GOVERNMENTALITY AND PEDAGOGICAL APPARATUSES IN MANAGEMENT TIMES

Silvia M. Grinberg
grinberg.silvia@gmail.com | CONICET/UNSAM, Argentina

ABSTRACT

Change and the novel have become privileged instances, images of obligation and of how things should be: schools must change and teachers must become instruments of transformation; rather than teach, they must guide learning processes. We understand that those faces of novelty ceaselessly express modes of confrontation and of struggle. In response to the hypotheses, increasingly fashionable in recent years, surrounding processes of deinstitutionalization and in direct relation to de-subjectivation, this work delves into how daily life at schools is enacted, shaped, affected from the perspective of governmentality studies. Through the notion of the pedagogical apparatuses, we evidence the heterogeneous, diffuse, contradictory, and overlapping ways that daily life operates in the government of population, that is, the experience of the State that involves both government processes as such (the direction of conduct) and ways to avoid being governed, that is, ways that we, as subjects, invent ourselves in the world. Thus, with Foucault, we can assert *that things might have changed a little… the battles may not have the same face*. Rather than deny institutions and declare their senselessness, we frame the question of pedagogy as a political question in relation to the new faces of current battles.

KEY WORDS

Pedagogical apparatuses; management societies; daily life; slums.

SISYPHUS
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION
VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,
2015, PP. 88-109

Governmentality and Pedagogical Apparatuses in Management Times

Silvia M. Grinberg

INTRODUCTION

The problematization of school life has, since the end of the 20th century, been enmeshed in processes of change and reform that became central to, among other things,[1] the dynamics of education systems. In the processes of school life, this is not a minor concern. Since the nineties, schools have been called on to effect transformations, to handle crises, and to administer change and teachers to become their students' coaches under the paradoxical notion that, in knowledge societies, it is no longer necessary to teach knowledge but rather to convey search procedures (Simons & Masschelein, 2008; Peters, 1996; Noguera, 2013; Grinberg, 2008; Armella, 2015).

The pedagogical apparatuses designed, conceived, and imagined by many important enlightenment thinkers were essential to creating a world in which the idea of normal, normalizable, and normalized subjects is commonsensical[2] (Veiga-Neto, 2013). In recent times, we have experienced a wide range of sensations, from the critical to the nostalgic, in relation to those "ideals"; it is clear that we no longer live in that world. Becoming normal,

1 The rhetoric of reform and change resonates a wide range of fields and institutions, from schools to hospitals, mental institutions to private companies, etc.

2 See Castro-Gómez (2010).

thinking of ourselves in the world as normal subjects, can even be cause for offense. Diversity, innovation, and creativity have become the terms that define what is good and worthy, what must be at the crux of any possible future and, of course, at the crux of education. Rather than suggesting that we are outside the measurement and definition of horizons of desirability, what matters here is to define the specificities of this non-narrative narrative that calls on us to be who we want to be and becomes a scale of modulations and endlessly open possibilities.

It is in this framework that we speak of management societies as key *elements* to current modes of governing a population no longer conceived as a whole. Society is no longer envisioned as a body that functions with organic integrity. It is no longer a question of homogenizing populations. In fact, the narrative of government entails just the opposite: the tolerance of diversity, the glorification of the Self and its individual potentials. Thus, according to management logic, the rationality of fragments defines the terms of population government where subjects are charged with making themselves and the school is re-interpreted as community institution that must manage itself.

In the framework of governmentality studies (Foucault, 1991; Rose, Valverde,& O'Malley, 2006; Castro-Gómez, 2010; Simons and Masschelein, 2008; Grinberg, 2008; Veiga-Neto, 2013), we inquire into those processes as they are experienced in the dynamics of school life. On the basis of the notion of the pedagogical apparatus,[3] it is important to interrogate lines of daily life understanding that they involve political modes that enable possibilities and manage action (Ball, et al., 2012) as well as resistance to those modes. Second, we understand that the relations of force involved in the daily life of schooling are increasingly enmeshed in urban fragmentation and selective metropolitanization and the forms that they adopt (Prévôt Schapira, 2002). In the metropolises of the global south, many areas have taken root as a consequence of crisis and of the fragmentation of economic and social life, processes that, since the end of the 20th century, have pushed large sectors of the popula-

3 "It is significant, from the point of view of considering the conceptual specificity of *dispositif*, that Foucault makes a clear distinction between it and *appareil*. Several times in his description of the *dispositif* he uses the term *appareil* with a different sense as part of the description. Apparatus in Foucault seems to be a smaller subset of dispositive, and one that is more specifically state-centered and instrumental. It seems unlikely that he would use the word with such specific associations if he meant it as purely and simply interchangeable with dispositive, which he has been at pains to describe as more heterogeneous and more distributed." (Bussolini, 2010, p. 93)

tion into informal settlements largely lacking in urban infrastructure (Davis, 2007; Chatterjee, 2008; Bayat, 2000; Rao, 2006, 2008; Roy, 2011; Slater, 2009). As we will discuss here, schools and neighborhoods have undergone similar experiences to such an extent that their study requires research strategies that heed school as a territorialized experience (Grinberg, 2011).

This is the framework, then, in which we inquire into the daily life of schools understanding that, on the one hand, many of the lines of current debates on education are common and/or globalized (see, among others, Simons & Masschelein, 2008; Peters, 1996, 2006, 2010, 2013; Popkewitz, Olson, & Petterson, 2006; Veiga-Neto and Corcini Lopes, 2011, Noguera, 2013; Grinberg, 2008) and, on the other, that many of those lines take on specific tones and nuisances as they intersect with urban life. If this holds true in general, it has a distinct set of characteristics in the global south (Rao, 2008; Arabindoo, 2014; Grinberg, 2011), where it is associated with, among other things, slums and the consolidation of specific ways poverty has taken rooted in the urban territory.

We turn here to the research that we are currently carrying out in schools in the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area located in areas that, since the end of the 20th century, have experienced, among other things, traumatic processes of impoverishment and, with them, the constant growth of slums, now inhabited by three generations. After long periods on the ground, we can conclude that these areas are marked by such extreme fragility that even policies of inclusion[4] often fail not only to revert exclusion but actually end up furthering it, becoming part of the very problem they attempt to solve. We can, in light of the notion of the pedagogical apparatus, describe the lines that characterize the tumultuous beginning of the century in and from the emerging processes of school life. Central to our concern are the historical ways a set of forces unfold and produce modes of schooling. Two concepts are key to the notion of the apparatus: politics and historicity. It is a question of exploring the multiplicities and crevices of daily life at school and its tasks, the heterogeneous, diffuse, contradictory, and overlapping ways that those multiplicities and crevices interact every day which, when studied, come before as like a puzzle impossible to solve.

Our fieldwork in schools is performed from an ethnographic post-structuralist perspective (Choi, 2006; Youdell, 2006; Ringrose and Coleman, 2013;

4 It is not our intention here to discuss the notion of inclusion. Regarding that, see, among others, Corcini Lopes & Hattge (orgs.) (2009).

Grinberg, 2013; Youdell & McGimpsey, 2015). Returning to Deleuze and Parnet (2007), it is a question of making history in the present, which is not the same as lived experience whose singularities are drowned out by observations of a universal to become mere moments. It is, rather, a question of studying the events of daily life, its divisions and detours, to yield a fractured historicity (Cole, 2013). From this perspective, we reflect on the particularities of pedagogical apparatus in those urban spaces of the global south where poverty and environmental decay—keys to understanding the daily life of the neighborhood and/or school—converge (Rao, 2008; Jones, 2011; Bussi, 2013; Langer, 2014). We attempt to grasp the complex interconnected structure of a daily existence where the changes that take shape overwhelm the virulence of social, political, economic and, of course, educational, transformations and their assemblages.

ON THE NOTION OF APPARATUS: METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

Foucault uses the notion of the apparatus—mostly in relation to the topic of "governmentality"—to speak of the conjunction of discursive and non-discursive practices that gives shape to the surfaces on which subjects are inscribed and produced, and themselves produce. This is a territory of multiple inscriptions, a field whose study requires heeding aspects of changing and unstable power relations that constantly suffuse society. That is precisely the role of the *dispositif*, which Foucault uses as a way to approach and analyze certain dimensions of power's application and exercise. The *dispositive* is, then, a historical formation per se, a network of relations that do not constitute any element in particular but rather "the resonance of heterogeneity" (Castro-Gómez, 2010).

At stake in the lines that cross and compose an apparatus are government policies on the levels of design and legislation, on the one hand, and of enactments (Ball, 2013) and opposition, on the other. This vision does not understand those two components as polar. Instead, it sees the daily operations of subjects in school in relation to the network of lines of force implicit to any apparatus. What matters, then, is not the opposition between micro and macro, between policy design and enactment, but rather lines that intersect with such intensity that one cannot be understood without the

other; these lines of schooling move, struggle, and mingle with the lines of, for instance, educational policies, urban life, the neighborhood, etc.

These are heterogeneous and dynamic configurations in constant motion that entail practices and forms of thought that give shape to contemporary experience. They can be studied like a polyhedron:

> [...] within a heterogeneous and dynamic field of relations, the dispositive would seem to be a kind of moving marker to allow some approximation of a particular preponderance or balance of forces at a given time. It helps to identify which knowledges have been called out and developed in terms of certain imperatives of power, and it aids in the discernment of the many resistances that also necessarily run through the multiple relations of force according to Foucault. This is all the more important given his castings of power as a fractured field in which the different lines of force are sometimes reinforcing, sometimes undermining and contradicting one another—reading the points of confrontation and intensity is historically and politically valuable. (Bussolini, 2010, p. 91)

The apparatus—the network established between elements—is always an act of bricolage (Rabinow & Rose, 2003) that can be performed using anything at all. What distinguishes apparatuses is not only the elements that they use but also the position that each of those elements occupies. Due to this very composition of the apparatus, the criticism of apparatuses and struggles are always strategic. The multiplicity of relations of force is immanent to the domain where they operate and those relations of force are constitutive of the organization of the apparatus, how it operates and is transformed, reinforced, or inverted by constant battles and confrontations. It is a question of grasping a particular preponderance or balance of powers at a given time, which helps to identify what knowledges, as well as practices of resistance, are deployed.

> The dispositive has janus-faced strategic functions as network of power relations allowing a certain confluence and direction of forces, or as conceptual tool allowing at least a provisional analysis of a certain configuration of entities, knowledges, and discourses that discloses points of existing and possible resistance. (Bussolini, 2010, p. 92)

Concepts, as well as how they are stated, are useful to grasping differences between historical periods but also to addressing overlaps, configurations, and re-configurations. Concepts operate differently according to those configurations and that is particularly important in these tumultuous times when many statements characteristic of criticism from the seventies and eighties have been relocated as truths of these times. Thus, for instance, the decentralization of education systems that was once associated with a criticism of authoritarianism now means the transfer of responsibility for the design of curricula and for performance onto subjects and/or institutions.

What matters here, then, is that resonance, that heterogeneous set of factors: lines of force in their historicity exactly as they are experienced and enacted in a territory.[5] Our fundamental concern here is to take root in the territory in order to unravel the networks at stake in processes of government and subjectivation.[6] Once again, "the lines of subjectivation seem particularly capable of tracing paths of creation, which are continually aborting, but then restarting in a modified way, until the former apparatus is broken" (Deleuze, 1992, p. 164). It is a question of addressing both sedimented processes, the archive, and lines of actualization. The question is how processes of government are lived and experienced, how the subject intersects with the sedimented, which lines are divided, traced and/or broken?

These practices are enacted in history, where the exercise of power and processes of subjectivation are by no means what they used to be: "the disciplines which Foucault describes are the history of what we gradually cease to be, and our present-day reality takes on the form of dispositions of overt and continuous control in a way which is very different from recent closed disciplines" (Deleuze, 1992, p. 164). Foucault (2007) is speaking of the configuration of the corporate society. Here, we use the term "management societies" to refer to the new dynamics of population government insofar as they entail a set of knowledges and technologies, as well as an ethos specific to these times.

It is important as well to differentiate and to recover the notion of *dispositif* in relation to the Deleuzian concept of "assemblage" (*agencement*) (Legg,

5 In Deleuze's words, "There are lines of sedimentation, Foucault says, but also lines of 'fissure', and fracture. Untangling the lines of an apparatus means, in each case, preparing a map, a cartography, a survey of unexplored lands—that is what he calls 'field work'" (1992, p. 155).

6 Regarding this point, see the interesting distinction that Castro-Gómez formulates (2011) between the notion of subjection and subjectivation. The first is bound to determining conduct and the second to subjects that direct their own conduct.

2011). As McFarlane (2011) point out, thinking with assemblage appears as a specific form of relational thinking that attends to the agency of wholes *and* of parts, not one or the other, the interplay between stability and change, order and disruption. In this framework, we engage the notion of assemblage ethnography as methodology (Youdell and McGimpsey, 2015). That is the "trans" nature of many productive relations; of the "map" as charting movements across orders and scales, with a different spatial or temporal sense than ethnography might otherwise provide. Assemblage requires the methodology to move, us to move, to make hopefully creative use of a range of qualitative and quantitative methods to account for the detail of assemblage components, the nuances of their productive relations and the far-reaching assemblages produced (p. 121). As Renold and Ringrose point out (2010), in recovering the notion of lines of "flight" and the Braidotti's concept of "alternative figuration", the ruptures and alternative figurations do not always involve a total "molar" resistance, but rather significant spaces of doing differently that are crucial to mapping practices that exceed the sedimented.

This is what we pursue through the fieldwork discussed below. We look to material produced during long periods spent in two high schools located in the middle of a slum and a third that, while not located within the confines of that neighborhood, draws students from the same population. In addition, in 2010 and 2011 we applied a semi-structured research instrument to teachers, parents, and students in a sample of high schools selected on the basis of a scale constructed from censor information where the 0.10-0.20 range corresponds to the sectors with the most favorable situation in the city and 0.40 to those living in slums. This approach enables us to describe some of the tensions characteristic of the aforementioned urban fragmentation.

PEDAGOGICAL APPARATUSES IN CONTEXTS OF URBAN POVERTY

MANAGEMENT AND RESPONSIBLE CITIZENRY: SCHOOLS AND NEIGHBORHOOD LEFT TO THEIR OWN DEVICES

Since the end of the 20th century, a range of programs and policies has been put in place that bestows on institutions and subjects the responsibility to manage themselves. The argument goes that those institutions and subjects are the ones that best understand their specific realities and hence should

undertake actions that reflect that understanding and consequent diagnosis. Under the mandate of efficacious management and responsible citizenship, subjects are left to run their own cooperatives and/or civil society organizations and to procure funding to improve streets and safety, and to paint schools (Grinberg, Gutiérrez & Mantiñán, 2012). The word "empowerment" has become commonplace to refer to attempts to elevate self-esteems assumed to be low and to make communities, schools, etc. responsible for their own fate. In the specific case of education, a new theory of human capital came on the political horizon, signaling a correlation between employability and educability. Thus, individuals and families are seen as responsible not only for their unemployment but also for a diagnosis that renders them not only unfit for employment but also for education. A sort of pastor who provides no guidance (Rose, 2007) is the figure that affirms that man is the one who must take center stage in his own development and, hence, participatory action must be undertaken on the part of the community (Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999) and of persons in order to improve egos and/or living conditions.

The exercise of responsible citizenship requires that subjects create NGOs, foundations, and cooperatives (Bayat, 2000) and procure funding by a variety of means in order to start and maintain soup kitchens and tutoring services, as well as establish micro-enterprises to clean schools, plazas, empty lots, streets, etc. In the poorest neighborhoods, then, we find management specialists who not only know how to devise projects but also the ins-and-outs of fundraising.

In the schools where we do our research, this new logic means that, in a variety of ways, responsibility for management has been transferred onto the school and teachers. This in a context where to procure working bathrooms, chairs for students, usable schoolyards, classrooms with safe electrical installations, ceilings and floors that don't collapse, the school administration must deploy strategies where the only way to make oneself heard is by shouting. As one principal told us after months of requesting heaters from the relevant authorities, "I sat on top of the heaters and told them that I would not come down until they had sent them to the school". While this might appear to be an amusing anecdote, it is the way that institutions operate or are made to operate.

The life of neighborhoods and schools left to manage themselves depends, then, on being able to shout loud enough to show that there is a real risk of things getting out of hand, of an explosion ensuing. It may then be possible

to get some attention that, for a few months at least, will calm things down and/or get the heaters[7] (Grinberg, 2011). In terms of population government, this means control of disorder or controlled disorder (Fearnley, 2005).

THE EDUCATION OF THOSE WHO ARE NO LONGER NECESSARY

In the age of flexible capitalism, education in the slums does not seem to revolve around the making of productive bodies. One of our field notes from observations at schools addresses the use and management of time, as well as how time is experienced at school. In terms of the time allocated to teaching a subject, for instance, it was often not clear when a new subject had begun after a test was taken (Langer, 2014; Armella, 2015; Grinberg, 2011). It is no longer a question of learning how to work and, hence, of learning the efficacious and adequate use of time. There is no hurry. This means that students graduate at least one year later than they were initially expected to. That is not only because they are not promoted, but also because in the middle of the year many students stop attending school and don't come back until the following year. Students do plan to graduate, but at a slower pace. And this is an important topic because it is no longer a question of dropping out, but of taking more time to finish school.

Location of the school	Have you stopped attending school for at least one year?		Total
	Yes	No	Yes
0.10-0.20	8.0%	11.8%	11.%
0.21-0.30	16.8%	36.1%	34.2%
0.31-0.40	25.7%	32.9%	32.2%
+ 0.40	49.6%	19.2%	22.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SOURCE: OWN ELABORATION ON THE BASIS OF THE "ENCUESTA A ESTUDIANTES DE ESCUELA SECUNDARIA" CEDESI. EHU. UNSAM (2010-2011).

The administration and/or enrollment in these schools manifest this slow pace. This fluctuating enrollment has given rise to a new category—"absent in attendance"—which refers to a way of inhabiting school space. It describes

7 See http://www.ghil.ac.uk/trg_poverty_and_education/publications.html (02/29/2016)

a situation where a student arrives at school late and is marked absent but is, nonetheless, at school. If there is no schedule, being on time doesn't matter. Then again, there are rarely enough chairs for all the students enrolled, so if they were all to show up at once that would be a problem. If, as Massey states (1993, p. 155), "spatiality and temporality are different from each other but neither can be conceptualized as the absence of the other", school life shows how, in fact, time and space are made up along the way.

The notion that time is gold that characterized modes of schooling geared to educating workers seems to have vanished: it is nowhere to be found in these fragments of the city, often despite what the subjects in the schools themselves would wish. Time is stretched out and a fatigued wandering has become the norm. And thus the circle of employability opens in on itself, blaming schools, teachers, students and/or families for what they do not do in a daily reality that questions the possibility of employability itself.

THE FLEXIBLE SCHOOL. THE SCHOOL IN THE PROCESS OF BECOMING

"A student is punished for jumping over a school wall to get in, that is, he jumps in from the street because he wants to get inside the school's premises." No matter how strange it may seem, that situation described in the field notes is just one of the scenes that takes place at school every day. It makes it patently clear that apparatus are historical: a situation like this one would have been inconceivable under Foucault's logic of discipline. These practices differ from those operative in the traditional school. While, at first glance, the anecdote may seem nonsensical (Deleuze, 1994), that is just what, paradoxically, charges it with meaning. If the student had gone into the school as he does every day, there would be nothing to report. What we have here, though, is a student climbing the walls not to escape from school, but to get inside, and that skews to say the least our expectations about misconduct while demonstrating the force of someone fighting to have a place.

Management logic takes on a specific set of traits when it entails the administration of the life of that population that Foucault so aptly defined as liminal (2007): subjects are charged with making themselves and the school reinterpreted as a community institution; both are left to their own devices in an unanchored back-and-forth. In the 21st century, those who attend school in slums are the children of welfare plans, day labor, trash

rummaging, and looking for something to eat in the *quema*;[8] these are the chronically unemployed and it is no longer necessary that their bodies be docile, at least not in the sense that they were under industrial capitalism. Foucault's luminal population has become the abject population (Kristeva, 1988; Butler, 2002; Grinberg, 2013) and that applies to both the subjects and the neighborhoods they inhabit in those zones that, though uninhabitable, are densely populated.

Situations like the one described above are common in schools where students knock on doors, ring bells, and jump over walls to try to get in (Grinberg& Langer, 2014). If the wall used to mark the limits such that the circulation through spaces was controlled in order to regulate exit, the current dynamics in these schools are just the opposite. What is pursued now is not escaping the gaze but rather getting in and gaining a place in the institution.

It is very difficult to administer school life in the age of management where institutions are asked to become more flexible, to function in exception (Grinberg, 2012). As opposed to the rigidness of schooling in times of management, disorientation seems to reign and a complex tangle takes hold of the institution. As will be discussed below, something very similar happens with teaching.

BECOMING A TEACHER IN A LEARNING ASSEMBLAGE

"You can't teach these kids anything because they don't participate", says one teacher, full of despair, after a number of attempts to give classes that appear to be taken from a manual for teaching according to learning apparatuses (Simons & Masschelein, 2008) where education is called on to prepare people to face changes autonomously; it should "prepare mankind to adapt to change, the predominant characteristic of our time. In this case, knowledge is viewed as an output of mental processes and, as such, the result of a "construction. Learning is an active, constructive, and social process that could and should be managed, and this first and foremost by learners themselves" (p. 401). In this dynamic, the act of teaching becomes coaching to orient processes and education—as the teachers themselves point out—a question of making students act. After a number of attempts and training

8 *Quema* is the name of the neighborhood located in one of the city's largest trash dumps.

courses, this teacher asks us for help because nothing seems to work, nothing seems capable of setting off that process of making student act. Thus, though teaching is relegated for the sake of construction, it hardly seems to augment "employability".

Before these images, we are consistently confronted with excess, with students who report being more and more bored in school (Grinberg & Langer, 2014), with teachers who are troubled because everything they do seems to hinder, rather than foster, the not always simple task of students composing texts. Situations like these only confirm that knowledge is more than just self-management. That's probably why students value most those teachers that explain, that is, the ones that teach. The aforementioned scene of the student jumping over a wall to get into school is not strange if understood as forming part of current apparatuses where the will to learn demands teachers that teach. And it is there, where lines of resistance—that which searches and also takes flight—seems to ally with those moments of life in the classroom where knowledge takes center stage not to be "constructed" but, rather, to be considered along with a teacher who understands that, despite everything, that is what they are there for.

LOOKING FOR SCHOOL. THE WILL TO LEARN

Finally, we would like to consider this scene that took place at the very beginning of the research:

> I am standing in the schoolyard during recess. It's my first day at the school. A female fourth grader comes over to ask me who I am and what I am doing there. I answer and ask her what she is doing here. She stands right in front of me, looks me straight in the eye and, with an expression on her face that says she does not understand the question, shrugs and says. "I'm here to learn."

We were startled by this scene: we came to the school having been warned of the state of crisis and the impossibility of education and what we find is a nine-year-old girl who, without batting an eye, expresses what should naturally take place in school. She was not there to get the certification that would entitle her family to a cash-transfer program, as many claim. She went to school every day to learn. There is an excess in this girl's statements,

one that is repeated in the words of the students as well as the teachers, who insist on teaching and learning in conditions that undermine those processes that constitute, after all, the very purpose of school.

Over the course of years, we have been able to confirm that that bold commitment to schooling despite all odds is permanent, and this regardless of claims that school does not meet the needs of young people, that the internet offers them something that school does not appear capable of giving. The following chart depicts students' commitment and assessment of school.

It's important to go to school because	School's level of socio-geographic vulnerability			
	0.10 -0.20	0.21 -0.30	0.31-0.40	+40
Access to future studies	85.3%	84.7%	74.9%	73.1%
Education to be a good person	58.9%	66.8%	61.2%	75.4%
It will help me in some way, no matter how small	48.1%	36.1%	39.9%	45.4%
Access to employment	89.2%	98.2%	94.8%	96.2%
It will help me participate in society and be able to defend my rights as a citizen	76.9%	76.7%	70.4%	80.7%

SOURCE: OWN ELABORATION ON THE BASES OF "ENCUESTA A ESTUDIANTES DE ESCUELA SECUNDARIA" CEDESI. EHU. UNSAM (2010-2011).

Both that girl who goes to school to learn and the above chart offer another perspective: they betray a staunch commitment to schooling and an assessment that differs vastly from the public image of schools, especially of schools in slums, and of students. The few times the schools where this research was performed are mentioned in the press, it is to report bad news. But other things happen there as well. In fact, in all cases the values in the chart are much higher for schools located in slums than in other areas. While it was perhaps predictable that students would affirm that school would increase access to employment, the positive responses to other questions like "it will make me a better person" are surprising. Despite everything—reformist rhetoric, learning apparatuses (Simons & Masschelein, 2008), focus on performance, the teacher-coach (Grinberg, 2008), and so many other discourses that compose the *episteme* of schooling in these times—there is something at

schools that refuses to be undermined. Or, rather, at school those discourses come up against alternative figurations that defy both outdated authoritarian modes of education as well as "you-can-do-it" management logic.

CLOSING REMARKS

As Deleuze pointed out, "Michel was amazed by the fact that despite all the powers, their underhandedness and their hypocrisy, we can still manage to resist. On the contrary, I am amazed by the fact that everything is leaking and the government manages to plug the leaks. In a sense, Michel and I addressed the same problem from opposite ends" (1986, p. 21). These opposite ends, which we believe are increasingly present in times of crisis, are exactly what we have attempted to describe here. This implies, among other things, denying the slums (Grinberg, 2011, 2013) and calling them abject, on the one hand, and students insisting on their wants and desires as they fight in and for school, on the other.

Thus, in times of crisis we come upon the configuration of these new ways of exercising power through technologies of the self-founded in a spirit of freedom and responsibility. These define a new framework in which we are called on to take responsibility for, direct, and redirect a self that is always-already at the border. We have attempted to show how this new configuration and its contradictions are expressed in the daily life of schools located in shantytowns.

A question arises: when everything melts away, the struggle lies in staying put, in being present, in putting stock in the existence of an institution that consists of something more than an isolated individual. When crisis becomes the most stable state of affairs, we find students who struggle for the continued existence of schools as well as a place for themselves in them. Second, before the image of abjection and apathy that are so often bestowed on these neighborhoods and the demand to foster resilience, we find young people who jump walls to get into school; these young people do not passively accept the negation that weighs them down and attempts to undermine their existence as subjects with a future.

In the current process of government, rationality is conceived (and enacted) in a fragmentary fashion. Narratives of permanent crisis express just that: the refusal to conceive of government and, hence, of the social as a

whole. This means that governmentality has become syndromic, the conduct of fragments. Under this logic, management acts in a number of ways: in the absence of a whole, subjects, institutions, and communities must take responsibility for themselves. In the specific case of education, this logic does not mean homogenization for the sake of an ideal but just the opposite, that is, inclusion that leads to tolerance of diversity and glorification of the Self and individual potentials. A rationality of fragments defines government that takes the shape of a non-narrative where education is the key space in which subjects are called on to make themselves. The school by no means eludes this logic but is, rather, reinterpreted as community institution left to manage itself as best it can. This dynamic is crucial to understanding these times. We think in fragments and, hence, operate on fragments such that—as with financial capitalism—if a part collapses the system remains intact. In this framework, it may be possible to read processes of subjectivation as well as the crisis and uncertainty to which we have grown accustomed as an episteme of government.

This is the framework in which we have undertaken the study of the complex network of relations, tensions, and struggles that these processes take on in the daily life of subjects and institutions with their struggles, fissures, and contradictions. Our field notes provide political diagrams of the ways that conduct is conducted, of governmentalities, modalities that can only be grasped in an incomplete state but that express modes of everyday assemblage.

REFERENCES

Arabindoo, P. (2014). Urban design in the realm of urban studies. In M. Carmona (Ed.), *Explorations in Urban Design: An Urban Design Research Primer*. London: Ashgate.

Armella, J. (2015). *Dispositivos pedagógicos y tecnologías de la información y la comunicación. Un estudio socio-pedagógico en escuelas secundarias públicas emplazadas en contextos de pobreza urbana*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Ball, S. J. (2013). *The education debate*. UK: The Policy Press.

Bayat, A. (2000). From 'Dangerous Classes' to 'Quiet Rebels'. Politics of the Urban Subaltern in the Global South. *International Sociology, 15*(3), 533-557. Retrieved from http://iss.sagepub.com/content/15/3/533.full.

pdf+html

Bussi, E. (2013). *Hacer escuela secundaria en barrios de degradación ambiental y pobreza urbana extrema: estudio en torno de los dispositivos pedagógicos en la sociedad del gerenciamiento*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. UNSAM, Argentina.

Bussolini, J. (2010). What is a Dispositive? *Foucault Studies, 10*, 85-107.

Butler, J. (2002). *Cuerpos que importan. Sobre los límites materiales y discursivos del "sexo"*, Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Castro-Gómez, S. (2010). *Historia de la gubernamentalidad. Razón de Estado, liberalismo y neoliberalismo en Michel Foucault*. Bogotá: Siglo de Hombre Editores.

Chatterjee, P. (2008). *La nación en tiempo heterogéneo y otros estudios subalternos*. Argentina: Siglo XXI Editores.

Choi, J.-A. (2006). Doing poststructural ethnography in the life history of dropouts in South Korea: Methodological ruminations on subjectivity, positionality and reflexivity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(4), 435-453.

Cole, D. (2013). Lost in Data Space: Using Nomadic Analysis to Perform Social Science. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 219-237). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Coleman, R. & Ringrose, J. (Eds.) (2013). *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Corcini Lopes, M. & Hattge, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Inclusão escolar: conjunto de práticas que governam*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora.

Corcini Lopes, M., Lockmann, K., & Hattge, M. (2013). Políticas de Estado e Inclusión. *Revista Pedagogía y Saberes, 38*, 41-50.

Davis, M. (2007). *Planeta de ciudades miseria*. Madrid: Foca.

Dean, M., (1999). *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage Publications.

Deleuze, G. (1986). The Intellectuals and Politics: Foucault and the prison (Interview with P. Rabinow and K. Gandal). *History of the Present, 2*, 20-21.

Deleuze, G. (1988/1989). *Pericles y Verdi. La filosofía de François Châtelet* (U. Larraceleta & J. Vázquez, Trans.). Valencia: Pre-textos.

Deleuze, G. (1992). What is a dispositif? In T. J. Armstrong (Ed.), *Michel Foucault Philosopher* (pp. 159-168). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheafs.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Lógica del Sentido* (M. Morey, Trans.). Barcelona: Paidós.

Deleuze, G. (2004). *Desert Islands and Other Texts, 1953-1974* (M. Taormina, Trans.). New York: Semiotext(e).

Deleuze, G. (2005). *La isla desierta y otros textos* (J. L. Pardo Torío, Trans.). Va-

lencia, España: Pre-textos.

Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (2007). *Dialogues II* (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Fearnley, L. (2005). 'From chaos to controlled disorder': Syndromic surveillance, bioweapons, and the pathological future. *ARC Working Paper, 5*.

Fendler, L. (2001). Educating flexible souls: The construction of subjectivity through developmentality and interaction. In K. Hultqvist & G. Dahlberg (Eds.), *Governing the child in the new millennium* (pp. 119-142). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Foucault, M. (1991). "La gubernamentalidad". In R. Castel et al. *Espacios de poder* (pp. 9-26). Madrid: Ediciones de la Piqueta.

Foucault, M. (2000). *Defender la sociedad*. Argentina: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Foucault, M. (2006). *Seguridad, territorio y población*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Foucault, M. (2009). *El gobierno de sí y de los otros*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Foucault, M. (2014). *Del gobierno de los vivos*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Foucault, M., & TERÁN, O. (1983). *El discurso del poder*. Mexico City, Mexico: Folios Ediciones

Gadelha, S. (2009). Governamentalidade neoliberal, Teoria do Capital Humano e Empreendedorismo. *Educação & Realidade*, *34*(2), 171-186.

Gadella, S. (2013). Empresariamiento de la sociedad y el gobierno de la infancia pobre. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, *65*, 233-256.

Grinberg, S. (2008). *Educación y poder en el siglo XXI. Gubernamentalidad y pedagogía en las sociedades de gerenciamiento*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Miño y Dávila.

Grinberg, S. (2011) . Territories of schooling and schooling territories in contexts of extreme urban poverty in Argentina: Between management and abjection. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *4*(3), 160-171.

Grinberg, S. (2013). Researching the Pedagogical Apparatus (*Dispositif*): An Ethnography of the Molar, Molecular and Desire in Contexts of Extreme Urban Poverty. In B. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 201-218). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Grinberg, S., Gutiérrez, R. A., & Mantiñan, L. (2012). La comunidad frag-

mentada: gubernamentalidad y empoderamiento en territorios urbanos hiperdegradados. *Revista Espacios Nueva Serie*, *2*, 154-172.

Grinberg, S. & Langer, E. (2014). Struggling for knowledge in times of cognitive capitalism: youth and school in contexts of urban poverty. *Knowledge Cultures*, *2*(4), 152-171.

Jones, G. A. (2011). Slumming about: aesthetics, art and politics. *City*, *15*(6), 696-706.

Kristeva, J. (1988). *Poderes de la perversión: ensayo sobre Louis-Ferdinand Céline*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.

Langer, E. (2014). *Dispositivos pedagógicos en las sociedades de control: prácticas de resistencia de estudiantes y regulación de las conductas en escuelas secundarias en contextos de pobreza urbana del Partido de San Martín*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Legg, S. (2011). Assemblage/apparatus: using Deleuze and Foucault. *Area*, *43*(2), 128-133.

Maguire, M., Ball, S. J., Braum, A. (Eds.). (2012). *How schools do Policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. New York: Routledge.

Masschelein, J., Simons, M., Bröckling, U., & Pongratz, L. (2006). The Learning Society from the Perspective of Governmentality. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *38*(4), 415.

Massey, D. (1993). Politics and space/time. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity* (pp. 141-161). London, Routledge.

Mcfarlane, C. (2011). Assemblage and critical urbanism. *City*, *15*(2), 204-224.

Noguera, C. (2013). Crisis de la educación como crisis de gobierno. Sobre la ejercitación del animal humano en tiempos neoliberales. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, *65*, 43-60.

Nogueira, C. & Marin, D. (2011). Educar es gobernar: La educación como arte de gobierno. In R. Cortés Salcedo & D. Marín Díaz (Eds.), *Gubernamentalidad y Educación. Discusiones contemporáneas* (pp. 129-151). Bogotá: Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico, IDEP.

Peters, M. A. (1996). *Poststructuralism, Politics and Education*. Westport and London: Bergin & Garvey.

Peters, M. A. (2001). Education, Enterprise Culture and the Entrepreneurial Self: A Foucauldian Perspective. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, *2*(2), 58-71.

Peters, M. A. (2010). Three Forms of the Knowledge Economy: Learning, Creativity and Openness. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *58*(1), 67-88.

Peters, M. A. (2013) "Radical Openness: Creative institutions, creative labor

and the logic of public organizations in cognitive capitalism", *Knowledge Cultures*, 1(2), 638.

Popkewitz, T., Olsson, U. & Petersson, K. (2006). The Learning Society, the Unfinished Cosmopolitan, and Governing Education, Public Health and Crime Prevention at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(4), 431-449.

Prévôt Schapira, M. F. (2002). Buenos Aires en los años '90: Metropolización y desigualdades. *EURE, 28*(85), 31-50.

Rabinow, P. & Rose, N. S. (2003). *The essential Foucault: selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984.* New York: New Press.

Rao, V. (2006). Slum as theory: the South/ Asian city and globalization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 30*(1), 225-232.

Rao, V. (2008). Pirating Utopia: Mumbai at the End of the Planning Era. In R. Mehrotra & P. Joshi (Eds.). *Mumbai Reader 07*. Mumbai: Urban Design Research Institute.

Ringrose, J. & Renold, E. (2010). Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girls and boys in school. *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(4), 573-596

Ringrose, J. (2011). Beyond Discourse? Using Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis to explore affective assemblages, heterosexually striated space, and lines of flight online and at school. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(6), 598-618.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought*. U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. (2007). *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*. USA: Princeton University Press.

Rose, N., O'malley, P. & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science 2*(5), 83-104.

Roy, A. (2011). Slumdog Cities: Rethinking Subaltern Urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 35*(2), 223-238.

Simons, M., & Masschelein, J. (2008). Our 'will to learn' and the assemblage of a learning apparatus. In A. Fejes & K. Nicholl (Eds.), *Foucault and Lifelong learning: Governing the subject* (pp. 48-60). London: Routledge.

Slater, T. (2009). Missing Marcuse: On gentrification and displacement. *City: 13*(2), 292-311.

Stuart, E. (2009). *Terror and Territory: The Spatial Extent of Sovereignty.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Veiga-Neto, A. (2006). Educação e Pós-Modernidade: impasses e perspecti-

vas. *Educação Online*, *2*(1).

Veiga-Neto, A. (2013). Gubernamentalidad y educación. In *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, *65*, 19-42.

Veiga-Neto, A. & Corcini Lopes, M. (2011). Gubernamentalidad, biopolítica e inclusión. In R. Cortés Salcedo & D. Marín Díaz (Eds.), *Gubernamentalidad y Educación. Discusiones contemporáneas* (pp. 105-126). Bogotá: Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico, IDEP.

Youdell, D. (2006). *Impossible Bodies, Impossible Selves: Exclusion and Student Subjectivities*. Netherlands: Springer.

Youdell, D. & Mcgimpsey, I. (2015). Assembling, disassembling and reassembling 'youth services' in Austerity Britain. *Critical Studies in Education*, *56*(1), 116-130.

*

Received: September 4, 2015
Final version received: December 15, 2015
Published online: December 30, 2015