of accountability is predicated on the belief that external accountability systems operate on the margins of powerful factors inside the school, and that understanding these factors is a major precondition to understanding how and why schools respond the way they do to external pressures for accountability. (Abelmann & Elmore, 1999, p. 38)

The cultural literature is an important shift in the research on educational accountability. It provided evidence of accountability systems already in place in schools; it challenged arguments that maintained that educator accountability was absent or based on selfish interests; and it provided evidence of how the concept of accountability was a negotiated and choreographed set of practices between educators and policy-makers (Ball, 2003).

NOTES

1 Maurice Tabard, Man Ray, Claude Cahun, and Roger Parry created a series of photographs between 1928 and 1930 that explored the idea of multiple identities, or subjectivities. These photographs used solarization and double exposure to disrupt the idea that the individual has a core self. Instead, the subject possesses multiple identities produced through applications of power (San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, Stitch, 1990).


3 Alberto Giacometti developed a series of busts that explored the ways the skull was malleable. Here, the head can be easily shaped and formed – willing forms of cognitive plasticity.

4 Many of Max Ernst’s landscapes were inspired as he witnessed the aftermath of the Second World War. In addition, his landscapes were also influenced by his experiences living in the southwest of the United States.

5 For instance, what issue the policy will address, who made that determination, and when it will be implemented. Frequently, but not always, curricular policies originate outside the school. Cochran-Smith and Susan Lytle (1993) argue that when policies originate outside the school this immediately places teachers in conflict with policy-makers about who has legitimate knowledge about students. These authors suggest that changes in curricula from teachers’ perspectives would circumvent much of the problems associated with teacher resistance to outside policies.

6 In Hargreaves’ example, teachers are again faced with making decisions about working more collaboratively with peers. Because assessments of teachers’ behavior remain in the policy’s hands, teachers resisted surveillance from both the policy and their peers. Hargreaves concluded that this policy really sought “contrived collegiality” and not a substantial form of teacher professionalism.
Data surveillance is “the collection of information about an identifiable individual [and organization], often from multiple sources, that can be assembled into a portrait of that person’s activities” (Stanley & Steinhardt, 2003, p. 3).

Sometimes described as organizational accountability or administrative accountability.

As noted, a significant intention of performance accountability policies is to increase economic production and efficiencies for state and federal governments. Studies of “neoliberalism” and “neoconservatism” abound. However, the idea that education is subordinate to the economies of government is not new (Tyack, 1974). What is new is the way governments now hold teachers accountable to these economic desires. I have disproportionately represented this literature here for two reasons. First, the literature is very well articulated elsewhere, and articulated in great volume. Second, I have foreground micropolitics in this book as a way to compliment the macropolitical literature and as a way to fill the hole left by continued macroanalyses of educational policies. While I imagine some readers will find this deliberate omission distasteful, I hope other readers find it refreshing.


CHAPTER 2

THE ANATOMY OF EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY

Theorizing Power as Assembling Subjectivity

In the previous chapter I discussed how, and why, governments hold schools accountable. I argued that teachers’ fractured knowledge landscapes represent fertile territories for government colonization and that the territorializing wars over teachers’ cognitions have produced golden opportunities for corporate states to ensure economic production in schools through teachers. However, I demonstrated that teachers sometimes resist macrodesires through micropolitical means.

The previous chapter discussed teachers’ knowledge conflicts historically and asked the question, why have educators not been sufficiently prepared for these inevitable conflicts in their work? I argued that research should map these conflicts to inform educators (and teacher educators) about what others expect from their work; more importantly, I concluded that educators must be prepared to act as democratic buffers between macrodesires and the microspaces of democratic schooling. The continued absence of these discussions in teacher education remains an appalling feature of too many preparation programs.

This study, consequently, attempts to identify and analyze normative micropolitics among educators that resisted, or attempted to resist, government accountability structures. My assumption was that educators’ micropolitical resistance was related directly, and produced directly, from the instantiation of power used to control them. In other words, I did not want to conflate politics with power in the research. I wanted to understand the form of power that lurked beneath performance accountability systems. How did this form of power operate? Would effective political resistance to this form of power operate as a contest at the macrolevel (Cole, 2003) or operate as an assortment of arts at the microlevel (Scott, 1990)? Would resistance occur at both levels (Vidovich, 2007), or does some intermediary space – a mezolevel – exist for resistance (Sibeon, 2004)?

Chapter Organization

In this chapter, I present my theoretical framework and its corresponding theory of action (theory of intention). The chapter proceeds in three parts. I first discuss how I conceptualized the idea of disciplinary power in relation to the measurement of school performance. I rely on the works of Michel Foucault (1977, 1980b) to explain how the disciplinary power of performance accountability operates as a technology of governmenalality. Because I share some of Nancy Fraser’s (1989) normative concerns about Foucault’s ideas, I use her critique of these ideas to articulate the ways I operationalized ideas about teachers’ intentions and subsequent actions.
In then discuss ideas of performativity that relate to surveillance and the production of organizational “truths” (Butler, 1990; Lyotard, 1984; Ball, 2003). In other words, I explore how the surveillance of schooling produces rituals for display purposes. More importantly, I discuss how performativity assembles educators’ subjectivities through the self-fabrication “identity truths,” for school surveillance produces “docile bodies” and assembles these compliant knowledge workers for more efficient education production. In this sense, educators’ deterritorialized knowledges are “retooled” for the edu-economic production of the corporate state (Fraser, 1989, p. 27).

Finally, I build upon the discussion of performativity to examine ideas about educators’ intentions and action. I briefly introduce the emerging politics of desire that is currently operating in schools through macrodecrees of educational performance (Peters, 2003). My goal is to understand how this visibility game can be appropriated and used in schools to disrupt and refract educational surveillance. This politics of subjectivity could produce a new ethic of schooling that has both liberatory and catastrophic consequences.

Throughout this chapter, I use a number of schematics to ground theory into a breathing system of understanding.

POWER AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

Power is a widely used but nebulous construct in social science research. It has been defined as domination, resistance, authority, influence, force, and capacity. It has been considered something to acquire and something to avoid. Hobbes (1660/1982) argued for a singular sovereign power while French and Raven (1959) believed power emanated from everyone. Machiavelli (1513/1981) demonstrated how easy it was to influence sovereign power and warned that power would eventually consume those in authoritative positions. Bolman and Deal (1991) considered power the most important resource in organizations, and Pfeffer (1981) described power as the “property of the system at rest [while] politics is the study of power in action” (p. 7).

Arendt (1958) and Hartsock (1983) drew attention to the democratic and cooperative aspects of power that were (too) often left out of male theorists’ conceptions. Contemporary definitions stress the covert ways that power is used and how it is structured into social relations so that it does not appear to be used at all (Foucault, 1977; Lukes, 1974). Given its multiple meanings, theorists have questioned the utility of the concept (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982).

Perhaps the most frequently used definition of power originates from literature in political science. It states that power is evident when somebody is able to motivate somebody else to do something they would not have done otherwise. Dahl’s (1961) study of key decision-making arenas focused on how power was used to resolve demonstrable conflicts: policy development in education, political nominations for local office, and an urban development proposal. Bachrach and Baratz (1970) critiqued Dahl’s work, arguing that Dahl limited his attention to formal, observable decision-making arenas. Bachrach and Baratz believed that
power is often used more covertly — behind closed doors. They believed that deals are struck “behind the scenes” to such a degree that some conflicts never reach a formal decision-making arena.

Lukes (1974) agreed that power was used both overtly and covertly, but he extended its definition. Lukes argued that these two early definitions of power focused too much on observable behavior or potentially observable behavior. Instead, he argued that power is much more difficult to observe because it can be used to shape people’s interests in such a way that their interests remain latent and unexpressed. For Lukes, power shaped people’s “perceptions, cognitions, and preferences in such a way that they accept their roles in the existing order of things” (p. 24).

The idea that power is structured into social practice (and in organizations, especially) is an attempt to understand how people are inculcated within a social practice or a set of social practices. The idea that power is structured in social practice is also an attempt to study how people are produced or inscribed with identity (e.g., “teachers,” “students,” “doctors,” “criminals,” and so on) (Foucault, 1977). Put differently, the idea that power is structured into social practice is an attempt to understand how people conform to dominant discourses (i.e., prevailing thought, language, and practices) and an attempt to understand the extent to which people can alter or resist the effects of disciplinary power. However, in order to resist the effects of power one must first understand how power colonizes cognition and fabricates desire.

**Deterritorialized Knowledge Exploitation — Is it Pleasurable?**

Lukes (1974) coined the phrase “the third face of power” and noted that people’s interests and beliefs were shaped by dominant ideology. Lukes (1974) explained how ideology shaped preferences when he stated:

A may exercise power over B by getting him [sic] to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very wants. Indeed, is it not the supreme exercise of power to get others to have the desires you want them to have — that is to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires? (p. 23)

The obvious connection here is that schools are places that need to organize, manage, control, and watch a growing number of students and educators. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the regulation of students and educators has increasingly become a priority for the corporate state. More importantly, the new technologies of power seek to control the unconscious of people, or, put differently, technologies of power seek conformity by controlling people’s thoughts and desires. Nietzsche (1968) noted this aspect of power when he stated, “Knowledge works as a tool of power … the measure of the desire for knowledge depends upon the measure to which the will to power grows in a species: a species grasps a certain amount of reality in order to become master of it, in order to press it into service” (Aphorism 480). Performance accountability is the current process
used to effect the cognitive colonization of educators. And, of course, in relation to
the economic concerns of the state, performance accountability is the contemporary
technology used to corporatize students’ cognitions as well (DeLissovoy &

Foucault (1980b) argued that power was not always structured into social
practices; the idea is a relatively new phenomenon of the last two centuries.
Foucault argued that power was wielded initially by feudal lords, and, over time,
these lords needed more efficient ways to control, order, and manage large
numbers of people:

In feudal societies power functioned essentially through signs and levies.
Signs of loyalty to the feudal lords, rituals, ceremonies and so forth, and
levies in the form of taxes, pillage, hunting, war, etc. In the seventeenth and
eighteenth centuries a form of power comes into being that begins to exercise
itself through social production and social service. It becomes a matter of
obtaining productive service from individuals in their concrete lives. And in
consequence, a real and effective “incorporation” of power was necessary, in
the sense that power had to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals,
to their acts, attitudes and modes of everyday behavior … These new
techniques of power needed to grapple with the phenomena of population, in
short to undertake the administration, control and direction of the
accumulation of [people]. (p. 125)

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2007), in
its Education at a Glance, noted the rapid increase in secondary-education
attainment by people in its 22 member countries. The OECD is quick to point out
how this rapid growth in “human capital stock” is ripe for economic utilization in
member countries (p. 26). The report provides a comparison of the member
countries’ accountability systems that perpetuate the normative uses of surveillance
to monitor schools (OECD, 2007, pp. 418-419). The OECD report confirmed
Foucault’s (1977) observation that state governments will produce docile bodies –
that is, “human stock” – for economic utilization rather than for democratic
emancipation.

Desirous Subjectivities and Willing Subjugation

A goal of panoptic power is to mask repression by positioning politics, or conflict,
in such a way that people desire the repression that accompanies their bodily re-
formation. In fact, Deleuze (1992) noted how people desire training re-formations
as a result of ignorance about disciplinary power. He stated, “Many young people
strangely boast of being ‘motivated’; they re-request apprenticeships and
permanent training. It’s up to them to discover what they’re being made to serve,
just as their elders discovered, not without difficulty, the telos of the disciplines”
(p. 7). Foucault (1982a) would often describe “willing” subjugation as a process of
power reproduction, as the process of reproducing the intent of disciplinary power
to subjuge people. Foucault, borrowing from Deleuze and Guattari (1983),
commented, “the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behavior, [is] the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us” (p. xiii).


Deleuze (1992) reminded us that democratic, capitalist populations are malleable and training is the preferred method to continuously de-form and re-form its economic force:

Desire in never separable from complex assemblages that necessarily tie into molecular levels, form microformations already shaping postures, attitudes, perceptions, expectations, semiotic systems, etc. Desire is never an undifferentiated instinctual energy, but itself results from a highly developed, engineered setup rich interactions: a whole supple segmentarity that processes molecular energies and potentially gives desire a fascist determination … It’s too easy to be antifascist on the molar level, and not even see the fascist inside you, the fascist you yourself sustain and nourish and cherish with molecules both personal and collective. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 215)

Democratic power can easily be subverted by masking fascist control through surveillance technologies and by coding its operation into schools. Max Ernst created his *The Angel of Hearth and Home* (below) as a direct representation and
physical embodiment of fascism. The seduction of capital through education and monitored through surveillance represents the co-optation of democratic interests and the social suicides that accompany such allure (Kozol, 2007; Loeb, 2007).

Figure 7. Max Ernst. The angel of hearth and home. 1937. © Estate of Max Ernst / SODRAC (2008)

Surveillance is one contemporary technology of disciplinary power that shapes people’s desires. I discuss surveillance in terms of its analytic relations – capillary, efficient, and reproductive. The word “discipline” is used in the Foucauldian sense (1977), and I relate it to the ways that surveillance codes cognition and shapes desire: surveillance is discussed not only in terms of “privacy issues” but also in terms of how it colonizes epistemes.

DISCIPLINARY POWER

Clegg (1989) argued that the central feature of surveillance was its ability to obtain people’s obedience by controlling their “private spaces” (p. 191). Drug testing,
computer monitoring, surveillance cameras, and test data represent contemporary examples of this intent. Foucault (1977) understood surveillance to be part of a larger government technique to control and train growing populations. Foucault (1977) explained how surveillance operated, in relation to the larger ambition of disciplinary power, as the “means to correct training”:

The chief function of the disciplinary power is to “train,” rather than to select ... It does not link forces together in order to reduce them; it seeks to bind them together in such a way as to multiply and use them ... It “trains” the moving, confused, useless multitudes of bodies and forces into a multiplicity of individual elements — small, separate cells, organic autonomous, genetic identities and continuities, combinatory segments. Discipline “makes” individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals
both as objects and as instruments of its exercise … it is a modest, suspicious power, which functions as a calculated, but permanent economy … The success of disciplinary power derives no doubt from the use of simple instruments; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination. (p. 170).

Contrary to some scholars’ ideas, the idea of surveilling educators and schools to hold them accountable is not a new idea (Fuhrman, 1999). Lortie (1975) discussed its nefarious micro-effects in schools 30 years ago. What is new is the scale of the education surveillance machine (e.g., state apparatuses of control) and the severity of threats tied to its coercive powers. The idea that schools are surveilled via high-stakes tests and levy a normalizing judgment (i.e., a performance score) is well documented in many countries in the English-speaking West (Earl, 1999; MacGillivray, Ardell, Curwen, & Palma, 2004; Shore & Wright, 2004).

In fact, what is new in macropolitical studies of the panoptic phenomenon is how the disciplinary machines of state governments and private groups are assembled together (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000). Accountability assemblages have been developed in the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand (see Apple, Kenway, & Singh, 2005; Olsens, Codd, & O’Neill, 2004). So-called think tanks have paved the way for an unprecedented number of governmentality constellations in the United States that surveil schools through high-stakes tests. The Manhattan Institute, the Cato Institute, the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Business Round Table, and the Christian Coalition (to name just a few) all represent libertarian and conservative constellations that continuously surveil education (Apple, 2001). On a smaller scale, the Fraser Institute and the CD Howe Institute in Canada operate like their counterparts in the United States. And Ofsted and the National College of School Leadership in the United Kingdom are examples of direct government constellations that do the same. Societies of control exist throughout many representative democracies to hold education accountable to performance (Deleuze, 1992). What has not occurred, but seems inevitable, is the assemblage of a performance accountability war machine into a global network of education surveillance.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discuss the effects of assemblage in relation to power and desire:

There isn’t a desire for power; it is power itself that is desire. Not a desire-lack, but desire as a plenitude, exercise, and functioning, even in the most subaltern of workers. Being an assemblage [agencement], desire is precisely one with the gears and the components of the machine, one with the power of the machine. And the desire that someone has for power is only his fascination with these gears, his desire to make certain of these gears go into operation, to be himself one of these gears – or, for want of anything better, to be the material treated by these gears, a material that is a gear in its own way. (p. 56)
What motivates this study is a desire to map the effects that surveillance has had on educators. My goal is to document how, or if, teachers have resisted the effects of surveillance. My goal is to try and develop a counter-politic to the surveillance of pedagogy. Of course, this needs to be done in relation to educators and schools. Foucault (1980b) helped me articulate my concerns when he suggested,

Let us not … ask why certain people want to dominate, what they seek, what is their overall strategy. Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of on-going subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours, etc. In other words, rather than ask ourselves how the sovereign appears to us in his lofty isolation, we should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thought, etc. (p. 97)

**Becoming Productive: Assembling Docile Subjects through Terror**

Historically, teachers have been considered guileful, deceitful, and desirous, which has prompted surveillance systems designed to hold them accountable to external policy (Warren, 1968). Warren (1968) believed that teachers should be surveiled because they often complied with organizational procedures without significant action or investment on their part. Essentially, argued Warren, teachers easily said one thing but did another. Warren hypothesized that surveillance was a more effective way to hold teachers accountable than devoting time to acquire symbolic acceptance of school policy. Surveillance provided administrators with ways to coerce teachers through “the expectation of punishment for failure to conform to an influence attempt” (p. 953).

Foucault (1980b) examined the relationship between surveillance and the inculcation of people’s preferences. In his words, he examined “the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives” (p. 39). Foucault argued that surveillance “circulated” within a social body and coercion was a property of organizational relationships exercised through the threat of being seen. The significance of this idea was that people were implicated in their own disciplining; they desired their own cognitive colonization. Foucault described how people tended to regulate themselves in proportion to the promise of being seen:

All that is needed then is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker, or a school boy … Hence the major effect of the Panopticon [is] to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. (pp. 200-201)
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The installation of cameras on local metro busses to reduce crime is another example of a panoptic technology. The camera does not even have to work properly to have the intended effect of people self-regulating their behavior (that is, the camera may not be “plugged in”). One-way mirrors are also panoptic technologies.

More to the point of the present research, consider the potential effect of unannounced principal supervisory visits on classroom teachers or the use of high-stakes achievement tests in state-wide accountability systems. Parental help in the classroom also has unintended effects on teacher performance when parents act as panoptic surveillance for other parents, principals, and districts. Finally, students can operate as surveillance technologies when they provide (mis)information to guardians about schools and educators (Corbett, 1991). However, the covert micropolitical uses of surveillance should not be read as the only form of school surveillance. Schools have been quite explicit about their use of surveillance to control students. However, this book is about surveillance used on, and by, teachers.

THE ANATOMY OF SCHOOL SURVEILLANCE: MICROSPACES OF TERROR AND COERCION

The surveillance of educators’ knowledge – the concerted effort to expose and exploit teachers’ thinking – occurs through two spaces of coercion. Lyotard (1984) considered “terror” the primary mechanism of educational coercion when he said:

By terror I mean the efficiency gained by eliminating, or threatening to eliminate, a player from the language game one shares with him. He [sic] is silenced or consents, not because he has been refuted, but because his ability to participate has been threatened. The decision makers’ arrogance consists in the exercise of terror. It says: “Adapt your aspirations to our ends – or else.” (p. 63)

The first dimension of coercion, terror, is produced through explicit micropolitical monitoring of performance data, which is understood in many professional fields as data surveillance and data mining. Governmental monitoring of performance data is accompanied by threats of school closure, school reconstitution, teacher dismissal, and penalties of reduced school income – all of which threaten schools and teachers with financial vulnerability or loss of careers. Of course, the use of terror need not always be used explicitly through micropolitical performance indicators. Surveilling unspoken expectations produces the second dimension of coercion. Unannounced visits by principals, for instance, regulate teachers through local, often unspoken, school or community norms and generic codes of the profession. Consequently, micropolitical uses of surveillance-terror produce a flow of pedagogical performances through acquiescence; teachers have historically, and consistently, conformed to pervasive ideology from fear of ostracism more than fear of overt punishment (Lortie, 1975).
Foucault (1980b) developed a framework, or what he called a “grid of analysis which makes possible an analytic relations of power,” to depict how surveillance operated (p. 199). For Foucault (1977), the framework expressed itself as a tactics of power that fulfills three criteria: first, to obtain the exercise of power at the lowest possible cost [efficient]; second, to bring the effects of power to their maximum intensity and to extend them as far as possible [capillary]; third … to increase the docility and the utility of all the elements of the system [reproductive]. (p. 218)

I have illustrated the three elements of Foucault’s thought in Figure 9. The figure represents the x-, y-, and z-axes of Foucault’s grid. In theory, the placement of a given act in the three-dimensional space depends on the extent of the efficient, reproductive, or capillary action it represents.

Figure 9. Constituent elements of surveillance.

Summary

There is a certain dialectical element involved in technologies of disciplinary power (e.g., cameras, towers, and accountability policies). By virtue of the technology, people respond to it; by virtue of how people act, technologies are adjusted. Those being watched are their own watchers. People control themselves even in cases where the technology does not work properly. Likewise, those watching are regulated by the technology and subject to administrative control. This “to and fro” or “give and take” quality of disciplinary power illustrates that power is continuous, anonymous, and productive.
So far, I have described surveillance as the means to produce more standardized and efficient teachers. And, of course, the goal of disciplinary power is to induce a desire for such re-formation. Even though surveillance explains how interests are held accountable to pervading discourses (e.g., performance standards), surveillance, by itself, does not explain the process of fabricating desires. To better understand how surveillance fabricates desires, it is helpful to understand the performance pressure associated with its effects. This idea is directly tied to province- and state-wide performance accountability systems. By understanding the pressures of performance, or what some authors call “performativity,” fabricated interests can be explained and better understood in micropolitical analyses (Ball, 2001, 2003).

ASSEMBLING COGNITIONS, PERFORMING TEACHERS

Everything is political, but every politics is simultaneously a macropolitics and a micropolitics.

– Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari,

A Thousand Plateaus
Ball (2001) described the current performance-accountability game as a “tactics of transparency [that] produce a resistance of opacity” (p. 211). This game relies on two important rules that govern who observes the performance and the way in which the performance is interpreted. Ball (2001) described the complexity associated with these two rules:

There is not so much, or not only, a structure of surveillance, as a flow of performativities both continuous and eventful. It is not the certainty of being seen that is the issue. Instead it is the uncertainty and instability of being judged in different ways, by different means, through different agents; the “bringing-off” of performances – the flow of changing demands, expectations and indicators that make us continually accountable and constantly recorded. (pp. 211-212)

Goals, objectives, and standards are prevalent and pervade discourses that shape the ritualized performance of the appraisal meeting, annual review, observation, and inspection. Ball (2003) noted that “the management of performance … is ‘called up’ by inspection. What is produced is a spectacle, or game-playing, or cynical compliance, or what one might see as an ‘enacted fantasy,’ which is there simply to be seen and judged – a fabrication” (p. 222). Butler (1990) commented that “acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are performativ[e] in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are fabrications manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means” (p. 66). Fabrications (e.g., test scores), then, are micropolitical performances circulated within schools to refract macropolitical gazes. Over time, Ball (2001) observed how performativity co-opts the organization’s interests when coalitions transform their practice into the accumulation of signs, or fabrications:

Organizational fabrications are an escape from the gaze, a strategy of impression management that in effect erects a façade of calculation. It is, as few have seen, a betrayal even, a giving up of claims to authenticity and commitment, it is an investment in plasticity. Crucially and invariably acts of fabrication and the fabrications themselves act and reflect back upon the practices they stand for. The fabrication becomes something to be sustained, lived up to. Something to measure individual practices against. (p. 217)

Fabrication as Micropolitical Strategy

Within organizations, many of us have participated in the gathering or creation of “evidence” to satisfy performance expectations, and we often use the corporate value of “efficiency” to guide our production as we create the minimum amount of artifacts intended to satisfy all of the criteria. Educators acquire preferences for fabrications because of the correct local, cultural, or organizational meaning they denote in schools (Kelchtermans & Ballet, 2002). In other words, the status quo is
maintained by virtue of mitigating, indeed eliminating, alternatives to the status quo through the surveillance of the performance of predetermined standards.

Pedagogical fabrications are created to be seen and judged; they are Baudrillardian (1981) signs circulated within the surveillance systems of schools. Educators create fabrications to control surveillers’ impressions of their work; they engage in adept micropolitical tactics to (re)control their knowledge and (re)control the meaning of their professional status – or what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) would describe as a “micropolitics of perception, affection, conversation, and so forth” (p. 213). Thus, teachers’ fabrications are strategies to reterritorialize their knowledge – they constitute a “new” set of cognitive microstrategies to refract the accountability gaze and a ubiquitous tactic to close the classroom door.

Fabrications are evidence of educator resistance produced from the panoptic gaze to refract the surveillance effects of performance accountability. Pedagogical fabrications momentarily shape surveillers’ impressions – throw a wrench in the panoptic machine – and “define innumerable points of confrontation, focuses of instability, each of which has its own risks of conflict, of struggle, and of an at least temporary inversion of the power relation” (Foucault, 1977, p. 27). Educator fabrications are micropolitical responses intended to insurrect teachers’ increasingly subjugated knowledge. Indeed, pedagogical fabrications can be
seductive performances circulated within schools in order to obfuscate accountability gazes.

Figure 12. Man Ray. Noire et blanche. 1926. © Man Ray Trust / SODRAC (2008)

The uncertainty of being judged in different ways by different surveilers frames how educators present their work. As a result, fabrications are micropolitical approximations intended to present oneself within contested performance geographies that comply, or literally are “seen to comply,” with accountability expectations. A politics of representation, therefore, becomes an integral way to understand how the audit culture produces subjectivity (Mehan, 2001). In his work, Man Ray captured the idea of subjectivity and the desire to (consciously) select multiple and different – and, depending on the times – “exotic” or “erotic” identities.

As forms of impression management, educators’ performances are political because they attempt to (re)control, or (re)claim, the discourse of what a “good” teacher does and/or is. Jones and Pittman (1982) identified five prevalent impression management techniques that individuals often use to create “reality”:

• ingratiation: individuals use flattery to be seen as likeable
• self-promotion: individuals play up their abilities to appear competent
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• exemplification: individuals meet and exceed expectations to appear dedicated
• supplication: individuals advertise their shortcomings to be viewed as needy
• intimidation: individuals seek to appear threatening to be viewed as dangerous

Impression management is a way (that is, one way) to strategically respond to (or refract) the surveillance of pedagogy. Readers might imagine this as deciding which mask to wear, and deciding in which situation to wear it. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) discussed micropolitics in just this way when they noted, “there is a micropolitics of perception, affection, conversation, and so forth” (p. 213). Viewed in this way, ideas about impression management relate well with ideas of cognitive politics (Anderson, 1991), strategic interaction (Goffman, 1969), the politics of representation (Mehan, 2001), and the politics of subjectivity (Ransom, 1997).

Schizoanalytics and Bodies Without Organs

The body is the body. Alone it stands. And in no need of organs. Organism it never is. Organisms are the enemies of the body.

– Antonin Artaud, quoted in Deleuze and Guattari (1987)

The risks associated with impression management carry a heavy burden. For instance, Woods and Jeffrey (2002) discovered that teachers suffered from strained psychics when they engaged in cognitive politics inside schools. Woods and Jeffrey (2002) described teachers as possessing “multiple selves” and “restructured identities” when they fabricated organizational expectations. Ball (2003) also noted cognitive crises of performativity that act as a kind of “values schizophrenia” for educators. In this sense, interests are shaped from, and fabricated into, the disciplinary discourse of performance. Foucault (1977) explained the logical outcome of restructuring:

The individual is no doubt the fictitious atom of an “ideological” representation of society; but he [sic] is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called “discipline.” We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it “excludes,” it “represses,” it “censors,” it “abstracts,” it “masks,” it “conceals.” In fact, power produces; it produces reality [interests, shared or otherwise]; it produces domains of objects [organizational coalitions] and rituals of truth [rational negotiations]. (Foucault, 1977, p. 194)

As Fraser (1989) noted, the goal of accountability is not simply to subjugate the educator “but rather to retool her” into a more effective instrument in education production. In this sense, educators are “the vehicles of power, not its points of application” (Foucault, 1980b, p. 98). Assembled together, teaching bodies (bodies as objects) represent the new disciplinary force of corporate state control. Deleuze
and Guattari (1987) explained how the surveillance machine assembles bodies (without organs) through fabrications:

There are a number of questions. Not only how to make oneself a BwO [body without organs], and how to produce the corresponding intensities without which it would remain empty (not exactly the same question). But also how to reach the plane of consistency. How to sew up, cool down, and tie together all the BwO’s [sic]. If this is possible to do, it is only by conjugating the intensities produced on each BwO, by producing a continuum of all intensive continuities. Are not assemblages necessary to fabricate each BwO, is not a great abstract Machine necessary to construct the plane of consistency? (p. 158)

The artist Hans Bellmer often represented restructured, or re-formed, body assemblages in his work. Bellmer’s sculptures articulate the material effects of bodily reconstruction. In this sense, Bellmer’s sculptures physically represent the more general idea of the body as object and, for my purposes, the more specific teacher as object – Foucault’s docile body, Fraser’s retooled body, and Deleuze and Guattari’s BwO. Given the predominance of female teachers in the world, Bellmer’s Doll (below) is an accurate portrayal of the violent effects done to teachers through performance accountability structures.

Schizoanalytics

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) noted that the schizophrenia that developed from capitalist fabrications could be analyzed through schizoanalysis. Schizoanalysis comprises four components that attempt to identify the different signs used in micropolitical representations. Delueze and Guattari (1987, p. 146) outlined the components of schizoanalysis as follows: (1) the generative, which is the study of concrete mixed semiotics; (2) the transformational, which is the study of pure semiotics; (3) the diagrammatic, which is the study of abstract machines; and (4) the machinic, which is the study of assemblages that effectuate abstract machines.

The ideas of schizoanalysis are rooted in descriptions of actions—descriptions of micropolitical semiotics—that interact with forms of disciplinary power designed to regulate people through visibility threats. However, micropolitical semiotics are often described as solitary endeavors, which says much about the (re)formational aspects of creating docile bodies (BwOs, (re)structured selves, assembled cognitions) for a more productive self capable of fulfilling the capitalist project more efficiently. Could micropolitical semiotics be used to resist a capitalist hegemony collectively? How? Smith (2005) pondered:

If, as Deleuze and Guattari suggest, schizophrenia appears as the illness of our era, it is not as a function of generalities concerning our mode of life, but in relation to very precise [disciplinary] mechanisms of an economic, social and political nature. The schizophrenic is like the limit of our society, but a limit that is always avoided, reprimanded, abhorred. The problem of schizophrenia [and schizoanalysis] then becomes: how does one prevent the breakthrough from becoming a breakdown? Is it possible to utilize the power of a lived chemistry and a schizo-logical analysis to ensure that the schizophrenic process does not turn into its opposite, that is, the production of the schizophrenic found in the asylum? If so, within what type of group, what kind of collectivity? (p. 190)

Might the fabrication process be subverted? If so, how? Writers have been quick to point out that Foucault did not sufficiently discuss the role of agency and intentionality in relation to power (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). Foucault was interested in how power “transforms human beings into subjects” and not how people resist, transmit, or otherwise use power (Foucault, 1982a). This particular focus leaves unanswered questions about how, or if, people exercise power when power is structured in social practices. Nancy Fraser (1989) argued that Foucault’s project, while extremely helpful, was not “capable of specifying who is dominating or subjugating whom and who is resisting or submitting to whom” (p. 29). I partially agree with Fraser. However, Foucault (1982a) did not avoid the issue. He recognized the need to talk about these concerns:

The relationship between power and freedom’s refusal to submit cannot therefore be separated. The crucial problem of power is not that of voluntary servitude. At the very heart of the power relationship, and constantly provoking it, are the recalcitrance of the will and the intransigence of
freedom. Rather than speaking of an essential freedom, it would be better to speak of an “agonism” – of a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyzes both sides than a permanent provocation. (pp. 221-222).

Foucault understood people’s relationships with power to be a constant struggle, a struggle that is made permanent by our continued calls for freedom. To understand this tension, Foucault (1982a) believed that researchers should analyze micropolitics by “focusing on carefully defined institutions,” because institutions exercise power relations to the highest efficacy (p. 222).4

**RESEARCHING MICROPOLITICAL SEMIOTICS IN SCHOOLS**

Make a map, not a tracing. The orchid does not reproduce the tracing of the wasp; it forms a map with the wasp, in a rhizome …. The map does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious.

– Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*

There is nothing mystical about fabricating educators’ interests. This point is emphasized when individuals and coalitions use a variety of strategies to socially construct “reality.” From cognitive politics to impression management to micropolitical semiotics, the school is a site that is recreated over and over in relation to the macropolitical (Blase, 1991). What is really at stake when researching stealth forms of power in schools is the extent to which educators are aware of the structures that fabricate their intentions and subsequently shape their agency.

**Macro- and Micropolitics: Issues of Educational Sovereignty and Accountability**

There is little consensus about what defines phenomena as uniquely micropolitical and distinct from those which are “macropolitical” . . . . Much that is now defined as specifically “micropolitical” is hardly distinguishable as uniquely “political” human interaction.

– Hanne B. Mawhinney, “Reappraisal”

In short, everything is political, but every politics is simultaneously a *macropolitics* and a *micropolitics*. (italics original)

– Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*

The juxtaposition of the above quotations reveals divergent ideas about the binaries of macro- and micro-. The primary difference between the two quotations rests on the extent to which identifying features (e.g., juridical, legislative, economic,
cognitive, etc.) distinguish macro- and micro-environments from each other and the extent to which political action can be understood within such distinctions. No easy task. Mawhinney (1999) suggested that there could be, and probably ought to be, distinct features that qualify something as uniquely macro- and, hence, micro-

Mawhinney (1999) suggested that micropolitical action could be derived deductively from mapping supposedly individual macro- and microterrains. On the other hand, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) suggested that the territorial borders are symbiotic and produce a politic in collapsed, or symbiotic, binaries (macro- and micro-). These conceptual differences regarding the territories of teachers’ work are generated from thinking about power as something that operates in stealth; thus, they produce divergent research trajectories for the study of educational micropolitics. These incompatible trajectories raise different questions and produce different forms of data. The two divergent methodological approaches can be summarized as (1) ways to partition macro- and microjurisdictions and develop concomitant notions of politics related to jurisdiction and (2) ways to understand political action produced from a symbiosis of macro- and microjurisdictions. The bold line in Figure 14 locates the school within a contested landscape, while the dotted lines represent the methodological debate between demarcated or permeable territories. I examine both methodological trajectories and identify how concomitant ideas of agency are developed to support respective conceptions of macro- and micro-.

---

**Figure 14. A representation of macro- and micro-environments in education.**
Political Territories in Education and the Cultural Isomorphs of Schools

Sovereign, law and prohibition formed a system of representation of power which was extended during the subsequent era by the theories of right: political theory has never ceased to be obsessed with the person of the sovereign. Such theories still continue today to busy themselves with the problem of sovereignty. What we need, however, is a political philosophy that isn’t erected around the problem of sovereignty, nor therefore around the problems of law and prohibition. We need to cut off the King’s head: in political theory that has still to be done.

– Foucault, *Power/knowledge*

Figure 14 represents one way to territorialize educational macro- and micro-environments. Typically, distinctions between these two environments are articulated by identifying roles, responsibilities, and interests within purportedly separate educational arenas (represented as nests). The significance of territorializing macro- and microterritories rests with understanding who is accountable to whom, and for what. As Foucault (1980b) noted, the methodological preoccupation of territorializing the macro- rests with determining who has sovereign legitimacy and who does not. In any event, once macro- and microterritories are demarcated in some fashion – for instance, as in Figure 14 – empirical data can then be gathered in an attempt to map how power operates between contested territories.

To support conceptions of separate territories, notions of agency attach identifiable interests to actors to explain political behavior. Power is used to explain the eventual clash of competing or conflicting interests. We could think of this as an “interest-based” or “identity-based” politics. Identity-based politics is an idea that is frequently used in micropolitical research, and it is operationalized as interest groups due to the popular idea that groups have “more” power than individuals (Bacharach & Mundell, 1993). Constituencies are formed from either shared interests or mutual interests in cases where the coalition is used as a temporary vehicle to achieve independent goals (Malen, 2001). Thus, organizational politics can be traced as a set of actions (i.e., strategies) used by coalitions to acquire, or otherwise use, said interests within the organization (Johnson, 2001).

The configuration of separate territories, consequently, produces micropolitical analyses that are intersectional in nature. The intersectional nature is evident when opposing coalitions try to and resolve conflicts – or, put another way, try to resolve conflict with an essentialized other. Political action, then, is predicated on isomorphic identities correlated with, or fixed to, a specific location on a territorialized map:

- [teachers] vis-à-vis [policy-makers]
- [teachers] vis-à-vis [parents]
Compound isomorphic identities could also be formed by combining territorial jurisdictions:

- \{{female} \{principal\} \text{ vis-à-vis } \{male \{teachers\}\}
- \{{black} \{activist\} \text{ vis-à-vis } \{white \{superintendent\}\}
- \{{poor} \{families\} \text{ vis-à-vis } \{wealthy \{communities\}\}

The intersectional aspects of micropolitics are reproduced, and reinforced, once interests are ascribed to particular groups. Identity politics, consequently, is limited only to the extent that competing or conflicting interests can be ascribed to particular groups.

REMAPPING POWER IN EDUCATIONAL MICROPOLITICS

Power must be analyzed as something which circulates.

– Foucault, *Power/knowledge*

Deleuze and Guattari (1987) provided a different conception of micropolitics than the one that results from interest groups that emanate from distinct territories. The authors’ conception of collapsed territories redirected attention toward the symbiotic relationship between macro- and micro-environments. As a result, the authors’ conception of power and political action is different. With this shift, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) focused attention on how conceptions of micropolitics are produced and maintained in traditional micropolitical analyses. More importantly, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) utilized a very different theory of power to support their conception. To understand that political action developed from a symbiotic relationship between macro- and micro- is to understand how micropolitical interests can be fabricated in the macropolitical. Hence, political action results from, and is enacted within, the macro- and micro-.

The attempt to dissolve territorial boundaries is not an attempt to deny the existence of structures and territories that demarcate macro- and micro-arenas in education. Hardly. One would be hard pressed to deny state and provincial regulation of schooling, for instance. Or, for example, it would be difficult to deny the unequal funding of education and its grotesque impact on public schooling (Kozol, 2005). Schools are located within strong structures and prevalent territories. The dissolution of territorial boundaries is instead an attempt to reveal how power circulates throughout macro- and micro-environments simultaneously, rather than simply within territorialized jurisdictions. Giddens (1984), for instance, provided one collapse point when he argued that interests are not independent of the structures they inhabit – they are often shaped by these very structures.

It should be no surprise, then, that interests and interest groups can be fabricated through the management of organizational structures. This was Lukes’ (1974) point when he made the following speculation:
A may exercise power over B by getting him [*sic*] to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very wants. Indeed, is it not the supreme exercise of power to get others to have the desires you want them to have – that is to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires? (p. 23)

Instead of understanding power as located and operationalized within specific territories and with “core” or essentialized interests, panoptic forms of power create opportunities to understand how power fabricates interests to produce micropolitical action. However, we could say that the research area of micropolitics is still wedded to the epistemological roots of determining the sovereignty of democratic power, as four centuries of debate about Hobbes and Machiavelli suggest.

**Cut off the King’s Head: Stealth Forms of Power and the Fabrication of Interests**

[Individuals] are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. Individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application.

– Foucault, 1980b, *Power/knowledge*

What types of units of analysis have been produced from conceptions of power as covert and panoptic? In what ways has agency been co-opted from stealth forms of power? Figure 15 distinguishes between stealth forms of power that operate in schools. One side of the continuum represents covert forms of power that are not witnessed (and are often not known).

**Figure 15. Continuum of stealth forms of power and micropolitical visibility.**

Covert forms of power also represent political action that attempts to maintain decision making in opaque forums. However, covert forms of power could be observed. The right side of the continuum represents invisible forms of power that shape peoples’ desires. Panoptic forms of power cannot be seen but are manifest in the unconscious of people through behavior. The introduction of a radical interiority of power disrupts notions of isomorphic interests and self-directed agency developed from intrinsic, core, essential, or otherwise self-aware and self-protected politics. Accounting for forms of power that are covert and radically
interior suggests that micropolitical interests are manipulated and fabricated because interests can be obscured from individuals and groups and, more importantly, because interests can be produced. Thus, panoptic forms of power fabricate interests through macropolitical mechanisms to achieve micropolitical ends.

Figure 16 represents possible units of analysis that are neglected in micropolitical analyses as a result of territorializing legislative and cognitive spaces. One end of the spectrum represents covert instances of power, and the corresponding units of analysis are the ways organizational structures are reproduced. For example, school governance models (i.e., site councils) have been identified as extensions of state and provincial control rather than, as they are advertised, powerful local constituencies (Malen & Ogawa, 1988). On the other end of the spectrum, once power is conceived as operating panoptically, the units of analysis become the ways in which interests are fabricated and performed within the organization. These types of units of analysis map the production of desire.

THE STRUCTURATION OF EDUCATORS' MICROPOLITICAL ACTIONS

People know what they do; they frequently know why they do; but what they don’t know is what they do does.

– Foucault, “The Subject and Power”

Four axioms guided my thinking about teachers’ micropolitical semiotics.
Axiom 1. Educators socially construct their working realities in relation to both the macro- and microstructures in which their work is located (e.g., calendars, budgets, architecture, gender, race, accountability policies, and so on).

Lukes (1977) noted the methodological implications of this idea when he stated:

Social life can only properly be understood as a dialectic of power and structure, a web of possibilities for agents, whose nature is both active and structured, to make choices and pursue strategies within given limits … Any standpoint or methodology which reduces that dialectic to a one-sided consideration of agents without … structural limits or structures without agents, or which does not address the problem of their interrelation, will be unsatisfactory. (p. 29)

The first methodological implication is related to how educators’ interests are shaped according to the macro-environment and the various micro-codes of the organization (Giddens, 1984). Thus, conceptions of agency are enacted within the structures that produce it, or “where structure is conceived as both the medium and the outcome of social practice” (Foster, 1989, p. 23). The first axiom seeks more nuanced accounts of how educators’ interests are shaped by the macro-environment and the micro-codes of the organization; it seeks richer descriptions of how micropolitical action is produced and performed within these symbiotic structures.

Axiom 2. Because notions of agency are structured, stealth forms of power represent the segmentation of power.7

This axiom replaces a popular conception that power is “distributed” in schools (i.e., the concept of distributive leadership). Power segmentation represents power as a property rather than as a resource of the organization. The distinction between segmentation and distribution seeks clearer descriptions of how power is coded into organizations (i.e., historically, normatively, through policy, and so on). More emphatically, the distinction reveals how organizational coding subjugates desires and, subsequently, produces action, resistance, or compliance. The second axiom, then, seeks more detailed accounts of how the macro-environment shapes organizational members’ interests and the ways these interests are performed within the organization.

The idea that power is segmented in schools raises methodological issues about agency in schools. The extent to which people are aware of the segmentation of power is the third axiom.

Axiom 3. The segmentation of power reproduces a striation of cognition.

While structuration theory provides a way to understand agency within segmented structures, the degree to which agents are conscious of such structures is not apparent. Perhaps we could theorize strong and weak forms of structuration,
wherein strong forms document the unconscious subjugation of educators as their interests become fabricated. This was one of Foucault’s (1980b) projects. He noted:

Let us not … ask why certain people want to dominate, what they seek, what is their overall strategy. Let us ask, instead, how things work at the level of on-going subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subject our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours etc. In other words, rather than ask ourselves how the sovereign appears to us in his lofty isolation, we should try to discover how it is that subjects are gradually, progressively, really and materially constituted through a multiplicity of organisms, forces, energies, materials, desires, thought etc. (p. 97)

Conversely, weak forms of structuration describe the ways in which educators produce, resist, or appropriate structures. The methodological implication that results from covert uses of power is that one must attempt to identify the extent to which educators are aware, cognizant, and conscious of the structures that mediate their micropolitical activity and the extent to which they are able to change them. Methodological attention to weak and strong forms of structuration, consequently, entails depicting whose interests are represented and how these interests are represented within the organization. Greater attention to how desires are fabricated would develop a politics of subjectivity that would redirect units of analysis away from the traditional emphasis on identity politics in educational micropolitics (May, 2005). Micropolitical researchers, consequently, should not hesitate to reveal how power operates to inculcate desires – indeed, to produce desires – for political gain.

Axiom 4. Micro- and macro-environments are better characterized as symbiotic rather than as autonomous arenas.

It is a question of method: the tracing should always be put back on the map. This operation and the previous one are not at all symmetrical.

– Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus

Rather than understanding educational micropolitics as conflicts between juridical territories, which are often characterized as distinct arenas, what is needed is an understanding of the symbiotic, and often emergent, relations that develop between micro- and macro-environments. Rather than developing more structural frameworks to explain micropolitical activity, inquiries ought to map power relations that identify micro- and macro-assemblages produced within institutional channels (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 156). In other words, micropolitical research ought to map the flow of power that assembles legislative and cognitive spaces together.

A critical cartography, or what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) call a “rhizome,” is a way to map the unconscious assembly from understanding political action
emerging from collapsed territories. Desire production, then, identifies how educators develop and use “new” cognitive geographies that are delineated from the revised boundaries of previously determined educator territories. Mapping these kinds of policy and organizational “dances” will indicate how power is socially and spatially constituted and reconstituted. More importantly, mapping power relations will describe the terrain that structures educators’ interests, including, for instance, the spatialization of gender (Massey, 1994), the spatialization of race (Gulson, 2006), the conflicting territories of language (Mehan, 2001), and the cognitive schizophrenia of organizational performances (Ball, 2003).

Conclusion: Repoliticizing Education Micropolitically

Identifying stealth forms of power in micropolitical analyses should, ironically, provide the conceptual clarity to proceed with more certainty in micropolitical inquiries. Switching focus away from macroterritorializing attempts to understand power that operates stealthily will help explain how schooling has persistently maintained the status quo. Put differently, micropolitical research into stealth forms of power will help explain the organizational reproduction of schooling for the last 100 years and the innumerable failed attempts at altering those structures.

More complete descriptions of stealth forms of power that operate in schools will eventually redirect discussions toward the actions of individuals and groups in schools. At this point, readers may assume that mapping power in the ways I have suggested will end any hope of political action in schools. To the contrary, mapping stealth forms of power, to my mind, reaffirms the importance of political action in schools. The idea that educators act unconsciously most of the time does not suggest that they must act that way. Clear descriptions about the ways stealth forms of power operate can be very instructive. Rather than assuming that poststructuralism denies political action, we could begin by discussing micropolitical action as a repoliticization of education from the poststructural position from which I argue (see also, Biesta, 1995; Youdell, 2006). From this, a “new” politic is born from which to address equality, and perhaps democratic, concerns in public schooling (May, 2007). However, such a politic is practiced micropolitically.

NOTES

1 I recognize the important debate surrounding Arendt’s feminism, particularly as it relates to women of colour, particularly black women (see, for instance, Allen, 1999). In general, I am aware of the violence perpetuated on women in some of the surrealist imagery I use to illustrate ideas about power. Given that the majority of teachers in the United States are white women, the illustrations of violence are apropos even as they are detestable. Thus, an entire level of analysis about how women teachers are implicated as both disciplinarians and the disciplined lies outside scope of this book, unfortunately.

2 Ernst noted that The Angel of Hearth and Home was a response to the “defeat of the Republicans in Spain” and that he wished to depict fascism as “a kind of juggernaut which crushes and destroys all
that comes in its path” (as quoted in Stitch, 1990, p. 159). Deleuze and Guattari (1983, 1987) discussed fascism from the standpoint of the body, much like Ernst does in his depiction of an assembled and mutated creature.

3 The eye held an important role in surrealist imagery. Like contemporary references, the eye represented surveillance mechanisms in surrealist mythology. More important, the eye represented a window to subjectivity that is often lost in contemporary discussions about surveillance. Buñuel & Dali (1929) used the eye in both ways in their movie *Un chien andalou*, only to violently destroy the symbol, and its meanings, at the end of the film. I use their violent image of cutting the eye in Chapter 6 as a way to represent my thinking about the politics of subjectivity for teachers.

4 An often overlooked and, in my opinion, important piece of Foucault’s oeuvre was embedded within Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982). Foucault’s emphasis on “carefully defined institutions” followed his discussion about how institutions act as contemporary and differentiated forms of state power (i.e., schools, hospitals, prisons, etc.).

5 The figure was adapted from Talbert, McLaughlin, and Rowan (1993).

6 I use the term “isomorphic” in its generally accepted use; i.e., “isomorphism” is a one-to-one mapping between an object and its purported property, identity, or function. I use the term to raise attention to the distinction between “core” interests or beliefs and interests or desires fabricated from power. As such, isomorphic interests are those interests mapped onto specific territories and territories demarcated from essentialized identities.

7 I am using the term “segmentation” as it is used in micropolitical analyses from Deleuze and Guattari (1987, pp. 208-231).