View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Jagiellonian Univeristy Repository

Power and Education
Volume 4 Number 1 2012
www.wwwords.co.uk/POWER

Obedience, Sabotage, Autonomy: power games within the educational system

GRZEGORZ MAZURKIEWICZ
Department of Management and Social Communication, Institute of Public Affairs, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland
BARTŁOMIEJ WALCZAK
Institute of Applied Social Sciences, University of Warsaw, Poland

ABSTRACT The authors' aim in this article is to use a critical approach to analyse the modernisation process of the pedagogic supervision system in Poland, looking at change not as critics but (co)authors. Their aim is not to exploit the strengths of critical sociology when applied to the processes of innovation, but to use these strengths reflexively to arrive at a better understanding of change, and of the reactions and the behaviour of all the participants in the process, including their own role in the system and its possible dangers. The authors believe that for a sociologist involved in the change process, the reflexive approach is crucial so as to comply with ethical requirements, and that it enables an active, needs-oriented involvement when making decisions about introducing change.

In this article, we take a closer look at the various consequences of the involvement of scientific expertise in the educational change process and then move on to discuss some possible scenarios. It should be noted that this involvement is *our own* involvement as academics responsible for the development of a new system.

We adopt a constructivist paradigm. Constructivism assumes the plurality of interpretations and knowledge. The social constructivism described by Thomas Kuhn emphasises diachronic change in knowledge (Sady, 2000; Kuhn, 2001), but the process of change we are concerned with is understood synchronically. This means that discussion about the mutual positions of the subjects involved in this epistemological process should not be seen as the meeting of different, independent perspectives. In our opinion, this approach leads to the self-reflectivity that helps to reduce prejudices (Weinsheimer, 1988; Gadamer, 1993, 2004).

Architects and Inhabitants: the pedagogic supervision modernisation project

For a sociologist immersed in the critical literature, the words 'modernisation' and 'supervision' sound rather false. Modernisation (*modernizacja* in Polish) refers to the neo-liberal ideology of constant growth, criticised widely in both sociological (Dahrendorf, 1993; Wallerstein, 2004) and economic literature (Mishan, 1986). The requirement of primary accumulation, which is the basis of capitalism, is shown as a mechanism which, in order to function properly, needs constantly to accumulate new resources (Wallerstein, 2007). 'Modernisation' as a term is criticised on many levels – as an expression of cultural imperialism; as a correlate of neo-liberal ideology; as a mask of voracious capitalism. It is also presented, on the self-reflective level of sociological studies, in opposition to the paradigms after the linguistic turn, as a mainstream, naturalistic and positivistic epistemology.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/power.2012.4.1.73

The word 'supervision' has several definitions in Polish. The literal equivalent of the English 'supervision' is the Polish word *nadzór*. According to the Polish dictionary, *nadzór* means:

- the act of controlling or overseeing somebody or something;
- the regulatory body of an institution supervising somebody or something. (*Słownik Języka Polskiego* [Dictionary of the Polish Language], 2011)

The word 'supervision' is mainly used in the context of authorities controlling the correctness of various actions performed by citizens and institutions. Societies create supervising authorities in all significant areas, and their task is to eliminate deviation on different levels and to control the adherence to norms. Examples are construction supervision, technical supervision, pharmaceutical supervision, etc. The Polish word for 'to supervise' (*nadzorować*) is close in meaning to the French *surveiller*, hence Tadeusz Komendant's translation of Foucault's (1998) *Discipline and Punish* as *Nadzorować i karać*. Polish sociologists associate the term 'supervision' strongly with a disciplined society as described by Foucault.

The pedagogic supervision modernisation project relates to the reform of the Polish educational system. Along with a system of standardised external examinations, it is intended to create a homogeneous diagnosis system for the quality of schools' work. Evaluation – one of the main tools in the new model of pedagogic supervision – is based on two pillars: the external evaluation carried out by special units of trained inspectors, and self-evaluation realised by head teachers and teachers. The legal basis and requirements are to be found in the Ordinance of the Ministry of National Education from 7 October 2007 on the matter of pedagogic supervision.

The system of pedagogic supervision (inspection) in Poland has passed through a series of changes and various forms of functioning since the political transformation of 1989. Paradoxically, the system generally remained virtually unaltered: as regards rules, climate, structure and organisation, the system followed rules inherited from the previous political system, including an authoritarian approach towards schools, the lack of a coherent strategy and poor communication, unclear goals, and priorities focused on administrative issues instead of on learning. In 2009, changes in educational law separated control from support and evaluation (which were described as the three functions of pedagogic supervision). This separation made it necessary to design and implement a new model of school evaluation that would remedy the weaknesses of the previous system and allow a new focus of attention on the development of schools and the whole educational system.

In the new model, external evaluation relates to a set of educational standards (referred to in Polish law as 'requirements') that were introduced into the educational system after a long debate involving various stakeholders, and which were organised early on in the project as the first step in the preparation of the evaluation. The standards set out a vision of schools' development and are generally formulated to grant the institutions autonomy in the process of setting priorities and the manner of their realisation in the face of challenges in the contemporary world. In the light of these standards, an interdisciplinary project team prepared the conceptualisation and the evaluation tools, as the second step in the preparation. All the criteria and tools of the evaluation have been made public and, likewise, the procedures of the examination and the evaluators' reports (which are published on the Internet; Berdzik & Mazurkiewicz, 2010).

When carrying out the external evaluations, which started early in 2010 as the third stage of the project, the inspectors are obliged to consider the school's specific character along with its self-evaluation. Amongst the research tools, there are provisions that ensure the participation of school and local communities in the creation of the school's image (for example, focus group interviews with students, their parents and non-pedagogical staff). The final outcome of the report is discussed with the teachers prior to its publication and the inspectors are obliged to respond to their comments.

In creating the system for the evaluation of education, we have attempted to follow certain principles. The first is democracy, by which we understand that all the actors involved in the life of the school are involved in the process – the employees, as well as the students, their parents and representatives of the local community. The second is transparency: publishing the procedures, tools and results of the evaluation on the Internet means no one is surprised during the process and, at the same time, the information gathered by the evaluators is available to everyone. The starting point is the clear vision of education agreed upon through a long and difficult process. But

the questions remain: To what extent does this vision meet the needs of all the interested parties, and to what extent does it allow minority communities to express themselves? The third principle is sensitivity towards the particular characteristics of the assessed people and their opinions. This is ensured by a flexible approach to the standards and methods of their evaluation. A process of continuing consultation is carried out and, simultaneously, their opinions on the requirements (standards) are gathered so that, at a convenient time, acceptable changes can also be introduced into the requirements.

A significant, distinct community within the school system are the Catholic schools (although these are not really a minority group). Although Catholicism is the dominant religion in Poland and there are Christian religious symbols in public schools and the Christian religion is taught in them, there is still a clearly visible discrepancy between public education and private schools of a Catholic identity. Catholic schools have taken up a position of strong opposition to the politics of the Ministry of Education, and they emphasise their distinctiveness in terms of their system of values. This system is not, in fact, far from that of other Polish schools, but, in axiologically neutral educational standards, there is no room for such references. The representatives of private Catholic schools cannot see their place in this system. The question remains: How do we include the needs of these and other, smaller, less influential communities in these homogeneous general standards?

There is an urgent need to change the outlook of people involved in school evaluation and, at the same time, to change the power relations, educational ideologies, political strategies and even economic procedures/processes through which the evaluation is conducted. As the representatives of the team responsible for the creation of the system for evaluation of schools' performance and other educational institutions, we are aware of the numerous hazards that come with our involvement in the process. The most acute one is the danger of combining bureaucratic power with academic knowledge. The authority of social science, even when used in good faith, poses a real risk to the reflexivity and autonomy of schools. We return to this problem later in this article as it raises a key question about the extent of the responsibility of a sociologist involved in a process of social change that has a political struggle at its basis and is carried out by a bureaucratic apparatus.

Critical reflection on the process of the modernisation of supervision suggests the analogy of architect and inhabitant. An architect is a person with power deriving from professional expertise and from the responsibility for the final shape of a building (or a complex of buildings) that other people will use. The architect's project may be altered throughout the process of construction or it may be put into effect in a way that is at odds with its original assumptions, but it is still the architect who remains the person with a wide area of authority. However, the architect is not the person who experiences the consequences of the solutions used. The inhabitant is a person who has little influence on the designing stage, but the inhabitant's influence becomes much bigger in the construction phase and it is paramount in the process of using the building, crucially determining its value (apart from aesthetic criteria). How can one make these two sides remain in constant, respectful contact, sharing responsibility for the project in question? Is it even possible? In trying to manage the relations between the architects and the inhabitants, it is important to bear in mind the difficulties inherent in such interactions.

Assumptions and Constructions: fears and frustrations

It is the people involved in any project, event or cultural phenomenon who create social reality. This reality emerges from conversations, conflicts and agreements, and then it exists to a greater extent in our subjective beliefs than in objective categories. From a sociological point of view, two factors are determining of the human world: the social character of individuals and their communication with the world through symbols. These elements shape the social reality for each person. It has a 'reality' since it is charged with meaning (Berger, 1983). Each person functions in this world through what they know – the boundaries of their knowledge are the boundaries of their reality. The modification of knowledge, which takes place through direct and indirect social contacts, leads to shaping the reality, which we cannot get rid of simply by an act of will.

The processes of institutionalisation result in mechanisms that validate the newly formed institutions and provide this new reality with the status of an objective area of facts, which subjects the individual to its principles (Berger, 1983). Hence, the reality formed by supervisor–supervisee

interactions is seen as objectified reality. The visit of an evaluator in school is a fact understood as an objectified element of reality. Failing to understand that all the events in our professional life are actually a result of certain agreements (sometimes made outside our area of influence) makes taking autonomous actions more difficult – sometimes it makes it impossible to actively co-create our own world.

People may work ineffectively because of the mental model they use when trying to understand the world and their role in it (Senge, 2002), if the conventional vision of reality or the prevailing interpretations of the observed facts make effective functioning difficult. Mental models that we are unaware of create barriers for effective action, especially when they are opposed to a value system or a way of acting that is being introduced. The obstacles are the frustrations caused by what is believed to be 'right' or 'functioning' (even subconsciously) and what is being proposed. The initiators of all changes must face the culture of fear (Palmer, 1998) and be willing to question the traditional approach to interpersonal relations in a professional context. The contemporary fear culture in schools, constructed by the situation of constant testing, grading and judging, is to be seen in reactions, priorities and ways of acting, focused mainly on ensuring one's safety by proving one's usefulness and infallibility. The concept of accountability used in the educational world, determined as it is by market forces and continuous competition, strengthens these feelings of insecurity, which are related to more than just the stress of the person being evaluated and derive from the wider culture outside the school.

The political, organisational and psychological complexities arising from the project of the change of the school supervision system may lead to frustration, anxiety or fear, from a lack of understanding of the demands and context. This is a very natural response, no more or less dangerous than the naive conviction that we know what we are doing and that the effects of our actions are obvious and understandable. Stephen Brookfield (1995), when talking about classrooms, uses the concept of 'teaching innocently', which comes from the assumption that the meaning teachers place on their actions is the one that students take from these actions. We may describe every potential interaction in exactly the same way – 'acting innocently' would describe behaviour which is based on the assumption that all involved parties share an identical, or at least similar, understanding of the situation. This assumption leads inexorably to pessimism and lethargy. The lack of a shared understanding of motives and intentions leads to the misreading of how others perceive these actions; and this gives rise to feelings of frustration and powerlessness.

One of the possible ways to break with the discourse of innocence (and blame) is to build a habit of critical reflection. The key element of critical reflection is the focus on owned assumptions – beliefs about the world and our place within it which seem so obvious to us that they do not need any further explanation. Paradigmatic assumptions, used to organise the world into fundamental categories, are the hardest to discover – it is possible not to recognise them as assumptions, even when they are pointed out directly. Instead, the impulse is to insist that they are objectively valid renderings of reality, the facts we know to be true. Paradigmatic assumptions are examined critically only after a great deal of initial resistance.

When introducing any new initiative of a complex character – for instance, a system of values and beliefs, theoretical assumptions, ways of acting or methods of assessment of these actions and, most importantly, their purposes – one should be aware of the frustrations caused by different assumptions about the right ways of acting. This is crucial when considering the traditional fear connected with evaluation in schools and the strained relations between people who, instead of offering support, may cause discouragement. This fear goes beyond schools and relates to culture in general: we cannot emphasise enough that we are now witnessing a serious crisis of interpersonal relations in contemporary society. At the present time, we are living in a state of endangerment to democracy because of this crisis. Democracy does not depend solely on the political system, methods of voting, human rights, etc. Democracy is primarily based on trust and on the assumption that people who make decisions on our behalf do so on the grounds of reasonable beliefs and judgements (Meier, 2000). When there is no such trust, the democratic system begins to fail. The same can be said about schools. When focusing on the project of creating a new pedagogic supervision system, we notice a prevailing lack of trust.

The Double Structure of Architects' Power

The new version of a pedagogic supervision system is a combination of two power structures. The first is bureaucratic power. It is based on public, hierarchic dependence. There is nothing revolutionary about recognising a hierarchic structure in schools. Numerous scholars have commented on this structure: 'Power is organized along vertical lines of authority from administration to faculty to student body; students have a degree of control over their curriculum comparable of that of the worker over the content of his job' (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 12).

The structure of power *inside* the school corresponds with the placing of the school in a structure of power *outside* it. In the Polish educational system, the highest authority is the Ministry of Education, managing a network of 16 voivodeship (local) boards of education. These departments are responsible for supervising the schools and institutions. The supervision is carried out by administrative bodies, organisations and associations that own the given school and are concerned with the legality of the school's activities and the quality of its work.

This is where power ultimately rests – the pedagogical supervisory board and the leading authorities may, for example, dismiss a head teacher or even close down a school. This relation of power, being explicit, allows an opportunity for resistance or, alternately, for taking up a strategy of conscious conformism. The other power structure, which has been discussed above, is hidden and involves the transmission from explicit power to suppressed power and symbolic violence. This transition is analysed by Pierre Bourdieu, who describes the 'dependence–autonomy' antinomy. He notes that the state is constructed as a separate, internally well-organised entity, commenting:

> Meanwhile in reality we deal with a set of bureaucratic and administrative fields ... inside of which people, or groups of people, connected or not connected with the government, compete personally or *per procura* with this specific form of power which is the opportunity to *regulate* a given area of practice ... by means of legal regulations, administrative tools (subventions, permits, etc.), in short, with everything which is meant by the term *policy*. (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2001, p. 95; original emphasis)

These comments notwithstanding, the arena of *real* power that shapes the existence of educational institutions and the people involved may be somewhere else – at the level of the formation of educational politics or even of the ideologies which provide its foundation (Meighan, 1993). The danger resulting from such power is that it remains relatively suppressed and, to that extent, hidden – a point we will return to. Here, we need to confront the ethical problem: the responsibility of sociologists as the co-creators of this reality.

Suppressed power relations appear on different levels. On the epistemological level, there is the unreflective usage of existing tools, procedures and solutions, since they have been created by so-called 'experts who know their stuff'. Negative responses towards our procedures and questionnaires, which were dismissed as 'academic', incompatible with the school's reality and insensitive to its specifics, were made on many occasions by teachers and head teachers. This seemed to us to be a probably conscious strategy of resistance towards an external model of imposed reality. These responses were part of a strategy for maintaining autonomy, and were difficult from our point of view. They were, however, focused on rather minor elements (like the terminology used in some questions or the consideration of specific methods for working with students and their individual situations). There has been no attempt to build a complex, alternative model of looking at a school in the two years of the project's operation.

On the ontological level, an unreflective acceptance of a certain model (for instance, that typified in the educational standards discussed earlier) may result in a lack of autonomy in the creation of one's own vision of the school, independent from political decision makers or current trends and ideologies. As Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976, p. 12) point out, the way the educational system works does not come from the everyday intentional actions of head teachers and teachers, but 'through a close correspondence between the social relationships which govern personal interaction in the workplace and the social relationship of the educational system'. Control is seen as a form of oppression that leads people to adjust to the world and inhibits their creative power (Freire, 1974). In this way, the educational system may become for its participants something that Niklas Luhmann (1994) described as a 'black box' – a metaphor for a situation in which social subsystems are impenetrable to each other. The working mechanism of one system is

not visible to the other; and one can question the need to understand how a system works if it is different from our own. Putting this into the language of education, we could imagine that the way a school fulfils its educational functions is not transparent, for instance, to a student's family (Luhmann, 1994). In the long term, this lack of transparency may turn into a mechanism of suppressed power.

How far do the consequences of starting the 'black box' mechanism go? We can look for the answer in Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*: 'The mechanisms [of disciplinary establishments] have a certain tendency to become *de-institutionalized*, to emerge from the closed fortresses in which they have once functioned and to circulate in a *free* state' (Foucault, 1998, p. 211; original emphasis). If disciplinary establishments are blurred in society and power over the subject's autonomy is increasingly obscured, the consequences of the processes described above may apply to many aspects of social life. If we find suppressed power at the basis of an educational system, it will not educate people to be autonomous. This is why we may ask about the limits of the architect's responsibility. Where does our responsibility end, as sociologists, social researchers and scholars aware of our potential role in constraining this autonomy?

Architects and Politicians

There is a further danger in the marriage of social science and administrative power. Sociology recognises the specifics of bureaucratic power quite well. Bureaucracy and its immanent characteristics – the formation of hierarchic relations between social actors, and the attendant depersonification and homogenising of people involved in institutions – have been the subject of sociological analysis, from the classic works of Max Weber (2002), pointing to bureaucracy as one of the ideal types of power, through the critical works of Charles W. Mills (1961), to Ralph Dahrendorf (1993, 2008) and others. The consequences of spreading bureaucratic power have also been analysed. As Zygmunt Bauman (1992) has argued, it was one of the causes of the Holocaust.

Bureaucracy is treated in the literature as an external phenomenon, a subject of analysis. It is less common to focus attention on the ivory tower built by scholars, which, as Mills (1961) points out, also forms a hierarchic bureaucratic structure. Paul Tylor (2010, p. 150) agrees: 'It is not unusual for sociologists with detailed knowledge of Weber to create their own personalized iron cages of rationality when in positions of authority themselves'. How can we be sure, while joining in the creation of a bureaucratic structure and being a part of a structure of power, that our activities will not aid the reinforcement of a hierarchic, depersonalised and standardised authority? The answer must lie, in part, in the assumptions that are fundamental to the idea of educational evaluation. An essential requirement is the involvement of all the social actors in the situation, so as to ensure that power does not spread vertically, but that each actor, independently from his or her position in the field (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2001), has an equal opportunity to shape the discussion. Even when this is so, the danger of the reproduction of a hierarchic power is inherent in the analysis of the evaluation reports, which show that inspectors routinely privilege the voices of people with a high rank in the field, especially schools' head teachers. Some analyses represent solely the voice of the head teacher, with a sprinkling of data from other sources, which – even when in opposition to the head teacher's words – has no apparent influence on the evaluator's opinion.

A similar situation may be observed with schools' technical personnel, with whom we conducted focus interviews. From our conversations with head teachers and inspectors, we could clearly see that the views of technical staff are given little weight. This appears to be a consequence of the perceived low rank in the field of this group of workers, who are considered to be inferior in social class and, consequently, as having no *right* to influence education directly. An example will illustrate this point. During the workshops for inspectors, there are simulations of group interviews with technical personnel, among others. The simulation is based on role play – one of the inspectors being the moderator and the others the people to be evaluated. From our perspective as trainers observing these simulations, it is instructive to note the exaggerated change of language which – much to their own amusement – the inspectors always make when playing the technical staff. Language, as a clear class distinction, becomes a legible sign, separating 'us' – educated people, using the elaborated code (Bokszański et al, 1977; Bernstein, 1990) – from 'them' – physical

workers, destined to use the restricted code. This reaffirmation of technical staff's otherness works to reinforce the exclusion of particular school groups according to the logic of class and functional distinctions. Meanwhile, as John MacBeath notes:

> schools are places in which there are many voices which carry, and carry in differing bandwidths. There are voices which demand to be listened to by virtue of their status. Some voices have an inherent authority ... There are strident voices and voices which have been systematically silenced by rules and mores, or by the weight of historical inertia and frustration. (MacBeath, 2006, p. 71)

A Self-reflective Community of Inhabitants: the ultimate goal

What solutions should we look for in order to avoid fear and lack of trust when introducing a reform of the system? For an authentic outcome, we should look for independence, autonomy and critical reflection rather than the easier option of pessimistic criticism. Autonomy expressed through critical reflection should lead to informed actions, leading, in turn, to positive outcomes and developing a rationale for practice, so that we know why we believe what we believe. We need to avoid tearing ourselves apart and taking blame for everything – a critically reflective person will try to investigate what others are experiencing and understand the social and political context, without attributing blame, resulting in a firm emotional foundation. Neglecting to clarify and question assumptions leads to a sense that the world is chaotic and that, apart from the dictates of those in authority, it is fate or serendipity, rather than human agency, that are the forces shaping the educational process (Brookfield, 1995).

Is autonomy through critical reflection an achievable goal? If so, we have the chance to increase the democratic trust which binds everything together. To be reflective is not only to be aware of the presence of power and its potential for misuse, but also to be able to approach the issue concerned with reduced anxiety and with a willingness to create space for public deliberation (Brookfield, 1995, pp. 22-26). For the sake of the new system, for education as a whole and, more widely, for a successful society, we not only need the skill of autonomous critical reflection to be at work individually, but also, most importantly, operating in groups, which may then become learning and reflective communities.

As the architects of the emerging system, we are aware of the dichotomy of the dialogue between the supervisors and the supervised, and also between those who design the system of operation (the political authorities and experts) and those who are expected to work within the system (in our case, the supervised and the supervisors – a box inside another box). On the one hand, we strongly believe in Freire's words that:

> Human existence cannot be silent, nor can it be nourished by false words, but only by the true word with which men and women transform the world. People by naming the world transform it – dialogue is thus an existential necessity. (Freire, 2006, p. 88)

On the other hand, however, we are aware that the potential of dialogue as an instrument of real change is easily overestimated, especially in the conditions of imbalanced power relations (a characteristic of the innovation of the Polish pedagogic supervision system that is our subject in this article). It is difficult to engage in a dialogue when we are not equal.

One of the threats to reflection and self-evaluation, apparent in the statements of the interviewed head teachers, as well as in some of the actions taken by schools, is the creation of what Baudrillard (2005) calls a 'simulacrum'. The world as described through the evaluation within the pedagogic supervision system often appears to be a world parallel to 'reality'. The evaluation (mainly through the voices of head teachers and teachers) may produce an 'unreal' image. The struggle is to determine what is real in this situation. To simulate means to pretend something that is non-existent in reality but, as Baudrillard notes, it is more than pretending, it is accepting as real the specific characteristics of the phenomenon that is being acted out. When we simulate an illness, we need to show the symptoms that are typical for that disease. In this situation, the result of simulation is problematic: how to recognise what is real and what is not. Pretence becomes reality (Baudrillard, 2005).

The quality of education has become a critical political and cultural issue in the development and the lives of societies and international communities. Is sociological opinion about the nature of educational relations, interactions, structures and games sufficient to improve educational processes, or is it only a theoretical description, lacking practical value? Is the quality of education determined at school? We need to redirect critical reflection from the individual to the group and social level. This will strengthen autonomy, which plays a key role in evaluation. Autonomy is connected with the perception of one's power and structural position, and might also be seen as a mechanism of decision making. It is a basic condition that is indispensable for evaluation and critical reflection. Without autonomy, the reflecting subject will find it impossible to understand how attitudes towards power can frame and distort educational processes, and to question the assumptions and practices that seem to make professional lives easier, but actually work against our interests (Brookfield, 1995, p. 8).

Key questions remain: How do we preserve schools' autonomy? How do we preserve not only the autonomy of head teachers and teachers, but also that of the inspectors and evaluators? Who is responsible for that? How do we remember and implement the reflection that the forces present in a wider society always enter schools and classrooms? It is important to consider the fact that politics is visible not only in the subject matter, but also in the discourse in schools. The rules of dispute are the key mechanism for empowering or disempowering (Shor, 1992), and the evaluation processes and procedures used within the educational supervision system should reflect both the voices of all the involved parties and the power relations influencing the appearance and perception of those voices.

How Do We Play the Game?

In the times of anxiety caused by the transformation from one system to another, from one mental model to another, the need arises to understand processes and mechanisms. People start to ask questions that are not usually in their main area of interest and/or expertise. The attempt to reform the Polish schools' supervision system has provided an opportunity, and almost a necessity, for the process of questioning and reflecting. Trusting the sociologists and their cognitive and substantive competence may lead to the suppression of power relations and the limitation of the autonomy of schools, which will then begin to see themselves through the eyes of sociologists. What is more, the hierarchy, unknowingly accepted, will fix and preserve the power relations in society. The question of sociologists' involvement and their position in the light of power structures and social responsibility has been an issue in sociological discourse at least since the 1920s. Marx's (1949, p. 385) quotation, 'The philosophers have so far only interpreted the world in various ways. The point, however, is to change it', has been quoted often and analysed rarely. *The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge*, by Florian Znaniecki (1987), and Robert Merton's (2002) reflections on an intellectual's role in public institutions were first published as early as the 1940s. Merton analyses models of independent and bureaucratic intellectuals, presenting them first in opposition to each other, but then coming to the conclusion that:

> an intellectual actively interested in introducing social innovations faces a dilemma which can be put this way: the voice of an innovator remains unheard, and the person whose voice is heard does not introduce innovations. If an intellectual is to play an important role while using his expertise, his entering the bureaucratic structure of power becomes basically unavoidable. (Merton, 2002, p. 275)

References

Baudrillard, J. (2005) *Symulakry i symulacja*. Warsaw: Sic!

Bauman, Z. (1992) *Nowoczesność i zagłada*. Warsaw: Fundacja Kulturalna Masada.

Berdzik, J. & Mazurkiewicz, G. (2010) Modernisation of Pedagogic Supervision as the Basic Strategy for the Development of Education, in G. Mazurkiewicz (Ed.) *Evaluation in Pedagogical Supervision: contexts*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Berger, P.L. (1983) *Społeczne tworzenie rzeczywistości*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Bernstein, B. (1990) *Odtwarzanie kultury*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Bokszański, Z., Piotrowski, A. & Ziółkowski, M. (1977) *Sojologia języka*. Warsaw: Wiedza Powszechna.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J. (2001) *Zaproszenie do socjologii refleksyjnej*. Warsaw: Oficyna Naukowa.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America: educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Brookfield, S. (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dahrendorf, R. (1993) *Nowoczesny konflikt społeczny*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Dahrendorf, R. (2008) *Klasy i konflikt społeczny w społeczeństwie przemysłowym*. Cracow: Zakład Wydawniczy NOMOS.

Foucault, M. (1998) *Nadzorować i karać*, trans. T. Komendant Warsaw: Fundacja.

Freire, P. (1974) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Salisbury Press.

Freire, P. (2006) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. M. Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1993) Koło jako struktura rozumienia, in G. Sowiński (Ed.) *Wokół rozumienia: studia i szkice z hermeneutyki*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Papieskiej Akademii Teologicznej.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004) *Prawda i metoda*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kuhn, T. (2001) *Struktura rewolucji naukowych*. Warsaw: Alatheia.

Luhmann, N. (1994) *Teoria polityczna państwa bezpieczeństwa socjalnego*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

MacBeath, J. (2006) *School Inspection and Self-evaluation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Marx, K. (1949) Tezy o Feuerbachu, in K. Marx & F. Engels *Dziela Wybrane*, vol. II. Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza.

Meier, D. (2000) The Crisis of Relationship, in W. Ayers, M. Klonsky & G.H. Lyon (Eds) *A Simple Justice: the challenge of small schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Meighan, R. (1993) *Socjologia edukacji*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.

Merton, R.K. (2002) *Teoria socjologiczna i struktura społeczna*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Mills, C.W. (1961) *Elita władzy*. Warsaw: Książka i wiedza.

Mishan, E. (1986) *Spór o wzrost gospodarczy*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Palmer, P.J. (1998) *The Courage to Teach: exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sady, W. (2000) *Spór o racjonalność naukową: od Poincarégo do Laudana*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Funna.

Senge, P. (2002) *Piąta dyscyplina: teoria i praktyka organizacji uczących się*. Cracow: Oficyna Ekonomiczna.

Shor, I. (1992) *Empowering Education: critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Słownik Języka Polskiego[Dictionary of the Polish Language] (2011) Pobrano 05 27, 2011 z lokalizacji Słownik Języka Polskiego. http://www.sjp.pwn.pl

Tylor, P. (2010) Totalitarian Bureaucracy and Bauman's Sociological Imagination, in M. Davis & K. Tester (Eds) *Bauman's Challenge: sociological issues for the 21st century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wallerstein, I. (2004) *Koniec świata, jaki znamy*. Warsaw: Scholar.

Wallerstein, I. (2007) *Analiza systemów-światów: wprowadzenie*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.

Weber, M. (2002) *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo: zarys socjologii rozumiejącej*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Weinsheimer, J.C. (1988) *Gadamer Hermeneutics: a reading of truth and method*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Znaniecki, F. (1987) *Społeczne role uczonych*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

GRZEGORZ MAZURKIEWICZ is an Adjunct in the Department of Management and Social Communication in the Institute of Public Affairs at Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland. He is a sociologist and teacher involved in different projects focused on educational change. His research

interests include educational leadership, intercultural education, evaluation in education, educational policy, gender in education and open pedagogy.
Correspondence: grzegorz@expedition.org.pl

BARTŁOMIEJ WALCZAK is a sociologist and cultural anthropologist, and Assistant Professor in the Institute of Applied Social Sciences at the University of Warsaw, Poland. His research interests include the change of social institutions, transnational families and the epistemology of social sciences. He has been involved in the project of the modernisation of Polish pedagogical supervision since 2009. *Correspondence*: b.walczak@uw.edu.pl