Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The critical purchase of genealogy: critiquing student participation projects

Anna Anderson*

Independent Scholar, Victoria, Australia

Until recently the dominant critique of 'student participation' projects was one based on the theoretical assumptions of critical theory in the form of critical pedagogy. Over the last decade, we have witnessed the emergence of a critical education discourse that theorises and critically analyses such projects using Foucault's notion of 'governmentality'. In this paper, I argue that while these governmentality studies challenge some of the key theoretical and taken for granted assumptions upon which such initiatives rest, they neglect to challenge the central assumption that such initiatives represent a historical break with traditional schooling practices. The importance of accounting for and critically analysing these projects within a historical framework will be argued through a discussion of Foucault's notion of genealogy as a particular conception and method of critique. It will also be demonstrated using an example, which shows an unacknowledged nineteenth century history of the current discourse and practice of student participation.

Keywords: student participation; student voice; genealogy; governmentality

Current critiques of student participation

'Giving students a voice' so they can share and participate in the governance of their school is an aim and practice that has come to dominate education discourses, policies and programmes under the headings of 'student participation' or 'student voice'. There is now a large and diverse literature dedicated to advocating, celebrating and critically evaluating such initiatives, ranging from journal special issues – *Educational Review*, 2006, *58*(2); *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 2006, *28*(3); Forum, 2001, *43*(2) – to manuals, and how-to guides on translating the ideal and values of student voice into practice (e.g. Kirby, Lanyon, Cronin, & Sinclair, 2003). As others (e.g. Bragg, 2007, p. 344) have discussed, the idea is that giving young people a voice will not only result in individual transformation through empowerment, but also in institutional transformation and reform. Indeed, such initiatives are typically understood and advocated as part of a larger emancipatory project, concerned with democratising traditional oppressive hierarchies within educational and other social institutions, and thereby transforming young people from 'passive objects' to 'active players' in the educational and democratic systems (e.g. Rudduck, 2007, p. 587). As others have also pointed out, '… progressive and radical visions of education have accorded student voice an important place in their critiques of traditional schooling and their proposals for change' (Lensmire, 1998, p. 261). Those who have theorised student voice locate the core values and ideals that underpin the work within the critical theory tradition, including the

*Email: andersonanna@bigpond.com

work of Habermas and Fraser, and the critical pedagogy of Freire and Giroux and their ideals of emancipatory education (e.g. Robinson & Taylor, 2007).

Until recently the dominant critique of student participation or student voice projects was one based on these same aims, ideas and critical theory framework in the form of critical pedagogy (e.g. Fielding, 2001). In line with this approach, the primary concerns were with judging the extent to which voice or participation was able to be expressed, power equalised, traditional hierarchical student-teacher relations democratised, and empowerment achieved, as well as the genuineness or otherwise ideological or managerial intentions of such projects (e.g Fielding, 2001; Fielding, 2004; Rudduck, 2006). Here, the critical question is:

> Are we witnessing the emergence of something genuinely new, exciting and emancipatory that builds on rich traditions of democratic renewal and transformations? … Or are we presiding over the further entrenchment of existing assumptions and intentions using student or pupil voice as an additional mechanism of control? (Fielding, 2001, p. 100)

This concern to critically evaluate such projects in terms of whether they are 'genuinely new' and 'emancipatory' is typical of this critical literature. It also indicates a key assumption that animates not only this critical literature, but also the very necessity for such projects. To question the newness of such projects is to assume that these projects, if genuine, represent a historical break with what are said to be traditional nineteenth century schooling practices that 'systematically denied agency and voice' (Wrigley, 2007, p. 10). This assumption is both implicit and explicit in most of the literature that advocates for and critically assesses student voice or participation projects. For example, it is explicitly evident in the language used where questions are asked about whether today's student voice projects are truly 'disruptive' or genuinely represent a 'rupture' of traditional practice, or whether they are misused in an 'ideological incorporation' into traditional control concerns of schooling (Fielding, 2004, p. 296, 298). References are made to the ways by which genuine student voice projects can not only 'transform' what it means to be a teacher and a pupil, but how their implementation will mean '… the spectre of schools as nineteenth century institutions will fade' (Fielding, 2004, p. 308), and 'traditional power relations' will be challenged (Rudduck & Fielding, 2006, p. 220). This assumption that nineteenth century schooling practices were simply repressive of agency and voice also corresponds with a common claim that the history of student voice or participation projects simply resides in 'radical' and 'progressive education movements' which emerged in the late nineteenth century in defiance of the dominant repressive practices of the time (e.g. Fielding, 2007; Rudduck & Fielding, 2006).

In the last decade, however, we have witnessed, including within this journal, the emergence of a critical educational discourse that theorises and critically analyses such participation projects using Foucault's notion of 'governmentality' (e.g. Bragg, 2007; Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005, 2006). These studies point out the limitations of what they identify as the 'liberal notion of empowerment' and its implicit 'negative' conception of power, which underpin student participation or voice discourse and practice (e.g. Bragg, 2007, p. 345; Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005, p. 54). They also set out the ways by which a governmentality perspective challenges such notions of power and allows for a different critical analysis. In these governmentality studies, student voice or participation projects are read not in terms of an increase or otherwise in freedom or empowerment, but as new modes of power and authority under

neo-liberalism, operationalised in the form that Foucault calls 'government', which actually require the exercise of agency or freedom to ensure their operation. From this perspective, the freedom or agency that such projects enable is not a 'sham', but it is integrated into the practices of government, thus linking the exercise of freedom or agency with the exercise of power (Bragg, 2007, p. 356). In doing so, such projects operate not simply to increase or merely allow agency to be realised and express itself, but constitute, utilise and shape it in relation to certain regulatory and normative ends, which respond to specific debates about school standards, effectiveness and completion (e.g. Bragg, 2007; Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005). It is in this way that these studies critically analyse student participation projects, not as a solution to power or rejection of regulation, but as a different way of thinking about and exercising power in the form that Foucault calls 'governmentality'.

In this paper, I will argue that, while these governmentality studies mark the emergence of an exciting area of educational theorising and research concerning student participation or voice projects, it remains underdeveloped. That is, while these studies challenge some of the key theoretical and taken for granted assumptions upon which such initiatives are advocated, criticised and operate through, they neglect to challenge the central assumption and claim that such initiatives represent a historical break with traditional schooling practices. Indeed, references are made to student voice projects operating as technologies of 'new configurations of power and authority under neo-liberalism' (Bragg, 2007, p. 343), and statements are made about how a governmentality analysis '… revealed participation to be an element in a mode of government, which is opposed to and compensates for the direct government of traditional educational practices …' (Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005, p. 1). Here, the assumption of the newness and opposition to traditional schooling practices of such projects is reasserted, albeit in governmentality terms. The consequences of this are threefold. First, in doing so, they allow one of the key justifications for the necessity of such programmes to evade critical analysis. Second, even while they show how participation initiatives work, not to lessen regulation or reject regulation but operate as a different form of indirect government, they work from the implicit or explicit assumption that these initiatives are a relatively recent or new way of governing young people. Third, while the deployment of the notion of governmentality in these studies has without doubt produced effective critical analyses of participation projects, the absence of any historical consideration or dimension weakens their critical purchase.

By not questioning the key historical assumption upon which participation projects rely for their very justification, these governmentality studies (Bragg, 2007; Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005, 2006) by default, ground their critique in conventional historical assumptions about traditional practices of schooling being simply repressive of agency and voice. Thereby, they also fail to problematise the corresponding assumption that the history of participatory projects simply resides in radical education movements (e.g. Fielding, 2007). These assumptions are left unchallenged and thus are treated as unproblematic historical facts. Yet, these assumptions support and indeed validate the key justification for student participation or voice projects; and one which is central to making these projects necessary and acceptable to us today. Indeed, it is the very reason given for why we need such projects in the first place. It is the key motivation for reform and for the introduction of such projects and what makes their necessity a given; what makes their importance 'go without saying' or seemingly unquestionable.

It is in this way that these governmentality critiques (Bragg, 2007; Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005, 2006) remain grounded in the assumptions of conventional education history and therefore leave undisturbed one of the key justifications of the very student participation discourse and practice that is the object of their critical analyses. This is even while these governmentality studies are clearly aware of this historical justification for current projects (e.g. Masschelein & Quaghebeur, 2005). It is also despite education studies such as Ian Hunter's (1994) genealogy of the modern school, which goes some way to problematising this assumption. This lack of historical awareness and dimension in these analyses is what leads to a weakening of their critical purchase. In the absence of history, the critical analysis is skin-deep, superficial, grounded in some of the same assumptions as that which it seeks to critique, and therefore neglects to disturb some of the very assumptions upon which contemporary student participation projects rest and rely for their validation. Also, while providing an analysis of participation projects which shows how they can be read as examples of neo-liberal governmentality, the question of how such a form of governmentality emerged historically within the context of the school is left unasked and unanswered.

Strengthening the critique by doing genealogy

The importance of accounting for and critically analysing student participation projects within a historical framework is illuminated through a brief exploration of Foucault's concept and method of critique, which he defines in terms of what he calls 'genealogy' (Foucault, 1997). Through the concept of genealogy, Foucault redefines the practice of critique. He asserts that:

> [a] critique is not a matter of saying that things are not right as they are. It is a matter of pointing out on what kinds of assumptions, what kinds of familiar, unchallenged, unconsidered modes of thought the practices that we accept rest. (Foucault, 1988, p. 154)

This is one of the characteristics that gives genealogy its critical purchase. Its ability to take as its target the assumptions upon which contemporary practice rests; or we can say, that this is what strengthens a critique that takes up genealogy.

The task of genealogical critique is, however, not only to point out and analyse these assumptions upon which taken-for-granted practice rests, but also to question or problematise them. What is presented as natural, timeless, self-evident, new, true or necessary ways of seeing, knowing and acting at present is approached by the genealogists as something to be problematised through historical investigation. Problematisation here refers both to the way genealogical critique aims to show the specific historical practices which give rise to or provide the conditions necessary for the emergence of forms of discourse, knowledge and practice, as well as to the ways in which genealogies are able to turn a 'given' into a question (Deacon, 2000). History is, therefore, the key tool of genealogical critique. Genealogy uses history to show that many of the things that we take for granted or conceive as 'natural', new, 'true' or necessary have a history, a genealogy or lineage, and therefore are artefacts of previous events, discourses, rationalities and practices (Dean, 1998). It is in this way that as a particular way of conceptualising, using and doing history, genealogy is defined by Foucault (1998) as a 'history of the present'.

While history is used as a privileged instrument of genealogical analysis, it is a special sort of 'effective history' that is undertaken (Foucault, 1991b). It is a method that aims to

identify instances of practices and forms of knowledge or discourses that are an exception to what is taken-for-granted, assumed or treated as self-evident and necessary. In contrast to conventional historical approaches, genealogy is concerned with subjugated knowledges and practices, with those knowledges and practices that have been left out or forgotten because they do not fit the story being told:

> The task of the genealogist is to provide a counter-memory. The task is to dredge up forgotten documents, minor statements, apparently insignificant details, in order to recreate the forgotten or unacknowledged historical and practical conditions of our present thinking and practice. (Mahon, 1992, p. 9)

This is done in order to bring about a breach of self-evidence and disruption of commonplace assumption by confronting them with their history. In so doing, genealogy '… seeks to prevent anachronistic understandings of the past that make the present a necessary outcome of a necessarily continuous past' (Dean, 1994, p. 24). In the case of participation projects, the task of genealogy is to breach the historical assumption that makes participation projects a necessary and progressive outcome and reform of a necessarily continuous repressive past.

The critical strategy of genealogy is therefore to use knowledge of historical thinking and practice to criticise contemporary thinking and practice rather than to support the current social order. Not to eschew current reforms and projects or their benefits, but to problematise the assumptions upon which they rest, and thereby show that things are not as self-evident or necessary as one believed; to show that what is accepted as self-evident or necessary, need no longer be accepted as such. History is thus used by genealogy, not to reassure us of the necessity and virtue of current thinking, policy and practice, but as a tool of critique to disrupt and undermine it. In so doing, these present ways of thinking and acting require rethinking as their accepted necessity is challenged. This then opens up a space, in the case of student participation projects, where we can ask the question: do we want to govern or be governed like that? Thus, by showing how things that we take for granted or assume to be necessities have in fact emerged out of a network of historically contingent practices, genealogy makes possible not only thought experiments and idle speculations, but also concrete change that can transform ways of life, power relations and identities (Oksala, 2007).

It is Foucault's concept and method of critique, which he defines as 'genealogy' that, therefore, provides the additional conceptual and methodological resources required to critique participation projects at the level of their historical and other assumptions upon which they depend for their validity, and thereby strengthens the critique. From this genealogical perspective, the point of a critique of student participation projects is not to object to them, but to point out and object to the assumptions that have established the validity and acceptability of these projects. A genealogical critique of student participation projects therefore requires departing from the established grounds of their validity, which is something different and far more risky than finding the assumptions invalid. This involves asking about and investigating the historical and practical conditions from which the discourse and practice of student participation emerged. To produce a genealogical critique of student participation projects we need to show not only how it works as a particular form of governmentality, but also to show how it came about. It is here that genealogy becomes useful in strengthening the governmentality critique of student participation.

Genealogy enables one to identify, as well as suspend the assumption about traditional practices of schooling, and thereby ask the critical question: how are contemporary student participation projects possible, and not only what has been the consequence of their existence? So, while taking up Foucault's concept of governmentality allows one to analyse student participation projects as a particular form of the exercise of governmental power that requires the exercise of freedom or agency for its effective operation, genealogy provides an additional instrument of critical analysis. If we accept that current participation projects can be read as certain liberal forms of governmentality, then taking up genealogy enables us to ask how such projects were made possible, and thus, what were the conditions of their emergence? What is the history or genealogy of these contemporary practices of governmentality that take as their object young people as subjects with a capacity for agency and enlists them and incites their participation in practices of self-government? It is this question that I researched in my PhD, and which I would now like to turn finally and discuss to illustrate the critical purchase of genealogy.

An unacknowledged nineteenth century history of contemporary participation projects

My Ph.D. research traced two lineages of a genealogy that shows an unacknowledged nineteenth century history of the current discourse and practice of student participation projects (Anderson, 2011). The thesis presents two historical case studies. The first traces one line of the genealogy of this discourse and participatory mode of governing young people to the nineteenth century debates about, and new practices introduced to reform the system of disciplining boys in the public schools of England and later the Australian Colony of Victoria. The second traces another line of this genealogy to the nineteenth century debates about, and new methods introduced to reform the system of disciplining juvenile criminals in the prison system of the Australian Colony of Victoria – a debate and project of prison reform that largely followed those already undertaken in France and England. For the purposes of this article, I will focus on the lineage traced to the reformed system of public school discipline.

The emergence of a liberal governmentality targeting boys in the public schools of England in the nineteenth century was first signalled in discussions of the problem of discipline in these schools and its need for reform. This can be evidenced by examining three short articles on the question of discipline in the public schools of England published in 1835 in *The Quarterly Journal of Education*. The articles (in order of publication) are titled 'Flogging and fagging at Winchester', 'On the discipline of public schools', and 'On the discipline of large boarding schools'.

What is significant about these articles is, first, the way the problem was identified in similar terms in each of the articles and considered to be a continuation of the system of discipline upon which the schools had traditionally operated that governed boys 'by fear and mere authority'. In particular, the problem was the system's sole reliance on the use of the practices of 'flogging' and 'fagging'. Concerning the practice of flogging, the articles criticised the excessive and indiscriminate use of such a punishment, which was considered by all as being ineffective as a remedy and, by some, as a cruel exercise of power (Anonymous, 1835a, p. 281; Anonymous, 1835b, p. 84; Anonymous, 1835c, pp. 114–115).

Criticised by all three articles as also guilty of abuses was the practice of 'fagging'; the practice of leaving the boys to govern themselves, where it was allowed to operate as a

lawless tyranny of physical strength. The problem identified was not simply that of tyranny, but also one of leaving boys to form an independent society of their own, lived according to their own moral standards, customs and public opinion set by the strongest and oldest boys among them, which was often 'evil in moral tone' (Anonymous, 1835a, p. 288; Anonymous, 1835c, p. 90). It was argued in all three articles that if public schools were to operate as an effective instrument and mechanism for the formation of character and moral training, they required a system of discipline different to the kind that had become their tradition.

Whilst there was a remarkable continuity in the way the problem of discipline was formulated in these texts and some agreement about reforming the use of flogging, such agreement is not to be found in the reforms concerning the practice of fagging. It is here that the second article Anonymous (1835a) departs from the other texts in a significant way, marking the emergence of a way of thinking about and practising the government of boys in public schools which exemplifies a liberal form of governmentality that seeks to work through the freedom and capacities of the governed.

The first and third articles recommended fagging (a government administered by the boys themselves) be abolished and replaced with a more constant, immediate and closely supervised government of boys by masters (Anonymous, 1835b, p. 90; Anonymous, 1835c, p. 93). However, against these proposed reforms were the reforms recommended in the second article, the author of which was later identified as Dr Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby public school at the time (Stanley, 1858, 1880). Arnold asserts that if public schools '… are to be cleared of their most besetting faults and raised in all that is excellent, it must be done by a judicious improvement; but most assuredly not by the abolition of the system of authorised fagging' (Anonymous, 1835a, p. 292). This, he argued, was because fagging is '… as indispensable to a multitude of boys living together, as government, in like circumstances, is indispensable to a multitude of men' (p. 292). According to Arnold, it was not possible for the masters to form a 'home or domestic-like government' of boys in a large boarding school, or to govern them 'immediately and at the same time effectively' (p. 287). What was possible was for a master to superintend the boys' government of one another, '… to govern them through their own governors' (p. 287). Indeed, such a system of boy government had been instituted by Arnold at Rugby and it is through a reflection on this that Arnold proceeds to recommend how to implement such a system through reforming the system of fagging.

According to Arnold, this reform involved first making any unauthorised system of fagging legal. The difference and advantage of this, he explained, was first, that it '… puts power into the best hands …' rather than allowing it to be claimed by the stronger from the weaker. Thereby, '… securing the advantages of a regular government amongst the boys themselves …' (p. 286). It also made it far easier '… to limit its exercise and prevent its abuses …' (p. 290), and solved the problem of the tyranny of public opinion, and thereby the problem of servility connected with it (p. 291). This made it possible to take advantage of the *'espirt de corps'* so prevalent among the boys, enlisting their sympathy and cooperation, so as, by their means, a sound and healthy moral opinion could be created and fostered, by which boys governed and taught each other. The healthy public opinion in turn worked as an instrument to assist with moral training and to maintain order and discipline. It also not only had beneficial pedagogical effects in those boys governed by it, but the very responsibility of the legal power of fagging also worked as a kind of moral training device for those boys granted it (p. 288).

By the middle of the nineteenth century this way of thinking about and practising governing boys indirectly through the self-governing capacities of the boys themselves, was providing a model according to which the public schools of England were being managed and evaluated. In 1864, a British Royal Commission into public schools (now commonly referred to as the Clarendon Commission) concluded that, '[t]he principle of governing to a greater extent through the instrumentality of the boys themselves …', had:

> … borne excellent fruits, and done [a] most valuable service to education. It has largely assisted … to create and keep alive a high and sound tone of feeling and opinion, has promoted independence and manliness of character, and has rendered possible that combination of ample liberty with order and discipline which is among the best characteristics of our great English schools. (Report of the Royal Commission …, vol. 1, 1864, p. 43)

This success was largely attributed to the work of Dr Arnold in particular (p. 44). At that time, the take up and practical application of this principle had also extended beyond the schools of England to at least one school in one of the British colonies of Australia.

Using history genealogically to interrogate and disrupt the present

Taking up Foucault's critical historical method of genealogy and concept of governmentality not only makes it possible to see within this historical material the emergence in the field of education of a way of thinking about and exercising power that Foucault (1991a) calls 'governmentality'. It also enables this historical material to be used as a tool to critique the contemporary discourse and practices of student participation or voice.

What emerges clearly from this case study is that the methods of exercising power introduced to reform the system of fagging were those that worked not by repressing or excluding individual and collective autonomy, but rather by inciting and directing it – a positive way of conceptualising and exercising power and an example of what Foucault terms 'governmentality'. The significance of these governmental methods of power is the fact that they were designed to promote, secure and facilitate participation, agency and autonomy with the aim of educating boys with a certain capacity to govern their own conduct responsibly. These objectives were not merely an ideological justification for enriching adult power or simply a principled attempt to enact a more humane, democratic and enlightened treatment of the school boy, but were an integral part of securing a more effective and efficient form of governing. As Foucault (2007) points out, the practical task of governmentality in its liberal form is not the rejection of regulation but the devising of forms of regulation that enable, ensure and facilitate forms of self-regulation in order that it can govern indirectly through them. The reformed system that Arnold instituted and advocated embodied this liberal rationality and technology of governmental power in that it aimed to govern indirectly through the self-governing capacities of the boys themselves in order to achieve a more regular and effective government of boys. The object of the reforms was not to regulate less but to regulate better, to insert the power to govern more deeply into the social body of the school. The reformed system made it possible to connect governmental intervention (the exercise of power) with practices of collective and individual agency (freedom). It was a government of boys that operated to manage through enabling, steering and facilitating the collective and individual agency of boys and no longer simply to control through rules and regulations, hierarchy, repression and authoritative command.

By following Foucault ([1991a](#)) and resisting the defining of freedom negatively as the absence of constraints and regulation, one can see how the freedom of boys to exercise self-government both individually and collectively is not the enemy or opposite of this mode exercising power, but rather becomes its condition of operation and key resource. The self-governing school boy and the autonomous society of school boys were both a precondition of, and an instrument in the operation of this system of government. It worked not by repressing or constraining agency, but by inciting and facilitating the boys' participation in particular individual and collective practices of self-government as a way of making this agency into a means to achieve certain pre-defined ends. At the level of the school, these were pedagogical and administrative ends including a more regular government of boys and effective moral training and reforming the discipline of the public school from authoritarian to Christian and liberal. At the level of society, they concerned the production of Christian men and citizens considered necessary for the success of liberal democratic government.

The critical strategy of genealogy is to use this knowledge of historical thinking and practice as a tool to critique the contemporary discourse and practice of student participation or voice. By setting this historical material against contemporary voice or participation projects, continuity can be discerned in the way this nineteenth century mode of governing, and this contemporary mode both work through governmental power, inciting specific exercises of autonomy with the effect of integrating the agency of the governed into the practices of government. We can see that the nineteenth century liberal government of boys forms part of the genealogy of the current discourse and practice of student participation projects that attempt to govern young people as subjects with a capacity for agency and by inciting individual and collective participation in practices of self-government. Thus, the nineteenth century debates about, and new practices introduced to reform the system of disciplining boys in the public schools of England can be understood as forming part of the historical and practical conditions of contemporary discourse and projects of student participation.

This analysis, therefore, reveals awkward continuities for those seeking to claim that the nature of contemporary student participation discourse and practice constitutes a break from the past and a counter to power thereby, upsetting the reassuring stories of how it came to be. In so doing, it breaches the self-evidence and necessity of such projects by problematising the central assumptions which support and validate the key justifications for such projects. Bringing into view the historically sedimented under-pinnings of contemporary student participation initiatives also provides a historical awareness of our contemporary arrangements, which enables us to problematise them in a way that governmentality analyses on their own cannot, and in so doing, can strengthen and deepen governmentality analyses. It also enables us to think differently about these projects. It makes it difficult to think about student participation in the ways that it is dominantly thought about, and, therefore, new ways of thinking about it, and acting in relation to it become urgent and entirely possible. This genealogical critique also opens up a space for us and young people to ask the question: do we want to govern and be governed like that?

Conclusion

I began this paper with an examination of the key assumptions upon which the literature that advocates and critiques student participation or voice is based and the initiatives are

justified. This included the more recent critiques undertaken using Foucault's concept of governmentality. I argued that while these governmentality studies challenge some of the key theoretical and taken for granted assumptions upon which such initiatives rest, they neglect to challenge the central assumption that such initiatives represent a historical break with traditional schooling practices. The importance of accounting for and critically analysing these projects within a historical framework was argued through a discussion of Foucault's notion of genealogy as a particular conception and method of critique. It was also demonstrated using the example of the reformed system of boy government operating in the nineteenth century English public schools, which was shown to form part of an unacknowledged nineteenth century history of current discourses and practices of student participation.

Illustrated here was the capacity for genealogy to generate historical analyses that lead us to reflect critically on the conditions that gave rise to contemporary student participation discourse and practice. It was shown how this historical material provides the historical awareness to genealogically problematise those self-evidences and commonplace assumptions upon which contemporary student participation discourse and practice rests; self-evidences and assumptions that are unable to be problematised using only the notion of governmentality. These are assumptions and self-evidences concerning the newness and necessity of student participation initiatives and how they came to be. It is in this way that doing genealogy was also shown to strengthen governmentality analyses and enable us to think and act differently in relation to these projects.

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, A. (2011). *The constitution of youth: Toward a genealogy of the discourse and government of youth* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). RMIT University, Australia.

Anonymous. (1835a). Discipline in public schools. *Quarterly Journal of Education*, *9*(18), 280–292.

Anonymous. (1835b). Flogging and fagging at Winchester. *Quarterly Journal of Education*, *9*(17), 84–90.

Anonymous. (1835c). On the discipline of large boarding schools. *Quarterly Journal of Education*, *10*(19), 82–119.

Bragg, S. (2007). 'Student voice' and Governmentality: The production of enterprising subjects? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *28*(3), 343–358. doi:10.1080/015963 00701458905

Deacon, R. (2000). Theory and practice: Foucault's concept of problematisation. *Telos*, *118*, 127–142.

Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology.* Oxon, London: Routledge.

Dean, M. (1998). Questions of method. In I. Velody & R. Williams (Eds.), *The politics of constructionism* (pp. 182–199). London: Sage.

Fielding, M. (2001). Beyond the rhetoric of student voice: New departures or new constraints in the transformation of 21st century schooling? *Forum*, *43*(2), 100–110. doi:10.2304/forum. 2001.43.2.1

Fielding, M. (2004). Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities. *British Educational Research Journal*, *30*(2), 295–311. doi:10.1080/ 0141192042000195236

Fielding, M. (2007). Beyond 'voice': New roles, relations and contexts in researching with young people. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *28*(3), 301–310. doi:10.1080/01596300701458780

Foucault, M. (1988). Practising criticism. In L. D. Kritzman (Ed.), *Politics, philosophy and culture: Interviews and other writings 1977–1984* (pp. 152–156). New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1991a). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gorden, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87–104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1991b). A question of method. In G. Burchell, C. Gorden, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 73–86). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1997). What is critique? In S. Lotringer (Ed.), *The politics of truth* (pp. 41–82). Los Angeles: Semiotext.

Foucault, M. (1998). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In J. D. Fabion (Ed.), *Aesthetics: Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984*, vol. 2 (pp. 369–389). London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Hunter, I. (1994). *Rethinking the school: Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism*. St Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Kirby, P., Lanyon, C., Cronin, K., & Sinclair, R. (2003). *Building a culture of participation: Involving children and young people in policy, service planning, delivery and evaluation*. London: Department of Education and Skills.

Lensmire, T. J. (1998). Rewriting student voice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *30*(3), 261–291. doi:10.1080/002202798183611

Mahon, M. (1992). *Foucault's Nietzschean genealogy: Truth, power and the subject*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Masschelein, J., & Quaghebeur, K. (2005). Participation for better or worse? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *39*(1), 51–65. doi:10.1111/j.0309-8249.2005.00419.x

Masschelein, J., & Quaghebeur, K. (2006). Participation making a difference? Critical analysis of the participatory claims of change, reversal, and empowerment? *Interchange*, *37*(4), 309–331. doi:10.1007/s10780-006-9006-8

Oksala, J. (2007). *How to read Foucault*. London: Granta.

Report of the Royal Commission into the revenues and management of certain colleges and schools, and the studies pursued and instruction given therein: with an appendix and evidence, Vol. 1. (1864). *British Parliamentary Papers*. Retrieved 22 January 2009 from http://www.britishparliamentarypapers.com/acatalog/Education.html

Robinson, C., & Taylor, C. (2007). Theorizing student voice: values and perspectives. *Improving Schools*, *10*(1), 5–17. doi:10.1177/1365480207073702

Rudduck, J. (2006). The past, the papers and the project. *Educational Review*, *58*(2), 131–143. doi:10.1080/00131910600583993

Rudduck, J., & Fielding, M. (2006). Student voice and the perils of popularity. *Educational Review*, *58*(2), 219–231. doi:10.1080/00131910600584207

Rudduck, J. (2007). Student voice, student engagement, and school reform. In D. Thiessen & A. Cook-Sather (Eds.), *International handbook of student experience in elementary and secondary school* (pp. 587–610). Dordrecht: Springer.

Stanley, A. P. (Ed.). (1858). *The miscellaneous works of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late headmaster of Rugby School, and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford*. London: T. Fellowes.

Stanley, A. P. (1880). *The life and correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late headmaster of Rugby School, and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford* (1st ed.). 2 vols. London: John Murray.

Wrigley, T. (2007). Rethinking education in an era of globalisation. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, *5*(2), 1–27.