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Abstract

This study focuses on a single school district as a site of concept-building in relation to teachers’ subjective experiences of power vis-à-vis a neoliberal policy regime. The assemblage of teachers’ subjectivities takes place in the context of the Southeastern United States, in a policy environment highly influenced by neoliberal ideology. The study focuses on the South Carolina School Report Card Policy (part of No Child Left Behind) as an instantiation of neoliberal education policy and draws on a Foucauldian and Deleuzian framework for understanding how power produces teachers’ subjectivities with and through policy. The researcher orients this work as a fieldwork in philosophy in order to think about power with teachers in the situated contexts of their lives in a unique school district; this study therefore generalizes to theory rather than to people or location. The research concludes that power affected teachers’ subjectivities through disciplinary technologies and the creation and maintenance of affective channels, having bodily and material impacts on teachers, and causing them to find ‘the other’ of students’ bodies, which have been raced, classed, and gendered, in themselves.
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Chapter 1: Teacher performance in neoliberal times

For Socrates, all virtues were forms of knowledge. To train someone to manage an account for Goldman Sachs is to educate him or her in a skill. To train them to debate stoic, existential, theological, and humanist ways of grappling with reality is to educate them in values and morals. A culture that does not grasp the vital interplay between morality and power, which mistakes management techniques for wisdom, which fails to understand that the measurement of a civilization is its compassion, not its speed or ability to consume, condemns itself to death.

Chris Hedges, 2009

The concepts we use to try to understand and act on the world in which we live do not by themselves determine the answers we may find. Answers are determined not by words but by the power relations that impose their interpretations of these concepts.

Michael Apple, 2007b

To this day, we have yet to fully comprehend the nature of power.

Michel Foucault to Gilles Deleuze, 1972

(my emphasis, all quotations)

Today, nearly half of public school teachers in North America quit teaching within five years of beginning their careers. In a society that purportedly emphasizes the importance of education, this is, and should be, cause for great concern. Educators, educational researchers, politicians and policy makers, and society at large needs to understand the confluence of factors that mold teachers’ experiences in educational institutions; we need spaces to think, re-think, and think differently about teaching in order to understand the framing of current educational problems, the politics of those problems, the policies that shape them and attempt to shape solutions to them, the ethics of engaging with these problems, and possibilities for educational futures. All these things—politics, policy, problems, possibilities—most often impact education most directly in and through the bodies of teachers.
Neoliberalism and accountability policy in education

What is happening now is the commodification of education. There used to be an accepted wisdom that education is a social good in and of itself, that it helps society and individuals. Not just because education allowed people to get jobs, but because it helped people perform better in a functioning democracy. I don’t see that anymore. Now I see education as a store: those who have credit or money can purchase education. Those who don’t, well, “This ain’t for you.”

*Mumia Abu-Jamal, 2012*

Neoliberal economic discourse has dominated educational policy discourse in the United States and other post-industrial democratic societies for the past 30 years (Larner 2000; Olssen, Codd, & O’Neill, 2004; Harvey, 2005; Apple, 2007b; Vidovich, 2007). In the United States, public school teachers who struggled to maintain the centrality of their students following the passage of No Child Left Behind hoped for a change of philosophy and policy with the Obama administration. However, with Obama’s selection of Arne Duncan as secretary of education and the establishment of the “Race to the Top” fund, the discourse of public education in the United States did not change much, if at all. The language of competition in the global economy, drawing on the tenets of human capital theory, infused the discourse put forth on the “Education” page of the “Issues” section of the Obama (2008) campaign’s “Organizing for America” website:

At this defining moment in our history, preparing our children to compete in the global economy is one of the most urgent challenges we face. We need to stop paying lip service to public education, and start holding communities, administrators, teachers, parents and students accountable. We will prepare the next generation for success in college and the workforce, ensuring that American children lead the world once again in creativity and achievement. (Organizing for America, 2010)
Accountability (the implication is through use of standardized test scores), success and competition (the implication is in economic terms), terms derived from the business world and the market, are construed as the foremost issues of public k-12 education at “this defining moment in our history.” The implications of the administration’s language veil and legitimate the governance of “accountability” as well as definitions of “success,” “competition,” and “creativity” within a market paradigm. Michael Apple stated that “there are key words that continually surface in debates over education…. These words have their own histories, but they are increasingly interrelated. The concepts are simple to list: markets, standards, accountability, tradition, God, along with a number of others” (2007b, p. 210). The Obama discourse about education has not changed since 2008; in the 2014 state of the union address, Obama discussed education as providing “skills for the new economy” (2014, January 28).

The interrelation of the concepts of standards, accountability, and markets, relates directly to the concept of “neoliberalism.” Apple described neoliberalism as “guided by a vision of the weak state. Thus, what is private is necessarily good and what is public is necessarily bad…. For neoliberals, there is one form of rationality that is more powerful than any other—economic rationality” (2007, p. 214). Wendy Larner wrote a similar definition of neoliberalism in *Studies in Political Economy*:

Neo-liberalism is associated with the preference for a minimalist state. Markets are understood to be a better way of organizing economic activity because they are associated with competition, economic efficiency, and choice. In conjunction with this general shift towards the neo-liberal tenet of “more market,” deregulation and privatization have become central themes in debates over welfare state restructuring” (Larner, 2000, p. 5).
Neoliberalism is also grounded in an implicit view of human nature as inherently self-interested; it views human actions as always in accordance with rational self-interest (Fowler, 1995). Because this view of human nature underpins neoliberal thinking, “The assumption that individual freedoms are guaranteed by freedom of the market and of trade is [also] a cardinal feature of neoliberal thinking” (Harvey, 2005, p. 7).

Neoliberalism, in addition to being a set of ideas about the proper relationship between government, education, and the economy, and a language with which to speak of those ideas, is also a descriptor attached to overtly political developments since the 1970s. As stated in the January 24, 2011 issue of The Nation magazine,

The power shift did not start with Obama, but his tenure confirms and completes it. The corporates [people in favor of greater power for corporations] began their systematic drive to dismantle liberal governance back in the 1970s, and the Democratic Party was soon trying to appease them, its retreat whipped along by Ronald Reagan’s popular appeal and top-down tax cutting…. (Also) beholden to corporate America for campaign contributions, the Democrats cut deals with banks and businesses and usually gave them what they demanded, so corporate interests would not veto progressive legislation. (Greider, 2011, p. 22)

This set of political developments is often cited as beginning around the time of Reagan in the US and Thatcher in the United Kingdom (Tucker, 2012) and as being continued by Clinton in the US (Fowler, 1995). But it has spread though the vast majority of the “developed” world and has taken root in many nations of the “global south” through the policies of the IMF (Klein, 2002).
The application of this logic to schooling produces a view of students as human capital to be used for the economic productivity of the nation-state, and a view of schools as the place where students have access to the skills necessary to achieve market success. As Alan Reid (2007) stated, “Contemporary neoliberal policies driving education narrowly focus on the individual economic benefits of education and force public schools to compete in quasi-education markets” (p. 291). These ideas are present in the Obama administration’s statement (cited above): there is a definition of success in individual economic terms: entrance into college and the workforce. The same ideas underpin Arne Duncan’s establishment of the “Race to the Top” fund, where schools that made the most innovative “progress” received the most monetary assistance. What Duncan and Obama and the Democratic party were either unaware of or ignoring was the tendency for such policies to privilege schools that already have resources with which to innovate: in many states, this meant schools located in districts with wealthy tax bases, not schools in the poorest and most underprivileged districts. Therefore, accountability for teachers framed in discourse that puts forth individual economic success (achieved through a regime of standardized testing) for students as the only and paramount purpose of education is deeply problematic for a democratic society.

**Neoliberalism and my teaching journey**

Polling shows teachers are depressed by the increasing reliance on standardized tests to measure student learning—the “high stakes” testing regime that the standards and accountability movement has put in place across the country and that Race to the Top has reinforced in some states and districts. Teachers are also concerned that growing numbers of parents are not able to play an active role in their children’s education, and they are angry about the climate of austerity that has invaded the nation’s schools, with state and local budget cuts threatening key programs that help students learn and overcome the disadvantages of poverty.

Goldstein, 2012
Educational policy infused with such discourse impacts teachers’ subjectivities as well as their pedagogy, both of which ultimately impact students. I began my teaching career in 2006, teaching 10th and 11th grade English at a public high school in South Carolina. The school at which I taught was in a low-income urban area, had approximately a 60% racial minority population, and had a high percentage of students who received free or reduced-priced meals. During my three-year tenure at that school, our administrative and pedagogical community faced intense pressure to improve test scores on the HSAP (High School Assessment Program) test, as well as standardized End-of-Course (EOC) tests for certain classes, and our 4-year graduation rate. For two years, our annual school report card had labeled our school “at risk,” or in the terms of “The State of South Carolina Annual School Report Card,” “school performance fail[ed] to meet the standards for progress toward the 2020 South Carolina (SC) Performance Vision” (South Carolina State Department of Education, 2013, January 11; 2014). During my third year at the school, if we had not raised our test scores and graduation rate, we as a school community would have faced potential takeover by the state, the replacement of our administration with outside personnel, restructuring, or privatization.

As a teacher in a core subject area with students preparing to take the HSAP that year, I was to document the specific interventions I was implementing for every student in my classes who had failed to pass the HSAP the previous year, as well as the preparations I implemented for my 10th grade students who were to take the test for the first time. The first half of the year, I had three 90-minute classes (10th grade Honors, 11th grade College Prep, and 10th grade College Prep), and in order to work individually with all students needing remedial or extra preparation for the tests, I often scheduled tutoring before or after school hours in order to meet the requirements of the administration. It was not so much that our individual jobs were threatened if
we did not do so, but that if the school could not specifically document all interventions taken by
teachers and administration, we faced consequences as an entire school community. In that
sense, we as teachers and members of our school community’s “team,” were either “on the boat
or off the boat,” as our administration often stated at faculty meetings.

An incredible amount of restructuring of our daily activities took place most especially
that third year of my teaching. New programs were implemented to attempt to encourage, entice,
or cajole students into passing classes, passing tests, or attending school more frequently.
Additionally, field trips had to be justified in terms of which of the state-mandated curricular
standards would be met, and field trips were banned completely after the beginning of April so
that students could spend maximum time in class preparing for the upcoming standardized tests
and staying after school to “make up” time for absences they had incurred.

With the lack of a strong or effective teachers’ union in South Carolina, teachers were
expected to spend however long after school hours it took to accomplish all these tasks. As part
of professional development during my third year, we were also to read a book called Results
Now!: How we can achieve unprecedented improvements in teaching and learning by Mike
Schmoker (2006). The book approached the concept of ‘improvement’ with an uncritical
emphasis on standardization and surveillance, and the work of reading and commenting (on a
shared, school-wide blog) on the book was expected to be done in addition to our other
responsibilities. The tacit directive, however, was that to complain about the proliferation of such
required activities was to betray oneself as a lazy teacher, a teacher not desiring the best for the
students and the school, a teacher who was not “‘properly passionate’ about excellence, about
achieving ‘peak performance’” (Ball, 2001, p. 217). Indeed, in many conversations I have had
personally with teachers and administrators throughout the Southeast, complaining is often
discussed as dangerous; it brings with it a high probability of ostracism from the respect of administrators and fellow teachers.

In truth, the workload was more than seemed physically achievable. Perpetual exhaustion, frustration, and a general feeling of powerlessness permeated the school atmosphere. Usually patient, kind colleagues became cynical, cantankerous, and at times downright noxious. The demands of a policy regime whose discourse focused on results, performance on standardized tests, and statistical measures of student progress created an environment in which teaching became a matter of performativity rather than praxis. The looming threat of school takeover created an atmosphere of suspicion and surveillance.

All of this, of course, affected who we were and who we were becoming—our subjectivities and our teaching desires. We often passed our stress and pressure on to our students. However much we cared for them as people, our students became numbers in a game we had to play in order to teach them, nurture them, or mentor them. I spent most of my time feeling a mixture of rage, exhaustion, despondency, and apathy. I began as a first year teacher—full of passion for learning, eager to start new initiatives at the school, and determined to care for my students. What happened? Even now, revisiting some of the memories necessary for writing this introduction recalls difficult feelings, including outrage. I left teaching high school after three years feeling that some part of myself had been deadened, defeated somehow.

The purpose of this research, therefore, was to better understand the impacts of accountability policy on teachers, including the concomitant affects produced in teachers’ subjectivities.
Results of neoliberalism: Performativity, policy technologies, regulation of teaching selves

Much academic literature reflects my experience of such a policy regime. Bob Jeffrey found in his study, “Performativity and primary teacher relations” (2002) that “the rise of a performativity discourse in education in England emanates from the importation of an economic ‘market’ structure for schools” (p. 531). Stephen Ball (2003) stated that the contemporary wave of educational policy reform (which is being spread [not only in the UK] by agents such as the World Bank and the OECD) is characterized by “three interrelated policy technologies: the market, managerialism and performativity” (p. 215). Ball (2001) defined performativity as

A technology, a culture, and a mode of regulation, or even a system of ‘terror’ in Lyotard’s words, that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change. The performances—of individual subjects or organizations—serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of ‘quality’, or ‘moments’ of promotion and inspection. They stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgment. ‘An equation between wealth, efficiency, and truth is thus established’ (Lyotard, 1984 p. 46). The issue of who controls the field of judgment is crucial. ‘Accountability’ and ‘competition’ are the lingua franca of this new ‘discourse of power’ as Lyotard describes it. (p. 210)

Indeed, as Nelda Wellman (2007) stated, “we live in the age of accountability” (p. 204). This rise of performativity in response to a neoliberal or “market” agenda “prioritiz[es] the pursuit of excellence and accountability by focusing on the satisfaction to be gained from the achievement of goals and improvements in performance. It has required… teachers to face up to
radical changes in practice” (Osborn et al. 2000, as cited in Jeffrey, 2002, p. 532). Ball took this idea a step further; not only are teachers experiencing radical changes in practice, but also “the novelty of this epidemic of reform is that it does not simply change what people, as educators… do, it changes who they are” (2003, p. 215, my emphasis).

Furthermore, Ball stated that such a policy regime, while claiming to act in the name of de-regulation and “freedom,” actually enacts “processes of re-regulation” (Ball, 2003, p. 217, original emphasis). However, re-regulation does not necessarily mean just another, or a new policy document. It is the embodied e/affects of these policies, the ways people take them up and use them on others and on themselves, that constitute what Ball means by “re-regulation” and reform that “changes who [teachers] are.” Such e/affects are powerful, but understanding how such e/affects are powerful and by what means they regulate teacher’s subjectivities requires understanding how power operates both in society and in the schoolhouse. Indeed, as Gunzenhauser (2008) warned, “critique or augmentation of accountability policy without attending to the implications of normalization for the constitution of the educated self is unlikely to curtail the largely negative effects of high-stakes testing” (p. 2225). Gunzenhauser went on to propose that using a notion of the self based in the work of Foucault, wherein the “self is continually constituted through exercises of power,” allows us to “see the extent of the crisis and formulate resistance” (2008, p. 2225).

**Performances and fabrications**

The e/affects of restructurings and radical changes in teachers’ subjectivities include what teachers do in order to construct teaching “performances” (which attempt to show observers
what is desired by policy requirements) in response to a policy regime. Stephen Ball used the
term “fabrications” to describe this phenomenon:

Fabrications are versions of an organization (or person) which does not exist—they are produced purposefully in order ‘to be accountable’. Truthfulness is not the point—the point is their effectiveness, both in the market or for inspection or appraisal, and in the ‘work’ they do ‘on’ and ‘in’ the organization— their transformational and disciplinary impact. That is to say: ‘To be audited, an organization must actively transform itself into an auditable commodity.’” (Ball, 2003, pp. 224-225)

The e/ffects of the pressure for fabrications on teachers and their teaching, as Bob Jeffrey found (2002), included “‘mutual instrumentality’… in which both teachers and children focus[ed] predominantly on assessment outcomes” as well as “more formalized… relations with the children because children’s and teachers’ unique dispositions and humanity became less relevant” (p. 532). Jeffrey went on to detail that “teachers found themselves ‘applying more pressure on the children as teachers [became] more pressured themselves’… and their caring, nurturing role was reconstructed into caring predominantly for pupil performance” (p. 535). Further, teachers themselves became “performer[s] rather than… pedagogue[s]” (p. 543), and democratic and collaborative relationships among teachers and between teachers and inspectors and teachers and administrators decreased, and were substituted for “less personal, less familiar, less emotional, less sensitive, less warm, and less empathetic” relationships among adults and between adults and students (p. 544).

1 A pop-culture analog to this concept in the United States might be Stephen Colbert’s use of the word “truthiness.”
Finally, pedagogy shifted toward a much more “inculcatory approach,” a much more “technical approach;” students were reduced, in the words of one teacher in Jeffrey’s study, to “a function machine. I pressed a button and out came the answer. I went at it bang, bang, bang, and if they hadn’t got it, tough titty. They learnt the facts, questions that might come up and examinations skills’” (Teacher, as quoted in Jeffrey, 2002, p. 536).

These various types of re-regulation have also significantly eroded teachers’ sense of themselves as professionals. Mary Bushnell (2003) explained that “we presume that external regulation of teachers is necessary because we cannot trust teachers to regulate themselves” (pp. 251-252). She went on to argue that

whereas professionalism [for other professions] can be measured by relative salary, social prestige, or entry requirements, teachers’ professionalism reveals itself through teachers’ opportunities to reflect and act with intellectual autonomy, on their presence within a collegial community, and on the trust they enjoy from peers, clients, and supervisors…. Teachers can become objects rather than subjects in the educational system when their opinions are excluded from decisions. (Bushnell, 2003, p. 253)

Because the accountability discourse in neoliberal educational policy takes a distrust of teachers as its starting point, teachers are encouraged to engage in such behaviors as teaching to standardized tests and narrowing the curriculum, as well as taking a technicist, commodified approach to knowledge (Wellman, 2007, pp. 205-206), and this often goes against their judgment and what they are taught in teacher preparation programs. What this means is that even though
Fabrications are meant “to be seen” and “to be accountable,” they are also a classroom reality, and a reality that the teacher produces even though she may object to it.

For example, I knew, and many other teachers know, that standardized tests often serve as better measures of students’ ability to take standardized tests of and their socioeconomic backgrounds than as measures of their actual learning or intelligence. Indeed, Jang and Ryan (2003) found that “these types of [standardized] assessments do not provide minority students from low socioeconomic backgrounds and students who speak English as a second language ‘with equitable and adequate opportunities to show what they learned’” (as cited in Wellman, 2007, p. 500). Jang and Ryan pointed out that the effects of testing and accountability are also differential and more pernicious for minority students, students who live in poverty, and students who do not speak English as a first language. Yet, we engage in test-preparation in class, even when it produces commodified, uncritical learning, and even when it reinscribes forms of structural racism. We fear that not to do so is to do our students a type of disservice because they must pass certain tests (i.e. to graduate or to advance to the next grade level), and we fear not raising test scores for the sake of our schools because we do not wish them to be perceived as “less than” or to be restructured. This is an erosion of our professional selves and a reinforcement of white patriarchal supremacy.

Webb (2007) conceptualized what is at stake here in his formulation of two axes of “terror” (drawing upon Lyotard2) that serve to coerce teachers: data surveillance and pervasive

---

2 Lyotard (1984) states that “By terror I mean the efficiency gained by eliminating, or threatening to eliminate, a player from the language game one shares with him. He [sic] is silenced or consents, not because he has been refuted, but because his ability to participate has been threatened. The decision makers’ arrogance consists in the exercise of terror. It says: ‘Adapt your aspirations to our ends—or else’” (p. 63). This relates to what Lyotard terms “the differend: I would like to call a differend the case where the plaintiff is divested of the means to argue and becomes for that reason a victim. If the addressee, the addressee, and the sense of the testimony are neutralized, everything takes place as if there were no damages. A case of differend between two parties takes place when the
community norms and ideology. As Webb explained, sometimes it is not the fear of overt punishment or job loss that encourages teachers to conform or to fabricate teaching performances; it is the “fear of ostracism” (Webb, 2007, p. 283). Ostracism, of course, carries its own very real consequences: a further erosion of professional power and respect, and the erosion of the ability to be taken seriously or even heard by ones’ peers and superiors. These consequences cause teachers to feel even more isolated, even more fragmented than they may when they capitulate by fabricating teaching performances in order to conform.

Thus, when encouraged by a policy regime to act against their better judgment, teachers enact what Webb (2007) called “pedagogical-simulation-reasoning,” which he stated, “actuates a more useful and docile educator when practice conforms to pedagogical fabrications (Foucault, 1977, as cited in Webb, 2007, p. 279). Webb argued that this “pedagogical-simulation-reasoning,” or the rationality teachers employ in order to create fabrications to be surveilled, created what Webb called “epistemological suicide” in teachers. Fabrications are thus “both cognitive resistance and capitulation” (p. 287), and teachers’ embodied knowledge and wisdom are deemed nonexistent; unaccountable. Among the most pernicious effects of all of this on teachers were “teacher guilt, doubt, and confusion [which] are effects born out of exterritorializing—forms of cognitive and epistemic violence” (Webb, 2007, p. 284). These are undemocratic e/affects. Violence to the ‘selves’ of teachers and how teachers’ subjectivities incorporate forms of violence under accountability regimes calls for further investigation. Understanding, in this case, may lead to new possibilities for resistance to such violence.

regulation of the conflict that opposes them is done in the idiom of one of the parties while the wrong suffered by the other is not signified in that idiom” (Lyotard, 1988, p. 9).

3 I understand that “resistance” is usually a term applied to overt, top-down power of the type usually employed for analysis by traditional Marxist scholars. I will complicate this term a great deal in the theoretical framework. For now, however, I use the term for the sake of economy of wording.
Research questions

Therefore, because neoliberal accountability policies impact teachers’ teaching performances and selves/subjectivities, and because prior research has demonstrated that teachers experience and perpetuate cognitive and epistemic violence on account of such policies, my research questions are:

1. How does power circulate between Riverton\(^4\) County, South Carolina public high school teachers and Riverton County Schools’ policies surrounding the annual ‘School Report Card’ accountability policy (SRCP)?

2. How does the circulation of power impact teachers’ subjectivities in Riverton County?

This study adds to a growing body of literature on teacher subjectivities, performativities and fabrications in a marketized/neoliberal policy environment. Other studies have explored the teaching environment created by such a policy environment, and many have explored the fabrications teachers create in response to the demands of a performative neoliberal policy regime. Most case studies, such as Jeffrey’s (2002) and Troman’s (2000), have focused specifically on effects of neoliberal policy on elementary school teachers, and have touched on issues of pedagogy among other facets of teaching that are impacted. However, fewer studies as yet have focused explicitly on the everyday impacts of power in/on teachers’ subjectivities and pedagogical performances at the secondary level in public schools. Even fewer have focused on schools in the American South, which are experiencing a renewed focus on accountability and performance (Jones, 2012; Rosenfeld, 2004). Indeed, in April 2011 there was a bill introduced in

---

\(^4\) Throughout this study, including in the References section, the pseudonym ‘Riverton’/‘Riverton County’ will be used to further protect anonymity of participating teachers.
the General Assembly of the South Carolina House of Representatives to implement performance pay in the state (H. 3363) (Sellers, 2011), and that bill is still in committee as of this writing. Florida has already implemented performance pay. For all these reasons, I used concepts of power employed by Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze/Felix Guattari for this thesis, and I will discuss these concepts of power in detail in Chapter 2. As Alan Reid (2007) said, “a new discourse is needed for public education for contemporary times,” (p. 291) and through exploring teachers’ subjectivities and experiences of power, this study seeks to contribute to what that new discourse may become and thus seeks to open new lines of flight in discourse about public education.
Chapter 2: Theoretical framework

In order to understand the ways in which neoliberal policy interacted with teachers’ subjectivities as well as their pedagogies, it is necessary to be clear about several key terms for this study. The major terms in use will include the following: power, policy, subjectivity, assemblage, affect. This chapter will develop the theoretical framework for understanding teachers’ experiences of power in schools, which include neoliberal accountability discourses, and the impacts these policies have on teachers’ subjectivities. The empirical portion of this study (chapters 4-6) will explore the interactions between teachers and their experiences of power and policy, and their subjectivities as teachers.

In this chapter, I explain the significance of using the work of Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. I describe and explain the conceptions of power used by these authors and review relevant literature and concepts concerning accountability policy and performativity in teaching. I explain the bearing these terms have on the concepts of ‘policy’ that this study will employ, and I explain the global and local context for my investigation into the e/affects of neoliberalism in/on education policy. Next, I briefly review research concerning teachers’ subjectivities as impacted by accountability policy. Here, my theoretical commitments have been informed by feminist, antiracist, and postcolonial scholarship. This chapter will segue into a more detailed discussion of my chosen methodology, fieldwork in philosophy, and the positionality of the researcher, in chapter three.
**Education policy**

There is more than one way to think policy, and there is a difference between so-called ‘traditional’ and ‘critical’ notions of policy. A more ‘traditional’ take on policy conceives of policy as documents, texts produced by governing bodies that dictate the procedures, rules, and governance of institutions and institutional life (Laswell, 1951; Taylor, 1997; Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, & Henry, 1997). This view is functionalist, linear, and positivist. However, this study used a more critical notion of policy as its beginning-thinking place; a critical view of policy sees policy not as just the text or document itself, but all the ways power, politics, ideas, and language infuse the documents, and all the ways actual people involved in making and practicing policies take up the flows of power, politics, ideas, and language in policies (Scheurich, 1994; Troyna, 1994; Taylor, 1997; Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, & Henry, 1997; Simons, Olssen, & Peters, 2009; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). People are the only ‘real’ instantiations of policy; the word ‘policy’ makes no sense absent of its context and the people who make, use, and enact it (Ball, Maguire, Braun, & Hoskins, 2011a; Braun, Ball, & Maguire, 2011). Furthermore, such research cannot be politically neutral; as Rizvi and Lingard asserted:

We thus reject the contention that policy analysis can be value-neutral, involving a set of rational-instrumental techniques, as much of the traditional policy sciences sought to assert. These rational-instrumental techniques take the status quo for granted, as a given, as well as a policy’s definition of the problem for which the policy is the intended solution. (2010, p. 52)

This study attempted to pay attention to contexts, not to take the status quo for granted, and to understand the interactions of power, politics, ideas policy as enacted through teachers’
subjectivities and bodies (Braun, Ball, Maguire, & Hoskins, 2011; Ball, Maguire, Braun, & Hoskins, 2011b).

This work focused its attention on a single instantiation of policy to seek an understanding of how this policy impacts public high school teachers in a single case setting. This work contributes to broader theoretical understandings of how power operates in and with teachers and policy, and how polices become taken up, and changed by, the embodied subjectivities of the teachers and teaching practices that policies attempt to lay claim to.

A “complex social process of power”

(Levinson & Sutton, 2001, p. 1)

What would educational policy studies look like if they reconceptualized the notion of policy itself as a complex social practice, an ongoing process of normative cultural production constituted by diverse actors across diverse social and institutional contexts?

Levinson & Sutton, 2001

Policy can be conceived of as a site of “normative cultural production” (Levinson & Sutton, 2001, p. 1). Policy produces norms, both stated and unstated, that push dominant thinking and discourse in particular directions. I say directions (plural) purposefully; there is not always one determinate direction for thinking that policy creates; policy is a seed—planted in the different soils of human beings and various contexts, it grows a species of plant—but the soil and the individual seed make each plant unique, if of the same species. Sometimes soil will not be amenable to the seed, and the seed or the already-sprouted plant will die altogether, and become fertilizer for other types of plants to grow instead. Cultural and discursive norms in policy operate similarly.
Weaver-Hightower (2008, p. 153) conceptualized policy as ecology; tracing a brief history of policy analysis, he discussed the traditional, rational-functionalist (input ‘a’=outcome ‘b’) model of policy: “problem → research → solution → implementation” (e.g., Lasswell, 1951, as cited in Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 153). With roots in positivism and what Lather (2009) called “scientism,” this model is both outdated and inappropriate for understanding such complex human interactivity as policy enactment (Braun, Ball, Maguire, & Hoskins, 2011) actually entails. Weaver-Hightower (2008) explained that this model is inappropriate because such a view relies on an assumption of value-neutral decision making, ignores issues of power, and underestimates the highly contested nature of education. It also relies excessively on assumptions of rationality and the power of human beings to fully understand intricate actions and events. The traditional view, further, grossly misjudges the complexity and grittiness, the false starts, the unabashed greed, and the crashing failures of some policy formation and implementation. (p. 153)

Instead of the traditional, techno-rational view of policy, Weaver-Hightower proposed to look at policy as an ecology, or ecologies: drawing upon indigenous knowledge systems and many Western academic traditions ranging from activity theory to chaos and complexity theory and others (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 154), Weaver-Hightower established a working definition of a policy ecology:

As I formulate it, a policy ecology centers on a particular policy or related group of policies, both as texts and as discourses, situated within the environment of their creation and implementation. In other words, a policy ecology consists of the
policy itself along with all of the texts, histories, people, places, groups, traditions, economic and political conditions, institutions, and relationships that affect it or that it affects. Every contextual factor and person contributing to or influenced by a policy in any capacity, both before and after its creation and implementation, is part of a complex ecology. (2008, p. 155)

I would add to Weaver-Hightower’s definition that the subjectivities of all persons involved in policy, in this case teachers, are as complex as the ecologies that create and flow through them, and that they co-create. Weaver-Hightower’s concept of policy as ecology is appropriate to a study that looks specifically at issues of power in policy because power does not operate linearly, in a positivist manner, or uni-directionally. A policy study, therefore, that takes up this notion of complex ecology, cannot use tools such as double-blind statistical analyses or Likert-scale surveys; it requires complex tools for thinking policy with its human and other-than-human contexts. Weaver-Hightower defined four categories of investigation for policy ecology study: actors, relationships, environments and structures, and processes (2008, pp. 155-156).

Because this study investigated how teachers experience power through/with/in policy, this case study is a partial ecology of a particular policy centering on one ‘keystone species’ in the policy environment: teachers.

One way to begin centering policy analysis on teachers, their lives, and their subjectivities, is through what Levinson & Sutton (2001) called policy practice and policy appropriation, which will be useful starting points for understanding policy as a ‘site of normative cultural production.’ Policy practice
gets at the way individuals, and groups, engage in situated behaviors that are both constrained and enabled by existing structures, but which allow the person to exercise agency in the emerging situation. (Levinson & Sutton, 2001, p. 3)

The situated behaviors and agency and/or constraint experienced by a given individual emerge in what Levinson and Sutton (2001) called policy appropriation. Policy appropriation is “a kind of taking of policy and making it one’s own. With this term, we draw attention to how previously excluded actors lay claims to the right to create policy” (Levinson & Sutton, 2001, p. 3). Ball et al. (2011a&b) took this concept a step further with their concept of policy enactments, which encompass “both complexity and incoherence” (Braun, Ball, & Maguire, 2011, p. 581). Teachers appropriate policy through their affective subjectivities in complex ways. Appropriation must be understood through the lenses of power and subjectivity, for with clear(er) understandings of what power is (becomes) and how it operates (flows), and with clear(er) understandings of the differences between identity and subjectivity, appropriation takes on new meanings infused with alternate understandings of teachers’ selves and agency.

Levinson and Sutton set out to “concern [themselves] with policy as a practice of power” (2001, p. 1). I took up their concern in this study, looking for the species(s) of plants policy grows. Just as the power of a growing plant is a productive power, I used ideas of power that helped to construct concepts and subjectivities policy produces through power, or that power produces through policy. However, the grammar of the previous sentence is something of a misnomer, for as a ‘practice of power,’ policy is also the practice of those who use it—or don’t use it, or use it scantily, or enact it (Ball et al., 2011a&b).
Power

Power to the people.

*John Lennon, 1971*

A may exercise power over B by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very wants. Indeed, is it not the supreme exercise of power to get others to have the desires you want them to have – that is to secure their compliance by controlling their thoughts and desires?

*Steven Lukes, 1974*

I was affected by the environment in which I taught. Indeed, how can one not become affected by one’s surroundings? As I mentioned in Chapter 1, I felt despondent, defeated, and angry, especially during the end of my second year and during the whole of my third year of teaching. The administrative duties, the rules I found ridiculous, the ever-expanding workload, the lack of recourse for my concerns, the numbing, routinized character that work took on in the school edifice, the daily bell-to-bell schedule, the lack of room for new possibilities in my life while I was teaching, all contributed to changes in myself that I still struggle with. I did not like the teacher I became by the end of my third year of teaching. I asked what forces could have conspired, willfully or accidentally, to make my self a person and a teacher whom I no longer enjoyed, who no longer found passion or drive in her work.

**Foucault and power**

Foucault’s definition of power as productive is useful for understanding the ways in which teachers’ subjectivities are inscribed through the school policy and environment. He stated,
We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it “excludes,” it “represses,” it “censors,” it “abstracts,” it “masks,” it “conceals.”

In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production. (Foucault, 1984a, pp. 204-205)

Foucault’s definition complements Lukes’ in that if power can produce rather than repress or force, it produces desires (in this case, teacher desires).

A major part of Foucault’s project was investigating how aspects of life we take for granted as “normal” may be historically and politically constructed. Todd May (2005) explained:

There are aspects of our world that seem to be immune from change. We must conform to the limits they place before us and order our world with those limits in mind. This is more deeply true, and more deeply constraining, when those limits are not merely placed upon us from the outside like barriers but are instead woven into the very fabric of human existence…. For Foucault, historical study reveals to us that many of these “internal” limits arise not from the constitution of our being but from the politics of our relationships. They are neither natural nor inescapable. (p. 9)

Foucault asserted that disciplinary power is an art of “training” that seeks to arrange the forces and powers of the human body; in other words, to construct the ‘internal limits’ May explained. Foucault (1984c) called disciplinary power “a policy of coercions that act upon the body, a calculated manipulation of its [the body’s] elements, its gestures, its behavior” (p. 182). But how, and for what purposes, would the body and its forces become manipulated and arranged under a
neoliberal school policy regime? Foucault explicated in “The Means of Correct Training” that hierarchical observation (of the type employed in the military, in prisons, and originally in Jeremy Bentham’s “Panopticon”), normalizing judgment (of the type employed in psychology, medicine), and the examination (tests) are what he terms “simple instruments” that “[do] not link forces together in order to reduce them; [they seek] to bind them together in such a way as to multiply and use them” (1984, p. 188). In this way, hierarchical observation (whether by prison guards or school or district administrators), normalizing judgment (whether through psychological evaluation tests or checklists filled out during teachers’ observations), and the examination (standardized tests, regimes of medical tests for certain diseases of the body), function in similarly powerful ways; they make bodies, or in this case, teachers’ bodies, useful, docile, and ‘correctly trained.’ The use to which these trained teacher-bodies are put is political, and the political context of this training will be discussed later.

These “means of training” are directly applicable to teachers, especially in American public schools, which are still based on the “factory model” of education, developed in the same time period as the industrial revolution and the mass factories of the early 20th century (Tyack, 1974). Indeed, Foucault noted in “The Means of Correct Training” that “the school building was to be a mechanism for training” (1984, p. 190). Hierarchical observation made teachers into “supervisors, perpetually supervised” (1984, p. 192). The school building itself is often set up in such a way as to separate and supervise, break teachers and students and staff down into units small enough that everyone can be watched at nearly, or at least theoretically nearly, all times. Indeed, surveillance has increased in the United States post-Columbine, as many schools have taken measures such as installing security cameras and metal detectors or instituting clear/mesh-bag-only policies for students. However, teachers also “watch” each other in less concrete, but
equally tangible ways; in my experience teachers often talked about what administrators or students said about other teachers, comparing them to implicit “norms” (Ball, 2003; Bushnell, 2003; Jeffrey, 2002; Webb, 2005, 2006).

Furthermore, the examination is obvious in North American schooling today not only in the proliferation of high-stakes standardized testing but also in the proliferation of paperwork teachers are required to file and keep track of, concerning everything from student behavior referrals to the collection of students’ signatures when they go over semester absence limits. Michael Apple discussed this phenomenon as part of the “audit culture.” (Apple, 2005a&b, 2007a&b; Kipnis, 2008). According to Apple (2005a), in response to the pressures of marketisation as well as centralization of state control in education and other sectors of society, “standardised and competitive labour processes [have begun] to dominate the lives of the newly ‘marketised’ workers” in sectors previously considered beyond the market (p. 12). The proliferation of paperwork, tracking, testing, etc. is one obvious aspect of such processes that have come into schools as they become increasingly ‘marketised.’

Foucault (1984a) argued that these disciplinary operations of power are distinctly different from the way the power of sovereignty operated in the age of monarchies; “in discipline,” he stated, “it is the subjects who have to be seen” rather than the monarch and his display of overt might. Continuous documentation (paperwork) “[t]urns… real lives into writing… it functions as a procedure of objectification and subjection” (pp. 203-204). Continuous documentation allows the subject to be known, documented, classified, objectified, subjectified (or subjected).
What does this accomplish? What is the point, in other words? Foucault stated in “Panopticism” that “the disciplines provide, at the base, a guarantee of the submission of forces and bodies” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 211). But for what would this binding and building up of the forces of the body be used? Foucault (1984b) answered,

the two processes—the accumulation of men [and their forces] and the accumulation of capital—cannot be separated; it would not have been possible to solve the problem of the accumulation of men without the growth of an apparatus of production capable of both sustaining them and using them; conversely, the techniques that made the cumulative multiplicity of men useful accelerated the accumulation of capital. (1984b, p. 210)

Foucault’s (2008) description of the “accumulation of capital” connects panopticism to the rise of neoliberalism as a globally dominant economic system, and capitalism has been linked to “globalization” as capitalist market hegemony. However, Rizvi and Lingard (2010) cautioned:

Changing histories of global relations in education policy need to be understood in their specific cultural and political contexts, with a focus on the institutions, organizations, and individuals who are the bearers of globalized education policy discourses. Good education policy analysis thus involves an understanding of how globalization effects actually work, rather than reifying globalization as the blanket cause of specific policy developments (Dale, 1999, 2006, as cited in Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 44)

As researchers, we are cautioned, therefore, not to make lazy attributions or assumptions about how a policy becomes enacted locally, yet the forces of globalization and neoliberalism still have bearing. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) went on to describe how
in recent years, there has been much talk of the need for evidence-based policy and professional practice in the public sector, a focus on ‘what works’ as the basis for public policy. This rise of evidence-based policy is linked to the new public management and pressures for efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of public policy (Head 2008) and perhaps could be seen as the contemporary version of the rational approach to policymaking. (p. 49)

Management, efficiency, and effectiveness, as neoliberal values (Fowler, 1995), do bear on local policy contexts. Exactly what bearing the forces of globalization and neoliberalism have in the specific site of this case study, and how those forces operate, are investigated in this study.

Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) showed that an absolute distinction between the macro- and micro-political is a false one: “In short, everything is political, but every politics is simultaneously a macropolitics and a micropolitics” (p. 213, original emphasis). Asserting this does not to deny any larger structure(s) in the world of public schooling; rather, this assertion simply draws attention to the ways that power always circulates through both macro- and micro-political environments simultaneously—one cannot be considered in isolation from the other (Webb, 2008, p. 132). Rizvi and Lingard (2010) detailed several different meanings of positionality in regards to education policy research in the age of globalization; these included the institutional location of the policy researcher, the researcher’s theoretical and political stance, the researcher’s spatial and national location, and the temporal and historical position of the researcher and the research (pp. 46-48). Thus, both the micro- and macro-political environments matter; the very-large-scale context of the historical connections among neoliberalism, globalization, and schooling matter, as do local instantiations, policy enactments, and unique contexts. In an education system becoming increasingly privatized through charter schools, and
with an increasingly large emphasis on skills training to make a workforce that can “compete in the global economy,” and particularly in the neoliberal environment of the American South (Jones, 2012), it is important to understand the historic connections between corporate capitalism and neoliberalism.

Foucault called the growth of the type of power that can produce and discipline people “bio-power,” and he described it as “a power that exerts a positive influence on life, that endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations” (Foucault, 1984b, p. 259). Power takes place at the level of individual biology—the self—and even smaller, at the level of forces, energies, gestures, movements, perhaps even cells. But it is intertwined with the forces that endeavor to administer, optimize and multiply it. The purposes it is used for are often set forth in policies, but as discussed earlier, policy is not simply text—it is contexts, bodies, subjectivities, resistances, capitulations, epistemologies, histories, genealogies—indeed, an entire ecology.

Power and subjectivity

I’m trying to find my peace / I was made to believe there’s something wrong with me / and it hurts my heart / Lord have mercy, ain’t it plain to see? / This is a cold war / you better know what you’re fighting for.

Janelle Monae, 2010

We have, in consumer society, been made to feel that if we are being paid, we should be willing to submit to certain forms of degradation in exchange for that pay. This economic co-optation desensitizes us and diminishes our feelings of bondedness with all people who are oppressed and abused. It makes us more willing to persecute those that are oppressed and abused because we are ourselves submitting to certain forms of abuse on a daily basis.

bell hooks, 1991
What is the self? What is subjectivity? Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari described “becoming” as a process of flows where the “individual” is not fixed or static but always in flux, interacting with and being affected by, as well as affecting, the environment and its different contexts. But how are affects produced by an environment? Are teachers’ subjectivities prescribed rather than willed or actively negotiated? And who does the willing in the first place? Lukes’ definition of power from his 1974 work *Power: A Radical View* (cited in previous section) illustrated that there is a much more subtle and insidious form of power than overt coercion. Overt coercion can be overtly recognized and perhaps overtly fought against. But how does one resist the shaping of one’s desires? Can one recognize it when and if it happens? The conventional sense in which people generally understand desire is usually a paradigm of ownership; I own and am sovereign over my desires—they are *mine*. But if desire itself can be formed, regulated, molded—then who and what do the molding, and who is the ‘I’ that does the desiring?

Identity implies that there is something essential and unchanging in the self. Subjectivity, on the other hand, calls attention to the constant flux of the self that depends for its existence on embodied experience, the constant integrating of new experiences and ways of knowing, the constant changing and interacting of the self with the world, both social and physical. Todd May (2005) explained in his book on Deleuze that

how we think about our world and how we live in it are entwined… For instance, if particular things are what they are and nothing else, then we will not waste our time imagining what else they might be or might become. We will conform ourselves to the possibilities presented to us by their actuality…. If we abandon this way of thinking of our world, then alternative ways of living may appear to
us. If things don’t have strict borders of identity and if the relations among them are not reducible to natural laws, then we can no longer be sure of what a body is capable. Perhaps there is more going on in our world than is presented to us. We don’t know. The only way to find out is to experiment. (p. 72)

A Deleuzian sense of ‘self,’ or rather, *subjectivity*, is grounded in difference and experimentation, not identity or transcendence (May, 2005, p. 27). Todd May explained: “Transcendence freezes living…Transcendence substitutes knowledge for thought” (p. 27). Deleuze & Guattari’s ‘knowledge through concepts,’ is not a frozen, transcendent knowing. Active thought does not freeze; it moves, and it moves the singularities of concepts, as well as moving through them. It is knowing always moving beyond its knowing. Thought moves through difference, which constitutes the potential ground for thought, the “relation of oneself to oneself,” and ultimately subjectivity (Deleuze, 1988). Kaustuv Roy (2003), in his study of teachers and curriculum, noted,

> Universals do not explain anything, Deleuze is fond of saying, but must themselves be explained. And all explanation can only come from within experience, that is, from immanence, and not from an a priori, transcendental ground…all universals are themselves the constructs of experience. (Roy, 2003, p. 10)

The *self*, then, becomes an experiment in multiplicities continuously in flow. As Roy (2003) explained, “we ourselves are the constructs of difference, multiplicities rather than identities” (p. 33). For Deleuze and Guattari, identity is simply one concept among many; for them, the self *is* not; the self *assembles* and *re-assembles* (is an *assemblage*), constantly in flux and created by multiple forces and intensities. Deleuze (1988, p. 98) explained that subjectivity is
an interiorization of the outside. It is not a doubling of the One, but a redoubling of the Other. It is not a reproduction of the Same, but a repetition of the Different. It is not the emanation of an ‘I’, but something that places in immanence an always other or a Non-self. It is never the other who is a double in the doubling process, it is a self that lives me as the double of the other: I do not encounter myself on the outside, I find the other in me. (Deleuze, 1999, p. 98)

The self, in geological time, is a shade of pink in a particular summer sky at dusk. Or, perhaps a metaphor using the sky reinscribes the notion that subjectivity is transcendent or spiritual because of the sky’s Western historical association with heaven and God. Perhaps subjectivity is more aptly a continental plate, grounded, but in constant motion undetectable to the casual or quick observer, constantly in varying states of upheaval. In this sense, Tom Conley noted that “the struggle for subjectivity is a battle to win the right to have access to difference, variation, and metamorphosis” (Conley, 2005, p. 172). The struggle for subjectivity, in other words, is the battle for the right to experiment, to see what mountains our bodies might be capable of throwing up or tearing down.
If the self is an assemblage, a multiplicity, then, the disciplining of desire (in this case, I will be investigating teachers’ pedagogical desires) becomes a way to actually change the flow of the assemblage in particular ways. This is because Deleuze and Guattari understood desire as the force that assembles and produces instantiations and events, in both the self and the non-human world. Kaustuv Roy explained that

Deleuze rejects the Freudian position that desire is desire for an object, whether phallus or breast. Following Spinoza and Nietzsche, Deleuze turns desire around and understands it as primary, positive, and productive. Instead of aligning desire with fantasy and illusion, as psychoanalysis does, Deleuze sees desire as what produces the real, creating connections, relations, and alignments. (Roy, 2003, pp. 42-43).

Desire, then, is intimately imbricated with power. Foucault named power as productive; Deleuze named desire as that which produces. Power, especially disciplinary power, operates through and in desire; desire is primary and produces in and through the body. This is perhaps what Foucault referred to when he described bio-power as a power that “invests life through and through” (1984b, p 262). Not only human life, but life ontologically, produces by means of desire.

Understanding the self/subjectivity of teachers as assemblage which incorporates the channeling of desire through technologies of disciplinary power, I was now in a better position to investigate how neoliberal educational policy assembled teachers’ subjectivities, how it a/effected their various pedagogical desires, and how/if/when teachers experimented with new becomings that escaped or smoothed the striations of neoliberal accountability policies in public high schools. I discuss my methods and methodology next.
Chapter 3: Methodology and methods

There is hardly a method you know.

T.V. on the Radio, 2006

Move down south... in the wilderness.

Curtis Lane, 2010

Design and methodology: Case study and fieldwork concerning teachers, policy, and subjectivity

A single case study provided an appropriate framework for the conceptual and necessarily messy contextual exploration that this study undertook. Yin (2009) stated that “‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are more explanatory and likely to lead to the use of case studies, histories, and experiments as the preferred research methods. This is because such questions deal with operational links needing to be traced over time, rather than mere frequencies or incidence” (p. 9). A survey could not engage what Lather (2009) called the “messy,” and an experiment was not appropriate because I did not wish to control behaviors or events; rather, I engaged with them in situ, in the complex daily reality of teachers in public high schools. A question of “how” does not wish to control; it attempts to understand mechanisms in all their complexity (as much as possible), and Webb (2009) also noted that case studies are “[intended] to describe situations that do not have a clear set of outcomes... [and to] understand the intricate complexity of one case” (p. 52).

Yin explained that there are several potential designs for case studies; the rationale for this particular study was (paradoxically) a combination of what Yin (2009) called the “representative” or “typical” case and the “unique” case. The school district I studied may be “representative” of many urban/suburban public high schools’ experiences with teacher
subjectivity assemblage in a neoliberal policy environment because of its status in a large, urban/suburban public school district; because of its diversity; and because of its recent district-wide effort to raise test scores. However, I did not wish to gloss over the unique elements in any school environment, and therefore it may be inappropriate to automatically label a particular case study as “representative.”

Because I based this study around questions of how teachers’ subjectivities are formed through power in a particular type of environment and along particular lines of desire, situating myself in the context I wished to understand was paramount. As I returned to the South in late 2011 from Vancouver, British Columbia to conduct my field work, I entered a “wilderness” (Lane, 2010). Though I grew up in the South, this wilderness was unfamiliar to me in its complexity and in its tangled, ecosystem-like organization. It was also a “wilderness” to me in that I was not the same person who left teaching in South Carolina in 2009. The process of preparing for this research changed my own subjectivity in fundamental ways. My studies in graduate school gave me new lenses through which to see, feel, and experience; though my residual knowledge of the geographical area of the school district of my study assisted me in contextualizing the district, I was as much an “outsider” as I ever was when I first moved to the South at eight years old. In this sense, I want to take a moment to discuss myself as ‘instrument’ in this research, and as a particular instrument in a particular place. Who was this tool of research? How did she interact with and develop data? Following this discussion, I will discuss my preferred methods of inquiry in relation to the orientation of the study: A fieldwork in philosophy, rather than fieldwork in culture or sociology.
Researcher’s background, or my-‘self’ in motion

FOUCAULT: Theory does not express, translate, or serve to apply practice: it is practice. But it is local and regional, as you said, and not totalizing....

DELEUZE: Precisely. A theory is exactly like a box of tools. It has nothing to do with the signifier. It must be useful. It must function. And not for itself. If no one uses it, beginning with the theoretician himself (who then ceases to be a theoretician), then the theory is worthless or the moment is inappropriate. We don’t revise a theory, but construct new ones; we have no choice but to make others.

“Intellectuals,” 1972

‘Knowing’ the limitations of one’s positionality, or pushing the limits of one’s knowing in such a way as to “map” both one’s subjectivity and one’s potential limits, helps to undo the most pernicious power relations that may become dangerous in a research situation; it also helps one to grow and expand one’s own subjectivity. According to M. Muñoz (Fieldwork in Philosophy lecture/discussion, March 22, 2011), the researcher herself becomes an “artifact” of the fieldwork. Because we cannot escape the social world and are ourselves embedded in it, it is necessary to understand the subjectivity of the researcher as well as the researched, such that the interaction between the two may be investigated as openly as possible. Drawing on Deleuze’s (1986/1988) concept of the “fold,” St. Pierre explained that a Deleuzian approach to data and research “breaks apart humanist dualisms like inside/outside, self/other, identity/difference, and presence/absence” (1997, p. 178). The Deleuzian concept of the fold also helps to break apart the dualism of researcher/research and can assist in understanding forms of domination that produce false dualisms5. Thus, my own subjectivity necessarily came into play in this investigation because I was the “tool” of the research.

5 “Our society teaches us to think in an either/or mode—kill or be killed, dominate or be dominated” (Lorde, 1979/2007, p. 76)
I was born in Ohio (United States), a third-generation daughter of Polish and Slovak immigrants who came to the United States in the early 20th century. When I first moved to Georgia at the age of eight, I not only moved from a very rural context in Ohio to a very suburban/urban context in metro Atlanta, but I also moved from a nearly all-white, mostly Central- and Eastern-European settler context to a racially and ethnically diverse suburb. However, I did not experience that diversity directly until I attended high school because my parents sent me to a privileged and nearly all-white Catholic school through eighth grade, though our family had noticeably less money than most of my peers’ and friends’ families there. During the first few months of our settling in Georgia, while my family’s car still had Ohio license plates, my family received a note on our car’s windshield in a supermarket parking lot telling us to “go back where we came from.” My family’s home customs (food, religion, sense of humor, etc.) were different from those of my southern, white peers, and even though high school was something of a culture-shock for me in 9th grade (I was in a very racially, religiously, ethnically, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse environment for the first time), in high school, I finally felt that, in some senses, I “fit in,” as there were people from across the globe attending my high school, and I did not feel I had to conform to white, upper-middle-class Southern culture in order to have friends. However, I still benefitted from white privilege, and I am now able to understand many of my experiences through that lens. Upon entering high school, I quickly figured out that in order to have the best chance to attend a more prestigious university, I should take the upper-level, “Gifted” and “Advanced Placement” classes (which did not contain nearly the ethnic, racial, or socioeconomic diversity that the rest of the school did). I was able to switch from “college prep” classes (the ‘average’ classes) to more advanced classes within three weeks of the start of my ninth-grade school year because such a move was not questioned by white
guidance counselors when confronted by white, middle-class parents with a child who had been in private school.

After college, I became a high school English teacher myself. Having come to a greater awareness and understanding of anti-racist feminism, I have questioned whether I fell too easily into the “acceptable” white female “missionary” role that colonizer societies have often relegated females of privilege. I thought, as I was becoming a teacher, that I wanted to “help underprivileged kids;” I specifically sought my first teaching post in a school in South Carolina that was demographically diverse and socioeconomically poor. Looking back on the ways in which my own subjectivity was assembled in such an environment, though, I can see many ways in which my position may have flowed to re-inscribe the same hierarchies of privilege I sought to question and subvert. I have problematized, and must continue to problematize my teaching desires. My motivation in this study was to look critically at the ways teachers’ subjectivities became assembled. In beginning a critical map of the ways signifiers with material consequences (such as race, class, gender, etc.) impact the performative flows in high schools, I might alert others (both in public schools and in academia) to potential spaces of terror, as well as potential spaces of healing from and/or resistance to policy regimes that operate through such signifiers. Teachers may then be able to navigate these spaces more carefully, more ethically, perhaps directing the flows of affects and performances in high schools in ways that aim towards greater social justice—understanding social justice itself as contextual, contested, and flowing, and not essentialized terrain.
Place and location

Riverton County Schools is located in the region of South Carolina called the ‘Upstate;’ the northernmost border of Riverton County comprises the beginnings of the Appalachian Mountains that stretch northward all the way to Canada. The city of Riverton lies just below the mountains and is in the rolling foothills. Just below Riverton, the landscape flattens into what is called the ‘Piedmont’ region—the flat land between the mountains and the coastal lands and marshes. Historically, the ‘Upstate’ of South Carolina has often found itself at least partially excluded from South Carolina politics—it has been mostly comprised of the descendants of both black and white sharecroppers, Scotch-Irish indentured servants, the descendants of the Cherokee people and former slaves. The ‘money’ of the state has largely been centered in the white populations of the metropolitan areas of Charleston in the “lower state” and Columbia in the Piedmont, where the descendants of antebellum land and plantation owners were largely concentrated, both before and after the American Civil War. The representatives elected to the state legislature from Upstate South Carolina have historically been associated with the industries of the area; until the mid-1990s, textile mills dominated much of the economy of the area. With the introduction of NAFTA (which took effect in 1994) and the ‘globalization’ of the 1990s, Central and South American immigrants began coming to the Upstate in significant numbers for the first time, and the district I studied had been greatly impacted by the influx of immigrants. Though historically the Upstate’s economy was dominated by textile manufacturing, manufacturing jobs left the Upstate as well as the entire Southeast in large numbers starting in the 1980s and continuing more rapidly post-NAFTA. Education in the South starting in the late 1990s and early 2000s (and continuing today) has become increasingly focused on what Stuart Rosenfeld (2004) called the “innovation economy” (p. 3). Rosenfeld, principal and founder of
Regional Technology Strategies, Inc., as well as author of the Guides to Cluster-Based Economic Development for both the National Governors’ Association and the European Union (“Stuart Rosenfeld”) wrote in a report to the South Carolina Policy Council:

Today’s industry is comprised not only of high-tech manufacturing businesses, but also of health care providers and service businesses that are dependent on the technical skills of their workers. The days of low wage assembly jobs in our state are long gone, and must be replaced with higher-paying jobs that are filled by people with advanced technical skills. (2004, p. 1)

Rosenfeld’s report advocated the continued advancement of “industry clusters” in South Carolina, such as the automotive industry cluster that has been taking shape in the SC Upstate since the early 2000s. The introduction of a BMW automobile plant changed the Upstate, and the development of the automotive industry cluster in the Upstate has been “supported by a strong partnership between private business, BMW North America, Clemson University and several of the technical colleges” (Rosenfeld, 2004, p. 3). It is also interesting to note that Rosenfeld inserted his own commentary that “Without this comprehensive strategic focus, the state may not produce new jobs in great numbers and in fact, its greatest export may very well become intellectual capital, rather than goods and services” (2004, p. 3). A similar trend continues in other Southeastern states (Jones, 2012). The focus on technical education in the service of tech industries, service work, and the health care industry, as well as the emphasis on “intellectual capital” (using the language of human capital), indicates that neoliberal language and economic and educational policies are strongly in play in South Carolina as well as in the Southeast. Furthermore, it was actually in South Carolina, at Hilton Head Island in 1986, that the National Governors’ Association first decided to adopt the business world’s language and model of
standards and accountability-driven educational reform. The governors were responding to the rising pressure in the 1980s to create jobs in their states because so many manufacturing jobs were moving to low-wage countries overseas (Tucker, 2012).

As of January 2010, South Carolina was ranked 11th nationally by a report card on “school policy and performance” (WCSC, 2010). The state was also ranked first for “its efforts to improve teaching by Quality Counts 2010, one of a series of annual reports published by Education Week. South Carolina ranked seventh for academic standards, assessment and accountability in the same report” (WCSC, 2010). The previous three years had seen South Carolina ranked 36th, 37th, and 39th by the same report, respectively. Last but certainly not least, as mentioned in Chapter 1, legislation has been introduced in the South Carolina legislature to institute mandatory performance pay for teachers, and the fate of this legislative bill is yet to be determined. South Carolina therefore is a state that has been experiencing rapid educational reforms pushed by the state legislature in partnership with business, industry, and the state’s technical and higher education systems, and as such, is a site prime for investigation into the affects of such neoliberal policies on teachers. This background forms the context for the accountability policies this study investigated.

This study investigated teachers’ subjectivities in a diverse (ethnically, nationally, racially, socioeconomically) public school district setting, and I attempted to map ways in which the neoliberal policy environment assembled onto and into teachers’ subjectivities. However, I would be remiss to assume that what many have termed “intersectionality” did not come into play. The ways a teacher’s race, class, gender, sexuality, (dis)ability, national status, etc. were read and experienced by each teacher and by others also necessarily assembled parts of each teacher’s subjectivity.
In an environment that made performative demands of teachers (Ball, 2003), attention to the power-filled assemblages of race, class, (dis)ability, sexuality, age, and gender in the context of the “schoolhouse panopticon” (Bushnell, 2003) was necessary. Delaine (2000) stated that “Reality is a staged performance and the metaphor of the theatre an interactional reality. Theatrical performances and the wearing of masks are no longer restricted to the stage but have ‘creeped into everyday life’” (Goffman, 1959, p. 254, as cited in Delaine, 2000, p. 38). Was it possible that, in the same way that Gillborn (2005) discussed education policy as an act of white supremacy in the UK, a neoliberal education policy environment demanded raced, gendered, and classed performances of its teacher-subjects? How did a white, middle-class, educationally privileged woman in a relationship society reads as heteronormative interact in such a way as to attempt to eliminate, as much as possible, the dangers of a privileged, even potentially colonizing gaze?

**Orientation and methods: A fieldwork in philosophy**

Lather spoke of doing empirical work in social science as “a philosophical ethnography” (not a cultural or sociological one) and explained that, epistemologically,

This is a postmodern materialism that is wary of radical constructivism. In situated inquiry, rooted in the specifics of a study, how does one negotiate the tensions or aporias between ongoing ambiguity and the political push of doing research for social justice? This might be termed a praxis of aporia, after what Derrida (1994) termed “the ordeal of undecidability” (75): tentative, contextual, interventionist, unfinished, in excess of our codes but, still, always already; forces already active in the present. (Lather, 2009, p. 345)
In this study, I explicitly focused on power and subjectivity in interpersonal relationships in a highly striated institutional formation—an institution in which power circulated. As such, I investigated power and subjectivity as concepts, from a philosophical, rather than a cultural or sociological perspective. Investigating subjectivity, the “assemblage” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) of the self through relations of power flows, intensities and affects, mapped philosophical, ontological, and epistemological issues. This work took philosophy as a starting point to understand how power operates.

“Knowing” is a term deeply imbricated with relations of power. Because “knowing” is often associated with essentialism and positivism, “knowing” is dangerous in that it can do violence if treated lightly or incautiously. The relations of power that attempt to fix identities and ways of living are dangerous relations that have historically functioned to colonize a subject, to arrange and assemble an object of study, a people, a race, a tribe, a nation, or subjectivities according to the desires of dominant/hegemonic power (Smith, 1999). Language itself, even the language of research, has been used for such white supremacist, patriarchal, colonial projects. Therefore, I had to pay (even painstaking) attention to the interplay of the language used for research, my own subjectivity (and its unavoidable interactions with the research), and the material, social, and historical conditions created and extended in and through relationships that are discursively constructed. Therefore, following Patti Lather (2009), I gave weight in this study to “what-is-there beyond one’s knowing of it;” (p. 346) in other words, I proceeded with caution to attempt not to reinforce unequal power relations or allow easy and/or unquestioned categories to operate in my interactions or through my writing. Was I successful in this task? I believe I have an ethical obligation to remain open to those who may point out my own omissions or oversights, but I interrogated, and continue to interrogate, my writing and myself as
this project manifested. Indeed, this study “[took] the side of the messy” (Lather, 2009, p. 346).

In doing this work, I attempted to “think with” rather than to know. I began thinking with several “conceptual personae” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994) in my conceptual framework, and I extended this thinking with the teachers I encountered, with the situated place of the school district, and with the policy environment I found there.

To speak of “knowing” in positivist terms enters essentialist terrain that has been called into question by much of social science in the latter half of the 20th century. Todd May (2005) explained in *Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction* that according to Derrida, “there are no ontological identities to be discovered, because what looks like a stable identity is not” (p. 18). There are, in other words, no fixed, stable, absolute truths, either in language or in reality. In fact, entropy theory in physics, chemistry, and biochemistry, as well as the implications of quantum physics, support and mirror this notion of ontology (Sen & Stacey, 2010). While dealing with the more nuanced possibilities for the application of entropy theory and quantum physics to the social sciences is beyond the scope of my current work, it is important that I explain how a “fieldwork in philosophy” can take place in absence of a fixed notion of ontological identities or Things to be discovered (May, 2005, pp. 18-19). Fieldwork in philosophy has a unique relationship to case study research, and in particular to concept development and analytical generalizations (Yin, 1994).

Because I was working in a single-district context, working to understand the flows and intensities borne of policy that built and striated the environment, and thereby, teachers’ subjectivities, the situated context of the school and the ever-changing flows that entered and exited the school environment bore greatly upon the type of analysis appropriate and ethical for the investigation of subjectivities in such a situation. Concerning ethics, Lather remarked,
“Embracing not knowing is the condition of a less dangerous doing” (2009, p. 346). Case study bears a unique relationship, then, to fieldwork in philosophy, in that it allows unique opportunities to bear witness to and participate in the unknown, where concepts may be built and/or emerge with the environment and with participants. On the other hand, on April 3, 2011, at the University of British Columbia, unceded Coast Salish territory, Gayatri Spivak told an audience that knowing, in contrast to its usual positivistic definition, can be defined as “intended affect.” By Spivak’s definition, then, we may indeed be able to “know” not for but toward new concepts in a case study setting.

Lather made an important distinction between “scientism” and “scientificity” that was useful for this study because, like this study, this distinction drew on Foucauldian understandings of the historical and power-inscribed nature of scientific inquiry: “Foucauldian scientificity is deeply historical, power-inscribed, both enabling and constraining, and ripe for genealogical delineation of its conditions of possibility” (Lather, 2009, p. 344). A type of what Lather called “Foucauldian scientificity” is more appropriate than an ahistorical, decontextualized, and epistemologically narrow “scientism” (Lather, 2009, p. 344) for a philosophical investigation of teachers’ subjectivities as coded, performed, and formed in a particular (neoliberal) school policy environment. Indeed, as Lather (2009) immediately went on to say: “Situated against both hypothetic-deductive orthodoxy and an anything goes arbitrariness, scientificity is an area of struggle in broadening the definition of science. This is especially so in this time of the rage for accountability where, I argue, policy work can be fruitfully situated as an arena for refusing to concede science to scientism in terms of an engaged social science” (Lather, 2009, p. 344). This study, in focusing on the e/affects that a neoliberal policy produced in/on teachers’ subjectivities through its “rage for accountability” thus extended the struggle for “broadening the definition of
science,” (Lather, 2009, p. 344) and a case study uniquely allowed engaged social science in that the full subjectivity of the researcher was engaged and immersed in the situation from which concepts emerged/were built. Case study, in its emphasis on paying intricate, scientific (not “scientism-ific”) attention to unclear outcomes and intricate complexity (Webb, 2009, p. 52) helped to open aporias for new concepts to coalesce.

Thinking and performing power: Methods in the study of subjectivity

In analyzing teachers’ performative subjectivities, then, I needed to pay very close attention to teachers’ desires for (or against, or with) performances of “being accountable;” whose desires appeared to come into play and to what extent; how teachers striated their own subjectivities according to stealth forms of power; and how the micro- and macro-environments (federal and district policies, neoliberal discourse, discourses of race, gender, class, material conditions, surveillance mechanisms, teacher-to-teacher and teacher-to-administration interactions, etc.) flowed into confluences that assembled teachers’ subjectivities.

Webb’s (2009) four axioms of “the structuration of educators’ micropolitical actions” became helpful here. According to Webb: (a) educators socially construct their working realities in relation to both the macro- and microstructures in which their work is located; (b) because notions of agency are structured, stealth forms of power represent the segmentation of power; (c) the segmentation of power reproduces a striation of cognition, and (d) micro- and macro-environments are better characterized as symbiotic rather than as autonomous arenas. (2009, pp. 46-48) (See Figure 3.1; below.) This map acted as a guide in considering the data I collected.
Methods overview

The actual methods used for dealing with the data were borrowed from ethnography and included conducting semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. I transcribed some of the interviews and outsourced the transcription of others. Each teacher also participated in a “member check,” and I agreed to send the teachers the quotations I intended to use from their interviews, allow them to make revisions if they deemed necessary, and to generally negotiate what form their data would take in the write-up. The interviews were initially transcribed “all-in,” including conversational pauses and markers such as ‘ums,’ ‘you knows,’ ‘likes,’ etc. I would have preferred to leave these all in the write up because I found some of them meaningful. However, leaving all of them in ultimately was neither practical nor ethical; I found that one participant was quite uncomfortable with appearing to be what he deemed “less than articulate” in the initial transcript. Perhaps this was my mistake—I knew I was interviewing English Language Arts teachers. As an ELA teacher myself, it did occur to me that quite probably the teachers would want their language “cleaned up,” made into coherent and “properly” punctuated sentences. Language itself is always contextual, historically constituted, and political, but the
need to translate oral language to a written, scholarly context was not lost on participants, and all wanted their language represented in a context-appropriate manner.

After ‘member checks,’ I did initial and intermediary codings of the interview transcripts and made notes on emerging topics and themes (see Appendix B). These were compared to the research questions and the conceptual framework. Notes were reviewed, and I coalesced the initial codings around “emerging themes,” which were really constructed commonalities. However, it is a false representation for me to say that re-organization and new ideas did not appear or continue to come into being as this text itself was composed. As Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) stated, "Writing is thinking, writing is analysis, writing is indeed a seductive and tangled method of discovery" (p. 965). Therefore, this text also became a tracing and an experiment as I wrote it; it could not become otherwise, though its possibilities for becoming were and are multiple. I also include footnotes about and occasional references to music and/or song lyrics and other “transgressive data” that made its way into the study because the first time I ever read Deleuze and Guattari, sitting in a coffee shop on Commercial Drive in Vancouver, BC, I began almost immediately noticing the way in which reading their work “queered/queried” my experience and began calling attention to synchronicities, most especially between the songs playing in the coffee shop and the reading itself. This experience struck me as so odd and fascinating that I began furiously taking notes on the songs that were playing during the time I read certain sections of the introduction chapter to A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. The experience resembled a re-arrangement of the rhizomatic connections of my brain cells, and indeed, during the next class my advisor taught (where we were to discuss this reading), my advisor showed pictures of neurons and their tentacled interconnectivity as
examples of Deleuzian “rhizomes.” As such, the analysis of this data will make an attempt at web-like analysis, doubling back on some moments, dwelling in others, passing over still more.

**Interviews**

**Participants**

All interviewees were high school teachers who had experience with accountability under the SC School Report Card policies. All participants were English Language Arts (ELA) teachers who either currently taught or finished their careers teaching high school English. Teachers were recruited by contact first with key informants in the school district, utilizing a “snowball sampling” technique. Teachers were not explicitly recruited under ELA teaching criteria, but the effect of the “snowball sampling” was that all who participated were ELA teachers.

**Semi-structured interviews**

Interviews were semi-structured with guiding questions (See Appendix A). The semi-structured format allowed me as the researcher to frame the discussion around the major concepts in play (power, disciplinary power, subjectivity, assemblage) while leaving space within the interview format for openness to “lines of flight” that emerged. Indeed, the aporias that occurred within interviews became the spaces of mutual philosophical inquiry and concept co-creation; this work therefore was not amenable to a tightly-controlled interview format. The interview data was not analyzed from a phenomenological or narrative framework; in framing this study as fieldwork in philosophy, the ‘lived experience’ of teachers was very important, but the ‘self’ and ‘experiences’ were not essentialized; they were interrogated for power. Indeed,

Denzin (1989) asserts that rather than arguing which interpretive frame (the inquirer’s or the story-giver’s) is the correct one, we ought to be trying to understand *how* a narrating subject provides coherence to her or his life. (as cited in Larson, 1997, p. 467)
How a narrating subject (in this case, both teacher and researcher are narrating subjects) provided coherence to her or his life (in the interviews, in my data analysis and write-up) were spaces in which power was investigated.

Furthermore, just as fieldwork in philosophy breaks down the binary of researcher/research, interviews in fieldwork in philosophy also necessarily broke down and questioned the binary of self/other. It is precisely because this binary was broken down, questioned, and opened for analysis, that interviews in a single-case study found themselves so amenable to fieldwork in philosophy and concept building in which we “find the other in ourselves” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 98). Using methods which not only did not “reify the Self-Other hyphen of social research” (Fine, 1994, p. 16) but which actually planted themselves squarely entangled in the hyphen, questioning the construction of the narratives of both the interviewer (researcher) and the interviewee (participant), entering a space where subjectivities and environments assembled subjectivities and vice-versa, the researcher’s own subjectivity became both tool and artifact. So did the subjectivity of the participants. These interviews were more than “power-sensitive conversations” (Haraway, 1988, as cited in Fine, 1994, p. 23); they were power-full. If interviewer and interviewee did/do not come away from the research encounter changed in some way, perhaps even questioning who interviewed who or whose idea was which, the research would not have been done right. The interview process may in fact be approximated by the image of M.C. Escher’s 1948 Drawing Hands:

**Figure 3.2**: The original figure has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It was a drawing of two hands, each of which is drawing the other in the drawing. Original source: Escher, M. C. (1948). *Drawing hands*. [Lithograph]. Retrieved July 11, 2012 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drawing_Hands

Furthermore, the interviews, as conducted from the standpoint of Lather’s “philosophical ethnography” (2009), were not an attempt at producing ‘truth’ as such, but instead became an ongoing interpretive engagement, a multi-layered, power-inscribed, historical and genealogical moment of “coming to worthiness” (St. Pierre, 2004, p. 291) of the event of the interviews and their ‘data.’ Participants’ expressions in interviews were pregnant with meaning, and as the interviews captured moments of these teachers’ changing expressions, I also engaged with participants after the interviews, continuing discussions (sometimes more at length, sometimes more briefly) in-person, over email, and by phone about the meanings and interpretations of some of these expressions. I did not regard these expressions, or the statements I go on in this study to make about them, as strictly ‘mine’ or ‘theirs’ as such. To explain further, St. Pierre (2004) stated:

Foucault (1971/1972), in a similar vein, writes that ‘the subject of the statement should not be regarded as identical with the author of the formulation—either in substance, or in function. He is not in fact the cause, origin, or starting-point of the phenomenon of the written or spoken articulation of a sentence.’ (p. 95, as cited in St. Pierre, 2004, p. 291)

Both the interviews and ‘my’ engagement with them as researcher took place from this philosophical standpoint. Because ‘I’ as researcher(’s subjectivity) am not/was not (becoming) the “cause, origin, or starting-point of the written or spoken articulation[s]” in this study, nor were the participants the causes, origins, or starting-point of theirs, the analysis followed ““a logic of impersonal individuation rather than personal individualization, of singularities rather than particularities. It [could] never be completely specified”” (Rajchman, 2001b, p. 8, as cited in St. Pierre, 2004, p. 291).
Nonetheless, some framing was necessary for these interviews. I assumed at the outset of this study, based on my own experiences of power with and through the School Report Card Policy, that other high school teachers’ subjectivities also became created with, through, in, and/or in resistance to the SRCP policies. In order to understand how other high school teachers’ subjectivities became assembled vis à vis these policies and how other teachers experienced power vis à vis these policies, my questions were framed around establishing important elements of teachers’ teaching subjectivities and desires, the disciplinary technologies encompassed by the school report card policies, zones of performativity, and opportunities to think power together with teachers. Based on my own experiences of performative demands on my teaching, particularly around this set of policies, I hoped that as the interviews took place, teachers would understand that I was asking questions relevant to their lives. I hoped that the interviews also provided an opportunity for teachers to think more and think differently about a policy regime they are/were subject to/with on a very regular basis, a policy regime that in my own experience, was woven into the very fabric of everyday experience in the “schoolhouse panopticon” (Bushnell, 2003).

Interviews took between 1.5-2 hours and were conducted either on weekends or weekday afternoons, at two local coffee houses, at the teachers’ discretion. I recruited four participants total, and while each teacher was officially interviewed once, follow-up interviews and questions were conducted in order to coalesce findings and allow teachers time to express follow-up thinking. Interviews were recorded with the subjects’ permission, and transcriptions were given to participants for their confirmation. Larson (1997) instructed researchers to be mindful that with interview data, the stories the researcher receives are only ever partial, and that as many member-checks and follow-up dialogues as possible assist in building more trustworthy research;
though, in this case, each follow-up was read as an additional layer of interpretation and concept-building rather than as a set of corrections per se. Ethical engagement here was paramount.

**Document analysis**

Documents were obtained and analyzed pertaining to the School Report Card Policy at the school, district, and state levels. The documents were obtained primarily using the researcher’s own background knowledge as a starting point, and branching out into a search for other documents and news articles that proceeded intuitively from Riverton County Schools’ and the South Carolina Department of Education’s websites, using keywords (South Carolina Report Card Policy, South Carolina and Education Accountability, ADEPT, etc.) in search engines (primarily Google) online. Keywords such as ‘accountability’ were searched for within documents, and other words that aligned with neoliberal ideology such as ‘quality,’ ‘efficiency,’ ‘Twenty-First Century economy,’ etc. were highlighted in the analysis. Language that indicated particular striations of subjectivity along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, etc. are discussed in Chapter Four. The document analysis that led to the background on the district, including how the SRCP operated in Riverton County, is discussed in Chapter Four drawing on a broad understand of “critical policy analysis” (Prunty, 1985, as cited in Taylor, 1997, p. 24; Baez, 2007; Turner, 2010), in which social context and history, and the struggle over language and power, and whose knowledge ‘counts’ (discourse), is paramount and highlighted. The analysis attempted to “inquire into which…constructions are privileged” and “[expose] hidden power arrangements, oppressive practices, and ways of thinking” (Baez, 2007, p. 19).
Journal

I needed a means to be vigilant with my own subjectivity during the interviews and analysis of this research in order to build into the research process further engagement with trustworthiness. For this reason, I kept a series of reflections (some verbally recorded, some written in notebooks, some typed, some sketched) on my own subjectivity and subjective reactions as I did this work. The “journal” included my own subjective reactions to the research process and all its elements, including affective flows (stress, joy, confusion, etc.), dreams, preliminary attempts at concept-building that were fleshed out or changed in the actual analysis, and other elements of the research project that inevitably seemed “in excess of [its] codes” (Lather, 2009, p. 6), or not to fit elsewhere in the study, but which seemed to have bearing. The journal (loosely defined) acted as a supplement to the other forms of data collected and an aid in the analysis. The journal also served to heighten my own ethical engagement with the research and allowed me to more fully track the process of my analytical and writerly decisions as I completed the study. Though initially planned to be scheduled and regular, the reality of the study was that journaling took place haphazardly, according to lines of flight as they appeared, but at least once following each initial interview. The journal became even in excess of its codes; I could not confine it to one space or even one medium. I kept a couple of physical notebooks, a few folders of Word documents, some audio self-recordings, some physical drawings, and some poems and fiction work. This part of the study engaged with what St. Pierre (1997) called “transgressive data,” and was folded into the concept-building of the study.
Context of the study

All lives are formed in history, power inequities, institutional arrangements, and relational negotiations.


Teacher subjectivity matrix: His blood was in the ship⁶

Before discussing the interview data in-depth, I will introduce a bit about each of the study’s participants. They did not share their life stories with me, nor is this a “life history” study; however, they did reveal bits of relevant information about their subjectivities. I began each interview by asking: How would you describe yourself to someone who did not know you and who had never met you? I was hoping for information about race, class, gender, etc., and I did get some of that information from some teachers. However, this question also offered a space for teachers to discuss aspects of their teaching subjectivities that appeared most relevant to them at that time. Their subjectivities appeared and interacted with mine as we spoke out of our various locations—spoke ourselves into becoming. Our conversations would not have been possible without our various positions, histories, and meanings; indeed, our “blood,” or our subjectivities, became tied up in and coursed through the moving “ships” of our locations and histories and experiences.⁷

---

⁶ Synchronous phrase from a dream from 9/30/2011
⁷ Using this phrase, I do not wish to reify the dangers of the concept of “blood” as kinship, entitlement, identity, or nationalism—but using it did point toward the genealogy of all our subjectivities as they met and performed for and with each other in the interviews and in the text. The word ‘ship’ also drew attention to the importance of motion in a Deleuzian/Guattarian framework of analysis.
Figure 3.3: Teacher participant subjectivity matrix

*BRSC: Born and raised in South Carolina
**School ratings based on South Carolina Report Card Policy and ESEA ratings, discussed later
Introducing the participants:

**DS:** First of all, I taught for 30 years. I’ve always taught in low-achieving schools according to “standards,” or testing. I am a male; I’m pretty strict, straightforward; I was in the army, so I have a definitive line of thinking in all things. In other words, I go step by step, objective by objective. I think I’m a very kind person; I tend to give breaks, or did give breaks. I like people a lot; I like kids a lot. I really enjoyed them as people. I love teaching; maybe I got a little tired of it at the 34th year, but I really did love all the experiences that I had as a teacher. I was an administrator for 7 years, and I did not love that experience, but it was beneficial. I taught middle school from 7th grade all the way through 12th grade. And that period would be 27 years of the total 34.

**SP:** Well, I grew up in the south, and I always wanted to teach school. I did get my certification to do so, and I’ve been doing so for 33 years. I recently retired. And I truly enjoy teaching students. I think it was the right career because it has made me grow as a person. But on the other hand, I’m a mother of two wonderful daughters, and learning from them and from the students I taught, and just the materials I had to teach, all that together has made my life full, and fulfilling. And I’m a grandmother, so that’s another added key—now I’m even learning more about life through my grandson.

**IJ:** Just in general, I’m a very creative person, so I have what I call “multiple project personalities;” in addition to being a teacher. I’m always doing multiple things in my life just to keep myself well-rounded. As a teacher, I try to bring a lot of that into the classroom as well. We teach on block schedule, so we don’t do one thing from the beginning to the end of the class; we might do four or five different activities during a block. . . . I’ve taught everything. I’ve taught from first grade on up. At one of the schools I taught at when I first began, I taught completely out of my field. I was a music teacher because they needed one, and I needed a job. And I taught two days a week in [large western US state] in a front room of a millhouse next door to the elementary school because there wasn’t a room for music. And the school was so tiny—there were 54 students, first through eighth grade.

**Figure 3.4:** Participants’ introductions of themselves.
I have chosen to introduce the participants who co-created knowledge with me in this study using some of the words with which they introduced themselves in the interviews, not because I wish to reify their ‘voices’ but because the aspects of their subjectivities they revealed about themselves were interesting and surprising to me; DS stated that he was ‘pretty strict’ but also ‘kind’ and ‘gave breaks.’ Each teacher also included concepts of enjoyment, pleasure, and/or passion in the way each introduced her/himself, indicating that the affective aspects of teaching subjectivity were indeed primary sites of subjectivity formation for these teachers, which will be discussed in chapter five.

**Data analysis**

In the analysis of ‘data’ (interview transcripts, notes, documents, journal data), my text also interviewed itself; it “ask[ed] why one research question or interpretation … prevailed over
others” (Fine, 1994, p. 16); it “look[ed] multiply at how [it constructed] the stories [it told] about others’ data” (Lather, 1991, as cited in Fine, 1994, p. 25). As this research could not be politically neutral, my analysis attempted to follow Fine’s (1994) delineation of the three criteria of feminist activist scholarship:

First, the author is explicit about the space in which she stands politically and theoretically—even as her stances are multiple, shifting and mobile. Second, the text displays critical analyses of current social arrangements and their ideological frames. And third, the narrative reveals and invents disruptive images of “what could be.” (Lather, 1986, as cited in Fine, 1994, p. 24)

Spaces where “what could be” is revealed or invented are spaces of becoming, aporia—spaces open for concept-building and for disruption of the status quo.

And finally, as St. Pierre (1997) detailed in her article concerning the “irruption of transgressive data,” the categories given to us with which to write a traditional research analysis are simply, at times, insufficient. Just as St. Pierre decided that she had to “‘say yes to that which interrupt[ed] [her] project,’” (Spivak, 1990, as cited in Hutnyk, McQuire, & Papastergiadis, 1986, p. 47, as cited in St. Pierre, 1997, p. 178), I found that in representing the entanglement of my data in multiple hyphens (self-other, researcher-research, interviewer-interviewee, etc.) I needed to find (some) novel ways of writing and/or representing my research, which I will discuss momentarily.
Generalization, validity/reliability, and suitability of methods

The case study method was also particularly suited to fieldwork in philosophy because of its emphasis on generalization to concepts rather than to empirical or statistical generalizations. The case study’s findings will also be assumed to be internally generalizable (Maxwell, 1992, as cited in Smith, 2000, p. 153). Concepts developed from the study may assist in what has been termed “theory extension” or “theory refinement,” and may also have practical implications (as opposed to applications) for the teachers who participated, for other similarly situated teachers, and for school and district-level policies if the concepts created are shared with teachers and district personnel. The goal will be to contribute both to theory as well as to teachers’ and districts’ understandings of the functioning of policy discourse and its regulation of teachers’ subjectivities.

A common charge against case study research is that its findings are not statistically generalizable. The question often raised is: How do we know that these findings are representative? Some advocates of case study respond to this by arguing that it is directed towards a different kind of general conclusion from that offered by survey research: Thus, Yin (1994) argued that it aims at ‘analytical’ not ‘empirical’ generalization, while Hammersley, Gomm, & Foster (2000) claimed that it involves ‘logical’ rather than ‘statistical’ inference (p. 234).

“Qualitative researchers often look for patterns, but they do not try to reduce the multiple interpretations to a norm” (Glesne, 2006, p. 9) Not reducing multiple interpretations to ‘norms’ honored Lather’s ‘messy’ and ‘what is there beyond one’s knowing;’ a qualitative case study seeks to be analytically valid to theory, reliable in its thoroughness and honesty, and also valid
because it does not seek to improperly reduce the irreducibilities of that which is researched (unique human experiences, power relations in situ). Smith (2000) reconceptualized validity as “trustworthiness” in qualitative research, drawing on the dual concepts of goodness and utility. “A trustworthy account is one ‘worth paying attention to, worth taking account of’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1985, p. 290)… A trustworthy account is one that demonstrates ‘the quality of goodness’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 233)” (as cited in Smith, 2000, p. 142). I took the criteria of ‘goodness’ to mean ethical engagement, honesty, and thoroughness (as much as possible for the data collected) for this study. Further, the quality of utility fulfills Deleuze’s (“Intellectuals,” 1972) requirement that theory “must be useful. It must function.” Smith (2000) also used the criteria of “reflexivity and transparency,” (p. 143), and drew on Altheide and Johnson (1994), who stated that what becomes paramount is “not so much the objective truth of what is being stated as … the process or way of knowing. We should continue to be concerned with producing texts that explicate how we claim to know what we know. (p. 496) (emphasis in original)” (as cited in Smith, 2000, p. 144). In this way, the journal portion of this study made a contribution to its trustworthiness (not ‘validity’).

Furthermore, Hammersley, Gomm, & Foster (2000) argued that case study “reveals theoretical relations in situ.” Case study therefore is suited to the type of feminist practice-in-theory Catharine MacKinnon (1996) explained:

For women in the world, the gap between theory and practice is the gap between practice and theory. We know things with our lives, and live that knowledge, beyond anything any theory has yet theorized….To write the theory of this practice is not to work through logical puzzles or entertaining conundra, not to fantasize utopias, not to moralize or tell people what to do. It is not to exercise
authority; it does not lead practice. Its task is to engage life through developing mechanisms that identify and criticize rather than reproduce social practices of subordination and to make tools of women’s consciousness and resistance that further a practical struggle to end inequality. This kind of theory requires humility and it requires participation. (para. 3)

This kind of theory is practice, and this theory-as-engaged-practice is itself an assemblage. It is ethical on account of its flow and its openness to changing based on the territories it encounters, and its collapsing of absolute distinctions between the micro- and macro-political realms. This kind of research seeks, on a practical level, to further practical struggles to increase teachers’ power in their practice, and over their subjectivities’ subjectification.

**Significance**

This research developed implications for schools and/or districts, and opened possibilities for different becomings. The study assembled itself onto the flows of power within teachers’ subjectivities or within the institutions of school and district, perchance re-directing some of those flows in new, but ultimately unpredictable ways. It assembled itself onto theories, refining or extending them so that the theories may map onto other contexts (Snow, Morill, & Anderson, 2003), though the particular and site-specific flows this piece of research may open up will stay specific to the site of the research. The a/effects of this research aimed towards mapping the operations of power vis à vis teachers’ subjectivities. In this way, the doing was the being, or, in other words, this work became not so much a “fieldwork in philosophy” as a “fieldwork as philosophy.”
Limitation

And, finally, there were areas of subjective terrain that were not mapped. Earning the teachers’ respect and trust by carefully assembling my own subjectivity with theirs was an ongoing process I will not cease to engage with after the thesis has been defended and made publicly available. I need to continue to demonstrate, through my words, my actions, my choices, my mannerisms, and the ways I conduct my research and writing, that I am working not to re-inscribe hierarchies of privilege, whether the patriarchal hierarchy of researcher-subjects or the operation of white privilege, class privilege, male privilege, able-bodied privilege, or heteronormative hegemony. There was some conceptual and experiential terrain that became too dangerous for teachers to feel comfortable discussing or including in the finalized transcripts of our discussions—they let me know these things—and so to respect the teachers, it was left undisturbed and/or unwritten.

And last but not least, in generalizing to theory and not to people or location, the data I collected with teachers in this particular school district may or may not “represent” how other teachers’ subjectivities in other settings would become assembled by power flows from policy. However, this study assists in refining theories of power, subjectivity, and assemblage in relation to neoliberal educational policies and privileged aspects of subjectivity, and these theories may have implications for how power operates in other settings. The study’s findings may bear strong resemblances to those from other settings, but are by definition not repeatable.
Chapter 4: The operation of power between teachers and the SRCP

*The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes, but in having new eyes.*

*Marcel Proust, 1923*

*No political revolution is possible without a radical shift in one’s notion of the possible and the real.*

*Judith Butler, 1999*

This chapter will address the first research question, “how does power operate between/among Riverton County high school teachers and Riverton County Schools’ policies surrounding the annual ‘School Report Card’ Policy (SRCP)?” Power operated through the disciplinary technologies Foucault (1984a, c, & d) described. Specifically, the SRCP utilized hierarchical observations, normalizing judgment, and examinations to perpetuate panoptic surveillance of teachers’ subjectivities and pedagogies. However, teachers also discussed situated knowledge that these technologies failed to account for, which will be discussed at the end of this chapter. This chapter will lead into the next, which will discuss the second research question.

Education as guided learning is a way of honoring the unique and entropic possibilities for human life, itself a unique and entropic possibility. Teachers, like students, like schools and communities, are idiosyncratic. They exist in specific contexts and not outside of context. The teachers who participated in this study defied easy heuristics. With each interview conducted, layers of meaning deterritorialized and reterritorialized themselves in flux. As such, these chapters can only ever hope to become a translation of the experiential aspects of this study. These chapters are necessarily a snapshot of a snapshot (the transcripts) of a snapshot (the interviews) of these teachers’ lives and communities at a given point in time.
The writing, selecting, and transforming of the research ‘data’ here was not and could not be neutral. To falsely purport to be ‘objective’ (which is impossible for a study conducted and imbricated in the social world) belies that this study took place between and among myself, my circumstances, the teachers who participated, their circumstances and school communities, past and present, and the district in which they all worked. This study resembles Pierre Boulez’s collection of essays *Le Pays fertile: Paul Klee* as discussed by Paul Rabinow (2003): like Boulez’s work, this study seeks to become “an instance of a friendly exchange between artists” (p. 69). I am one of the artists, and perhaps the one exerting the most control over the study and the text, but I have been, and continue to be through this text, in an exchange with other ‘artists,’ for teaching is much more art than science, and as illustrated in chapter three, interviews and interview studies are like hands drawing hands. My text, also like Boulez’s, takes a “philosophical and pedagogical” form, and “its mode is formative, of self and other” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 69). As Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) explained,

Language is a constitutive force, creating a particular view of reality and of the Self. Producing “things” always involves value—what to produce, what to name the productions, and what the relationship between the producers and the named things will be…. No textual staging is ever innocent…. Styles of writing are neither fixed nor neutral but rather reflect the historically shifting domination of particular schools or paradigms. Social scientific writing, like all other forms of writing, is a sociohistorical construction and, therefore, is mutable. (p. 960)

As such, this text participates in the constraints and the possibilities lived by all the teacher-participants in this study (including myself). It also participates in the constraints and possibilities of an academic thesis, attempting at all times to become more, or other than a thesis.
as well, as ‘my’ investment in this work includes the notion that a thesis should not be done only for a thesis’ sake; such work becomes dangerous when pursued only for credentials. It, too, should experiment with reality. Teachers perform and fabricate, resist and create, capitulate and overcome, and this text attempts to do likewise. Though it is constrained by the requirements of a formal master’s thesis in a particular academic field, it also both utilized and created what St. Pierre (1997) called “transgressive” data. As such, there may be some parts of this text that seem non-traditional or surprising. This is on purpose, and this is to honor what this study attempts to study, and to do and become. The data and writing style attempt to honor “the messy,” and like teaching itself, this text seeks to become a form of “organized chaos.”

**Analysis of Riverton County Schools' policy environment: ‘Quality’ education and educators with whom discussing power dynamics is forbidden?**

*The multiple, discontinuous, unstable, and tactical nature of discourse and discursive practices insists that relations of power are contextually specific, mobile and potentially fragile. This suggests a subject who is subjectivated—formed and constrained, but not determined—through the productive power of discursive practices that render the `world` and the `self` knowable and known.*

_Foucault, 1990, 1991, as cited in Youdell, 2004_

The recruitment of teacher participants in the study was partially delayed because the research proposal to the school district was denied. Though the district delineates on its website that the usual time for hearing back concerning research proposals is four weeks, I heard back in a single week and was given a simple denial, stating that the district at that time was not interested in participating in my research. I asked the district for feedback as to whether the timing of my research study or the topic of the research was the reason for the proposal’s rejection; however, I never received a reply to my inquiry. Because the district declined to...

---

8 I recognize that even making such a statement puts me in a rather contradictory position. While receiving credentials for this work is indeed privileged in society, I attempt to use this research space to struggle simultaneously for different becomings and knowledge toward social justice both inside and outside of academic space.
participate, I was unable to visit these teachers’ schools, observe their practices, or use their district email accounts to contact them. So, I recruited participants through key contacts I had established in years past and by word of mouth. It was a small and modified form of “snowball sampling.”

The office to which I submitted my research proposal within Riverton County Schools was the “Department of Accountability and Quality Assurance.” The very language used in the naming of this department had the effect of delimiting what research would be deemed acceptable or appropriate within the district. It would be interesting to know if there was an explicit directive(s) from the state or other layers of the educational bureaucracy dictating or informing the naming of this department or the types of research it is generally permitted to accept within the school district, but neither could my searching find any such directive, nor are similar departments of neighboring districts named likewise.

Either way, the name of the department reinscribed, reified, and legitimated the concepts of accountability and quality, both key words in neoliberal educational policy discourse. The introduction to the “Department of Accountability and Quality Assurance” and its functions read as follows on the district website:

Our department supports and assists schools and district representatives in reaching goals by designing and implementing planned programs of research, testing, evaluation, and accountability structures related to the ongoing development of instructional and other student-related programs. In addition, we provide constituents with data and concomitant interpretations with the intent to better inform data users in making data-driven decisions. General departmental functions include: testing; evaluating programs; writing and evaluating grants; training for school building teams/leaders related to strategic planning
and data analysis; facilitating accreditation processes to meet both internal and external accountability and accreditation goals; and providing research along with other supporting functions. (Riverton County Schools, 2014)

The repetition of the words ‘data’ and ‘testing’ constructed the department as functioning within a positivist, functionalist framework for understanding the meanings of both ‘research’ and ‘accountability.’ The district also implicitly constructed ‘testing’ and ‘evaluation’ as “student-related” practices, drawing on the common conflation of standardized testing and “student-centered” education in current neoliberal educational discourse. Teachers were implicitly some of the ‘data users’ cited in the first paragraph, and ‘data-driven decisions’ were implicitly constructed as being in the best interests of students. The “internal and external accountability and accreditation goals” referenced here are not made specific, but most likely refer to the South Carolina School Report Card policy as well as other state and federal measures under No Child Left Behind.

Additionally, the title of the department, “Accountability and Quality Assurance,” as a “policy technology” (Ball, 2003, p. 215) linked the concept of a ‘quality’ education (and its ability to be ‘assured’ to the consumer public [and the implication is consumeristic in that the word ‘quality’ draws upon citation of ‘quality inspections’ in manufacturing, business, etc.]) to the regime of accountability currently in place. In other words, to take part in accountability policies and regimes was to assure quality, and assuring quality was a form of accountability. Ball (2003) explained that within neoliberal discourse, there becomes “‘the possibility of a triumphant self[,]’ of becoming a new kind of professional[,] or of entry into the ever expanding ranks of the executors of quality” (p. 218). And furthermore, “The new technologies of reform play an important part in aligning public sector organizations with the methods, culture, and
ethical system of the private sector” (Ball, 2003, p. 216). As these values become more deeply aligned,

The changing roles of the central management agencies in this new environment rest, as the OECD (1995: 75) put it, on ‘monitoring systems’ and the ‘production of information’. It is … these aspects of reform, monitoring systems and the production of information, that… engender what Lyotard (1984) calls the terrors of performativity. (Ball, 2003, p. 216)

Further, among the “projects usually denied” listed on the “Department of Accountability and Quality Assurance’s” website (which also includes the usual stipulations about not unnecessarily detracting from instructional time, using informed consent practices etc.), the district also listed the following:

Research requiring particular risk for students, teachers, schools, parents, etc., such as, external research dealing with self-worth, family/personal problems, race, sexual behavior or orientation, illegal activities, etc. Benefits provided by external research in these areas do not compensate for the potential risks to participants. (Riverton County Schools, 2014)

By constructing the topics of “race, sexual behavior or orientation” and the like as automatically “risky,” and by categorically stating that any potential benefits from such external research would not compensate for the potential risks, the district constructed these categories as dangerous. The district ironically gave a particular power for harm to these categories and reinscribed “othered” identity categories (implied here are non-white, non-heterosexual identities) as what Youdell (2004) described as “wounded” identities. The categorical denial of
engagement with research dealing with such subjects also reflected what Smyth (2001) described as a context that increasingly forbids ‘analysis of societal relations and asymmetries of power within the educational system’ (Morley and Rassool, 1999 p. 34). In other words, there is a denial of ‘education as a socio-cultural practice,’ with the culture of management now strongly ‘fram[ing] educational policy and practice, and the predominant focus on the monitoring of work practices and processes, dislocat[ing] education from its socio-cultural base.’ (Morley and Rassool, 1999 p. 34, as cited in Smyth, 2001, p. 131)

In other words, the policy environment in Riverton County Schools reflected the culture of managerialism that has increased under broader neoliberal policy trends discussed in chapter one. This culture rendered teachers’ knowledges and practices as “socio-cultural work” invisible, and concurrently engendered a “corporate culture of education” (Ball, 2003; Smyth, 2001) consistent with neoliberal values. This culture forbade analysis of schooling as an inherently political activity with differential effects on various minority groups and becoming teacher-subjectivities. I will go on in my analysis of the teachers’ interviews to discuss the impact of this culture on teaching subjectivities specifically, and I will show how race, class, gender, and other such striations of subjectivity inevitably do enter into teachers’ work in spite of the culture of managerialism, how teachers navigate the spaces where these aspects of subjectivity inevitably appear, and the highly complex entanglement of teachers’ subjectivities with the microfascistic pleasures associated with meeting the demands of such managerialistic accountability regimes.

South Carolina state policy as neoliberal regulatory regime

At this writing, South Carolina evaluates teachers during their second contractual year using variations of a system called (variously) ADEPT/PASS-T/SAFE-T. Some of the
observations that teachers in this study discussed fell under the ADEPT/PASS-T/SAFE-T evaluation systems; however, the main focus of this study was the School Report Card Policy (SRCP). Therefore, I will briefly describe the ADEPT evaluation system and its sub-indicators, but I will discuss the SRCP in more detail.

Briefly, ADEPT (or its District-based variations, PASS-T and/or SAFE-T) is described by the State of South Carolina in the following way:

The ten ADEPT Performance Standards (APSs) for classroom-based teachers can be grouped into four broad categories, or domains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning</th>
<th>Domain 2: Instruction</th>
<th>Domain 3: Classroom Environment</th>
<th>Domain 4: Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS 1 Long-Range Planning</td>
<td>APS 4 Establishing and Maintaining High Expectations for Learners</td>
<td>APS 8 Maintaining an Environment That Promotes Learning</td>
<td>APS 10 Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 2 Short-Range Planning of Instruction</td>
<td>APS 5 Using Instructional Strategies to Facilitate Learning</td>
<td>APS 9 Managing the Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 3 Planning Assessments and Using Data</td>
<td>APS 6 Providing Content for Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 7 Monitoring, Assessing, and Enhancing Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(South Carolina State Department of Education, February 2013)

Table 4.1: Ten ‘ADEPT’ performance standards

These performance standards are then sub-divided into “key elements,” and teachers are to produce work portfolios that include evidence for each performance standard. Second-year teachers (as well as all teachers every fifth year of their careers in Riverton County) are also formally observed three times per semester. While the ADEPT evaluation system presents itself
as a “common-sense,” “comprehensive” overview of teacher professional competencies, it says nothing of the relational or philosophical aspects of teachers’ constantly assembling subjectivities. Affective teaching, as opposed to ‘effective’ teaching, is erased from this evaluation system; having gone through the evaluations myself, I can testify to the fact that, for example, APS 8, “Maintaining an Environment That Promotes Learning,” is construed as the teacher’s maintenance of the physical classroom environment—word walls, student work displayed, and the like. Teacher-student rapport, for example, or working to establish environments of trust and risk-taking among students, rarely enters the discussion, and is not documentable in a portfolio. As such, the ADEPT system, along with the School Report Card Policy’s evaluation system for schools and districts, assembled what Smyth (2001) referred to as “narrowly defined professional competencies” (Morley & Rassool, 1999, p. 33, as cited p. 131) in a positivist environment of performative imperatives.

The South Carolina School Report Card Policy (SRCP), at this writing, is based on elements of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. The SRCP is divided into four categories for high schools (and a fifth for elementary schools, the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) test, which is outside the scope of this study). These categories include passage rate of the End of Course (EOC) tests, first time passage rate of the HSAP (High School Assessment Program—which includes standardized tests in reading, writing, and math through Geometry), 4-year graduation rate and 5-year graduation rate. The school district of Riverton County, like each of the 93 individual schools within the district, receives both an “absolute rating” as well as a “growth rating” each year based on these factors, plus the elementary school PASS test. The rating scale includes the categories: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and At-Risk. For 2012, the district’s absolute and growth ratings were both ‘good.’ For 2011, the
district received an absolute rating of ‘good’ and a growth rating of ‘average.’ These ratings were preceded, from 2008-2010, by absolute ratings of ‘average’ and growth ratings of ‘average,’ ‘below average,’ and ‘average.’ Thus, it may be said that according to these measures, the school district has been “improving” over the last five years.

The SRCP states that a rating of ‘good’ in either category means: “School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision” (South Carolina State Department of Education, January 11, 2013). The 2020 SC Performance Vision reads as follows:

By 2020 all students will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy, participate in a democratic society and contribute positively as members of families and communities. (South Carolina State Department of Education, January 11, 2013)

Thus, the state takes the functionalist view that the indicators measured by the SRCP will lead to students graduating with knowledge and skills that will help them economically, democratically, and in their families and communities. It is interesting to note that alongside the (unsurprisingly) neoliberal language of “compete successfully in the global economy,” democratic and social goals are listed as of equal importance. While this study focused on teachers within the district, an interesting possibility for further study would be the district’s and its functionaries’ views of how the measures indicated on the SRCP connect with the democratic and social goals of the 2020 SC Performance Vision. In their interviews, teachers mentioned democratic and social goals they themselves had for their students, but they did not connect these to policy initiatives or the SC Performance Vision (which will be discussed later).
The SRCP for the district also includes data from both the SAT test as well as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)/Federal Accountability Rating System. According to the SRCP for Riverton County,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2: Riverton County annual measures of objectives scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina uses new Annual Measures of Objectives (AMOs) that are based on actual school performance as measured by student test scores on the state standards assessments and end-of-course exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Weighted Points Total 88.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Grade Conversion B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points Total - Elementary Grades 92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points Total - Middle Grades 89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points Total - High School Grades 73.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(South Carolina State Department of Education, January 11, 2013)

A grade of ‘B’ means that the district’s “performance exceeds the state’s expectations.” However, given the numerical ‘grade’ for high schools only, 73.6, high schools in the district “meet the state’s expectations.” On the ESEA rating system, a score of 73.6 falls into the ‘C’ category. The ESEA ‘grade’ for districts and states is determined by criteria very similar to those used for the SC ‘absolute’ and ‘growth’ ratings. The ESEA’s score comes from the criteria for Annual Yearly Progress in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act, which divides students into sub-categories based on race, sex, disability, limited English proficiency, and socioeconomic status. There are ‘performance’ measures (how many students passed standardized tests) and ‘participation’ measures (how many students out of each sub-category were actually tested) (South Carolina State Department of Education, January 28, 2013). The ‘performance’ measures used for the ESEA rating are based on the same tests as the South Carolina rating; however, Science and Social Studies test scores are also included, but weighted much less heavily than English and Math scores. The Annual Measures of Objectives (AMOs), described by the SRCP...
as ‘based on actual school performance as measured by student test scores on the state standards assessments and end-of-course exams,’ are constructed as transparent measures of ‘actual school performance’ (my emphasis); reality here is viewed as transparent and one-dimensional—it is (in a functionalist, positivist manner) measured and represented by test scores.

Of the teachers who participated in this study from Riverton County, two came from a school whose ESEA rating in 2012 was a ‘D,’ though the SC ‘absolute’ and ‘growth’ ratings were both ‘good.’ One teacher came from a school whose ‘absolute’ rating was ‘good,’ growth rating was ‘average,’ and ESEA score was ‘B’ in 2012. One teacher came from a school whose absolute rating was ‘excellent,’ growth rating was ‘good,’ and ESEA rating was ‘A.’ The school with the ESEA rating of ‘D’ is known to be one of the most ethnically diverse and socioeconomically poor schools in the district, and the school with the ESEA rating of ‘B’ also serves a significant number of students with low socioeconomic backgrounds.

In the SRCP, the state is constructed as an expectant agent, akin to a parental figure with expectations of a child (in this case, the district and/or individual school). These expectations, if not met, will result in ‘consequences’ for districts and/or schools.

When a Title I school misses the same subject area performance target for two years consecutively, the school is designated in "Needs Improvement" status. For schools identified as being in “Needs Improvement” status, parents must be offered the choice of sending their children to another school in that district that is not in "Needs Improvement" status. A second year in "Needs Improvement" (third year of not meeting AYP) requires the school to offer supplemental services such as student tutoring, as well as the choice option.
Title I schools that continue in "Needs Improvement" status ultimately face “restructuring” that can include firing most or all of the school’s staff; being operated by a private company; being converted into a charter school; or being taken over by the state. (South Carolina State Department of Education, 2011, paras. 10-11).

Furthermore, the ‘expectations’ of the ESEA rating system contrast with the language of a performance ‘vision’ from the state of South Carolina.9

**Regional and national context: From ‘competition’ and ‘choice’ to ‘freedom’ and ‘rights’**

As of this writing, *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) is still the most current instantiation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA). The Obama administration, under Secretary of Education Arne Duncan’s leadership, currently offers waivers to states in order to avoid the most unreachable goals of NCLB—namely, that 100% of students reach “proficiency” on standardized test scores by 2014. While the varying abilities of diverse students and the potential biases of standardized tests, as well as the statistical near impossibility of reaching 100% proficiency on any standardized test are all worthy aspects of this discussion, they are beyond the range of this current research; however, these factors do impact the context of this study. In South Carolina, two major developments are taking place in response to the current national education policy climate. In the first, Mick Zais, South Carolina Superintendent of Education, has proposed a teacher-accountability evaluation system (as federally required in order to receive an NCLB waiver) that would grade teachers on an A-F scale (as teachers do students) based on their students’ annual standardized test scores (Zais, 2013). This proposed

---

9 A new development also came about during spring of 2013: passing the HSAP exam will no longer be required in order for students to graduate (S. Hilton, professional communication, May 3, 2013). The future of the test is still being determined as of this writing. It will still be given during the 2013-2014 school year, but may or may not be phased out as the Smarter Balanced assessments that align with the Common Core Curriculum in South Carolina are phased in. At this writing, teachers have not yet been informed of how the assessment data from the Smarter Balanced assessments will or will not affect the SRCP ratings and/or individual teachers’ potential ratings.
teacher grading system has been proposed so that South Carolina can qualify for an NCLB waiver. There is the possibility that such ratings could be tied, over time, to merit pay and/or continued licensure of educators. Similarly, elsewhere in the United States’ Southeast, Florida has already implemented a similar teacher performance system, which will tie 50% of teacher performance evaluation to annual standardized test scores and eliminate Professional (continuing) Service Contracts, put teachers on annual contracts for life, and eliminate due process for educators (Florida Education Association, 2013). Georgia is currently implementing a slightly less draconian measure, but one that ties standardized student achievement data to annual teacher performance evaluations (using a 0-30 numerical ranking system) as one criterion out of three (the other two being teaching observation data and student survey data) (Barge, 2012). Georgia also announced on May 7, 2013, that the state will be rolling out a new “College and Career Ready Performance Index” to replace Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). According to the Associated Press (May 7, 2013),

Each school will get a score out of 100. The overall score will be made up of three areas: achievement counts for 70 percent; progress is 15 percent; and achievement gap accounts for the remaining 15 percent. Each of those areas is broken up into subcategories. The subcategories used will likely mirror the AYP’s subcategories. However, weighting these scores in order to achieve a score out of 100 will be a new practice in Georgia. South Carolina uses an “out-of-100” score not for the state’s annual rating of schools and districts, but for the federal letter grade assigned to schools based on AYP.

The second major development in South Carolina is the planned full implementation of the national Common Core Curriculum in school year 2014-2015, with materials spearheaded by the private companies Pearson and Smarter Balanced (South Carolina State Department of
Education, 2013, December 3). The curriculum is not designed by the states; it is in some ways quite similar to the older South Carolina state standards, but in other ways it gives much more specific and detailed “indicators” educators are to teach. Its a/effects on actual teaching are as yet unclear, though a robust national debate on the issue has drawn critique from all parts of the political spectrum.

Throughout the Southeast and the US generally, there is a national push for increasingly tying student standardized test data to teacher performance evaluation/accountability rating scales as well as “performance” or “merit” pay and/or teachers’ licensures. A further important development on the national scale is that on July 19, 2013, the Republican-majority House of Representatives passed its newest instantiation of the ESEA, the “Student Success Act.” The bill has yet to pass the Democrat-majority Senate (as of August 2013), and its fate is unclear at this writing. This newest reauthorization of ESEA would, if passed,

[Repeal] federal “Highly Qualified Teacher” requirements and [direct] states and school districts to develop teacher evaluation systems that measure an educator’s influence on student learning. These evaluations [would] be locally developed and implemented within broad parameters that factor in student achievement, incorporate multiple measures, and include feedback from all stakeholders. (Education and the Workforce Committee, 2013a)

How exactly “student achievement” (read: standardized test scores instead of advanced degrees in relevant subject areas and/or National Board Certification) would be factored in, and to what degree, are yet to be seen, but given the developments in Florida and Georgia, it is likely that the developments would proceed along similar trajectories. The bill would also
[Eliminate] AYP and [replace] it with state-determined accountability systems, thereby returning authority for measuring student performance to states and school districts.

(Education and the Workforce Committee, 2013a)

There are fewer examples to draw from to predict what these developments would look like or what parameters would be given to states to determine what would substitute for NCLB’s AYP (Annual Yearly Progress).

The bill was drafted by the Education and the Workforce Committee, chaired by Congressman John Kline (Republican of Minnesota), and the “Welcome Message” on the Committee’s website mirrors much of the Obama administration’s neoliberal discourse concerning education, its connection to the “21st Century” economy, and economic competition:

The dawn of the 21st century brought with it a new global reality, accompanied by great challenges and opportunities. We need an education system that prepares our children for the future and an economy that fosters entrepreneurialism and American enterprise.

To achieve those goals, federal education and workplace policy must be rooted in that defining American principle of freedom: the freedom for states and local communities to pursue innovation and constant improvement in education and the freedom for workers and businesses to grow the economy and bring us back to prosperity. (Education and the Workforce Committee, 2013b)

Here, the word ‘freedom’ draws on the discourse of de-regulation and de-unionization that has circulated throughout the United States over the last decade. ‘Freedom’ has begun to be substituted for words like ‘choice’ and ‘competition,’ particularly on the US’s political right. Three years ago, the Obama administration was using the word ‘competition’ in reference to
education (see quotation from Organizing for America, 2010, page 3 of this work), and still does so on the current Organizing for Action website; it is also interesting to note that education is now primarily subsumed under the “President’s plan for an economy built to last,” (Organizing for America, 2013) which was not the case in 2010.

“Competition in the economy,” a more overt reference to a neoliberal capitalist ethic, is replaced in the Republican/neoconservative language by ‘freedom,’ a word that has historically inspired deeply nationalistic feelings in the United States and elsewhere. American ‘freedom’ is constructed as a neoliberal ethic: it is the freedom “to pursue innovation and constant improvement in education” and “the freedom for workers and businesses to grow the economy and bring us back to prosperity.” While education is still constructed as primarily and even solely serving the economy (after all, the committee’s very name unifies “education and the workforce” as a single entity), this marks a shift, at least on the US political right, from what Ball (2003) identified as the trajectory of “discursive interventions into the public sector” in the early 2000s (p. 218). Furthermore, South Carolina is also one of the so-called “Right to Work” states (placing large restrictions on public sector unionism); the discourses of “freedom” and “rights” are being substituted for the discourses of “competition” and “choice” in the ongoing development of neoliberal/neoconservative framing. Foucault (1984c) discussed the ‘military dream [or ideal] of society;’ the neoliberal ideas of competition in the economy, skills training, and standardized performance evaluation reflect this ‘military dream’ in its fundamental reference…not to the state of nature but to the meticulously subordinated cogs of a machine, not to the primal social contract but to permanent coercions, not to fundamental rights but to indefinitely progressive forms of training. (p. 186)
However, in substituting the language of ‘fundamental rights’ for more overtly neoliberal language, a discursive and ideological shift (bait-and-switch?) is taking place, implicitly claiming to speak for ‘philosophers and jurists’ (Foucault, 1984c, p. 186), and drawing upon more overtly nationalistic, patriotic discourse. The idea of “innovation and constant improvement” in education (as ‘permanent coercions’) is also paramount.

**History of testing in South Carolina**

Before I go any further, I owe a debt of gratitude to one participant, DS, who helped me to contextualize the progression of accountability regimes in South Carolina. His description of the flow of accountability technologies and apparatuses over time was key to developing the “scientificity” of this study. As discussed in the methodology chapter, “Foucauldian scientificity is deeply historical, power-inscribed, both enabling and constraining, and ripe for genealogical delineation of its conditions of possibility” (Lather, 2009, p. 344).

DS spent 30 years teaching in South Carolina, retiring in 2009, and had experienced the changes in South Carolina’s accountability systems first-hand over that period of time.

In the 80s, BSAP, which was the Basic Skills Assessment Program, (that was supposed to be the report card), was tested all the way down into middle school…. And then the emphasis began to be, ‘did you meet those criteria according to your grade-level standards?’ Then it became a school-wide evaluation. Never really was it an evaluation of a class or a teacher, per-se. Who was being more effective? It would be hard to tell. They never separated us—who taught what student, etc. But then schools began to be rated. So if you were a lower-rated school, you were looked down upon, and there was more pressure to get students to achieve to a higher level. And pressure increased when the report card came. The report card began to individualize schools. So in the beginning you
had many, many schools failing, getting an ‘F’ on the report card, whereas the previous year they would have done much better (if they had been rated) because we all had to get used to the new test, plus none of these kids had highly educated backgrounds.

Then they started putting pressure on middle schools to increase reading levels, whereas before, the high school people always thought the middle schools were not doing their job because we always got these kids, and they couldn’t read. I mean really, really couldn’t. They could not do the basic freshman curriculum. And so we found ourselves behind, and by the time they were in 11th grade, what we were trying to do was to increase their reading ability enough so that they could pass the exit exam. And so they would take the test the first time as sophomores, and then anyone who didn’t pass, say, the Language Arts, would go into my class, or another person’s specialty class, in order to learn the skills to pass it. And basically it was all reading…. Now, probably until about 2005, at [school name], we were pretty effective in raising that mark, the passage of the exit exam, the BSAP. And at that point, we would only have maybe three percent of the students not graduating because they didn’t pass that test. But when they put in the new HSAP, which was so much more stringent, the cycle began again. In other words, the students had to achieve a higher reading level. …And it had to come from the bottom up, and it would be difficult to move these students to a much higher reading level when you got them in high school. So, the pressure began again and we began to have more kids who would not graduate, so the rate went from I think four percent that would not graduate because they couldn’t pass the exit test, up to seven or eight percent, which was a large increase. And that’s where the real pressure started to come. It began to become focused on teachers who taught the subjects and grade levels tested. So the emphasis
went from a whole school to an individual teacher who taught those classes. Thus, people didn’t want to teach those classes [laughter].

DS discussed the shifts in testing and accountability systems over the last 30 years in South Carolina; he explained the increase in pressure each time a new system was put in place. The progressive emphasis on individualizing schools and teachers is a neoliberal move that draws on the idea of human capital, and the progressive waves of new tests and accountability measures act as ‘permanent coercions’ that engage teachers and schools in a form of constant training, keeping them in a state of ‘I must.’ It would appear that policies do not want teachers or schools to get too comfortable, and the constant shifting of the accountability terrain is one technology operating to diminish teachers’ sense of professional subjectivity. South Carolina is going through the process of shifting accountability systems again this school year (2013-2014) as the state prepares to implement the Common Core Curriculum and associated testing. Accountability systems, and shifts in them (such as South Carolina is going through this year) impact teachers’ subjectivities.

**Disciplinary technologies and impact on performativity and fabrications**

*How dangerous it is to neglect little things.*

*J. B. de La Salle, 1783, as cited in Foucault, 1984c*

If performativity indeed “employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change,” (Ball, 2001, p. 210) then moments in which teachers ‘perform’ are moments in which power operates. At first I thought I could separate a discussion of disciplinary technologies in operation in these teachers’ lives from a discussion of their performances and fabrications. The two, however, are deeply imbricated with each other. Disciplinary technologies
often formed the stages on which teachers constructed their performances; as theater is meant for the stage, teaching performances are assembled for disciplinary technologies. Disciplinary technologies take place on the level of the everyday, the mundane, and the ‘expected.’ It is, as mentioned above, precisely through the role of ‘expectations’ that they operate. ‘Expectations’ in turn assemble/become assembled into teachers’ subjectivities, making ‘expectations’ ‘expected’ by teachers and making teachers ‘expect’ these ‘expectations’ of themselves. As Foucault (1984a) explained, “Discipline ‘makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of a power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise” (p. 188).

‘The means of correct teacher-training’

In this first segment of analyzing teachers’ experiences of power through and with the SCRP and related accountability policies in South Carolina, I will discuss teachers’ experiences of power using Foucault’s “Means of Correct Training:” hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and the examination. However, because this heuristic is useful as an introduction but by no means is comprehensive enough to entail the many lines of flight teachers’ experiences and subjectivities took from these categorizations, this analysis will serve as an introduction to lay the groundwork of further analysis, not as an end in itself.

Hierarchical observations, normalizing judgment, and examinations are methods of accountability that the SCRP and related policies (ADEPT, etc.) employed. Teachers were seen as needing to be ‘accountable,’ and the word ‘accountable’ itself implies the presence of others. ‘Accountability’ is to give account of oneself, to make one’s self and work visible for the scrutiny and judgment of others. The eighth definition of the word ‘account’ in the Miriam-Webster dictionary online reads as follows:
A description of facts, conditions, or events: report, narrative <the newspaper account of the fire> <by all accounts they're well-off>; also: performance

The act of performing is intimately tied to giving account, or constructing a narrative, of oneself. To give account of oneself, various techniques may be employed, and performances take place in response to technologies of observation, normalizing judgment, or examinations—very often a combination of the three. Teachers’ performativity (Ball, 2001, 2003; Jeffrey, 2002) became manifest in response to/in conjunction with hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and testing and examinations.

Hierarchical observation
The exercise of discipline presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation; an apparatus in which the techniques that make it possible to see induce effects of power and in which, conversely, the means of coercion make those on whom they are applied clearly visible.

*Foucault, 1984a*

Hierarchical observation took place primarily through actual observations of classroom teaching for the teachers in Riverton County. Some teachers were observed quite frequently, while others, though observed with less frequency, discussed the affects that observations produced and their responses to observation. Teacher TJ worked at a school that received an absolute rating of ‘Good,’ a growth rating of ‘Average,’ and an ESEA score of ‘B’ for 2012. She is a veteran teacher who is respected by her peers, and teaches multiple subjects that fall under the category of ‘High School English.’

Teacher TJ discussed extreme visibility at her particular school within the district.

*TJ:* We’re observed all the time. We have an 8-week cycle, and you know what weeks are your weeks. On even weeks I get observed; odd weeks other people get observed.

We have four administrators in our building plus a curriculum resource teacher, and all of
them observe us…. We also do the 5-year cycle with the ADEPT system, and I’m on my 5th year of that.

**MAC:** And that means formal observations for that year?

**TJ:** Yes, we create a binder of all the things that we can do, proving that we have met all those standards. So I feel like there’s a revolving door to my room, and I just tell the students, ‘they’re here to see what we’re doing and how it’s going.’ And the good news is that because I’m strong at what I do, I regularly get asked to visit other schools, look at their best practices and see what we can incorporate. I regularly get asked to be an exemplar for new teachers, but it doesn’t make it any easier for me. …

TJ was made into a “supervisor, perpetually supervised” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 192). She was commended for being a strong teacher, and then asked to go observe other schools. At the same time, TJ went on to state that she “[felt] like [she’s] lost a lot of integrity in the eyes of the state because of numbers that [she has] very little control over.” Testing and numbers, therefore, became part of the observation, and her observed teaching self. In turn, her supervisors were also supervised, which TJ spoke to:

I think the test scores at [current High School] are higher than the test scores were [at previous High School], but the expectations, I think, are getting bigger every year—there’s external motivation there—and so [the supervisors are] just trying to meet them the best way that they can to prove that they’re hitting all the benchmarks that they can. Then they can say to their bosses, if it doesn’t meet some benchmark somewhere, ‘but we did this, and this, and this, and this, and this, so now what do you want us to do?’ So there can be no question about the integrity and effort that went behind the process.
TJ used the word ‘integrity’ multiple times; she felt that she had ‘lost integrity’ herself because of testing and observation; however, for those observing her, observing her was a way to ‘keep’ or ‘prove’ their integrity. Furthermore, to be made into one who supervises others, who ‘[looked] at other schools’ best practices,’ was the reward for observations of TJ’s teaching that went well. However, she stated that this ‘doesn’t make it any easier for [her].’ She went on to explain:

In fact, in some ways it’s harder because if you’ve been good at what you do, and you had some control of the outcome based upon your evaluations, and how hard you work, and the effort, and you put your heart and soul into everything you’re doing, all that’s going to be swept under the rug for these test scores.

Hierarchical observation was, for TJ, a system that purported to reward her hard work and how much of her subjectivity she invested in her teaching only to “sweep all that under the rug.” Testing, then, is the penalizing extension of a system of hierarchical observation that acted as a “microscope of conduct… an apparatus of observation, recording and training” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 191).

DS also discussed observations at his school, which received both absolute and growth ratings of ‘good’ on the SRCP in 2012; however, the school received a ‘D’ ESEA rating for 2012 because the criteria are weighted differently for the ESEA rating than for the South Carolina SRCP scores.¹⁰ For DS, observations were not nearly as frequent as they were for TJ:

We had an observation or two every year maybe, and it was the principal, and the principal does not know your subject. So, if you were keeping kids busy, and pretty much

¹⁰ DS went on to discuss the shifting and, in his words ‘arbitrary’ nature of the various accountability technologies. I will go into more detail about this observation by DS later.
talking like an English teacher should talk… Furthermore, they looked at your control.

Your students were doing what they were supposed to do; that was the basic evaluation. Now, when we had the evaluations the last two years, we did have curriculum people come in—that was eye-opening, although I never felt—well, I felt nervous when they came in. [Laughter] I never felt threatened because I always felt I was doing what I needed to do. … But I’m not so sure that [the observations] helped us. I think when you feel that much stress… When I got this little evaluation, it was a paragraph, basically; it was hardly anything. I couldn’t use it to help myself. I didn’t want it. I would not have really minded criticism. That would not have hurt me. Professional to professional, that would not have been a problem. And I’m not so sure that there was that kind of criticism levied, but more criticism of ‘the students didn’t behave in such a way,’ or ‘you aren’t teaching them writing,’ or something general that—maybe if you came in the next day, you could’ve seen what you were looking for. And the rate of observation is way too small. I mean, how can you, in one session, evaluate a year’s worth, or even a month’s worth, of activities?

DS was not observed nearly as often as TJ, though his school was in the same district as TJ’s. However, DS pointed out that power operated through the observations and the creation of ‘stress’ and ‘nervousness’ in the observed, observable moment. Foucault explained in his discussion of hierarchical observation that hierarchical observation “[permits] an internal, articulated and detailed control—[it renders] visible those who are inside it; in more general terms, … [it] would operate to transform individuals: to act on those it shelters, to provide a hold on their conduct, to carry the effects of power right to them, to make it possible to know them, to alter them” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 190). Hierarchical observation here, then, did make DS and TJ
visible and did provide a hold on DS’s conduct through stress, but it failed to ‘know’ them; DS pointed out how little can actually be ‘known’ in observing one class, or one part of a class, in comparison to a whole year of instruction.

EC felt similarly about her observations at another school in the district. She was observed at her school, but she discussed not feeling as much ‘stress’ or ‘pressure’ in response to observations. She also discussed how observations failed to ‘know’ her teaching.

I’m observed several times a semester…. But [the high school is] huge; I have a principal and 6 assistant principals, and they’re paced to come once a semester. They stay 15 minutes; they just do drop-by’s, basically. And this year is my ADEPT year, so I get two 1-hour observations. They will tell you things like, ‘your lesson plan had a different EQ [Essential Question] than what’s on your board’ or ‘I notice that these kids were playing with a phone and you weren’t paying attention.’ They will tell you minor things like that, and if there’s a problem, they will bring you in and talk to you. And they’re going to say, ‘is this a consistent issue?’ And they may put you on an additional ADEPT year—and that has happened in our school, but typically I don’t feel like they’re there as a threat in order to get rid of me. To tell you the truth, I feel like they’re there because it’s part of their job to be there, but look at me, look at the demographic. I think other people view it as a more punitive kind of thing; they’re terrified the whole time that the guy’s in there. They’re not here to get you; they’re not out to get you—sometimes I suspect that they are. I may not have been the best person to talk to because I’m not exactly typical…. But I’m not easily intimidated.
EC explained that she is not ‘typical’ compared to other teachers for two reasons: her school’s demographics, as well as the fact that she is ‘not easily intimidated.’ EC’s school was the only school out of schools represented by teachers in this study that received the highest possible absolute report card rating of ‘excellent.’ It also received a growth rating of ‘good’ and an ESEA score of ‘A’. EC’s school had a significantly lower percentage of students on free and reduced lunch than the other schools represented in the study, a significantly lower percentage of ‘Limited English Proficient’ (LEP) students, and a smaller minority population than DS and SP’s school. While TJ’s school actually had the smallest percentage of minority students, TJ’s school did have a greater percentage of students receiving subsidized meals and a greater percentage of LEP students than EC’s school. EC was aware that systems of privilege were in operation in her school because it benefitted from the higher proportion of privileged students, a theme I will discuss again in chapter five. EC also felt that the feedback she received from observations was often unhelpful because observations failed to capture the range of her teaching practice, and often focused on issues that she considered minor, even trivial, compared to the real learning of her students. Furthermore, she, like TJ, understood that those observing her were being ‘observed’ themselves—it was ‘their job to be there.’ She therefore did not feel the system was necessarily ‘punitive’ to her, though she acknowledged that it may be, or feel so, for others. Interestingly, she stated that ‘they’re not out to get you,’ but added as an aside, ‘sometimes I suspect that they are.’

SP also discussed how observations gave inappropriate feedback, but had a different take on observations than the other teachers. She, instead, constructed the observations as ‘necessary’ for ‘accountability.’ She did not speak of a ‘stress’ response to being observed, but did speak of aspects of observations that she disliked:
The observations normally weren’t intrusive at all. The administrators would come in, they would stand at the back of the room, they would write things down. There weren’t a lot of things they were looking for [in the observations] that were difficult to do every day, but I didn’t like putting an agenda on the board, putting your standards on the board, that took a lot of time every day to do. But… it kind of sped up after a while. And sometimes they would be looking for stuff that was on the board, but I’d have a poster over it or something. They would always ask me about that: ‘Where were they? They were probably there.’ I always got good observations and I think they were fair.... They might ask a question: ‘Where did you go with this lesson after I left?’ But I think observations are absolutely a must, and I’m going to have to say that, because like any human being [teachers] have to be accountable. If I didn’t go in my kids’ bedrooms when they were little and check on them once in a while—it’s the same concept. We’re all human, and we do need to be checked on. But what I really liked was when they gave us a section where we could comment back and explain something if they’d said something [on the evaluation]. But there’s one downfall with that too; I know that there were some teachers that had comments that were more like, ‘I don’t understand how you were teaching that lesson; I don’t think the kids got it.’ My concern was: did you meet with the teacher and help her with that? I don’t like someone telling a teacher you didn’t do that well, and then not help her with [the problem]. Even these ADEPT evaluations that these young teachers are going through—[young teachers] have to be taught; somebody needs to come in and teach these young teachers, not just criticize them—tell them how to do it. Give them a chance. I don’t see how young teachers go through it.
SP, like the other teachers, acknowledged that sometimes minor details were what was looked for in the observations (an essential question or something else written on the board, which a poster might be covering on any given day), but understood the observations as fair. She found that with practice, putting questions on the board each day took less of her time and became easier; she incorporated the disciplinary technology into her teaching subjectivity more smoothly over time. She, unlike the other teachers in the study, stated that ‘We’re all human and we do need to be checked on.’ SP also did not see the need for accountability as unique to teachers; she believed it was necessary for all human beings. However, in comparing the need for accountability to her need to check on her children in their bedrooms, she used the discourse in circulation by the state, that the state is the ‘expectant’ parental agent, and teachers are like ‘children’ in the state’s charge. However, similarly to the other teachers, she expressed a desire for more helpful and meaningful feedback. In reference to younger teachers, she said she did not ‘see how they go through it [the observation/evaluation process].’ She did not see helpful feedback given to younger teachers; instead the observations offered them criticism without helpful critique or assistance in becoming better teachers at the novice stage. SP explained that when she was a novice herself, surveillance and observation still occurred through the principal and fellow teachers (‘the teacher next door’), but there was less emphasis on documentation, indicating that disciplinary technologies have increased over the last thirty years in Riverton County. Additionally, TJ also discussed the various forms of documentation that hierarchical observation produced:

We have a form that we have to do our lesson plans on every week. We have to have certain things visible in the classroom so that no matter when people come in, they know exactly what we’re doing, what we’re working towards, so the students don’t have
questions about what are we doing and why, and we have to prove that we’re doing that every step of the way every day. And then when we have our individual learning community meetings within our subject area, we have to document those, and sign off that we met, and we have an administrator that’s in charge of each subject area that we have to report to, plus we have our grade level administrator that we have to report to.

Documentation will be discussed further in the upcoming discussion of testing and examinations; however, the process of constant documentation of meetings, and making lesson plans visible on a form, as well as keeping certain things “visible in the classroom” all contribute to power’s operation by making teachers seen and visible (Foucault, 1984a, pp. 189-193). The everyday acts of filling out a lesson plan form each week, having certain things (like “Essential Questions” and standards) visible in the classroom at all times, and documenting each meeting with other teachers and with administration seem trivial; however, these “innumerable petty mechanisms” of surveillance, through hierarchical observation, “can only be seen as unimportant if one forgets the role of this instrumentation, minor but flawless, in the progressive objectification and the ever more subtle partitioning of individual behavior” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 191). Constant observation through documentation objectified teachers and their teaching practices into that which could be seen, observed, and further documented. It partitioned their behavior into ‘striated spaces’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 479) such that other behaviors became less possible (though not necessarily impossible).

Last, but not least, teacher TJ explained how at her school, space to refract the surveillance of hierarchical observation was shrinking:
Many teachers over the years have said the old adage of, “you say, ‘yes sir, or no sir,’ or whatever, and you shut the door and you teach.” You can’t shut the door and teach anymore because they’re coming in like a revolving door all the time, and looking for these statistics and so forth. I think education is suffering greatly. I think children are suffering greatly.

Previous studies have found that teachers’ performativity acted as a means of refracting surveillance (Webb, 2009, Ball, 2001, 2003). For TJ, the increase in observation meant that she had to perform more often and that her performativity could not refract and/or fragment surveillance as often or as effectively. TJ saw a decrease in moments that exemplified her vision of ‘real teaching.’ To illustrate, she related a story of a young man in her creative writing class who originally hated the class but grew to love it because he found in the class an opportunity to express himself that she valued as his teacher. TJ said,

I think that child in my creative writing class who can now smile at coming into class—his world has changed in ways that he would have never expected if he hadn’t been given the opportunity to share his voice, and recognize that he had a voice worth sharing. There is no test in the world that would have ever done that.

TJ contrasted the experience of teaching a child that he had a ‘voice worth sharing’ with what a ‘test’ could teach a child. TJ’s teacher knowledge was deemed ‘nonexistent’ by tests, and this idea (of teachers’ knowledge being deemed nonexistent) will also be explored in more detail in the upcoming discussion of testing/evaluations.
**Normalizing judgment and validity of teachers’ knowledge**

I asked teachers to discuss how they were evaluated at their schools, and what criteria were used. In response, many of the participants discussed punitive, punishing, parent-child-like systems that resulted from the state-sanctioned discourse of the state as ‘expectant’ parental agent with the capacity to punish the teachers in its charge. Discussing the orphanage at Chevalier Paulet, Foucault explained the function of normalizing judgment and its connection to punishment, and punishing systems.

At the heart of all disciplinary systems functions a small penal mechanism. It enjoys a kind of judicial privilege with its own laws, its specific offenses, its particular forms of judgment…. A whole series of subtle procedures was used, from light physical punishment to minor deprivations and petty humiliations. It was a question both of making the slightest departure from correct behavior subject to punishment, and of giving a punitive function to the apparently indifferent elements of the disciplinary apparatus: so that, if necessary, everything might serve to punish the slightest thing; each subject find himself caught in a punishable, punishing universality. (Foucault, 1984a, pp. 193-194)

Teachers were aware of the functioning of normalizing judgment in their experiences of power. Aware of potential punishments, teachers learned to regulate their speech and behaviors according to ‘norms,’ both spoken and unspoken. Foucault (1984a) stated that “The disciplinary mechanisms secreted a ‘penalty of the norm,’ which is irreducible in its principles and functioning to the traditional penalty of the law” (p. 196). The ‘punishments’ teachers could receive, then, were not necessarily legal or administrative penalties, though they sometimes were.
DS discussed the way that the operation of normalizing judgment changed when the state changed its evaluation from BSAP to HSAP.

There was a derivative at one point that if you were a Title I school, because of the challenges you faced, you could score lower [on the tests] than a school that had wealthier and more privileged demographics. And so what you were trying to do was basically get the most out of the child. So at the schools at which I taught, we usually got what they said those kids should be accomplishing. And they used IQ, and demographics, so a lot of times we were ok. We would be the average, and you basically had to get the average. Other schools that had students from higher social classes tended to struggle sometimes because they couldn’t quite meet all of that. We would have struggled if we would have had to meet the criteria that they did. But then they changed it, so that everybody was compared equally no matter who was on the same ground, so to speak. Then it became a lot more difficult.

With the introduction of the HSAP in accordance with the principles of “No Child Left Behind,” every child was then compared to the same ‘norm,’ and teachers, by extension, became compared to the same ‘norm’ regardless of context. While in theory NCLB purported that every child should experience the same ‘high expectations’ in school, and while authors such as Jonathan Kozol (1991, 2005) have written scathing critiques of the ‘culture of low expectations’ in high-poverty and high-minority schools that should not be discounted, the normalizing judgment associated with the SRCP (and HSAP and NCLB) failed to take account of the varied challenges that students faced, particularly students living in poverty. Instead of honoring the different ways that every child, can, in fact, achieve, the SRCP expected all children to achieve in the same manner and regardless of context. Those who did not achieve (either teachers or
students) were regarded as ‘nonconforming,’ ‘not meeting expectations,’ and therefore became ‘punishable’ (Foucault, 1984a, p. 194).

The a/effects of normalizing judgment varied from teacher to teacher. Just as DS’s interview was getting started, and he was describing the demographics of the school at which he taught, DS revealed that since he had become a retired teacher, parts of his regulated subjectivity had become, in fact, less regulated. He hesitated and corrected himself:

The neighborhoods were working class, excuse me, mostly blue-collar types—including students and parents. I think that’s about right. I’ve forgotten all my education-ese.

[laughter] I’m trying to think of all the right words, to say what I want, I mean.

DS was aware that even in the context of an interview, he was, in some sense, performing his subjectivity as a teacher. Speaking ‘education-ese’ was part of the expected ‘norm’ of performing teacherhood, and DS was aware that in order to ‘sound like’ a teacher, he needed to ‘speak’ ‘education-ese.’ He needed to become what was expected.

TJ particularly felt the pressure to ‘become what [was] expected,’ to conform to increasing ‘norms’ at the schools at which she had taught in the district:

I can tell you, for example, one school that I was at had a district official actually meet with the teachers once a month and say, ‘it must be this way.’ It’s not that way where I am now, but, I think there’s a push from the district to go that direction, and they made a point at our last meeting to say, ‘This doesn’t mean we’re getting rid of all of your individuality,’ but it feels that way to me. We have a learning-focused curriculum where we start with an Essential Question every day; we all have to be on the same Essential Question. We all have to be covering the same topic within that question. There are many
ways we can go about it, but ‘your life could be a lot easier if you all had the same exact test at the end.’ And, ‘your life could be a lot easier if you could sit down,’ and they tell us how much easier it’s going to make [teaching] if we all were almost automated.

TJ’s experience on at least one level was of a mechanism of normalizing judgment. She spoke in terms of her ‘individuality’ and contrasts the concept of ‘individuality’ with ‘automation.’ The district personnel she encountered ‘[made] it a point’ to tell the teachers that they are not ‘getting rid of [their] individuality;’ however, TJ experienced friction between what the district administrator said and how she experienced the exhortation to teach ‘the same topic within the same Essential Question’ each day. When she spoke, the words of the district administrator (indicated with ‘single quotation marks’ within TJ’s last quotation) were articulated in frustrated pantomime with verbal inflection that indicated her disagreement with the district administration. The ‘punishments’ TJ experienced, then, were frustration and anger—affective friction—for thinking differently than the norms being established by the district. This part of TJ’s interview, and the fact that TJ herself brought up the work of George Orwell more than once during her interview, contained parallels to this famous passage from *1984*:

In Oldspeak it is called, quite frankly, “reality control.” In Newspeak it is called *doublethink*, although *doublethink* comprises much else as well.

*Doublethink* means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one’s mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them. … *Doublethink* lies at the very heart of Ingsoc, since the essential act of the Party is to use conscious deception while retaining the firmness of purpose that goes with complete honesty. To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then,
when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies—all this is indispensably necessary. (Orwell, 1981, pp. 176-177)

Here, the district administration stated that “this doesn’t mean we’re getting rid of all your individuality” precisely because the administration knew that that is precisely how teachers would likely experience their exhortations. The emphasis on the word ‘easier’ was also grotesque. The word implied that life as a teacher would be ‘easier’ with a standardized, standard-paced curriculum (even if teachers had the ‘freedom’ to ‘decide’ how to implement it day-to-day)—the word functioned as a seductive invitation to “doublethink.” It denied the reality that teachers will and do use their judgment to decide among many instructional options in order to benefit their students (even if some of those options require more work).

The friction TJ felt between the administration’s statement and her teacher knowledge manifested for TJ as questions about “What is a priority here?” and not having a “well-shared” vision with the district. The district was also engaged in “doublethink” when they required teachers at TJ’s school to attend four planning sessions on “rigor in the classroom;” TJ explained that

Even though we’re doing [laughter] ‘all the same thing all the same way’ [sic], they want to make sure that there are higher-end thinking skills going on, and [our instruction is] not just all multiple choice, even though the EOC is all multiple choice; the MAPS test is all multiple-choice…But it’s hard to know—what they want, where they want it. The vision isn’t really well-shared at the moment.
TJ experienced normalizing judgment as a confusing vision that was not well-shared. She was frustrated that she had to act and teach as if she did share the district’s vision: her compliance was enforced by observations and testing. TJ stated that “If people wanted to teach from a script, we wouldn’t be teachers. We’d be actors.” She was aware that a performance—that performativity is required and enforced by disciplinary technologies. She was also aware of the imperative to fabricate and perform: concerning her teaching, and the many observations it was subject to, she stated, “I don’t do anything differently from what I’ve already planned, but the plans that I create are different from what I would do if I could follow my heart.”

The potential punishments resulting from normalizing judgment were also palpable to other teachers. DS explained a very ‘real’ potential punishment when he said, “You’ve got people saying, ‘either you do it this way, or we’re going to put reprimands in your files’—that’s pretty powerful!” Penalizing documentation was one form of punishment; EC also talked about yet another punishment, the punishment of being perceived as a ‘failing’ school:

Parents don’t look at gains, the public doesn’t look at gains; they look at absolute scores…. So then the public perception becomes involved in this miasma of suspicion and failing…. It’s a self-perpetuating attitude of failure because if the state sends that stupid piece of paper out, and my school hasn’t gotten AYP, that means we failed. There’s nothing in between passing and failing, and if the school failed, then the principal must have failed, and the teachers must have failed, and then the kids are feeling the failure. So even if your child is receiving an exemplary education … then you’re probably going to think, I wonder what he could have done if he’d been at a really good school. So the perpetuation of the manufactured crisis is part of the problem. I tell parents and kids all the time. I say, ‘what do you know about school?’ ‘Well, we’re, like,
way behind everybody else in the world.’ ‘But we’re not.’ ‘Yeah we are; it’s in the newspaper.’ ‘Yeah, but we’re not. If you subtract the high poverty schools, we’re right there with everybody else. So this school is not failing. Like, didn’t you get some scholarships already?’ ‘Yeah.’ ‘Didn’t you get accepted to [a college]? And is that where you wanted to go?’ ‘Yeah.’ ‘OK, well how much have I failed you?’ ‘I didn’t think about it that way.’ ‘That’s right, you didn’t think about it that way because it’s a blanket, and individual schools and neighborhoods simply don’t matter as much.’ Because everybody’s branded with the same iron, and they compare schools with similar demographics. Well, how does that even work? We get another large suburban school somewhere, exact same racial mix, exact same special education mix, exact same bunch of teachers—there’s not a way to compare apples to apples, ever.

EC pointed out that even in comparing schools with similar demographics (listed on the SRCP as ‘schools like ours’), there is no real way to compare actual contexts and actual children. She, like TJ, discussed the erasure of individuality by normalizing judgment and established ‘norms.’ EC also pointed out that normalizing judgment becomes pervasive in the community, among both parents and students. Concerning her comment that everyone was “branded with the same iron,” Deleuze and Guattari (1987) similarly noted “…the whole perverse apparatus of repression and education, the red-hot irons, and the atrocious procedures have only this meaning: to breed man, [sic] to mark him in his flesh, to render him capable of alliance, to form him within the debtor-creditor relation, which on both sides turns out to be a matter of memory - a memory straining toward the future.” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 208). The ‘marking’ of teachers’ and others’ bodies will be discussed in more detail in chapter five.
EC also gave the counter-example of asking her students whether or not they have been able to achieve their college goals—“memories straining toward a future” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 208)—countering what she saw as the ‘miasma of suspicion and failing’ that her school was caught up in.

**Testing teachers’ unaccountable knowledges**

Testing was ubiquitous in teachers’ realities and became incorporated into teachers’ subjectivities. This incorporation was haphazard and not along set striations of cognition; the incorporation of testing into teachers’ subjectivities seemed to happen in individualized fashions, but teachers nonetheless had to find *some way* to incorporate it. It also formed a background for teachers’ assembling their subjectivities, calling attention to the temporality (and temporariness) of the construction of subjectivity on a background—in this case, the plane of testing.

**SP:** There’s always a test out there waiting…. We have tests for everything, but I think that we have to be able to do something in order to say [the students are] ready to graduate. I think we have to do something to say, ‘my teachers did teach me,’ because without accountability, it would be a disaster. There has to be some form of accountability, and I think that it’s good if it’s used in a healthy way, without making teachers feel pressure to the point that they’re afraid they’re going to lose their jobs—without making teachers feel that they’re in competition with one another, without making different departments feel ‘I’m doing better than you.’ It’s creating a lot of animosity, a lot of power struggle, and just a lot of conflict.

SP incorporated the idea that ‘without accountability, [education] would be a disaster’ into her teaching subjectivity; however, she desired an accountability qualitatively different from that which is currently offered and expected. She desired a form of accountability without the ‘stress’
that creates ‘competition,’ ‘animosity,’ ‘power struggle,’ and ‘conflict.’ By identifying these four aspects of the results of current accountability regimes, SP identified power operating through testing, through the neoliberal thrust for competition, and through negative affects created with the accountability and testing environment.

Teachers TJ and DS also experienced negative impacts from testing regimes:

**TJ:** In fact in some ways it’s harder because if you’ve been good at what you do, and you had some control of the outcome based upon your evaluations, and how hard you work, and the effort, and your heart and soul going into everything you’re doing, and all that’s going to be swept under the rug for these test scores. I feel like I’ve lost a lot of integrity in the eyes of the state because of numbers that I have very little control over.

**DS:** Teachers felt that they were in control until the last round of the testing objectives. I can’t say I know for a fact; I’ve just heard from people who worked on the testing committee—that the testing objectives did not look at what should be the expected intellectual levels of children at certain ages. It was like, we have to get a test done, so we’ll just put a lot of things in it. And some of the people just—since they all wanted to be contributors—would put these arcane things on the test, and it just seemed like the test lacked legitimacy, to me. It lacked legitimacy. In other words, they wanted a tougher test, they wanted tougher standards, but it was like, OK, we’re just going to add some more stuff. It wasn’t like, what’s the value of this? … I’m not so sure that it wasn’t arbitrary.

Both teachers felt decreasing senses of control over their teaching. Feelings of lack of control over content viewed as arbitrary on standardized tests, feelings of having one’s efforts be for naught because the testing had become reified as ‘true’ and complete knowledge, dominated
these parts of these teachers’ conversations, but their articulation of their sense of decreasing control also indicated a form of subjective resistance to these testing regimes.

**Unaccountable knowledges**

All teachers who participated in the study articulated knowledge that the current regime of accountability apparatuses denied. The types of unaccountable knowledge teachers expressed centered on other types of knowledge and other capacities teachers wanted to engage their students in.

**DS:** Students who have other activities beyond that regimented, scholastic endeavor in high school, tend to be better people…. More open, more unbiased, better at getting along with others who are different than themselves—not so one-sided, able to listen to others, take in an opposing argument without getting irrational about it. Also a respect level—in some areas of this particular county, the arts are totally disrespected; everybody who is not the same as everybody else isn’t given respect; whereas, if they have those experiences, they see—Oh! These people are different, but they can do that, and I really don’t like to and can’t do that. I think that you remember those experiences—and they give you a better quality of life, plus make you more content.

**TJ:** They need to not treat administrators, districts, or [high school] teachers like we have some magic wand that can undo four years of a process that has allowed non-learning to occur.

**EC:** But the thing is—I know that my kids are learning. I know they enjoy what they’re doing, I know which ones of them are in band, I know which ones of them play volleyball, I know who has the car—I know these children; I’m interested in them, and I
know they’re learning. I don’t need somebody with a notebook in my room to tell me that…. And that’s the thing; [those tests] don’t matter…. My tests don’t matter, it’s a number. Are you learning something; are you having a good time? I’m so put out with this metadata.

**SP:** They have to look at the elements in play; they have to be fair and they have to design [accountability accordingly]. We have gotten away from circumstances and conditions of different people and environments. In my opinion [our] school’s different than [the wealthy] high school [across town]; I am different than a 25-year-old teaching [the same subject] across the hall.

**DS:** Some people don’t have the potential to reach some of the academic goals we have; I’m sorry, they’re just not going to do it. At least not in the time you have in 12 years…. people haven’t gotten smarter just because we want [them to]. So, you’re teaching the same groups of people with the same IQs. You didn’t have this influx of suddenly bright people, and yet you’ve been demanding more of them, and a lot of the things that have been demanded of them are not within the capabilities of these students. So what we have is a higher drop-out rate because of frustration from students, early on, standards they could not meet, not just from intellectual, but probably from prior mental circumstances too, and I just think that that is not good for the child or for the workplace.

The teachers in this study knew their *students*, though some of this knowledge was problematic itself. The teachers knew their students’ backgrounds, social circumstances, challenges, and interests, and the contexts of their students’ lives. They knew that their students had had previous learning and school experiences before they ever came into their classrooms—
experiences that shaped their learning. Some of these statements indicated a continued fixation with the types of knowledge tested by the SRCP—IQ levels, standards that were “not within the capabilities” of students to meet. When DS said that the created situation is “not good for the child or for the workplace,” he saw a need to connect the needs of the workplace with the school, using the language of schooling in service of the economy. However, in DS’s first quotation above, he discussed giving students opportunities for other types of learning that would make them “better people,” countering the language of neoliberalism.

All these teachers knew that students needed experiences besides and beyond “regimented, scholastic endeavors” in order to learn, and to learn to become more open-minded, balanced human beings. None of this knowledge was accounted for by hierarchical observations, normalizing judgment, or especially by the examinations. Teachers used the space of the interviews conducted for this study to articulate some of this knowledge, and to assert its validity.
Chapter 5: Teachers’ subjectification vis à vis the SRCP

Generally speaking, it might be said that the disciplines are techniques for assuring the ordering of human multiplicities. It is true that there is nothing exceptional or even characteristic in this: every system of power is presented with the same problem. But the peculiarity of the disciplines is that they try to define in relation to the multiplicities a tactics of power...in short, [they attempt] to increase both the docility and the utility of all the elements of the system.

Foucault, 1984d

This chapter addresses the second research question, “How does power impact teachers’ subjectivities?” In this chapter I discuss the affective channels created and used by the circulation of power through the SRCP. The SRCP circulated as a pedagogical gatekeeper in teachers’ pedagogies, standardizing curricula and intensifying time pressure demands on their work and bodies. These channels and impacts also created sites of contradiction and resistance in/with teachers’ subjectivities. I will also discuss how power operated to create already power-inscribed striations of subjectivity, including striations of race, socioeconomic class, and gender within the subjectivities of teachers.

Heavy affects: Teacher stress, health, and violence

Stress is taken to be an attribute of the teacher as a self-enclosed entity. Although it is recognized that teacher-student relations are a major contributor to stress, the relationality itself is considered as something external to the phenomenon.

Roy, 2003

For Deleuze... affects are movements from one state to another, ‘transitions, passages that are experienced, durations through which we pass’ to an enhanced or diminished sense of being. ... In other words, affects are transitions or differences between states produced in relationship, and if we ask about the nature of these differences, we cannot get a representational interpretation precisely because it is experienced as a transition between states. ... Accordingly, stress can be thought of as a negative affect, a certain transitional moment in the composition of bodies.

Roy, 2003

The circulation of power between teachers and the SRCP created and used affective channels in order to operate. Teachers were aware of these channels, speaking of them largely in
the language of negative emotions/feelings, as well as stress and pressure that ultimately impacted their bodies. Teacher stress, in this analysis, was taken to be relational (Roy, 2003); it was understood as affect produced by power in relationships of teachers to policy and to other policy actors. For the teachers in this study, multiple affects and concepts passed into and around each other, swirling with and through the teachers and the intensities created with the disciplinary technologies of the SRCP.

Furthermore, ‘affect,’ in turn, is a term that is used grammatically as a noun but defies nominal categorization. Seigworth and Gregg (2010) stated,

There is no pure or somehow originary state for affect[.] Affect arises in the midst of in-between-ness: in the capacities to act and be acted upon. Affect is an impingement or extrusion of a momentary or sometimes more sustained state of relation as well as the passage (and the duration of passage) of forces or intensities. That is, affect is found in those intensities that pass body to body (human, nonhuman, part-body, and otherwise), in those resonances that circulate about, between, and sometimes stick to bodies and worlds, and in the very passages or variations between these intensities and resonances themselves. Affect, at is most anthropomorphic, is the name we give to those forces—visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally other than conscious knowing, vital forces insisting beyond emotion—that can serve to drive us toward movement, toward thought and extension, that can likewise suspend us (as if in neutral) across a barely registering accretion of force-relations, or that can even leave us overwhelmed by the world’s apparent intractability. Indeed, affect is persistent proof of a body’s never less than ongoing immersion in and among the world’s obstinacies and rhythms, its refusals as much as its invitations. (p. 14)
Affect, then, is not “conscious knowing” but is not reducible to “gut feeling” or simply “emotion” either. Affect, like intensity, is a force that causes and rides the waves of becomings; it is the wave itself. Force and energy are not strictly separable categories.

Affects directly impacted concepts of power for the teachers in this study. Deleuze and Guattari (1994) discussed the concept this way:

The philosophical concept does not refer to the lived, by way of compensation, but consists, through its own creation, in setting up an event that surveys the whole of the lived no less than every state of affairs. Every concept shapes and reshapes the event in its own way. (pp. 33-34).

What does a concept do when it creates a surveying event? The concept speaks the event, not the essence or the thing—pure Event, a haecceity, an entity…. It is like the bird as event. The concept is defined by the inseparability of a finite number of heterogeneous components traversed by a point of absolute survey at infinite speed…. It is infinite through its survey or its speed but finite through its movement that traces the contour of its components (p. 21).

Concepts deploy their intensity by surveying ‘no less than every state of affairs.’ Concepts, in other words, can reconfigure, or at least touch, all affairs—they can fundamentally rearrange reality, though they are, by their nature, finite in the components that make them up. As both infinite and finite, they appear paradoxical. Affects, in turn, offer another paradox: they are not intensities but can be found in and through them. They move toward concepts, in concepts, and around concepts, supporting and even creating them, but are not themselves concepts. To name them, though, requires a concept of each affect. Writing concepts of affects, then, is the only way to approximately report affective data, for pure affect is never representational.
In this study, teachers’ subjectivities were moved by and moved with affect, as Seigworth and Gregg (2010, p. 14) noted. It caused their subjectivities to incorporate and resist aspects of the SRCP, and it also propelled them into difficult terrain where they encountered the subjectivities of ‘others’ (both human and non-human) folded into themselves.

**Affect as “negative emotion:” adding insult to injury**

Teachers in this study experienced the operation of power through the SRCP as negative affects in their subjectivities. Teachers felt the SRCP’s regulation of their subjectivities as both personal and harmful. However, the SRCP’s drive for accountability also became assembled into the teachers’ subjectivities at the same time that they experienced negative affects from it. Below is a grouping of participants’ thinking with and through themselves, with affect. I have highlighted some of these affective moments in bold.
Figure 5.1: Operation of power through the SRCP as negative affects

**DS**: As far as the graduation rate was concerned, I was very self-conscious of that. ... I objected to one of the report card’s standard policies. When we would have students who would transfer to another school, but somehow they got lost, then we lost the credit for [those students]. So I took offense to that. I thought now why are they doing this? We have all the paperwork, and the kid somehow left. We don’t know why, yet we were penalized for something we didn’t do, and even though I had the parent contact and had done what I could do—what can you do? That was very frustrating to look at something you had no control over. (My emphasis)

**DS**: I think my teaching and emphasizing arcane things [for the test] that are not going to be used except if you're an English major is an insult to my teaching. I mean—an insult to what I do. I mean it really is, because that's not the purpose. The purpose is to make better workers, that's the whole purpose. (My emphasis)

**EC**: But if you get negative comments on a PAS-Tor a SAFE-T [evaluation], I always feel like somebody just smacked me, because we don’t like to be told we weren’t exemplary. And even though we all know that we could improve ourselves—of course we can improve, we can improve everything... But when you get negative comments on those, you feel almost like a failure.... But if your students’ test scores are now being tied to that [evaluation], you're going to be a nervous wreck all the time because we’re being undermined. I'm not, because I don't care, they can just fire me, but... It's true, I'd just as soon leave the profession. (My emphasis)
Frustration, hurt, despondency, insult, and disheartening: there is a physical, embodied heaviness to such concepts of affects. EC even uses the verb ‘sunk.’ Interestingly, these “negative emotion” affects were often attached to the inability, or perceived inability, to meet the SRCP’s mandates. For some teachers, the frustration was directed more at the unfairness of the
criteria, as it was for DS (“penalized for something we didn’t do”) and EC (“I don’t believe calling children failing is the way to get there”); for others, it was more personalized: SP particularly desired her students’ success on the HSAP, the test attached to the SRCP, and felt that her students’ success on the test became “a personal part of [her];” she knew her students were capable of higher scores. Her desire for student success became transmogrified into desire for student success on the test—she became “‘properly passionate’… about achieving ‘peak performance’” (Ball, 2001, p. 217) concerning students’ test scores. Her care became “reconstructed into caring predominantly for pupil performance” (Jeffrey, 2002, p. 535). She knew, as did other teachers, that test scores are often the most visible aspect of a school community and thus have replaced other notions of the meaning of ‘school community’ in public perception. She knew there were very real material consequences attached to the numbers for her students and their community, and therefore it became personal, even hurtful, when her students’ scores were not as high as she desired or knew they could be. TJ as well knew the heaviness of the numbers when she reminded herself frequently, “I am not this number; don’t let this number kill you.”

DS felt that the SRCP and its technologies were an ‘insult’ to his teaching, but he also stated that the ‘whole purpose’ of education was to ‘make better workers.’ Yet, as noted in chapter four, when asked specifically about the purposes of education, DS listed many potential purposes other than work and economic productivity. DS incorporated and resisted neoliberal language simultaneously.

EC spoke of the bodily affects of the policy technologies in play: when she received negative evaluations she would feel like “someone just smacked [her].” Youdell stated in her 2004 article “Wounds and Reinscriptions” that “The possibility of both injury and resistance is
intrinsic to performative constitutions. Indeed, a discursive moment of injury may simultaneously open up particular possibilities for resistance” (p. 481). Experience of negative affect as injury for these teachers did cause pain; it also opened possibilities for resistance through their critique of the wounding and through their awareness of pain, epistemic dissonance, and their subsequently assembling their pedagogical performances differently than they may have otherwise.

Throughout the discussion of these teachers’ experiences, physical bodies came up frequently in both metaphors and in fact. In Youdell’s (2004) discussion of Butler’s “peformatively constituted subject,” Youdell explained that

Taking bodily activity to be formed by and formative of ritual and convention, [Butler] argues that the bodily habitus can be seen as “a citational chain lived and believed at the level of the body” (Butler, 1997a, p. 155). She suggests that this might be understood as a “tacit performative” which gives the body “a practical sense.” (Bulter, 1997a, pp. 159-160, as cited in Youdell, 2004, p. 480)

More on the impact of the SRCP and associated policy technologies on the formation of the embodied subjectivities and resistances of these teachers will be discussed in the following sections.

**SRCP: policy naggings, lurkings, and pressure: an ‘individual’ problem**

Multiple teachers said they experienced stress, pressure, and depression in connection with the SRCP; stress and pressure were framed as individual problems (again, individualization is a tenet and function of neoliberal ideology), and the SRCP became a figure that ‘lurked’ and ‘nagged’ at each individual. DS paid particular attention to the way the SRCP further individualized surveillance upon given teachers, while in the past, accountability had focused
more on districts or at least whole schools. The SRCP increasingly concentrated power individually, a point also discussed by Foucault:

Thus, in a certain sense, the operation of power was individualized in order to achieve its maximum concentration.

In a disciplinary regime... individualization is 'descending': as power becomes more anonymous and more functional, those on whom it is exercised tend to be more strongly individualized; it is exercised by surveillance rather than ceremonies, by observation rather than commemorative accounts, by comparative measures that have the 'norm' as reference rather than genealogies giving ancestors as points of reference, by 'gaps' rather than deeds. (Foucault, 1979, p. 193, as cited in O’Neill, 1986, p. 53)

The ‘gaps’ here were between the accountability systems of the past and the current systems of accountability under the SRCP; these ‘gaps’ created the shifting motion of policy power discussed. Teachers themselves became more individualized, more individually surveilled over time through the SRCP and its release of intensities; these intensities manifested as stress and pressure, affects that affected the materiality of teachers’ subjectivities. Below, I illustrate a few of these ‘gaps’ through participants’ talk. Again, I highlight some of the affective productions in bold that haunt participants in the senses of ‘lurking’ and ‘nagging.’
The SRCP manifested as a ‘lurking,’ ‘nagging’ presence of surveillance that became folded into the subjectivity of each teacher—even EC found it necessary to flatly and bodily refuse to attend workshops on some of the standardized tests as a way of resisting the ‘stress,’ ‘tension,’ and ‘pressure’ created. However, her emphasis on wanting to “offer [students] something that is far more practical” was simultaneously an insistence on the validity of her knowledge of her students and a rejection of standardized curricula as well as a more neoliberal emphasis on something akin to ‘job skills.’
Furthermore, as Webb (2009) also found: “participants monitored their peers and themselves, reproducing the effects of surveillance in the school” (p. 110). This reproduction took place for DS and EC through affective pressure vis-à-vis their subjectivities. DS went on to state that

I think a lot of teachers, though, who were slack, felt stress because they didn’t want to be caught; they didn’t plan right, or etc. When I was a DIF [District Instructional Facilitator], I’d go and evaluate people even though I had really no authority; I could tell when people weren’t planned.

He, like TJ, eventually became a supervisor who surveilled others (whether in the capacity of a DIF or a PAS-T/ADEPT evaluator). He “had really no authority” (a DIF could not make personnel decisions or officially reprimand teachers, and would not have the power to “pass” or “fail” a teacher as a PAS-T or ADEPT evaluator would), but the effect of his surveillance reproduced the a/effects of more ‘official’ forms of surveillance, specifically ‘stress.’

SP also found that stress and pressure took place in relational spaces among teachers and the support and administrative staff at her school.

**SP:** I don’t want the credit for anything, I’m not asking for it, but what I saw was there were other people—they were teachers—that never entered my classroom, except two or three times, who absolutely wanted credit for all of it [raising test scores]. What it’s becoming is the teacher is just the work dog; you work, you do it, you do it, you do it, and if you have any problems, they’re just not treated very professionally. If you have any requests, you’re not treated very professionally, but when the scores come out, you’re not even given credit that much, and your students… I can’t explain it. It’s just a very
bad situation because we’ve never had this kind of pressure before. And I knew it was bad a long time ago because [our scores] were low, but I had much more support when the scores were low than when they improved. And over the course of time, there were people who were not doing their jobs as far as helping teachers with these test scores, and they are at [my] High School. They’re not doing what they’re supposed to be doing.

**MAC**: Do you think that that interpersonal dynamic was on account of the tests and the pressure, or do you feel like it was the people who were particularly at that school in those positions, or a combination thereof?

**SP**: This is so complicated, because it’s not just about the interpersonal relationships. Unfortunately we’re among people who were different; some of those people were very power hungry for some odd reason—I have no idea. They were very judgmental. I know this sounds strange… but it’s almost like little bullies that you teach in a classroom, saying things about teachers that should not have been said, and you dare not really intervene because the interpersonal relationships were defective because of defective personalities, I’ll put it that way. And sometimes you want no trouble because you have enough in your classroom, and you maintain yourself, but after a while you can’t maintain it anymore; you just can’t listen to it, you can’t watch it, and you definitely can’t let it happen to you.

SP experienced the reproduction of surveillance and disciplinary technologies in the bodies of others in the school. She stated that these others wanted credit for her work when scores rose, but gave her fewer resources and less support the more the scores rose as well—perhaps this was a means of maintaining pressure even when it could have been ameliorated. She also referred to
administrative and support personnel in the school as “little bullies” who were “power hungry” and “judgmental.” She experienced the full assault of their judgment and their hunger for power, but had to find ways of refracting the assault; her body and mind could not take more “trouble because [she had] enough in [her] classroom.” After a while, she realized she “definitely [couldn’t] let it happen to [her],” in other words, she had to find a means to protect herself from the bullying because there was only so much she could take—and her decision to leave the classroom mid-year after over twenty years in the same school reflected just how intense (and intensely negative) the environment became for her under the SRCP’s disciplinary and surveillance regime and its incorporation into the subjectivities of those around her. Furthermore, her depiction of those others in the school bullying by using what resources they had (or withholding such resources) was apt. Teachers do have an intuitive grasp of how power operates, and while it ‘lurks’ and ‘nags,’ it also seduces some to use its disciplinary technologies against others to curry favor or to gain more power within the hierarchical power structure as it exists, rather than using power to subvert or change the existing power structures. As in many systems of oppression, it was easier for some teachers to lash out at or climb on top of those next to them rather than to attack the source of power.

An understanding of Deleuze and Guattari’s work also illustrated that though the SRCP did seek to become more individualized in its a/effects of power over time, if we understand teachers as subjectivities rather than individuals, the picture becomes more complex:

Individuation doesn’t have to be personal. We’re not at all sure we’re persons: a draft, a wind, a day, a time of day, a stream, a place, a battle, an illness all have a nonpersonal individuality. They have proper names. We call them ‘hecceities.’[sic]…They express themselves in language, carving differences in it, but language gives each its own
individual life and gets things passing between them. If you speak like most people on the level of opinions, you say, ‘me, I’m a person,’ just as you say ‘the sun’s rising.’ But we’re not convinced that’s definitely the right concept. …Our individuality is rather that of events, which isn’t making any grand claim, given that haecceities can be modest and microscopic. I’ve tried in all my books to discover the nature of events; it’s a philosophical concept, the only one capable of ousting the verb ‘to be’ and attributes. (Deleuze, 1990/1995, p. 141, as cited in St. Pierre, 2004, p. 290)

If policy ‘lurked’ individual teachers, yet teachers were not personally individuated, then individuation as a concentration of power was itself a policy-event, a policy-haecceity of the SRCP. Stress and pressure were not ‘individual’ problems of ‘autonomous’ individuals; they were affective channels of the individuation of power that concentrated itself in the bodies of teachers, moving them from state to state. This is the ‘relationality’ of stress that Roy (2003, p. 155) spoke of, and the “drive toward movement, thought and extension” Seigworth and Gregg (2010, p. 14) expressed. Furthermore, the affects of stress and pressure, feeling wounded or depressed—‘smacked’—were indications of what Seigworth and Gregg (2010, p. 14) called “a body’s refusals as much as its invitations.” A wound opens the possibility for resistance through its pain—embodied subjectivity’s indication that something is wrong. Pain alerts a subjectivity to the need to do something different—to become differently.

As mentioned previously, while EC did experience pressure as well as negative affective channels in tandem with testing and with the organization of the school curriculum generally, she did not experience the exact same pressure from test scores and numbers because of her school’s demographic situation:
MAC: Have you ever felt pressure to act or think differently than you otherwise might? Either in front of colleagues, administration, parents or anything because of the school report card policies or the associated testing?

EC: No. But there again, I think I’m the wrong person to ask that. I just have such a unique demographic and it’s gravy; I know that, but I’ve never really been in a situation where I felt like I needed to reassure parents... I just don’t feel like I’ve ever been pressured to present myself anything as other than what I am, which is kind of a loopy, fun teacher. (My emphasis)

EC’s circumstance (in a school that served a generally more middle-class white community than the communities the other teachers taught at within the district) pointed to how historically power-filled striations of subjectivity—over-coded spaces of race, class, and access to wealth, resources, and power in the community—impacted the intensity of circulation of particular affects. EC was not entirely shielded from the impacts of the SRCP, but she, in contrast to teachers in previous studies, “just [didn’t] feel like [she’d] ever been pressured to present [herself] as anything other than what [she was].” None of the other participants in this study talked about feeling this way at any time; EC’s perspective indicates the need for further comparative study of the circulation of affects and disciplinary policy technologies under differing socioeconomic and racialized conditions.

Teachers’ regulating subjectivities

Both DS and SP retired from teaching—from the same school in a low-income neighborhood—because the conditions generated through and with the SRCP became too much to bear. For DS, teaching wasn’t ‘fun’ anymore, and he didn’t feel valued or that he was having
valuable experiences in the classroom. SP could not take the lack of support; she felt betrayed by her school environment, the lack of support, and the power games of others.

**Affects: Health**

When I followed up with SP after her initial interview, she connected the stress of her working environment to health problems she and others had experienced. She went on to say that she felt she “could have made 40 years [of teaching] if things were different.” As things were, she stated, “teachers find ways to survive, and that is a pitiful way to work.” She expressed her desire that a school could have been a “loving place to work,” using a different discourse than the neoliberal discourse of efficiency, productivity, and effectiveness.

SP also discussed impacts on her physical health that stemmed from the combined affects of the SRCP and its technologies:

**SP:** I just did not appreciate the support system [at my school] at all with HSAP. There was nothing there, except when DS was there. That was the only time I felt like I had any camaraderie at all, any teaching companion who took it seriously, backing me up, my backing him up. When the teamwork stops, you retreat to your room and do what you have to do with your own—and that’s how it was…. It’s kind of ironic, but it seemed like the more that you worked with passion and care… it seemed like nobody else really took it seriously…. And health-wise I just felt like I was so tired all the time. I couldn’t enjoy my own life at home. I would start thinking about things at night, dreading going in the next day. It was a very tough experience.

SP’s investment in teaching, and in her students, was obvious. However, her physical and mental health suffered through the negative affects she experienced, as did TJ’s. Likewise, TJ
discussed overhearing many colleagues discussing early retirement, changing careers, and/or quitting. TJ’s previous quotation also bears repeating here, with a different emphasis, because she also discussed the impacts she experienced on her physical health:

I’ve become bitter about it to be honest. I work really hard. I actually have a mission statement that I keep on the desktop of my computer that I read to myself every day to remind myself this is what I’m about. I am not this number, don’t let this number kill you, because it disheartens me. I physically have changed quite a bit; I’ve put on 40 pounds because I don’t eat right; my sleeping’s horrible. I think I’m a lot more on the edge emotionally where, I’ll just have days I just feel like nothing went right and I’ll go home and cry about it. And I’m thinking, when you are doing something that you’re supposed to love, you shouldn’t cry about it when you go home at night. (My emphasis)

While the concept of a “mission statement” carries echoes of a neoliberal corporate culture of schooling, TJ appropriated it for an alternate purpose: her survival as a teacher. Her mission statement acted as a barrier to deflect the worst of the negative affects produced by the SRCP and accountability policy technologies—she told herself, “Don’t let this number kill you.” However, her embodied subjectivity was still assembled differently in rather dramatic means—40 pounds became assembled into/onto her body; her sleeping and eating changed and she stated she was “more on the edge emotionally.” Her phrasing here indicated the blurry boundaries of teachers’ subjectivities. To be “on the edge” is to be in a border-zone, to become in a space that is not quite one thing or another; in this case, it was the space of subjectification between teachers and the SRCP’s technologies of the self—the space in which power flowed through affective channels to assemble and re-assemble teachers’ embodied subjectivities.
Finding the ‘other’ in teachers’ subjectivities: Concrete controls and becomings in the body

Folding race, class, and teacher bodies
Deleuze’s concept of the fold, which he discussed in his book Foucault, was Deleuze’s attempt at explaining Foucault’s conundrum of his “incapacity to cross the line” of power, to tra(ns)verse it, to resist even after “the transversal relations of resistance…become restratified” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 78). Instead of imagining a line between power and resistance or between power and not-power, Deleuze instead imagined a fold. He asked,

But is there an inside that lies deeper than any external world, just as the outside is farther away than any external world? The outside is not a fixed limit but a moving matter animated by peristaltic movements, folds and foldings that together make up an inside: they are not something other than the outside, but precisely the inside of the outside…. The unthought is therefore not external to thought but lies at its very heart, as that impossibility of thinking which doubles or hollows out the outside….

Either it is the fold of the infinite, or the constant folds (replis) of finitude which curve the outside and constitute the inside. (Deleuze, 1999, p. 80)

Just as the outside and the inside fold into and against one another, “curv[ing] the outside and constitut[ing] the inside,” teachers’ subjectivities were folded into and against the power of historical discourses of race and class, and historical discourses of race and class were folded into and against teachers’ embodied subjectivities.

EC’s stating that accountability policies sought to “brand [teachers] with the same iron,” while on the surface seemingly a bit flippant, drew on loaded historical discourse here in the South Carolina. There are two possible (most likely overlapping) references: one to the branding
of cattle as property, thus framing teachers as “stock,” a “resource” (human ‘capital’) to be “farmed” in a standard way where one ‘cow’ is no different in an economic sense than the next, except in terms of the money it can produce for the farmer. The second citation this phrase draws upon is South Carolina’s history of slavery. South Carolina developed a slave code in 1712 called “An Act for the Better Ordering and Governing of Negroes and Slaves,” which would subsequently act as a model for slave codes throughout the Southern United States (Rothenberg, 2007, p. 532). Under the slave laws, branding was used in South Carolina as punishment for infractions ranging from attempting to run away to stealing (Christian & Bennet, 1999, p. 27). The practice, in other words, became part of the antebellum South’s “punishing universality” (Foucault, 1984a, p. 194), which utilized the right of the sword. EC’s statement carries a double-historical-reference to the farming of livestock and the forced enslavement of Africans on this land.

If accountability policies attempt to “brand” teachers, the impact is by implication physical, and at first glance, teachers [and also students] are framed as human chattel/‘capital’ in a neoliberal educational-economic enterprise. However, with the assistance of Deleuze’s (1999) concept of ‘folding,’ the framing of teachers’ subjectivities becomes more complex than simple human chattel. Both the impulse to brand and the enslavement of the branded circulate and are folded into teachers’ subjectivities vis à vis accountability policy because the desire to regulate oneself as an efficient ‘accountable’ teacher is created through affective channels the SRCP circulates. Importantly, what I am not saying is that teaching under the current accountability policy regime is tantamount to enslavement. The utter horror and brutality used against African-American slaves in the antebellum South was a singularity that cannot be compared, claimed, or co-opted by those who did not experience it, and too often white theorists far too glibly co-opt
the ideas, experiences, cultures, and bodies of non-white ‘others.’ That is not what I seek to do here. However, understanding the history of the place in which these teachers teach, it is perhaps important to recognize that a shadow, a specter, or a trace(s) of the slaving mentality may still (affectively) haunt/hunt teachers’ subjective practices in South Carolina (and likely elsewhere). Using Deleuze’s idea of the fold (1999), a recognition that teachers are not only ‘branded’ but that they also ‘brand’ themselves and ‘others’ acknowledges teachers’ complicity in regimes of power, and white privilege in particular.

Teachers’ subjectivities are perhaps still the most powerful tool in the educational apparatus, and if teachers were, in some senses, not powerful, such ‘accountability’ technologies would not be needed. In the words of author, philosopher, theologian, educator and 20th Century American civil rights leader Howard Thurman, when explaining Jim Crow laws to his young daughters, “‘The measure of a man’s estimate of your strength… is the kind of weapons he feels that he must use in order to hold you fast in a prescribed place” (as quoted in Wilkerson, 2010, p. 41). However, as I will explain momentarily, the ‘prescribed places’ accountability policies attempted to hold teachers in also became folded into teachers’ subjectivities and therefore, paradoxically, became moving ‘fixed’ places, undeterminable in advance. Teachers’ subjectivities did not stay neatly in prescribed places, though they folded attempting-to-become prescribed places of race and class into and out from themselves. In her analysis of Claude Levi-Strauss’ ‘The Science of the Concrete’ and Alfred Crosby’s Ecological Imperialism, Radhika Mohanram (1999)

[suggested]… there is an embodiment of blackness with a simultaneous disembodiment of whiteness, a disembodiment accompanied by two other tropes at the level of discourse. First, whiteness has the ability to move; second, the ability to move results in the
unmarking of the body. In contrast, blackness is signified through a marking and is always static and immobilizing. (p. 4)

Mohanram’s insight becomes important in analyzing how the ‘other’ of students’ raced, classed, nationalized (immigrant vs. non-immigrant, English-speaking as a first language vs. non-English speaking as a first language), and gendered bodies became found in these (primarily white) teachers’ subjectivities (though for TJ, her Jewish and Irish heritage were understood as distinctly not privileged, at least historically). If whiteness has the ability to move, power in motion can move with and through whiteness. However, to form fixed striations of subjectivity, power also needs the construction of blackness and non-whiteness, non-American-ness, in teachers’ subjectivities, in order to form striated spaces where power flows. Accountability technologies ‘mark’ (brand?) non-white subjective spaces; the construction of blackness in South Carolina in turn engenders the continuing construction of the embodiment of whiteness in teachers’ subjectivities (as was also previously the case concerning slave codes in South Carolina in a past era).

Postcolonial theory has recognized for some time that the construction of the ‘other’ takes place through white supremacist, Eurocentric powers, and in turn constructs white subjectivity (Said, 1978, 1993). Mohanram is not unique in her pointing out that racialization is a process that stems from and supports a white supremacist power structure (Razack, 2007; Cruz, 2001; Gilroy, 2000) or in her connection of racialization processes to space and place (Razack, 2007), but the central insight that race is never constructed in the absence of place is essential here. These places (where race is constructed; in this case, in South Carolina) are not only theoretical or abstract; the distinction between the abstract and the concrete breaks down when considering the embodiment of teachers’ subjectivities and the embodiment of ‘othered’
subjectivities in the subjectivity of the teacher. The affects engendered are both abstract and concrete and embodied, yet not always knowable in advance.

Deleuze explained in his (1990) text *Negotiations* that processes of subjectification can become resistant even while they may create new axes of power/knowledge that become the dominant power, and teachers’ processes of subjectification were equally complex:

It definitely makes sense to look at the various ways individuals and groups constitute themselves as subjects through processes of subjectification: what counts in such processes is the extent to which, as they take shape, they elude both established forms of knowledge and the dominant forms of power. Even if they in turn engender new forms of power or become assimilated into new forms of knowledge. For a while, though, they have a real rebellious spontaneity. (Deleuze, 1990, p. 176)

Thus, the creation of the ‘other’ in teachers’ subjectivities, while following certain striations, resisted them at the same time that that these striations were created anew.

**Resistance strategies**

Many of the places in which power operated through and with the SRCP most forcefully were also places where teachers created the most creative subjective resistance. Teachers’ “rebellious spontaneity” was not categorically successful at all times, and it was not always uniform or uncomplicated, but teachers found ways to escape striated spaces that forceful affects sought to create as the only pedagogical options.

In this case, Foucault’s “care of the self”—the ‘creation of the self as a work of art’—was the space where teachers also became responsible unto themselves, their pedagogies, and their students. Care as “unselfish” (or, perhaps more accurately, “other-selfish”) moments in
teachers’ lives, allowed teachers to create themselves and their pedagogies as works of art. They created alternate aesthetic spaces where reparative and transformative work took place, even as those spaces doubled back and “engendered new forms of power.”

**Figure 5.3** Teachers’ ‘rebellious spontaneity’ as resistance
For SP, the creation of humor, and her passion for teaching for purposes other than those mandated by the SRCP, created her sense of professional responsibility unto herself. Her use of humor was an important element of resistance in the classroom, and was especially important for students living in poverty because they faced a greater intensity of accountability technologies in operation in their schools. Humor opened alternate affective space not regulated by accountability technologies, even if at the same time that affective space may have been used to learn a word or a concept included as part of what accountability policy desired. Even the act of prayer was folded into SP’s subjectivity; prayer became a resistance strategy for SP because prayer and conscience used alternate discourses and facilitated alternate ways of knowing and assembling her subjectivity.

TJ also found ways to incorporate alternate discourses into the assembling of her subjectivity: she used the *Seven Habits of Highly Effective Teens* (though itself also problematically neoliberal in its discourse) to talk to her students about “who they were” and “what they [were] aiming for” during a transitional time of high accountability. While TJ diverged from the space of accountability regimes with this practice, her subjectivity also folded back into neoliberal discourse (‘highly effective’), though it also sent out lines of flight from this same neoliberal discourse. Teachers’ subjectivities spiraled between/among striated and smooth spaces of subjectification.

**Spiraling subjectivities and marking bodies**

The ‘marking’ of non-white, ‘other’ bodies also took place in and through the embodied subjectivities of the teachers in the schoolhouse panopticon. Imagining a spiral shape was useful to my thinking here: subjectivity may spiral back to the same segment of a vertical plane (a certain striation along race, or class, gender, sexuality, ability, or a striation of neoliberal discourse, etc.), yet each time subjectivity cycles back to the plane of a striation of race, class,
etc., it has traveled further along the variation of that plane, creating and extending the landscape of that plane, and also diverging from it, at the same time that it spirals back to it. The ‘marking’ of ‘other’ bodies takes place at the junctures in the Figure 5.4 (below) where the spiral touches the plane.
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Figure 5.4: Marking of ‘other’ bodies in and through teachers’ embodied subjectivities

Only half a century ago in the American Southeast, the ‘marking’ of spaces as ‘colored-only’ or ‘white only’ in the Jim Crow era took place in and through *white bodies*, and that legacy continues in the institutional space of the schoolhouse panopticon. The Southeast’s present is not the past, but it carries the past’s echoes.

**Teachers’ marking of ‘othered’ student bodies**

SP mentioned that most of the students who came willingly for tutoring were Spanish-speakers; she stated, “We had one day a week where we tutored. I was basically tutoring Spanish students; they were coming in more regularly.” The construction of immigrant identities vis à vis education is an area deserving of further discussion, but a full discussion of immigrant subjectivities specifically is beyond the current scope of this work. However, what SP did point out was how the narrowing/standardization of curricula under the SRCP worked through her to
construct a version of the “model minority” through these Spanish-speaking students. While persons of Asian descent are usually constructed as the “model minority” in the United States, in SP’s school community there were not many Asian students, and the Spanish-speaking students were constructed as taking over this role, particularly in teachers’ perceptions of how hard they were willing to work to learn English, to do well in school, etc. The construction of the Spanish-speakers as local “model minority” usually operated in SP’s school community as against the construction of black/African-American students as not as willing/able to work hard. Thus, the SRCP’s affects, through teachers’ subjectivities, did operate along striations of subjectivity that have been and continue to be historically power-filled (i.e. race, class, gender, etc.). This point will be discussed again momentarily.

It was also noteworthy that in EC’s interview, she brought up the impacts of historically power-filled striations of subjectivity such as race, ethnicity, and class more so than any other teacher.

**EC:** In September we got these pieces of paper. They had scores; they had the child’s name on it, and then it said ‘below basic.’ And you hand it to that child year after year, below basic, basic, proficient, below basic, below basic. So I’m handing this kid a piece of paper that I’m legally required to hand to him to tell him he’s below basic again. That’s motivating…. I wanted him to have basic—I wanted him to have proficient. I think that’s cruel, and it’s unnecessary. I think we’re cruel to an entire underclass who are not strong advocates for themselves, and do not know how to be strong advocates for themselves. And that’s where the adversarial relationship between home and school begins. It’d be just a shame that you’re going to assume that because my child’s black, that because my child speaks Spanish at home, because, because, because… you’re going
to treat my child differently and we’re going to pre-empt that by treating you like crap. I really didn’t like that I was being asked to do that.

**EC:** But I think that it’s very easy to put people in boxes, and frankly the boxes that we put them in are very often racial…. I think that we don’t expect the same kind of student based on color and based on background…. There are some white kids whose behavior is horrible. Their attitude is horrible, they’re racist, they get out of everything, they get on Twitter and are horrible about other people, they drink on the weekends, they do PTI [Pre-Trial Intervention], they have lawyers. When they’re up for expulsion, they get a lawyer; they take a lawyer to the district. Those kids, because they are white, and because they have lawyers, and because they have somebody advocating for them, who knows you need a lawyer—they are out of control. I don’t mean that that’s a huge population at the moment, but with these kids it’s because they’re white. We have some really wealthy Hispanic people, and we have some wealthy black people as well, but for the most part it’s just lower-middle-class kids, but nobody would ever think to kick ‘Evan’ out of class. But you wouldn’t take that same thing from somebody else who was a different color, or didn’t have as high an IQ, or it wouldn’t cross your mind. I’m ashamed to say that this has crossed my mind—it’s like, oh my god, is this really worth it? Because his mom is going to be up here, and do I really want to go ten rounds with his family?

Race may be a social construct, but it has very material impacts. Class, likewise, is not simply a matter of household income in this regard. Class is the social power attached to financial and racial status. What EC recognized in the above quotations is that these socially constructed aspects of subjectivity often determine the larger context in which education takes
place in the first place. Furthermore, the privileged hierarchical system that ‘sorts’ people by striations of subjectivity, over-coded spaces such as race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, etc., directed the power flows of accountability policy and “the social distribution of resources” (Connell, 1995, as cited in Smyth, 2001, p. 126). As EC aptly noted (and as SP noted above concerning Spanish-speaking students), children’s subjective experiences are often striated and articulated by race, class, language, gender. Here, by labeling children’s abilities as “basic,” “below-basic,” etc., the tests associated with the SRCP reinforced the ‘sorting’ mechanisms of over-coded spaces of subjectivity for students, particularly around race and class. EC also described how white privilege operated in her particular school setting; white children could act “out of control” because their privileged status afforded them both lawyers and parents who knew how to utilize the legal system, while similar behaviors would not be tolerated from students whose bodies were black or brown; they lacked the social resources white students had. The expectation of negative behavior was also more present for students whose bodies were constructed as non-white; EC stated that “no one would ever think to kick ‘Evan’ out of class.” She used ‘Evan’ as a white name, pointing out how teachers’ perceptions and expectations of students differ by racial categories in ways teachers themselves may not consciously acknowledge. For EC, sometimes the acknowledgement of tolerating different behavior could even be conscious, but her awareness of a students’ parents’ willingness to utilize their privilege also impacted her decisions. What EC’s thoughts indicated here was that teachers need to explicitly become more conscious of the ways that striations of (non-white, ‘othered’) subjectivities are folded into their own, and how those foldings manifest in expectations, perceptions, and teachers’ disciplining of non-white bodies. Furthermore, teachers need anti-racist administrative support so that all students’ families’ concerns (particularly those dealing
with disciplinary issues) are treated equitably, not based on how much privilege a given family has and/or knows how to use. As the international conversation about the “achievement gap” and the “school-to-prison pipeline” continues, this must become part of the conversation.

EC also articulated how religion played a role in constituting *classed* student subjectivities in South Carolina; poverty, according to EC, is still considered a “sin;” she said,

I think that what I want to say is that I do believe that in South Carolina that the attitude of poverty being a sin is still incredibly pervasive, and that grace often has to do with that. I think that the poor and ethnic children of the state are under served because I think that Columbia [the state capital] doesn’t care.

EC indicated that a blame-the-victim mentality persists in South Carolina around the poor, and minority children disproportionately grow up in poverty in South Carolina. According to the South Carolina Commission for Minority Affairs, African-Americans make up 94.5% of racial minorities in the state, and furthermore, “African-Americans in the state have a 28 percent family poverty rate with 37.0 percent of children living in poverty compared to whites whose poverty rates are 5.9 percent for families and 12.0 percent for children” (Albergottie, 2008). Once again, the implications for social justice are that children living in poverty and minority children are not served by the pervasive systems of racialization and class, and that the SRCP reinforces these sorting systems rather than ameliorating them.

**Teachers’ bodies, whiteness, and the nation/state**

Just as Mohanram (1999) emphasized that the construction of black bodies is fundamentally connected to place and space, the planes of striations of subjectivity (particularly the racial plane) were rooted in place in this study (former plantation lands on former Cherokee
lands), and the history and genealogy of race in this place. Furthermore, this process of subjectification was both abstract and frightfully concrete, just as the consequences of colonization and slavery and Jim Crow laws on this land once were, and just as the resistance of teachers’ bodies to such subjectification was also simultaneously both abstract and concrete.

This emphasis on the body is also an anti-racist feminist emphasis. Cruz (2001) remarked that

We as educational researchers find ourselves entrenched in the Cartesian dichotomy of public/private and theory/experience. Never mind our rallying cry that the personal is political, the sets of sanctioned attitudes and behaviors in the social sciences that emphasize the mind over the body, such as the values of the rational, autonomous, independent, isolated researcher, somehow dismiss corporeal approaches that validate the lived experience of the body. (Bordo, 1993; Jagger, 1983; Mohanram, 1999; Pillow, 1997; Tong, 1998, as cited in Cruz, 2001, p. 659)

Cruz (2001) went on to explicate that the body is a “messy text,” “excessive in its disorderly movements and conduct” (p. 659). The bodies of teachers and the ‘othered’ bodies constructed in and through their subjectivities interrupted this research; they were “excessive,” yet it was ethically necessary to follow Spivak’s directive to “say yes to that which interrupts [our] project” (Spivak cited in St. Pierre, 1997, p. 178). Teachers’ bodies in this study lived in excess of their codes—as did mine—as did ‘othered’ student bodies. They ‘interrupted’ this research, but became folded into it. St. Pierre (1997) explained that the Deleuzian concept of the fold “breaks apart humanist dualisms like inside/outside, self/other, identity/difference, and presence/absence” (p. 178). The concept of the fold helped me as a researcher to follow Cruz’s
Anzaldúa (1987) also offered my thinking a gift in her explanation of *mestiza* consciousness. Once again, learning from Cruz’s and Anzaldúa’s theory is not an attempt to co-opt or to reduce the singularities of brown (and in Cruz’s work, also lesbian) bodies’ experiences and/or theories. To co-opt is to *steal*; to *learn from* is to acknowledge the giving of a gift and to acknowledge the contributions of others to the necessary work of constructing theory more inclusively. Cruz and Anzaldúa offer the gift of understanding *mestizaje*, which is defined as “the embodiment of the multiple, often oppositional, subject positions of Chicana/Latina lesbians…. Anzaldúa’s mestiza consciousness is a movement toward divergent thinking—an inclusive, plural, constantly shifting, suturing synthesis of an epistemology that signals the rupture in the subject-object duality that grounds Enlightenment epistemologies” (Cruz, 2001, pp. 660-661). Just as Deleuze and Guattari attempt to break down this duality with their concept of ‘the fold,’ Anzaldúa attempts to break down this duality with her concept of *mestizaje*.

For the teachers whose bodies were primarily constructed as white, there was a similarity to *mestizaje*, though it was complicated by the embodiment of whiteness. These teachers’ subjectivities were indeed inclusive, plural, constantly shifting, and they ruptured the subject-object duality of Cartesian thinking with their lives, their bodies, their teacher knowledges. However, one of the axioms of understanding white privilege is that a privileged person has “the privilege not to acknowledge one’s privileges,” even unto oneself. Therefore, whiteness became an ‘unknowing’ of the ways ‘othered’ student subjectivities were folded *into and onto* teachers’ own subjectivities. Whiteness became an ‘unknowing’ of the ways whiteness itself was folded *into and onto* these teachers’ subjectivities. Teachers’ subjectivities were indeed multiple; many
aspects of their embodiment challenged dominant power and were “in excess of their codes,” and yet whiteness was not aware of its folding in with the rest, producing one of the splits in teacher consciousness that assisted in producing what Webb (2009) called “epistemic suicide.” The epistemic schizophrenia teachers experience under accountability regimes is thus assisted by the blind-folding of whiteness into the multiplicities of teachers’ subjectivities.

Furthermore, Mohanram goes on to explain that

Bodies are specifically linked with nations…. The conflation of bodies and nation is implicit in a myriad texts written in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries…. The distinction between body and the place in which it originates implodes. (Mohanram 1999, p. 4)

This distinction implodes particularly, as Mohanram goes on to explain, in imperial, colonizing nations, and the bodies of white people—white women in particular—have historically been put into the service of colonialism through being used as “fore-runners” of military colonizers: as missionaries, nurses, teachers. Teachers’ bodies help construct the nation; the nation (a white supremacist nation) becomes folded into the subjectivity of the teacher as well. In the Jim Crow South, white bodies historically constructed place by occupying a narrowly-defined range of acceptable behavior on behalf of the nation-state, or the so-called “Southern culture.” In the ground-breaking narrative non-fiction work The Warmth of Other Suns: The Epic Story of America’s Great Migration (2010), a narrative history of the Great Migration of African-

---

11 I understand that theorists and those with mental dis/different/abilities may object to my use of the word ‘schizophrenia’ here; however, in this case, I wish to use the word to indicate the kind of double-consciousness or Orwellian “double-think” produced by power through whiteness and accountability technologies. What is important here is that two contradictory consciousnesses simultaneously co-exist.

12 Similarly, I wish to use the word ‘blind’ not to reinscribe any discourse of dehumanization (Baynton, 2001) for those who are physically blind, but to indicate the willing but unconscious ignorance that inheres in the construction of whiteness through the double entendre of “blind fold”/“blindfold.”
Americans from the Jim Crow South to the American North and West, Isabel Wilkerson described the situation of whites in the South in the Jim Crow era:

What few people seemed to realize or perhaps dared admit was that the thick walls of the caste system kept everyone in prison. The rules that defined a group’s supremacy were so tightly wound as to put pressure on everyone trying to stay within the narrow confines of acceptability. It meant being a certain kind of Protestant, holding a particular occupation, having a respectable level of wealth or the appearance of it, and drawing the patronizingly appropriate lines between oneself and those of lower rank of either race in that world. (p. 33)

Wilkerson’s use of the word ‘prison’ is interestingly appropriate in its potential referentiality to panopticism and surveillance. Teacher EC echoed this sentiment when she stated (and the quotation is worth repeating),

I do believe that in South Carolina the attitude of poverty being a sin is still incredibly pervasive, and that ‘grace’ often has to do with that. I think that the poor and ethnic children of the state are under served because I think that Columbia doesn’t care.

EC’s statement also indicated that two other channels of power were in operation to create a striation of subjectivity along class lines: “grace,” which would be the Protestant Christian concept of “the grace of God;” hence, Protestant Christian religion, which often (though not unilaterally) espouses the “prosperity gospel,” or the idea that if one opens one’s life to “God’s grace,” one will become “blessed” (the implication is usually financial and material), and “Columbia,” the state capital of South Carolina—in other words, state government, and continuing historical attitudes about the Southern caste system. The bodies of ‘the poor and
ethnic children of the state’ were also constructed in E.C.’s subjectivity: they were described as ‘under-served’ by a government that ‘doesn’t care.’ Poor bodies, ‘ethnic,’ brown/black bodies have historically been constructed as lacking, needy, incomplete bodies. This discourse is still in circulation in South Carolina currently, concerning particularly the lower four-year graduation rates of African-Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians (68.7%, 71.1%, and 64.3%, respectively) as compared to whites (81.1%) in Riverton County Schools in 2013 (South Carolina State Department of Education, 2014).13

Folding stress, gender, and teachers’ bodies

Teachers’ multiple, folded subjectivities also carried echoes of the past in another sense. The bodies of teachers also potentially resisted the accountability regime through physical ailments brought about by the “stress” and “pressure” they experienced. These physical responses to “stress” echoed both the medicalization and the real, physical resistance to denial of legally independent subjectivity for women in the nineteenth century described by Chris Weedon (1997); she explained that “in the nineteenth century, the law defined married women as the property of their husbands…Many frustrated women, trapped within unhappy marriages, turned to negative protests, such as illness” (p. 110). Because public schooling as an institution still carries echoes of nineteenth-century factory models of education, as well as echoes of teaching’s historical construction as (cis-gendered) ‘women’s work,’ I suggest that the illnesses described by the participants in this study may carry echoes of negative protest against policies over which teachers were unhappy, but over which they could not or would not exert more active forms of protest. It is also interesting to note that although DS, the only self-identified male participant in the study, experienced physical illness himself, he did not discuss it in his interview; his illness

13 The connection of the construction of brown/black/non-white student bodies as “lacking” to lower four-year graduation rates is an important and fascinating area of potential study, but is beyond the scope of the current instantiation of this project.
was only discussed by SP, who knew him. Though the sample size of this case study is too small to claim representativeness, DS’s process of representing his subjectivity, as contrasted with SP’s and TJ’s, also called attention to the construction of cis-gendered male subjectivity. The gendered construction of teachers’ bodies vis-à-vis accountability policies is also an area warranting further research.

And yet, even if illness is a “negative form of protest,” it is not as if these teachers were “choosing” or “willing” the illnesses they experienced, or their physical experiences of stress. Physical ailments flowed through the time pressure and panopticism of the policies; as Weedon (1997) also stated,

Power is a relation. It inheres in difference and is a dynamic of control, compliance and lack of control between discourses and the subjects constituted by discourses, who are their agents. Power is exercised within discourses in the ways in which they constitute and govern individual subjects. (p. 110)

Power in the SRCP and related accountability measures in Riverton, South Carolina constituted ailing bodies responding to the “stress” of accountability. Both the striations of subjectivity along lines of race and class, as well as teachers’ embodied physical ailments in response to power through accountability policy indicated that these operations of power echoed the past and brought the raced, classed, and gendered past of schooling in the South (and Western culture generally) into a becoming-present. These were “memories straining toward a future” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 208). At a temporal juncture where this type of modulation is intensifying but not complete, the question of resistance, of becoming-otherwise in such an environment,
must take account of multiple controls and modulations, multiple and constantly shifting subjectivities, and unpredictable possibilities simultaneously.

Returning to the concept of the fold, Deleuze (1999) asked,

But is there an inside that lies deeper than any internal world, just as the outside is farther away than any external world? The outside is not a fixed limit but a moving matter animated by peristaltic movements, folds and foldings that together make up an inside: they are not something other than the outside, but precisely the inside of the outside…. The unthought is therefore not external to thought but lies at its very heart, as that impossibility of thinking which doubles or hollows out the outside. (p. 80)

The ‘other’ bodies teachers found in themselves, whether the raced, classed bodies of students, or the forty extra pounds teacher TJ found herself having gained, became the “inside of the outside” of teachers’ subjectivities. They were folded into (and out of) teachers’ subjectivities. As Cruz (2001) noted, Western thought has been dominated by Cartesian (and Judeo-Christian) dualism of mind/body and inside/outside (among many other dualisms [good/evil, light/dark, body/soul, God/Satan, slave/free, etc.]), and the concept of the fold helps break down these dualisms. Seeing power as a folding of paradoxes and binaries, subjectivity and the body (of the teacher) become folded into one another; the body and its affects are folded into subjectivity; teachers’ subjectivities are folded into accountability policies. Tiredness, stress, anxiety, pressure as affective channels—all need/knead the body to operate. The body, in turn, is not a passive site of subjectivity; the body kneads subjectivity, and raced and classed student bodies emanate variously, modulating, from power-full (and partially, intersectionally privileged) teacher bodies.
Bodies in the schoolhouse panopticon operated “in excess of their codes,” even in excess of current languages’/discourses’ abilities to ‘account’ of them as bodies at all.

**Conclusion to Chapter 5:**

As Foucault stated: “In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production” (1984a, pp. 204-205). In this case study, power produced teachers’ subjectivities, both ‘complicit’ and ‘resistant.’ Power disciplined teachers’ bodies through disciplinary technologies and while it did produce, in some instances, docile, useful bodies, it also produced uneven, resistant bodies: bodies that resisted disciplining by ill health, through assembling infinite speeds of conscience that touched and rearranged teachers’ bodies and their bodies’ interactions with other bodies. It created fabrications and surreptitious subjectivities, subjectivities that became slippery to the SRCP’s affective grip. When Deleuze (1988, p. 98) remarked that “I do not encounter myself on the outside, I find the other in me,” this remark can be applied to the experiences teachers described in which they found the ‘other’ (testing, neoliberal values, racialized and classed minorities) in themselves; in turn these ‘others’ found teachers in them—teachers they did not expect or ‘account’ for. I also found these teachers in myself, and likely they found a researcher in themselves as they spoke their experiences. SP even spoke of the experience of the interview as ‘healing.’

In turn, disciplinary technologies here also ‘found the ‘other’ in themselves:’ The disciplinary technologies of the SRCP produced their own resistance; disciplinary technologies and bio-power do ‘invest life through and through;’ however, they do this by
simultaneously producing their own resistance. Disciplinary technologies set out to (and often succeed in) producing docile, useful bodies, but they also produce bodies that are ‘out of order,’ anachronistic, diseased, rebellious, thrashing, surreptitious, vibrating, singing bodies that refuse to be so easily tooled. Power is paradoxical.
Chapter 6: In otherworlds: Conclusions, contradictions, and emerging questions for future research and becoming-teachers

*Teachers do not have the option to choose to be nonpolitical because the nature of the work is such that they are continually involved in making decisions that affect ‘the social distribution of resources.’*

*Connell, 1995*

Conclude: *v.intr.* 1. To come to an end; close.

[from Latin *conclūdere* to enclose, end, from *claudere* to close]

This work, because it is becoming, cannot conclude. It can point; it can resonate; it may even ruminate. It is not closed; it is becoming and will become beyond my writing of it. In this last chapter, I will discuss resonations of the findings of this study with theory, as this case study seeks to generalize to theory, not to a statistical representation of teachers’ experiences. Next, this chapter will ruminate on methodology and methodological implications of this study, then point out some questions this study raises for further research. In the last section of this chapter, I will discuss an emergence from this study: some thoughts toward an ethics of policy enactment and subjective becoming concerning teachers and teaching.

**Resonating: generalizations to theory**

Because the neoliberal SRCP, with teachers, created conditions of performativity that circulated power through affective channels and produced opportunities for both capitulation and resistance, teachers’ embodied subjectivities became assembled as bodies that *needed* and that also *distributed*. The creation of need contributed to teachers’ ‘docility’ and their ‘utility’ to the SRCP and associated policy technologies. The health problems and stress that became folded into teachers’ bodies assembled them as needing more time, needing support, needing to “de-
stress,” and in the absence of support, time, and opportunities to “de-stress,” needing “quick-fixes” that policy and its concurrent technologies could offer—temptations to further increase docility and utility. In other words, needs were constructed, and ameliorations to these needs were offered through the circulation of policy technologies. Because policy technologies served to intensify pressures on teachers’ time, teachers lacked an important means for further resistance to the ways the SRCP assembled their subjectivities. Teachers found spaces to minimally survive: spaces for creativity, care, and the intermittent (and irregular) use of their consciences; however, resistance could not be coordinated long-term or strategically with other teachers because of the intensity of time pressures created through normalizing judgment, hierarchical observations, and examinations. Power operated in both time and space; power is immanent in time and space, and though the plane of the virtual is limitless, the plane of the physical is not, even if its possibilities are. In this case, time pressure as well as neoliberal policy discourse circulated as gatekeepers, regulating teachers through the threat of bodily harm while purporting to ‘raise standards’ and ‘prepare children’ for the ‘Twenty-first Century economy.’ As such, the circulation of terror (Ball, 2001) created very ‘real’ embodied affects. Though Foucault discussed the shift in technologies of power from the ‘right of the sword’ to ‘disciplinary technologies,’ this study’s findings show a connection between disciplinary technologies and the right of the sword. The sword is still present, but circulates in less physically obvious ways: through affective channels.

The implications of this finding for democracy and social justice warrant attention. Teachers did not cease to care, to use their consciences, or to use creative pedagogies, though these aspects of their subjectivities were constantly threatened; however, it is precisely in these places, where teachers did care, in the use of conscience, in seeking to be creative, that teachers
also learned to *use* the concepts of neoliberalism, that teachers cared for student performance, that teachers’ situated knowledges—*their intended affects* (Spivak, 2011)—became the places the SRCP manifested affective force in their subjectivities. Teachers enacted policy and learned to do this work on themselves; it was in the relationality of teachers to the SRCP that intention, affect, and subjectivities themselves were formed. The spaces of teachers’ embodied knowledge and wisdom, then, were spaces of potentiality, but not necessarily spaces of positivity.

**Violence, ethics**

There is insufficient dialogue between paradigms of power traditionally used for anti-oppression work and so-called "post-structural" conceptions of power such as Foucault’s and Deleuze and Guattari’s. Concepts of both violence and ethics (and ethical responses to violence) are at the heart of so-called “paradigm wars” over concepts of power. Those using Foucauldian/Deleuzian frameworks of power still have an ethical responsibility to actively work to understand what oppression and violence might mean and how it might be resisted given non-binary/assembled/multiple understandings of subjectivity.

We must not forgo a discussion of violence in theory simply because we understand subjectivity as multiple, assembled, and in flux. When teachers complied with the demands and technologies of the SRCP, they became more docile, useful teachers. If and when they did not or could not fold the SRCP into their subjectivity evenly or smoothly, they became more nervous, frustrated, bitter, insulted teachers, which affected their stress levels and physical health, even as striated spaces were occupied by and assembled into their subjectivities. These two things often happened at the same time. Again, the ‘threat of the sword’ circulated through affect and through the threat of psychic and bodily harm. Also importantly, these impacts were most obvious on/in
the teachers who taught in the schools that served the lower socioeconomic and higher minority student populations in this study.

To speak of anti-oppression paradigms as not theoretically compatible with Foucauldian/Deleuzian-Guattarian discussions of the operation of power is another false binary. Anti-oppression paradigms can become folded into and with Foucauldian and Deleuzian-Guattarian becomings; we can find each in the other through the peristaltic movements of the membrane of the outside and the inside.

Ruminations on methodology

As Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (2004) stated: “Theory seldom springs forth from nothing but is most often produced in response to problems of everyday living” (p. 293). I found myself working on this study—I encountered this work at varying junctures of memory, affect and thought; sometimes, many times, it seemed as I wrote, or as I thought, that a concept, or a phrase, came to me—presented itself to me by happenstance. I would be looking once more at a particular quotation one of the teachers said, or I would type a term into Google Scholar. I would be reminded of something I read before, only to find a quotation, a haecceity of theory that coalesced—and a concept began to crystallize in, with, and through ‘me’ and the ‘data.’ Much of the writing of this work came from what I found on-hand at the time ‘I’ needed it. Perhaps it needed itself. In this way, the straightforwardness of my methodology became ‘queered;’ the research became a living, untranslatably complex process—truly, it became a policy ecology of its own right (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). As Browne and Nash (2010) stated, “‘Queer research’ can be any form of research positioned within conceptual frameworks that highlight the instability of taken-for-granted meanings and resulting power relations” (p. 4). Because this
research does question taken-for-granted meanings and power relations in accountability policy, as well as taken-for-granted assumptions about the linearity of the research process under positivist paradigms, it became queer—and enacts queer as I write it. It is queer research because I experimented with the data; though I used methods borrowed from traditional ethnographic methods, my mode of engagement with the research and data was a mode of experimentation and openness, following Rabinow (2003).

I found myself asking what it was possible to ‘know,’ or not to know, and to write down, based on the experiences I had talking with these teachers. Tom Boellstorff said that the “relationship between theory and data is a methodological problem” (2010, p. 210). I found ‘myself’ immanent in the methodology of this study; methodology became in this sense a ‘fieldwork of the self.’ I related ‘myself’ to the methodology of this study, and similarly, Paul Rabinow presented the problem of relating logos to ethos (2003); he stated, “Attempts to establish a relationship between these two terms [logos and ethos] have produced different affects” (p. 6). Certainly, relating the concepts, the affects, and the data in this study was an intensely affective process. Sometimes unnamable sensations washed over me as I read and re-read the things these teachers told me.

Furthermore, Rabinow contended that “equipment” for thinking is what humans use to confront “the challenge of bringing logos and ethos into the right relationship” (p. 11). In order to make this research more trustworthy—more ethically engaged—I found myself engaged in a mode of hot “nominalism” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 67), a mode in which I actively challenged ‘myself,’ asking the question “what are these teachers’ words trying to show me?” I read and re-read their interviews, looking for phrases, parts, words, that reminded me of something another participant had said, or which I had read elsewhere. I re-read my conceptual framework, looking
for coalescences. Much of the literature I found discussed “coding” interview data, but little discussed the coding process itself. Coding is more than looking for commonalities. It is reading, re-reading, and asking tough questions when things don’t seem to line up. It is a willingness to be open to “what is there beyond one’s knowing of it.” It was allowing my own preconceptions to be broken down if they needed to be, sometimes at the expense of what I thought I knew. It was dwelling in places I “did not particularly want to occupy” (St. Pierre, 1995, as cited in St. Pierre, 1997) in the data—places that didn’t line up neatly with my analysis heuristics, places that felt uncomfortable. It was actually, at times, more like meditating on the data—using deep breathing, sleep, or physical exercise to clear the mental “chatter” in my head so that connections could coalesce in a space of quiet. Learning to cultivate a subjective stillness in which to ‘hear’ one’s data is part of “data analysis” in such work.

A question that has come to me is: What does it mean to conduct honorable research? By honorable, I mean research that respects not only the participants, their lives and bodies and the momentary constructs the interviews or other ‘data’ create, but also that respects the researcher, her life and body, and the concepts and affects in play, the conceptual personae, the in-between-ness, the imbrication of all these? The politics of our survival as teachers require relating logos to ethos—require equipment for thinking—and the tools we fashion are political choices. Teaching, as Connell (1995, p. 101) stated, is an inevitably political activity—as is research on teachers and teaching.

This research was also a ‘queer’ process because of its impacts on my physical body. The body of the researcher is a ‘tool’ of research folded into the researcher’s subjective and analytic abilities. I experienced health issues not unlike those of the teachers who participated in this study. There were times that continuing to write, though necessary, was physically painful. This
writing process also sent me off on a search to re-fashion my subjectivity over and over, constantly folding and unfolding new ways of becoming as the research emerged. Doing this research required me to learn to ‘surf’ the wave of a multiplicity, a constantly shifting haecceity that many times overwhelmed me before I began to learn to ride it. Ultimately, doing this research was a form of ‘arbeit,’ a form of work that took place in the totality of my subjective experience in conjunction with the subjectivities of the teachers who participated. Rabinow (2003) explained:

The process that concerns me is the one in which… “knowledge-things’ are being assembled. That process of assembling—on the part of those producing authorized claims to knowledge and on the part of those seeking to find a form to re-present that process—lacks a name…. In German the term arbeiten, ‘to work,’ is useful in that it captures an essential dimension of what we are seeking to describe on both the side of those who are constituting the object of the empirical anthropological inquiry as well as on the side of those conducting it…. Arbeiten can be used to capture an important processual aspect that carries across domains of knowledge and care, of self and other, of figure and ground…. No satisfactory term yet exists to name this work. Assemblage/work is one possibility, and form/work is another. Missing from both is the processual dimension of emergence as well as the state that proceeds coalescence into a configuration or apparatus. (p. 85)

Just above, I said this work took place in a mode of hot nominalism. I chose the word ‘hot’ because it communicates the heightened state of entropy and entropic possibility in research. Entropy proceeds coalescence in both the natural world and the virtual, and from entropy, a formative mode, a nominalist mode, emerges. What warrants further discussion is: what practices allow the researcher to enter a hot nominalist mode? Is this mode ethical by its nature,
or if ethically neutral, what equipment is required to become ethical while engaged in this process?

**Transgressive research practice**

Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre (1997) described how, in her own research process, “I find my own validity when I write and cry and then write some more. As the bones of my soul break ground for my intellect, I push through into spaces of understanding I did not particularly want to occupy” (p. 181). I found myself at the junctures of understandings I did not particularly want to occupy during this study, and the search for validity came, for me, through my own experiences writing, crying, teaching, dancing, screaming, and many more things that have not made it into the narrative of this research. Sometimes a movie I went to see with my partner or a book given to me by a friend informed my thinking—nudged the trajectory of thought in a new direction. Sometimes transgressive parallels with the subject matter I was teaching my own students as I wrote struck me and made me question what was the ‘outside’ of this research and what was the ‘inside.’ As Paul Rabinow (2003) stated, “The fate of a [graduate] student is to live within a process of liminality and self-formation… Thinking is a practice, and practices are learned gradually over time” (pp. 88-89).

According to Elizabeth Adams St. Pierre, “Lather (1995b) writes of a ‘situated/embodied’ transgressive validity (p. 41) that emerged from her study of women with HIV/AIDS. With Lather, [St. Pierre] began to understand that validity in [her] study must be situated within the construction of subjectivity—[her] own as well as [her] participants’—since that was the focus of [her] research” (1997, p. 181).

St. Pierre also described ‘transgressive data’ that became folded into her research: emotional, dream, sensual and response data. I have included a variety of quotations from other
texts, as well as from music that I have listened to during the composition of this work. The inclusion of these quotations has been one way I have attempted to include “transgressive” and “eruptive” data into this text. Furthermore, this text has been written “out-of-order.” I mean that in a double sense. Its construction was anything but the (at times) linear narrative I have had to turn it into. I wrote some later parts before others that appear before them, giving the phantasmic appearance of linear organization. This text also attempts to become “out of order” as a political stance. ‘Order’ implies both striated space as well as hegemonic, autocratic rule. This text attempts to escape both, or at least send ‘lines of flight’ out from both spaces, though in some other senses, it may reinscribe these in places, constrained by the necessity of finishing a thesis. There are many, many more things I wish to have included in the text.

Fieldwork of the self and others

This work has been moody work, often stressful, often so joyful and powerful I have been afraid of doing it. My subjectivity has become something quite different than when I began this work, and this is one thing that the simulacric linearity of this text actually partially expresses. The first chapters were originally written as parts of the research proposal that led to this project, and to a certain extent, though they have been edited, this text provides a tracing, a mapping, of my subjectivity and my thinking over the course of this research project. Much subjective work took place in order to ‘decide’ upon, or to encounter, the theoretical framework that led to this work; much, much more subjective work took place afterward, throughout the interviews and analysis and further thinking and the coalescence of concepts and writing. The subjective work of this research, which required ‘me’ to call into question the most fundamental of assumptions on which ‘my’ society and language and assumed identity had been founded, became what Donna Haraway called “an intellectual pleasure and a political necessity” (Harraway on cover of Butler, 2006). It was also fraught. There were times at which I thought I
might lose my life partner over this work, not to mention many other things even more personal.

Over the course of doing this research, I experienced increasing physical and mental health problems, and financial problems. I also traveled, and experienced the fishing docks of Plymouth, England one evening with a group of Canadians and Portuguese. I saw and heard elephant seals on the coast of California on Highway 101; experienced the eerie sound of a train at night while camping in the forest at the foot of the “Chief’s Head” in Squamish, British Columbia, Coast Salish territories; witnessed the brilliant red and purple painted desert in Arizona, and the soft, gray, crab-scattered Atlantic on the flat, sand-duned coasts of the Carolinas. This has been beautiful, compelling, and terrifying work. So many of the nuances of the act and experience of doing this work, writing this text, have been ineffable, and are gone forever, or remain only as transmogrifications of memory.

Some of the most poignant and self-formative questions I have asked, or been forced to ask, or found myself asking—that asked me?—during the last five years have included:

- Did I choose teaching as a career because I internalized the white ‘savior’ myth often used to colonize and exploit people of color and indigenous peoples?
- Did I choose the white female role of ‘missionary’ in colonizer societies by becoming a teacher?
- Did I choose teaching English as a career because I internalized gender norms that expect women to be helpers, care-givers, and nurturers, and that women are better at the arts, rather than pursuing the interests I had, and still have, in quantum physics, astronomy, Spanish language and literature, visual art, marine biology and archaeology?
- If there is no fundamental ‘I,’ is there such a thing as free will?
- If even a glance, or a look, can be filled with power, how can I operate in society as a white person without harming others, and without shame, but with responsibility?
- Did I get married when and to whom I did at least in part because of societal, gendered, and parental expectations? What does that mean for my relationship with my partner?
Did I betray a feminist ethic by choosing to change my name when I got married? Should I change it again if I did, and/or does my current name trace an important aspect of my subjectivity?

Is gaining a graduate degree from a university on un-ceded indigenous territories particularly, or at any university in any location, a fatally flawed endeavor that serves and shores up my own and others’ hegemonic privilege more than it serves any possible trajectories toward social justice?

How will I continue to teach as I begin to experience a sense of devastation concerning some of the conclusions my data has brought me to?

How can I use these findings to tangibly impact the teaching environment in which I now find myself, in the place I now live? How will I use these findings to give back to the teachers who constructed this knowledge with me, and to our shared communities?

In some ways, my answers to these questions have been constrained by the necessity of finishing a thesis. In other ways, I cannot fully know the answers. I do, however, hope. What gives ‘me’ hope is understanding that for each potential reader, this text will become part of the flow of he/i/r life, a flow that meets other flows, that will become transformed again in the process. The nature of these questions underscores the feminist axiom that the personal is always political, and vice versa.

This work also undeniably caused me to re-think my teaching practices along the way. I continue to re-think them every time I revisit the participant teachers’ words. I adopted creative practices that some of the teachers described almost immediately after some of the interviews. I shared information I was learning about legal matters in South Carolina with my colleagues at work. I have my own investments to count.

Further, at least two of my four participants told me directly that being able to share the things they shared with me was important to them. One participant told me that she felt like it was a kind of ‘healing’ to be able to talk to me, to ‘get it all out.’ She had things going on in her ‘personal’ life at the same time that she decided to stop teaching, things which for her privacy I
will not reveal here, but her experiences spoke to me, reminded me, of how the personal, the political, and the professional are inextricably intertwined. We, as teachers, do not have our ‘professional’ lives and our ‘personal’ lives. We have our lives. We can categorize some aspects of them as professional or personal, but ultimately, a teacher’s axiom, like the feminist axiom that “the personal is political,” might be that “the professional is personal.” We teach with our bodies, with our emotions, our affective encounters, our ethics, our passions. Teaching is deeply personal work, and any attempt to “de-professionalize” teaching ultimately is an attempt to “de-personalize” the teacher—or rather, to “re-personalize” the teacher, shaping our subjective constituencies and pedagogical encounters. Even though when teachers talk, we all engage in complex strategies of resistance and capitulation, there is healing in the attempt to understand, theorize, and claim the spaces of our experiences in relationships of power.

I told the teacher who told me that giving her interview felt like ‘healing’ work, that doing this study felt like ‘healing’ work for me as well. I could not envision myself teaching again after I left my teaching position in 2009 until I found myself deeply engaged in this study. Doing this study has been an act not only of the reclamation of, but also of the very survival of my teaching subjectivity. My teaching encounter will not be foreclosed or encapsulated by regimes of accountability, regimes of truth that threaten at every moment. I may also fabricate; I may also perform; I may become complicit and resistant and even capitulate at times, but continuing to examine the microfascisms constantly coalescing on my body like barnacles on a ship allows me periodically to examine these microfascisms—and, at times, if I’m lucky and strong, to make artwork with them. Or, at least to be mindful of those that will stay and those that will go. Then, I may sail off in a different direction rather than being fated to slowly fuse and encrust myself to the docks.
Final methodological rumination

Because this study attempts to speak a different discourse, to become otherwise in its discussion of possibilities for teachers’ knowledge and experiences of power, its conceptual implications are not ‘either-or.’ Teachers’ subjectivities are assembled multiplicities, and power can and does circulate in affective channels, among and between bodies and policies. Social justice becomes a concern, a trajectory, a line of flight of this study. Implications for social justice will be discussed further in the final section on ethics.

“It’s not polite to point:” Impolite questions for further research

Many questions emerged from this research that may give direction to potential future research. Because some of the discourse in the South Carolina and Riverton County Schools policies frames the relationship between teachers and policy and/or the state as a child-parent relationship, is it useful for teachers to think of themselves in something akin to a parent-child relationship with the state and its standards? What other form(s) of relationships could teachers use to conceptualize their relationship to state standards (or, now, Common Core standards) and accountability technologies? How might actively re-conceptualizing this relationship affect teachers’ sense of agency in their work?

Under a regime that utilizes the technology of intense time pressure, how do teachers actually spend their non-instructional time, both during planning periods and during afternoon/evening/weekend hours? How does the allocation of teachers’ time affect their stress levels, health, and experiences of power through accountability policy? Could pedagogy be improved through differently allocating teachers’ time, and vis-à-vis their time, teachers’ teaching subjectivities?
Which aspects of teachers’ work cause them to experience the punitive a/effects (stress, nervousness, fatigue, insult, bitterness, hurt, etc.) of disciplinary power the most? (Time spent on documentation, email, parental contact, administrative contact, meetings, professional development, grading, planning, etc.?) Do teachers who experience fewer punitive a/effects of disciplinary power become more a/effective, caring, democratic teachers?

Which changes in the policy and work environment would most improve teachers’ subjective experiences as teachers?

Furthermore, what impact will the current introduction of Common Core State Standards have on teachers’ subjective experiences of power through accountability policy in South Carolina? Given the suggestions of further performative measures (Zais, 2013), teachers may be particularly at-risk of experiencing an intensification of the affects discussed in this work in the immediate future in South Carolina. The operation of power vis à vis the new standards and associated testing and policies, and the impacts of the new standards and concurrent accountability systems on teachers’ subjectivities, warrant further research.

Any attempt to understand the operation of power vis à vis accountability policy and teachers’ subjectivities in South Carolina also must take account of the histories of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability on this land. Further genealogical work on the folding of these histories into schooling in South Carolina, and the South generally, and into the subjectivities of teachers in the South, is called for.
Implications for educators, administrators, and policy makers

There is an immediate and urgent need for more democratic spaces for overt discussion of our practices as educators and the political nature of our work, particularly how we serve minority students, and how minority students and students living in poverty are constructed vis-à-vis our subjectivities and practices. This work needs to be done in democratic dialogue with the communities surrounding our schools as well (Smyth, 2001). Professional development/paid time/PD credit to do this work could be paramount to making it possible, considering the number and intensity of pressures on educators currently; however, the medium of official ‘professional development’ may be fraught with already striated and over-coded spaces as well. The viability of using ‘professional development’ for such endeavors may depend upon local contexts.

A further practical suggestion would be for teachers to develop a school-by-school “teachers’ report card with the community” through which to invite the school community to dialogue with them about the types of accountability teachers face and its potential impacts on students and teaching. Too often dialogue about teachers, and education generally, is dominated by neoliberal accountability discourse that does not consult or include teachers, and too often “community consultation” is tokenistic and uses members of school communities, particularly minority community members, to shore up privilege on the part of teachers, administrators, or official discourse. Teachers must first take on the responsibility of having “difficult confrontations” with their own subjectivities, educating themselves about the operation of power and privilege, having difficult conversations, and then inviting the school community (especially parents and students) to ongoing dialogue about education, and working to create and maintain spaces in which members of marginalized communities feel safe and respected in dialogue. This
is dauntingly large work, and there is not enough space in this current writing to detail all this would entail, but may lead to future action research.

It is also equally important to caution educators that the places where our work becomes the most pleasurable can become the most powerful places in our work, both for folding into our subjectivities microfascistic teaching desires and/or subverting de-professionalizing accountability regimes. Points of pleasure in our teaching are places onto which fascistic forces may attach themselves. It is not a sadomasochistic pleasure—there is not an ontologically a-priori teacher ‘self’ that is consciously or willfully assembling microfascisms, deciding first to fold them into one’s subjectivity, and then doing so. Microfascisms become assembled and folded into teachers’ subjectivities. Sadomasochism is too easy an answer here, but the pleasure of becoming the ‘accountable’ teacher is nonetheless a pleasure with ‘teeth.’ Judith Butler (2006) stated that “free will and determinism” are an “unnecessary binarism” (p. 201). Just as power operated through paradox in teachers’ subjectivities throughout this study, power here is paradoxical as well, and it is within the space of paradox—the space between the smooth and the striated, the borderlands, the spaces that are not quite one thing or the other—the foothills between the Appalachian mountains and the South Carolina piedmont—that agency becomes.

The virtuous teacher: Toward an ethics of policy enactment and subjectification

For to survive in the mouth of this dragon we call america [sic] we have had to learn this first and most vital lesson—that we were never meant to survive. Not as human beings. And neither were most of you here today, black or not. And that visibility which makes you most vulnerable is also our greatest strength. Because the machine will try to grind us into dust anyway, whether or not we speak. We can sit in our corners mute forever while our sisters and ourselves are wasted, while our children are distorted and destroyed, while our earth is poisoned, we can sit in our safe corners as mute as bottles, and still we will be no less afraid.

Audre Lorde, 1977
I didn’t hold back, because I’m really at that point where I feel if people don’t speak up nothing can change. And I’m Jewish, and also half Irish, so with that heritage, I think people not speaking up and standing up for themselves can be deadly, whether it’s economically, or literally for some people. People get to their breaking points and they point fingers and they blame, and so I’ll speak up.

TJ, 2013

Socrates, famous for his ‘gadfly’ questioning, knew the power of questions in opening lines of flight from the ordinary, the ‘common sense,’ to traverse the plane of the extraordinary and the plane of sense that was anything but common. Questions are some of our most powerful tools as teachers—tools with which we educate students, and tools with which we form and re-form ourselves as teachers. As an undergraduate, I had an affinity for Matthew Arnold’s proposition that education ought to show students “the best of what has been thought and said.” However, it is dangerous to leave his proposition unexamined. We need to open dialogue by asking, “Thought and said for whom? By whom? What kind(s) of thinking have been employed? What values were implicit in such thinking?”

Theorizing democracy and education in an ostensibly democratic society from a Foucauldian/Deleuzian/Guattarian perspective requires thinking differently. Most currently existing democratic republics began during or following the so-called Western “Enlightenment,” utilizing and/or drawing heavily from Cartesian concepts of selfhood. The “Western” emphasis on the self as an autonomous, separate individual stems directly from European Enlightenment philosophy. In North America, the United States’ Constitution and Bill of Rights and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms focus heavily, if not exclusively, on the rights of the individual. Society is conceptualized as a collection of atomized individuals who can freely come together to associate or break apart to pursue their own ends. What a viewpoint based in the work of Foucault and Deleuze & Guattari illustrates is that the concept of the individual is one fold in
the social fabric of a given time period of history, with all its regimes of truth and forms of knowledge, and that free will and determinism are indeed a false binary.

What, then, becomes of the concept of democracy, whether conceptualized as part of a state apparatus or not? Though the word ‘democracy’ is not as often mentioned in work based in Foucauldian or in Deleuzian/Guattarian theory, I would like to suggest that we need not discard the word altogether. Perhaps it is more useful to conceptualize democracy as a mode (a concept of Paul Rabinow’s (2003) from which I have borrowed heavily in this work as well)—a mode that produces a certain ethics as well as certain aesthetics. The ethics and aesthetics of democracy (and conversely, the ethics and aesthetics of domination) are an area prime for further investigation, for even domination seeks to justify itself ethically and seduce both dominator and dominated aesthetically.

The work of this study, and the teachers who participated in it and formed it with me, implies that at the very least, the ethics and aesthetics of democracy are able to fold with the ethics and aesthetics of domination in complex ways such that it can even become quite hard to tell one from the other at times. The work of nuanced parsing of subjectivities to tease democratic impulse from microfascism requires both space and time in order to become possible—and both space and time are precisely two of the domains most under threat from regimes of accountability and standardization. Democratic and/or fascistic impulses also take place on the level of collective subjectivities, and work on collective subjectivities is also called for in deepening and reinvigorating concepts of democracy.

Affective channels the SRCP created did intensify the teaching environment and may have, in some cases, made teachers’ teaching more intentional/intensional, but there is not a 1:1
functionalist relationship between the types of knowledge on standardized tests and increases in student learning. The neoliberal SRCP carried with it a desire for performance; performativity created “stress” as a “virtuous” affect in the teacher’s body; the teacher too “at ease” with her work or her subjectivity was suspect and constructed as in need of surveillance. The solution offered to problems of teacher “stress,” to minority-student drop-out rates, etc. is often more surveillance, but as has been shown in this study and others, more surveillance only reproduces itself and its affects, including pedagogical gatekeeping and narrowing of curricula. Therefore, there must be space for teachers to invert the gaze of power from themselves onto power itself and its operation. Teachers must have time and space to do the gazing, as much at their own subjectifications and policy enactments as at accountability policy technologies. Teachers and those who work with them must render power visible, rather than power rendering them visible.\footnote{Of course, even the grammar of this sentence is not quite right because if power operates vis à vis teachers’ subjectivities, we make our subjectivities visible inasmuch as we come to understand power’s operation. However, and importantly, we render our subjectivities visible \textit{differently} than neoliberal accountability policies do.}

The neoliberal accountability regime of the SRCP also sought to erase its entanglement with the historicity and genealogy of the place it occupied (and the verb is deliberate); as discussed in chapter five, teachers’ subjectivities in Riverton County folded the histories of race, class, gender, and religion on this land into their subjectivities but were not necessarily consciously aware of this folding. Certainly, becoming-aware of the folding of one’s subjectivity with painful histories of race, racial and economic oppression, white privilege, and the sense of guilt white bodies often experience in response to this becoming-aware are not easy territories to enter. To reiterate St. Pierre (1997) once more, these are “spaces of understanding [we, as teachers, often do] not wish to occupy” (p. 181). However, teachers must develop means of
learning to enter these spaces of understanding. The places in which we teach are already found articulated and folded with racial histories that we will fold with our subjectivities because we find ourselves already occupying these spaces whether we acknowledge this fact or not. Mohanram (1999) stated, “It is a commonplace to point out that the concept of race has always been articulated according to the geographical distributions of people” (p. 3). I would suggest we as teachers must begin to ask ourselves what histories and what lands we already occupy, and what histories and lands are already fold into our subjectivities. We need to work explicitly on 1. Developing the capacities to ask these kinds of questions and 2. Questioning our perceptions of these histories and how they play out or echo through our day-to-day practices and pedagogy.

One cannot ask these kinds of questions if one is not prepared to do so. Part of my process of coming-to-awareness has been reading theory—not only the theory of Foucault and Deleuze, but also the theory of Mohanram, Fanon, Said, Cruz, Tuhiwai Smith, bell hooks, Cornell West, Mumia Abu-Jamal, Marc Lamont-Hill, Peggy McIntosh, David Gillborn, Audre Lorde, Judith Butler, Patty Lather, Michelle Fine, and innumerable feminist, queer, anti-racist, and decolonizing internet blogs. These readings challenged me; they called into question assumptions about the self and subjectivity I had not even realized I had. I also owe an immense debt of gratitude to anti-racist feminists, scholars and teachers with whom I studied, and women I encountered in the world—not the least of whom have included my good friend Fatima Jaffer, who challenged me concerning my entitlements and has given me the privilege of honest conversation, and my good friend Ivonne Ocampo, who regularly cleaned my classroom at the first school I taught at, and who shared some of her experiences with me. However, going back further, this work began for me in college during training I did to become a resident assistant in the dormitories on campus: the organization was called the National Coalition Building Institute,
and I became involved with the organization’s prejudice reduction and diversity building work on campus after a powerful experience with that training. And going back even further, both the public high school I attended as well as the next-door-neighbors I grew up with, an African-American family named the Francises, all helped me develop these capacities. Thinking about and naming these experiences reminded me of a quotation from St. Pierre (2004), in which she discussed her response to Deleuze’s (1969/1990) statement on ethics:

“Everything was in order with the events of my life before I made them mine; to live them is to find myself tempted to become their equal, as if they had to get from me only that which they have that is best and most perfect.” Either ethics makes no sense at all, or this is what it means and has nothing else to say: not to be unworthy of what happens to us (pp. 148–149, as cited in St. Pierre, 2004, p. 291).

The process of coming-to-worthiness of this research has ultimately, in some way, involved everything in my life up to “this point” (these lines of flight, these trajectories)—everything, and everybody. With so much personal history that has led to ‘my’ capacity to ask the (at times very uncomfortable) questions involved in and related to this work, perhaps I may learn from a concept included in the celebration of African heritage that is Kwanzaa: Umoja. “I am because we are” (Asante Filmworx, 2009, para. 2). Understanding subjectivity as multiple and folded, no subjective capacity is developed in isolation. Conceptual personae and other bodies and subjectivities become folded into our own. A further question this led me to was: how do ethics take the offensive in the development of subjectivities, rather than reacting defensively to the technologies of accountability policies, structural racism, and other oppressions? A willingness to pass into the uncomfortable, the frightening, and the self-formative is required, but also a willingness not to become static in those spaces is required. Active thought moves, and we think
with our bodies and subjectivities. Power is a relation, and a wise person I know once told me that all relationships are like sharks: they must keep moving or they die. How does one heal a wounded or broken joint in a body? With a combination of rest and rehabilitative motion. How can teachers heal the wounds already folded into our subjectivities, and the wounds and woundings we encounter in our coming-to-awareness of our subjectivities and their rootedness in place, space, and history? Perhaps also with rest when we need it, but also with an insistence on motion as soon as and as much as we are able. Indeed, this work has become rehabilitative motion for my own teacher-subjectivity: I left teaching to pursue this work, and the circumstances of this work led me back into teaching both in research and in practice. Doing this work as I taught and researched other teachers gave me space to theorize my becoming-teacher subjectivity. Doing this work became a literal, physical and subjective act of survival.

This work has been done with learning from another concept that the celebration of Kwanzaa teaches: Ujima: collective work and responsibility. “Collective work and responsibility reminds us of our obligation to the past, present and future, and that we have a role to play in the community, society, and world” (Asante Filmworx, 2009, para. 4). We as teachers must help each other to come to awareness of the operation of power and privilege, to heal the wounded parts of our subjectivities, to construct students’ embodiments in our own subjectivities differently. This is work many of us are already partially engaged in when we check on the teacher next door or down the hall, when we brainstorm what to do for a particular student together, when we brainstorm how to approach a topic in the classroom together, and (sometimes) when we talk about drop-out rates and race at faculty meetings and in the hallways, though these are also spaces in which we must be vigilant of our privileges. However, spaces for this work are still often piecemeal and not complete enough, carved out of time appropriated for
other “professional development,” shared as we gulp food in the twenty or so minutes we get to eat lunch, or created when we linger in each other’s classrooms past five or five-thirty in the afternoon, putting off the stacks of papers on our desks or the dinner waiting to be cooked at home or the spouse we told we’d meet. Teachers such as myself, privileged to have had time and space and education to come to a fuller awareness of the struggle for this space, must take leadership in creating more explicit spaces for this work.

We also must take collective responsibility for the “social distribution of resources” through our subjectifications. Encountering our own privileges requires a type of “difficult encounter with the self,” and acknowledging ways in which we may have unconsciously done violence to others, particularly to those not equally privileged, then re-building subjectivities capable of resisting such violence is work that should—that must—be done in community. This could become a qualitatively different type of ‘accountability.’ For as Gillborn (2005) pointed out, though individual acts of overt racism do occur, larger patterns of systemic racist violence are systems for which we all share responsibility. How larger social groups (including teachers) push our collective subjectivities into zones of collectively responsible action is an area of scholarship this work may lay groundwork for.

Patience with ourselves and with others is required for doing this kind of work, but a balance between pushing ourselves and others into uncomfortable territory and slowing down enough that we can adapt is required as well. Too often this kind of space is constructed as “narcissistic” work; any time teachers take for or to work on themselves, even among teachers themselves, is often discussed using phrases such as “I shouldn’t have…but I did.” Our time, our space, our bodies, our health, and our subjectivities are constructed as not really our own even in spite of the individualizing affects of neoliberal accountability technologies; too often the ‘good’
teacher is constructed as the docile, useful teacher who comes early and stays late and works on weekends to the point of physical and emotional exhaustion. She successfully incorporates the discourses of neoliberal accountability policy into her subjectivity. We see her in the news, hear her praises in speech from the districts we work for, hear praise for her from each other, and see her in other teachers held up as ‘exemplars.’ Where are the exemplar teachers who make explicit time to work on themselves with other teachers and with the community, who lead balanced lives, who are emotionally, intellectually, and physically healthy and responsible examples for their students? We as teachers need to use the self-formative spaces we encounter and create to speak out against the trope of the over-worked, under-paid, docile and useful teacher, and to critique the disciplinary technologies, histories, and other mechanisms that operate vis à vis our subjectivities. Foucault said that critique is resistance because critique asks “‘how not to be governed like that, by that, in the name of those principles… not like that, not for that, not by them’” (2007, p. 44). Judith Butler also wrote, discussing Foucault, Adorno, and Habermas and critique: “For critique to operate as part of a praxis… is for it to apprehend the ways in which categories are themselves instituted, how the field of knowledge is ordered, and how what it suppresses returns, as it were, as its own constitutive occlusion” (Butler, 2001). Doing this research has been a form of critique, on my part and on the part of those teachers who participated in it with me. Teachers need spaces for this kind of work; this is part of the work of the virtuous teacher. Indeed, Foucault went on to say in “What is Critique?” (2007): “there is something in critique which is akin to virtue” (p. 43).

We as teachers must critique existing power relations, even and especially ‘within’ our own subjectivities, and we also must say “yes” to “that which interrupts our project” of teaching. We must say yes to our bodies, yes to entering the discomfort of confronting histories of race,
class, sexuality, ability, gender, and religion, yes to naming and legitimizing the affective aspects of our teaching subjectivities that are so often silenced, yes to taking time away from grading and emailing and calling parents and planning lessons and filling out paperwork and testing and being on committees and sponsoring clubs, and yes to using that time, and those spaces, to articulate different visions/versions of what we, as teachers, as educators, can become.
Epilogue

On February 14, 2014, teacher TJ informed me that she would be resigning from teaching at the end of the 2013-2014 school year. She stated in personal correspondence, “The original plan was to move closer to family, but the whole truth is really to get away from the value-added measures.” She now plans “to follow some of [her] personal creative dreams as a storyteller, writer and visual artist.”
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Appendices

Appendix A: Interview protocol

Background

1. How would you describe yourself to someone who does not know you and who had never met you?

2. What subject(s) and level(s) do(did) you teach?

Assessments, Teaching, and Curricula

3. In what ways do (did) the High School Assessment Program testing and End of Course testing—and its attachment to school report cards— affect your teaching? How does(did) it affect you?

4. Does(did) the school report card affect what and how you teach? Explain. Does (did) it affect when you teach(taught) certain topics? Which times? Which topics?

5. Are there any other assessment policies that affect (ed) your teaching more than the school report card? Which ones and why?

6. Please describe changes to your pedagogy that have otherwise resulted from the School Report Card Policy (SCRP).

Teaching Performance

7. How are(were) teachers at your school evaluated? What criteria are(were) used? Are these criteria influenced by the school report card policy and/or testing?

8. Does(did) the school report card policy and/or its required standardized tests affect who observes your teaching, how they observe you, or how often? What effects does (did) this have on you and/or your teaching?

9. The school and district report cards are designed to give information about a school’s or district’s “overall performance.” What does the word ‘performance’ mean to you when you think about school report cards?

10. In what situations do (did) you feel you are required to give ‘performances’ as a teacher? How do (did) those performances affect you? How do they affect how and what you teach?
11. Do (did) you ever feel pressure to teach and/or discipline any groups of students differently than others on account of the Annual Yearly Progress sub-indicators? If so, how?

12. Do (did) you ever feel pressure to act or think differently than you otherwise might “in front of” others (i.e. colleagues, administration, parents, etc)? In what ways, and why do you think this is?

13. Do (did) you feel that the School Report Card policy, or other accountability policies, has any affect on who you are as a teacher, or who you have become over time as your teaching career has progressed?

Decision Making

14. Do (did) you have any power to participate in the decisions made around the high school report card policy or its associated testing? Would you like (have liked) to? If you could, would you change anything about it, or how it is implemented?

Hopes and Aspirations

15. What are/were some of your dreams as a teacher? Do you think the school report card policy, or other accountability policies, affect(s/ed) any of those dreams? How?

Final

16. What effect has my presence as a researcher had on you and/or your teaching, if any?
Appendix B: Interview data coding categories

Disciplinary Technologies and impact on Performativity and Fabrications [DT]

Hierarchical observation (discuss dialogue/lack of)—[DT—HO]

Normalizing judgment/validity of knowledge—[DT-NJ/VN]

Testing and examinations—[DT-TE]

Unaccountable knowledges [DT-UK]

Context [DT-UK-C]

Impact on Teacher Subjectivities: Affective channels. [AC]

A/Effects: Teacher Stress, Health: Violence [AC-SH]

A/Effects: Negative: Frustration, bitterness, offense, etc. [AC-NEG]

A/Effects: Teacher retention/possible elimination (threats) [AC-ET]

Shifting terrain, subjective dissonance [AC-SD]

Speaking the ‘lingua franca’ of neoliberalism: Conscience, care and resistance/reappropriation; or, capitulation [AC-NL]

“Microfascistic pleasures of the ‘enterprising subject’” (Webb, 2009, p. 26) [AC-MP]

(SOME TEACHERS NO PLEASURE) [AC-NP]

A/effects of power on pedagogy: [AP]

Pay more attention to needs of students, not give up (positive impacts) [AP-POS]

Pedagogical gatekeeping [AP-PG]

Reorganization [AP-PG-R]

Standardization [AP-PG-S]

Time pressure [AP-PG-TP]

Leads to: Role of teacher shifted to coach—[AP-ROL]

Operated along striations of subjectivity; subjectivity and power perceptions [AP-PG-SS]

Class [AP-PG-SS-C]
Race [AP-PG-SS-R]

Gender [AP-PG-SS-G]

Levels of operation of power: Position/school/District/State [PL] [Power Levels]

  Administrative leadership style [PL-ADM]

  State leadership [PL-SC]

  Relational aspects among teachers [PL-T]

Teachers’ resistance strategies [RS]

  Conscience/care: [RS-CC]

  Creative strategies (with fabrications?) [RS-CRS]

  Claiming (shrinking) space [RS-CLS]

  Relating to other teachers [RS-ROT]

  Refusal to obey [RS-RO]

  Educate self alternately [RS-ESA]

  Resistance dependent on school population/environment [RDS]

Teachers’ perceptions of power: [PP]

  Feelings of powerlessness [PP-PL]

  Perceptions of power/participation [PP-PAR]

‘Talking back’ to power from subjective positionality [TB]

  What is really happening concerning accountability [TB-AB]

  What is teaching really about? (Purpose) [TB-P]

  What would be better accountability? [TB-BA]
Appendix C: Letter of introduction and consent

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Department of Educational Studies
xxxx Main Mall
Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6T 1Z4
Tel: xxx-xxx-xxxx
Fax: xxx-xxx-xxxx
http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca

Invitation to Participate and Consent Form

Otherworlds: Teachers’ experiences of power vis a vis accountability policies in South Carolina

Principal Investigator:
P. Taylor Webb, Associate Professor, University of British Columbia, xxxxxxx.xxxx@xxx.xx

Co-Investigator:
Mary R. Adkins Cartee, Master of Arts candidate, UBC, and English Teacher, XXXXX High School, XXXXXXXX SC, (xxx) xxx-xxxx (C); (xxx) xxx-xxxx (W; after 2pm please),
xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxxx.xxx, xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx

Purpose
You are invited to participate in a research project, the data from which will be used for the co-investigator’s master’s thesis. The study will address two areas of inquiry: (1) teachers’ perceptions of power vis-a-vis the School Report Card Policy (SRCP), and (2) the impact of policy on teachers’ stress and pedagogical performances. Power in this proposal refers to the ways the SRCP shapes and is shaped by teachers’ day to day practices in and outside of their classrooms. The impact of policy refers to the habits, emotions, and types of pedagogy embodied in and practiced by teachers in relation to the SRCP. The research will involve personal interviews with volunteer participants (teachers and administrators). The purpose of the interviews is to explore the range and nature of participants’ perceptions of accountability policy and the impact it has on themselves.

The researchers are principal investigator Dr. P. Taylor Webb from the University of British Columbia (UBC), and graduate student Mary R. Adkins Cartee, who will conduct the interviews. This project is not funded, and again, will be part of Ms. Adkins Cartee’s master’s thesis research. Results of this study may be published in scholarly articles and presentations, and results will be made available to you.

Sponsor
This project is not funded, but will serve as the research for the co-investigator’s Master of Arts thesis for the University of British Columbia.

Study Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in the project, you will be contacted by the co-investigator to partake in one 60-minute interview and one 30-minute follow-up interview, scheduled at your convenience. The first interview, and possibly the second interview (with your renewed consent) will be audio-taped and transcribed. You will receive a copy of the transcripts and have the opportunity to change, delete or add anything you wish.
Confidentiality
Your identity and your school’s identity will be kept strictly confidential. All documents will be identified only by code number and kept in locked filing cabinets and password secured computer files. Participants will not be identified by name in any reports completed of the completed study. Your identity and the school’s identity will be disguised with a pseudonym in any information used from your interview.

Potential risks and benefits
No foreseeable harm and no risks should come to the organization or the participants as a result of its or their participation in this research. In fact, not only will this research not impede instructional time at all, but we also believe that this project will provide teachers a potentially valuable opportunity for reflection on their practices within the current educational policy environment. Concerning possible scholarly publications, it may also be a structured means to communicate with the public regarding teachers’ lived experiences. We anticipate that your participation in this study will contribute to furthering scholarly understandings about accountability policy, pedagogy, and teachers’ lives.

There is no penalty for not participating. You have the following rights in this research: (a) To not participate; (b) To withdraw from the project at any time without prejudice to pre-existing entitlements, and meaningful opportunities for deciding whether or not to continue to participate; (c) To opt out without penalty, at which point any collected data pertaining to yourself will be withdrawn from the data base and not included in the study; (d) To privacy and confidentiality; (e) To safeguards for security of data (data are to be kept for a minimum of 5 years following completion of research).

Contact for information about the study
If you have any questions or desire further information with respect to this study, you may contact Mary Adkins Cartee, the co-investigator.

Dr. P. Taylor Webb <xxxxxxx.xxxxx@xxx.xxx>
Associate Professor
Department of Education Studies, UBC
xxxxx Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z8

Ms. Mary Adkins Cartee
Master of Arts candidate
Department of Education Studies, UBC
xxxxx Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z8
English Teacher
XXXXX High School, XXXXXXXXX, SC XXXXX
(xxx) xxx-xxxx (C); (xxx) xxx-xxxx (W: after 2pm please; 4th block planning period)
xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.xxx; xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxx.xxx

Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects
If you have any concerns about the treatment of any of your organizational members as research subjects, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the University of British Columbia Office of Research Services at xxx-xxx-xxxx or if long distance e-mail to xxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx.
Consent and Approval

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time. Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.

*Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study. You do not have to sign or take any further action if you do not wish to participate, and there is no penalty for not participating.*

_____________________________________________________________________
Signature                                                                    Date
_____________________________________________________________________
Printed Name, Position Title, and Organization