

A Fair (Af)fair?

On Subjectivation and Differentiation in Educational
Capitalism

Martin Harling

Licentiatuppsats 2014



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET
Institutionen för pedagogik och specialpedagogik

A Fair (Af)fair?

Abstract

Title: A Fair (Af)fair? On Subjectivation and Differentiation in Educational Capitalism
Author: Martin Harling
Keywords: Marketization, partition of the sensible, investmentality, subjectivation, differentiation

In our time the school is organized with the market as a model and schools are operating on the basis of a marketized rationality, yet within normative frameworks of inclusion and “a school for all”. Then it becomes increasingly important to understand how markets and inclusion have been seen as relevant categories in education and what subjects and relations of power these categories assume and produce. Thus, this is the general purpose of the thesis, investigated in two studies of ethnographic art, in which analyzes are emphasizing relations of power, knowledge and subjects. Study one focused how subjects were constructed in relation to achievement, competition and perceptions of inclusion in a high school, while study two examines interpellations and affirmations in three upper secondary school-fairs.

The results suggest that subjects in my studies identify with existing educational partition to functions, places and positions in education and society. Discourses of identity, differentiation and equality partake in giving the market almost metaphysical qualities beyond historicity and geography. The notion of ”Investmentality” was introduced to think about how unequal, hierarchical orders were staging educational values and knowledge, but also “stakes” and “needs,” to be calculated in economic terms as investments for students, schools or regions and nations. I suggest this simultaneous governing of subjects and school system can be recognized as a partition of the sensible in contemporary Swedish educational capitalism.

Acknowledgments

”What do we really learn in school?” That was the title of the first issue of the Swedish journal ”KRUT” [Critical Journal of Education] published in 1981. The different articles addressed issues of power in schooling and tried to figure out why the official curriculum [Läroplanen] was so often treated as ”the word of God,” as eternal ”truths” that teachers were to mediate as organizing principles for life in classrooms. Some of the answers pointed towards the idea of a ”hidden curriculum” – a set of rules and standards that were working ”behind the back” of those people who spent their lives in school and sometimes fostered practices that were the opposite of those in the official curriculum.

I came in contact with these notions some 20 years later thanks to Bertil Gustafsson who was my teacher at the teacher-training program that I was enrolled in at the time. We started to debate these issues then and have continued to do so until this day. The first of my credits therefore goes to him. Thank you, Bertil, for your indefatigable faith, encouragement and friendship.

Then, of course I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Sverker Lindblad and Tom Popkewitz. Thank you, Sverker, for including me in the ”POP-group” [Pedagogy and Politics], sharing all your networks with me and for engaging me in your research project. You also set me up with Tom, who came to be such an inspiring person during the last five years, which I spent as a PhD-student. Tom, you invited me as an Honorary Scholar to UW Madison, where I spent a semester with my family. There I had the opportunity to join the Wednesday-group, which is the most stimulating intellectual milieu I have ever been a part of. Thank you also, Tom, for inviting us to your home, and even more so for all the time you have spent with the hopeless drafts, that finally resulted in this thesis.

I also wish to thank the Educational Committee at the Swedish Research Foundation which financed the research projects, ”School Results and Lived Curricula in Contemporary Society,” where I conducted my studies and also ”The Network of Studies in the Political in Education” where I served as a Secretary for four years. Through these projects I have not only been financially supported, but moreover, gotten the opportunity to meet many fellow scholars, to whom I would like to show gratitude for their inspiration and support.

I have now mentioned the ”POP-group” and the ”Wednesday-group” - the two groups that would have been nothing if it were not for the great people that constituted them. Thank you for all your support, and I want to direct a special gratitude to Annika Bergviken Rensfeldt, Rune Romhed, Sverker Lundin, Caroline Runesdotter and Ingrid Henning Loeb in the POP-group and Licho Lopez and

Ezequiel Gomez Caride from the "Wed-group". Thank you also, Kristiane Stapleton – the queen of proofreading and editing – you "acted on my will," and it helped a lot.

At my workplace, The Department of Education and Special education, there are many people who have shown support and friendship over the years and I can't mention them all here. However, so many of you at the former unit of Special Education deserve my warmest thanks. I think in particular of Girma Berhanu, my friend in wet and dry. Thank you also Gun-Britt Wärvik, Director of Postgraduate studies at my department.

Now we are closing in. The closer I get to the daily work, the more emotional I get. The friends with whom I have shared the gift and burden of being a Phd-student are indescribably important for me. Andreas Ottemo, Robert Sjöberg, Mattias Nylund and Malin Sandén – you are sunshine. Thank you, Mattias for spending Christmas with my manuscript. The same goes for the "LAVA-group", where Michael Hansen, Elsi-Brith Jodal and Katarina Samuelsson have been the best "critical friends" one can have.

Finally, I think of Tinna and my three children Fabian, Rasmus and Elsa, the essences in my life. Thank you of all my heart. You show me what life is really about. I love you. And really, I never thought this was going to happen.

Gothenburg, 2014-03-13

Content

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: THE ODD COUPLE OF MARKETS AND INCLUSION	11
Problematic, purpose and research questions	14
The empirical studies: summaries.....	15
Study one	16
Study two.....	17
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF RESEARCH	19
Subjectivation and differentiation in education.....	19
Identity and differentiation in studies of schooling.....	22
Subjectivation, schooling and what categorizations “do”.....	23
Hopes and fears in the education economy.....	28
Restructuring and marketization in education.....	29
Foucauldian studies of restructuring and marketization in education ..	32
Conclusions of the review	36
CHAPTER 3. RANCIÈRE AND FOUCAULT: MARKETS AND INCLUSION – STUDYING THEIR PROBLEMATICS	37
The lessons of Rancière: stultification, equality and emancipation.....	38
Governmentality as an analytic lens	42
CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	47
Ethnography	47
Design, selection and production of data	47
Analytical Strategies	48
Research ethics	50
Validity Issues	51
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION.....	53
Subjectivation, partitions and positions.....	54
The political economy of futures – investmentality	58
The common base of marketization and inclusion	61
Problems, shortcomings and future research	63
Conclusions of the thesis.....	63
REFERENCES.....	67

Chapter 1. Introduction: The odd couple of markets and inclusion

In the introduction to her book *The Death and Life of the Great American School System* (2010) the author Diane Ravitch describes how she lost her faith in standardized testing and school markets, both reforms she had implemented during her service as Assistant Secretary of Education some 15 years earlier. But, in the last decade, despite Ravitch's disillusion, we have witnessed the increasing impact of marketization and market forces on how we think of education. In an illustration that was less likely ten years ago, Sahlgren, who is the Director of Research at the Centre for Market Reform of Education, postulates that the introduction of a profit motive to education "raises equity."

The most effective means of expanding choice is through introducing a profit motive to education. [...]The cross-national evidence suggests that expanding access to publicly funded private schools raises equity; the profit motive clearly has an important role to play here. (Sahlgren, 2013 p.22)

This claim suggests that marketization and equality are not always presented as such adversaries we may think, even if the opposition is persisting, in for instance national curriculum and in governance of education (cf. Lundahl et al. 2013). The scope of this conjuncture – using marketization as an argument for increased equality in education – is a good illustration of the contingencies and disassociations of "marketization" and "inclusion" that will be put under scrutiny in this thesis.

Few words evoke such feelings as "marketization." For some, the market brings freedom, creates choice and builds the future. For others, the market is a synonym of exploitation and crude competition. When combined with education, marketization becomes, if possible, even more ambiguous. Is the market in education the liberator, empowering people who were enchained by state bureaucracy and collectivist dogmas? Or is market-based competition turning people into either winners or losers, threatening the struggle for an equal society?

This thesis¹ will study markets and marketization in education. But it will also engage with inclusion² – a term described as an antithesis to marketization. For

¹ This research was funded by the Swedish Research Council and its Education Science Committee by the Research Project School Results and Lived Curricula in Contemporary Society. VR dnr 2008-4999.

A fair (Af)fair?

instance, Lundahl et al. (2013) write: “In parallel with the strong discourse of excellence, performance and competition, another, that of social inclusion and equality (A school for all), still prevails, for example in national curriculum guides for preschool, primary and secondary education” (Lundahl et al. 2013, p. 499). It is sometimes argued that Sweden has one of the most de-regulated school systems in the world (Skolverket, 2009, p.14; Arreman & Holm, 2011), and market principles have been introduced by conservatives, liberals and liberal-minded social-democrats as a redemption to many proclaimed problems, for instance, a democratic deficit, low return on education expenditures and rigid state bureaucracy (SOU, 2008:69; for a critique, see eg. Lundahl et al. 2013; Beach & Dovemark, 2011). When school choice urged pupils and parents to “vote with their feet” a deepening of democracy was expected by market oriented policymakers, and when private actors began running “free schools” as companies, those schools were supposed to increase competitiveness and to strengthen quality (SOU 2014:3, p. 72). Marketization also meant that some teachers³ approached their pupils as customers (Fredriksson, 2010, p.130), worked with benchmarking (Lundahl et al. 2013) and that principals were treated as CEOs (Fredriksson, 2010; Arreman & Holm, 2011). Referring to similar tendencies on a global scale, Ball and Youdell (2007) argue that

Market forms, competition, choice and a focus on performance management all carry with them ethical dangers. Many examples of opportunistic and tactical behaviors are already apparent in schools and among parents within such systems. For the teacher, competitive relations often produce ethical dilemmas between the interests of the institution and those of students. All of this is indicative of a general moral pauperisation (aa, p.59).

When put together like this, the expectations and alerts tied to marketization and inclusion can be represented as “cultural theses”, and sometimes “salvation narratives” (Popkewitz, 2008) that circulate in media, in policy and in scientific

² The problems of equality, equalization and equity in and through education have been increasingly translated and reconfigured as “equality of opportunity” [eg. “Likvärdighet”, in Swedish] “individual participation” [eg. “delaktighet”, in Swedish] and “inclusion” [eg. “Inkludering”, in Swedish] in research and policy, since the 1970’s and onwards, in Sweden as a part of a general tendency (See Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000; Ozga & Lingard, 2007). In line with this tendency I have focused on discourses of *inclusion* relative to questions of equity, equality and equalization in the contexts investigated in this thesis. In other words: inclusion is one of my objects of study, as a part of the more general concept of equality.

³ Fredriksson (2010) delimits himself to upper secondary school teachers, but since school choice with vouchers includes also compulsory schools, the principal argument might be valid for the entire school system. In Fredriksson’s study teachers in free-schools run by profit-motive were more likely to adapt to market relations with pupils.

Chapter 1. Introduction

contexts of our time. These theses and narratives point to societal and educational problems on one hand, while proposing solutions and remedies to these problems on the other.

To understand these complex processes a well-equipped theoretical “toolbox” is valuable for an accurate understanding of how inclusion and marketization have been attributed with *hopes* for a more progressive school and society and *fears* of exclusion and economic decline. The twin concepts in my title – *subjectivation* and *differentiation* – are a large part of such a toolbox, and a substantial share of this text is devoted to elaborating on their meanings, uses and abuses. Although I will explore this in greater detail in the review, and theory sections, a preliminary characterization of subjectivation pertains to the ways it helps untangle the dynamic processes when subjects are constructed and construe themselves (cf. Foucault, 2003a; Rancière, 2010a). Differentiation is perhaps an even more ambiguous concept since it has shifting meanings in many different contexts. School differentiation, for instance, traditionally means that identified groups (age, sex, socio-economic background, etc.) are divided up into different trajectories and sometimes school forms (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). This aspect of differentiation is important for arguments in the thesis, but it will also be problematized in order to elaborate on how differentiation and equality become intelligible in today’s education. The primary concept that I will use to problematize differentiation is “the partition of the sensible,” borrowed from Jacques Rancière (2010a). This notion helps to understand how subjectivation, differentiation and equality in education embody double qualities of what it means to share something. A sharing or partition is at once a splitting up in different parts, but it is also simultaneously a constitution of that which is shared in common. This doubleness will have consequences for how a “common sense” of, for instance, the developing ways that pupil’s school failures/achievements are constituted, but also who the “failing/achieving school subject” is. The other part of the concept, that is, “the sensible,” is closely connected to the first part. Rancière proposes how a partition of different parts and a constitution of the totality of those parts simultaneously set the boundaries of what is and is not sayable, visible and perceptible (i.e., “sensible”) within a particular order. Thus, I consider partition of the sensible to be a useful concept addressing differentiation in education since it combines the particular with the general in one analytical maneuver.

My ambition with this research is consequently to explore subjectivation and differentiation between the cultural theses of marketization and inclusion. I want to investigate how markets and inclusion have been historically presented as relevant categories in education and what relations of power these categories assume and

A fair (Af)fair?

produce. I pursue why and how the categories have been translated into policies, research and organizational arrangements in Swedish schooling at this moment in history. This is a way to meet the need for new and relevant theorizations concerning marketization in education, as is requested for instance by Lundahl (2012):

This profound change of the basic structures and nature of education and schooling requires a revision and development of our theoretical tools; we need to conceptualize and theorise the dynamics of the privatisation of education in order to better understand the workings and effects of the school market. To a considerable degree, such understanding is still lacking (cf. Ball 2007, p. 15) (aa, p. 218-219).

Problematic, purpose and research questions

When marketization and inclusion are considered in education, high stakes are voiced in research, policy and public debates. Some say we are entering a “knowledge economy” demanding subjects with new qualifications and qualities such as “flexibility,” “lifelong learning” and “entrepreneurship” (Skolverket, 2010). Others say that the promise of the future resides in a rational planning of schooling where every pupil’s need, problem or demand is met with raised standards, individual motivation, expertise interventions and improved instruction (cf. Hattie, 2012; Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Sanandaji, 2013). A rational, fair, efficient and – as has been recently argued - sustainable education should be enhanced with deliberative models (Englund, et al., 2008) or well-organized school markets (Sahlgren, 2013).

So, while the cultural theses and salvation narratives are both many and multifarious today, I will delimit my investigation on how markets are seen as either a remedy or a threat to education in our time, and how markets are related to inclusion. Why did marketization of education appear here and now? What historical conditions allowed, or perhaps ascribed “the market” to solve, arrange and more so – to define some of the basic problems in education? This argument, of course, is also vital for a significant critique on what marketization “does” in education, for instance if we want to challenge how power operates within a marketized context. Therefore, there is a need to historicize and un-think the market; a need to explore what problems it was expected to solve in different times and places and to examine critically the contingency of its roles, functions and the mechanisms derived from it, that is, to explore under what circumstances it was presented as a problem or a solution (cf. Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983).

Chapter 1. Introduction

The first impetus to explore marketization and inclusion in education concerns how attempts to improve the school system seemed in themselves to be part of new problems. An example of this dynamic is how particular categories in research, policy and practices like “motivated,” “able” or “included” schoolchildren always seem to embody their opposites – the “unmotivated,” “unable” or “excluded.” Thus, inclusion/exclusion can be seen as a “double gesture” that simultaneously produces spaces of inside/outside and delimits the standards and qualities of those children who belong to each category (cf. Popkewitz, 2008). Conceptualized in relation to my theoretical framework, this means that the thesis’ *research problematic* regards the double gestures of marketization and inclusion in contemporary Swedish schooling, which will be “spirally” developed as I turn to research and theory. The next step in making this problematic researchable was to formulate *the purpose* of this thesis, which became to analyze how discourses of marketization and inclusion have become historically intelligible in Swedish education, and what relations of power these discourses pertain to concern. This will be explored with notions of subjectivation and differentiation in analytical focus. To meet this purpose and to operationalize the study, two *research questions*, were raised, where the first is mainly empirical and the second theoretical:

- What principles of governing education connect discourses of the market and equality at school fairs and in a high school setting in Sweden?
- How is the partition of the sensible configured when marketization and equality are ways of governing in contemporary Swedish education?

The thesis is structured in two main parts: the first part is a background framing and discussing my two studies, which are presented in one book chapter and one article in part two. The following three chapters are devoted to reviewing research positions, to outlining a theoretical base for my study and to discussing methodological considerations. This is followed by a discussion wherein I⁴ present my contributions to the studies of subjectivation, marketization and inclusion, where after I reflect on their significance, problems and future research.

The empirical studies: summaries

The thesis includes two separate studies with different, but overlapping empirical focus and a common theoretical base drawing on *governmentality* and *partition of the sensible* (Foucault, 2003a; 2008; Rancière, 2010a). Taken together they contribute in

⁴ The frequent use of the first pronoun “I” throughout the thesis is a deliberate consideration on my part so as to position myself in relation to the ongoing debates in academic discourses and in society at large.

A fair (Af)fair?

meeting my thesis' general aim to analyze how discourses of marketization and inclusion have become historically intelligible in Swedish education, and what relations of power these discourses pertain to concern. Study one is an article investigating how different futures are distributed and naturalized in everyday school practices where equality is perceived as a goal, instead of a starting point. Study two is a book chapter where three different empirical cases are combined exploring post-political tendencies in the governing of Swedish education.

Study one

In this study some central assumptions and practices within discourses of accountability, competition and inclusion are analyzed and problematized. A special set of assumptions regards the relation between pupil's ability and affluence and the central question of the study is how this relation is articulated in a Swedish High School-setting, including how subjectivations are enacted. The backdrop is a public debate about the "school crisis" in Sweden, where general results are declining and the "achievement gap" between schools is widening (Skolverket, 2009). This perceived crisis is met with a range of pedagogical and policy answers while the study is focusing an emphasis on assumed measurable results, marketization initiatives, including competition between schools and pupils and finally policies and practices under the banner of inclusion.

The empirical part of the article is structured around how "the crisis" and some responses – here represented as double gestures of "hopes and fears" (cf. Popkewitz, 2008) are staged and articulated by staff and pupils at a High School called "Eastern Hills" in a suburb of Gothenburg. The school is ranked among the worst in terms of school results, the area is poor and the large majority of the population has an immigrant background (Skolverket, 2014). The study's results are presented as four narratives where two seemingly contradictory discourses; one pertaining to inclusion, and one discourse of "investmentality" are considered in terms of their shared explicatory logic. The analysis shows how attempts to include pupils and make schooling more equal is based on assumptions of inequality where pupils "need" expert interventions and explanations to eventually become included in an anticipated future. "Investmentality" works by translating motivation and knowledge into investments that govern the pupil with choice, competition and entrepreneurship as self-technologies, explained as an antidote to exclusion. However, one narrative shows the significance of approaching equality as a practice in teaching and not as a utopian goal with hierarchies in ability and explaining masters as a precondition for equality.

Chapter 1. Introduction

Study two

The background for this study is a restructured education system in Sweden where actors such as the media, private corporations, providers of statistical web services and marketing platforms have come to play profound roles in setting the agenda for education. A transformation of education politics during the post-war period has not only altered the means of governing but also the ways in which politics itself has mutated (Tefahuney & Dahlstedt, 2008). From a “reform-political” focus on rules and regulations until around 1980, over a “result-political” emphasis on goal steering during the following two decades, a “post-political” period, where government by means of comparisons have emerged and expanded since the turn of the millennium. This “post-political” turn has neutralized politico-ideological conflicts concerning education’s role in society and has instead established a neo-liberal consensus on the purpose with education (and generally the entire welfare state) subsumed under an economical imperative that in turn is dressed in a technical and administrative language (cf. Zizek, 2006; Rancière, 2006a; Mouffe, 2005).

The study analyzes three instances where these tendencies have emerged and contributed to dramatic changes in the educational landscape. These are the provision and application of statistical on-line databases for school results; the role of the news media on school rankings and finally a collection of practices staged at regional upper secondary school fairs, where market mechanisms like choice, competition and an “investment attitude” are put in play. These last practices – at school fairs – are my contribution to the study⁵ and I will therefore limit the rest of this summary to the main results of that part that are analyzed with the help of Rancière’s notion of partition of the sensible (2010a). The two integrated aspects of partition – the general and the particular, are analytically separated to grasp how a common ontology is established at the fair and how differentiations are made within that common framework.

The schools present, compete with each other and advertise themselves in showcases where staff and senior students interpellate prospective students/customers within an apparently open, un-hierarchical and labor market oriented discourse built on individual choice. Unlimited dreams of the future are

⁵ The book-chapter is co-written and draws on the methodological concept of pointillism as it focuses some “points” to illustrate a post-political “picture” in contemporary education. Besides my contributions to the general framework of this chapter I have written the part with the subtitle: *School Fairs as organization of upper secondary school choice* [Skolmässor som organiserar av val till gymnasieskolan]. In the elaboration below, I have chosen to concentrate on the analysis from my part of the book-chapter.

A fair (Af)fair?

sold with images of success and prosperity, conditioned only to ambition and endurance. However, subtle divisions and differentiations are nevertheless made based on individual preferences and styles that are supposed to guide the individual's utility maximizing choice. An entrepreneurial discourse is staged where lived curricula are outlined as the students' *investments* in themselves, regardless if they are interpellated as "theorists" or "practitioners" – a central partition that is signaled through exhibitor's clothing and their direct questions. The study concludes that school markets in this form have been introduced and naturalized quickly without public debate. Practices analyzed in the study are considered as partitions of the sensible at an emerging school market. The strong economical discourse that organizes upper secondary school choices today subjugates other (democratic) values and therefore needs to be problematized and further analyzed.

Chapter 2. Review of research

The following review is thematized and conceptually organized into two sections; the first dealing with notions of subjectivation/differentiation and the second with restructuring/marketization in education. At the end of the review I will summarize the relevance of this review in relation to my own investigation. Guided by an analytical interest in the relationship between subjectivation and differentiation in marketization- and inclusion-processes, I will move between international and Swedish studies, mapping a research territory with many layers, underlying assumptions and opposing standpoints. The positions and arguments presented here are neither lengthy, nor exhaustive with respect to the amount of studies in the field. I have, however attempted to discuss often-cited works⁶ and to summarize significant contributions to the research discourse of my object of study.

Subjectivation and differentiation in education

This section will review and discuss research on *subjectivation* and *differentiation* in schooling with the intent of exemplifying how these problems have been historically enunciated, and thereby showing how epistemic shifts (that is what type of knowledge it is possible to claim) have provided “grids” for what is seen as natural, given or meaningful knowledge (Popkewitz, 2008). I selected studies based on a literature search in Google Scholar;⁷ the key words “identity⁸,” “subjectivation” and “differentiation” were applied in various combinations with “education,” “pupil” and “school.”

As Hall (1996) has noted, the notion of *identity* has been extensively debated in social theory for a long time and its relevance for research is often questioned. Social identity has traditionally been constructed within a discourse (for instance, in a “field” of “dispositions” or “habitus”) where relations between the subject, knowledge and power may remain largely unproblematized with regards to the role

⁶ Here I used citation index derived from Google Scholar (see below).

⁷ The search was conducted August 18, 2013.

⁸ The notion of “identity” is not mentioned in the introduction. However, since notions of identity is commonly used either introducing, overlapping with, or contrasted to subjectivation (see eg. Youdell, 2010), I find it relevant to include in the review.

A fair (Af)fair?

of scientific categorizations and classifications (See also Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008; Gee, 2000). However, more recently the concept of identity is sometimes challenged with the notion of *subject*, where the individual is perceived as decentered, contingent, open to formation and constructed in relation to context and to intersecting categories/categorizations (Foucault, 1979; Butler, 2005; Hacking, 1995; Wetherell, 2009; Popkewitz & Lindblad, 2000). Another distinction between “identity” and “subjectivation” is that the former is not only critiqued and replaced with the latter but the sometimes pluralistic assumptions⁹ making identity intelligible¹⁰ may be substituted with dissensus¹¹ (Rancière, 2010a) or agonistic conflict (Laclau & Mouffe, 2008) that destabilizes oppressing identities, opening up for critique, interruptions and a re-politization.

Instead of working with bold notions of identity Foucault (1979) proposed the concept of “subjectivation,”¹² with a focus on *how* subjects are historically constructed as a result of multiple forces. With this concept, Foucault points to how human agency comprises both the aspect of a subject acting in relation to context *and* a subject being subjected to relations of power through discourse within contextual conditions. Another central facet of subjectivation regards how the subject historically is expected and given resources to work on him/her-self, that is the government of self. This line of thought has affinities with one of Foucault’s teachers, Louis Althusser, who invented the concept of interpellation (Althusser, 1971/2006), meaning that the individual is interpellated, or hailed, by authoritarian/dominant ideologies (Ideological State Apparatuses – the school is thought to be the most powerful) into certain positions, which in turn are recognized by the subject. Foucault was not the only theorist to find the concept of interpellation useful; Judith Butler (2005; 2009) elaborates on the idea of interpellations as a critique against the notion of identity. Since authoritarian and

⁹ Pluralistic assumptions regards how diverse groups of individuals with an assumed shared identity (ethnicity, class, sex, etc.) voice their concerns and that an autonomous government conducts these groups to create a balance, hence equilibrium in the general society (See eg. Laclau & Mouffe, 2008; Youdell, 2010).

¹⁰ It should, however, be noted that several notions of identity are grounded on assumptions of conflict.

¹¹ I will return to the notion of dissensus in the theory section below when I elaborate on how actions and subject constructions outside the “partition of the sensible” instantiate a “wrong,” that is, a dispute with a given order and, as such, a politics of dissensus.

¹² The term “subjectivation” (Butler’s translation of Foucault’s *assujettissement*) has been used extensively, as the term describes both how the subject is constructed by the exercise of power/knowledge and how he/she is constructing him/herself in relation to the truth. Often the terms “subjectification” (see e.g., Stauness, 2003; Davies, 2006) or simply “subjection” (see e.g., Davies, 2006) are used as synonyms. However, since Rancière uses “subjectivation” somewhat independently and with other connotations, I will explain in detail below when I use the term “subjectivation” in Foucault’s and Rancière’s meanings, respectively. For a clarifying discussion, see Chambers (2012).

Chapter 2. Review of Research

repetitive language works performatively, that is to say certain speech acts may call into being what is uttered (for instance, the evoking of expected identities tied to a married couple when the priest declares them “a man and a woman” during a marriage ceremony). What Butler refers to as “identity politics” is the prevailing (liberal) *recognition* of subjugated and underprivileged groups that are assumed to be oppressed, such as gays, minorities, women, etc. She argues that these fixed identities and categories are bound up by hierarchical binaries and often classified in causal relations (such as gender and sex) that need to be problematized, deconstructed and rejected (See also Youdell, 2010, for a critique of identity in education).

On a similar note, Hacking (1995) discusses what he refers to as “looping-effects,” activated when identity categories become *interactive* and fabricate/refabricate subjectivities and the identity categories themselves. Certain “styles of reasoning” embedded in scientific truth-claims fabricate certain “kinds of people” in a process that Hacking presents as “the dynamics of classifying people” (2002, p. 12). Here modern science plays a crucial role. By establishing “schemes” and categories, for instance, as ascribed to particular pupils in schools, they become *calculable* and *administrable*, as, for example, “the gifted,” “the life-long learner,” “the pupil at risk,” etc., that either can be “counted in” or “counted out” in given educational contexts (Popkewitz, 2012; Rancière, 2005, see also Wetherell, 2009 on “troubled subject positions”). When the individual acts on these classifications and thinks/acts simultaneously on himself/herself and the category, then the “looping-effect” between the category and the subject is established.

In the realm of Foucauldian analysis these governing powers are considered to be productive as they produce subjects, knowledge and reason and are conditional to discourses where the individual perceives himself/herself as free. This is not a common-sense “freedom,” but, rather, a particular rationality that underpins and makes certain subjects intelligible, enhancing truths, morals and practical guidelines to improve conduct, by which is meant the kind of truth-telling and prescriptive moral codes governing what Foucault names “psychagogy” intended to show the conjuncture between psychology and pedagogy (Foucault, 2010). The categories of, for instance, “identity” thus establishes a “grid” that makes certain actions and performances comprehensible and possible to compare, improve and judge in relation to others. The arguments of identity politics, the use of freedom and looping effects are relevant in the thesis because of my interest in how subjugated groups of pupils, identified to be in need of “inclusion” or “entrepreneurship”, become intertwined into hierarchical discourses of identity politics in school. This

A fair (Af)fair?

problematic will be elaborated below, but first I will discuss some studies where constructions of identity and differentiation in schooling are addressed.

Identity and differentiation in studies of schooling

Johansson (2009) has studied how students' "institutional identities" are formed in Swedish upper secondary school, arguing that these identities are increasingly characterized by individual performance, monitoring and evaluation of students. Her study takes a critical ethnographic approach, seeking support in Giddens' structuration theory, and concludes that students are differentiated, given different opportunities and identities based on gender, social and ethnic background, which the author claims are rarely or never problematized but, rather, enhanced by the teaching format and content of the various programs. Pupils' achievement and relational work also partake to make different positions of identity possible, and in her analysis she identified three ideal-typical student identities: "the demanded" (p. 242), "the partially included" (p.244) and "the perhaps suited" (p.247). These are categorized mainly to theoretical, vocational and individual programs, in that order. Johansson argues that, for most pupils, school means adapting to the dominant patterns and norms, which in turn creates particular school identities. This argument is interesting in my thesis since it engages with equality and inclusion through the relation between the categories of class, gender and ethnicity on one hand and with identity-constructions and differentiation in schooling on the other.

If Johansson focus on the relation between evaluation of pupils and their identities, Dovemark (2004) and Österlind (1998) focus more on what individual responsabilization means for identity constructions, differentiation and equality in contemporary schooling. Dovemark (2004) provides a study of school's individualization, which is a central part of an increasing responsibility put on students. In her critical ethnography she notes how the increased demands for planning and responsibility - for both results and work in or outside the classroom (freer, more flexible working arrangements and a new role for teachers) - led to growing differences between those who can use school as a springboard and those that fail. She writes, "This shift is (at least partially) counter-intuitive for those involved, expressing a belief of the school as just and the individuals themselves as 'the missing link'" (s.235)[My translation]. Similar results are presented by Österlind (1998) in her combined habitus and discourse analysis in which she examines how students' own work and planning is seen as a resource for those with well-trained parents, but an obstacle for students with a working class background. She believes that disciplining is made invisible and naturalized thanks to the students' ability to

Chapter 2. Review of Research

orient themselves towards goals and that self planning is assumed on the part of the school. In a historical perspective, the authoritarian function of the cane is replaced by detention, then by appraisals and today it is dominated by self-control as manifested in one's own planning and performance management.

The three studies in this section exemplify hierarchical identity-formations in relation to social categories such as class or gender and differentiation to positions both within and beyond schools. Social categories are sometimes attributed by the researcher; while in other cases evoked by the informants themselves but are nevertheless given a strong explanatory value for different forms of exploitation or dominance. By turning to theoretical accounts of relations between structure and agency (Giddens/Bourdieu) the studies in this section share an interest in situated power negotiations and identity-formation, hereby opposing determinism. For instance, they relate to Willis' (1977) analytical interest in meaning making and negotiation that partly undermines deterministic accounts of schooling as subordinated to capitalistic exploitation (cf. Bowles and Gintis, 1976). In a Swedish context Johansson (2009) argues that differentiations to particular identities were made based on the structures of gender, ethnicity or class that saturated daily work and knowledge content, and Dovemark (2004) illustrated how the domination of winners over losers was "counter-intuitive" for those who fail in school, hence school failure was explained by symbolic dominance, apparently invisible for the victims.

In relation to my study, the focus on institutional identities and processes of differentiation becomes interesting as power and domination in Swedish schooling is examined. The three empirical studies are here presented as examples where relations between scientific categorizations such as social class and constructions of particular identities are in focus – a focus that will be discussed in the end of this thesis.

Subjectivation, schooling and what categorizations "do"

A different way of thinking about questions that are traditionally related to identity and differentiation in schooling, with a focus on categories of class, gender or ethnicity, is thus through the notion of *subjectivation*. As discussed above, the concept is used to make visible the relational and sometimes subordinating, yet productive, powers of classification and categorization. Drawing on Foucault's notion and Butler's refinement of "subjectification," Davies (2006) investigates daily life in contemporary (Australian) schools. She examines encounters between teachers and pupils and argues that the act of taking up possible subject positions and performing them is a double accomplishment of mastery of and submission to

A fair (Af)fair?

discursive powers, an accomplishment that is unevenly distributed in the classroom and constantly assessed by peers and the teacher. The fear of becoming “object” or “unintelligible” subjects - regulated by official curriculum and hegemonic discourses – governs, in particular, the marginalized pupil’s behaviors and apparent self-evaluations. However, in line with Foucault and Butler, Davies argues for a nuanced and multifarious understanding of subjectification (which she uses synonymously with subjectivation). Hence, her analysis demonstrates ways that subjects are always discursively conditioned, but also need these very conditions to make subversions or to trouble given “either-or” categories.

Youdell puts forward another significant approach to subjectivation in education while attempting to destabilize prevailing subordination (2006; 2010). In her book *School Trouble* (2010), she tries to rethink problems of inequality and subordination to market principles in education, with help of theories by Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, Chantal Mouffe and similar thinkers. By showing how pervasive and unjust school identities, such as everyday accounts of pupils with “Social, Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties” (“SEBD”), heterosexual gender norms, or staff and pupils reduced to crude measures of achievement, *can be* subverted and disrupted, she argues for a radical and performative¹³ politics of schooling. For instance she points to how political pedagogies in a small scale can destabilize predominant identities, exemplified by de-terrorizing the “object” “SEBD-pupils,” and making other subjectivations intelligible, or the enactment of “classroom trouble” and “anti-identity politics,” such as a teacher’s purposeful troubling of traditional sexual and gender norms. However, although other subjects might be opened up and staged as “a politics of becoming” through conscious acts, Youdell nevertheless stresses the problematic fragility and individuality in these interventions in a school context still dominated by “business as usual.”

In relation to the present study, Youdell’s (2010) analyses of subjectivation in schools dominated by market rationality, yet still with a strong emphasis on equality are highly significant. Putting analytical tools in line with Foucault’s “productive powers” to work, her analyses are helpful to understand how actors in school today are interpellated by market discourses and constructed in affirmations to these discourses that reformulate the meanings of equality and justice. Inspired by Youdell (2010), I thus use subjectivation to think about the double qualities in

¹³ The concept “performative” is here used in Butler’s (2005, 2009) sense, which is different from “performativity” as described by Lyotard (1984) that is developed in educational contexts by for instance Troman et al. (2007), Ball (1998). See also Youdell (2006a).

Chapter 2. Review of Research

reforms and categorizations that simultaneously cast particular children out, and pull them back in. Such doubleness also sometimes travels into research that for instance tries to “save” particularly vulnerable groups of children. Popkewitz (2008) uses the notion of “double gestures of hope and fear” (p. 55) to explore this, and I pursue that approach in the section below, called “Hopes and fears in the education economy”.

“Intersectionality” has become a catchword for researchers interested in the subjectivation of schooling (Lykke, 2005; Wetherell, 2009) and destabilization of particular norms and patterns of dominance. Staunæs (2003) brings together the concepts of subjectification and intersection as a way to overcome determined master identities and homogenizations of certain categories in accounts of educational subjectification processes by focusing on “the complexity of lived experience” (p. 103). She is distancing herself from dominant patterns in research where the application of concepts like subjectivation and subject positioning are used to understand constructions of “the Other.” In Staunæs’ work, not only are constructions of “the Other” as subject positions untangled, but also subjectivations of the “privileged” and “powerful.” In her analysis of daily life in a multi-ethnic school in Denmark, she investigates how intersectionalities between ethnicity and gender work in subjectification processes; for instance, how two boys are struggling to make themselves recognizable in relation to peers and staff. By negotiating power, taking up particular masculine and raced positions – thereby using the discursive resources to “work on themselves” - and compensating for a lack of power in one position by another, the boys are at least partially subverting their troubled subject positions.

Granath (2008) has conducted an analysis of "work on oneself" in Swedish schools, inspired by Foucault's later work, in her ethnographic study of school performance and logbook notes. She concludes that the teacher's gaze and the intimacy of relationships is transformed to a way the student looks at oneself, thus it becomes a norm and difference-creating technology shaping what Granath refers to as an “ideal school-identity.” Such an ability to present a selling, attractive narrative about oneself is seen by Granath as a constant work in progress for the pupil’s reflexive subjectivation. One of the "selves" that emerges in her analysis is what she calls an “entrepreneurial self”: “[...] autonomous planning and responsible, sometimes calculating”(p.171) [My translation].

The need for the "right attitude" and to constantly evaluate oneself is akin to Bartholdsson’s (2008) anthropologically oriented study emphasizing the moralizing discourses governing not only the students' work, but also the school's approach to parenting, an approach characterized by the belief that parenting is impoverished

A fair (Af)fair?

and that the school is forced to "compensate for parents' supposed inabilities" (p.129) [My translation]. The importance of the pupils "desir[ing] the right thing"(p.129) and producing themselves as healthy, lifelong learning subjects is emphasized (i.e., Fejes & Nicoll, 2008), a desire which coincides with the school's assessment of the student's performance and of the student's personality. A forward-looking, reflective and responsible student is portrayed as the norm when students are directed to deploy technologies like "confessions" and self-reflection. Bartholdsson refers to Frykman's ideas about how school, instead of allowing social mobility, has become society's "therapeutic space," where "[...] today is about making students into someone rather than something" (p.142). This "becoming of someone", within a particular context and "order" is a main topic for the French philosopher Jacques Rancière.

The last group of studies with relevance here is informed by the writings of Rancière. For him, the notion of subjectivation is significant as it opens up possibilities for people to become *something else* than a result of their social categorizations, for people to move beyond the dividing practices that assign to individuals positions in the given hierarchical order. This is what he refers to as the "partition of the sensible," that is a consensual "[...] configuration of a field of perception-in common [...]" (Panagia and Rancière, 2000, p.123). Recently, a few studies have discovered the values of Rancière's analytical apparatus in the educational field (e.g., Säfström, 2011; Bingham & Biesta, 2010; Biesta, 2008, 2010; Simons & Masschelein, 2010; Pelletier, 2009a, 2009b). In particular, his book *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* (1991) has received attention, but his later works, focusing on the relations between politics, aesthetics and democracy have also engaged the educational research community. Some associate his work with Foucault (Biesta, 2008; Simons & Masschelein, 2010) and Butler (Pelletier, 2009b), thus the interest in how power, knowledge and subjectivation are intertwined in educational processes is a mutual concern for scholars in the educational field interested in Rancière's work. For the purposes of this study, I maintain that Rancière's concepts of subjectivation and identification can help to destabilize and rethink established notions of identity.

Simons and Masschelein (2010) elaborate on Rancière's notion of "political subjectivation" as a potential process of becoming intelligible outside and beyond the partition of the sensible in a particular context. According to the authors there is a tendency in current forms of democracy to grant the individual participation in society in terms of "stakes" taking the form of interests, preferences or opinions. These stakes become intelligible under the logic of "the police," that is, the configuration, differentiation and administration of every society including the

Chapter 2. Review of Research

hierarchical distribution of places and positions for individuals. This distribution is what Rancière refers to as “identification,” realized when a person becomes “included” in the consensual police order, a process that Simons and Masschelein relate to Foucault’s notion of “governmental subjectivation.”

Following Rancière further, they argue that in current forms of schooling the identification of pupils with different “qualifications” and “stakes” (as measured by tests or in terms of “needs”) becomes a powerful verification and reproduction of the inequality that schools are officially and ostensibly trying to combat under the banner of equality, and thus the exact opposite of the political subjectivation proposed by Rancière. However, by ending their article with Foucault’s call to question how power is exercised in and through institutions, they introduce the concept of “pedagogic subjectivation” inspired by Rancière’s “political subjectivation.” They describe this as a potential and experimental act of verifying ability and equality in schools by putting a “thing-in-common” (like a book) in between students and teachers who can verify their ability or learn endlessly. This, they argue, could be realized if the teacher becomes *ignorant* of prevailing assumptions of inequality and differences in intelligence and instead *assume* equality on the level of intelligence. That is what differentiates on one side “pedagogical subjectivation,” from “identification” into particular “abilities” that leads to positions, etc., on the other. That is also a fundamental shift in the teacher’s attention – from that of students “abilities” – to that of their “will” (to learn, compare, understand, etc.). Thus, the pedagogic subjectivation can be perceived as acts in school that works from the assumption of equality “[...] not as a selection or qualification machinery but as a ‘public space’ because one is equally exposed to a thing-in-common.” (aa. p. 601).

According to Pelletier (2009b) this approach to subjectivation and identification is much needed in educational studies, particularly in ethnographic work, which she argues “[...] has been extensively informed by the notion of habitus, particularly in terms of the relationships between students’ background, projected future and their discursive acts in school” (2009b, p. 281). Elaborating on Rancière’s notions of “disagreement” or “*mésentente*” (French) and putting these concepts in relation to Butler’s “performativity,” she calls for studies approaching subjectivation in education by valorizing and verifying ethnographic accounts with “the method of equality.” This means to analyze “data” not as expressions of sociological conditions or as the effect of social categorizations, but instead to engage in research with the assumption of equality and to valorize accounts where disputes of “social” categorizations occur. A basic consequence of treating the categories as performative is that they may become what they describe. Thus they are not only

A fair (Af)fair?

“interactive” in Hacking’s (1996) sense, but when the “imitative” logics of identity is disrupted by Butler’s (2009) “drag” or Rancière’s (1991) “ignorant,” they make visible the notion that certain research accounts of identity are can be not only descriptive, but also prescriptive and, as such, can contribute to construct “the abject Other” in education.

I have now looked at a range of studies addressing notions of identity and subjectivation. The initial ones focused on constructions of identity arguing that social categories such as class, gender or ethnicity and the propensities tied to these categories are produced and reproduced in certain educational contexts. Here dominant groups exert their power onto dominated groups, although “resistance” also might be traced in ethnographical accounts. Then I moved to a different way of thinking, drawing on Foucault and Rancière and directing attention to questions of difference that are always discursively constructed and to subjectivities that are always in the making and become apprehensible through the workings of knowledge and power. In particular the work done by Pelletier (2009a,b) is useful in my study, as it challenges common understandings of scientific categorizations and identifications into a given social (hierarchical) order. “The method of equality” can inspire to interpret data differently and to re-think particular discourses of equality and inclusion in everyday schooling.

Hopes and fears in the education economy

What is meant by “hopes and fears” is inspired by Popkewitz (2008) and refers to the historical articulations of how education in various ways is believed to “rescue” the nation or groups of population from a variety of “dangers,” such as moral decay, economic decline or social exclusion. Moreover, Popkewitz argues that research has played an important role in producing these fears or “salvation narratives.” He makes visible the doubleness in cultural theses of hopes and fears that pertain to the relative nature and mutual constitution of twin concepts such as exclusion and inclusion, where the former embodies the latter in accordance with a binary cultural logic, that is to make sense of someone being included, someone else needs to be excluded. The following section reviews selected research that critically addresses some of these cultural theses, but I will also try to illustrate how the same research may simultaneously unconsciously articulate others. At the end of this section I briefly develop my thoughts on how the double gestures in this small sample of research are relevant for my study, that aims for a better understanding of marketization in contemporary schooling. The selection is done

Chapter 2. Review of Research

based on searches in Google Scholar¹⁴ where I searched for “education” in combination with “restructuring,” “market/-ization,” “accountability” and “governmentality.”

Restructuring and marketization in education

The restructuring of education as a part of the public sector’s welfare transition has been studied for a long time and from a variety of perspectives. The research has mainly focused on shifts in policy and rationales of reform, (see e.g., Whitty & Power, 2000; Englund, 1996; Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000) but there have also been many critical ethnographic accounts of restructured and marketized school systems, often combined with policy analyses (see e.g. Apple, 2006; Ball, 1998; 2003; Beach et al. 2003; Lund, 2006; Kallstenius, 2010). Arguments for deregulation and the introduction of market principles in schools were raised as a critique of the assumed ineffective, regulating and omnipotent state persistent in many western societies during the latter part of the 20th century. As a response, the critique of universalism, centralism and social engineering led to an increasing of particularism and decentralization that in turn were driven by the principles of the economy and the market (Lindblad & Wallin, 1993; Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). Hence, the reforms echo the famous slogan ‘TINA’ – There Is No Alternative – introduced by Margaret Thatcher in her political campaign of the late 70’s and early 80’s (Ritzvi, 2004). Lundahl argues that Sweden experienced waves of educational reforms in the late 70’s: first with the principle of decentralization, then a second phase in the 90’s based on neoliberal market principles of competition and choice, followed by a third phase in the early 2000’s when alarms about inequality between schools and particular student categories as well as declining school results on a general level contributed to a partial re-centralization characterized by accountability¹⁵ and New Public Management¹⁶ (Lundahl, 2005, 2008).

Some scholars assert that Sweden has been transformed into the most de-regulated school system in the world (Skolverket, 2009; Arreman & Holm, 2011). Central arguments for deregulation have been neoliberal ideas about production of human capital; reforms of self-governance, autonomy and responsabilization (Ball,

¹⁴ The search was conducted August 26, 2013.

¹⁵ Accountability refers to a set of ideas and practices where individuals and/or institutions are held accountable and responsible for their actions (See Power, 1997).

¹⁶ New Public Management (NPM) is a concept used to describe broad changes in welfare policies from the 1990’s and onwards, where business-like phenomena such as management, provider-purchaser relationships, decentralization, choice and competition are put in play in the welfare sector, including education (Ball & Youdell, 2007).

A fair (Af)fair?

2007; Shamir, 2008; Gewirtz, et al. 1995); as well as privatization, accountability and competition (Lindblad, 2011; Lindblad & Popkewitz, 2004; Whitty & Power, 2000). This intensified just as it did in many other western nations during the period since the 1980's when neoliberal politics were embraced also in social-democratic governments and it became more intense after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 as neoliberal policies were introduced on a large scale (Ritzvi, 2004). Market reforms meant a form of steering often referred to as New Public Management (NPM), with competition, privatization, accountability and school choice as vital components. These principles were accordingly proposed in Sweden by the right wing government from 1991-1994 and implemented in large scale by the social-democratic government that followed (Lindblad & Wallin, 1993; Lundahl, 2005; Dovemark, 2004; Dahlstedt, 2011; Beach & Dovemark, 2011).

Englund (1996) has described and analyzed the transition in education policy and practice from “public good” to “private good.” This meant a shift away from collective values and interests – that is, what education can do for the society – to individual and family norms and stakes – i.e., a privatization of the means and purpose of public education. Six main characteristics in the restructuring of education can be found in the literature: a) *decentralization*, such as governing education through centrally defined goals and local autonomy (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000; Jarl & Rönnberg, 2010); b) *commodification*, i.e., in line with economic rationality; subjects, education and knowledge are treated as commodities and can as such be produced, traded and selected by potential consumers (Beach & Dovemark, 2005; Dahlstedt, 2011); c) *competition* between actors; both individuals such as pupils or professionals, and between schools intended to increase efficiency and quality (Beach & Dovemark, 2011; Lund, 2006); d) *privatization*, that is, to introduce self-interest, calculation over private return and an internationally unique invitation for private corporations to gain profit by managing schools (Beach & Dovemark, 2011; Lunneblad, 2010; Arreman & Holm, 2011); e) *accountability*, such as measurement and constant evaluation (i.e., standardized testing and self-evaluation) to ensure accurate performance, quality and improvement by individual actors and schools as organizations (cf. Power, 1997; Grek et al., 2009; Wahlström, 2009); f) *choice*, that is, the fundamental element of autonomous individuals acting on their preferences and private interest which, in turn, is expected to improve democracy, participation and inclusion (Englund, 2006; Lund, 2007).

This restructuring has been most recognized in Swedish upper secondary schools. Here the school market and “edu-business” (cf. Ball, 2007) is well established and after decades of cohesive organization, building a common base for theoretical and vocational orientations, major reforms in 2011 further underlined

Chapter 2. Review of Research

the neoliberal and neoconservative agenda creating (or “restoring”; see Lundahl, 2008) different trajectories for different social groups, or, as described by the euphemisms of reform –“choices” built on different “interests” or “aptness”. Furthermore, the recent reforms emphasized the curriculum’s subordination under labor-market and private interests, such as focusing on the “employability” and adaptation to knowledge demanded by corporations (Nylund, 2010; Lundahl et al., 2010; Carlbaum, 2012).

The consequences of these reforms can be divided into three parts: for society, for schools and for individuals. Several scholars have stressed the segregating effects the reforms have had and, even more, will have in the future. For society, an identified threat is decreasing social cohesion (Englund, 1996; Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000) and intensification in the means by which dominant groups exercise their power onto the oppressed (Beach & Dovemark, 2011). Schools are facing new obstacles such as constant evaluations; since schools are competing over resources in a (quasi) market, the pressure to “deliver” in terms of students’ results on standardized testing, but also in terms of economic efficiency and profit, intensifies. The schools are also compelled to follow the imperative to “profile,” or “brand,” themselves to compete successfully on the market (Skolverket, 2013; Kallstenius, 2010; Palme, 2008). Teachers in some schools are reported to feel the pressure to approve or pass dubiously performing students so the school’s reputation does not suffer (Wyndhamn, 2013). Finally, a significant account of the restructuring for individuals includes reduced social mobility; the effect of a pupil’s social background is increasing and the threshold for good life-chances is getting higher and more difficult to reach, thus offering fewer opportunities for advancement (Bunar, 2010; Skolverket, 2009). Another example of reduced social mobility concern the trajectories determined by school choice, for instance investigated by Lund (2006) and Palme (2008).

Lund (2006) has examined students' choice paths at a local school (quasi) market for upper secondary schools using Habermas' deliberative theory as a base and with Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis approach. The results show that students' choice paths and rationalities can be understood as either vocational, career-oriented or consumption-oriented, all of which are framed by a market discourse in which meaning is created according to a utility-maximizing principle. He argues that:

The institutionally subordinate integration- and differentiation- processes show that educational choices in upper secondary education are made through disparate grounds and that this disadvantages some students. The dissertation together with other international studies can display that students who lack study traditions

A fair (Af)fair?

within their family are disadvantageded by an increased freedom of choice (Lund, 2006, p.212) [My translation].

Furthermore, Lund's results show that one consequence of the deregulated school is that the segregation between rich and poor groups increases as more responsibility for choices is imposed on individual students. Palme (2008) frames his study differently theoretically but finds similar results. He conducts a Bourdieu-inspired examination of the relationship between habitus, upper secondary school and beliefs about school career. By analyzing the symbolic values at secondary schools' websites, with the help of Bernstein's notion of classification and Rosengren's notion of topoi, he argues that school vouchers, competition and market reforms have led to the growing importance of legitimate cultural capital among both schools and students. To attract the best students, schools must signal the skills and abilities that are considered to have a high legitimate cultural capital, while the attending students tend to use these symbolic resources to define their social class, distinction and identity.

With few exceptions, the studies presented above share a critical stance towards the aspects of restructuring and reforms referred to as "marketization." Some build on theories of social class and dominance, and they sometimes point to hegemonic forms of neoliberalism in explanations of increased exclusion, inequality and segregation. The increased significance of "social background" has endangered both social cohesion and social mobility, has made "choice" a springboard for advantaged groups and has intensified the oppression of the disadvantaged. For me these are valuable insights in the dynamics and transitions of educational marketization discourses. Against this backdrop, I will now align towards studies of restructuring and marketization all more or less inspired from Foucault.

Foucauldian studies of restructuring and marketization in education

Here, I present studies that have investigated the restructuring in Sweden from a Foucauldian perspective, thus with a focus on relations between power, knowledge and the subject. The perspective is vital for this study's interest in the productive powers of marketization, how particular discourses have been made historically intelligible and how the hopes and fears of education might come under scrutiny.

Hultqvist and Petersson (2000) make a genealogy of the teacher and schooling as significant hopes of the future in their analysis of stagings in policy, public debate and research during the 20th century in Sweden. They historicize liberal and progressive accounts of freedom and emancipation where the teacher was given a central position. Fears of moral degeneration or national economic recession were

Chapter 2. Review of Research

met with images of schools and teachers as key agents that must be activated “from the bottom and up and self-governed” (p. 503). Following Rose (1999), they address how liberal governmentality¹⁷ produces, but also assumes, an autonomous teacher subject governing him/herself with particular knowledge, technologies of freedom and choice. The freedom is, however, always conditioned to productivity, and within moral and economic boundaries, it thus becomes a way to govern the conduct of conduct, that is the rules and standards of how to act upon the actions of others (cf. Foucault, 2003a; for a pedagogical context, Popkewitz et. al., 2006).

With the intention of understanding and problematizing how pupils and teachers were positioned during the reform of the 1980s in Sweden, Sjöberg (2011) analyzed policy documents concerning teacher education. She argues that a hegemonic discourse order constructs the school subjects “seductively” where alternative positions become unintelligible. She also discusses how governing technologies and discourses are creating inequalities for teachers and particular student groups. Congruent results are presented by Carlbaum (2012), who discusses the different meanings implied by neoliberal governmentality in diverse student populations. Increased marketization and focus on choice implies that citizens are positioned as customers of education. Wyndhamn (2013) claims that market-economic considerations are affecting the daily life in classrooms and conditioning students for available subject-positions. In a study investigating the governing of higher education, “flexible learning” and the introduction of IT, Bergviken-Rensfeldt (2010) draws on subjectivation, governmentality and spatialization and uses those notions to denaturalize differentiations and particular spatialities that are produced within a liberal rationality. Dahlstedt and Hertzberg (2011) emphasize how knowledge and education become subordinated under economy as they elaborate on the rise of “entrepreneurship” in Swedish education, with the help of Foucauldian notions of technologies of power and technologies of the self. The discourse of entrepreneurship was presented as a salvation, intended to awaken agency, openness and dynamics, hence the authors stress the role entrepreneurship has taken in education as a doctrine for the individual’s responsibilities in learning and self-management in schooling. These are valuable arguments relating to my intentions to analyze discourses of marketization and inclusion through the lens of governmentality in the Swedish school.

Internationally, a great number of scholars have used the notion of governmentality to analyze recent reforms in education but also to historicize

¹⁷ The concept of governmentality was invented by Foucault and refers to the art of government in increasingly liberal societies (Foucault, 2003a). See also chapter 3.2.

A fair (Af)fair?

redundant statements of the market. Some special issues have been devoted to governmentality and education (see e.g., Simons & Masschelein, 2006; Fejes & Nicoll, 2008; Peters et al., 2009) and several books have been published on the topic, although they do not exclusively address education (see e.g. Foucault et. al., 1991; Rose, 1999; Dean, 1999; Brennan & Popkewitz, 1998). The scope and variety of approaches and findings cannot be elaborated here but a few studies are worth mentioning, since they address the problems of marketization and equality. In line with Foucault's interest in historical accounts of subjectivation's relation to freedom and how particular objects become problems of government, for instance, Ball (2007) and Simons (2006) have expanded on the dual function in governmentality to simultaneously individualize and totalize, thus shaping both the population and the individual and exercising "the conduct of conduct" (cf. Foucault, 2003a).

Analyzing educational restructuring as mechanisms of governmentality, then, involves a rethinking and re-categorizing of power from repressive to productive in as much as it produces subjectivity, both collective and individual, bringing together general ethics and self-technologies of individual responsabilization. Self-regulated subjects learn how to become homo oeconomicus when the notion of "the social" is re-described as "the economical"(Peters, 2001). The educational dimensions of what it means to develop an entrepreneurial relation to oneself are developed by Masschelein & Simons (2005) and related to inclusive education and contemporary notions of democracy. Here, they elaborate on the idea that in the "economical" times we live in everyone has to present his or her "stakes" in competition with others. "Needs" of different kinds should thus be articulated as "assets" that produce subjectivity through the apparatus of expertise, explanations and interventions circulating in, for instance, "special needs education."¹⁸ They write: "Therefore, creating and sustaining inclusion is a permanent concern for government, it is a way to deal with inequality in a society of entrepreneurial selves" (p.133). In a similar way, Ball (2013) analyzes how assessment and visibility of, and "investments in" for instance low performing students, can be regarded as a construction of productive subjects in the sense Foucault referred to as "abilities machines" (p.105ff.), that is how individuals are made productive and useful in modern societies.

¹⁸ For an elaborated critique on normative accounts of inclusion and special needs, see Allan (2007) who uses post-structural theories to deconstruct and problematize the political in contemporary notions and practices of inclusion and exclusion.

Chapter 2. Review of Research

For my purpose, this approach to *economy* and *inclusion* is highly profitable since I want to investigate what principles of governing and relations of power these discourses pertain to in particular educational settings such as school fairs and a “disadvantaged” school context.

Within rationalities of “homo oeconomicus” and “responsibilization”, the subject’s improvements are made intelligible as investments (Peters, 2001; Masschelein & Simons, 2005, Ball, 2013) and always comparable to an external quantified norm. Rose (1999) defines the power of numbers as an intrinsic element in liberal democracies: “Democratic power is *calculating power*, and numbers are integral to the technologies that seek to give effect to democracy as a particular set of mechanisms of rule” (p. 675). This ‘governing by numbers’ (cf. Rose, 1991) is a well-established *managerial* policy-discourse and resonates to what Porter (1995) describes as “[a]...call for a clear separation between the scientific phase of objective, quantitative risk determinations and the political one of subjective management decisions” (p. 195).

Several scholars have attempted to historicize contemporary accounts of governing through economics, and Poovey (1998) and Porter (1995) provides analyses useful for my study. To make valid and trustworthy political and economical decisions, the establishment of scientific facts representing the society, its parts and positions were introduced with Adam Smith’s notions of a *political economy*. Poovey (1998) describes how Smith used a combination of numbers (neutral/natural economic facts) and particular assumptions of human nature (homo oeconomicus) to engage in conversations on governmentality and political reforms. Porter (1995) terms this a “mechanical objectivity” providing a response to a moral demand of fairness and justice; hence numbers have historically been motivated to gain trust and standardization. Porter writes, “Quantification is a way of making decisions without seeming to decide” (aa. p. 8), and seen as this social technology, “the numbers” allow for individuals to be turned into objects, abstracting away their individuality, and then to be manipulated, and perhaps most importantly - compared.

This type of comparability could be understood as a mode of governance (cf. Nóvoa & Yariv-Mashal, 2003) where the authority of statistical reasoning establishes norms through which ideas of normality and deviance are constructed. These measurements can be seen as a particular form of social engineering. Often targeting injustice, poverty and discrimination, the differentiations are created to “improve” or “empower” certain groups, such as those “at risk,” “girls” or “low performers” (Porter, 1995). Certain (scientific) ideas of what is counted as facts and truth have historically become advanced as governing strategies (Poovey, 1998).

A fair (Af)fair?

Hence, this “culture” becomes a way of installing the image of trust and impartiality through (self)-monitoring technologies and, ultimately, creating legitimacy and consensus.

Conclusions of the review

To summarize the review, attention is put on three intersecting research areas of vital importance for this study. The first concerns the studies of subjectivation and differentiation in schooling where subjectivation is analyzed as the double process of being *subjected to* while simultaneously *affirming and working on* these subjections. The second area of interest bears upon governmentality and historicizing studies of reforms and marketization in education. This includes ways in which freedom, choice and market mechanisms as well as an increased emphasis on quantification and statistical comparability are adapted and translated into the educational area. Many of these studies claim the importance of historicizing notions of the market whenever it is essentialized or treated as a fact. Finally, the third field of interest regards approaches drawing on Foucault and Rancière on discourses of inclusion and equality. The relevance here pertains to the ways scientific discourses of progress contains “double gestures of hopes and fears,” that is, accounts of exclusion with the impulse to include in multiple ways through for instance categorizations, comparisons and explanations.

What makes this study relevant as a response to the problems discussed in the diverse array of studies above? Obviously, in a study of this size, I cannot address adequately the scope and depth of all these problems and questions. Still, by delimiting on theoretically informed questions concerning relations between market and equality and how subjectivation is conceptualized and enacted in these relations that I trace in diverse educational settings, in policy - and in research - I hope to contribute to the field with new perspectives, questions and possibilities. This means to continue the work of others to disseminate the ways in which research and other knowledge claims are turned into “social epistemologies” that classify, regulate and performatively reproduce the “common senses” of schooling (Popkewitz, 2008; Pelletier, 2009a,b; Simons & Masschelein, 2006; Bingham & Biesta, 2010, Youdell, 2010).

Chapter 3. Rancière and Foucault: Markets and Inclusion – studying their problematics

My thesis departs from the assumption that education is a profound political phenomenon. This meaning something more and different than announcing how politicians are governing schools and education systems. Instead I want to focus how education partitions the world that is sensible to us and how individuals and institutions are produced in such partitions. It is important for two primary reasons. First, I want to take an anti-essentialist stance, which means I will embrace the contingency of subjectivation and reject reductions of people's characteristics to their place in the social order (cf. Rancière, 2010a). Anti-essentialism is also vital for my argument about historicizing the market and inclusion because it points to the cultural specificity in explanations where these phenomena are assumed as stable and universal facts, be it in the form of either "hopes" or "fears" or in their mutual constitution. Secondly, this study is driven by theory. By this I do not mean that it takes a deductive approach, attempting to verify empirical observations according to theories. Instead, I suggest an abductive process (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2008) whereby data and theory are constantly woven together in a continuous process. Obviously, from a social constructivist point of view there are no "data" without "theory." Yet, on the other hand, to make theory "practical" it must be posed to the particularities of the world, that is, to different contexts and to other theories, with a certain set of questions. My questions are not of the phenomenological kind asking what meanings actors give to certain phenomena, since "experiences" in my view are already pre-configured (cf. Scott, 1992). They are instead, inspired by Foucault (2003d) and Rancière (2010a), investigating the principles of classification that give certain things sense, voice or reason while treating others as nonsense, noise or insanity.

In the following I elaborate on ideas presented by Rancière and Foucault that will untangle why and how particular discourses of the market and inclusion have become so powerful in shaping the way we think about and govern education today. In a spiral way, I try to bring in some of the arguments from the review section and pose them in the light of some of Rancière's and Foucault's analytics. Rancière is primarily used to analyze discourses of inclusion and Foucault is mostly activated for problematizing discourses of marketization. I will not provide any

synthesis of the two theorists, but when their concepts are used in the discussion, I try to show how they sometimes overlap and can mutually reinforce each other, thus I claim the fruitfulness of combining them in this and similar analyses (cf. Biesta, 2008; Simons & Masschelein, 2010).

The lessons of Rancière: stultification, equality and emancipation

Rancière challenges some common understandings of democracy, equality and what emancipation in and through education could mean. His ideas also have major implications for thinking about pedagogical subjectivation and differentiation. Throughout his work he has criticized dominating sociological and political discourses, often shared in consensus by researchers and politicians on educational emancipation and the belief in enlightenment rationality, instead advocating a sort of dissensus and political subjectivation that works under the assumption of equality between all intelligences. In his book *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* (1991) he recalls the true story of Joseph Jacotot, a university teacher who experimented with his students in the 1820's. Jacotot did not understand their language, nor did they understand his.

What Jacotot discovered was that his former (and the generally accepted) assumptions of a hierarchy in intelligences between a master explicator and his assumedly ignorant students were wrong. He named this hegemonic assumption *stultification*, and Rancière explains how this is the prevailing logic of – and even a passion for – inequality; a logic that constantly reproduces itself through education's explanatory logic. To explain is to put a temporal and cognitive distance between intelligences, to assume a hierarchy between the master (teacher) and his ignorant (student). Although Rancière (1991) states that “Reasoned progression of knowledge is an indefinitely reproduced mutilation” (p.21), he also refers to stultification's genius, as it can “transform loss into profit” (p.21). The logic of progress is always hierarchical insofar as the student after explication has advanced to more sophisticated explanations and that he/she in turn can explain to others – more inferior than him/her. In accordance with this logic much (if not all) of schooling becomes a verification and naturalization of inequality. As he writes, “Public Instruction is the secular arm of progress, the way to equalize inequality progressively, that is to say, to unequalize equality indefinitely. Everything is still played out according to a sole principle, the inequality of intelligence” (Rancière, 1991 p.131).

Chapter 3. Rancière and Foucault: Markets and Inclusion – studying their problematics

Thus, the hierarchical order legitimizes itself through its assumed attempt to close the gap between the equal and unequal and enhance progress. He writes: “If explanation is in principle infinite it is because its primary function is to infinitize the very distance it proposes to reduce” (Rancière, 2010b, p. 3). The “democratic scandal” and therefore the hatred against democracy (that Rancière associates with the undoing of hierarchies to social positions and places) partly appears from this pedagogic logic and more generally from the totally pedagogicized society, i.e., from a social logic based on two fundamental axioms: “First one must start from inequality in order to reduce it; second, the way to reduce inequality is to conform to it by making it an object of knowledge” (aa p.4). For Rancière (2006) this double act is understood as an aesthetic and performative function of (social) scientific knowledge as it partitions the world in two: the researchers who unveil the social logic and the (poor) people who merely obey that logic. This performative partition is a central element in his critique of Bourdieu. According to Rancière (2012), the Bourdieuan sociology is based on a perfectly circular argument and a “moving tautology” proposed in two of Bourdieu’s major works:

1) Children from the popular classes are excluded from the universities because they are unaware of the true reasons why they are excluded (The Inheritors).

2) Misunderstanding of the true reasons why they are excluded is a structural effect produced by the very existence of the system that excludes them (La Reproduction).

In other words, they are excluded because they do not know why they are excluded; and they do not know why they are excluded because they are excluded (aa, p.161).

The only one, then, who can understand this tautological mystery is the scientist, who has “penetrated” the “system” and therefore can explain to the poor why they are poor. The explanatory logic has, in fact, argues Rancière, expanded to the more general idea of emancipatory – and progressive – politics, where the explicators, such as politicians, scientists etc., have given themselves the objective of “lifting the veil of ignorance” from the poor, the uneducated, the ignorant (Rancière, 2010b).

Emancipatory politics is a central part in Rancière’s writings of what he refers to as “the police” or “the “police order,” a notion he shares with Foucault as a power that orders and distributes bodies, spaces and positions in every society. Foucault introduced the notion of the police in his lectures on the reason of the state during the 17th and 18th century. He emphasized the productive character of the police as it uses scientific knowledge to care for the population: its health, productivity and usefulness – in short, the totality of an individual’s life and its relation to the nation

A fair (Af)fair?

as a whole (Foucault, 2003a; 2008). Foucault argues that the police's main task was not to prevent crime or to maintain law and order, but rather that of "[...] assuring urban supplies, hygiene, health and standards considered necessary for handicrafts and commerce" (Foucault, 2003a, p.133).

Still, for Rancière the police has simultaneously a more general and a more specific meaning. He is referring to society's symbolic configuration and, as such, a particular "partition of the sensible," that is, the configuration of what is possible to see, to say and to do in every given society that is regulated by police order. The notion of partition of the sensible has a central place in Rancière's analytical apparatus. It thus refers to a distribution of spaces that defines this sharing of parts and positions and so regulates the forms of action that determines both the mode in which something common offers itself to participation and also in how individuals have a part in this distribution. The first part – the "partition" – is used in both senses of the word; that is, to disclose at once the existence of a *common* while simultaneously defining the *division* of the parts and positions of that which is common. The second part – "the sensible" – refers to the evidence we can apprehend with our senses, to what is perceptible. Taken together the notion of the partition of the sensible thus captures what in a given society is consensually *partaged* as visible/invisible or hearable/unhearable, etc., thus the formation of a sort of social ontology (Rancière, 2010a):

The essence of the police lies in a partition of the sensible that is characterized by the absence of void and of supplement; society here is made up of groups tied to specific modes of doing, to places in which these occupations are exercised, and to modes of being corresponding to these occupations and these places. In the matching of functions, places and ways of being, there is no place for any void. It is the exclusion of what 'is not' that constitutes the police-principle at the core of statist practices (Rancière, 2010a, p.36).

Institutional explanations such as schooling or the sociology of education thus belong to the police order's particular partition of the sensible where the process of *identification* has a vital function. Identification means that each and every one has – and has been provided with resources to "find" – his or her specific and "proper" place in the existing distribution or "counting in" of subjects. The processes of identification are quite similar to what Foucault and others refers to as "subjectivation," that is the double process of being subjected to affirm a certain identity or position – and to act on oneself in relation to that position, be it for instance "working-class-children" or "pupils with special needs." However, Rancière reserves the notion of subjectivation for the "supplement" he mentions in the quote above, i.e., the essence of *politics* that disputes and disturbs an established partition of the sensible and the police order. This is a politics of dissensus that

Chapter 3. Rancière and Foucault: Markets and Inclusion – studying their problematics

destabilizes the divisions, positions and hierarchies per se, but more fundamentally it disputes the idea that there are dispositions specific to positions and it “[...] counts a part of those without a part” (2010a, p.36).

At this point it is necessary, however, to stress that, according to Rancière, “police” is not similar to Althusser’s Ideological State Apparatuses; it cannot be reduced to repression and – most importantly – “There is a worse and a better police” (1999, p. 30-31) which is always historically embedded and conditioned. Crucial to an understanding of the police is though the *productive powers* of ideology/discourse, notions introduced by Althusser (1971/2006) and then taken further by Foucault (2003a), Butler (2005) and Rancière (2010a). The point that links these thinkers is how subjects become “real” through *affirmations* (Althusser); through discursive productive powers which *constitute and constrain* (Foucault); through *performative* actions (Butler) and finally through *partitions of the sensible* within the police (Rancière) (See also Youdell, 2006b). Therefore, it becomes valuable to unpack and map the current dynamics in “politics of the police,” its practices of identification as well as instances of subjectivation in different contexts (Chambers, 2011; Bingham & Biesta, 2010). Rancière writes: “There is no place outside of the police. But there are conflicting ways of doing things with the ‘places’ that it allocates: of relocating, reshaping or redoubling them” (Rancière, 2011, p.6).

Instead of reproducing inequality by assuming it, Rancière proposes that we assume equal intelligences and reject the idea of equality as a goal to achieve in the future. The lesson of Jacotot is to verify equality as an axiom. The verification of equality, and the demonstration of a “wrong,” is what Rancière refers to as *subjectivation*, which is his notion of *politics* enacted by disrupting the limits of the sensible and the order of police. This reconfiguration of the private and the public, the universal and the particular (Rancière, 2005), reminds one of Judith Butler’s (2009) analysis of “drag” as potentially subversive inasmuch as it makes gender and sex norms visible and destabilized. A reversal of the category/identity-relation means that social categories such as class or gender are treated as the effect, rather than the cause, of particular actions or behavior (Butler, 2009). Thus, the verification of equality for Jacotot, the workers who wrote poetry in the early 19th century or the woman Olympe de Gouges, who demonstrated a wrong and claimed her right to speak, since she already had the “right” to be executed (Rancière, 2005) have a direct relation to Butler’s “abject” subjects who challenge particular distributions of the sensible through performative actions (Pelletier, 2009a).

For my purposes the analytical toolbox provided by Rancière (including Althusser, Foucault and Butler) gives an opportunity to rethink particular explanations of dominance as such are staged in pedagogical discourses of the

A fair (Af)fair?

market and inclusion (i.e. practices, policies, theories and their interconnections) in those contexts where I conduct my empirical studies (i.e. School Fairs and a High School). It also allows me to think about the aesthetic and performative dimensions of research; for instance, how “scientific knowledge” divides the world and knowledge in two: the ones who understand the social logic and speak thanks to their scientific discourse and those who can only follow the social logic, identify with their positions and mumble speechless. Furthermore Butler’s critical examination of the heterosexual matrix is an inspiration to trouble assumed causal relationships between affluence and ability. Finally, relations between subjectivation and identification such as they are staged in discourses of the market and inclusion are possible to discern, analyze and possibly destabilize with the conceptual apparatus presented by Rancière. A better understanding of how the matching of positions and ways of being is performed in particular settings may also increase our knowledge of how policing – the partition of the sensible is configured in contemporary education. Thus, by exploring these theoretical tools I expect to answer the related empirical and theoretical research questions asked in the thesis.

In the two studies included herein I emphasize different aspects of Rancière’s concepts. In the article I mostly use his notions of subjectivation/identification, the aesthetics of knowledge and explore what he refers to as an “explicatory logic.” In the book chapter I demonstrate the analytical usefulness of the partition of the sensible.

Governmentality as an analytic lens

To think about how the subject was related to the problem of government, Foucault invented the notion of governmentality in his lectures during the late 1970s. The notion, which is a play on words, comes from the French *gouvernementalité*, thus implying a mentality with respect to governing wherein the individuals perceive themselves as free. This condition allows the subjectivating powers to work as it guides what Foucault (2003a) refers to as “the conduct of conduct,” that is, an activation of the double senses of the word conduct – to lead and guide intentionally and also to conduct oneself such as to behave or self-regulate according to predetermined standards (Dean, 1999). Thus, at the core of governmentality – as an analytical notion – lies an analysis of how the individual and the society simultaneously became a “problem” and possible to govern. In this chapter I will present Foucault’s historization of neo-liberal rationalities where he addresses precisely this doubleness (Foucault, 2008). This is followed by commentaries by other scholars in the field of education and then a paragraph

Chapter 3. Rancière and Foucault: Markets and Inclusion – studying their problematics

where I discuss the implications for my own study devoted to investigating how subjectivation, differentiation and inclusion is made intelligible within a discourse of educational marketization.

In the analyses of neo-liberal rationalities in his lectures from 1979 Foucault (2008) examines influential strands of neo-liberal thought emerging in the post-war era. Here he introduces the notion of *governmentality* as an analytic concept trying to understand the simultaneous governing of individuals and of the state inherent in liberal political rationality. The first neo-liberal paradigm he discusses is the “Ordo-liberalen” in Germany that introduces a “social market economy,” doing away with classic liberal notions of *laissez faire*, and instead advocating an active intervening and engineering state and keeping the fragile market economy going. The Ordo-liberalen claim the determined creation of conditions that makes the markets’ inner essence of competition possible. Hence, the establishment of “[...] pure competition, which is the essence of the market, can only appear if it is produced, and if it is produced by an active governmentality” (Foucault, 2003c, p.121).

Pure competition must also be promoted in areas where the market mechanism is not normally engaged, like family life or housing. This can be managed by what Röpke, one of the proponents of Ordo-liberalen, describes as “Vitalpolitik” – a sort of “politics of life” (Foucault, 2008, p. 148), which in turn is described as a multiplication and generalization of the idea of enterprise or business to all areas of life subsumed to the rationality of the market. This “[...] involves extending the economic model of supply and demand and of investment-costs-profit so as to make it a model of social relationships and to existence itself, a form of relationship of the individual to himself, time, those around him, the group and the family” (aa, p. 242). The Ordo-liberalen, writes Foucault, are also strong opponents of a social policy aiming to balance the effects of the market economy, thus social politics should not will intervene in the logics of the market: “Social policy cannot have equality as its objective” (aa, p.143).

The other neoliberal school investigated by Foucault is the American “Chicago School” represented by Milton Friedman and Gary Becker. Here the elimination of state interventionism is the main target and by collapsing the distinction between the autonomous state and the market, having the latter absorb the former, the political and social domains become redefined as economic domains. The Chicago School redefines homo oeconomicus: no longer, as in the classic liberal doctrine, a man of exchange, but instead a man who produces his own satisfaction – in short: “[...] an entrepreneur of himself” (aa, p. 226). As such, and as a producer of human capital, the economic rational can expand almost endlessly, and a market-embedded morality becomes the common good. Areas like health care, migration

A fair (Af)fair?

and, of course, education then becomes means of investment, shaping the individual to become “an abilities machine” (aa, p. 239).

The innovation of American neoliberalism for Foucault is the generalization of the model of *homo economicus* to all forms of behavior representing an extension of economic analysis to domains previously considered to be non-economic and the redefinition of *homo economicus* as entrepreneur of himself with an emphasis on acquired elements and the problem of the formation of human capital in education (Peters, 2009).

Thus Foucault forefronts a strong recognition of the state in the two neo-liberal traditions, which are both connected to ideas of markets and entrepreneurship. The common features regard the ways in which market freedom has to be protected and actively expanded and produced. Thought of as governmental strategies, the market of competition and enterprise requires a governing state, although the American version insists upon a state subsumed under market rationality. Donzelot (2008) writes about the state’s role in an article on governmentality in recent European policy:

Its role is no longer to curb a freedom, which is the expression of man’s inevitably evil nature, but to regulate it, by means including prohibition if necessary. For there is no freedom that is not produced, that is not to be constructed, and this construction takes place through interventions by the State, not by its mere disengagement (Donzelot, 2008, p. 122).

This neo-liberal configuration of freedom and autonomy is indeed a historically produced freedom that has production of life (hence, the notion of bio-politics) as its object; thus, it must produce welfare for the individual and the society simultaneously (Simons, 2006). An intersecting government of the individual, society and its institutions is made possible through a dialectics of power/knowledge where discursive practices regulate and produce the body and its behaviors (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983). In terms of subjectivation the governmentality of neoliberalism produces a set of technologies of the self that is based on the faculties of truth, choice and rationality. The individual must continuously produce and reproduce it-self to maximize the subject’s self interest (Fitzsimons, 2011). This responsabilization, where the subject needs to reflect on itself has, according to Foucault, a price. Butler (2005) makes the following interpretation of the self-constituted subject of “busnopower”:

This seems to mean that the forms of rationality by which we make ourselves intelligible, by which we know ourselves and offer ourselves to others, are established historically, and at a price. If they become naturalized, taken for granted, considered as foundational and required, if they become the terms by

Chapter 3. Rancière and Foucault: Markets and Inclusion – studying their problematics

which we do and must live, then our very living depends upon a denial of their historicity, a disavowal of the price we pay (2005, p.121).

It appears as if the analytic strength in the notion of governmentality directs our attention to forms of governing that become possible *not despite* a strong centralization or a strong state, but *thanks to* particular ways of state governing as it reconfigures its role and function. Thus, a double movement, centralization and dispersion, or, in other words, the “governmentalization of the state” might be at hand (Foucault, 2003c; Dean, 1999; Simons, 2006; Ozga, 2009). This line of thinking thus aligns Foucault with Butler and Rancière’s notion of partition of the sensible as it focuses how individuals are monitored through particular discursive knowledge on the subjects, who consequently govern themselves within given social ontologies.

For the purposes of this study, the historization of the market and the elaboration of governmentality by Foucault becomes a way to rethink attempts to essentialize the market as either hopes or fears in education. In Foucault's analysis, as we can see, configuring the state so it did not regulate the market but rather made it possible for markets to expand endlessly into all areas of life, was a vital problem for neo-liberal thinking. This included love, passions and, of course, incorporating education and knowledge production within the market’s realm so that the individual could learn how to become an entrepreneur of himself. This required also the active production of freedom that in turn made the conduct of conduct possible. At this point, and in addition to Foucault’s governmentality, I want to mention briefly Lazzarato’s (1996) notion of “immaterial labor” that theorizes the intrinsic ways subjectivity and economic values are produced simultaneously through new technologies, communication and new relations between producers and consumers of symbolic/economic values and desires.¹⁹

When I use these analyses in relation to my own study they let me see how the pedagogical self-technologies in “governing by goals” or “investments in the self” are connected to more general networks of power: networks of research, corporations and state policy where “entrepreneurship” and “immaterial labor” are constructed as a panacea for welfare state failures. Since the thesis’ aim is to analyze power relations within and between discourses of marketization and inclusion, the governmentality suturing the individual to society, thus the particular to the general, is a critical part of my investigation. The translation of educational numbers,

¹⁹ For a thought-provoking analysis of the entrepreneur as a “quasi-radical” political subject, see Palmàs (2011), who draws on Lazzarato’s and Latour’s notions of invention and repetition as twin powers of contemporary “symbolic” capitalism.

A fair (Af)fair?

pedagogies and knowledge into human capital, and then into further economical languages (like branding, investments and choice) ties individual achievements to the nation's need for growth and prosperity. Indeed, these self-technologies, knowledge productions and governing strategies are conditioned to an active promotion of freedom by the state. The governmentality analyses can correspondingly be activated in this study to critically examine how markets have historically made its way into educational affairs and how economic terminology and rationality for instance has become an ingredient in educational discourses of inclusion.

Chapter 4. Methodological considerations

Ethnography

While there are a number of ethnographical schools of thought, equipping the ethnographer with various tools and approaches ranging from “micro-,” to “policy-,” to “critical-ethnographies” (Atkinson, et al., 2001; Walford, 2008), I have mostly engaged with post-structurally informed notions of ethnography where the distinctions between theory, the empirical and method are somewhat rethought. I use, for instance, the notion of “stagings” in one of my articles, inspired by Hultqvist & Petersson (2000), as a way to stress the constructivist approach in my study, arguing that ethnography can easily make friends with discourse analysis. From a genealogical and discourse theoretical horizon, I did not pre-define the phenomena of subjectivation, differentiation, inclusion and marketization. Rather, I attempted to examine how these concepts were given meaning, normalized and challenged in different contexts and articulations, for instance how “inclusion” was attributed a particular set of practical guidelines to pupils and teachers in the school where the ethnographies were made. This performative lens thus inspired to investigate articulated subjectivities, abilities and needs, which are often considered to be causes of actions and conduct, but in my study were *treated* as their effects (cf. Butler, 2009).

Design, selection and production of data

My two studies were planned, financed and conducted within a research project entitled *School Results and Lived Curricula in Contemporary Society*. This project investigates forms of organization of schooling and students’ lived curricula using a mix of longitudinal quantitative data and ethnographies. A special interest in this project is the dynamic of classification and the ways in which (self-)categorization forms and constrains identities and school careers. My studies are partly a response to this problematic. In line with the frame of this project, my ethnographic approach approximated what Jeffrey & Troman (2004) describe as “a compacted mode,” suggesting that ethnographic fieldwork doesn’t necessarily have to take two years, but can instead be conducted in less time without losing advantages of the ethnographic approach. Within this “mode,” especially regarding schools, they

A fair (Af)fair?

emphasize that the researcher gets access to many different contexts, such as classrooms, staff-rooms, corridors, field trips, etc. Accordingly, this was conducted in my school-ethnographies²⁰ and supplemented with a large number of administrative documents, such as codes of conduct, individual action plans, goal-maps and school assessments made by the school itself and other agencies. In addition I carried out approximately 30 interviews with pupils, teachers and other staff ranging in time from 15-60 minutes, and I also wrote fieldnotes. All fieldwork was conducted at the high school I call “Eastern Hills” in my article, that is, a school described in media and government reports as “at risk.” The vast majority of pupils in the area have an immigrant background and the SES (Socio-economic status, measured by official statistics) is low, as are the official results measured in grades (Skolverket, 2014). This choice of school for my ethnography was strategic since I expected to encounter articulations of “social background/class” and “ethnicity/race,” particularly in relation to “results/ability,” which turned out to be an accurate presumption.

My other study (study two) set out to explore “school markets in the making,” and I therefore chose to engage in three annual “school fairs” held in Gothenburg. These fairs are for upper secondary schools in the region and for some schools recruiting students from the entire country. This was just as strategic a choice as my choice of schools for my ethnography, but here I predicted I would encounter articulations and stagings of “market,” “schools” and “pupils,” as well as other categories circulating in marketization discourses of education. Although similar fairs are organized in 15 places in Sweden, the choice of Gothenburg was due to: a) practicality, b) the project’s other data was produced here thus prospective mixed-methods-analyses were made possible and c) since Gothenburg was the first region in the nation to set up a fair, I expected a certain consolidation and experience from the discursive practices articulated by the actors involved. The data produced during these fairs consisted of approximately 35 interviews, 20 recorded conversations between school representatives and prospective students, photos and printed folders, fieldnotes and policies and evaluations made by the organizers.

Analytical Strategies

My analytical framework is generally indebted to Foucault and Rancière, but also to scholars in different educational genres who have adapted and made these theories

²⁰ The total time I spent in the field was three months divided into two periods in the fall of 2009 and spring of 2010 when I visited the school referred to here. The data produced here was analyzed in study one.

Chapter 4. Methodological considerations

operative in relation to politics of education in general (Popkewitz & Tabachnick, 1981; Popkewitz, 1998, 2008; Baker & Heyning, 2004) and to dynamics of subjectivation, equality, inclusion and marketization in particular (Ball, 2013; Youdell, 2010; Bowman & Stamp, 2011; Pelletier, 2009a, b; Simons & Masschelein, 2010). In the analysis I refer to the interpretive analytics of Foucault in a more general sense, intending thereby to reach beyond dualisms (like micro and macro, etc.) and take into account the social and political epistemologies inscribed in the problematics investigated (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983).

This method means to “historicize” taken-for-granted notions of study, and through “eventalization”²¹ to ask how certain ways of thinking of and acting on, in this case the market in education, have become historically intelligible as “problems” – and as solutions to those problems (Foucault, 2003d; Popkewitz et al., 2006). Doing this involves elaborating on instances where “focal points of experience” are formed by interrelations between possible knowledge, normative frameworks for behavior and potential modes of existence (Foucault, 2003d).

For analytical purposes I used notions of articulations, stagings, interpellations and partitions (Laclau & Mouffe, 2008; Hultqvist & Petersson, 2000; Butler, 2005; Rancière, 2006b). *Articulation* captures the utterances and practices in my material that (potentially) changes the discursive practices in scope of my study (Laclau & Mouffe, 2008 p.157). *Staging* refers to how desired visions of human subjectivity are performed through particular languages constructing intelligible practices or “realities” (Hultqvist & Petersson, 2000 p.499). But stagings also carries other connotations and is analytically used in line with Hacking’s (2004) combination of Foucault’s and Goffman’s approaches to discourse as a way to get a better understanding of how both the *actual* (Goffman) and *possible* (Foucault) “[...] lives of individuals are constituted” (Hacking, 2004 p.288). The notion of *interpellation* is borrowed from Althusser, but with Butler’s elaborations. Originally referring to how individuals become subjects by recognition through ideology, Butler (2005) refines the concept of interpellation to include the compulsion, appropriation of guilt and reprimand, through performative acts of naming (cf. Davis, 2012). *Partition*, finally, is the concept that sutures Foucault’s and Rancière’s notions of subjectivation/identification, which is elaborated in the next paragraph. These

²¹ Eventalization means for Foucault to invoke a singularity and a polymorphism of the object of study simultaneously. It is a kind of causal multiplication that he describes as a “[...] polyhedron of intelligibility” (Foucault, 2003d, p. 249). For me, this is an invitation to treat data as events – that is, to historicize accounts – to explore the ways in which the relation between affluence and ability has become meaningful and how it sometimes is perceived as a metaphysical “essence,” to take an example that I use in my analysis.

A fair (Af)fair?

concepts were used to think about the standards, boundaries and classifications that were already in the material – for instance, how interview- and observed subjects referred to “goals” and “needs” as investments during a class or how “needs” and “ability” were given meaning in relation to codes of conduct and assumed to be objective criteria of comparisons, such as grades statistics or outcomes of standardized testing. In concrete terms, for me, this meant to read and re-read the data multiple times, to invent and reject categories and to write up narratives I “tested” on supervisors and colleagues

The notions of “historicizing” and “eventalization” – and even more so – the focal points of experience, borrowed from Foucault, interrelate with Rancière’s ideas about “the partition of the sensible,” that is, a system of self-evident facts of sense perception and ontologies that simultaneously relate the existence of something in common and the limits that define both parts and positions within it (Rancière, 2010a). By combining these two theoretical apparatuses, and using Laclau and Mouffe’s (2008) articulations and Butler’s (2005) interpellations as mediators, I tried to understand not only how the partition of the sensible (the police-order) was constituted, but also how subjectivations in the Rancièran sense – that is, in dispute with the police order – could be made possible. To make these instances of subjectivation visible in my material I tried to “disentangle” words, meanings and assumptions from their “social places,” as suggested by Pelletier (2009a), which meant that I tried to put structural categories aside and focused on “wrongs” (see elaborations below in theory section) and verifications of equality that were made sensible in the material. An example of a “wrong” in my data was when teachers at the school fair, who were interpellated by a marketized discourse, disputed their positions as “sellers,” and instead described the school fair as “parodic.”

Research ethics

I have continuously reflected on the problems of research ethics during the different phases of my work: sampling, getting access to the field and writing up narratives with anonymized informants. I think of research ethics in ethnography as multifaceted and problematic but still highly relevant, since it brings attention to categorizations and to relations between the researcher and the ones researched (see e.g., Lather, 2001). As discussed in the review and theory sections above, I reject divisions of knowledge and ignorance on behalf of the (enlightened) researcher with *his* scientific discourse on the one hand and the (ignorant) informant, obeying the social logic on the other (e.g., Rancière, 2006b). This epistemic partition, where science exerts mastery over its objects of study through

Chapter 4. Methodological considerations

methodological rigor and expertise, according to Rancière (2006b; see also Pelletier, 2009a) actually runs the risk of reproducing the hierarchies it's trying to eradicate. Research accounts – like this one – are inevitably a part of discursive practices of power, knowledge and truth, that is, in Rancière's words an “aesthetics of knowledge” (Rancière, 2006b) and can, as such, potentially play a role in stabilizing or destabilizing hierarchies and common-sense. Notwithstanding research rules and ethic standards (Vetenskapsrådet, 2013),²² which are, of course, indispensable, I would like to stress the performative function of scientific discourse as being far more ethically ambiguous since it may in fact stabilize the very same things it proposed to destabilize.

Validity Issues

Constructing the narratives and arguments in this thesis involved considerations of different kinds. First and foremost, I had to articulate a research problematic that had been revised many times during the process. Then, I decided to engage with concepts and theories that allowed me to think of this problematic in a non-essentialist way – e.g., to rethink what seemed to be taken as givens, both by me and by some of the earlier studies concerning the problematic. This constituted in one sense my “interest of knowledge,” that is, an attempt to problematize, destabilize and rethink established accounts of marketization and inclusion with the help of different notions of subjectivation and differentiation (i.e., the partition of the sensible in marketization and inclusion discourses). It is against this backdrop that the thesis and my potential contribution to rethinking marketization and inclusion in education should be read and judged. Are the interpretations of theories and data reasonable? Is the argumentation clear, coherent and, perhaps most importantly – does the thesis contribute to a significant understanding of the problematics it set out to explore? As suggested by Jørgensen and Phillips (2000), the validity of discourse analyses should be assessed in relation to the theoretical framework and whether the study can contribute to new perspectives on the phenomena investigated.

²² This study has been scrutinized and was approved on December 21, 2009 by the Regional Ethical Review Board. All interview- and observed subjects have given consent to participate in my study and they are all given confidentiality and are thus anonymized in this thesis in accordance with recommendations from the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, 2013).

Chapter 5. Discussion

This thesis has the general purpose to analyze and problematize discourses of marketization and inclusion in education policies, research and practices. What I hope to accomplish is to scrutinize, develop and clarify the concepts of subjectivation and differentiation and to explore discourses of educational inclusion and marketization in relation to these concepts, based on two empirical studies. The study is an attempt to introduce a somewhat new and different voice in a research field since long dominated by critical studies trying to reduce exclusions, segregation and inequalities in education with explanations of dominance, resonating to what Rancière (1991) refers to a “a passion for inequality”(p.80). There is no doubt that critical studies of the persisting inequalities reproduced in and by education are both valuable and necessary. However, when inequality is assumed, explained and verified; when actors are represented as a result of their social categorizations in research accounts and pedagogical practices; and when equality (i.e. inclusion) is perceived as a goal lying at the end of the pedagogical and political process, Rancière helps us to understand that we performatively venture to reproduce inequality even more, no matter our intentions. The second – and related - aim with this thesis is to discern some of the ways that power operates within discourses of marketization and inclusion.

Where Foucault has received massive attention in the educational research community, Rancière still remains largely undiscovered, particularly in ethnographic work, although exceptions occur²³. This study has the ambition of putting homologous ideas from both Foucault and Rancière to work in relation to ethnography. There is a need for discussion, not only about the intrinsic ways that repressing powers are circulated and exercised in schools but also regarding the superiority and performative repercussions that certain research accounts can have (See also Biesta (2008); Bingham and Biesta (2010); Pelletier (2009a,b) and Simons and Masschelein (2010)). In this last section I will reflect on the significance of my study and relate to an ongoing dialogue in the research community. I will discuss

²³ In a Swedish ethnographic study, however, Beach and Dovemark (2011) have used Rancière’s ideas about hierarchical intelligences in educational discourses to analyze how schools misrepresent successful student’s own accounts of personal gains by school performance as “abilities”, “interests” etc. This in turn is used as an argument to differentiate and naturalize students into stereotype categories, such as “smart or “dull”. Also Säfström has published work inspired by Rancière, analyzing for instance notions of emancipation in relation to current Swedish education policies (see eg. Säfström, 2011).

A fair (Af)fair?

not only my contributions but also some of the caveats and shortcomings that permeate the work, as an invitation for critique, but also as an impetus for myself and others to continue investigations of power, subjectivation and restructuring in education.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze how discourses of marketization and inclusion have become historically intelligible in Swedish education, and what relations of power these discourses pertain to. This is explored with notions of subjectivation and differentiation in analytical focus. The research questions derived from this purpose are:

- What principles of governing education connect discourses of the market and equality at school fairs and in a high school setting in Sweden?
- How is the partition of the sensible configured when marketization and equality are ways of governing in contemporary Swedish education?

The rest of this discussion will address the purpose and these questions while putting forward three main contributions of my studies, organized around notions of *subjectivation*, *investmentality* and *assumptions in discourses of marketization and inclusion*. Thus, the first contribution regards the ways subjectivation in contemporary Swedish education relates to the distribution of positions by assumed dispositions, abilities and capacities. In my analyses I present narratives where subjects are identified as particular “kinds” of people, but also when pedagogic subjectivations, in Rancière’s terms, are enacted. My second contribution draws attention to instances where the ongoing marketization of education has enhanced “investmentality,” represented as a salvation narrative, but also as a target for some critical investigations of restructured education. I argue that these hopes and fears have contributed to a consolidation of “marketization” as a social fact, thus essentializing “the market” almost metaphysically. The third contribution concerns how discourses of equality and marketization share consensual elements and assumptions based on an explicatory logic that runs the risk of stabilizing the common sense of contemporary schooling.

Subjectivation, partitions and positions

A main tenet in my two empirical studies focuses on the ways educational standards, goals and technologies partition, but also design, schoolchildren as hierarchical “hope/fear-binaries” such as: able/not able, affluent/poor, vocational/academic, immigrant/native, normal/deviant, etc. Here each child was assigned and identified to his/her proper place and trajectory in accordance with the police order established in current pedagogic discourses where pupil’s “lacks” or “failures” are coupled with expert interventions intending to bring school and

Chapter 5. Discussion

the individual “closer” to equality. This is illustrated when the special needs teacher in study one was positioning herself as a “distributor of equality” for the assumed “unable” pupils “without a part.” But also the stagings of students as either “practitioners” or “theorists”, despite the proclaimed “openness” at the School Fair in study two is indicative of partitioning technologies. My analysis thus tried to unfold and problematize how these subjectivations/identifications and partitions were discursively constituted: sometimes destabilized but also reproduced in daily life, policy and research.

This discursive construction of hope/fear-binaries was associated with a greater narrative of planning the society and the nation under the banner of progress within a political economy of “differences,” or doing what pedagogy always does in Rancière’s words, “[...] to equalize inequality progressively, that is to say to unequalize equality indefinitely” (1991, p. 131). Trust and authority was given to these partitions between different pupils/students through statistical reasoning, apparently “objective” testing and professional “expertise,” etc., empirically represented for instance when “winners” and “losers” were identified with reference to assumed abilities based on school rankings and quantified “results” in study one. Governing by using goals for the (utopian) future as practices in the present is a practice closely related to the prevailing assumption that democracy (as goal) will level an equal or inclusive future society. However, by destabilizing and recasting the assumed causal relations between affluence and ability I have gestured to the role that contingent ontological status plays in prevailing assumptions of inequality (cf. Biesta, 2010; Butler, 2009). The recasting was an analytical “experiment” in relation to how abilities and affluence were coupled in study one. Here the “normalized” staging of school failures tended to pose pupil’s social categorizations (i.e. sex, race or social class) as the cause explaining low abilities as an effect. Many “poor, immigrant boys” were categorized as “excluded” and because of that they could not “deliver” (acceptable test scores, grades and social skills etc.). This logic of cause and effect can be seen as an “educational matrix” (cf. Butler, 2009), stabilizing social categorizations and their relation to school failure as an “ontological fact”. However, during “Elisabeth’s Spanish lessons” (see below and study one for more details), the educational matrix was troubled and destabilized, due to the teacher’s apparent assumptions of equality, where she interpellated her pupils as equals and used a book as a neutral thing between herself and them to verify their abilities. These verifications of equality points to the paradoxes in, and contingent character of the educational matrix in current police order, and thus to a potential re-thinking of school failures.

A fair (Af)fair?

My aim with this thesis also concerned questions of subjectivation and differentiation in discourses of marketization. I start to answer this question with theoretical arguments bearing upon the first two concepts. Subjectivation²⁴ has become a pertinent concept employed to analyze how productive and de-centered powers construct an endless line of subjects (individuals, institutions, nations, etc.), but also how subjects need these powers to construct, work on and govern themselves (Foucault, 2003a). The notion of “identity” is far more limited and problematic a concept, since it tends to reduce and anchor the subject’s characteristics to either inner essences of the brain or imposed qualities apprehensible through classifications or categorizations, thereby reducing the individual to a consequence of his/her social position, an assertion that is problematic even when “intersectionality” is claimed (cf. Rancière, 2006b; Pelletier, 2009a; Stauness, 2003). Since the arguments I present in various ways above make identity propositions problematic, I therefore argue that in studies on the formation and government of people, schools, etc., it might be more advantageous to use the notion of subjectivation compared to that of identity. Not only does subjectivation make visible how power is relational and productive to its character, but it also runs less of a risk of performatively constructing the identity under scrutiny.

The other theoretical proposition I want to make regards the notion of “differentiation.” This concept has a long tradition in the educational sciences tracing back to Durkheim’s sociology at the turn of the preceding century. It is for instance used to investigate society’s and education’s “structural differentiation” – that is on what basis (such as intelligence, class, race or sex) allocation and positioning of people to different functions in schools and society were made. In Sweden the problematic of differentiation (cf. Hultqvist, 2006) was articulated in debates about why, how and when divisions between compulsory and secondary schools should be made (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). I believe that the concept of differentiation in itself may implicate the different representations and characteristics it aims to divide and, thus, treats the parts as isolated entities and facts rather than historicized and relational accounts of a whole. For instance, the problematic of differentiation in Swedish school reforms used statistical classifications (age, SES, grades, etc.) that were treated as givens in order to decide at what level the divisions were to be made. The problem with this reasoning is that the profound political character of difference is translated into “technical” questions when uncritical notions of differentiation are employed. Instead, I would

²⁴ With “subjectivation” I here refer to Foucault’s (2003a) notion (sometimes used synonymously with “subjection” and “subjectivization”), which has a similar meaning to Rancière’s (2010a) “identification.”

Chapter 5. Discussion

propose the fruitfulness of Rancière's notion of "partition" (of the sensible), since it not only divides into parts, conditioned to the sensible of an historical configuration, but also implies how those parts are constituted in relation to the whole (cf. Rancière, 2010a).

In my study of subjectivation at school fairs, that is presented in study two, I analyzed interpellations and affirmations while focusing on identification – that is, when individuals affirm the already existing positions. I have been thinking of these articulations as partitions of the sensible at an emerging school market. First I analytically divided the articulations into what constituted the shared common and then the shares and parts. The "common" of school fairs was staged as a pluralistic dream of grandiosity without boundaries interpellating responsible and motivated individuals with the language and style of commercial marketing (cf. Alvesson, 2006; Bauman, 2007). The "school market" was organized as a space that is preparation for other spaces, such as the labor market and future studies. Attractive labor positions and individual happiness were promised and the pupils were encouraged to constitute their own lived curricula as an investment in themselves. The "parts," on the other hand, were articulated as preferences on behalf of the students investing in school and future. The partition of different "kinds" of binary coded people – the theorists and the practitioners – were symbolically staged with posters, clothing and questions from the schools to the visitors, who generally appeared to affirm their offered positions.

Interpellations and identifications into particular categories and positions were evident when students were engaged as "sellers" of the school in which they were enrolled themselves. Here, they embraced the values connected to their school's brand and identity; for instance, a student "selling" a business-school's identity with a "cosmopolitan" code of economic language and style. A conclusion drawn from this analysis is that identification, as utility-maximizing homo oeconomicus becomes a non-negligible part of an actively governed educational capitalism in today's Sweden. However, as the "economic man" becomes a shared rationality at the school fair, the partition into parts and positions is on one level reduced to students' "preferences" and on another (here unobservable) level governed by the educational "currency" of grades that opens or closes access to different futures. In spite of this identification to homo oeconomicus and binary coded students, subjectivation in Rancière's conception may occur as students penetrate the staged "limitlessness" or when teachers articulate the "parodic" market rationality of school choice. On a general basis it is, however, dubious to propose serious disputes of the partition of the sensible as it is constituted in investigated school fairs. What are visible and audible are grandiosity, prosperity and binary coded

A fair (Af)fair?

subjects, monitored by assumed “objective” knowledge on individual performances and classifications. Penetrations and disputes are barely visible or simply noise. Furthering the argument from Pelletier (2009b), it can be concluded that studies trying to reach beyond and also disrupt partitions into classifications (e.g., identification) are much needed in the field of ethnography in education – in particular in the stagings of educational markets. In my study from Eastern Hills where discourses of inequality were strong, a staging of this sort of disruption was orchestrated. During the teacher Elisabeth’s Spanish lessons, she *verified* her pupils as equals, thanks to her ignorance of prevailing discourses, connecting social attributions (such as class, sex or race) to ability. Instead she directed her attention to their *will* to compare, experiment and learn – actions that only made sense from her assumption of equality between intelligences and abilities. I have interpreted this staging as an instance of “pedagogic subjectivation” in line with the thinking of Simons and Masschelein (2010).

The political economy of futures – investmentality

In study one, the notion of “investmentality” is introduced, obviously inspired by Foucault’s “governmentality” (Foucault, 2003c). Let me stress that investmentality is not a “fact” or an ideology. Rather I think of investmentality as a heuristic analytical concept helpful in order to think more deeply about what appears to be sayable, thinkable and doable in the research material when interest is turned to how individuals and schools are identified (and are identifying themselves) as productive and competitive in the “education economy” (cf. Lundahl, 2012) and how they are governed in relation to education at this given place and time. Investmentality establishes boundaries, produces norms and knowledge, constrains people to certain positions, but also makes it possible for individuals to construct an entrepreneurial relation to themselves. This is analyzed in detail in study one where activities in classrooms are directed towards “governing-by-goals,” like when, for instance, a “trade logic” makes intelligible the ways students and teachers communicate about grades, outputs (knowledge) and abilities – conversations organized around pupil’s efforts (investments) and their return, that are similar results to those from Beach and Dovemark (2011) and Ball (2013).

The organization of learning into measurable goals and the trading of efforts to grades invite, and sometimes urges the pupils (and teachers) to think of themselves in economic terms. In analogy with governmentality, investmentality “works” at many levels simultaneously: investments by individuals are tied to school investments, which are tied to regions and the nation in network-like configurations. These networks can be seen and is also analyzed in study one

Chapter 5. Discussion

where discourses promoting “entrepreneurial learning” or “Social Capital Markets” are claiming to introduce a *new* “*welfare-mentality*” based on voluntarism and individual responsibility (cf. Dahlstedt & Hertzberg, 2011). The voluntarism illustrates a central feature in investmentality that the concept shares with governmentality. This feature pertains to the “produced freedom” (see the quote by Donzelot (2008) in theory section, and also Hultqvist and Petersson (2000) for paradoxes in liberal governing) that is vital for investmentality to exercise power. There is no repressing power demanding the subjects to share the attitudes and conducts of investmentality, but rather it builds upon the active self-government that appears possible only when the individual perceives him-/herself as free and autonomous. This is also illustrated by the way that a student voluntarily engages in “selling” a school’s “brand” and simultaneously construe herself as a subject at the School Fair analyzed in study two.

Furthermore, the governing by numbers, i.e., standardized testing, and the plethora of quantified measurements circulating in contemporary schooling - which is very evident in my two studies - works by governing the individual, the school and the nation according to the same calculating, comparative and competitive logic. Here individual responsibility is essential to becoming accountable and “technical items” (such as knowledge to get particular grades, test results, or schools in ranking lists that are articulated in study one) are made comparable and as such productive as they build the image of trust and impartiality (cf. Rose, 1991; Lazzarato, 1996; Porter, 1995; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1997). An important function for investmentality is thus to produce, allocate and distribute “goods,” “technologies,” “desires,” “knowledge” and “subjects” to different spaces or positions. The relational and micro-level powers put to work by investmentality are both assumed on behalf of the pupil-subjects and interpellated and explained by policymakers, researchers and teachers in accordance with a liberal ontology of the “society of consumption” (cf. Bauman, 2007; Rose, 1999; Hultqvist & Petersson, 2000).

Notions of “market” and “marketization” appear in my studies in several ways. Discourses that stabilize, possibly to the degree of essentializing the market are first and foremost found within the framework of investmentality as a “philosopher’s stone.” This discourse is expected to magically allocate values and growth to partitioned subjects thanks to the self-regulating “hidden hand” of marketized education, assumed to provide goods to the many, due to individual maximizing of goods. Schools, professionals and pupils are constructed as more effective, rational and accountable within the “school markets,” as these are illustrated in both study one and two. Identified as such, it becomes possible to govern them and for the

A fair (Af)fair?

subjects to make themselves intelligible aligning with a market-embedded morality (Foucault, 2008; Ball, 2013). Then advocates of decentralization and market reforms additionally claimed that the “small democracy” – characterized by individual freedom and responsibility – has been granted thanks to this restructuring (Pettersson, 1999; SOU, 2008:69). The notions elaborated in my analysis allowed me to reflect on the contingent and dynamic characteristics of how “the market” has become historically and geographically intelligible. Instead of treating the market as that which explains the phenomena in study, I tried to think of it as something that needs to be explained (Foucault, 2003b; Popkewitz, 2012). To think discursively about market and marketization sharpens the focus on the historical appropriations of the terms and not on a single, pre-ordained directionality.

Problematizing and historicizing notions of “the market” was an attempt to understand, but also disrupt, dichotomous thought and common sense attributions as Hopes or Fears. More so, I tried to distinguish how the twin processes of hopes and fears were mutually constituted when for instance the hopes residing in a “new welfare mentality” embodied the fears of both state bureaucracy and social disintegration, while simultaneously advocating responsabilization and entrepreneurship (cf. Rose, 1999; Popkewitz, 2008; Dahlstedt & Hertzberg, 2011). My approach to the market in this study was that of being “suspicious” and not judging whether it is inherently “good” or “bad,” but instead making it an object of empirical investigation in schools, in policy and in research. This allowed me to unthink some of the “truths” attributed to the market that were circulating in my empirical accounts, but also in public and scientific discourses.

Summarizing this section, I would propose the analytical usefulness of *investmentality* in studies investigating productive power relations and subjectivations in education, in particular for explorations of discourses of marketization and inclusion. The dynamic concept allowed me to elaborate on how individual strategies and responsibilities, for instance in “special needs” as “entrepreneurial stakes,” were connected to knowledge and work on the self which in turn were a part of the government of schools. Compared to existing terminology, like Bernstein’s concept of classification and Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital, used by Palme (2008) in his study on symbolic values and school choice, I’m suggesting investmentality as a good alternative. Obviously, it builds on a totally different set of assumptions (for instance that power is exercised through perceived freedom), but partly thanks to that it may contribute to a finely grained understanding of simultaneous governing of a marketized school system and of entrepreneurial school subjects.

The common base of marketization and inclusion

How is it possible to govern education and its subjects with market rationality and ideas about inclusion? While such a proposition is extremely difficult to grasp, some parts of the problem may be possible to discern and problematize with the help of the analyses provided in this thesis. Here I suggest that subjectivation/identification in the contexts investigated works under assumptions of “investmentality,” but I also explore how this attitude was explained to and provided for the subjects in instances where *inclusion* was the focus of the analysis. To me, at first, this seemed contradictory, since the market discourses in my material were usually so differently constituted to those relating to inclusion. Also, in my pre-understanding, the market was generally opposed by the advocates of inclusion. In public debate and in some research (cf. Lundahl et al., 2013) there is an antagonism described between market and inclusion discourses. What seems to be a paradox, or at least to be binary positions on the ideological map where the political right advocates markets and the left inclusion might in fact be shared assumptions in the discursive practices hitherto analyzed in my thesis.

Firstly, both formations of discourses²⁵ perceive of their goals respectively as visions, lying at the *end* of the political process. These goals can a bit simplified be characterized as “quality and effectiveness” in market discourses and “equality” in the inclusion discourses. Both believe that only progress can lead us to these goals, in this context, either with the means of the market or with that of inclusion. Both formation of discourses assume inequality, referring to fundamental differences between intelligences and dispositions, as these differences are represented by social and scientific categories, and when they “count” their schoolchildren, all they see is a confirmation of this inequality. *Secondly* - and here is the “counting” of vital concern – both political positions and the practices that become intelligible within that framework provide a *quantitative notion of democracy* (cf. Simons & Masschelein, 2010). Thus, there can be more or less democracy and equality, but only as defined by those on the “inside,” being already “democratic,” (like special-needs teachers or other “experts”) for those on the “outside” (like poor and “weak performing”

²⁵ In line with the argument that there is not a singular discourse of marketization or inclusion I hold the position that they should be posed in plural. However, the two formations of discourses constituted on the basis of the relation to marketization or inclusion either oppose or share assumptions based on different level of analysis. Foucault (1972) writes: “Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a discursive formation [...]” (p. 38).

A fair (Af)fair?

pupils) who have been excluded. Inclusive education, participation and marketization then become ways to count those who qualify in (e.g., with “stakes” or parts – see below). *Thirdly*, explaining failures by positing a *lack* that remedial interventions can compensate for appear to be a shared assumption between the discourses. The “lack” in marketization discourses is the same individual freedom that well organized (school) markets are believed to explain and compensate for. In inclusion discourses the “lacks” are particular dispositions (social positions) that would lead to abilities in school. Inclusive education is then assumed to explain these lacks and progressively move towards a more equal society with compensatory measures (cf. Bingham & Biesta, 2010). *Fourthly*, investmentality is partaken by discourses on both sides. I here refer to ideas about “*stakeholder-*” or “*interest-group-society*” elaborated by Simons & Masschelein (2010), who describe that similar positions and practices are based on the assumption that democracy and participation can be obtained only if different groups and individuals take responsibility for and articulate their “parts,” “stakes” or “interests.” Special needs as well as the promotion of individual freedom follows the logic of *pluralistic consensus* wherein every one has his/her own proper part or place and are regarded as an asset that the individual should claim in order to construct an entrepreneurial relation to oneself.

To summarize, I argue that there are fewer differences between discourses of marketization and discourses of inclusion than one might first expect. Obviously the two formations of discourses are still staged as adversaries posing separate hopes and fears of education. Marketization is associated with choice, competition and an investmentality that pursues egoistic calculation of the goods of the individual in relation to the goods of society in general. Inclusion is instead connected to equality, “a school for all” and the idea to “count” those on the outside in. However, in four points of reference - assumptions of inequality, a quantitative notion of democracy, explanatory logic and interest-group-society - the two formations of discourses seem to share important assumptions. Why then, is this a problem? I believe, in line with “post-political” (cf. study two) and “post-democratic” (Rancière, 2010a) arguments, that when these basic assumptions are shared in consensus by the two formations of discourses on marketization and inclusion, many more fundamental political problems in education and society²⁶ are obscured and will not be debated. The main problem of consensus is that these problems are translated into technical, managerial or economic terms and thereby

²⁶ For instance the problem in assuming hierarchization of intelligences in schooling (cf. Rancière, 1991) or the uneven distribution of material resources on a global scale (cf. Bauman, 2007).

Chapter 5. Discussion

de-politicized (Rancière, 1999). As these liberal and progressive assumptions have become the “common sense” of education, a policing educational matrix almost impossible to disagree with is unavoidably created, stabilizing the status quo.

Problems, shortcomings and future research

The explorative nature of this investigation has leaned heavily on ideas I picked up from Foucault and Rancière. Aligning these thinkers in the same analysis has been interesting but far from unproblematic. To make sense of their different meanings in subjectivation was somehow manageable, but while Rancière seems overtly “political” with a clear voice in his writings, Foucault whispers, always analytically focused on knowledge and power. Even as it has been my ambition, it has been difficult for me to translate both theorists and to make them work mutually to reinforce each other and my research so as to provide a novel (and I hope useful) contribution to my field. Another potential problem regards my focus on policing. Despite suggestions from others (see e.g., Simons & Masschelein, 2010; Pelletier, 2009a) to avoid verifications of inequality and instead focus on subjectivation and dissensus in line with Rancière’s own writings, I stayed to a large extent in the mapping of police-affairs, taking the risk of being a target myself for the criticism I levied at others. Nevertheless, I will use this experience as an insight into future studies and as an invitation for others to consider when planning and conducting their own research.

Conclusions of the thesis

The results suggest that a “common sense of marketized and inclusive schooling” is shared by different formations of discourses that stabilize assumptions and principles of progress; inequality; a quantitative notion of democracy; explicatory logic and a “stakeholder-society.” However, pedagogic subjectivation, which is a verification of equality, appears nevertheless to be enacted when pupils are verified as “able” and when teachers refer to the “parodic” logic in a school market. Assumptions of equality and ability were additionally staged as pedagogical subjectivations (cf. Simons & Masschelein, 2010) during “Elisabeth’s Spanish lessons”. Here were the pupils that normally were attributed as unequals, instead verified as equals and thus “able.” These acts are also an exercise by “those without a part” (that is, the “poor” and “unable” pupils who are attributed with “failure” in much research (cf. Skolverket, 2009) and in public debate). This creates a small but important rupture in the persistent pedagogic – explicatory – logic, which needs to

A fair (Af)fair?

be re-thought in many every-day classrooms, but also in persistent research accounts on “school failure”. These principles of governing – a “common sense” of today’s education, including the small disagreement in pedagogical subjectivation – are all engaged and illuminated in my empirical analyses and are answering my first research question.

Moreover, my results indicate that the subjects in my studies identify with existing educational partition to functions, places and positions in education and society. The “sensible” (e.g. what can be heard as voice, what can be seen or otherwise perceived as reasonable (see Rancière, 2010a) for subjects in my studies is a preconfigured world where “ability” is distinct from “inability” and where voice and reason is separated from nonsense and insanity. Discourses of identity, differentiation and equality partake in giving the market metaphysical and essential qualities beyond historicity and geography. “Investmentality” works as an attitude assumed to be inherent in, but nevertheless explained to the subjects, in line with the paradox inherent in liberal political rationality, which is simultaneously assumed to be an internal and natural state for all humans (cf. Rose, 1999; Hultqvist & Petersson, 2000). Investmentality verifies an unequal, hierarchical order staging educational values and knowledge, but also “stakes” and “needs” in discourses of inclusion, to be calculated in economic terms as investments for students, schools or regions and nations. Indeed, investmentality can be seen as a governing strategy operating on both system and individuals in accordance with the logic of hopes and fears in education (cf. Popkewitz, 2008). A conclusion drawn from this is that the simultaneous governing of subjects and the system can be recognized as the partition of the sensible in Swedish educational capitalism, and as such it is an answer to my second research question.

I have tried to show the significance of these results for researchers and anyone interested in the politics of education. To those readers who feel falsely accused for using “wrong” theories or concepts, such as “identity,” “differentiation” or “inclusion,” which I perhaps too baldly criticized and dismissed, this is the place for an important disclaimer. I do not underestimate the value and contribution of studies drawing on these concepts. They have provided important knowledge about the dynamics and power struggles in schooling. I have argued that concepts are not “innocent” – they have performative consequences and therefore need to be scrutinized and discussed. I maintain this position, however, I consequently realize that this argument is also valid for the concepts I have proposed as being more fruitful.

The title of this thesis asks the rhetorical question of “a fair (af)fair?”, and I leave to the reader to judge whether the educational capitalism discussed in my

Chapter 5. Discussion

analyses can be considered fair or not. But, I argue that attempts to rethink and destabilize essentialist accounts of “marketization” in education are important, be it as articulations of either hopes or fears or their mutual constitution. I find destabilization of “marketization” to be even critical if we want to understand – and un-think – the strong grip it has taken on how we think of education today, and in the future. Therefore we need carefully conducted analyses on its ability to transform, mutate and re-produce itself as a salvation narrative that makes itself necessary and thus penetrates every nook and cranny of our lives. Finally, I want to underline the problem with “progress” and “explanations of dominance.” The limitations of quantitative notions of inclusion for already existing subjectivities are manifold and miscellaneous. In my studies strong voices spoke from the “inside” of inclusion discourses about emancipation of failing school children and the urgent need for more equality in the increasingly segregated school system. However, since more equality was assumed *after* policing – that is after explanations and expert interventions – no matter the good intentions, inequality might be stabilized even more. The problem with reducing the distance between “unequals” and “equals” will never cease to confirm and reproduce the axiom of inequality. Therefore, we should start to verify ideas and practices of equality, not as a goal in some utopian future, but here and now. That is where radical schooling and politics start.

References

- Allan, J. (2007). *Rethinking inclusive education: The philosophers of difference in practice* (Vol. 5). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Althusser, L. (1971/2006). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). *The anthropology of the state: A reader*, 86-111. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Alvesson, M. (2006). *Tombetens triumf: Om grandiositet, illusionsnummer & nollsummespel*. Stockholm: Atlas.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2008). *Tolkning och reflektion: Vetenskapsfilosofi och kvalitativ metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. London: Routledge.
- Arreman, I. E., & Holm, A. S. (2011). Privatisation of public education? The emergence of independent upper secondary schools in Sweden. *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(2), 225-243.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of Ethnography*. London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Baker, B. M., & Heyning, K. E. (Eds.). (2004). *Dangerous coagulations?: The uses of Foucault in the study of education* (Vol. 19). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Ball, S. J. (1998). Big Policies/Small World: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 119-130.
- Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of education policy*, 18(2), 215-228.
- Ball, S. J. (2007). *Education Plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ball, S. J. (2013). *Foucault, power, and education*. London: Routledge.

A fair (Af)fair?

- Ball, S. J. & Youdell, D. (2008). *Hidden privatisation in education*. Brussels: Education International. Retrieved 2014-01-24 from: http://old.ei-ie.org/annualreport2007/upload/content_trsl_images/440/Hidden_privatisation-EN.pdf
- Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top*. New York, NY: McKinsey.
- Bartholdsson, Å. (2008). *Den vänliga maktutövningens regim: Om normalitet och makt i skolan*. Stockholm: Liber.
- Bauman, Z. (2007). *Konsumtionsliv*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Beach, D., Gordon, T., & Lahelma, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Democratic education: Ethnographic challenges*. London: Tufnell.
- Beach, D., & Dovemark, M. (2005). Creativity, schooling and the commodity problem. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 3(2), 158-183.
- Beach, D., & Dovemark, M. (2011). Twelve years of upper-secondary education in Sweden: the beginnings of a neo-liberal policy hegemony?. *Educational Review*, 63(3), 313-327.
- Bergviken Rensfeldt, A. (2010). "Opening Higher Education:" *Discursive transformations of distance and higher education government*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg).
- Biesta, G. (2008). Toward a new "logic" of emancipation: Foucault and Rancière. *Philosophy of Education Archive*, 169-177.
- Biesta, G. (2010). A new logic of emancipation: The methodology of Jacques Rancière. *Educational Theory*, 60(1), 39-59.
- Bingham, C., & Biesta, G.J.J. (Eds.). (2010). *Jacques Rancière: Education, Truth, Emancipation*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist society*. New York, NY: Basic.
- Bowman, P., & Stamp, R. (Ed.). (2011). *Reading Rancière*. New York, NY: Continuum.

References

- Brennan, M., & Popkewitz, T. S. (Eds.). (1998). *Foucault's challenge: Discourse, knowledge, and power in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Bunar, N. (2010). Choosing for quality or inequality: current perspectives on the implementation of school choice policy in Sweden. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(1), 1-18.
- Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Carlbaum, S. (2012). *Blir du anställningsbar lille/a vän?: Diskursiva konstruktioner av framtida medborgare i gymnasier reformer 1971-2011*. (Doctoral dissertation, Umeå University).
- Chambers, S. A. (2012). *The lessons of Ranciere*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahlstedt, M. (2011). I val (o) frihetens spår: Segregation, differentiering och två decennier av skolreformer. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 12(1), 20-38.
- Dahlstedt, M., & Hertzberg, F. (2011). Den entreprenörskapande skolan: Styrning, subjektskapande och entreprenörskapspedagogik. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 16(3), 179-198.
- Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4), 425-438.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- Donzelot, J. (2008). Michel Foucault and liberal intelligence. *Economy and Society* 37(1) February 2008: 115-134.
- Dovemark, M. (2004). *Ansvar-flexibilitet-valfrihet: en etnografisk studie om en skola i förändring*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg).
- Dreyfus, H.L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Englund, T. (1996). *Utbildningspolitiskt systemskifte?* Stockholm: HLS förlag.

A fair (Af)fair?

- Englund, T., Öhman, J., & Östman, L. (2008). Deliberative communication for sustainability?: A Habermas-inspired pluralistic approach. *Sustainability and security within liberal societies: Learning to live with the future*. London: Routledge.
- Fejes, A., & Nicoll, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Foucault and lifelong learning: Governing the subject*. London: Routledge.
- Fitzsimons, P. (2011). *Governing the self: A Foucauldian critique of managerialism in education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Pantheon books.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1. An Introduction*. London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault (2003a). The subject and power. In Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (Eds.), *The Essential Foucault*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Foucault (2003b). Structuralism and post-structuralism. In Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (Eds.), *The Essential Foucault*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003c). Governmentality. In Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (Eds.), *The Essential Foucault*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003d). Eventalization. In Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (Eds.), *The Essential Foucault*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the College the France 1978-1979*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2010). *The government of self and others. Lectures at College de France 1982-1983*. New York. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M., Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds.). (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fredriksson, A. (2010). *Marknaden och lärarna. Hur organiseringen av skolan påverkar lärares offentliga tjänstemannaskap*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg).
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.

References

- Gewirtz, S., Ball, S. J., & Bowe, R. (1995). *Markets, choice and equity in education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gewirtz, S., & Cribb, A. (2008). Taking identity seriously: Dilemmas for education policy and practice. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 39-49.
- Granath, G. (2008). *Milda makter: Utvecklingssamtal och loggböcker som disciplinerings tekniker*. (Doctoral dissertation University of Gothenburg).
- Grek, S., Lawn, M., Lingard, B., Ozga, J., Rinne, R., Segerholm, C., & Simola, H. (2009). National policy brokering and the construction of the European Education Space in England, Sweden, Finland and Scotland. *Comparative Education*, 45(1), 5-21.
- Hacking, I. (1995). The looping effects of human kinds. *Causal cognition: A multidisciplinary approach*, 351-83.
- Hacking, I. (2004). Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: between discourse in the abstract and face-to-face interaction. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 277-302.
- Hall, S. (1996). Who needs identity. *Questions of Cultural Identity*, 16(2), 1-17.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Synligt lärande för lärare*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.
- Hultqvist, K., & Petersson, K. (2000). Iscensättningen av samhället som skola. In Bjerg, J. (Ed.), *Pedagogik. En grundbok*. 496-527. Stockholm: Liber.
- Hultqvist, K. (2006). The future is already here-as it always has been. The new teacher subject, the pupil, and the technologies of the soul. *The future is not what it appears to be Pedagogy, genealogy and political epistemology. In honor and in memory of Kenneth Hultqvist*, In T.S. Popkewitz, K. Petersson, U. Olsson, & J. Kowalczyk, (Eds.). 20-61. Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- Jarl, M., & Rönnerberg, L. (2010). *Skolpolitik: från riksdagshus till klassrum*. Malmö: Liber
- Jeffrey, B., & Troman, G. (2004). Time for ethnography. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(4), 535-548.

A fair (Af)fair?

- Johansson, M. (2009). *Anpassning och motstånd: En etnografisk studie av gymnasieelevers institutionella identitetskapande* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Skövde).
- Jørgensen, W.M., & Phillips, L. (2010). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kallstenius, J. (2010). *De mångkulturella innerstadsskolorna: Om skolval, segregation och utbildningsstrategier i Stockholm* (Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm).
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2008). *Hegemonin och den socialistiska strategin*. Göteborg: Glänta.
- Lather, P. (2001). Postmodernism, Post-structuralism and Post(Critical) Ethnography: of Ruins, Aporias and Angels. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography*. (pp. 477-493). London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Lazzarato, M. (1996). Immaterial labor. In *Radical thought in Italy: A potential politics*, 133-147.
- Lindblad, S. (2011). Turn taking in large-scale reforms: re-modelling welfare state education in Sweden. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 14(1), 67–81.
- Lindblad, S., & Popkewitz, T. S. (Eds.). (2004). *Educational Restructuring: International Perspectives on Traveling Policies* Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.
- Lindblad, S., & Wallin, E. (1993). On transitions of power, democracy and education in Sweden. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 25(1), 77-88.
- Lindensjö, B., & Lundgren, U. P. (2000). *Utbildningsreformer och politisk styrning*. Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- Lund, S. (2006). *Marknad och medborgare:-elevers valhandlingar i gymnasieutbildningens integrations-och differentieringsprocesser* (Doctoral dissertation, LNU).
- Lundahl, L. (2005). A Matter of Self-Governance and Control. *European Education*, 37(1), Spring 2005, 10–25.
- Lundahl, L. (2008). Skilda framtidsvägar. *Utbildning & demokrati*, 17(1), 29-51.
- Lundahl, L. (2012). Educational theory in an era of knowledge capitalism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 31(3), 215-226.

References

- Lundahl, L., Erixon Arreman, I., Holm, A. S., & Lundström, U. (2013). Educational marketization the Swedish way. *Education Inquiry*, 4(3), 497-517.
- Lunneblad, J. (2010). Skolidentitet och managementkultur som mytologisk diskurs. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 19(1), 25-44.
- Lykke, N. (2005). Nya perspektiv på intersektionalitet: Problem och möjligheter. *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 26(2-3), 7-16.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (Vol. 10). University of Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Masschelein, J., & Simons, M. (2005). The strategy of the inclusive education apparatus. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 24(2), 117-138.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- No'voa, A. N., & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003). Comparative research in education: A mode of governance or a historical journey? *Comparative Education*, 39(4), 423-438.
- Nylund, M. (2010). Framtidsvägen: Vägen till vilken framtid för eleverna på gymnasieskolans yrkesprogram? *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 15(1), 33-52.
- Ozga, J. (2009). Governing education through data in England: from regulation to self-evaluation. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24: 149-162.
- Ozga, J., & Lingard, B. (2007). Globalisation, education policy and politics. In Ozga, J., & Lingard, B. (Eds.) *The Routledge Falmer reader in education policy and politics*, (65-82). London: Routledge.
- Palmås, K. (2011). *Prometheus eller Narcissus? Entreprenören som samhällsomvälvare*. Göteborg: Korpen Koloni.
- Palme, M. (2008). *Det kulturella kapitalet: Studier av symboliska tillgångar i det svenska utbildningssystemet 1988–2008* (Doctoral dissertation, Uppsala University).
- Panagia, D., & Rancière, J. (2000). Dissenting words: A conversation with Jacques Rancière. *Diacritics*, 30(2), 113-126.
- Pelletier, C. (2009a). Rancière and the poetics of the social sciences. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 32(3), 267-284.

A fair (Af)fair?

- Pelletier, C. (2009b). Emancipation, equality and education: Rancière's critique of Bourdieu and the question of performativity. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(2), 137-150.
- Peters, M. (2001). Education, enterprise culture and the entrepreneurial self: A Foucauldian perspective. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2(2).
- Peters, M., Besley, A.C., Olssen, M., Maurer, S., & Weber, S. (2009). (Eds.) *Governmentality studies in education*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Petersson, O. (1999). *Samhällskonsten*. Stockholm: Studieförbundet Näringsliv Samhälle.
- Poovey, M. (1998). *A history of the modern fact: Problems of knowledge in the sciences of wealth and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2012). The sociology of education as the history of the present: Fabrication, difference and abjection. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, (ahead-of-print), 1-18.
- Popkewitz, T.S., & Lindblad, S. (2000). Educational governance and social inclusion and exclusion: Some conceptual difficulties and problematics in policy and research. *Discourse*, 21(1), 5-44.
- Popkewitz, T.S., Petersson, K., Olsson, U. & Kowalczyk, J. (Eds.). (2006). *The Future Is Not What It Appears To Be: Pedagogy, Genealogy and Political Epistemology*. Stockholm: HLS.
- Popkewitz, T.S., & Tabachnick, B. R. (Eds.). (1981). *The study of schooling: Field based methodologies in educational research and evaluation*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Porter, T.M. (1995). *Trust in numbers: The pursuit of objectivity in science and public life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

References

- Poovey, M. (1998). *A history of the modern fact: Problems of knowledge in the sciences of wealth and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: rituals of verification*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rancière, J. (1991). *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rancière, J. (2005). *Hatet mot demokratin* Hägersten: Tankekraft.
- Rancière, J. (2006a). *Texter om politik och estetik*. Lund: Propexus.
- Rancière, J. (2006b). Thinking between disciplines: An aesthetics of knowledge. *Parrhesia*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Rancière, J. (2010a). *Dissensus On Politics and Aesthetics*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Rancière, J. (2010b). On ignorant schoolmasters. In Bingham, C., & Biesta, G.J.J. (Eds.) *Jacques Rancière: Education, truth, emancipation*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Rancière, J. (2012). *The intellectual and his people: Staging the people*, Vol.2. London: Verso.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Rizvi, F. (2004). Debating globalization and education after September 11. *Comparative Education*, 40:2, 157-171.
- Rose N. (1991). Governing by numbers: Figuring out democracy. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 16: 673–692.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sahlgren, G. H. (2013). *Dis-location: school choice, residential segregation and educational inequality*. London: Institute of economic affairs.
- Sanandaji, N. (2013, August 09). Klassresor möjliggörs av disciplin och bra skolor. *Göteborgs Posten*.

A fair (Af)fair?

- Scott, J. (1992). Experience. In Butler, J., & Scott, J. W. (Eds.). *Feminists theorize the political*. London: Routledge.
- Shamir, R. (2008). The age of responsabilization: On market-embedded morality. *Economy and Society*, 37(1), 1-19.
- Simons, M. (2006). Learning as investment: Notes on governmentality and biopolitics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(4), 2006.
- Simons, M., & Masschelein, J. (2006). The learning society and governmentality: An introduction. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 38(4), 417-430.
- Simons, M., & Masschelein, J. (2010). Governmental, political and pedagogic subjectivation: Foucault with Rancière *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(5–6).
- Sjöberg, L. (2011). *Bäst i klassen?: Lärare och elever i svenska och europeiska policytexter* (Doctoral dissertation, University West).
- Skolverket. (2009). *Vad påverkar resultaten i svensk grundskola? Kunskapsöversikt om betydelsen av olika faktorer*. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Skolverket. (2010). *Skapa och våga: Om entreprenörskap i skolan. Forskning för skolan*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Skolverket. (2013). *Det svåra valet Elevers val av utbildning på olika slags gymnasiealternativ*. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Skolverket. (2014). *SIRIS Kvalitet och resultat i skolan*. Retrieved 2014-01-30 from <http://siris.skolverket.se/siris/f?p=SIRIS:7:0::NO::>
- SOU 2008:69. *Välja fritt och välja rätt. Drivkrafter för rationella utbildningsval*. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- SOU 2014:5. *Staten får inte abdikera – om kommunaliseringen av den svenska skolan*. Betänkande av utredningen om skolans kommunalisering. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Staunæs, D. (2003). Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 11(2), 101-110.

References

- Säfström, C. A. (2011). Rethinking emancipation, rethinking education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30(2), 199-209.
- Tesfahuney, M. & Dahlstedt, M. (2008) (Eds.) *Den bästa av världar? Beträktelser över en postpolitisk samtid*. Hägersten: Tankekraft.
- Troman, G., Jeffrey, B., & Raggl, A. (2007). Creativity and performativity policies in primary school cultures. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(5), 549-572.
- Vetenskapsrådet. (2013). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Retrieved 2013-08-20 from:
<http://www.codex.uu.se/texts/HSFR.pdf>
- Wahlström, N. (2009). *Mellan leverans och utbildning: Om lärande i en mål-och resultatstyrd skola*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Walford, G. (2008). The nature of educational ethnography. In Walford, G. (Ed.) *How to do educational ethnography*. London: The Tufnell Press.
- Wetherell, M. (2009). *Identity in the 21st century: New trends in changing times*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Whitty, G., & Power, S. (2000). Marketization and privatization in mass education systems. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20(2), 93-107.
- Willis, P. E. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Winther Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2000). *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Wyndhamn, A. K. (2013). *Tänka fritt, tänka rätt: En studie om värdeöverföring och kritiskt tänkande i gymnasieskolans undervisning*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg).
- Youdell, D. (2006a). Diversity, inequality, and a post-structural politics for education. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 27(1), 33-42.
- Youdell, D. (2006b). Subjectivation and performative politics—Butler thinking Althusser and Foucault: intelligibility, agency and the raced—nationed—

A fair (Af)fair?

religioned subjects of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4), 511-528.

Youdell, D. (2010). *School trouble: Identity, power and politics in education*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Zizek, S. (2006). *Against the Populist Temptation*

<http://www.lacan.com/zizpopulism.htm> Retrieved 2013-04-18

Österlind, E. (1998). *Disciplinering via frihet: Elevers planering av sitt eget arbete*. (Doctoral dissertation, Uppsala University).