

CHANGING THE WORLD OF THE CLASSROOM BY UNDERSTANDING IT: A REVIEW OF SOME ASPECTS OF THE WORK OF LAWRENCE STENHOUSE

JEAN RUDDUCK, *The University of Sheffield*

Lawrence Stenhouse's work in curriculum development and research was guided by the belief that "the virtue of humanity is diminished in man when judgement is overruled by authority." He defined the "most civilized state" as the one whose "citizens are successfully trusted with the responsibility of judgement." He aspired to this responsibility both for the teacher and for students in schools. He went on: "We are still two nations" because we produce through education a minority served by knowledge "and a majority ruled by knowledge . . . an intellectual, moral and spiritual proletariat, characterised by instrumental competences rather than autonomous powers." He wanted teachers to act as "the instrument of a redistribution of the means of autonomy and judgement."¹ Thus his work was a major contribution to the debate about knowledge and control, as well as to the debate about the structure of curriculum development and the professional learning of teachers.

One of the remarkable things about Stenhouse was the continuity of his purpose. He first started writing about authority and emancipation in education when he was 16 or so—in a school assignment—and continued for the next 40 years, using a series of research and development projects as opportunities to extend his inquiry. When he died in 1982, he was directing a project that had attracted him because it offered the possibility of looking into the development of independence of mind among older students. His goal was the liberation of young people from uncritical dependence on the teacher and other authority figures and from the false view of knowledge that schooling traditionally supports. He saw the majority of teachers offering their students a protective safety net of facts and certainties and instilling in them a distrust of the importance of doubt. He sometimes quoted a renowned school principal in support of his position:

¹Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Towards a Vernacular Humanism," in *Authority, Education and Emancipation* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1983), pp. 163, 166 (The paper was first given at a conference at Dartington, England, in 1978.)

The school should not give people their political ideals or religious faith but the means to discover both for themselves. Above all, it should give them scepticism so that they leave with the ability to doubt, rather than the inclination to believe.²

It is not easy to free students from what Giroux has called "the tyranny of imposed meaning."³ It entails stripping away the layers of unexamined reality that hide behind the "facts" and helping students and teachers to sever their reliance on the chimera of intellectual certainty.

Stenhouse's concern to liberate students from a disempowering dependence on authority figures in school runs parallel to his interest in liberating teachers from dependence on "academic" researchers and from a view of themselves as "mere" practitioners:

Central to Stenhouse's view of education is the teacher . . . It is the teacher, purposive and free, informed by knowledge and understanding, with clearly articulated values and a repertoire of practical skills, he saw as the central agent in the education enterprise and the ultimate focus of his view of research.⁴

Five years after his death, Stenhouse's ideas seem just as important, and his work is widely quoted. I have been asked, as a close colleague, to identify and summarize the main thrusts of his work in curriculum development and research

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AS SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ACTION

by virtue of their meaningfulness, curricula are not simply instructional means to improve teaching but are expressions of ideas to improve teachers. Of course they have a day-to-day instructional utility: cathedrals must keep the rain out. But the students benefit from curriculum [projects] not so much because they change day-to-day instruction as because they improve teachers.⁵

Stenhouse worked in the era of the big, externally funded curriculum development projects, but he did not subscribe to the top-down values that structured many attempts at wholesale curriculum change. He saw a curriculum development project not as a convenient means of regimenting teachers in a different set of routines, but as a way of extending their individual and communal power. A curriculum project was not a solution worked out by others and offered to teachers, who had merely to apply it, it was a diagnostic and experimental tool, designed to help teachers examine some of the fundamental problems of schooling. In its framework and materials, a curriculum project gave support for trying out and evaluating new approaches in a spirit

²John Rae, "On Teaching Independence," *New Statesman*, 21 September 1973, p. 380.

³Henry A. Giroux, *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling* (London: The Falmer Press, 1981), p. 81.

⁴Malcolm L. Skilbeck, "Lawrence Stenhouse: Research Methodology," *British Educational Research Journal* 9 (No. 1, 1983): 12.

⁵Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Curriculum Research and the Art of the Teacher," *Curriculum* 1 (Spring 1980): 40.

of inquiry. Teachers, not curriculum packages, are the agents of change, and the function of curriculum projects is to service the professional learning of teachers by offering specifications teachers can evaluate by testing them in their own classrooms:

I have argued that educational ideas expressed in books are not easily taken into possession by teachers, whereas the expression of ideas as curricular specifications exposes them to testing by teachers and hence establishes an equality of discourse between the proposer and those who assess his proposal. The idea is that of an educational science in which each classroom is a laboratory, each teacher a member of the scientific community. There is, of course, no implication as to the origins of the proposal or hypothesis being tested. The originator may be a classroom teacher, a policy-maker or an educational research worker. The crucial point is that the proposal is not to be regarded as an unqualified recommendation but rather as a provisional specification claiming no more than to be worth putting to the test of practice. Such proposals claim to be intelligent rather than correct.⁶

Stenhouse wrote about curriculum development not as an observer but as an engaged practitioner. His main curriculum commission was given to him in 1967 by the Nuffield Foundation and the Schools Council. The intention was to develop a humanities course for students aged 14–16 in the final two years of compulsory schooling. The project was known as the Humanities Curriculum Project (or HCP). The humanities, for Stenhouse, had a central place in the curriculum because they represented a route to individual emancipation.

Stenhouse did not use the then popular objectives model, with its statement of intended learning outcomes, as a way of framing his project's activities and communicating them to teachers. He regarded the objectives model as appropriate only in the limited area of the mastery of skills, and he was worried to see it being hijacked into knowledge-based areas. It was, for him, a symbol of the academic researcher's distrust of the classroom teacher. Wrongly used, the objectives model trivializes the task of curriculum change and disempowers teachers in the same way that some instructional teaching can distort the complexity of knowledge and deceive students. In curriculums that deal with knowledge and understanding, he argued, to specify learning outcomes in advance is to limit genuine inquiry. Indeed, it is important to liberate the learner from the intentions of the teacher, which may be too confining:

I believe that the objectives model actually rests on an acceptance of the school teacher as a kind of intellectual navy. An objectives based curriculum is like a site-plan, simplified so that people know exactly where to dig their trenches without having to know why.⁷

⁶Lawrence A. Stenhouse, *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1975), p. 142.

⁷Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Product or Process? A Reply to Brian Crittenden," *New Education*, 2 (No. 1, 1980): 139.

In his Humanities Curriculum Project, Stenhouse offered the alternative structure of a broad aim and a coherent set of classroom procedures derived from an analysis of both the aim and the content of the learning:

To abandon the support of behavioural objectives is to take on the task of finding some other means of translating aims into practice. . . . We concentrated on logical consistency between classroom process and aim rather than between predetermined terminal behaviours and aim.⁸

What did this look like in practice? The proper focus of a humanities project is the study of human issues that are of universal concern to members of society. As Elliott has said, these areas constitute

. . . human acts and social situations which are empirically controversial in our society, for example abortion, divorce, the roles of men and women in society, streaming by ability in schools, war and pacifism, nuclear weapon production etc. In addition, they are areas of experience where society acknowledges the right of individuals to disagree and exercise their own judgement.⁹

The aim of the project was to help students develop an understanding of social situations and human acts and the controversial value issues they raise. Taking aim and content together, the task for the project team was to create a strategy for handling controversial issues in the classroom. Stenhouse argued that if controversy characterizes the content of the curriculum, then instructional teaching is inappropriate. The teaching style must be one that supports the exploration of evidence in the pursuit of understanding. If students are to arrive at a sense of responsibility for action, then they must be sure that the judgment that determines action is based on careful weighing of evidence and sensitive consideration of different perspectives. They have to realize that in the complex arenas of social action, answers cannot be dictated but must be constructed responsibly by individuals. The process of construction is fostered by dialogue that is questioning, critical, but essentially cooperative. Through such dialogue, the individual learns how to manage the task of looking at issues from different angles—a task he or she may at times have to manage alone in adult life, without the support fellow questioners provide in the classroom.

The classroom strategy Stenhouse developed depended, then, on dialogue and evidence and on a set of procedures that support collaborative and reflective inquiry. Evidence was needed to extend pupils' experience. Of course, there are different kinds of evidence that help us understand situations, including the evidence offered by literature or art and the evidence offered by, say, journalism, sociology, or history. Stenhouse and his team gathered collections of evidence that could support open-ended inquiry into a range

⁸Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "The Humanities Curriculum Project: The Rationale," *Theory into Practice* 10 (No. 3, 1971) 158.

⁹John Elliott, "A Curriculum for the Study of Human Affairs: The Contribution of Lawrence Stenhouse," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 15 (April-June 1983) 112.

of fundamental issues of human concern that, as we have noted, were characterized by controversy. In supporting the pupils' inquiry into a controversial issue that interested them, the teacher had to abandon his or her position as an authority, for the individual teacher's view of a situation is merely one of several that might be held. After all, teachers disagree with each other, and they are often known to hold positions with which parents of the students in their classroom might disagree. Schooling supports this pluralism. It is not therefore the teacher's responsibility to impose his or her own view, but to help students develop a commitment to and competence in exploring controversial issues and examining the basis of any view that is offered. In this area of curriculum activity, then, the teacher is charged with responsibility for teaching the process of inquiry, not its outcomes. Stenhouse summarized the teacher's role in the phrase, "the teacher as neutral chairperson." By this he meant that in the course of an inquiry, teachers would not enter into the discussion as participants because the authority of their traditional role might lend their views undue weight. Instead, teachers would act as chairpersons, adopting the stance of neutrality as a procedural device in the interest of encouraging students to pursue issues thoughtfully, to arrive at their own understanding, and to be able to articulate the basis of that understanding and take responsibility for it. This is not an inactive role for the teacher, whose task is to demonstrate the skill of courteous questioning and set standards for the reasoned interpretation of evidence and experience.

Stenhouse's project gave new direction to the teaching of humanities in secondary schools. A central problem for humanities teachers had been to find ways of helping their students extend their understanding of "lived experience." As Elliott said, "All too often . . . discussions went round in circles, each student merely affirming, in the face of opposition, their existing interpretation of experience."¹⁰ Teachers were uncertain how to move the understanding forward. Their training often led them to cling to the simple structure of the debate, which is basically competitive and oppositional in nature and which works through a rhetoric of persuasion. But debate is not an appropriate form for the exploration of complex and sensitive human issues where the aim is to develop personal understanding. Stenhouse struggled with the logic of an alternative form of classroom interaction; he constructed one, and he paid teachers the respect of translating his ideas into a curriculum so they could be explored and disciplined through the realities of classroom practice. As he said, "All educational ideas must find expression in curricula before we can tell whether they are daydreams or contributions to practice."¹¹ Implementing a curriculum project means getting inside its logic, and Stenhouse

¹⁰Ibid., 107

¹¹Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Curriculum Research and the Art of the Teacher," *Curriculum* 1 (Spring 1980) 41

saw a curriculum project as a set of classroom procedures that teachers could experiment with in order to tackle fundamental problems of institutionalized learning.

Through his curriculum work, Stenhouse offered teachers an opportunity to build together, in areas of significant educational concern, "a language of possibility."¹² School improvement, as Jonathan reminds us, is not merely a matter of "rapid response to changing market forces through a trivialised curriculum,"¹³ but a question of dealing with the deep structures of school organization and the habits and values they embody. The way forward, as Aronowitz and Giroux suggest, is not "to programme students in a certain direction so that they will behave in set ways,"¹⁴ but to help students toward a reasoned and responsible autonomy. Schools must be places of critical education in the service of creating a public sphere of citizens who are able to exercise power over their own lives and especially over the conditions of knowledge acquisition.¹⁵ In order to achieve such a situation, teachers, as Jonathan points out, must perceive themselves as, and be trained as, intellectuals—in the Gramscian sense "of any social category which stands in a critical, reflective relation to dominant institutions and ideas."¹⁶ The current anti-intellectual trends in curriculum development and in the inservice training of teachers are denying education its critical and emancipatory potential. Stenhouse offered a way of enhancing the intellectual power of teachers through curriculum development. He saw teachers as the single most important factor in the task of revitalizing schools in the face of the prevailing ideology. It is not surprising that teachers chose the following text for a commemorative plaque on the grounds of the university where he worked. "It is teachers who, in the end, will change the world of the classroom by understanding it."

TEACHERS AND RESEARCH

Earlier in this paper, I quoted a statement by Lawrence Stenhouse in which he argued that we supported "two nations" in our society—a minority served by knowledge, and a majority ruled by it. Much attention has been given, particularly since *Knowledge and Control* was published in 1971, to the perpetuation of inequalities in and through education. Stenhouse was critical of a similar pattern of inequality in relation to teachers and research.

¹²Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, *Education Under Siege* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, 1985).

¹³Ruth Jonathan, "Education Under Siege," review, *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 19 (November–December 1987): 568.

¹⁴Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, *Education Under Siege* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, 1985), p. 9.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. xi.

¹⁶Ruth Jonathan, "Education Under Siege," review, *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 19 (November–December 1987): 568.

There were, in his view, two cultures—the culture of academic researchers, who are served by research, and the culture of practitioners, who are ruled by research or merely ignore it. He saw a need to analyze the structures that govern the production and distribution of research knowledge and that determine the right to engage in research acts. His aspiration was to bring educational research into the orbit of the practitioner's world. Many teachers have been suspicious of the academic researcher and ready to dismiss research findings. One elementary school teacher expressed a view many teachers would sympathize with:

A lot of theory is not relevant to what goes on in a classroom. It hasn't got any connection to the teeming world of education that researchers are supposedly trying to influence.¹⁷

Of course, teachers engage in research when they enroll in a master's or a doctoral program, but the experience is usually said to be one of joining the world of academics on a temporary ticket, rather than one of research entering the world of the school.

Responses such as the one by the elementary school teacher quoted above are not surprising, for research activity has traditionally been located in universities, not in schools. Research reports are placed in university libraries, rather than in school libraries, and the language of research reports has often shown little concern for the discourse of the classroom and the theoretical literacy of teachers. In short, a concern to communicate effectively with practitioners has not, in the main, been a striking characteristic of much academic research. Stenhouse claimed that teachers should be at the heart of the educational research process, as the proper audience for research and as researchers in their own right, for, as he said, "Using research means doing research."¹⁸ This is how he argued the case:

Teachers are in charge of classrooms. From the point of view of the experimentalist, classrooms are the ideal laboratories for the testing of educational theory. From the point of view of the researcher whose interest lies in naturalistic observation, the teacher is a potential participant observer in classrooms and schools. From whatever standpoint we view research, we must find it difficult to deny that the teacher is surrounded by rich research opportunities.

Moreover, there is in the research field of education little theory which could be relied upon by the teacher without testing it. Many of the findings of research are based on small-scale or laboratory experiments which often do not replicate or cannot be successfully applied in classrooms. Many are actuarial and probabilistic, and, if they are to be used by the individual teacher, they demand situational verification. The application of insights drawn from naturalistic case studies to a teacher's situation rests upon the quality of the teacher's study of his home case. The teacher has grounds

¹⁷Nick May and Jean Rudduck, *Sex-stereotyping and the Early Years of Schooling* (Norwich, Great Britain: School of Education Publications, University of East Anglia, 1983), pp. 4–5.

¹⁸Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Using Research Means Doing Research," in *A Spotlight on Educational Problems*, ed. Helge Dahl, Anders Lysne, and Per Rand (Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1979), pp. 71–82.

for motivation to research. We researchers have reason to excite that motivation: without a research response from teachers our research cannot be utilized¹⁹

Stenhouse reformulated this position in various papers. In the following passage, he modifies the idea of teacher as researcher, for he himself had defined research as "systematic inquiry made public," and he was well aware of the limited time available to teachers to write for publication. He proposed instead that teachers undertake inquiry as a way of deepening their professional understanding of their own practice—often in the context of testing ideas offered by academic researchers:

The function of educational research in its application to practice is to provide a theory of educational practice testable by the experiments of teachers in classrooms. In a sense this calls for the development of the role of teacher as researcher, but only in a minimal sense. The basic desideratum is systematic inquiry, it is not necessary that this inquiry be made public unless it offers a contribution to a public theory of education.

Such a view of educational research demands of teachers the capacity to see educational action as hypothetical and experimental. Researchers on this view should disseminate to teachers a scepticism about research results and theories and hence a disposition to test them. Research should underwrite speculation and undermine assertion.

Research can be adequately applied to education only when it develops theory which can be tested by teachers in classrooms. Research guides action by generating action research—or at least the adoption of action as a systematic mode of inquiry.²⁰

In talking with teachers about his own research, Stenhouse tried to strengthen their sense of their right to respond critically to research findings. Here, the context is his research on the problems and effects of teaching about race relations:

I want to make it quite clear that in reporting research I am hoping to persuade you to review your experience critically and then test the research against your critical assessment of your own experience. I am not seeking to claim that research should override your judgement. It should supplement it and enrich it. All too often educational research is presented as if its results could only be criticized technically and by other researchers. But I am arguing that it should be subject to critical appraisal by those who have educational rather than research experience and who are prepared to consider it thoughtfully in the light of their experience.

I return to my earlier thoughts about my relation as a researcher to this audience. You might be tempted to appeal to research as a source of authority which will exempt you from the need to make judgements. You would be making an error if you were to regard this research—indeed, most educational research—in that light.²¹

¹⁹Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "What Counts as Research?" *British Journal of Educational Studies* 29 (No. 2, 1981) 109–110.

²⁰Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Applying Research to Education," in *Research as a Basis for Teaching. Readings from the Work of Lawrence Stenhouse*, ed. Jean Rudduck and David Hopkins (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1985), p. 29.

²¹Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Culture, Attitudes and Education," in *Research as a Basis for Teaching. Readings from the Work of Lawrence Stenhouse*, ed. Jean Rudduck and David Hopkins (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1985), p. 40.

This point can be linked to Stenhouse's approach to curriculum development. He saw a curriculum as a set of hypothetical specifications that are open to question and testing by teachers. Curriculum development defines and highlights areas within which knowledge can be deconstructed and reconstructed. Itself a research act, curriculum development feeds understanding, and understanding guides action. The process helps teachers to theorize about what goes on in their classrooms and to combine a sense of what may be generalizable with a detailed knowledge of the particular.

Let me pause and summarize the argument: School-based curriculum development should proceed in a research mode. Externally developed curriculums should be seen as offering teachers a framework for research. Research that is not communicated through the structure of a curriculum development project (and most academic research is not) should respect the way practitioners learn and discipline itself by offering hypotheses that teachers can test or accounts that teachers can recognize, judge, and respond to. As Stenhouse put it:

I conclude that research can only markedly improve the art of teaching if it

- 1 offers hypotheses (i.e. tentative conclusions) whose application can be verified because they can be tested in the classroom by the teacher [or]
- 2 offers descriptions of cases or retrospective generalizations about cases sufficiently rich in detail to provide a comparative context in which to judge better one's own case.

I also believe that at the moment the improvement of schooling depends more than anything else on the development of the art of teaching.²²

Stenhouse mounted a series of Quixotic attacks, challenging what he saw as the neglect of research conducted in the positivist paradigm to face the real problems of educational practice. Research findings that emerge from this paradigm are often expressed as abstract generalizations, and it is difficult for teachers, faced only with such generalizations, to decide what action to take in the particular context of their own concerns about their own classrooms. Different guidance is needed. Descriptions of cases have, in Stenhouse's view, an important contribution to make to teachers' professional learning. He explored the idea of offering portrayals of experience—case studies—along with the generalizations derived from measurement. Generalizations, he argued, can do little more than alert teachers to trends and help them identify variables that seem to be significantly affecting practice in schools and classrooms. But case study data, set alongside other data, can expose, and help teachers explore, some of the interesting differences that generalizations disguise. Teachers will be able to speculate in a more informed way about the likely effects of certain courses of action in their own settings if they can compare their own case with the cases offered and if they bear in mind, while doing

²²Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Can Research Improve Teaching?" in *Research as a Basis for Teaching: Readings from the Work of Lawrence Stenhouse*, ed. Jean Rudduck and David Hopkins (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1985), p. 40

so, the general pattern of effects that the quantitative data reveal. For example, in the final report of a project on the problems and effects of teaching about race relations, Stenhouse, practicing what he preached, helped teachers make sense of the findings of the statistical data by using case studies of classrooms to communicate the force of contextual differences.²³ Some studies show contextualized practices that reflect the major trends, while others highlight differences of effects that the generalizations had smoothed out and offer sufficient contextual detail for readers to speculate about the reasons for the differences.

In justifying the contribution of case study research to the professional development of teachers, Stenhouse argued that educational theory must be tested by how well it fits with the realities of experience in schools and classrooms. Case studies provide evidence of such realities and give practitioners a way to test theory. They constitute, in a sense, a bridge between the academic researcher, who constructs theory from a range of experiences from which he or she is distanced, and the practitioners themselves, whose experience is, by comparison, limited but is compensated by detail, depth, and continuity. Case study research, as Stenhouse tried to develop it, offers both a way of grounding inquiry in the experience of teachers and pupils and a means of promoting dialogue about practice. Here, his perspective is close to Stake's. Stake argues that "the research enterprise will be insufficiently useful as long as researchers have little interest in studying the entwining, personalistic, and crisis-like problems of everyday practice"²⁴ Case studies, Stake says, offer "the detailed description necessary to generate vicarious experience for readers . . . portrayals of actual teaching and learning problems, [the] witnessing of observers who understand the reality of classrooms, [the] words of the people involved."²⁵ Case studies permit teachers to "weigh the given data against their own experience and perhaps confront previous interpretations and temper convictions formerly held."²⁶ Stake says, in words similar to those of Stenhouse, that contextualized evidence can inform the practitioner in different and better ways than generalizations that are derived from statistical data and conveyed through the unsupported abstractions of theory.

Moreover, case studies can report to practitioners in a language that does not alienate them by preventing them from engaging in an equal dialogue with the text. In asking for a language and conceptual framework that might stretch teachers' understanding but not distance them, Stenhouse turned, as

²³Lawrence A. Stenhouse, Gajendra K. Verma, Robert D. Wild, and Jon Nixon, *Teaching About Race Relations: Problems and Effects* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982)

²⁴Robert E. Stake, "An Evolutionary View of Programming Staff Development," in *Staff Development for School Improvement*, ed. Marvin F. Wideen and Jan Andrews (Philadelphia: Falmer Press, 1987), p. 59

²⁵Ibid., p. 60

²⁶Ibid., p. 61

he often did, to the discipline of history for support. History, he said, "is the most accessible of studies":

We turn to histories of art or football or country life because they further our understanding by retrospective generalizations and summaries of experience which ask for little technical language other than that of the subject itself—art, football or country life—with which the interested reader would be familiar. Case study in an historical tradition would attempt to treat education in a language comprehensible to the educator, though it might aspire to build out that language.²⁷

Stenhouse's case studies were largely based on interviews. He saw the interview as a means of capturing the meanings of practice in the everyday language of practitioners. He encouraged other case study researchers to present the evidence of the interviews with their final report. There were two reasons for this: First, it allows readers to check the researcher's own interpretation of the evidence against the data. Second, it is a way of preserving, as raw data, the personalized accounts offered by teachers and students, for, in the final analysis of a published study, individual voices and views tend to give way to the broader contours of theoretical explanation, and much of the potential for engaging practitioners and helping them to identify with the research and learn from it is lost.

Stenhouse also argued that case studies provide good documentary evidence for the discussion of practice by groups of teachers. Focused professional dialogue should be carefully nurtured and strengthened, he believed. When teachers meet to consider problems of practice, each has in mind a unique personal experience, and it is difficult to establish common ground that is open to scrutiny. Case studies offer a reference point that allows practitioners, through comparing and contrasting their own case with the case before them, to comprehend more of each other's diversity. The capacity for insightful critique, which is central to the problem of quality in education, can thus be developed and refined through the consideration of different cases. In the same way that a critic's understanding of *Antony and Cleopatra* is developed through exposure to a number of interpretations of the play in performance, so the critical standards by which a teacher interprets and evaluates his or her own practice can be sharpened and extended by exposure to the close-up coherence of other practices in other contexts.

Stenhouse's concern for the professional development of the teacher through case study research affected not only his sense of audience, but also the principles of procedure by which he worked. In particular, in regard to teachers' rights over data, he maintained a position the classic ethnographer might take issue with; namely, that people who provide data should have some control over its use. He sent interviewees copies of the transcripts of their interviews so they could accept responsibility for their words and autho-

²⁷Lawrence A. Stenhouse, "Case Study in Educational Research and Evaluation" (unpublished paper, University of East Anglia, 1980), p. 32

alize their use in a research report. He also acknowledged that, on occasion, the researcher might need to tutor the interviewees about what aspects of their disclosures might make them vulnerable, for the logic of the so-called democratic process fails if interviewees have no sense of what is at stake for themselves or their school in the act of giving clearance. Stenhouse was also committed to the view that a school should get more than just a final copy of the research report if it had contributed substantially to the research. He would therefore negotiate with staff members about what they wanted from the research: It might be a seminar at which some evidence could be presented for discussion, or it might be series of short discussion papers focusing on themes that were important to the school and offering evidence that might generate collaborative review.

Whether teachers should be so highly regarded by the case study research is a matter of dispute, dividing those field workers who see themselves as contributing to sociological research from those who see themselves as contributing to educational research. Where Stenhouse was prepared to derive the overall focus for his research in consultation with practitioners and to make his appeal to the judgment of practitioners, other researchers looked elsewhere for advice and response:

What constitutes a satisfactory account of the institution under study will ultimately be derived from the researcher's academic community. It will be the contours of relevance currently predominant in that community that will define appropriate forms for explanation, definition of problems and topics of study. The account can only be taken to be finally adequate when or if it is acknowledged as acceptable by members of the research community.²⁸

So writes Ball, a case study researcher whose early work was roughly contemporary with that of Stenhouse but whose views derived from a different tradition of case study.

Stenhouse's contribution to the rethinking of case study was adventurous, sometimes buccaneering, but it undoubtedly arose out of genuine concern and support for the way teachers learn and genuine concern about their image of themselves in relation to the academic research community. The idiosyncrasy of his allegiance to history rather than to sociology brought into the debate a set of perspectives that were challenging and provocative. As Skilbeck has said:

The case study, as Stenhouse left it, is a tantalisingly open element of methodology. Taken in one direction, it leads us to the perfection of documentation, taken in another, it is a key factor in the revitalisation and democratisation of educational practice and educational knowledge.²⁹

²⁸Stephen J. Ball, "Case Study Research in Education. Some Notes and Problems" (unpublished paper, University of Sussex, 1979), pp. 12, 21.

²⁹Malcolm L. Skilbeck, "Lawrence Stenhouse Research Methodology," *British Educational Research Journal* 9 (No. 1, 1983): 18.

It is the latter achievement that Stenhouse would have been most delighted with.

SYNTHESIS: TEACHING AS AN ART

The artist is the researcher whose inquiry expresses itself in performance of his art rather than (or as well as) in a research report. In an essentially practical art like education all the research and all the in-service education we offer should support that research towards performance on the part of the teacher. For there is in education no absolute and unperformed knowledge. In educational research and scholarship the ivory towers where the truth is neglected are so many theatres without players, galleries without pictures, music without musicians. Educational knowledge exists in, and is verified or falsified in, its performance.³⁹

The central principle in Stenhouse's work in curriculum development and research is his view of teachers as practitioners who, like artists, can improve their art through the practice of that art, and whose judgment and professional imagination are strengthened by careful scrutiny of themselves and other artists at work. Curriculum development is a way of focusing the teacher's inquiry in an experimental manner on important problems in teaching and learning; research is the process of inquiry by which teachers analyze and learn from practice. Involvement in curriculum development and research is a way of empowering teachers by allowing them a greater stake in the ownership of understanding, an ownership they too often perceive to have been appropriated by academic researchers. One might argue that curriculum research and development offer teachers what the strategy of neutrality offers students who participate in the Humanities Curriculum Project: It establishes a framework for inquiry in which the actors can seek understanding and, through understanding, recognize a greater personal and communal command of the situation in which they have to act. In Stenhouse's world, the right to play a part in the criticism and construction of professional knowledge is returned to the teacher, and students are persuaded to accept some responsibility for the authority of their knowing and their right to know.

JEAN RUDDUCK is Head of the Division of Education, the University of Sheffield, Arts Tower Floor 9, Sheffield S10 2TN, United Kingdom

³⁹Lawrence A. Stenhouse, 'Curriculum Research, Artistry and Teaching,' in *Research as a Basis for Teaching: Readings from the Work of Laurence Stenhouse*, ed. Jean Rudduck and David Hopkins (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1985), p. 110 (The paper was first given at a conference in Vancouver, Canada, 1980)

Copyright © 1988 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.