



Translating policy: governmentality and the reflective teacher

Jane Perryman, Stephen J. Ball, Annette Braun & Meg Maguire

To cite this article: Jane Perryman, Stephen J. Ball, Annette Braun & Meg Maguire (2017) Translating policy: governmentality and the reflective teacher, Journal of Education Policy, 32:6, 745-756, DOI: [10.1080/02680939.2017.1309072](https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1309072)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1309072>



© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 10 Apr 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1899



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Translating policy: governmentality and the reflective teacher

Jane Perryman^a, Stephen J. Ball^b, Annette Braun^b and Meg Maguire^c

^aDepartment of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment, UCL Institute of Education, London, UK; ^bDepartment of Education, Practice and Society, UCL Institute of Education, London, UK; ^cSchool of Education, Communication and Society, Kings College London, London, UK

ABSTRACT

This paper deploys some concepts from the work of Michel Foucault to problematise the mundane and quotidian *practices* of policy translation as these occur in the everyday of schools. In doing that, we suggest that these practices are complicit in the formation of and constitution of teacher subjects, and their subjection to the *morality* of policy and of educational reform. These practices are some ways in which teachers work on themselves and others, and make themselves subjects of policy. We conceive of the processes of translation, its practices and techniques as a form of ethics, the constitution of a contemporary and contingent version of professionalism through the arts of self-conduct. In all of this, it is virtually impossible to separate out, as Foucault points out, capability from control. We argue that the development of new capacities, new skills of classroom management, of pedagogy, bring along with it the intensification of a power relation. We are primarily concerned with Foucault's third face of power, pastoral power or *government* and how this interweaves and overlap with other forms of power within processes of policy and educational reform.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 11 November 2016
Accepted 15 March 2017

KEYWORDS

Policy translation; power; Foucault; governmentality; care of the self; reflection

In a previous paper which explored the question of 'How schools do policy', we described one set of actors within schools and within policy as *policy translators*, that is the people who 'plan and produce the events and processes and institutional texts of policy in relation to others who are thus inducted into the 'discursive patterns' of policy' (Ball et al. 2011, 630). Thus, we suggested: 'Translation is a process of invention and compliance. As teachers engage with policy and bring their creativity to bear on its enactment, they are also captured by it. They change it, in some ways, and it changes them' (ibid.).

In this paper, we intend to take the idea of translation further, in relation to our data, by deploying some concepts from the work of Michel Foucault. We want, in his terms to problematise the mundane and quotidian *practices* of translation as these occur in the everyday of schools. In doing that, we will suggest that these practices are complicit in the formation of and constitution of teacher subjects, and their subjection to the *morality* of policy and of educational reform. These practices are some ways in which teachers work on

CONTACT Jane Perryman  j.perryman@ucl.ac.uk

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

themselves and others, and make themselves subjects of policy. Finally, we conceive of the processes of translation, its practices and techniques as a form of ethics, the constitution of a contemporary and contingent version of professionalism through the arts of self-conduct. In all of this, it is virtually impossible to separate out, as Foucault points out, capability from control. The development of new capacities, new skills of classroom management, of pedagogy, bring along with it the intensification of a power relation.

We are primarily concerned then with Foucault's third face of power, pastoral power or *government*. Nonetheless, we are not suggesting that this form of power has displaced its predecessors, sovereign and disciplinary power, rather the three interweave, overlap and compound one another within processes of policy and educational reform. According to Foucault, the nature of power evolved because of growth in society, which meant that sovereign power could no longer be effectively wielded by an autocrat. Power needed to be filtered through structures and organisations in order to be effective, and subjects needed to be compliant in their domination as well as participating in power structures themselves. Foucault (1982) argued that in the modern state this disciplinary power evolved into pastoral power, a form of power which 'cannot be exercised without knowing the inside of people's minds, without exploring their souls, without making them reveal their innermost secrets. It implies a knowledge of the conscience and an ability to direct it' (Foucault 1982, 783). In schools, disciplinary power and 'the gaze' have not gone – neither has sovereign power from some institutions in which head teachers have a very authoritative notion of their role. However, pastoral power gives the subject responsibility for their own production. This shift is linked to governmentality, a portmanteau word combining government and mentality or rationality. Foucault used governmentality to describe a range of procedures and techniques used to guide and control conduct. Governmentality is not just about national and local political control, but also refers to the self, so is also how and why the self shapes its own conduct in particular ways. Governmentality, according to Foucault (2008, 147), creates *homo aeconomicus*, 'the man of enterprise and production'. He describes this new human as the 'entrepreneur of himself, being for himself the source of [his] earnings' (226). Whilst the governmentality of school leadership is about shaping one self and others' conduct, technologies of the self lead to teachers influencing themselves and each other in more subtle ways. Our 'care of the self' analysis will offer insights into this governmentalisation of the teaching profession and explore the paradox of the teacher as a particular type of ethical subject, governed by self-reflection.

What is involved here is a focus on 'the interrelationship between the technologies of domination and the 'technologies of the self' Dahlstedt, Fejes, and Schonning (2011, 400) and on 'practices that constitute, define, organize, and instrumentalize the strategies that individuals in their freedom can use in dealing with each other' (Foucault 2000, 300).

This means in particular attending to what Foucault (2000, 177) called 'technologies of the self', that is, the ways in which humans constitute themselves through a constant engagement in self-understanding and self-reinvention. Those strategies that:

permit individuals to effect by their own means a certain number of operations on their own bodies, their own souls, their own thoughts, their own conduct, and this in a manner so as to transform themselves, modify themselves and to attain a certain state of perfection, happiness, purity, supernatural power. (Foucault 2000, 177)

The perfection that is sought here is that of the 'good lesson' and more generally 'good' practice and the 'good' teacher (see Moore 2004), a set of normativities embedded within policy and within reform.

Research context

The paper draws on an ESRC funded study of ‘policy enactments in secondary schools’ (RES-062–23-1484), which was based on ‘case-study’ work in four ‘ordinary’ schools. The study had two main objectives, one theoretical, that is to develop a theory of policy enactment, and one empirical, that is a critical exploration of the differences in the enactment of policy in ‘similar’ contexts. It focused on four main issues: (1) the localised nature of policy actions, that is the ‘secondary adjustments’ and accommodations and conflicts which inflect and mediate policy; (2) the ways in which many different (and sometimes contradictory) policies are simultaneously in circulation and interact with, influence and inhibit one another; (3) the interpretational work of policy actors; and (4) the role of resource differences in limiting, distorting or facilitating responses to policy. We worked in four co-educational, non-denominational and non-selective secondary schools. The schools were moderately successful schools with a sound track record of academic achievement, performing at around the national average. They had experienced and established head teachers in post. The sample of schools was from different Local Authorities, including one that is in inner-London (Atwood), two in different parts of outer-London (George Eliot and Wesley) and a fourth in a county town (Campion). We collected four kinds of data: (a) Contextual information from each school; (b) Policy texts – national, local and school-centred; and we conducted a ‘policy audit’ in the schools; (c) Observations of meetings, training, etc.; (d) Semi-structured interviews. The research generated a data-set of 93 digitally recorded and transcribed interviews together with a wide range of documentary and observational data.

Surveillance

Translators use techniques such as observation to enrol teachers as policy subjects – both in relation to practise and commitment. Recipients are enabled to improve, freely, for the most part, committing themselves to the development of new competences. In all of this, practices such as *observations* and *learning walks* become normalised and underpin the process of improvement. This is ‘a marvellous machine’ (Foucault 1979, 202) for perfecting the teacher.

However, *observation* here works in a number of ways, both in bringing judgmental gazes to bear but also more fundamentally in reworking the teacher subject. Submission to the gaze becomes a constituent part of teacher professionalism. Observation of oneself and others (peer observation) articulates a new kind of professionalism focused on technique and technical competence rather than values and judgement, or perhaps more accurately a new relationship between judgement and the judgmental, a new kind of relation to ourselves. This involves ‘a plurality of agencies and authorities, of aspects of behaviour to be governed, of norms invoked, of purposes sought, and of effects, outcomes and consequences’ (Dean 2009, 18) or in other words it defines a discursive field within which the exercise of power is ‘rationalized’. In *The Care of the Self* (1988), Foucault described how individuals were made subject to codes of ethics and behaviour and talks of ‘forms of elaboration’, individuals follow sets of practices, ‘techniques of the self’, which enable them to believe themselves in need of change:

The practice of the self implies that one should form the image of oneself not simply as an imperfect, ignorant individual who requires correction, training and instruction, but as one who suffers from certain ills and who needs to have them treated either by oneself or by someone who has the necessary competence. (Foucault 1988, 57)

Thus it is not a question simply of observing that policies are enacted, rather it is about ensuring that teachers articulate themselves and their professionalism within the discursive field of policy in relation to and through the cult of self-reflection in teaching. ‘Thus national programmes of government can render themselves consonant with the proliferation of procedures for the conduct of conduct at a molecular level across a territory’ (Rose 1999, 51). According to Infinito (2011, 70):

if we constantly practice care of the self, if we are intimately involved in making judgements, in thinking critically and imaginatively about who it is we wish to be and the actions we perform, if we are practiced at reflection and in dialogue with others then we will bring about a self who is free

Edwards and Nicoll (2006, 128) compare reflection to a Foucauldian act of confession.

The normalizing gaze is internalized and turned upon the self as reflection becomes self measurement and self evaluation against the standards and the appropriateness of performance justified in relation to a combination of codified and practical knowledge

Policy enactment via translation encourages and rests upon this practice of confession and reflection, which provide a new set of language and concepts, ‘modes of perceptions’ and ‘vocabularies’ (Rose 1999) and new ways of representing the teacher and teaching, and relations between teachers – a new form of collegiality.

This work will have to be more than a test for measuring what one is capable of, and something other than the assessment of a fault in relation to rules of conduct; it should have the form of a steady screening of representations: examining them, monitoring them, sorting them out. More than an exercise done at regular intervals, it is a constant attitude that one must take towards oneself. (Foucault 1988, 62)

The issue of self-reflection is further developed by Ross (2011, 115) writing about on-line reflection in higher education. She reports

Reflection in education is generally grounded in a humanist discourse of a ‘true’ or ‘central’ self which can be revealed, understood, recorded improved or liberated through the process of writing about thoughts and experience ... however, it is problematic, for two main reasons: it masks the increasingly invasive character of educational practices which demand confession and self surveillance as evidence of progress and learning and it assumes a knowable, malleable yet cohesive self at its centre.

Ross here is writing about self-reflection which is summatively assessed on an academic course and is thus high-stakes. We are writing about a much more informal and mostly mundane – but nonetheless sometimes stressful and sometimes significant – self-reflection. Once they are fully qualified, teachers are not required to produce regular written self-evaluations after every lesson, but the phrase ‘reflective practitioner’ is now normalised within the discourse of ‘good teacher’, and feeds into the translator’s role of encouraging teachers to ‘own’ that which the school defines as good practice. Hence

Reflection itself is performative and claims for the authenticity and intrinsically motivating nature of reflection become part of the performance of a reflective identity which is produced in the complex space of compulsory, high stakes practices. (Ross 2011, 116)

The reflective practitioner is an accepted and expected characteristic of the ‘good teacher’, and good schools are expected to have become *learning organizations*, as described by Leithwood, Aitken, and Jantzi (1995, 41);

A group of people who are pursuing common purposes (and individual purposes as well) with a collective commitment to regularly weighing the value of those purposes, modifying them where they make sense and continuously developing more effective and efficient ways of accomplishing those purposes.

Fejes (2011, 797) calls this 'the mobilization of reflective practices as disciplinary practices'. Reflection pervades the discourse of initial teacher education and ongoing professional development. As Pollard et al. (2008, 505) write 'from a government perspective then, continuing professional development helps teachers and others to accommodate to new initiatives, requirements and challenges'. When Pollard wrote this, reflection was a standard for Newly Qualified Teachers in the UK, but the revised Teacher Standards (Department for Education 2011) apply to all professionals and include the statement 'Appropriate self-evaluation, reflection and professional development activity is critical to improving teachers' practice at all career stages' (Department for Education 2011, 4). This is enforced by the requirement within the revised Standards that 'all teachers reflect systematically on the effectiveness of lessons and approaches to teaching' (Standard 4, page 7) and 'take responsibility for improving teaching through appropriate professional development, responding to advice and feedback from colleagues' (Standard 8, page 8). Mulcahy (2011, 96) notes that such Standards are in essence performative; 'Standards do not simply describe pre-existing realities such as accomplished teaching practice or accomplished teachers; they actively produce them'. Watson and Drew (2015, 449) describe the rise of the term 'accomplished teacher', and argue that 'a clear connection is thus established between accomplishment and the professional responsibility for self-development, with the rationale for this being the need to handle the increasingly complex nature of teaching in a rapidly changing world'.

We are not claiming that schools have moved on from disciplinary power to something more subtle and more intense. There is much in our data about the ongoing disciplinary power of surveillance and observations. This is not unusual. Webb (2005, 189) in his study of an American elementary school found extensive surveillance of teachers designed to 'coerce them into accepting normalising judgements of their practice'. Strategies included unannounced classroom visits by the principal, comparison of teachers' examination results through analysis of data, evaluations by curriculum developers and teachers observing each other, in lessons and informally in corridors. He concluded 'the capillary effects of surveillance caused participants to internalize definitions of accountability at [the school]' (Webb 2005, 202). Thus;

Participants reproduced the form of surveillance by discretely watching their peers inside the school and reproduced the function of the surveillance by coercing peers through unstated expectations of their work. Surveillance and coercion were such an efficient accountability dynamic that participants acquired a preference for teaching practices they disliked and maintained these preferences in the absence of any direct monitoring. (Webb 2005, 204)

In a later paper on the same case study, Webb (2006, 210) argues that teachers would resist some of the strategies by producing fabricated performances. Thus, 'participants cultivated an awareness of their peers' abilities by surveiling their performances which led to institutionalising specific fabrications'. He uses the example of bulletin boards, not used for information likely to be useful, but used as self-promotion of good performance.

Powell and Edwards (2005, 100) writing about the increase in accountability in education since the 1988 reform act suggest that increased surveillance is 'part of the strategic agenda of wider social context of morality and control without which the technology surrounding

education fails to make sense to those employed to use and facilitate it'. Similarly, writing about teacher professionalism in the audit society, Groundwater-Smith and Sachs (2010, 347) argue that 'the audit society requires constant surveillance and inspection ... it requires of its professionals self ordering, not based upon individual moral judgement but upon meeting externally applied edicts and commands'. They advocate the status of activist professional, teaching based on participation in decision-making and on self-reflection. Our translators are perhaps an example of these.

Observations were accepted as routine and normal and part of everyday life of our schools. 'Every head of department is expected to have a sort of monitoring schedule for the year, expected to' (Ken, Atwood). However even within this data on traditional Foucauldian forms of disciplinary power, there is still a sense of self-improvement and coaching which leads us to employ the 'care of the self' analysis. We found evidence that observations were (sometimes enthusiastically) welcomed as an opportunity to learn. They were not threatening, but helpful, seen as a genuinely supportive to self-improvement. Respondents welcomed feedback and responded accordingly. This fits into the model of the reflective practitioner, always willing to move on, take on new ideas and embrace change. 'Educating oneself and taking care of oneself are interconnected activities' (Foucault 1988, 55). Policies can thus be enacted at ground level, perceived now as belonging to everyone and part of 'obvious good practice'.

I love teaching and that's what I, you know... I mean, yesterday I had an observation and I got a real buzz before it. I was like, 'Oh, great, someone's coming in to see me and make a judgement.' And, you know, you want that. (Atanu, Atwood)

When like the headteacher's observed me and, you know, you have informal conversations and then my line manager is the assistant headteacher so I see them every two weeks and so on. And then when you've been observed by someone and had feedback and it's gone okay or, well, it's gone well...you know, you feel like you've built a rapport with them. (Aabid, George Eliot)

These are not the words of the disciplined subject, but a subject who embraces self-improvement; and one who will not fabricate a performance, but believes in its internal validity. It is worth noting here also that these schools and individuals within them were willing to engage with our research, to let outsiders in to observe the school at work. This presumably was part of their acceptance of themselves as learning organisations, willing to benefit from our gaze. In the next section, we look at the methods and techniques employed by policy translators to achieve this version of power, the subject which produces itself.

Technologies of the self – and others

One of the main techniques of policy dissemination within schools is training and CPD (Continuing Professional Development). Interestingly, Watson and Michael (2016, 266) analysed the evolution of the term CPD to reveal 'not just the linguistic shift in which the term professional learning is ousting CPD, but also a conceptual shift manifest through the confusions and confluences between continuing and continuous – with continuous substituting for 'career-long' in one case'. In their interviews with individuals responsible for organising teacher professional development in four local authorities in Scotland, they found that:

A range of intermediates between CPD and career-long professional learning was therefore referred to. Curiously, ‘continuing’ appears to be giving way to ‘continuous’ which the Collins English Dictionary defines as ‘unceasing’. True, ‘to continue’ can mean ‘to carry on uninterruptedly’ but continuing is most often defined as ‘to resume after an interruption’. Continuing professional development is therefore understood as a discontinuous process and hence CPD can be picked up and put down again. This fits with a notion of CPD as a ‘course’ or an event, external to the participant. Continuous learning or development is ongoing. It supports the notion of the professional in an unending process or quest for betterment. (Watson and Michael 2016, 266, 267)

As part of this quest for betterment, in our schools we found that before policies were even presented to staff, small groups worked on policy to create a sense of ownership. Here Laura talks about how a working group had been set-up to research good practice in other schools

Well, this year there’s been about twelve teaching staff who’ve volunteered to be part of a working group, looking at – we’ve called it Thinking Skills and it’s stuck. We started by researching what’s going on in other schools because it was soon apparent we’re quite behind. There has been a bit of cherry picking in terms of pulling the team together and then who’s delivering it. (Laura, George Eliot)

In Wesley, another teacher talks about how a hand-picked group will work on policy before it is presented to the wider staff body.

We tend to get a smaller group of people who we know will be dedicated and it seems to work better if you could just have two or three meetings creating a policy. (James, Wesley)

Workshops, it would seem, are where the messages of the working groups are further translated into practice. The big policy areas are broken down further, but this time all staff are involved.

Each member of staff is actually doing – has actually signed up for a workshop on a different aspect of the school that they want to work on. (Raiida, Wesley)

It’s called a workshop, so there’s usually a teaching and learning one and that’s usually the one that I do and that will be getting staff thinking about what Assessment for Learning takes place in their lesson. (Alice, Campion)

Workshops is where I think people can nominate themselves to deliver different areas of what they’re working on. (Nick, Atwood)

So there’s been a series of workshops where we’ve gone in, they’ve, sort of, I suppose, given us some of the theory, the pedagogy behind what they’re trying to do; we’ve evaluated our own school and practice. (Laura, George Eliot)

The workshops cover all aspects of the work of the school and in the examples above there is a sense that they are voluntary, although everybody must be a member of one. The governmentality of the teacher is here moulded as an ‘actively responsible individual because of the development of new apparatuses’, e.g. training programmes, ‘that integrate subjects into a moral nexus of identifications and allegiances in the very processes in which they appear to act out their most personal choices’ (Miller and Rose 2008, 214). Interestingly this is seen as a ‘bottom-up’ initiative despite the semi-compulsory nature of the activity. Teachers are inculcated with a sense of ownership and become recruited to creativity. They do the work of policy by making policy work.

I suppose I’m trying to use quite a, kind of, a bottom-up model when we’re disseminating it to staff. And a trickle effect, so rather than going, ‘Right, here’s another new government initiative,

this is what we're going to do,' because I think people hear enough of that. It's been, kind of, disseminated in dribs and drabs with the real launch in September, by which time people know quite a bit already. (Laura, George Eliot)

The final most formal step, following working groups and workshops, is training and CPD. Sometimes it is about clarifying policy. Here Laura describes training on delivering lessons;

We've done – we've had a lot of sessions where we've looked at each other's material and have, kind of, analysed it, pulled it apart, made suggestions, so by this point there should be something more final. As we go through we need, sort of, short meetings where people are feeding back, you know, essentially what worked and what didn't. So it's training for the staff that are delivering it and I think we need to open up those lessons because, in theory, they should be some of the better lessons or modelling good practice for other people to look at. (Laura, George Eliot)

As a result of training, good practice is identified and named and becomes a model for others to emulate. This is still not top-down, there is a sense of conversation as ideas are tried out, discussed and altered with a real sense of industry and urgency – a most productive form of power.

Get a working group together, go out, explore, investigate different models, come back, feedback at a staff meeting. We've had students in staff meetings collecting people's ideas, responses to the different models, what do you think will work well, take all that back, the working group mould it a little bit again, go back and present and so on. (Fiona, Campion)

Policy is made into practice, *enacted* with an appropriate creativity and sometimes satisfying the sense that everybody can contribute to its development. Follow-up activities, at a less formal level involve activities, such as peer-marking and joint lesson planning. Teachers are working on themselves and each other, at a very informal level, taking on responsibility for policy ideas.

It had had some time and I think there had been an INSET day, for example, given over to it. So it had done some collective thinking about what the Key Stage 3 curriculum should look like but it hadn't really gone anywhere. So one of my first tasks was to, kind of, reinvigorate that thinking process and put in place something that would be enacted in September. (Catherine, Atwood)

As with the workshops, the theme is often one of 'sharing good practice'.

So one activity we've come up with, for example, is all the exercise books out, give them to your peer or look at them yourself, or whatever it is, and they assess each other in terms of the script and the habits. Well, 'Oh look, you've not underlined your date and title. You haven't ticked the box in terms of your presentation'. (Laura, George Eliot)

Technologies of reflexivity and pastoral power

There is a sense in some of the data from our study of a deliberate creation of a discourse around self-improvement and reflexivity. Recent recommendations from the OECD (2013, 69) highlighted the need for a 'recognised and explicitly stated norm that recognises the complexity of good teaching, and insists on the professional obligation of every teacher to be engaged in a career-long quest for better practice'.

I had a series of inserts into the staff bulletin in the first term focusing on a different area each week or whatever to, you know, just keep it alive in people's minds. (Hazel, Wesley)

Sometimes this is more strategic – a discourse is created within which to think about practice

Because at the moment we've got lots of different messages around the school and I think we need much more coherent messages that if we use the same sorts of words we are talking about speaking and performing, that it should stimulate the students to take from these discrete lessons, certainly in year 7, to start applying them to other lessons. And that's probably one of the hardest things we've got to overcome. (Laura, George Eliot)

Here Laura is talking about getting a message across about the teaching of thinking skills. She is clearly talking about reiterating the language and concepts which frame the policy. Another prevalent discourse, that of the 'reflective practitioner', leads to teachers offering themselves up for improvement in a rather unquestioning way.

We did two INSET sessions and we had just under fifty...members of staff that came in total. So that was really successful, then on the back of that there was more of a natural curiosity from staff; a few had stayed behind at the end of the session to say, 'I want to know more about this. Can you come and observe me? Can you look at some of my lesson plans? Can you ...?' (Heather, Atwood)

There's a requirement, or I don't know if it's a requirement or a recommendation, that teachers attend at least six [CPD] sessions during the year. I've been, I mean, I've been to all of them but that's because I've, you know, got more to learn so, obviously, I find them useful and get a lot out of them. (Jamie, George Eliot)

Here Jamie values the session, which might or might not be required, as he 'obviously' has a lot more to learn. In this complex and anonymous, microphysics of power 'free subjects' are made capable of action. Training becomes self-improvement, judgements become advice.

In Wesley, Robert describes how a Teacher Learning Community (TLC) was set-up.

I'm also one of the co-chairs of the teaching – sorry, the Teacher Learning Community here in Wesley. There's approximately twenty-five members from different departments across the school and we meet regularly with the idea of sharing good practice. [We] set up a conference, which they actually repeated towards the end of the last academic year, in a hotel in central London. So we went down on Friday and were working until Saturday afternoon, showing good practice, developing ideas, formulating strategies, even contributing to policy writing within the school. (Robert, Wesley)

Calling training a 'community' and combining it with a residential trip in which 'good practice' is shared brings policy into an intimate and social relation to the teacher. These teachers are made responsible for improving their practice within a delimited space of possibility in which only some statements can be meaningfully expressed and understood. Robert talks about this as 'an opportunity' not as extra work.

People are to be asked to join working parties, working groups, and everyone's going to be given the opportunity to be a part of a group. So one of the things we're doing this year as the TLC is growing, we're taking six areas and the TLC will be dividing up into small groups and contributing throughout the year towards these various aspects of teaching and learning. (Robert, Wesley)

Coaching and mentoring are also forms of pastoral power that encourage the subject to contribute to its own production. Here the curious and interested are encouraged to position themselves as observer, to take responsibility for identifying the qualities of a good lesson. Such observations can only function successfully when connected to a system of understanding that dictate their use and interpreted their results. The requirement of feedback recruits the observer to that system of understanding and what is meaningful. Again, we suggest, this connects perception, practice and professionalism to policy.

[If] you're interested in, you know, developing aspects of literacy, behaviour management, whatever that may be, then there'll be an open classroom across the school where you can go and officially observe those lessons, either for a full hour or just part of it. And we just ask that you come in, take notes and perhaps be prepared to offer a little bit of constructive feedback at the end (Robert, Wesley).

There is even a therapeutic dimension to these activities. Laura likens coaching to counselling, self-improvement is tied to care and cure, and to self-crafting – 'to shape yourself into the teacher you want to become'. The question is what teacher is it possible to become?

I think coaching is great, I think it's a bit like counseling, where it works it works brilliantly but God forbid if you get it wrong it can be quite damaging. So I think all of us, in theory, bar first year, second years and those that aren't quite ready for it where it's mentoring, should have a coach within the school. (Laura, George Eliot)

And I suppose it underpins the whole CPD here, which is we will try our very best to give you the training and development that enables – I don't like the word training, I'm quite uncomfortable with the word training – but the development opportunities that enable you to shape yourself into the teacher you want to become. (Lesley, Campion)

This notion of shaping oneself, and the associated techniques and practices of observation, coaching and mentoring are points of contact between technologies of domination and technologies of the self. Or as Miller and Rose put it: '...the self-regulating capacities of subjects, shaped and normalized in large part through the powers of expertise, have become key resources for modern forms of government and have established crucial conditions for governing in a liberal democratic way' (Miller and Rose 2008).

We wonder what happens to teachers in such schools who express dissent in this context. A lack of interest in self-improvement becomes increasingly difficult if not impossible within a regime of governmentality.

I think one of the other keys is it should make staff more reflective themselves because, actually, this is the other thing, to deliver all of this you've got to tick all the boxes, haven't you, you've got to be a speaker and performer yourself. You've got to be a reflective learner. Because, I mean, I think that should be a prerequisite for teaching full stop. (Laura, George Eliot)

Discussion

What we have begun to do here is to explore some facets of what we have called the *translation* of policy. That is, a set of relationships and practices, and foremost a relation to oneself, that enable policy to become a part of the practice, perception and self-crafting of teachers. Our data have illustrated some of the ways in which teachers work on themselves and others, and make themselves subjects of policy and we have argued that we conceive of the processes of translation, its practices and techniques as a form of ethics, the constitution of a contemporary and contingent version of professionalism through the arts of self-conduct. We have been primarily concerned with Foucault's third face of power, pastoral power or *government*. Nonetheless, we have not suggested that this form of power has displaced its predecessors, sovereign and disciplinary power, rather the three interweave, overlap and compound one another within processes of policy and educational reform.

Teachers in effect become policy, but not in some visible brute form, rather in a process that hails them through 'interest' and 'curiosity' to improve themselves, become a better teacher, a 'good' teacher. This is done by making the teacher responsible for themselves

and their practice in a relationship of ‘ownership’ of policy; but at the same time, as part of that ‘good’ teacher, they are made responsible for the performance of their students and the school as a whole. In this respect, the teacher is hailed as a very particular kind of ethical subject who is left to resolve a set of displaced tensions, in relation to their students, between care and calculation, and intrinsic value and extrinsic worth, while striving for excellence in their practice.

These technologies of the self-draw on many of the tropes of self-improvement, like coaching and mentoring, which bring policy up close and personal, that intertwine policy with who we are as a teacher. But the key technique in play here is ‘the gaze’, a technique for identifying, and remediating where needed, the visible structures of the lesson, its parts. Both the object of knowledge and the knower are constructed or re-constructed in this practice. There is embedded here as both: ‘a meticulous observation of detail, and at the same time a political awareness of these small things, for the control and use of men ... (Foucault 1977, 140, 141) – the connecting up of the molecular to the molar. The processes here are in themselves mostly benign and are always open to challenge, but this kind of response is always at the risk of jeopardising one’s recognition as a proper professional (see Ball 2016) and making oneself unintelligible to colleagues. Teachers now joining a school may not be ruled by an autocratic head nor cowed by the tendrils of performativity that terrorise their soul (Ball 2003), but will be ruled by themselves, by becoming a truly reflective practitioner under the subtle persuasion of governmentality, dominated yet free. We have identified here a new relationship between judgement and the judgmental, a new kind of relation to ourselves, a cult of self-reflection in teaching, enshrined in the Teachers Standards, the replacement of the need for fabrication with a belief in internal validity, a deliberate creation of a discourse around self-improvement and reflexivity.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Jane Perryman is a senior lecturer in Education at UCL IOE. Her main research interests are inspection, performativity, accountability and policy sociology.

Stephen J. Ball is a distinguished service professor at UCL IOE. His main areas of interest are in education policy analysis and social theory.

Annette Braun is a lecturer in Sociology of Education at UCL IOE. Her main areas of interest centre on gender and social class, trajectories from education to work, professional identities and critical policy analysis.

Meg Maguire is a professor of Sociology of Education at Kings College, London. Her research is in the sociology of education, urban education and policy.

References

- Ball, S. J. 2016. “Subjectivity as a Site of Struggle: Refusing Neoliberalism?” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 37 (8): 1129–1146.
- Ball, S. 2003. “The Teacher’s Soul and the Terrors of Performativity.” *Journal of Education Policy* 18 (2): 215–288.

- Ball, S. J., M. Maguire, A. Braun, and K. Hoskins. 2011. "Policy Actors; Doing Policy Work in Schools." *Discourse* 32 (4): 625–639.
- Dahlstedt, M., A. Fejes, and E. Schonning. 2011. "The Will to (De)Liberate: Shaping Governable Citizens through Cognitive Behavioural Programmes in School." *Journal of Education Policy* 26 (3): 399–414.
- Dean, M. 2009. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Department for Education. 2011. *Teachers' Standards*. <http://www.education.gov.uk/publications>.
- Edwards, R., and K. Nicoll. 2006. "Expertise, Competence and Reflection in the Rhetoric of Professional Development." *British Educational Research Journal* 32 (1): 115–131.
- Fejes, A. 2011. "Confession, In-service Training and Reflective Practices." *British Educational Research Journal* 37 (5): 797–812.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 1982. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Enquiry* 8 (4): 777–795.
- Foucault, M. 2000. "The Ethics of the Concern of the Self as the Practice of Freedom." In *Ethics, Subjectivity and the Truth: Essential Works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984*, edited by Rabinow, 281–301. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978–1979*. New York: Palgrave.
- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel. 1988. *The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of the History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Groundwater-Smith, S., and J. Sachs. 2010. "The Activist Professional and the Reinstatement of Trust." *Cambridge Journal of Education*. 32 (3): 341–358.
- Infinito, J. 2011. "Jane Elliot Meets Foucault: The Formation of Ethical Identities in the Classroom." *Journal of Moral Education*. 32 (1): 67–76.
- Leithwood, K., R. Aitken, and D. Jantzi. 1995. *Making Schools Smarter: A System for Monitoring School and District Progress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Miller, P., and N. Rose. 2008. *Governing the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Moore, A. 2004. *The Good Teacher: Dominant Discourses in Teaching and Teacher Education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Mulcahy, D. 2011. "Assembling the 'Accomplished' Teacher: The Performativity and Politics of Professional Teaching Standards." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. 43 (1): 94–113.
- OECD. 2013. *Teachers for the 21st Century. Using Evaluation to Improve Teaching*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <http://www.oecd.org/site/eduistp13/TS2013%20Background%20Report.pdf>.
- Pollard, A., with J. Anderson, M. Maddock, S. Swaffield, J. Warin, and P. Warwick. 2008. *Reflective Teaching*. London: Continuum.
- Powell, J. L., and M. Edwards. 2005. "Surveillance and Morality: Revisiting the Education Reform Act (1988) in the United Kingdom." *Surveillance & Society* 3 (1): 96–106. [http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles3\(1\)/education.pdf](http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/articles3(1)/education.pdf).
- Rose, N. 1999. *Powers of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, J. 2011. "Traces of Self: Online Reflective Practices and Performances in Higher Education." *Teaching in Higher Education*. 16 (1): 113–126.
- Watson, C., and V. Drew. 2015. "Teachers' Desire for Career-Long Learning: Becoming 'Accomplished' – And Masterly" *British Educational Research Journal* 41 (3): 448–461.
- Watson, C., and M. K. Michael. 2016. "Translations of Policy and Shifting Demands of Teacher Professionalism: From CPD to Professional Learning." *Journal of Education Policy*. 31 (3): 259–274.
- Webb, T. 2005. "The Anatomy of Accountability." *Journal of Education Policy*. 20 (2): 189–208.
- Webb, T. 2006. "The Choreography of Accountability." *Journal of Education Policy*. 21 (2): 201–214.