ABSTRACT
        Schools and universities in the United Kingdom are
coming to accept performance appraisal as a fact of life. The first
part of this paper discusses appraisal policies as "negotiated
ambiguities." Ambiguous criteria concerning wording subject to
misinterpretation has created reservations on the side of the
National Union of Teachers. This study demonstrates how an appraisal
scheme, which appears to satisfy all the criteria specified in the
government's conciliation service's framework for school teachers,
can operate as a ritualistic mechanism for ideological construction.
The report presents a guide that outlines the process of improving
performance at all levels of the hierarchy in schools. The
possibility of a counterhegemonic practice in the appraisal context
is also discussed. (18 references) (SI)

ACTION-RESEARCH AND THE EMERGENCE OF

TEACHER APPRAISAL IN THE UK

John Elliott

Centre for Applied Research in Education
School of Education
University of East Anglia
Norwich
England

2   BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE EMERGENCE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL IN THE UK

In England and Wales teachers in schools and universities are
increasingly coming to accept performance appraisal as a fact
of life.   The government's conciliation service (ACAS)
constituted the national mechanism by which agreed frameworks
were negotiated between employers (Vice-Chancellors and
Principals in the case of university teachers and Local
Education Authorities in the case of school teachers) and
teachers' professional associations.

In an earlier paper (see Elliott 1987) I described the
transformation in the political rhetoric of teacher appraisal
in schools during the period between the publication of the
government's White Paper on 'Teaching Quality' (1983) and the
ACAS negotiated agreement (1987).   The White Paper quite
unambiguously proposed appraisal as a strategy of hierarchical
surveillance and control over the work of teachers, fulfilling
such management functions as discovering grounds for dismissal,
providing a rationale for redeployment and merit pay, and
identifying training needs.

The response from teachers was a hostile one.   Much of the
resulting controversy centred around the 'legitimate purposes'
of appraisal rather than the idea in itself.   Teachers and
their organisations emphasised classroom focused professional
learning together with career development ⁿs the primary

3

purposes of appraisal. They also argued for the right of appraisees to exercise a high measure of control over access to, and use of, appraisal records. All of these ideas were eventually incorporated, in some shape or form, into the ACAS negotiated agreement. The later controversy over appraisal in universities proceeded along similiar lines, culminating in not dissimilar trade-offs between what one might crudely dichotomise as the cultures of 'managerialism' and 'professionalism'.

The possibility of creative conformity

The study of negotiations, over both the appraisal of school and university teachers, indicates that teachers are not entirely powerless to resist attempts to transfer control over their profssional work and careers into the hands of the managers and administrators of resources. To the extent that policy-makers feel they need to legitimate their policies to those affected by them, they have to accommodate at the level of rhetoric the professional culture of the target group. Of course, a measure of control over the rhetoric of appraisal is not the same as realising the ideas and values it signifies in practice. But it does give the targets of policy a measure of leverage over how it shapes up in practice.

In the earlier account of appraisal issues referred to above, I asserted that I was "optimistic enough about human nature to

believe that if formal appraisal is part of a broad strategy for transforming schools into systems of coercive-power it can be successfully resisted". Such optimism was based on the belief that teachers do not have infinitely plastic natures. However, I rejected the view that resistance must always manifest itself in forms of rebellion and obstructionism, and advocated a stance of 'creative conformity'. It is the rhetoric constructed in attempts to legitimate social policy through negotiated frameworks which make such a stance possible. The 'conformity' stems from adherence in practice to the policy enshrined in the rhetoric. The 'creative' aspect lies in the novel interpretations of policy which can be legitimated by the rhetoric.

Appraisal policies as 'negotiated ambiguities'

From the evidence of the English 'agreements' it would be a mistake to see appraisal policies as clear, coherent, and unambiguous guides to practice. Let's first consider a few examples from the school teachers' 'agreement':

- **The nature and purpose of appraisal.**

   "The Working Group understands appraisal not as a series
   of perfunctory periodic events, but as a continuous
   and systematic process intended to help individual
   teachers with their professional development and career
   planning, and to help ensure that the inservice training

5

and deployment of teachers matches the complementary needs of individual teachers and the schools".

The reference to professional development and career planning accommodates a professionally acceptable view of the purpose of appraisal whereas the reference to deployment and inservice training may accommodate a more managerial perspective. I use the term 'managerial' to signify a particular style of management, namely: one which dispossesses the workforce of the power to control their occupational performance and futures. If appraisal is to foster professional development, then it must enhance personal competence. No professional could object to this, since it suggests increased self-mastery and control over performance. Similarly the purpose of helping professionals with career planning suggests giving them more control over their 'futures'. Inasmuch as facilitating the development of professional competence and careers are legitimate functions of management, the use of appraisal as a tool which enables it to exercise these functions effectively is professionally acceptable. Rather than exercising power over the practices and careers of individuals, this kind of appraisal can professionally empower them.

'Deployment' and 'Inservice Training' can be interpreted as fostering professional and career development. But they can also be interpreted as destructive forces. 'Deployment' can signify the continuous disruption of careers, and the removal of the individual's powers of self-determination. In this

context 'inservice training' shifts its meaning. It becomes a means of reskilling individuals to occupy the job slots to which they are 'deployed' by managers, rather than a continuing process of developing individuals' capacities to do the things they want to do better.

- **Who appraises whom?** A teacher's immediate supervisor who may be the Headteacher, or other experienced teacher designated by the Headteacher.

This principle is also high in ambiguity. It endorses both professional peer appraisal and hierarchical appraisal. It does the former by highlighting the importance of professional experience and thereby rules out non-teachers or beginning teachers. (Indeed, it also rules out student and parent appraisal). However, the peer appraisal is hierarchised although the appointment of an "experienced teacher designated by the Head" offers the option of minimising the hierarchical relation between appraiser and appraisee. A truly peer appraisal would surely be one in which the selection of appraisers was controlled by the staff group as a whole and not hierarchically.

- "the appraisal proceess needs to be of a continuous nature. Appraisal must not become a brreaucratic chore or a casual paper exercise. Against that background we think that the

frequency of formal appraisals culminating in written reports
should vary according to the stage of the teacher's career."

Again the principle is somewhat ambiguous. Having defined
appraisal as an ongoing and non-bureaucratic professional
development process, an element of periodic formal appraisal,
culminating in the production of written records, is then
inserted.

- The elements in the appraisal process are self-appraisal,
review discussion with appraiser, observation by appraiser, the
appraisal interview, appeals against appraisers' judgements,
reporting to headteacher.

Although there is a tendency to place these elements in a
mechanical sequence, the agreement accepts that "after the
introductory phase, many of the items may be run together". In
other words, self-appraisal may be integrated into other
elements such as a review of progress, observation, and the
appraisal interview. Rather than proceed according to an
ordered mechanical sequence, some of the items may operate as
continuously interacting dimensions of a dynamic process.

What the ambiguous criteria described above do is to permit a
degree of latitude over how the appraisal process is to be
interpreted in practice while at the same time accommodating
both a professional and a managerial view of its management

functions. The options with respect to interpretation appear to be about the emphasis placed on one perspective rather than the other.

In commenting on the ACAS document the National Union of Teachers (one of its signatories) argued that it "was capable of varying interpretation" and therefore the use of the word 'agreement' was not strictly accurate. Indeed the union stated reservations about wording which could be interpreted ambiguously, and claimed they were shared by all the teachers' organisations represented on the ACAS Working Party. The reservations were as follows:

1. The reference to the "deployment of teachers" was capable of "misinterpretation and subsequent misuse". The union argued that whereas in one sense deployment constitutes an aspect of "successful and acceptable career development...it will bring to mind the process of redeployment to take account of falling rolls..."

2. Although the 'agreement' asserts that appraisal would be quite separate from disciplinary procedures, a connection between the two was implicit in the statement that the latter "might need to draw on relevant information from the appraisal records".

3.   Although the document argues that appraisal reports should be "regarded as transient, not as a final reckoning", the fact that they are available "to officers authorised by the CEO (Chief Education Officer)" implies the possibility of unspecified but wide access to them.

The union argued that records should be confidential to appraiser and appraisee, have an agreed life, and have access to them controlled by the appraisee. For the purposes of school-based management decisions "an appropriate separate extract" should be made available to the Headteacher.

4.   The reference concerning the application of appraisal results to the LEA management of the teaching force" is ambiguous. If this refers to better-informed arrangements for inservice-training, it is highly acceptable. However, teachers might be suspicious that it refers to other things; eg forcible redeployment, dismissal, etc.

What is clear is that the unions wished to eliminate ambiguities of expression which allowed managers to use appraisal as an instrument for compulsory redeployment and/or dismissal. The comments embrace a view of the legitimate functions of management in relation to teachers; those of enhancing and supporting their professional and career development. If the unions had succeeded in eliminating these ambiguities altogether from the document, then they would indeed have completely reversed the conception of appraisal

expressed in the government's 1983 White Paper. As it stands the ACAS document's ambiguities allowed for the possibility of establishing, at least in the context of the pilot expriments subsequently established in a few LEAs, a model of teacher appraisal in which managerialism is minimised and the management functions of appraisal subordinated to the purposes of professional and career development. Such subordination is most clearly expressed in procedurrl form by the NUT's view that documeatation available to the Headteacher for the purpose of school-based management decisions should consist only of extracts from the full appraisal record. This appears to imply a two-tier model consisting of a first tier of self and peer appraisal and a second-tier management appraisal. The management appraisal is dependent on data gathered in the first-tier prccess and selected by those involved in it.

I have argued that the 'professional' and 'management' functions of appraisal can only be reconciled through the development in practice of a two-tier model. This view was developed in a paper (see Elliott 1988) which looked at the implications of the ACAS agreement about staff appraisal in universities. Although the university teachers' document is not entirely lacking in ambiguity of expression, it does appear to be more explicit about subordinating management functions to teachers' professional and career development. For example, the stated purposes of appraisal are to:

(a) help...staff to develop their careers within the institution;

(b) improve staff performance;

(c) identify changes in the organisation or operation of the institution which would enable individuals to improve their performance;

(d) identify and develop potential for promotion;

(e) improve the efficiency with which the institution is managed.

There is no reference to the ambiguous term 'deployment'. Purpose (d) refers instead to identifying and developing potential for promotion. Inasmuch as 'deployment' is implicit in this objective, it is expressed in a manner acceptable to professionals.

Purpose (c) acknowledges the ways in which organisational contexts can enable or constrain the development of individuals' practices. Thus appraisal should involve the appraisee in assessing context as well as performance, and thereby identify for managers changes to organisational/institutional arrangements which will enable staff to improve their practices. Here the management function

of organisational development is clearly subordinated to the aim of improving professional practices.

Purpose (e) is perhaps the most obviously ambiguous statement. In one sense it can simply be interpreted as subordinate to purposes (a) - (d). In another sense it can legitimate linking appraisal to compulsory redeployment, dismissal proceedings, etc.

The criteria outlined in the universities' document also suggest a primary emphasis on professional and career development. For example, the appraisal process should:

"(d) encourage staff to reflect on their own performance, and to take steps to improve it;

(e) involve an appropriate mixture of self-assessment, informal interviewing and counselling. The appraisal process should be regarded as a joint professional task shared between appraiser and appraisee, with the latter involved at all stages. The views of students and others who are affected by the performance of staff should also be taken into account;

(f) provide for an agreed record of discussion, and of follow-up action;

(g) provide for staff to record dissent on an otherwise jointly agreed appraisal record;

(h)   provide for a second opinion in any serious case of disagreement between appraiser and appraisee;

(i)   provide for effective follow-up action in relation to staff development needs, weaknesses in organisation, provision of resources..."

In many respects these criteria are similar to those listed in the school teachers' document. But they are even more explicit in emphasising appraisal as a reciprocal or two-way process characterised by self-reflection, dialogue, and mutual trust. They are at pains to specify procedures to overcome any 'hierarchy of credibility' between the views of appraisers and appraisees.   The introduction of a 'second opinion' and 'student feed-back' can all be seen as a means to this end. Such possibilities are not specified in the school teachers' document.

When it comes to 'Institutional Arrangements' the university teachers' document gives appraisees "the right to request that an alternative appraiser be appointed" and to agree about the appointment.   The document also, like the schools' document, leaves room for non-management personnel to be designated as appraisers. However, in spite of its measures for securing reciprocity in the appraisal process, the relation between appraiser and appraisee is, as in the school teachers' document, largely conceived as a hierarchical relation.   Even when a manager is not the appraiser, management largely

controls selection through a power of designation. This opens the appraisal process to the risk of merely reproducing a hierarchical control over what are to count as credible judgements.

In comparing the school and university 'agreements' I would conclude that the former is rather higher in ambiguity about purposes and procedures. The latter tends to build in more explicit safeguards to counter managerial excess. However, both appear to give considerable leverage to those who wish to develop forms of appraisal which empower teachers to exercise greater control over their performance and careers, and thereby minimise managerial uses of appraisal. Nevertheless, I do not underestimate the fact that ambiguities in both documents are sufficient to give a considerable amount of leverage to those who wish to use appraisal as a system for legitimating managerial control over teachers' work and futures. The leverage lies essentially in the hierarchical relation between appraiser and appraisee, and the way this enables a consensus in judgements to be ideologically rather than rationally constructed; i.e. in a form which legitimates amd masks relations of domination between managers and the teaching force.

The ideological construction of appraisals: an example of how it can be done.

In this section I will attempt to demonstrate how an appraisal scheme, which appears to satisfy all the criteria specified in the ACAS framework for school teachers, can operate as a ritualistic mechanism for ideological construction. In doing so I shall focus on the practical guide produced by Suffolk Education Authority (1987), a Local Education Authority participating in the national pilot scheme. The guide outlines a concrete process which appears to have the exclusive aim of improving performance at all levels of the hierarchy in schools. There is no mention of using appraisal records for redeploying, dismissing, or even making decisions about who should or should not be promoted. Appraisal is also seen as a continuous, cyclical process of staff development in which the formal interview with an appraiser has been redefined as "the appraisal dialogue" and constitutes only one of its elements.

At each level of the school hierarchy individuals are appraised by their immediate superior, described in the guide as "their 'line manager'." But hierarchical control over the appraisal process is further reinforced by giving the appraiser's appraiser responsibility for monitoring the appraisee's progress six months after the formal appraisal dialogue. The role of the appraiser's appraiser is known as the appraisee's "grandparent". The point of such 'second-order' monitoring by

the 'grandparent' is stated as "a way of ensuring that help and support towards the attainment of targets has been/will be forthcoming".

Targets are referred to at some point in eleven of the 20 pages in the guide. It is a term which appears to structure each of the five "practical steps for appraisal" outlined.

At the stage of preparing for the "appraisal dialogue", the appraiser will consider the appraisee's job, performance, work related relationships, training/qualifications, past job experiences, attitude, and personal matters. A consideration of the job includes "targets sc· after last appraisal discussion", and any explicit standards that have been established for assessing the attainment of job-related targets. Considering the appraisee's actual performance includes:

"Targets attained or not;
Reasons for causes of non-attainment;...".

The appraisee's preparation is called "self-appraisal" and it appears to involve the same range of considerations.

One aspect of the preparation process is classroom observation, consisting of three components: planning, observation, and feed·back discussion. Appraisers are told to "make observations throughout the school year - a minimum of four

hours (including time to feed back)." In planning for
observation they should, amongst other things:

"make certain that each teacher is aware that the

observation of what happens in the classroom will

be related both to overall performance and any pre-

established targets".

Making the teacher so aware is likely to focus his/her
attention on target-attainment during the observed lessons.
The guide suggests that during the feed-back discussion a "good
obse. ver" should:

"-allow the teacher to talk;
-check progress towards previously established targets;
-focus on a limited number of areas (not more than three)
 for remedy/improvement/setting targets;
-ensure careful recording so that commitments and
 suggestions to support improvements are not lost;
-enable the teacher to diagnose his/her own performance
 and to suggest future needs and targets;
-leave the teacher wanting to repeat the process".

In spite of the guidance that the feed-back session should give
the appraisee opportunities to talk and evaluate their own
performance, it is clear that the discourse is framed by a
particular conception of how good teaching should be appraised;
namely, in terms of its instrumental effectiveness in achieving

<u>pre-specified</u> <u>targets</u>. This conception is presumed to be non-problematic. The notes of guidance nowhere suggest that this view of good teaching is highly contestable. In other words the terms in which 'the discussion' is couched pre-empt the raising of certain issues about what constitutes good teaching.

Not only do the notes of guidance prescribe a feed-back session which enables progress in attaining pre-determined targets to be evaluated, but they also give the observer the role of suggesting further targets for the teacher to achieve. One function of these sessions then appears to be to keep the teachers' attention focused on targets to be achieved. This surely is also the point of asking observers to record their advice about how appraisees can improve their performance. Such advice would include targets to be aimed at and strategies for meeting them. In this way the appraiser can remind him/herself and the appraisee at some future point of the targets the latter should be aiming at.

Keeping the teacher's thinking focused on targets is also the point of keeping their number small. Having to think about many targets can result in a situation where the teacher is no longer able to focus his/her mind on any. However, focusing on only two or three targets, as recommended, encourages the teacher to regard teaching as a simple technical enterprise, rather than a conmplex practice whose specific elements need to be appraised in the light of the whole. Focusing attention

19

continuously on a few targets is a good recipe for ensuring that the teacher is unable to "see the wood for the trees".

My interpretation of the Suffolk principles for observers is that they specify a form of control over the way teachers reflect and talk about their performance while appearing to foster self-evaluation, dialogue, and trust. If I am correct, then the view that good teaching consists of its instrumental effectiveness in achieving pre-specified targets is an ideological construction which serves the purpose of hierarchically controlling performance.

The processs outlined above constitutes a preparation for "the appraisal dialogue" between appraiser and appraisee. The latter is described as a summative appraisal, in the sense that it culminates in a formally recorded summary of a discussion about the appraisee's performance to date and of agreements reached concerning future targets and the training and support the appraisee needs to achieve them. The notes of guidance lists and defines the criteria the appraisal dialogue should satisfy. It must be objective, honest, constructive, valid, two-way, developmental, effective, realistic, and encouraging. At a first glance few would disagree. The criteria as a whole appear to embrace a concern for both grounding judgements in factual evidence and giving positive guidance. However, 'objectivity' and 'honesty' are defined in ways which appear to rule out of the appraisal dialogue judgements which go beyond the facts of performance to focus on the personal qualities it

manifests. It is implied that such judgements are inevitably conditioned or biased by the subjective values of the appraiser. The notes of guidance provide the following definitions of objectivity and honesty:

"Objective - by removing prejudice, subjective/
unsubstantiated comment, and personality clashes.

Honest - by giving the teacher an accurate picture
of where he/she stands."

I would suggest some alternative definitions of these concepts:

Honest - by making the personal biases and prejudices
which underpin one's judgements clear to the teacher.

Objective - being open to critiques of one's judgements
by the teacher.

Embedded in these alternative sets of definitions are two quite different accounts of the object of appraisal. The first set encourage the appraiser to focus on the technical dimension of performance; on its instrumental effectiveness or consequences. Objective judgements of instrumental effectiveness are grounded entirely in factual evidence about the extent to which a course of action brings about its intended consequences (or targets). In the context of judging instrumental effectiveness objectively, an honest appraisal

will be one in which the appraiser accurately represents the factual evidence of instrumental effectiveness, i.e. telling the appraisee where he/she stands in relation to his/her targets.

The criterial definitions of objectivity and honesty contained in the Suffolk guide presuppose that the appraisal dialogue is about the instrumental effectiveness of performance. It is in this context that one needs to locate the suggestions that the appraiser's role within the appraisal dialogue should be a positive one; constructive, effective, realistic. Since appraisals of instrumental effectiveness can be justified entirely by the facts about performance, such facts can also serve as a basis on which the appraiser can secure agreements about future courses of action. They legitimate this 'positive' role because they enable the appraiser to make 'constructive' and 'realistic' suggestions for improvements, based on evidence of "strengths and past achievements", which the appraisee can accept.

The logic underpinning the criterial definitions of the appraiser's role in the appraisal interviews is as follows. By getting appraisees to see their performance from an instrumental point of view the appraiser is able to secure their agreement to a future plan of action. In other words the adoption of such a perspective by appraisees enables appraisers to control the outcome of the appraisal dialogue, and therefore the appraisee's future performance. The dialogue proceeds in a

'rational' sequence beginning, as the Suffolk guide advocates, "with the appraisee's 'self-appraisal'" and ending "with a set of mutually agreed targets". The initial 'self-appraisal', structured in terms of attainment targets, reinforces an instrumental view of practice, and thereby establishes the strong possibility that the appraisal dialogue will culminate in a consensus.

The alternative definitions of 'objectivity' and 'honesty', which I provided, presuppose a radically different perspective on teaching and its appraisal. They presuppose a value perspective which is expressed in judgements about the qualitative, rather than purely technical, aspects of performance. The qualitative dimension of teaching is manifested within the performance itself rather than its results. It constitutes the extent to which teachers realise or fail to realise in their interactions with students those values which define their professional identities as educators, eg care and respect for students as persons, a concern to protect and foster their powers of understanding, and respect for their potential as self-actualising and self-determining beings.

This view of teaching as a moral practice does not exclude the technical dimension but places it in a broader context of educational values. Appraisals of teaching are not viewed simply as judgements of instrumental effectiveness. They involve critiques of intended targets and/or the methods

employed to achieve them, on the basis of perceived inconsistencies with the professional values and principles which constitute teaching as an _educational_ process. Such critiques will inevitably be perceived by appraisees as threatening to some extent. They are not just critiques of performance but also of the professional 'self', or identity it manifests. Such critiques render a teacher's sense of self problematic.

This problem of identity is not necessarily resolved by an appeal to the facts. Such facts may be ambiguously interpreted because appraiser and appraisee disagree about what the professional values of teachers ought to be, or what constitutes evidence of their manifestation in practice. The appropriate context for handling such contestable appraisals is open and free dialogue in which appraiser and appraisee reflect together about their own and each other's interpretations of the facts and the evaluative perspectives embedded in them. In this context the concept of 'objectivity' and 'honesty' take on rather different meanings to the ones they possess in the context of purely technical dialogue. Moreover, such dialogue need not result in total agreement. Both appraiser and appraisee may emerge from it having modified and changed their views. Through it they may both develop their personal understanding of professional values, and what constitutes a realisation of them in practice, but still 'beg to differ' in some respects. It would be quite inappropriate for the appraiser to attempt to

secure agreement to a future plan of action.   Moral dialogue
about teaching, when genuine, gives the teacher the right to
self-determine his/her own future practice.

Genuine moral dialogue keeps the threat experienced by moral
appraisals of teaching to a level which stimulates but does
not inhibit self-reflection.   But it is quite inconsistent
with a hierarchical relation between appraiser and appraisee.
When moral appraisals are hierarchically structured the level
of threat is inevitably high.   The existence   of the
hierarchical relation symbolises   the   uncontestable   moral
authority of the appraiser.

In an earlier document (1986) Suffolk Education Authority
advised that appraisal should not involve inferences about the
personal qualities manifested in performance.   This policy is
not simply about   reassuring   teachers.   The trade-off it
secures is to reduce the threat and anxiety hierarchical
appraisal arouses in teachers in exchange for getting them to
accept purely instrumental conceptions of their practices.

The policy of ruling out inferences about the personal
qualities of teachers constitutes a mechanism of 'ideology
formation' because it focuses attention on quantifiable
performance targets.   According to Suffolk's practical guide,
targets should "be stated in clear, unambiguous languag   be
few in number...; be measurable or observable".   This 'target
ideology'   facilitates   hierarchical   control   ove.   the

performances of teacher. The targets are largely derived from 'the job description', and department, school, LEA policies. They are hierarchically imposed, rather than self-generated within a framework of professional values.

The alternative way of reducing the threat and anxiety of appraisal is to construe it as a form of unsequenced moral discourse between professional peers which enables each person to develop capacities (eg of reflexivity) for self-determining improvements in the quality of their teaching. The final phase of the appraisal process outlined by Suffolk is the monitoring of the appraiser's 'help and support' by the appraisee's 'grandparent'; a procedure which reinforces hierarchical control over the latter's thinking and performance.

The Suffolk appraisal process poses the danger of alienating the professional self of a teacher from his/her performance. If successful, teaching will lack 'soul' because the teacher will lose touch with him/herself. Teacher development then becomes a process of acquiring low-level technical/instrumental skills, in contrast to a process of developing the professional wisdom to realise educational values in concrete forms of action. Competence gets defined as a mastery of techniques rather than a mastery of the self in the service of the professional values it professes. The teacher becomes deprofessionalised and transformed into a

technician, thereby losing a professional identity which
defined by the values of the professional culture.

Teacher appraisal of the Suffolk variety can be interpreted as
an attack on the professional culture, since it isolates the
individual teacher from the influence of peers by bringing
his/her performance under the direct surveillance and control
of a 'line manager'. In this way discourse about practice is
hierarchised (???), and institutionalised opportunities for
lateral communication and the sharing of experience betwe.
peers restricted. The development of a distinctive
professional culture is jeopardised. Claims by teachers to
have a special knowledge and understanding of the aims and
processes of education get interpreted as rationalisations for
'restrictive practices' which are inconsistent with providing
an efficient service to the consumers of education.

Appraisal of the kind I have described can be viewed as part
of a broader political strategy to transform the cultures of
social organisations which have previously provided a buffer;
a social space between individuals and the state. Nicholas
Boyle (1988) has argued that such autonomous or semi-
autonomous organisations have protected individuals from
direct state interference and given "shape and substance and
continuity to their lives, a focus for loyalty and a place of
engagement with other citizens that is not simply an extension
of the market-place..." Boyle suggests that the most

significant of all these attacks on intermediate organisations
has been our present government's assault on the professions:

"The case of the professions is significant because
it shows that Thatcherism is indeed hostile to the
whole range of social institutions that are not part
of the state, and not simply to those that exercise
quasi-government functions. A profession is by definition
a corporation that restricts its membership by other than
market considerations, and professional standards are
standards imposed not by the market but by the opinion
of fellow-professionals. You cannot have professional
standards without professional restrictive practices
and an assault on restrictive practices is an assault on
the professional institutions themselves."

He goes on to conclude that:

"There is no room in the Thatcherite view for any social
units larger than the individual, and the individual
has his identity only as a unit of consumption or of
labour, not as one who shares in the life of any
institution...

...in a consumer society people's labour is expensive.
This, however, does not mean that in it people them-
selves are of worth...Like expensive computing time,
people must be used to the full when switched on and

be either instantly transferable to another function
when one job is completed or else simply switched off.
In the language of Thatcherism: people - that is workers -
must be flexible, or unemployed...They are in short to be
dismembered, reduced to a series of functions that they
exercise in accordance with no principle of continuity of
their own choosing but only with the demands of the
market".

One could view the Suffolk practical guide to Appraisal as a
micro-political strategy for penetrating the professional
culture and subordinating those elements which restrict the
utility of individuals as marketable commodities.   In this
view it constitutes a device for reducing the individual
teacher to a flexible resource in the labour market: one with
an infinitely plastic and malleable nature, capable of being
remoulded in whatever shape is required. Within the Suffolk
scheme performance targets can be continuously redefined in
the light of changing job descriptions and LEA, school, and
departmental policies. Appraisal can then be used as a device
for rationalising the acquisition and distribution of
marketable skills.   Redeployment doesn't have to be made
explicit as a function of appraisal. The possibility of using
appraisal in this way is implicit in the very form and
structure of the process outlined in the practical guide; one
which embodies the assumption that 'professional development'
is the individualistic and possessive process of acquiring
techniques.

Appraisal, as advocated in the Suffolk guide, is not simply a
strategy which operates on the professional soul of the
teacher. It is also a strategy which operates on the soul of
the manager. Within an autonomous professional organisation
managers are professional leaders. Their task is to regulate,
orchestrate, and co-ordinate the activities of individuals so
that they realise shared professional goals, values and
standards. But within an overall assault on intermediate
organisations by the state, managers are pressurised into
detaching themselves from the professional culture to become
agents of state control at the workface. Teacher appraisal
schemes which construct an ideology of teaching also construct
an ideology of school management which legitimates it as an
agency of state control.

The Suffolk guide should not be viewed as an idiosyncratic
interpretation of the criteria established in national
agreements. Hewton (1988) in a 'State of Play' review of the
national scene suggests that the general trend is to embrace
"a 'top down' form of appraisal involving interviews conducted
by a senior person - either a headteacher, deputy head or head
of department." He refers to alternative approaches which
have evolved organically in some schools outside the process
of national policy development. They "relate to self-
evaluation and peer appraisal (as distinct from line
management appraisal)", but Hewton concludes that "it is
unlikely these will play a major part in any widely adopted
scheme." Schemes of appraisal currently being devised in some

universities' also appear to be taking a similar hierarchical shape. The use of appraisal as a management tool seems to be an immovable force.

Is a counter-hegemonic practice of appraisal possible?

Outside the context of the national pilot schemes many LEAs have, in spite of some initial and I believe misguided pressure from the teachers' unions, proceeded with the development of appraisal schemes in their schools. Some LEAs have done so with the quite explicit intention of supporting the organic development of appraisal schemes from the grass-roots. Their hope is that these can then be accommodated to any extensions of the ACAS criteria resulting from the national pilot schemes. Such LEAs are aware that the government may wish to establish standardised procedures and strategies nationally, rather than allow variation within a criterial framework which is open to ambiguous interpretations. In which case overt conflict is likely to emerge between national and some local appraisal policies. However, the hope is that only an amended criterial framework will be established.

Those LEAs fostering 'bottoms up' development can be viewed as facilitating a counter-hegemonic strategy. But it is not simply an 'oppositional' one. Rather it is an exercise in creative conformity; a strategy for securing a form of

appraisal which genuinely fosters <u>professional</u> development, yet at the same time appears to conform to the nationally negotiated rhetoric. Some of these 'counter-hegemonic' LEAs are now in a position to observe some of the developments they have initiated coming to fruition, and may be grateful that they were not invited to participate in the national pilots. The latter involves the implementation of schemes which tended to be bureaucratically constructed in the light of the ACAS criteria. Developments in some LEAs outside the national pilots have emerged from official support for the dissemination, comparison, and discussion amongst the teaching profession of school initiated schemes. In at least one of these LEAs a 'creative compromise' is emerging between peer and management-based appraisal. The London Borough of Enfield is evolving a two-tier model.

Earlier I suggested that something like a two-tier model was implicit in the NUT's reservations about ambiguities in the ACAS agreement. Indeed in one earlier paper (see Elliott 1988) I attempted to articulate this model in a more explicit form, using teachers' based action-research as the paradigm for the first-tier peer appraisal.

Teachers-based action research can be characterised as follows:

1. It focuses on the identification, clarification, and resolution of problems teachers face in realising their

educational values in practice. As a form of inquiry it is a practical/moral rather than theoretical/technical science.

2. It involves joint reflection on means and ends. Educational values as ends are defined by the concrete actions a teacher selects as the means of realising them. Such values are realised in a teacher's interactions with students and not as an extrinsic outcome of them. Teaching activities constitute practical interpretations of values. Therefore in reflecting about the quality of his/her teaching a teacher must reflect about the concepts of value which shape and give it form.

3. It is a reflexive practice. As a form of self-evaluation or self-appraisal, action-research is not simply a matter of the teacher evaluating his/her actions from any perspective, eg that of their technical effectiveness. It is primarily a matter of the teacher evaluating the qualities of his/her 'self' as they are manifested in their actions. From this perspective such actions are conceived as moral practices rather than mere expressions of techniques. Self-appraisal in the context of a moral practice involves a particular type of self-reflection; namely, reflexivity.

4. It integrates theory into practice. <u>Educational</u> theories are viewed as systems of values, ideas, and beliefs which are represented not so much in a propositional form, as in a form of practice. Such theories are developed by reflectively

improving practices. Theory development and the improvement of practice are not viewed as separate processes.

5. It involves dialogue with professional peers. Inasmuch as teachers strive through action-research to realise professional values in action, they are accountable for the outcome to their professional peers. Such accountability is expressed in the production of records which document changes in practice and the processes of deliberation/reflection through which they were brought about.

Whitehead (1989) has argued that such records tacitly imply a teacher's claim to self-understanding, i.e. to know his/her own professional development. Such a claim constitutes an invitation to peers to engage in a professional dialogue about the validity of a teacher's practical interpretations of educational values as these are evidenced in the records provided. This kind of dialogue can influence a teacher's self-understanding and stimulate new direction for practical inquiry. Self-appraisal and peer-appraisal are both integral to educational action-research.

The process I have described above is barely accommodated within the kind of management-led appraisal illustrated in the Suffolk practical guide. The peer appraisal is distorted by being individualised and hierarchised in the form of the formal appraisal interview. Accountability is exercised upwards to a line-manager rather than laterally to a

professional peer-group. I have already demonstrated how the discourse of the hierarchical formal interview is structured in a manner which rules out the kind of free and open dialogue cited in 5, and by implication the conception of teaching as a moral practice such dialogue rests on. In focusing attention on the instrumental effectiveness of actions, the discourse structure of the hierarchical interview encourages teachers to dissociate their actions from the educational values which define their identities as professionals. The appraisal interview permits reflection on the technical aspects of performance but not a reflexivity in which teachers evaluate their actions as manifestations of 'self' in the light of the educational values they profess.

Now of course it can be argued that discourse about targets can refer as much to values as to concrete objectives. Why, for example, cannot a commitment to the value of fostering co-operative learning be defined in terms of tangible targets. The answer is quite simple. To do so would be to distort and inhibit the development of a teacher's understanding of what it means to foster co-operative learning. Such an understanding can never be finally fixed. It develops and evolves through continuing reflection by a teacher about the strategies s/he adopts to foster co-operative learning in a range and variety of contexts. To operationally define strategies for fostering co-operative learning in the form of fixed targets is to pre-empt the kind of reflective process described in 3.

It is not only the peer appraisal which is distorted by the structure of discourse in the hierarchical formal appraisal inerview. The meaning of self-appraisal is distorted by focusing attention on the technical aspects of teaching, and neglecting the moral aspects. This happens not only within the interview itself. The value of the earlier self-appraisal and classroom observation phases is construed purely in instrumental terms; as a preparation for the appraisal interview rather than as a worthwhile professional development process in iteself. The result is that these phases are also individualised and hierarchised. The self-appraising teacher reflects in isolation from his/her professional peers, and in the light of a hierarchically constructed agenda of questions. The questions for self-appraisal are not self-constructed. Similarly, classroom observation is not a reciprocal arrangement between peers but a hierarchically managed procedure.

A two-tier model of appraisal, in which action-research constitutes a first-tier process, would prevent self and peer appraisal being distorted by the individualisation and hierarchization which results from their subordination to the formal appraisal interview. The first-tier would constitute a process of professional development in itself, capable of enabling individuals to identify their own learning needs and determining how these are best provided for. Indeed it would be a major task of management to facilitate and support such an action-research process at the organisational level, eg

with respect to the provision of time for reflection, peer observation, and teachers' meetings.

However, the two-tier model also acknowledges the legitimate appraisal functions of management. The latter need to monitor the extent to which the first-tier process is enabling the professional development of staff, and they need to assess the potential contribution of individuals to roles and tasks within the organisation. The records constructed by individuals, and 'validated' in dialogue with peers, during the course of the first-tier process of action-research, would constitute the data-base for a management-led appraisal of how individual potentials might be developed and used to the benefit of the institution. Such records would incorporate accounts of the validating dialogue with peers, in which areas of agreement and disagreement were documented. Within this two-tier model, the individual teacher in discussion with peers would select and organise the material for the formal appraisal interview. Access of managers to performance data would therefore be controlled by appraisees and their peers, and release of data would depend upon the confidence and trust the latter were able to establish with the former. Part of this would involve establishing agreements about the conditions governing access to the second-tier appraisal records beyond the boundaries of the institution.

The advantage of the two-tier model is that it limits the use of teacher appraisal to management functions which can easily

be legitimated to professionals in educational institutions.
The formal interview can provide an opportunity for managers
to engage in genuine two-way dialogue with those at 'the
chalk-face' about how the organisation can both meet
professional needs and support the development of demonstrated
potential.

At least one LEA, the London Borough of Enfield, has been
encouraging its teachers to discuss the possibility of
developing this two-tier model in schools (see Boothroyd and
Burbidge 1988). This is partly due to my own involvement as a
consultant for Enfield on teacher appraisal. But it is also
due to the fact that one of the first schcols in Enfield to
organically evolve its own appraisal scheme appeared to do so
along two-tier lines. Boothroyd and Burbi ` two senior
teachers released from their schools to stim . reflection
about appraisal in the teaching force, case studied this
school, and argue that its development of a two-strand model
was an example of "the removal of threat by creating
ownership". They claim that:

> "The staff were concerned that the appraisal should
> not be done by one person, and that observation of
> lessons would pose a potential threat. Through
> consultation and staff discussion a model of peer
> group observation was developed."

There is some evidence that the 'bottom up' development of
two-tier schemes in response to the threat of managerial
models - which individualise, hierarchise, and technologise
appraisal processes - is not an isolated event. Reports of
such schemes, from those responsible for monitoring
developments in LEAs which have opted for organic development,
are on the increase. The growth of such schemes can be
explained in terms of the professional culture's response to
the managerial hegemony expressed in many of the national
pilot schemes.

Two-tier approaches constitute, as Boothroyd and Burbidge
claim, a strategy for removing threat by creating ownership.
They constitute what I have termed a creative compromise
between the prevailing professional culture and the growth of
management in educational institutions. Such a compromise is
more than a mere accommodation to elements of an invading
culture, as the development of individualised, hierarchised
and technologised approaches like the Suffolk scheme appear to
be. The latter do indeed embrace certain features of the
dominant professional culture of teachers. The incorporation
of the classroom observation element, for example, reflects
the priority teachers give to work in classrooms with
students; their feeling that professional acknowledgements
and rewards should be largely based on appraisals of such work
and that inservice training resources should largely be
directed to helping them function better in classrooms. But
these accommodations do not prevent appraisal from being used

as a device for ideologically reconstructing the culture of
teachers, so that they come to view their performance in
classrooms in ways which legitimate the hegemony of the state.
The creative component in the two-tier approach is that it not
only breaks this hegemony but also establishes new conditions
for the development of the professional culture.

The traditional culture of teachers has largely taken the form
of craft knowledge; 'know-how' encapsulated in behavioural
repertoires   which are transmitted as commonsense 'tips'
within the professional peer group and fine-tuned in trial and
error experience of numerous classroom settings.   The craft
knowledge embodied in the behavioural repertoires experienced
teachers draw on, is largely treated as a matter of
commonsense. The values, ideas, and beliefs which underpin it
are not in the main objects of conscious reflection.   The
craft culture does not necessarily entail reflexive practice.

The growth of the educational action-research movement within
the UK over the past 25 years marks a transformation from the
traditional craft culture to a reflective culture in which
teaching strategies are perceived as potentially problematic
and therefore objects of reflective deliberation in particular
contexts.   Within a reflective professional culture teaching
strategies are treated as provisional, context-dependent, and
hypothetical.   Such   a   culture   also   generates   analytic
frameworks which enable teachers to anticipate problems and

issues particular strategies may pose with respect to the realisation of educational aims and values.

It may well be the case that the organic development of two-tier approaches to teacher appraisal in schools is drawing on the legacy of the action-research movement, which first evolved during the '60s in the UK during a period of widespread curriculum reforms. Although action-research emerged organically in the UK as part of teachers' initiated curriculum reform (see Elliott 1988), its underlying logic and methodology was explicated and refined within the Schools Council Humanities Project under the academic direction of Lawrence Stenhouse. The subsequent growth of the educational action-research movement has been sustained, and methodclogically sophisticated and systematised in the context of inservice professional development programmes designed and staffed by teacher educators in higher education establishments. The impact of such progre s on the development of the professional culture of teachers within the UK has ye to be systematically evaluated.

It is significant that the action-research movement emerged as the pace of social change rendered the traditional craft practices of teachers problematic. In other words, it is only when social change renders the commonsense wisdom of the craft culture problematic that teachers experience a need to engage in deliberative reflection about their educational values and how best to realise them in practice.

However, an additional stimulus to the development of a
reflective professional culture in the late 60s and early 70s
was the threat of increasing political control over
educational practices in schools. The threat was manifested
in early attempts to establish, through curriculum reform
projects at the national level, sets of behaviourally defined
learning outcomes. Stenhouse explicitly resisted
accommodating the specification of behavioural objectives
within the Humanities Project, and generated an oppositional
'process model' of curriculum development as the basis for the
project's design (see Stenhouse 1975). This 'process model'
was characterised by a specification of a teaching-learning
process in terms of educational values which it was the task
of teachers to reflectively realise in their practices. At
the heart of the 'process model' stood the teacher as a
researcher. The experience of the threat of
political/administrative regulation over the practices of
teachers was indeed part of the conditions which stimulated
the emergence of the action-research movement in the UK over
25 years ago.

Although the emergence of counter-hegemonic two-tier appraisal
schemes from 'the grassroots' may owe a great deal to the
impact of the educational action-research movement on the
professional culture, we must also view such schemes as
indications of the further growth and development of a
reflective and critical professional culture. The threat of a
managerially transmitted hegemony in the form of teacher

appraisal has itself established a condition which stimulates the further growth of action-research as a central feature of the professional culture of teachers. The threat, although real, opens up creative possibilities for the transformation of teachers' professional culture. Two-tier schemes grounded in action-research illustrate such possibilities. They are not simply strategies of resistance which accommodate a degree of compromise. The resistance takes the form of a very creative compromise indeed.

Foucault (1980) has argued that:

"There are no relations of power without resistances;
the latter are all the more real and effective because
they are formed right at the point where relations of
power are exercised; resistance to power does not have
to come from elsewhere to be real, nor is it inexorably
frustrated through being the compatriot of power. It
exists all the more by being in the same place as power;
hence, like power, resistance is multiple and can be
integrated in global strategies."

In his book Theory and Resistance in Education (1983) Giroux
argues that Foucault's analysis of power relations reminds us
that they are never uni-dimensional. Power expressed as
domination is countered by power expressed as resistance.
According to Giroux we lack an adequate account of resistance
to the hegemony of the state in educational institutions, and
he warns us against equating resistance with any form of
oppositional behaviour. The former has a creative and
productive dimension which the latter may lack. He claims
that:

"...inherent in a radical notion of resistance is an
expressed hope, an element of transcendence, for
radical transformation - a notion that appears to be
missing from a number of radical theories of education

that appear trapped in the theoretical cemetery of
Orwellian pessimism."

The theories he refers to are those based on an interpretation
of Marx which implies that social practices are determined by,
and reproduce, the prevailing power-relations within society.
Such theories view teachers and schools as passive vehicles of
social reproduction.   Giroux argues that as a theoretical
construct the idea of resistance points to a need to:

"Understand more thoroughly the complex ways in which
people mediate and respond to the interface between
their own lived experiences and structures of
domination and constraint."

The study of the emergence of two-tier schemes of teacher
appraisal may indeed give us a keener appreciation of how the
lived experience of teachers in clasrooms and schools
interacts with structures of domination enforced by the
agencies of the state.

I would suggest that it is a mistake to view the professional
culture of teachers and the values, ideas, and beliefs of
which it consists solely as ideological structures which shape
practice and legitimate its subordination to the purposes of
the state. Such a view, expressed by many radical educational
theorists, adopts what Block (1987) calls an anthropological
heory of cognition.   This theory, partly derived from

Durkheim, asserts that our everyday practices ar determined by cognitive structures which are derived from history and tradit. n rather than experience. These historically transmitted collective representations of reality (cuitures) are then defined as ideologies, or misrepresentations of reality, by incorporating Marx's explanation of certain cognitive structures as legitimating relations of domiration and thereby preventing people from becoming aware of their real interests.

Block points out that anthropologists, and others who draw on their ideolological theory of cognition, have forgotten that in the German Ideology Marx discussed two types of processes in the formation of everyday practical knowledge. He argued that some aspects of cognition were the products of interaction with the environment and other people. According to Block this latter type of explanation is very similar to "the well documented conclusion of modern developmental psychologists that the child forms concepts as the result of a pre-linguistic analytic process on the basis of interactions with the environment". In other words, "a child is not taught categories or modes of reasoning but constructs them from his experience..." Block concludes that such a well-documented finding of developmental psychologists "rules out the view that cognition is an arbitrary scheme developed outside practical experience and learned ready-made from elders and betters..." Everyday practical knowledge, according to Block, is not all of a kind but the outcome of "at least two

fundamentally different processes"; namely, the transmission
of misrepresentations of reality which legitimate rela _ons of
exploitation and domination, and the construction of
representations on the basis of interaction with the natural
and social environment. The latter is the primary process.
Such processes for transmitting ideologies depend on
commonsense knowledge which is developed through interaction
with the natural and social environment. Ideology affirms and
negates commonsense knowledge. Block argues that this is how
"ideology can mystify, invert and hide the real conditions of
existence". I have argued in this paper that some teacher
appraisal emes operate to transmit and sustain
misrepresentations of teaching. They do this by distorting
representations of teaching which emerge from the practical
experience of encountering students in classrooms.

Teaching involves influ ncing students in a manner which
enables them to learn. It is therefore experienced as an
activity directed towards an end; namely, learning. But
encounters with students generate conceptions of moral
obligation to them in their capacity as learners. It is from
such interpersonal encounters that teachers construct both the
concept of learning as their end in view and the concepts of
value which guide the means they employ to realising it. This
experience of teaching as a moral enterprise (see Elliott
1989) is both affirmed and negated when teachers are
manipulated into adopting an instrumental view of their
activity. Such a view holds that the end of teaching is

learning and that it is a source of moral obligation. In this way the instrumental ideology affirms aspects of a teacher's practical experience. But it also negates that experience in viewing learning as a product of the teacher's activity rather than an enabling activity which is constituted as such by its ethical qualities. Within the framework of an ideology which separates conceptions of ends form con eptions of means, ethical obligations become displaced. They become associated with a teacher's commitment to producing quantifiable end-states in students, rather than with a commitment to realising certain qualities in his/her interactions with them as learners.

I would argue that there are limits on the extent to which educational practices can simply reproduce an instrumental ideology which legitimates the hegemony of the state. These limits are experienced in the everyday encounters that teachers have with their students, and manifest themselves as problems within those encounters. Such problems may not be consciously articulated but experienced as feelings of irritation, frustration, and anger which arise when students demonstrate an unwillingness to be treated as infinitely plastic and malleable material which can be moulded into any desired shape the system requires. These feelings may also be accompanied by feelings of guilt. For there is a sense in which the teacher 'knows' what s/he is doing; namely, transcending certain ethical limits in his/her pedagogical relation with students. This experience of dilemmas within

the pedagogical relation arises from a tension within the self-understanding of the teacher, between its ideologically structured elements and those elements which s/he has constructed on the basis of classroom experience.

The professional cultures of teachers constitute resources of knowledge they draw on for interpreting classroom situations and making decisions within them. Their practices cannot be explained solely in terms of the reproduction of ideologically structured knowledge. Professional cultures will include ideological elements, but also ways of understanding which evolve on the basis of teachers' experience of pedagogical environments. As pedagogical environments change over time these ways of understanding are continuously reconstructed. Professional cultures are not static but dynamic practical traditions continuously reconstructed by teachers on the basis of experience.

This interaction between professional cultures and practical experience often occurs below the level of conscious self-reflection. The acquisition and utilisation of professional knowledge is a largely tacit and intuitive process. It is only when teachers experience severe dilemmas which arise from conflicting elements in their self-understanding of what they are doing, that they are prompted into conscious self-reflection. The emergence of a reflective practice is both a critical and creative enterprise. It is critical because it involves a critique of the ideologically distorted components

of teachers' self-understandings in the light of their reflections upon experience. It is creative because, in attempting to resolve dilemmas in their self-understandings, teachers develop new ways of understanding the relationship between educational values and their practices. On the basis of my experience as a facilitator of educational action-research in schools and classrooms I would assert that this self-reflective process always involves teachers clarifying the nature of the dilemmas evidenced in their practices and the ambiguous self-understandings they manifest.

The emergence of action-research within a two-tier model of appraisal is a response to both an internal and external threat, and the two are not unconnected. The internal threat implicit in the experience of dilemmas is to the values which define the professional identities of teachers as educators; iden_ities established in numerous encounters with students in classrooms. Feelings of being threatened stem from the pressure on teachers to reproduce ideological conceptions of practice which legitimate the hegemony of the state. This is why the imposition of a hierarchised appraisal scheme is experienced as a threat. Such a scheme reinforces the ideological components in teachers' practices and thereby enhances the dilemmas experienced by the 'educational self'. The connection, between the threat of formal appraisal schemes and the dilemmas teachers experience in their everyday interactions with students, explains why the former can stimulate the growth of educational action-research in

schools as a form of resistance to ideological hegemony. The growth of school-based action-research as a form of ideological resistance expressed in two-tier shcemes of appraisal, implies that the source of resistance to the hegemony of the state lies in teachers' own self-understandings of their practices; in the ambiguities and tensions implicit in them.

There is a dangerous account of action-research currently being perpetuated by certain radical theorists who have been influenced by the critical theory of Jurgen Habermas (see McCarthy 1978). Such theorists have tended to perpetuate an assumption contained in the anthropological theory of cognition; namely, that the self-understandings teachers have of their everyday practices constitute ideologically distorted misrepresentations of reality. Therefore a critique of ideology must come from understandings generated by a critical social science. It is the task of such a science to provide teachers with critical theorems which explain how their self-understandings misrepresesnt teaching and learning processes and legitimate hegemony.

Of course, all this involves a dialogue between the critical educational theorist and teachers, since a critical theory can only be validated in teachers' own self-understandings as it prompts them to reflect upon their experience of classrooms and schools. Nevertheless, action-research tends to be portrayed as a process which depends on an external source for

51

theory generation. Teachers' self-understandings of their practices, unassisted by a critical social science, cannot constitute the source of an ideology critique, since they are themselves products of ideological conditioning. It follows that teachers' self-understandings cannot alone serve as the basis for their emancipation from ideological control. Teachers need to be emancipated through interaction with the critical theorems of the educational scientist.

This position tends to permeate, sometimes ambiguously, what has now become a major source of action-reserach theory; namely, Carr and Kemmis' <u>Becoming Critical: Knowing through Action-Research</u> (1983). The dominance of the anthropological theory of cognition in this work is illustrated hw the following passages in which the authors are commenting on and apparently endorsing Habermas' conception of critical theory:

"...any reduction of the social sciences to the explication of subjective meanings ['self-understandings': my brackets] fails to recognise that the subjective meanings that characterise social life are themselves conditioned by an objective context that limits both the scope of individuals' intentions and the possibility of their realisation."

"...emancipatory interest requires going beyond any narrow concerns with subjective meaning in order

to acquire an emancipatory knowledge of the

objective framework within which communication

and social action occur. It is with this emancipatory

knowledge that a critical social science is essentially

concerned."

"...if, as Habaermas concedes, self-reflection and self-

understanding may be distorted by social conditions,

then the rational capabilities of human beings for

self-emancipation will only be realised if critical

theory can elucidate these conditions and reveal how

they can be eliminated."

"The Verstehen method ['eliciting subjective

understandings': my brackets] is insufficient...

because it provides no critical basis for rendering

the nature of social life problematic."

All of the passages appear to deny the possibility that
teachers' self-understandings of their practices can alone
constitute a source of critical self-reflection and
emancipatory action. The authors neglect the ambiguities,
conflicts and tensions contained within these self-
understandings, and therefore do not seriously entertain the
possibility of a self-generating, reflexive, and critical
pedagogy emerging as a form of action-research. It is a
possibility which renders false the distinction Carr and

Kemmis draw between a 'practical' and 'emancipatory' paradigm of action-research.

I have argued, to the contrary, that a self-generating critical pedagogy is possible as a form of creative resistance to the hegemony of the state, and that it is evidenced in the emergence of two-tier approaches to teacher appraisal. A detailed study of such approaches may well advance our understanding of how the power of the state interacts with the professional culture of teachers.

References

Block, M. (1985) 'From Cognition to Ideology', in R. Forden (ed.) Power and Knowledge : Anthropological and Sociological Approaches Scottish Academic Press: Edinburgh

Boothroyd, D. and Burbridge, S. (1988) Teacher Appraisal? Enfield Teachers' Centre, London Borough of Enfield, U.K.

Boyle, N. (1988) 'Understanding Thatcherism' in New Blackfriars, Summer '88

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1983) Becoming Critical: Knowing Through Action Research Ch.5, pp132-141, Deakin University Press, Victoria, Australia

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals/Association of University Teachers (1987) Career Development and Staff Appraisal Procedures for Aademic Related Staff, London, CVCP

Department of Education and Science (1983) Teaching Quality, Cmnd 8836, London, HMSO

Department of Education and Science/ACAS Independent Panel (1986) Report of the Appraisal and Training Working Group

Elliott, J. (1987) 'Knowledge, power and appraisal' paper delivered to the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, Centre for Applied Research in Education, School of Education, University of East Anglia, Norwich, U.K.

Elliott, J. (1988)'The Great Appraisal Debate: some perspectives for research' in Restructuring Higher Education, H. Eggins (ed.), Open University Press, Milton Keynes

Elliott, J. (1989) 'Teacher Evaluation and Teaching as a Moral Science' in Perspectives on Teacher Professional Development, Mary Lou Holly and Caven S. McLoughlin (eds.) The Falmer Press, London and New York

Foucault, M. (1980) Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972-1977(ed.) Colin Gordon, Harvister Press, Brighton, sussex

Giroux, H. (1983) Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition, pp.107-111, Heinemann Educational Books, London

Hewton, E. (1988) 'Teacher Appraisal: the present position', Education 8 January

McCarthy, C. (1978) The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas, pp 187-193, Hutchinson

Stenhouse, L. (1975) <u>An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development</u>, Chapters 5,6,7 and 10, Heinemann, London

Suffolk County Council Education Department (1985) <u>Those Having Torches --- Teacher Appraisal: A Study</u>, St. Andrew Hall, County Hall, Ipswich, Suffolk, U.K.

Suffolk County Council Education Department '1987) <u>Teacher Appraisal: A Practical Guide</u> St. Andrew House, County Hall, Ipswich, Suffolk, U.K.

Whitehead, J. (1989) 'An Educational Theory For and From Professional Practice' in <u>Cambridge Journal of Education,</u> <u>Vol.19,no.1,</u>, Cambridge Institute of Education, Cambridge, U.K.