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Power has long been recognised as central (and as problematic) in the experience of schooling for all participants but, to date, educational researchers have produced little detailed systematic evidence of how power operates in classrooms. The study reported here is designed to bridge that gap by examining micro-practices of power in pedagogy.

Four pedagogical sites were selected for their differences along two major analytical dimensions: whether or not they were clearly located within the institution of education, and the extent to which the explicit approach taken could be seen as "radical" or "mainstream". These dimensions were identified as a result of earlier theoretical work I had done on radical pedagogy discourses (Gore, 1993). The specific sites were: high school Physical Education classes (PE), with an explicit focus on bodies; a first year Teacher Education (TE) cohort, working with three lecturers, where the explicit course agenda included critically discussing dilemmas and tensions underlying the institutional practices of schooling; a Women's Discussion Group (WG), which met for purposes of intellectual stimulation, usually via reading courses provided by community education organisations; and a Feminist Reading Group (FEM), in which women met specifically to address feminist texts (broadly defined) and issues. The following table summarises the analytical location of each site.

Mainstream Radical
Data were collected via observations of each group for most of its meetings during a period of approximately six months per site, and via semi-structured interviews.

The theoretical framework for the study is grounded in a conception of power based on the work of Michel Foucault. Key features of this conception of power are that power is productive and not solely repressive, that it circulates rather than being possessed, that it exists in action, functioning at the level of the body, and that it operates through "technologies of self", that is, that individuals are active in their own subjection. Foucault's conception of power (power relations) requires a focus on the mechanisms of pedagogy rather than on individuals or groups who might traditionally have been seen as holding power. Hence, the primary research question was "What specific practices actualise relations of power in pedagogy?" While other scholars and researchers in education have engaged with some of Foucault's ideas (e.g., Ball, 1990; Cherryholmes, 1988; Jones and Williamson, 1979; Marshall, 1990; Meredyth and Tyler, 1993; Walkerdine, 1990), this study aims to demonstrate, rather than assert, the applicability of Foucault's thought to the study of power.

I have conducted multiple analyses of this data, including the application of two sets of coding categories to the data -- the first set designed to identify techniques of power derived from Foucault and a second set emerging from a grounded analysis of the data. In this paper, however, the analysis is limited to findings emerging from the first coding process. The following working definitions were developed (with my research assistants) in order to cover a wide range of micro-techniques, or practices, of power.

**Surveillance:** Supervising, closely observing, watching, threatening to watch, avoiding being watched
**Normalisation:** Invoking, requiring, setting or conforming to a standard, defining the normal
**Exclusion:** Tracing the limits that will define difference, boundary, zone, defining the pathological
**Distribution:** Dividing into parts, arranging, ranking bodies in space
**Classification:** Differentiating individuals and/or groups from one another
**Individualisation:** Giving individual character to, specifying an individual
Totalisation: Giving collective character to, specifying a collectivity/total, will to conform
Regulation: Controlling by rule, subject to restrictions; adapt to requirements; act of invoking a rule, including sanction, reward, punishment
Self(r/t/s): Techniques/practices directed at the self by researcher, teacher or student

Figure 2. Coding categories

Given clear patterns evident from the qualitative analysis of these data, an attempt was made to quantify the results despite no pre-established unit of analysis. Hence, data coded with these techniques have been analysed in quasi-quantitative mode, to identify patterns in the proportion of each practice of power relative to the other practices within sites, and to make comparisons between sites. Furthermore, each coded segment has been analysed, in a more contextualised way, for the object of the particular practice of power, the specific way in which the technique of power was enacted, the direction of the exercise of power, and any reactions or consequences evident.

Some broad findings are: (1) that these practices of power occurred in rapid succession, often overlapping, and were enacted by teachers and students alike—hence, supporting Foucault's view of power as circulating; (2) none of the sites was free of these techniques of power, a finding which has significance for thinking about limitations of critical and feminist (and progressive) pedagogies which have attempted to shift power relations (see Gore, in press). That is, even in the site most removed from educational institutions, these techniques were constitutive of pedagogy—part of what I'm doing is attempting to distil techniques of pedagogy and those of institutionalised pedagogy through the proportional comparisons I am making; (3) there are identifiable patterns in the circulation of power which enable claims to be made about the relationship between these techniques of power and various dynamics such as class, race, and gender—hence, as I've argued elsewhere (Gore, in press) the study connects with, but provides a more grounded and systematic analysis, than has been evident in much of the hidden curriculum research. This finding also highlights the political utility of Foucault's account of power despite the scepticism of some critics.

In the remainder of the paper, I provide a very brief picture of each site, highlighting key points about the exercise of power there and beginning to build comparisons between the different types of sites. I begin with the high school site in order to provide something of a baseline for the comparisons with more radical and non-institutionalised pedagogy. [Details on normalisation and
individualisation to be added]. Next, I begin my attempt to explain the functioning of power relations in these different sites, drawing especially on the results of a correspondence analysis applied to the data.

Physical Education site

Two classes were studied -- one Year 8 and one Year 11 -- both taught by the same experienced female teacher. While the configuration of techniques of power was similar across these two classes, there were some qualitative differences which seem to relate to the older age of the Year 11 students, their smaller class size, the students' choice to take the class, and their negotiation of class rules. In the Year 8 class, these techniques were also more often employed for disciplinary purposes, while in the Year 11 class the same techniques were employed more often for instructional purposes (such as getting students to closely observe their classmates). This finding was particularly true of distribution.

In terms of exercises of power by the teacher in relation to the students, there were comparatively high (that is, in comparison to the other sites) levels of surveillance, regulation and distribution. Interestingly, the majority of these instances were directed toward male, rather than female, students. These data support earlier research on classroom gender relations which demonstrates that male students both demand and receive an inordinate amount of teacher attention, particularly in relation to disciplinary matters. In the Year 8 class, these techniques were used more commonly by the teacher alone, while in the Year 11 class students participated more in the exercise of power in relation to their peers (particularly in relation to the enactment of class rules around swearing and other misdemeanours). In that class, girls were more likely than boys to employ these techniques of power and to direct them toward boys.

Classification was used by both teachers and students. When used by teachers it was used nearly as often for disciplinary purposes as it was for instructional purposes. When used by students in relation to each other, it was often for name calling or labelling. Especially in the Year 11 class, this type of classification was often delivered in jest. In the Year 8 class, with its greater use of discipline techniques, males were more frequently classified, while in the Year 11 class, classification of male and female students was roughly equal.

Power was also exercised by the students in relation to the teacher in four major ways: watching the teacher in order to avoid being caught; attempting to catch the teacher out (e.g., making an error, being inconsistent -- with an emphasis on fairness); assisting the teacher (e.g., reminding her of duties she needed to perform, calling on
classmates to behave); challenging the teacher.

Power exercised in relation to the self was, for students, most obvious in the case of distribution. In Year 8, boys distributed themselves toward the back, and often engaged in mock fighting, shoving, jumping in, etc. while girls tended to distribute themselves quietly, often seated, sometimes avoiding contact with the ball in games.

Teacher education site

In comparison to the Physical education site, the teacher education site revealed less use of explicit or formal rules, and overt techniques of power, thus continuing a trend, possibly age related, from Year 8 through Year 11 to first year university. In this site, there was a stronger reliance on self-discipline than in the school site, although regulation was still evident in relation to assignments (such as not plagiarising) and practicum requirements and students were under surveillance in relation to the practicum, the course work, and their behaviour in lectures (particularly noise levels, restlessness, and inattentiveness). The predominance of mass lecture pedagogy was no doubt a factor in this site, even though there were times at which the lecturers attempted to make their lectures more interactive. That is, with more than 100 (well-schooled) students in a lecture theatre, it is uncommon to see cases where lecturers overtly "discipline" their audiences, and especially, individuals in those audiences. As in the school site, there were exercises of power by students (but even these were less visible), such as observing the lecturers to ensure that they wouldn't be observed doing unrelated things during lectures or avoiding eye contact with the lecturers when they asked questions.

The high use of normalisation, however, was consistent with the program's aims of constructing thoughtful young teachers. Indeed, there was a clear opposition set up between caring, reflective, active and socially aware ("socially critical") teachers on the one hand, and uncaring, unreflective, unprofessional teachers on the other. Students were encouraged to view many aspects of schooling and society as problematic.

Because of the imperative to educate teachers in this site, there was also considerable discussion of these techniques as they have been used, or might be used, in schooling. That is, while the techniques were not directly applied to the students' own behaviour as students so much, they certainly were applied in the production of knowledge designed to influence their performance as future teachers. Discussion about rules, observation, organising groups of students, etc., were all part of the curriculum in this site. That is, techniques of power, though not named as such, were part of the curriculum at the same time as the curriculum was enacted by techniques of power.

Classification, for instance, was almost entirely used by lecturers and
directed at students for instructional purposes, even when the classification was of themselves. Outlining for students how to observe in classrooms was one way in which surveillance was used in this site, again for instructional purposes. Self surveillance was also encouraged, with students advised to observe themselves via video tape and course journals.

Women's group site

In both of the non-institutionalised sites, there was relatively less use of techniques of power in the immediate context of the group, that is, actions upon the actions of others in the immediate context. Instead, a great deal of power was mediated by the texts (broadly speaking) under discussion. Nevertheless, it was much more common for these women to articulate their own views, and in so doing articulate particular norms, than it was for them simply to reiterate or accept those provided in the texts themselves.

The women's group was closer in its configuration of power relations to the institutionalised sites, than the feminist group, probably because of the group's adherence to course guidelines provided to them which determined both the roles of group members and the "formal" curriculum. That is, during the period of observation the group was "studying" a community education program entitled "Women Travelling". A set of guidelines was available, and used by the women, to direct their discussions of the six books set for this course. Written reports were prepared and sent to the tutor for reaction rather than "assessment". Although there was no teacher, the (absent) course tutor provided a substitute for similar exercises of power. For instance, the women regulated themselves and each other in relation to ensuring they progressed through each of the questions designed for discussion.

However, there was considerable discussion of the tutor and his performance in a much more collective and explicit way than was found in any other site. Indeed, in this context, the "teacher" occupied a relatively powerless position -- which has possible implications for distance education and the corporeal presence or absence of the teacher.

Classification was related to the material being studied/discussed and often followed conventions of literary criticism re style of author, etc. To some extent this approach to the material was driven by the course notes.

In both of the non-institutionalised sites, distribution was used little and really only involved individuals' placement in the room.

Feminist group site
Although there was virtually no regulation or surveillance within this group, and any effects of distribution were invisible, the most remarkable aspects of this site were the high levels of normalisation and individualisation in the group.

Interestingly, like the other so-called radical site (TE), a great deal of normalisation centred on reinforcing the knowledge that was the primary reason for the group's existence. That is, within the feminist site, the vast majority of norms centred on feminism (just as in the TE site there was considerable emphasis both on what it is to be a teacher and on a range of social issues around which one aspect of the course was designed). Normalisation was frequently linked with individualisation whereby individual articulations reinforced particular feminist views. Unlike the physical education site, with its strong corporeal dimension, most of the techniques of power in the feminist and women's groups were employed in the form of verbal statements (comment, statement, suggestion, criticism, discussion, argument, reading quotes aloud, quoting figures or statistics, describing, recollecting). Thus, the normalising process often took the form of a number of statements by different group members building on each other's comments.

Preliminary findings

From these snapshots of each site, the following preliminary findings can be reported:

1. There was proportionally greater functioning of surveillance, regulation and distribution in the institutional and mainstream settings and particularly in the school site.
2. There was an inverse stronger functioning of normalisation in the radical and non-institutional settings.
3. The spread of techniques was greatest in the mainstream institutional setting.
4. Normalisation was strongest in the radical institutional setting.

These findings suggest the following arguments:

(a) Surveillance, regulation and distribution may be defining features of institutional pedagogy. If so, we have some explanation of why attempts to enact radical pedagogy within institutions are often thwarted/unsatisfactory (e.g., When one of my students years ago wrote in his journal "I'm not into this regimented reflective stuff", he was reacting to a compulsion that characterises institutionalised pedagogy and assessment and possibly undermines goals of radical pedagogy). That is, radical goals/content may well be at odds with the monitoring, regulating and controlling of students that is always-already part of
institutional pedagogy (e.g., Canaan, 1996). Ellsworth's (1989) oft-cited statement that attempts at radical pedagogy were "not only unhelpful, but actually exacerbated the very conditions we were trying to work against" (Ellsworth, p.91) may be related to these techniques of power.

(b) There is a qualitative difference about the techniques of surveillance, regulation and distribution, compared with classification, normalisation, and individualisation, as more corporeal; having more to do with the disciplining of bodies and conversely less connected with the learning of knowledge or content. Here we may have some explanation for the frustration of teachers and students who are unable to get on with the task of teaching/learning while time is spent on these other activities. These more corporeal techniques as characteristic of institutionalised pedagogy, as mentioned, are related to the compulsion to be there and struggles related to that compulsion. Haberman (1994) speaks of "try and make me pedagogy," as the norm in most schools. Perhaps the bodily struggles that create an emphasis on control rather than learning produce these conditions. If these techniques are less connected with learning, then the institutionalisation of the WG practices as they rigidly followed course outlines may also account for the apparently superficial nature of discussions in that site which centred on answering the questions.

(c) Schools/institutions may be characterised by a more diffuse and more comprehensive functioning of power relations, with the relatively strong functioning of a whole range of techniques, which may lead to the production of "schooled students" (a student subjectivity with "tightened" bodies [Corrigan, 1991] and sharpened minds)

(d) The relatively stronger functioning of normalisation than other techniques in the radical settings (around feminism in the FEM site, and around radical politics and ethical and professional teaching practice in the TE site) is consistent with: (a) my argument about radical pedagogy's emphasis on social vision, and (b) the enactment of new regimes of truth around these pedagogies. That is, given the strong functioning of normalisation in these sites, we may have some explanation for the kind of "resistance" educators encounter from students when they attempt to enact radical pedagogies. If power relations are inescapable in pedagogy, then whatever techniques are most strongly experienced are likely to encounter resistance. Foucault said "there are no relations of power without resistances; the latter are all the more real and effective because they are formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised" (Foucault, 1980, 142, my italics).

The strong experience of normalisation is likely to precipitate the resistance of which radical educators write (e.g., Lather, 1991; Lewis,
McWilliam, ?) especially when located in the institution. [Check TE interview data in particular]. Hence, the schooled body should be understood not only as the primary target of the techniques of disciplinary power, but also as the point where these techniques are resisted and thwarted.

Together, these findings show, as Bernstein suggests, that pedagogy is more than a relay for power relations external to itself. Pedagogy, and particularly institutionalised pedagogy seems to carry its own set of power relations. Even outside of the institution and in a most "radical" setting, power relations are characteristic of pedagogy. As Foucault puts it:

It seems to me that power is 'always already there', that one is never 'outside' it, that there are no 'margins' for those who break with the system to gambol in. But this does not entail the necessity of accepting an inescapable form of domination or an absolute privilege on the side of the law. To say that one can never be 'outside' power does not mean that one is trapped and condemned to defeat no matter what. (Foucault, 1980, 141-2)

It is also important, in all of this analysis, to remember that Foucault sees power as productive. For instance, he says of surveillance that it is a "mechanism inherent to pedagogy". In this analysis, my aim is not necessarily to suggest that we should attempt to alter power relations in these sites or that these configurations of power are negative. Instead, I am concerned, as a preliminary step, to attempt to understand in detail how power operates.

Mapping the findings through correspondence analysis

I want to turn now to a second, but related, form of analysis I have undertaken in order to better understand power's operation. Correspondence analysis is one of the most efficient procedures for "describing and establishing relationships in qualitative data. . . . [It] has as its principal characteristic an exchange of the roles of variables and observations and seeks to represent them in the same space" (Henry, 1988). Essentially, correspondence analysis has taken the data I had in the form of a frequencies on a 6 x 4 matrix (6 techniques of power by 4 sites) and calculated correspondences between these variables in order to identify primary axes along which variation occurred.

I have conducted (with assistance) two analyses using the technique of correspondence analysis, in order to explore different ways in which power operated. Consider the category of surveillance as an illustration of why these two analyses were deemed necessary: (1) surveillance was evident in the immediate context observing the actions of participants; (2) there was also talking or reading about surveillance in school or in society; (3) students were instructed to
observe themselves or each other for learning purposes. While the effects of these different exercises of power may be quite different in terms of visible dynamics, they have all been recorded and analysed primarily because, in Foucault’s approach to power, power-knowledge is as important as power relations. That is, the production of knowledge in each of these pedagogical sites is a result of relations of power, (e.g., actions of lecturers/teachers upon students who are compelled in one way or another to be there, who are tested on some of that knowledge, etc.) just as instructions to keep quiet or keep journals are enactments of power relations. Because each of the techniques of power was used in such multiple ways, I have distinguished between “all techniques” and those which pertain only to dynamics “within groups”. Using correspondence analysis for these two sets of data identified some differences between them. The two axes identified accounted for 99.6% of the variation between categories (all coded techniques) and 90.3% of the variation between categories using the within group data only. Also there was slight movement of some categories plotted on the diagrams, although the axes (or dimensions) and general location of variables did not alter significantly (See Figures 3 and 4). What follows is a preliminary interpretation of the outcomes of these processes.

The first axis (or dimension) represents the corporeality of the techniques of power. Surveillance, regulation and distribution are quite clearly grouped together but apart from normalisation, classification and individualisation. Here, a split between the institutionalised and non-institutionalised sites is also evident. Indeed, there is evidence of less corporeal exercises of power the less institutionalised the site, with PE being very closely linked with these techniques. Furthermore, for both the institutionalised and non-institutionalised sites, the mainstream site is stronger on corporeality than is the radical site. This is not to say that power is not felt upon the body in radical sites. Indeed, as Rail and Harvey (1995) put it:
"the great procedure put in place, the tactic no figure can represent, is the one of internalization. The noncorporeal [sic] is at the centre of disciplinary procedures. It is at the centre of their functioning as much as their purpose" (p.162).

The second axis (or dimension) is harder to describe. It sets up an opposition between normalisation and individualisation. On this axis, regulation and surveillance are most closely associated with individualisation while classification and distribution lie closer to normalisation. One interpretation of this axis pertains to totalising exercises of power. This interpretation is made possible by also examining the location of sites on the axis. The TE site, which is clearly at one pole of the axis, was most strongly characterised by normalisation. Indeed in this site, nearly half of all exercises of power (within groups) were normalising ones. But they were enacted in relation to large groups. On the one hand, this finding may be
partially explained by the mass lecture format of most activities within the TE site. More compelling, I think, is a view that in this site there were clear attempts to mould a new cohort of student teachers, with particular

Figure 3

Figure 4

perspectives and dispositions. Similarly, the location of the FEM site at the other pole along this axis could be explained by the relatively small size of the group. However, the fact that the not much larger Women's Group is located considerable distance from the FEM group on this axis would suggest that something else is going on. In terms of the proportions of techniques within the various sites, normalisation was actually the second most prevalent technique within FEM. Hence, its location on this axis does not mean that it was the furthest removed from normalisation. Rather, I think the axis is indicative of the means by which normalisation was achieved. In the FEM site, the participants shared a set of feminist norms and when norms were applied or invoked it was largely individual clarifications or points of view. In the TE site, the invocation of norms was much more commonly directed from lecturers toward the whole group of (around 100) students and it was achieved by classifying teachers and students, good and bad teachers, forms of pedagogy, etc.

Another, and related, way to think about the second dimension is that it highlights the way in which power is exercised for the production of knowledge. Normalisation and classification are perhaps the two techniques (of the ones studied) that most directly shape truths. Individualisation, specifying an individual, for instance, while contributing to the production of knowledge, does not, by its very nature, necessarily lead to collective understandings or forms of knowledge in the way that normalisation and totalisation do.

Most stark in these analyses is (1) the correspondence between PE and surveillance, regulation and distribution, (2) the correspondence between TE and normalisation, (3) the clear split between the institutionalised and non-institutionalised sites, and (4) the marginal location of the FEM site.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have provided an overview of the study and of some of the findings that have emerged from the first site of coding categories applied to the data. The presentation is rather technical and
emphasises categorisation at the expense of contextualisation (Maxwell and Miller, 1993). I apologise for the style produced by this approach but not for the approach itself. From the outset I have wanted to conduct a systematic analysis of power relations in order to theorise from a strong empirical base. My aim, ultimately, is to produce a "friendlier" style that conveys in more narrative form the operation of power in these sites at the same time as I work towards a sociological theory of power relations in pedagogy.
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Technique suitable for use with nominal data. Correspondence analysis seeks to account for the distribution of data in the specified categories.

from vigarello: "discipline `makes' individuals" (F, 170)

rail and harvey: The body "as a surface on which the social is inscribed" 165

Mauss' classical essay on "Bodily Techniques" (1954), a call for research on the body which Foucault's work has put at the center of the research agenda in the social sciences and humanities. 169

"Pedagogies are carriers of precepts which give the body a form, and control it to submit it to norms in a way more efficient than thought. . . . The body is the first place where the adult hand marks the child;
it is the first space where we impose social and psychological limits to its behavior; it is the emblem where culture inscribes its signs as blazons" (from Vigarello, 178, p.9. -- trans Rail and Harvey. 171)

[In both of the institutionalised sites, there were formal requirements enacted, for instance in the form of attendance checks. However, in the other sites, women also attempted to account for absent group members and so such concerns were not unique to the institutionalised sites.]

[Classification in relation to the issues being discussed. In all sites, classification varied in degree of subtlety -- implicitness/explicitness

In both the women's group and the feminist group (possibly all groups), there was considerable laughter which might also be connected with exercises of power. For instance, collective laughter at an individual's suggestion may well undermine that individual's conviction or at least limit their influence. (This is speculation, not data).

Sur. reg, and dist as defining features of institutional ped in "contradiction" to the goals of sharing power in radical ped. That is, not only that power is experienced and exercised by the teacher but that it is there is a relatively high proportion of these particular techniques.

Compulsion and assessment (e.g., Canaan, 1996, Examining the Examination) as features of inst.ped.

Foucault sees resistance arising at the points where power relations are their most rigid and intense. The category of resistance therefore is closely linked with the idea of power as productive. For Foucault, repression and resistance are not ontologically distinct, rather repression produces its own resistance:

The indirect exercise of power in relation to matters other than content may also be a factor in the strong experience of and resistance to normalisation.

Analysis of techniques (excluding interviews):

Inst(59% explicit, 27% indirect)
Non-Inst (33% explicit, 50% indirect)
Radical (37% explicit, 48% indirect)
Mainstream(62% explicit, 24% indirect)
Challenging/questioning the teacher insignificant in all but PE sites
Official sanctions and threat of sanction only in PE and TE
Retaliation only in TE
"Pedagogical techniques" substantial in all sites

<< Regimes in this site are reflective of the multiple purposes re
formal curric, school norms and societal norms. Regimes unique to the
physical education site were Discipline, Competition, Behavioural
Norms, Physical Body, Alcohol/Drugs. >> RW

On regimes

Across all four sites, four major regimes were identified: (1) work
practice/conduct; (2) conceptions of teaching/teacher/student; (3)
politics/policy/social issues (including sexual politics and racial
politics); (4) theory/methodology. Theory/methodology was almost
entirely limited to two sites TE and FEM or the so-called radical
sites. Feminism was identified as a regime more than 4 times more than
any other regime in the feminist site. In WG, Professionalism, Value
of Education, and Politics/Economics and Colonialism were most common.
In TE, Professionalism and Critical Reflection/Sociology dominated,
along with Ethics/Fairness/ Democracy and Radical Politics/Reform. In
PE8, Alcohol/Drugs which was a major part of the formal curriculum
predominated, while in PE11, the regimes of Ethics/Fairness/Democracy
prevailed (PE11 finding is consistent with the negotiation of class
rules that characterised that site).

These data demonstrate:

∑ clear emphasis in the radical sites on the articulation of the
particular social vision to which they subscribed (feminism in FEM and
radical politics, ethical and professional teaching practice in TE).
Critical reflection/sociology was also found much more in these two
sites than in the others. This is an interesting finding which provides
some confirmation of my earlier arguments about the emphasis in radical
pedagogy.
∑ In the institutionalised sites, more emphasis than in the other sites, on regimes to do with work practice/conduct. Here, the institutional imperatives certainly seem to take up a significant amount of the air space in the groups. The group in which there was the lowest proportion of regimes of this type was FEM, the "least institutionalised" of the four groups.

∑ the clear articulation in all sites of regimes associated with the formal agenda of the group (e.g., alcohol/drugs and the family in PE8, feminism in FEM, etc.)

Surveillance

In the school sites (PE8 and PE11), surveillance was mainly exercised by teachers in relation to male students. In the senior class female students also exercised surveillance in relation to their male peers. Surveillance was evident primarily in relation to classroom management. However, there was some surveillance of the teacher by the students (particularly in the Year 11 class), such as blaming her for obscuring their view of the board or reminding her when she needed to leave the class in order to make school announcements.

In PE8, surveillance was strongly linked with regulation. Student surveillance of teachers in the Yr 8 context took the form of watching to ensure the teacher wasn't watching their own (unacceptable) behaviours. Surveillance took both visible and articulated forms. Surveillance was also used as a pedagogical technique by having students watch each other's performance (physical skills, role plays).

Objects of surveillance included students' movement (in and out of change shed, classroom, s, ovals, sports halls) their placement in groups, their injuries, their participation and objects they touch (especially objects they should not touch), their activities, classwork (progress, assignments, books) and behaviour.

In the Year 11 class, and probably because of the negotiated class rules, surveillance of students by each other was much more common than in the Year 8 class. There was also more surveillance of teachers by students.

Objects of surveillance included students' activities, progress on class work, assignments, books, performance on tests, behaviour, particular answers on exam questions, attendance/ non-attendance, inattentiveness, bodily positions, time to complete agility tests etc...
In the TE site, surveillance was mainly used to gain student attention but rather than using threats or disciplinary action, more subtle techniques such as making eye contact and circulating among students were used. There was also formally sanctioned surveillance of students' attendance and of their performance on practicum. Students were under surveillance in relation to practicum, course work, behaviour (noise, restlessness, inattentiveness).

In WG there was some surveillance of group members and also of the tutor.
In FEM there was very little surveillance.

**Regulation**

In PE8 regulation primarily centred on student behaviour and was directed from teacher to students.
In PE11 regulation was more concerned with assessment requirements and negotiated class rules.
In TE, regulation centred on assessment and practicum requirements.

In WG, regulation focussed on the progression in the meetings through the guiding questions and ensuring that main points of discussion were recorded.

In FEM there was almost no regulation.

**Distribution**

In PE8 distribution was used as a disciplinary tool much more than in any other site.

In PE11 distribution was used much more as an instructional tool than it was in PE8.

In TE distribution was used by the lecturers to unify their actions and the content of lectures, as well as to organise students. By students, distribution mainly took the form of individuals differentiating themselves by actions such as coming in late, arranging themselves or their bodies in particular ways.

In WG distribution really only concerned individuals' placement in the room.

In FEM distribution really only concerned individuals' placement in the
Circles and group work were an interesting commonality across all sites.

The significance of this paper lies in its contribution toward a theory of power relations in pedagogy which, in addition to extending past macro-level theories, will account for patterns in the micro-level circulation of power and disciplining of bodies. Moreover, this study contributes to such theory from a unique empirical base. To the extent that power relations are central in the micro-level enactment of pedagogy, and that enormous continuities over time are evident in the character of what occurs among teachers and students, a theory of power relations in pedagogy which identifies patterns and specific practices in such a way that enables new points of intervention to be explored, has the potential to make a substantial contribution not only to educational theory, policy, and practice but also to social theory more generally.

on the usefulness of Foucauldian concept of power for empirical study, for understanding of power in pedagogy, for providing an account of the complexity of power relations
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