



RESEARCH REPOSITORY

This is the author's final version of the work, as accepted for publication following peer review but without the publisher's layout or pagination.

The definitive version is available at:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2012.732010>

Thompson, G. and Cook, I. (2013) The logics of good teaching in an audit culture: A Deleuzian analysis. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 45 (3). pp. 243-258.

<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/15559/>

Copyright: © 2013 Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia.
It is posted here for your personal use. No further distribution is permitted.

The Logics of Good Teaching in an Audit Culture: A Deleuzian Analysisⁱ

This article belongs to a series of papers that wrestles with international manifestations of neoliberal education policy reform and its capacity to change and/or reform to school and schooling in late-capitalism. We use the word 'series' in a number of distinct ways: as recognition of work done in the field of education policy and neoliberal critique; as a marker of a significant and useful theorisation of contemporary governance, institutions, power and possibility by Gilles Deleuze; and, lastly, as a particular unfolding of change and continuity in schools and schooling in the new millennia. This paper examines a particular 'machine' of that reform in Australia, the high-stakes testing machine of NAPLANⁱⁱ. NAPLAN represents a machine of auditing, that creates and accounts for data that is used to measure, amongst other things, good teaching. This measurement occurs within an international education reform trajectory that aims to promote quality and equity as articulated through a particular logic of good education, good policy and 'good teaching'. By scrutinising NAPLAN through Deleuzian philosophy, the ordering and possibilities of educational reform and change through auditing practices can be re-evaluated.

While difficult concepts are necessary for this re-evaluation, this article's logic can be summarised relatively simply: An audit culture has emerged in education policymaking in the UK, USA and Australia. In each of these countries various high-stakes testing machines like NAPLAN are deployed to bring about systemic reform. This education reform aims to improve schools and schooling through collecting and providing data that is used to measure (overtly and covertly) teaching quality. However, we argue that seeing high-stakes testing as enabling a return to those subjectivities and significations discursively associated with 'good teaching' is a misrepresentation. The audit culture actually represents a change in public administration that reflects, or inflects, the current dominance of neoliberal economic ideas amongst those in the public sector. The use of statistical measures, particularly through high-stakes testing machines like NAPLAN, for determining the presence of 'good teaching' results in a revision to logics of 'good teaching' that changes its character. At least, it does so for policymaking – though

policymakers' fail to appreciate the significance of the change in their administration of and for, 'good teaching' because reform is couched in terms of a return to past principles. This changing manifestation of 'good teaching' in education policymaking, however, has not resulted in a corresponding change in that way teachers conceive and practise 'good teaching'. Most teachers continue a tradition of 'good teaching' that precedes and succeeds an audit culture because neither policymakers nor teachers fully appreciate the change to 'good teaching' that resultant in the audit culture.

Neoliberalism, Audit Cultures and Good Teaching

The rise of an audit culture in education is linked to wider social shifts towards processes and theories of governance that mobilise a marketised and managerialised administration of public institutions. Apple argues that the audit culture in schools rationalises the richness and complexity of multiple possibilities so "only that which is measurable is important" (2005, p. 11). This rationalisation is an effect of neoliberal political-economic governance that aims to transfer risk, both financial and legal, from government-run programmes to individuals (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Shore describes an audit culture not so much as "a type of society, place or people so much as a *condition*: one shaped by the use of modern techniques and principles of financial audit, but in contexts far removed from financial accounting" (Shore, 2008, p. 279).

Our contention in this paper is that the audit culture inflects a complex interplay of series and events that manifests different logics, or senses, of 'good teaching' for education policymakers and teachers. Whereas, for policymakers, the audit culture gives rise to new practices of education policymaking for 'good teaching', for most teachers 'good teaching' continues to repeat old practices and patterns in the 'sense' or logics of 'good teaching'. The policy interventions associated with high stakes testing programs, such as NAPLAN, express this new conception of 'good teaching' and Australian teachers, like their counterparts in the UK and USA, are confronted with changing expectation of what constitutes 'good teaching'.

One of the effects of the audit culture has been the appropriation of specific forms of language. Words such as 'efficiency', 'effectiveness', 'transparency', 'accountability' and 'performance' now dominate the conceptualization of 'good' schools and 'good teaching'. For example, education policymakers now use the word 'accountability' differently— moving from “a notion with real democratic potential to a set of procedures that have stifled educational practice and that have reduced normative questions to questions of mere procedure” (Biesta, 2010, p. 50). This is evident in public statements of politicians such as Australian Deputy Prime Minister Gillard in 2009 who framed NAPLAN as a mechanism to promote accountability through pressure. “But the beauty of transparency, while it may make us all uncomfortable at times, is the pressure it puts on decision makers to strive for improvement and to justify greater investment” (Bita, 2009). Gee, Hull and Lankshear (1996) argue that comments like this are indicative of a change in teachers' work and the commonsense meanings expressed through language that constitutes their work, which effects the subjectivities produced by those using that language.

Zipin argues, further, that the relationship between teachers' work and the shifting language used to describe that work has resulted in neoliberalised language that orders through stripping words of their critical possibilities (Zipin, 2011). This use of language is significant because it enables a sort of ontological capture. Deleuze and Guattari write of “order-words” or the “relation of every word... to implicit presuppositions” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p. 79). Furthermore, they argue “language is not life: it gives life orders. Every order-word... carries a little death sentence” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p. 76). 'Efficiency', 'effectiveness', 'transparency', 'accountability' and 'performance' have become order-words that characterise the 'good teacher'. Thus, parents, teachers, principals, bureaucrats and politicians are entranced by the commensurate good sense of promises to measure, and 'know', 'good teaching' but cannot recognise this as a manipulation of order-words within education policy. These order-words are not specific (although they often result in specific practices) as they exist to meet policymakers' narrow economic conceptions and priorities. These order-words drive “fantasies centred

on illusory harmonization of equality with excellence (the latter achieved through markets, managerialism, and performativity), along with horrific fantasies of economic decline” (Clarke, 2011, p. 14) ⁱⁱⁱ. Order-words within an audit culture are one of the machines of ‘control’ supplanting the disciplinary form of power in institutions such as schools (Deleuze, 1995).

One of the issues for education concerns the language of, and therefore the capacity for, change. Education policy has always contained a language of change as a justification for its aims, goals and effects. Despite massive expenditures of money, time, energy and expertise, however, high-stakes testing has done little more than amplify the inequities and inequalities experienced in schools (Au, 2009). Putative changes repeat that which was to change and do so at great cost. Thus, policies to improve educational equity and quality result in a decrease in equity and quality from the perspective of the most disadvantaged, which registers a loss of equity and quality for those students (Lumby, 2009; Thompson & Cook, 2012).

This leads to questioning the meaning of change and the relationship between reform agendas and the continuities of teaching in the new millennia. We employ ideas from Gilles Deleuze, in particular, those of series and events (from *The Logic of Sense*) and simulacra and copies (from *Difference and Repetition*) to suggest a new way to understand how audit cultures effect logics of ‘good teaching’ and their implications for change and/or reform.

The rise of the audit culture in education is an international experience. In the UK the OFSTED reforms aimed to improve education to achieve quality and equitable outcomes (Ball, 2008). The ‘No Child Left Behind’ policies in the USA similarly aimed at increasing education quality in low-performing schools (Hurch, 2008; McNeil, 2000). Australia’s ‘Education Revolution’ aims to improve educational equity and social justice outcomes (Clarke, 2011; Reid, 2009). Common to these policies is the use of, and belief in, nation-wide, standardised tests such as NAPLAN to measure ‘good teaching’ – with concomitant promises to reward ‘good teaching’ as a vehicle to promote quality education^{iv}.

Understanding these reform agendas requires us to think carefully about claims that policy instantiates common or 'good' sense. Policy reform agendas, as a specific subset of the notion of change in education are not new. However, what is new is that education policy in late capitalism is marked by a "hyperactivism" (Dunleavy & O'Leary, 1987). Those who work or learn in schools have been repeatedly exposed to reforming 'moments' (Ball, 1994). These aim to replicate some past utopia, such as literacy reforms that aim to return a golden past when all students could spell, understand and use complex grammar and obey writing conventions (Snyder, 2008). Many of these reforms, however, have altered the conception of 'good teaching' so profoundly that it becomes difficult to think that good teaching could exist under any other conditions. A recent 'history' of educational reform, including curriculum reform, assessment reform, structural reform, administrative reform, governance reform and regulatory reform, then, precedes and is changed by auditing.

Neoliberal education reforms have deployed quantitative data machines, such as NAPLAN, that measure what appears to matter most. It is almost as though current logics of 'good teaching' could not exist until accounting practices that measure the 'good' emerged. The paradox is that these accounting practices seem to reinstate common or good sense iterations of 'good teaching'. Thus, there is something new and paradoxically old about the attempts to reform 'good teaching' through generating quantitative data through high-stakes testing.

Series, Events and Sense

'Good teaching' makes sense, but is part of two sense-makings or two logics of sense. It is enacted by teachers, while being administered by education policymakers. Teachers justify and make sense of what they do through a concept of 'good teaching' and education policymakers justify and make sense of what they do through another concept of 'good teaching'. These two concepts interact and affect each other, and are neither separate nor the same. Teachers' ideas and practices and education policymakers' reforms to promote 'good teaching' change over time. This is where Deleuze's idea of a

series is important. For we have at least two series: one for teachers and one for education policymakers. Each of these series expresses a sense, or a logic of sense, which changes over time and arrange enactments or instantiations in terms of past and future, rather than here and now.

No enactment is identical to a preceding enactment, but each continues a series until an event occurs that changes that series. In this case neoliberal reform changes the education policymaker series 'good teaching'. For example, a policy event like NAPLAN works against the series 'good teaching' by manifesting change and differences within structures and practices that "are causes of certain things of an entirely different nature" (Deleuze, 1990, p. 4). Importantly, the event works on the series in both a forward and backward direction. It changes the logic of the series and, as a result, the entire series.

Deleuze used an analogy from Alice in Wonderland to explain:

When I say "Alice becomes larger," I mean that she becomes larger than she was. By the same token, however, she becomes smaller than she is now. Certainly she is not bigger and smaller at the same time. But it is at the same moment that one becomes larger than one was and smaller than one becomes. It pertains to the essence of becoming to pull in both directions at one: Alice does not grow without shrinking and vice versa (Deleuze, 1990, p. 1).

'Alice changing size' is represented as a series that has two, contradictory and coexisting, logics^v. One series is that of 'Alice becoming larger'. The other is the series 'Alice getting smaller'. The importance for Deleuze of this process is that whether Alice is bigger or smaller depends upon which series you employ to construct a logic. There can be no certain identity, we are in a state of becoming and language is an attempt to make sense of that which has no sense. Deleuze argued that this was the paradox of pure becoming "the infinite identity of both directions or senses at the same time – of future and past, of the day before and the day after, or more and less, of too much and not enough, of active and passive, and of cause and effect" because language both sets the limits and transcends those limits (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 2-3).

The sense of 'good teaching' for the teacher is both of surface and corporeal (handing out a worksheet, marking a test or disciplining a student) and virtual and incorporeal, in becoming of the past and the

future (the series 'good teaching' includes, amongst others, 'was good teaching' and 'will be good teaching', 'was not good teaching' and 'will not be good teaching'). The teacher series is not a causal chain as understood in a structuralist sense, where relations, meanings and ontologies form fixed patterns or configurations of social practices (Williams, 2008). Rather, it is a set of transformations that is "structured in order to allow for events and yet also for the connectedness and continuity of all series" (Williams, 2008, p. 2). While an event belongs to a series, an event also reconstitutes the series to which it belongs, as it has been and as it will be, through transforming the logic of sense generated as and through that series. Thus, Alice changing size ends the series of Alice as roughly the same size and changes forever those Alice series that include Alice that was and the Alice that will be. For our purposes, there are logics of 'good teaching' that constitutes multiple series that are transformed by multi-serial events. For the teacher is not the only one who thinks of 'good teaching' and, in some way, enacts it.

Series do not exist in isolation and require other series for their meaning because "the serial form is necessarily realised in the simultaneity of at least two series" (Deleuze, 1990, p. 36).

Each series returns to itself as the other series returns to it, and returns outside of itself as the other series returns within itself: to explore all distances, but over a single line; to run very fast in order to stand still (Deleuze, 1990, p. 179)

So the logics of 'good teaching' are actualised through multiple series because their sense is "multi-serial" (Deleuze, 1990, p. 37). For example, a teacher can conceive practices called 'good teaching' because they make sense through multiple series that comprehend multi-serial events. 'Good teaching' recalls the series 'examinations', 'disciplines', 'care', 'knowing' and 'knowledge' (amongst others) each of which weaves a logic around, or gathers up, different events. Further complication arises because other series differentiate good teaching logics for different teachers and teachings, the series 'Kindergarten' is not the series 'Year 12' and the series 'Maths' is not the series 'Geography'.

At the same time, the neoliberal approach to public policy has changed the logic of the series administration for 'good teaching', though it has not yet effected the logic of sense of the series teaching for 'good teaching'. This is because "the law governing two simultaneous series is that they are never equal. One represents the *signifier*, the other the *signified*, even if these roles are interchanged as we change points of view" (Deleuze, 1990, p. 37). For Deleuze, the signifier is the ideal event or actualisation of an event, while the signified is "the state of affairs together with its qualities and real relations" (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 37-38). In the logics of 'good teaching', we find the teacher who comprehends (misguided) policy interventions to promote 'good teaching' as manifestations of a series of interferences by policymakers and the policymaker who comprehends 'low quality or inefficient teaching practices' as a manifestation of unreasonable (not commonsense) resistance as a series of teacher resistances to change. The logic of 'good teaching', then, is neither a simple nor a commonsense site for intervention by reformist or neoliberal policymakers. To understand how and what change is possible, however, we need to turn our attention to the ways that events (such as NAPLAN) and neoliberal series interrelate and the singularities, ontologies and philosophies they enable and enact.

Logics of Economics, Administration and Teaching (Good Teaching)

Now that we have developed an understanding of Deleuze's ideas concerning the making sense of events and series we can apply these ideas to the sense of 'good teaching' made up as it is as multiple series and multi-serial events. Before we do so, we reflect on the various logics that operate through three series: political economy, public administration and good teaching. Our interest lies in understanding how the logics of sense that signify 'good teaching' interact with attempted change and calls to return to 'good teaching' of the past. There is, of course, no beginning point or primary series, as economists and public administrators have attended school and are implicated in 'good teaching'.

Understanding the logic of sense means recognising that we are always in the middle of the series/event interplay. Alice is always becoming bigger and smaller depending upon from where we view her.

So let's start in the middle with political economists, who renamed themselves economists, thereby seeking to instantiate a series in which 'politics' was absent (and therefore fully present). These (political) economists have been made sense of through a variety of series, each of which reconstitutes the series through another sense. The 'progression of economics' or simply the 'economic' series begins with the 'classical' (Smith and Ricardo) through the 'neo-classical' (Jevons, Walras, Marshall) to the 'Keynesian revolution' and finally to the 'neo-classical counter-revolution', monetarism and the triumph of (mathematical) microeconomics. The logic of this series, with the advent of the neo-classical counter revolution and as a series that concludes with neoliberalism, presents 'good economics' as the truth of the superiority of free markets over regulated markets and central planning.

Economists note "the establishment of neoclassical orthodoxy as the dominant school of thought within economics, and the concomitant separation of economics from other social sciences, especially economic history and sociology" (Milonakis & Fine, 2009, p. 2). By decoupling from the series 'history' and 'sociology', "economics has become asocial and ahistorical, in the sense of deploying universal categories without reference to time, place or context" (Milonakis & Fine, 2009, p. 3). Further, "social classes have no relevance, politics are excluded and methodological individualism reigns" (Mavroudeas, 1997). In acquiring this new logic, 'economics has become totally intolerant of approaches other than its own mainstream' (Milonakis & Fine, 2009, p. 4). This new logic of the series 'economics' also 'strengthened its commitment to falsifiability (or to close consistency with empirical evidence through statistical methods), to axiomatic deduction from abstract assumptions, to methodological individualism of a special type (utility maximisation), and to equilibrium (and efficiency) as an organising concept' (Milonakis & Fine, 2009, p. 5). It has also meant that 'whatever is not comprehensible through their state-of-the-art tools (for example model building, econometrics, game

theory) is considered as lying outside the scope of the economists' research interests, and is cast aside as either non-economic or non-scientific – and usually both” (Milonakis & Fine, 2009, p. 9).

From the perspective of the event through which neoliberal orthodoxy was established, the series 'economic policymaking' improves and the audit culture is enabled. In this logic, neoliberalism repeats an earlier 'Truth', recovered in (neo)classical political economy. This logic provides legitimacy by reconstituting a past for the 'history of economics'.

The audit culture inflects events that change the two series 'economics' and 'economic policymaking'. While 'political economy' was displaced and replaced by 'economics', the political nature of economics has never been lost. While it has not always been the dominant logic of the series 'public administration' or 'public policymaking', the series 'economics' has always interacted with that series— that the series was once 'political economy' is one indicator of this, as is the branch of economics known as macro-economics, which is 'the study of the aggregate economy' of which fiscal and monetary policy are important components (Frisch, 2008).

When the event neoliberalism affects as microeconomics the series public administration, that series changes. Public administration is no longer prior to and 'standing over' economics, but as something that emulates economics. Economists in Finance and Treasury departments were no longer one of many who worked in the public service but a dominant group whose word order came to reconfigure all other parts of the public sector.^{vi} In Australia, the dominance of economists meant that 'the profit-seeking corporation is promoted as the admired model for the public sector, and for much of civil society too' (Connell, Fawcett, & Meagher, 2009, p. 334). In the UK, 'the so-called public sector is becoming more business-like', 'the dominant language in the discourse of public administration has tended to be economic' and introduced a 'change in identity from public administrators to public managers' (Lawton, 2005, pp. 231, 238, 240).

The series 'public administration' is reinitiated as New Public Management (NPM), which 'involved a different conception of public accountability, with different patterns of trust and distrust and hence a different style of accountingization' (Hood, 1995, p. 94). Two of its effects, as Hood goes on to point out, were to conflate the public and the private sectors and to shift from achieving accountability by focussing on processes to focussing on results (Hood, 1995, p. 94).

Accounting was to be a key element in this new conception of accountability, since it reflected high trust in the market and private business methods and low trust in public servants and professionals, whose activities therefore needed to be more closely costed and evaluated by accounting techniques. The ideas of NPM were couched in the language of economic rationalism, and promoted by a new generation of "econocrats" and "accountocrats" in high public office (Hood, 1995, p. 94).

Education policymaking is reconfigured through the implication of economics as public administration. This explains the emergence of an audit culture in education, which presents and represents a new way of managing teachers. The focus remains that of achieving 'good teaching' but the goal is very different from 'good teaching' as commonly understood and as a lived experience in schools, teacher training institutions and other professional associations. However, a change to the logic of 'good teaching' for the political economist and policymaker does, and has, not necessarily corresponded with widespread change for the ways teachers themselves understand 'good teaching'. Despite the changes to the series 'economics' and 'public administration', teachers largely continue to repeat practices of teaching that inflect series unaffected by the change in the series 'education policymakers' and the audit culture that is a marker/event of the change in this series. Arguably, it is this capacity to repeat an unaffected series of 'good teaching' that is most compelling – for how long will teachers be able to resist the ontological shift required to fully engage (and be successful) in the audit culture?

Repetition, Copy and Simulacrum

Understanding the capacity to repeat both series and logics requires an explanation of three important concepts in Deleuze's work. These are repetition, copy and simulacrum.

Repetition

Repetition is crucial for understanding the logics of policymaking and teaching as series of the repetition of the practices of policymaking in education and teaching in a classroom. In short, every policy produced by an education policymaker, who seeks to make policy to control or produce something we can refer to as 'good teaching', is of an ongoing series of making such policy. When this policy is implemented, it alters, in tiny or gigantic ways, the sense of what 'good teaching' is, has always been and should be. Every time a teacher 'teaches' in a classroom, s/he repeats both previous 'good teaching' that s/he has conducted in classrooms and that teachers before and after her/him have conducted.

Repetition is important because of the need to repeat. "*Repetition is a condition of action before it is a concept of reflection. We produce something new only on condition that we repeat...*" (Deleuze, 1994, p. 90). Everything that is has been done and, unless it is to cease to become, will have to be done again. Repetition is both the need to remake ourselves and the practice of remaking ourselves.

There is a limit point, however, with respect to the possibility of making ourselves as we were, or repeating ourselves identically. The presence of a will to repeat, to be once more, is important, but such a will cannot achieve its end. I can be, but I cannot be once more as I was once. I cannot be exactly as I was. "According to the law of nature, repetition is impossible" (Deleuze, 1994, p. 6). Only if I had no sense of being before might I repeat identically. Even if this was possible, however, it wouldn't be a repetition, and would be an event. The school student is remade as the student-teacher who is remade as the teacher. All are exhorted, at multiple points along their 'education', to repeat some virtual sense and physical enactment of 'good teaching'.

But I cannot repeat what has been done before. No matter how hard I try to model myself on others, I cannot repeat them and cannot do so by following their instructions. I cannot even repeat myself, so the idea that I can repeat others through some instantiation of the sense of their instructions is simply unavailable. Teachers attempting to repeat other practices, actions and idealisations that were understood as 'good teaching' will always fail because exact repetition is impossible. We can't repeat that which has already been done, the 'good teaching' of yesterday, last month, last year, last generation are already unavailable.

Copy

The second important concept is that of copying. As repetitions of 'good teaching' are governed by a model (or logic) of 'good teaching' our repetitions are attempts to reproduce this model. The idea of copying is an attempt to replicate a model or ideal that, because it fails and continues to fail, will draw further and further from the original. While for Plato this is a debasement, for Deleuze it is a celebration of the centrality of difference and the peripheral nature of sameness or identity. If we cannot repeat precisely, as Deleuze insists, then we may well celebrate the falling away.

Deleuze's approach to repetition opposes Plato's view that an ideal image constitutes a model which is copied and rejects his concern with 'authenticating'. Plato sought to determine which of the copies is closest to the Idea (model). 'The one problem which recurs throughout Plato's philosophy is the problem of measuring rivals and selecting claimants' (Deleuze, 1994, p. 60). In this context, we might think of this as determining who, amongst those who claim to practise it, knows what 'good teaching' is.

Deleuze rejects the view that a model dominates and sense is governed by Sameness. He denies 'an originary superior identity' that means that 'the copy is judged in terms of a derived internal resemblance' (Deleuze, 1994, pp. 126-127). Deleuze also refuses to give the copy precedence and to follow Plato in privileging good copies over bad copies. Indeed, as we will explain, Deleuze gives bad copies precedence. He rejects Platonic practice, in which 'copies are selected, justified and saved in

the name of the identity of the model and owing to their internal resemblance to this ideal model.' He refuses to 'eliminate the bad images' (Deleuze, 1994, p. 127).

From this, we must reject the view that 'good teaching' exists in an ideal form that forever determines the essence of 'good teaching'. All we have, for Deleuze, is a series 'good teaching' that captures any particular instance of teaching according to its particular logic. Instances of teaching are not attempts to copy a model of 'good teaching', and neither are instances of policymaking for 'good teaching'. They are either moments that attempt and, in being different, fail to repeat an existing series 'good teaching' or bad copies (as the simulacrum) that, as we shall see, initiate a new series 'good teaching'.

Simulacrum

Deleuze celebrates the bad copy, the simulacrum, as a repetition that establishes the futility and the perversity of attempts to copy models as repetition. At some point, a series evidences the true character or effect of repetition and returns something that forces us to confront the tragedy of the attempt to repeat the same. This is the simulacrum, a repetition that reveals the absurdity of a model-copy obsession and, at least potentially, implicates a new series that repeats as difference and not as sameness. The simulacrum does more than this, however, as it reveals the derivative nature of the model. Rather than coming before the copy, the copy predates the model. The bad copy, the simulacrum, strips us of the cosy (un)truth of the possibility of copying and the madness of the attempt to repeat a model that antedates practices of repetition themselves. It denies the validity of a 'good teaching' series in which (already-failed) attempts to copy 'good teaching' exert a tyranny over those who continually fail to measure up because they cannot measure up. Our argument is that high-stakes testing, as evidenced by NAPLAN in Australia, alters the logic of 'good teaching' despite claiming to bring back the 'good teaching' of the past.

His conception of the simulacrum is the point at which Deleuze enacts his philosophy of difference. He does so by reversing the relationship between model and copy and simulacrum in Plato. Simulacra, for Plato, are copies that have fallen so far from an origin or model that they become "demonic images

stripped of resemblance”; or at least internal resemblance; for “man is in the image and likeness of God, but through sin we have lost the likeness while remaining in the image...” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 127). Simulacra are, at best, regrettable and, at worst, pernicious.

For Deleuze, the model is of little interest because it is an attempt to prioritise sameness over difference, when the priority goes in the opposite direction. Deleuze prioritises the series over the model and makes sameness peripheral and not central. The result is that difference comes first, ahead of identity and resemblance, and must not be understood in their terms. Difference does not manifest “the comparative play of two similitudes: the exemplary similitude of an identical original and the imitative similitude of a more or less accurate copy” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 127).

Released from its degraded status, the simulacrum asserts the priority of difference. The triumph of the simulacrum is to overturn the model-copy relation founded upon the prioritising of sameness. It may be a copy, but “the simulacrum is not just a copy, but that which overturns all copies by *also* overturning the models: every thought becomes an aggression” (Deleuze, 1994, p. xx). For “the simulacrum seizes upon a constituent *disparity* in the thing from which it strips the rank of model” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 67). Simulacral ‘good teacher’ moves us beyond the ways it has always been done by disrupting any claim to know what ‘good teaching’ is and should be because of what it was and has been^{vii}. This is the terrain of change or reform – even though we doubt whether simulacral ‘good teaching’ is the intent of policymakers and administrators when they present a suite of policy reforms and name them as order-words, such as in the Australian Education Revolution^{viii}.

Simulacra challenge *both* the copy *and* the model. “The model collapses into difference, while the copies disperse into the dissimilitude of the series which they interiorise, such that one can never say that the one is a copy and the other a model” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 128). It is in this movement, that repetition can be reasserted as primary. For, “in the infinite movement of degraded likeness from copy to copy, we reach a point at which everything changes nature, at which copies themselves flip over into

simulacra and at which, finally, resemblance or spiritual imitation gives way to repetition” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 128).

Deleuze, then, provides a framework that allows us to appreciate the series of repetitions that instantiate policymaking for good teaching and teaching for ‘good teaching’ and to understand why we believe that a simulacral copy has emerged within the series policymaker series ‘good teaching’, but not in the teacher series ‘good teaching’. For, as they are enacted around NAPLAN, both of these are governed by failures to recognise either the copying that they repeat and the difference between repetition as copy and repetition as simulacrum. The fact that these failures are not recognised by those who engage in the repetitions means that we are not yet in need of a theory of a self-conscious repetition which is enthusiastically chosen forever (as eternal return). We may be moving closer to this future as a different sense of ‘good teaching’ emerges – ‘good teaching’ as constituted by data points and data bases through NAPLAN as opposed to other, more traditional measures, such as levels of care, subject knowledge and effective disciplining. Following Deleuze’s theorisation perhaps the simulacral teacher is that which we should term ‘non-teacher’ as, like Alice, “the loss of the proper name is the adventure” (Deleuze, 1990, p. 3).

Theorising NAPLAN as reform and/or change

As stated earlier, one of the features of the audit culture in education is the faith in standardised testing to bring about equitable reform in schools through verifying claims to provide ‘good teaching’ through the creation of statistical data sets. We argue that much of the logic of education policy as change and/or reform of a system that is in crisis is predicated upon a desire to repeat those practices and logics of good teaching that make ‘good’ or ‘common’ sense. As we have shown using Deleuze’s theories, however, it is not possible to claim both simulacral change and repetition. Simulacral change to the logic of ‘good teaching’ as expressed in the audit culture will create (if it has not already done so)

a new set of logics of good teaching such that the very identity and function of teaching will become unrecognisable.

What we have argued is that, when viewed from the perspective of the policymaker, the implementation of standardised testing as an extension of the auditing imperative to improve quality and equity of educational outcomes through the adoption of counting and accounting practices, suggests a simulacral change to the logic of 'good teaching'. Processes of 'accountingization' purport to repeat a copy of 'good teaching', to return 'good teaching' that is remembered as a relic of the past. We argue that this process changes the 'sense' or logic of 'good teaching'. It changes from something that can be identified in non-statistical ways, such as student responsiveness, depth of understanding of key concepts and student engagement, to one that can be measured by data points generated through student performance in literacy and numeracy testing. The teacher is encouraged by this event to turn their face away from the student, irrevocably altering the series 'good teaching' as caring for students that has been part of the series 'good teaching' since Plato forced his students out of the cave and into the light.

For many teachers this simulacral change has been refused. The logic of the 'good teacher' as understood by many teachers has involved a refusal to be drawn by the simulacral possibilities of the NAPLAN tests. Teachers continue to repeat that sense of 'good teaching' as concerned with a care for the student and/or a care for their responsibility to their subject. Thus, despite the simulacral possibility of the NAPLAN tests, the teacher's refusal to embrace the uncertain, and possibly unpalatable, possibilities of the simulacra means that any change, thus far, is superficial rather than deep.

There is growing evidence, however, that some teachers are embracing the simulacral possibility of the NAPLAN tests (Thompson & Cook, 2014). An increase in teachers refusing elements of the moral series 'good teaching' and altering (cheating) student tests have been reported in Australia (and other countries in which this new administration of 'good teaching' has been practised) (Dillon, 2011). To

these must be added reports of schools manipulating the data through encouraging 'weaker' students to stay home, of increasing suspensions of 'difficult' students during NAPLAN and of coaching students by providing them with questions that anticipate those to be found on the tests (Barrett & Minus, 2010). This may appear troubling to the commonsense of the 'good teaching' prior to the simulacral chance to education policy, – but if policymakers truly want a revolution, perhaps they should not be surprised if the possibilities enacted far outstrip their initial intentions (Thompson & Cook, 2014).

Conclusion

This analysis of the logic of 'good teaching' has been constructed from elements drawn from *The Logic of Sense* and *Difference and Repetition* and reflects a machine for producing concepts and planes of immanence that bespeak containment. The extent to which Deleuze's earlier work develops concepts on a Lacanian plane of immanence is the extent to which it produces machines that perpetuate triadic, even Oedipal, containments that prevent the ready conceptualisation of processes of change. In his later work, particularly in his collaboration with Guattari, Deleuze suggests a number of possibilities to move beyond that containment in the theory of radically new planes of immanence in which desiring-production releases lines of flight, deterritorialisation and nomadic smoothing which enables transformative, but not transcendental, possibilities (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005). Perhaps one possibility is that the changes to the logic of 'good teaching' in an audit culture presents new micro- and macro- political possibilities as evidenced by new lines, flows and unmapped terrains. It is important to caution, however, that "smooth spaces are not in themselves liberatory" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p.500).

That said, the intent of this paper is to building a theoretical framework to understand and characterise changes to the series 'good teaching' as affected through and in an audit culture, ultimately exemplified by NAPLAN. One of the challenges of this frame that we have built, utilising Deleuze's works *The*

Logics of Sense and *Difference and Repetition*, is how we escape, or move beyond, those heightened striative processes that are central to NAPLAN. In other words, how does NAPLAN trigger counter-striative or smoothing processes that open new possibilities, new lines of flight available to teachers when the logics of 'good teaching' change? Partly, as Cole suggests, this requires a "making sense" of the ways that order-words flow in collective educational environments and the "incorporeal transformations that take on board power and life and circulate around institutions and places of education" (Cole, 2011, p. 554). These order-words that inform and command through the auditing practices and policies of NAPLAN, such as accountability, quality and efficiency, are machines of capture and striation. The first step in moving beyond this reterritorialisation, as we have done in this paper, is to begin a process of "mapping" and through this mapping of these logics, open "them up to new lines of flight" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p. 14).

The theorisation of 'good teacher' in this paper belongs to a plane of immanence in which the flows are continually caught and desire-production produces interiorities (and a plane of immanence patrolled by unconscious that is 'structured like a language') that have no means for engaging exteriority. We leave open the possibilities for deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation released by the event of NAPLAN. Rhizomatic and nomadic possibilities are present, but it remains to be seen how these possibilities will manifest. In certain moments, we must admit to even imagining teachers going war machine, though this produces both concern and interest. So we see this as an early product/story that is to be superseded through the assembling of a subsequent apparatus, as evident in Deleuze and Guattari's collaboration that requires the production of a variety of sequels.

The education reforms that derive from the audit culture, and expressed in NAPLAN, are not a repetition, by way of copying, of previous logics or a commonsense of 'good teaching'. They are, in fact, a simulacral change in the education policymaking series. While they may claim to repeat an ideal model drawn from the past, they do not do so. Whatever they might think they have done, education policymakers have instantiated an event that is not only simulacral in their series 'good teaching' but

potentially simulacral in the teacher's series 'good teaching'. We have yet to experience the full ramifications of this event because teachers have not yet realised that they cannot repeat the series 'good teaching' as they have done so prior to this event. 'Good teaching' has changed and practices of data manipulation are becoming the new commonsense of 'good teaching'.

References

Apple, M. (2005) Education, markets and an audit culture. *Critical Quarterly*, 47:1-2, pp.11-29.

Au, W. (2009) *Unequal By Design: High-Stakes Testing and the Standardization of Inequality*. (New York, Routledge).

Ball, S. (1994) *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-structural Approach*. (Buckingham, Open University Press).

Ball, S. (2008) *The Education Debate*. (Bristol, The Policy Press).

Barrett, R., & Minus, J. (2010) *Students 'told to stay home' from NAPLAN tests*. Retrieved August 1st, 2010, from The Australian: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au>

Biesta, G. J. (2010) *Good Education in an Age of Measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy*. (Boulder, Colorado, Paradigm Publishers).

Bitá, N. (2009) *Testing foes want happy, uneducated kids: Gillard*. Retrieved June 28th, 2012, from The Australian: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/testing-foes-want-happy-uneducated-kids-gillard/story-e6frg6nf-1225797124314>

Clarke, M. (2011) Talkin' 'bout a revolution: the social, political and fantasmic logics of education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, pp.1-19.

Cole, D. (2011) The Actions of Affect in Deleuze: Others using language and the language that we make... *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43:6, pp.549-561.

Connell, R., Fawcett, B., & Meagher, G. (2009) Neoliberalism, New Public Management and the Human Service Professions. *Journal of Sociology*, 45:4, pp.331-338.

Deleuze, G. (1994) *Difference, Repetition*. (New York, Columbia University Press).

Deleuze, G. (1995) Postscript on Control Societies. In G. Deleuze, *Negotiations*. (New York, Columbia University Press).

Deleuze, G. (1990) *The Logic of Sense*. (New York, Columbia University Press).

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. (Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press).

BIBLIOGRAPHY \ 3081 Dillon, J. (2011). *Results backlash - officials condemn NAPLAN abuse*. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/archive/national-old/results-backlash-officials-condemn-naplan-abuse/story-e6freuzr-1226059246038>

Dunleavy, P., & O'Leary, B. (1987) *Theories of the State*. (London, Sage Publications).

Frisch, R. (2008) *The Concise History of Economics*. Retrieved January 19, 2012, from Library of Economics and Liberty: <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/bios/Frisch.html>

Gee, J. P., Lankshear, C., & Hull, G. (1996) *The new work order: behind the language of the new capitalism*. (St Leonards, NSW, Allen and Unwin).

Hood, C. (1995) The "New Public Management" in the 1980s. *Accounting, Organisations and Society*, 20:2/3, pp.93-109.

Hurch, D. (2008) *High-Stakes Testing and the Decline of Teaching and Learning*. (Lanham, Maryland, Rowman & Littleman Publishers).

Lawton, A. (2005) Public Service Ethics in a Changing World. *Futures*, 37, pp.231-243.

Lumby, J. (2009) Performativity and Identity: Mechanisms of Exclusion. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 24:3, pp.353-369.

Mavroudeas, S. D. (1997) Deconstructing the Canon: Political Economy and Post-Modernism. *The History of Economics: Constructing the Canon*. (Panteoin University, Athens, European Conference on the History of Economics (ECHE)).

McNeil, L. M. (2000) *Contradictions of School Reform: Educational Costs of Standardised Testing*. (New York, Routledge).

Milonakis, D., & Fine, B. (2009) *From Political Economy to Economics: Method, the Social and the Historical in the Evolution of Economic Theory*. (London, Routledge).

Olszen, M., & Peters, M. (2005) Neoliberalism, higher education, and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20:3, pp.313-347.

Pusey, M. (1991) *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*. (London, Cambridge University Press).

Reid, A. (2009) Is this a revolution? A critical analysis of the Rudd government's national education agenda. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 29:3, pp.1-13.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010) *Globalizing Education Policy*. (Abingdon: Routledge).

Shore, C. (2008) Audit culture and illiberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory*, 8, pp.278-298.

Snyder, I. (2008) *The Literacy Wars: Why teaching children to read and write is a battleground*. (Crows Nest, NSW, Allen and Unwin).

BIBLIOGRAPHY \ 3081 Thompson, G. (2010) *Modulating Power and 'New Weapons': Taking Aim at the 'Education Revolution'*. Retrieved May 9th, 2011, from Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia Annual Conference: <http://www.pesa.org.au/>

Thompson, G., & Cook, I. (2014) *Manipulating the Data: Teaching and NAPLAN in the Control Society*. *Discourse: The Cultural Politics of Education*, 35:1, [In Press].

Thompson, G., & Cook, I. (2012) *Spinning in the NAPLAN Ether: 'Postscript on the Control Societies' and the Seduction of Education in Australia*. *Deleuze Studies*, 6:4, [In Press].

Williams, J. (2008) *Gilles Deleuze's Logic of Sense: A critical introduction and guide*. (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press).

Zipin, L. (2011) *Reclaiming 'Accountability' in a Socio-Ethical Register: A Research Methodologic for Pursuing Equity*. *AARE Annual Conference 2011*. (Hobart, Tasmania, AARE).

ⁱ The writing of this paper has been assisted by a grant from the Australian Research Council.

ⁱⁱ NAPLAN stands for the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy and is a series of standardised tests given to each Year 3, 5, 7 and 9 student in Australia each year. After results have been finalised, school results are published online on the My Schools website where each school can be 'compared' with 'like' schools across Australia.

ⁱⁱⁱ In 2010 the Australian Prime Minister outlined education as a key platform in the nation's productivity and economic agenda. The shift in definition from social good to economic driver represents part of this capture.

^{iv} One of the reasons for these similarities is the sense of globalised competition the OECD's PISA tests have on national education systems. For further review Rizvi and Lingard (2010) do an excellent analysis of the effects of PISA as a move towards a globalised education policy.

^v Deleuze goes on to argue that the pure becoming of Alice is really "the loss of her proper name" understood as the shift from a fixed identity to uncertainty (Deleuze, 1990, p. 3).

^{vi} The best expression of this for Australia is Michael Pusey's work on the rise of economic rationalism in Australian governance (Pusey, 1991).

^{vii} This explains why the constant calls to return to some golden age of teaching which stresses the 3Rs will never really change teaching. It is an attempt to return a model/copy that is impossible to repeat no matter how strident the calls are.

^{viii} For a detailed examination of the phantasmic and modulatory logics contained in the Australian Federal Government's Education Revolution, see Clarke (2011) or Thompson (2010).