This may be the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

Bourke, Theresa, Lidstone, John, & Ryan, Mary
(2015)
Schooling Teachers: Professionalism or disciplinary power?
Educational Philosophy and Theory, *47*(1), pp. 84-100.

This file was downloaded from: https://eprints.qut.edu.au/63673/

© Consult author(s) regarding copyright matters

This work is covered by copyright. Unless the document is being made available under a Creative Commons Licence, you must assume that re-use is limited to personal use and that permission from the copyright owner must be obtained for all other uses. If the document is available under a Creative Commons License (or other specified license) then refer to the Licence for details of permitted re-use. It is a condition of access that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights. If you believe that this work infringes copyright please provide details by email to qut.copyright@qut.edu.au

Notice: *Please note that this document may not be the Version of Record (i.e. published version) of the work. Author manuscript versions (as Submitted for peer review or as Accepted for publication after peer review) can be identified by an absence of publisher branding and/or typeset appearance. If there is any doubt, please refer to the published source.*

https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2013.839374

Schooling Teachers: Professionalism or disciplinary power?

TERRI BOURKE, JOHN LIDSTONE & MARY RYAN

Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

Corresponding author:

Dr Terri Bourke
School of Curriculum, Room E326
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Victoria Park Road
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
Australia
Tel: +61 7 3138 3498
Email: theresa.bourke@qut.edu.au

Co-authors:

Professor John Lidstone
School of Curriculum
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Victoria Park Road
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
Australia
Tel: +61 7 3138 3289
Email: j.lidstone@qut.edu.au

Associate Professor Mary Ryan
School of Curriculum
Faculty of Education
Queensland University of Technology
Victoria Park Road
Kelvin Grove QLD 4059
Australia
Tel: +61 7 3138 3569
Email: me.ryan@qut.edu.au

Schooling Teachers: Professionalism or disciplinary power?

Abstract

Since public schooling was introduced in the nineteenth century, teachers in many western countries have endeavoured to achieve professional recognition. For a short period in the latter part of the twentieth century, professionalism was seen as a discourse of resistance or the 'enemy' of economic rationalism and performativity. However, more recently, governments have responded by 'colonising' professionalism and imposing 'standards' whereby the concept is redefined. In this study, we analyse transcripts of interviews with 20 Queensland teachers and conclude that teachers' notions of professionalism in this second decade of the twenty-first century are effectively reiterations of nineteenth century disciplinary technologies (as proposed by Michel Foucault) yet are enacted in new ways.

Keywords: disciplinary power, Foucault, professionalism, teachers

Introduction

There is an abundance of literature on professionalism, with many attempts to provide a definition, and even more government-led agendas calling for higher degrees of professionalism in education. However, what professionalism is, how it can be defined and by whom, are still sites of struggle within the education sector. In the spirit of Foucauldian archaeology[1], Table 1 identifies some of the writers who have elaborated various interpretations of professionalism since the start of World War Two.

[1] Foucault's archaeology traces bibliographic references or citations and as professionalism is an already well researched and theorised concept, we have presented it here as a table (see Table 1).

Table 1: Interpretations and definitions of professionalism identified by selected writers from 1939 to present

Selected writers in chronological order	Interpretations and definitions of professionalism
Marshall (1939), Goode (1957), Wilensky (1964)	social service professionalism
Parsons (1954), Stinnett and Huggett (1963), Purvis (1973), Travers and Rebore (1990)	professions based on functionalist theory
Hoyle (1974)	professionalisation, professionality
Goodson and Hargreaves (1996)	classical, flexible, practical, extended, complex and post-modern professionalism
Hanlon (1998)	commercialised professionalism
Goodson (1999, 2000)	new and principled professionalism
Freidson (1994, 2001)	the ideology of professionalism
Sachs (2001, 2003, 2005)	transformative, democratic, managerial and activist professionalism
Hargreaves (2000), Day (2002)	the four ages of professionalism
Hilferty (2007, 2008), Evans (2008, 2011)	enacted professionalism
Evetts (2009)	organisational, occupational professionalism
Evans (2011)	deduced, assumed professionalism
Bourke (2011)	new/classical/practical discourses of professionalism

Little appears to have changed since Freidson (1994) concluded that the use of the term professionalism was inconsistent, Goodson and Hargreaves (1996) proclaimed that there was no universal agreement of the concept, Hanlon (1998) regarded it as a shifting rather than a concrete plan, Helsby (1995) observed that it was subject to geographical and cultural differences, and Holroyd (2000) concluded that it had changed its meaning throughout history. According to Quicke (2000), Durkheim considered the professions to be ‘a moral force in society, acting as a bulwark against economic individualism and an authoritarian state’ (p. 302) while Marshall (1939) regarded the professions as a source of stability and democracy in a changing world. Professional characteristics included having specialised knowledge, a shared technical culture, a strong service ethic, and self- regulation (Carr, 2000; Etzioni, 1969; Goodson & Hargreaves, 1996; Gore & Morrison, 2001; Larson, 1977). However, currently, any phone book reveals restaurants, dog-minding services and hairdressers allegedly offering ‘professional services’, suggesting that the term may have lost purchase and become an empty and meaningless catch-all category (Fournier, 1999).

In this paper, we begin by outlining Foucault's (1995) notions of disciplinary power and archaeology as the basic tools or theoretical/analytical framework through which we will examine contemporary teachers' statements on professionalism. Our analysis leads to the conclusion that the nineteenth century disciplinary technologies of hierarchical observation, normalisation and examination are still well and truly alive in education, yet in more covert ways, masquerading as a 'new' professionalism. We argue that disciplinary technologies in the twenty-first century apply equally to teachers[2] and their students, with the surveilling gaze[3] emanating from above (regulatory authorities), beside (communities and colleagues) and below (students).

Theoretical/Analytical Framework

Foucault (1994) often referred to his work as a 'tool box' through which one could go rummaging. Accordingly, we have borrowed Foucault's archaeology and disciplinary power as the analytical framework for this paper. Such strategic borrowing from Foucault's theorisations on power-knowledge allows an opening up of the verbal formulations (statements) of Queensland teachers to reveal how current notions of professionalism reflect old and new ways in which disciplinary power operates in the daily routines of practising teachers.

Disciplinary Power

Foucault subdivides disciplinary power into three simple instruments: hierarchical observation, normalisation and examination, each of which is now briefly explained.

[2] The use of the word 'teachers' in this study refers to all levels of the hierarchy within schools. This will help capture subject positions.
[3] One of the characteristics of Foucault's language is his repeated use of certain key words. Many present no difficulty in translation, but others such as 'gaze' have no normal equivalent. In such cases, it is generally preferable to use a single unusual word. In *The birth of the clinic* (Foucault, 1973), the unusual 'gaze' is used to mean the common 'regard'.

Hierarchical Observation

Hierarchical observation is a technology of surveillance, a way of controlling conduct and improving performance. Since the early nineteenth century, schools have been places of training, but according to Foucault, they are also apparatuses of observation or panoptic mechanism (Foucault, 1995). By panoptic mechanism, Foucault is referring to Bentham's model of a prison where everyone is made 'visible' (Foucault, 1995, p. 200). He uses panopticism as a metaphor for systems of surveillance that operate within the social body including schools. In Queensland, this system of surveillance included the old inspectorate system that existed until the early 1980s and still includes the hierarchical organisation of teachers in schools with a 'head' at the top, the organisation of space in the form of classrooms, timetables, and 'a network of gazes' all laid down as a means of visibility (Foucault, 1995, p. 171). Even though the inspectorate system has been abolished, surveillance in the form of school data publication and teacher professional standards agendas mean that schools and teachers continue to operate under constant gaze.

Being subjected to this visibility, teachers become the mechanism of their own subjection, whether 'being watched' is verifiable or not. In other words, they modify their behaviour as a result of the perceived or real 'all seeing eye' (Foucault, 1995) whether this is from leadership, their colleagues, their students or the wider community, including regulatory bodies like the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT) or the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), parents or politicians. Thus, through the lens of this description, we identified hierarchical observation masquerading as what many teachers believe to be professionalism.

Normalisation

Normalisation is defining the 'normal'. Schools have always enforced norms of behaviour, knowledge, and attitudes amongst both students and teachers. Deviation from the norm is 'punishable', to use Foucault's terminology. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1995) writes about nineteenth century schools having penalties for students' lateness, inattention or impolite behaviour. While schools still apply corrective mechanisms to 'put right' student 'problems' by training or reward, such mechanisms remain also applicable to teachers, securing the functionality of the overall school operations. In interrogating our interview data, we looked for this strategy in the accounts of teachers.

The Examination

The examination combines both hierarchical observation and normalisation as an effective mechanism of disciplinary power. Foucault describes this instrument as 'a normalising gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish' (Foucault, 1995, p. 184). Schools are apparatuses of the examination (through their testing procedures) where individuals are judged and performance is measured and compared. Teachers impart knowledge to their students, whilst simultaneously gaining information about their students. In this way, data on students' conduct and performance are documented and interpreted as a measure of teacher 'quality'. Such documentation means that each individual (students and teachers) can be described and measured, as well as trained to bring about improvement (Foucault, 1995). In essence, normalisation occurs. We sought evidence of this mechanism of disciplinary power in the participants' accounts.

In this paper, we intentionally seek the operation of these three micro technologies of power in the interview data and thus 'unpick the threads' of what is said and done in the name of professionalism. It must be remembered that Foucault does not see power as

necessarily oppressive in nature, but rather argues that power can be productive in generating different types of knowledge and behaviour. He prefers to regard power as ‘a relation in which one guides the behaviour of others. And there’s no reason why this manner of guiding the behaviour of others should not ultimately have results which are positive, valuable, interesting and so on’ (Foucault, 1988, p.12). For example, Gore (2001) examined power relations across four pedagogical sites and concluded that power mechanisms yielded a positive result. Elsewhere, the current authors have identified and acknowledged pockets of resistance to performativity as positive (see Bourke, Lidstone, & Ryan, forthcoming). However, for Foucault, productive does not necessarily mean that all outcomes are positive but rather, generative of behaviours, structures or events, either positive or negative.

Methodology

Interviews of around one hour duration were conducted with 20 teachers, selected through snowball sampling (Appendix 1). Unstructured interviews provided insight into the interviewees’ socially constructed world (Freebody, 2003). Interviewees were initially asked to ‘Tell me about a time when you felt you were being professional or behaving in a professional manner’, and the conversation continued with further probing by the interviewer.

In the spirit of Foucauldian archaeology, we subjected the transcripts to discourse analysis to reveal the teachers’ ‘regimes of truth’ or ‘discourses’ on professionalism (see Appendix 2). This involves examining similar and contradictory statements (Foucault, 1972) and identifying the repetition of key words, terms and phrases. Teachers’ subject positions were also investigated to ascertain if school sector or their position in the hierarchy influenced their enactment of professionalism. The statements from teachers were further examined for evidence of Foucault’s notions of disciplinary power. Other commentators such as Scheurich (1994), Ball (1990, 1994), Gale (1999, 2007), Taylor (1997) and Graham (2011)

all draw to some extent on Foucault's theories of discourse. Whilst acknowledging these writers' interpretations, we, however, borrow directly from the Foucauldian toolbox. In archaeological analysis, it is common to offer a 'history of the present', so we begin by outlining the current Australian educational context to illustrate the simultaneous discourses circulating at this time.

History of the present

For at least twenty years, teachers have been 'casualties' (Hargreaves & Lo, 2000, p.173) of declining support, tighter controls, intensified workloads and discourses of derision (Ball, 1994). At the same time they are under increasing pressure from politicians and the community to be more accountable and improve quality (Sachs, 2003). In what has been referred to as the marketisation of education (Sachs, 2003), their positions have been further weakened by curriculum prescription, testing regimes, performance management, and multiple iterations of standards documents purporting to enhance the professionalism of educators. According to Sachs (2003), the imperatives of this market regime were for schools to produce numerate and literate students capable of social and civic responsibility as multi-skilled, flexible workers to boost the economy and increase international competitiveness. The complexity of these political agendas colonising professionalism creates an overwhelming space for teachers to inhabit.

Having contextualised the complex environment within which the teacher statements emerged, we examine them for notions of disciplinary power. For clarity, we consider them from perspectives of regulatory bodies and professional development opportunities (gaze from above); community, parents and colleagues (gaze from beside); and students (gaze from below).

Findings

Regulatory Authorities/Education Systems: Gaze from above

Our conversations with teachers reveal the ubiquity and normalcy of disciplinary power from regulatory authorities. The teachers' accounts suggest that professionalism as accountability may be classified as compliance with (1) professional conduct and (2) professional performance as demonstrated through both high stakes testing of students and professional standards for teachers.

All teachers in Queensland must register with the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT). The QCT is a government statutory body, established in January 2006 'to regulate, enhance and promote the teaching profession in Queensland in the best interests of the public and the profession' (Queensland College of Teachers (QCT), 2012). One of the major QCT discipline and enforcement functions relates to professional conduct. While the teachers' comments reveal their acute awareness of the current legal requirements of the system, they nevertheless regard the code of conduct as diminishing their professional power. This is shown by frequent references to: 'teachers being deregistered, dismissed from teaching, finding themselves in all sorts of legal problems' (Cecilia); 'nowadays with litigation at every corner' (Jean); 'staying within the law, legal obligations' (Sue); and, 'you have to behave perfectly, otherwise you could be up for misconduct' (Kate). The repetition of phrases and words such as 'legal problems', 'litigation', 'legal obligations', and 'misconduct' demonstrate the extent to which legalities are foreground in the minds of the interviewees regardless of school sector or position in the hierarchy. Such statements reveal power wielded through normalisation. The regulatory authorities are concerned with the construction of a certain type of teacher with certain characteristics who can be readily managed. Intense registration, document accumulation (Foucault, 1995) and monitoring of conduct gives a sense of being judged (examination), producing indicators that make teachers 'continually

accountable and constantly recorded' (Ball, 2003, p. 220). This documentation is a disciplinary mechanism related to the examination where teachers are placed into a 'field of surveillance' or hierarchical observation (Foucault, 1995, p. 189). As explained by Foucault in the context of nineteenth century institutions, twenty-first century teachers fear that any departure from correct behaviour, non-observance or 'that which does not measure up to the rule' (Foucault, 1995, p. 178) might result in deregistration or dismissal from the profession. Professionalism as accountability also comes in the form of national high stakes testing programs. In Australia, the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) was introduced in 2008 for Years 3, 5, 7 and 9. Student performances on these standardised tests are published on the (Federal Government) *MySchool* website. In this way, students' performances are on display. The publication of such data is central to surveillance and read as synonymous with teacher effectiveness. Judy's statements reveal how important it is to prepare students to perform: 'we have developed a program', 'you definitely need to use the data', and 'we had two trial tests, one in February … and that gave us the feedback we needed to see what they [the students] didn't know'. Xanthe's comment repeats the message of reading data: '20% were under national benchmark'. Furthermore, Jan indicates how examination results are a key indicator of teacher performance: 'each teacher has a list of their class and the number of As, Bs, etc., so there needs to be some discussion about each teacher and their performance'. Student performances on standardised tests are not only used to evaluate teacher competency, but they also control teachers' daily routines because of their need or desire to prepare students for these tests. The external pressure from high stakes testing forces teachers not only to operate as regulatory authorities demand, but also to entirely focus on enhanced examination (if not learning) outcomes. Jan, Judy and Xanthe are senior managers in state schools and therefore risk managers against poor public data. However, James, who is a middle manager in a private school, in contradiction states that

‘with national tests, people just feel that they are constantly being checked up on’. With these forms of surveillance, the spotlight is on every teacher leaving no ‘zone of shade’ (Foucault, 1995, p. 177). Foucault says, ‘it is the fact of being constantly seen … that maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection’ (Foucault, 1995, p. 187). Through such hierarchical observation, teachers’ productivity is made visible and it is this visibility that results in teachers being seen as describable or analysable objects whose value can be examined, measured and compared with others. In effect, teachers are disciplined into conforming with government sanctioned high stakes testing programs. According to Smeed (2010), in Queensland, preparation lessons for high stakes tests are now the norm.

Another QCT responsibility has been the development of professional standards for teachers. Whilst some of the teachers interviewed have little knowledge of professional standards discourses – ‘never heard of them’ (Mike) or ‘I wouldn’t be able to articulate what the detail is’ (Barbara) – others have comprehensive knowledge of their formation and content. For example: ‘the ten QCT Standards were developed by the State Government’ (Kory), and the ‘second group or cluster is about interpersonal relationships’ (Sally). It is noteworthy that Kory and Sally are both first-year teachers who explained that their knowledge of standards was obtained during their university training. Higher education institutions (HEIs) are reinforcing the standards reform agenda. This is not surprising as HEIs’ funding and accreditation of courses are linked to standards implementation. Here, it is the universities that are under the gaze from higher regulatory authorities and must comply in order to have courses accredited. The standards agenda has progressed recently with the development of the *Australian professional standards for teachers* (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), 2012). Similar to the QCT standards, these professional standards normalise the practices and knowledge that a teacher should possess. In other words, they have become the disciplinary structure of professionalism and teacher

quality against which teachers are measured or examined. However, with standards described as 'important' (Sally), 'a level that people should aspire to' (Sue), 'comprehensive' and 'having application' (Kate), it appears that some teachers welcome their arrival.

Professional Development: Gaze from above

Regulatory surveillance in cyberspace is mentioned in interviewees' accounts of professionalism as professional learning. This twenty-first century panoptic mechanism is used by regulatory authorities such as the QCT in the form of online auditing systems where teachers register their professional development each year. Jean states 'we have to keep account of the 30 hours that we have to do a year'. Therefore, the QCT regulatory gaze focuses not only on personal and private information through their registration processes but also the Continuous Professional Development (CPD) habits of teachers. Thirty hours (recently reduced to twenty) became the norm, and failure to achieve this could result in non-renewal of registration. Cecilia explains, 'even though I am doing a PhD in Education, I failed … as I had not fulfilled all of their criteria', revealing the acceptability or otherwise of specific forms of professional learning. Xanthe describes, 'we can only go to PD if it fits in with the standards', and Jean states 'I wanted to go to this workshop on de-stressing but because it is not in the standards, I was not allowed to go'. Obviously, CPD should be encouraged but should not be restricted to the prescription of standards documents. Since teachers have little choice but to comply with the rules, they are placed in a position of strict subjection emphasising compliance.

Community: Gaze from beside

Responding teachers are well aware that the community has high expectations and include role modeling as part of their discourse of professionalism as accountability. Multiple

statements reveal teachers cautious of the public gaze and maintaining a conservative community image:

> I never get involved in conversations about school aspects in social situations (Mary)
>
> I certainly would never be involved in alcohol or anything like that (Xanthe)
>
> I was aware of not being seen with a gin and tonic in my hand (Mabel)
>
> I think they [teachers] need to be aware that the community has high expectations of them (Kate)
>
> I can't go anywhere in this locality without seeing someone I taught (Judy)
>
> It is important that wherever you go, I am a teaching professional, I am going to be seen, even if it is by the parents or the students, you are a professional (Kory)
>
> However, you still have to act as a professional even outside school (Xanthe)

The repetition of definitive negative statements such as 'I never get involved', 'I certainly would never' and 'I was aware of not …' reveals that teachers know community expectations, or at least what the community does not expect, in terms of perceptions of professional conduct. Such expectations may be similar to teachers' fear of formal dismissal for inappropriate behaviours as discussed above. These comments reveal the critical gaze of the community fixed on teachers' actions both within the school environment and beyond – 'you still have to act as a professional even outside school' (Xanthe). Mabel is less accepting: 'I … believe that teachers need time to themselves so that they can have their own private or personal life'. Genevieve concurs, stating that '[school] should [not] invade too much in your private life'. However, more participants feel this omnipresent surveillance is acting as a mechanism of control, than don't. As Foucault describes, the gaze is 'everywhere and always

alert … and constantly supervises the individuals who are entrusted with the task of supervising' (Foucault, 1995, p. 177).

The conservative image that teachers portray to the wider public is also illuminated by statements revealing restrictions in dress and presentation. Common statements include: 'the dress code', 'smartly dressed' (Mabel); 'acceptable work clothes' (Kory); 'standard of dress', 'total presentation' (Barney); 'good impression', 'dressed very businesslike' (Sally); 'well groomed and dressed without going overboard' (Kate); 'not like they have rolled out of bed' (Jean); and, 'well dressed or being dressed appropriately' (Xanthe). By 'appropriately', Xanthe means that 'you aren't in a low cut top or short skirt and for men that you are well groomed and clean shaven'. Others agree with these 'appropriate' boundaries – 'I don't think having parts of body on show that could cause kids to talk about them is very appropriate, like the midriff open or lots of piercing or tattoos and stuff, I think that's pretty much inappropriate' (Jean). This policing of appearances, particularly for females, promotes conservative attire as the norm, presenting teachers as 'true professionals' to the public. Disciplinary power is established through normalising judgement whereby any deviation from a conservative image will be publicly examined.

Parents: Gaze from beside

Statements from teachers about their students' parents revealed ways of working with them as partners or supporters – 'it is important parents are involved' (Judy), 'it's a three way triangle' (Mike), 'it's a three way relationship' (Mary). However, other statements reveal uneasiness about this partnership or gaze – 'let the teachers move on with the education' (Judy), 'it's a very matter of fact type relationship' (Janice), 'if you explain things very clearly for them then they go away' (James). A more extreme example of the parental 'gaze' is revealed by James when he speaks about professionalism as relational. He says:

> Parents are ‘investing so much money and effort … they are there all the time … they want to see something for their investment … Parents have amazing aspirations for what their kids can do, so that’s why they’re there all the time.

In this example, James, a middle manager in a private school identifies the parental ‘gaze’ which coerces him to perform effectively and achieve ‘results’. Teachers do not consent to this and may react to parents as they choose but where parental pressure is applied, this becomes disciplinary pressure in the form of observation. Individuals who know they are being observed and evaluated tend to display behaviours oriented to the forthcoming evaluation. The possibility of parental surveillance induces teachers to behave as if under continual observation and therefore maintain self-discipline. Such surveillance and student performance data become ‘decisive economic operator[s]’ (Foucault, 1995, p. 175) protecting parental investment.

Colleagues: Gaze from beside

Many teachers recognise working with colleagues as part of their professionalism as relational. Their statements such as ‘you should be helpful’ (Genevieve), ‘feel supported by me’ (Mike) and ‘people working together’ (Maire) reveal ‘collegiality’, ‘collaboration’, and ‘teamwork’. However, Foucault argues that hierarchical school structures provide an uninterrupted, multi-leveled network of supervision. In what he sometimes refers to as ‘spatial ‘nesting’ of hierarchised surveillance’ (Foucault, 1995, p. 171–172), he maintains:

> Although surveillance rests on individuals, its functioning is that of a network of relations from top to bottom, but also to a certain extent from bottom to top and

> laterally; this network 'holds' the whole together and traverses it in its entirety with effects of power that derive from one another: supervisors, perpetually supervised. (Foucault, 1995, pp. 176–177)

This is exemplified by Marie. Speaking about her principal, she states that 'the ones that come into the classroom and are interested in getting involved – to me that shows professionalism'. However, Genevieve suggests 'sometimes the observation is not appreciated – they [teachers] don't need to be pursued or watched'. Jan (a senior manager) shows how she observes a less experienced teacher in order to make him more efficient – 'I had to work with him … and then try to convince him to run his subject in a different manner' – whereas Sally, a first-year teacher, actively seeks professional guidance by observation – 'I need to watch and find out what other people are doing'. In these instances, disciplinary power in the form of hierarchical observation is 'indiscreet' since it is everywhere, and at the same time 'discreet' as it functions in silence (Foucault, 1995). For schools, this means that all levels of the hierarchy are watched in order to make them more productive. It appears that many of these twenty-first century teachers, rather than seeing their 'visibility' to colleagues negatively, describe the collective enterprise as positive.

The scenario where Jan observes the less experienced teacher 'to convince him to run his subject in a different manner' reveals normalisation and hierarchical observation. From Jan's point of view, this teacher's actions are incorrect. By working with him, she shapes and trains the less experienced teacher so that he becomes more skilful and productive (Foucault, 1995). In this instance, disciplinary power is present in the form of corrective training – 'intensified, multiplied forms of training, several times repeated' (Foucault, 1995, p. 179). This 'art of the human body' (Foucault, 1995, p. 137) is directed not only at skills growth but also to make the subject, in this case, the less experienced teacher, more obedient. Therefore,

this teacher has been subjected, used, transformed and improved (Foucault, 1995). In Foucault's words (although his reference is to students rather than teachers), constant pressure is exercised so that there is

> … conform[ity] to the same model, so that they all might be subjected to subordination, docility, attention in studies and exercises, and to the correct practice of duties and all the parts of discipline. So that they all may be like one another. (Foucault, 1995, p. 182)

The examination is also present where the less experienced teacher is judged on his performance.

Students: Gaze from below

Teachers have always monitored their students, but the statement from Sue is an example that the reverse is also true – 'I am so adamant with them ... being punctual that when I am one minute late ... they all let me know'. Although this statement depicts the close relationship that Sue shares with her students, another statement from her reveals that teachers are aware and suspicious of the students' 'gaze'. She says, 'they tell us that if we are working with students one-on-one, that we should be within sight of other people, other teachers or if we have a group of students, we have doors open. We are very transparent in our dealings with kids'. Other participants also work to keep the students' gaze focused: 'I keep ... distance' (Mary), 'a line is drawn' (Holly), 'boundaries are clear' (Kory), 'professional distance' (Janice). Unfortunately, this scenario signifies lack of trust between teachers and their students even though the interviewees include establishing positive relationships with students as part of their professionalism.

As already mentioned, many of the discursive practices associated with normalisation are concerned with correct training for students in terms of behaviour and performance. The comments from Kory and Sally reveal how they use efficient organisation as a means of behaviour management:

> I make sure that all my classes begin in a very business-like manner, settling the students before I walk into the room … ensuring that everyone is settled before any work begins, going through the roll, taking attendance. (Sally)

Kory concurs with Sally:

> I think it is important that you are there before the students, and the room is set up, you are prepared … have things up on the board, notes or points you want to cover … the time it had to be finished.

These comments are examples of how two relatively new teachers to the profession pre-plan not just the learning in the lesson, but also the logistics of the classroom. Both these teachers organise their classrooms as a disciplinary space so that 'each individual has his own place; and each place its individual' (Foucault, 1995, p. 143). As Foucault (1995) points out, 'one must eliminate the effects of imprecise distributions, the uncontrolled disappearance of individuals' (p.143). By 'going through the roll, taking attendance', Sally establishes 'presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals', 'to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual' (Foucault, 1995, p. 143), practices that she refers to as 'business-like'. This 'functional site' (Foucault, 1995, p. 143) is organised for supervision purposes as well as the need to 'break dangerous communications' (Foucault,

1995, p. 143–144). This is shown by Kory's further comment: 'when the kids get there, they walk in, you can just sit them down, start them, and they can get straight into it, because as soon as you turn your back, there is a chance for them to muck up'. This shows how Kory organises his class to risk-manage behaviour. Furthermore, statements such as 'they can get straight into it' and 'the time it had to be finished' show the creation of a 'useful space', what Foucault refers to as 'a spatial arrangement of production' (Foucault, 1995, p. 144–145). He says: 'it [makes] the educational space function like a learning machine, but also a machine for supervising' (Foucault, 1995, p. 147). According to Foucault (1995), organisation of space guarantees 'the obedience of individuals but also a better economy of time and gesture' (p. 148). According to participants, by organising their classrooms and controlling activities, they constitute a total use of time 'delivering effectively', providing 'quality learning' and 'engaging productively in the learning process'.

As in nineteenth century institutions, teachers control and normalise their students' activity and time, but in doing so, inadvertently also subject themselves to similar disciplinary processes. The comment below elaborates how timetables are used as disciplinary mechanisms. This comment by Judy reveals how the work of teachers is standardised and normalised for the effective and efficient use of time:

> As a faculty we will always have a topic timetable and on the topic timetable there are outlines – what part of the work program people should be teaching at different times, so that when there is more than one class or cohort we are all kind of working on the same page and we can arrive at the same places for points of the assessment.

From a Foucauldian perspective, these disciplinary powers, embedded in the common, even trivial, daily routines, now represent professionalism.

Discussion

The statements cited above reveal persuasive indications that twenty-first century teachers and schools in Queensland are subject to hierarchical observation, normalisation and examination. These are precisely the same kinds of disciplinary power identified by Foucault as controlling nineteenth century institutions such as the army, prisons and schools albeit with the adoption of more covert technologies.

Twenty-first century covert technologies include the increased modes of surveillance epitomised by Bentham's Panopticon (Foucault, 1995), so that today's teachers, like Bentham's prisoners, behave as if surveillance is omnipresent. Subjection to the assumed gaze results in teachers' self-monitoring so that self-regulation occurs 'naturally'. Whether this is through parental or community demands, registration systems, the online audit of professional learning or the publication of high stakes testing data, the monitoring system or the 'eyes that must see without being seen' (Foucault, 1995, p. 171) produce information so teachers are knowable and thus regulated. This 'visibility is a trap' (Foucault, 1995, p. 200), locating teachers in a political field invested with power relations which render them docile but 'productive'. A hold is placed on their conduct as they are coerced by means of observation. Teachers, in their quest to achieve enhanced professional status through conforming to current constructions of professionalism, become regulated and controlled by disciplinary technologies of the self (Osgood, 2006).

In addition to this hierarchical observation, covert normalisation including the need to satisfy registration requirements and students' needs and to work productively with colleagues produces 'docile' bodies. Some of these normalised behaviours are legacies from the past; for example, the conservative image teachers portray both in the ways they dress and how they present themselves publicly. Over many years, the constant pressure to conform has

conditioned teachers to subordination and docility so that they perform the 'correct practice of duties' (Foucault, 1995, p. 182). Whether consciously or in order to keep their jobs or to further their careers, teachers to a great extent abide by the rules – 'the rule to be made to function as a minimal threshold, as an average to be respected or an optimum towards which one moves' (Foucault, 1995, p. 183). The Normal is established as a principle of coercion and acts upon teachers and moulds them into recognisable shape. In other words, they conform precisely as their nineteenth century forebears did.

Finally, whereas school examinations used to be 'a question of jousts in which pupils pitched their forces against each other' (Foucault, 1995, p. 186), the publication of detailed school examination data now creates teachers as the examined, covertly placed under perpetual uninterrupted scrutiny by parents, colleagues, regulatory authorities and education systems. Their effectiveness is on display and with the intensification of prescribed curriculum, high stakes testing programs and Australia's insatiable appetite for performance agendas such as professional standards, teachers have become more examined than ever before.

Conclusion

From the interviewees' responses it is apparent that teachers' notions of professionalism in the twenty-first century align with Foucault's notions of disciplinary technologies. Thus one could argue that the notion of twenty-first century professionalism is simply a revamped version of nineteenth century disciplinary techniques. Educational institutions have always exercised discipline to produce docility through, for example, the buildings, the timetable or the old inspectorate system of testing and assessment. However, in the modern era, the scale and rate of such discipline has intensified, becoming much more abstract and sophisticated in securing power over teachers. Unlike the older forms of regulation which were overt, this

‘secret invasion’ (Foucault, 1995, p. 170) is now a less visible form of control. Far from achieving autonomous professionalism, here we name the continued influence of such covert forms of discipline with the multidirectional gaze of the community, parents, colleagues, administrators and students, acting both independently and in consort, imposing the severe form of teacher self-regulation now defined as twenty-first century professionalism. We posit the argument that teachers are in a position to resist such control from within the disciplinary sphere. Our ‘unpicking’ of these technologies of disciplinary power can provide loose threads to unravel and subvert in a quest for professionalism that prioritises autonomy, emotional investment in students and subject matter.

References

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2012). *Australian professional standards for teachers*. Melbourne, VIC: AITSL.

Ball, S. (Ed.). (1990). *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S. (1994). Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ball, S. (2003). The teacher’s soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(2), 215–228.

Bourke, T. (2011). *Teacher professional standards: Mirage or miracle cure. An archaeology of professionalism in education* (PhD Thesis). Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane.

Bourke, T., Lidstone, J., & Ryan, M. (forthcoming). Teachers performing professionalism: A Foucauldian arachaeology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.*

Carr, D. (2000). *Professionalism and ethics in teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Day, C. (2002). School reform and transitions in teacher professionalism and identity. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(8), 677–692.

Evans, L. (2008). Professionalism, professionality and the development of education professionals. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 56*(1), 20-38.

Evans, L. (2011). The ‘shape’ of teacher professionalism in England: Professional standards, performance management, professional development and the changes proposed in the 2010 White Paper. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 851–870.

Evetts, J. (2009). The management of professionalism: A contemporary paradox. In S. Gewirtz, P. Mahony, I. Hextall & A. Cribb (Eds.), *Changing teacher professionalism: International trends, challenges and ways forward* (pp. 19–30). London: Routledge.

Etzioni, A. (1969). *The semi-professions and their organization: Teachers, nurses, social workers*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* (A. M. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1988). Power, moral values, and the intellectual. An interview with Michel Foucault by Michael Bess. *History of the Present, 4*, 1-2 + 11-13.

Foucault, M. (1994). *Dits et ecrits, 1954–1988*. Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, NY: Random House.

Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to ‘professionalism’ as a disciplinary mechanism. *The Sociological Review, 47*(2), 280–307.

Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: Interaction and practice*. London: Sage.

Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn: Theory, prophecy and policy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism, the third logic: On the practice of knowledge*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gale, T. (1999). Policy trajectories: Treading the discursive path of policy analysis. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 20*(3), 393-407.

Gale, T. (2007). Critical policy sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. In S. J. Ball, I. F. Goodson & M. Maguire (Eds.), *Education, globalisation and new times* (pp. 148-166). New York, NY: Routledge.

Goode, W. J. (1957). Community within a community: The professions. *American Sociological Review, 22*(2), 194–200.

Goodson, I. (1999). *Towards a principled professionalism for teaching*. Keynote address presented at the New Professionalism in Teaching Conference, Chinese University of Hong Kong, January.

Goodson, I. (2000). The principled professional. *Prospects, 30*(2), 181–188.

Goodson, I., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *Teachers' professional lives*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Gore, J. M. (2001). Disciplining bodies: On continuity of power relations in pedagogy. In C. Paechter, R. Edwards, R. Harrison & P. Twining (Eds.), *Learning, space and identity* (pp. 167-181). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Gore, J. M., & Morrison, K. (2001). The perpetuation of a (semi-) profession: Challenges in the governance of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(5), 567-582.

Graham, L. J. (2011). The product of text and 'other' statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(6), 663-674.

Hanlon, G. (1998). Professionalism as enterprise: Service class politics and the redefinition of professionalism. *Sociology, 32*(1), 43–63.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching, 6*(2), 151–182.

Hargreaves, A. & Lo, L. (2000). The paradoxical profession: Teaching at the turn of the century. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education, 30*(2), 167-180.

Helsby, G. (1995). Teachers' construction of professionalism in England in the 1990s. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 21*(3), 317–332.

Hilferty, F. (2007). Contesting the curriculum: An examination of professionalism as defined and enacted by Australian history teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 37*(3), 239–261.

Hilferty, F. (2008). Theorising teacher professionalism as an enacted discourse of power. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 29*(2), 161–173.

Holroyd, C. (2000). Are assessors professional?: Student assessment and the professionalism of academics. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 1*(1), 28–44.

Hoyle, E. (1974). Professionality, professionalism and control in teaching. *London Educational Review, 3*(2), 13–19.

Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Marshall, T. H. (1939). The recent history of professionalism in relation to social structure and social policy. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, 5*(3), 325–340.

Osgood, J. (2006). Deconstructing professionalism in early childhood education: Resisting the regulatory gaze. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 7*(1), 5–14.

Parsons, T. (1954). *Essays in sociological theory*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Purvis, J. (1973). Schoolteaching as a professional career. *The British Journal of Sociology, 24*(1), 43-57.

Queensland College of Teachers (QCT). (2012). *The QCT*. Retrieved from http://www.qct.edu.au/college/index.html

Quicke, J. (2000). A new professionalism for a collaborative culture of organizational learning in contemporary society. *Educational Management Adminstration and Leadership, 28*(3), 299-315.

Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Educational Policy, 16*(2), 149–161.

Sachs, J. (2003). *The activist teaching profession*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Sachs, J. (2005). *Professional standards: Quality teachers for the future*. Paper presented at the Sharing Experience: Ways forward on standards conference, Melbourne, August 21.

Scheurich, J. (1994). Policy archaeology: A new policy studies methodology. *Journal of Education Policy, 9* (4), 297-316.

Smeed, J. L. (2010). Accountability through high-stakes testing and curriculum change. *Leading & Managing, 16*(2), 1-15.

Stinnett, T. M., & Huggett, A. J. (1963). *Professional problems of teachers*. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Taylor, S. (1997). Critical policy analysis: Exploring contexts, texts and consequences. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 18*(1), 23-25.

Travers, P. D., & Rebore, R. W. (1990). *Foundations of education: Becoming a teacher* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wilensky, H. (1964). The professionalisation of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology, 70*(2), 137–158.

Appendix 1: Participant characteristics

Name (Sex)	Qualifications			Type of School				Positions of Responsibility				Years of Service		
	Undergrad	Masters	PhD	Primary	Secondary	State	Private	Principal	Middle Manager	Senior Manager	Teacher	0-10	11-19	20+
Genevieve (F)	*				*	*					*	*		
Mabel (F)	*				*		*		*				*	
Tia (F)	*				*	*			*				*	
Cecilia (F)	*				*		*		*					*
Barney (M)		*			*		*	*						*
Mary (F)		*			*		*			*				*
Marie (F)	*			*		*					*			*
Barbara (F)		*			*		*		*				*	
Mike (M)		*			*		*			*				*
Judy (F)	*			*		*				*			*	
Sue (F)	*				*	*			*				*	
Holly (F)	*				*	*					*	*		
Jan (F)	*				*	*				*		*		
Xanthe (F)			*		*	*				*				*
Kate (F)	*			*		*		*					*	
Jean (F)		*		*		*			*					*
Kory (M)	*				*	*					*	*		
Sally (F)	*				*	*					*	*		
Janice (F)		*			*		*	*						*
James (M)		*			*		*		*				*	

Appendix 2: Personal discourses on professionalism from the interview data

DISCOURSES
1. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS
2. EFFICIENT ORGANISATION
3. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS
4. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING/DEVELOPMENT
5. SPECIFIC PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES
6. ACCOUNTABLILITY
7. LEADERSHIP
8. REFLECTIVE PRACTICES
9. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS