Composing A Care of the Self

A Critical History of Writing Assessment in Secondary English Education

David Lee Carlson and James Albright

SensePublishers

Composing A Care of the Self

Composing A Care of the Self

A Critical History of Writing Assessment in Secondary English Education

David Lee Carlson, Ed.D.
Arizona State University, Tempe, USA

and

James Albright, Ph.D.
Newcastle University, Australia

SENSE PUBLISHERS
ROTTERDAM/BOSTON/TAIPEI

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: 978-94-6209-020-0 (paperback)
ISBN: 978-94-6209-021-7 (hardback)
ISBN: 978-94-6209-022-4 (e-book)

Published by: Sense Publishers,
P.O. Box 21858,
3001 AW Rotterdam,
The Netherlands
https://www.sensepublishers.com/

Printed on acid-free paper

2012

David Lee Carlson dedicates this book to his mother, Helen Carlson and to his father, Donald Lee Carlson

Jim Albright dedicates this book to Junjie Pang

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words fail to capture the appreciation and gratitude we feel for the support and encouragement we have received throughout this project. We are deeply grateful to all the individuals who have propelled this project along over the last couple of years. It has required great sacrifice, time and effort. While our names are listed as authors, we understand that any one success is a collective endeavor. There are a few people, however, each of us would like to acknowledge.

David Lee Carlson would like to thank his soul mate andgreatest champion, my identical twin brother Daniel Lee Carlson. Thank you for reminding me of my roots and for believing in me. You sang my songs back to me during some of the most critical times. I love you!! To my best friend and sweetest partner, Tyler Gerdes, thank you for loving me in your most generous and kind way. The joys of living with a writer who meanders in ambiguities of language and fusses as he wrestles with himself to compose a scholarly self are tenuous. Your sacrifices drove me to finish this book. We are two peas in a pod and I love you with all of my heart.

To my many friends in the Phoenix area, thank you for your continual interest in my work. Thursday breakfasts with Roger Snell afforded me the delight to put aside thoughts about germs, fingerprints, and X-rays to relish in whispers about all things camp and Liza. Roger Guererro for keeping me grounded and reminding me of the steps that propelled me to this place in my life. Sunday playing laser-tag was a real blessing!

Professionally, I would like to thank my mentors, Jean Anyon, Janet Miller, and David Moore, who have offered consistent support throughout the years. There is no question I owe so much to each of you. Your hospitality, encouragement, trust, and respect continue to inspire me in countless ways. Janet Miller for reintroducing me to Foucault in a graduate seminar at Teachers College Columbia University. Your courses were the most provocative. Your arrival to campus no doubt changed my life. You continue to be a teacher and a dear friend to me and I think of you often as I write, read, study, and teach. I strive to emulate your scholarly life. Jean Anyon for offering me the opportunity to speak to her graduate seminars at the CUNY Graduate Center about my dissertation and about Foucault's ideas. Your questions about Foucault have sharpened my own understanding of his works, and I cherish the friendship that we have developed over the years. David Moore for your continual kindness and guidance. You mentored me through some very difficult years, and your candor and honesty allowed me to meet both personal and professional challenges with dignity and strength. James Albright for his commitment to this project and astute commentary on the content of this book. This book would not be the same without your efforts.

I would like to thank my wonderful colleagues at Arizona State University, especially Dean Mari Koerner. I hope this work makes you proud and illustrates the seriousness with which I took the responsibility that comes with privilege. Additionally, I would like to thank Suzanne Painter, Elizabeth Hinde, my

asperational peer, Audrey Amrein-Beardsley, who continues to inspire me with her brilliant scholarship and the grace and beauty with which she lives her life. Donald Blumenfeld-Jones, Catherine Weber for four hour lunches and laughs, Jory Brass, Irena Okhremtchouk, Rosa Jimenez, Jeannie Powers, Kimberlee Rowe, and Michelle Jordan.

Special appreciation to the individuals who read portions of the text including: Colin Talley, John Willinsky, Gustavo Fischman, and Michael Peters. Your comments and suggestions were invaluable. I greatly appreciate the efforts of my two graduate research assistants, Melinda Hollis and Denny Aletheiani.

Finally, to my most demanding lover, Michel Foucault, your experience books provoke me to care for myself in the most ecstatic and pleasurable ways in what will certainly be a life-time of self-fashioning. The style and content of this book may indeed make you groan from the grave, but please know that it was completed with a profound respect for your life, scholarship, and personal essais.

Jim Albright would like to acknowledge that this book is a conversation that began over ten years ago. I thank David for bringing it into focus through our weekly meetings this past year. I look forward to working with him on following projects. Our conversation grew in that most delightful of transformations, which occur when a pedagogical emerges into a collegial relationship. I thank the inspired leadership of Janet Miller, who at Teachers College, Columbia University continues to model remarkable scholarship, teaching, and leadership. David and I owe her much. As I do the mentorship of Alan Luke, who invited me to come work at Singapore's Centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice and my current University of Newcastle students and colleagues. I would like to particularly note my ongoing work with Peter Freebody, Jenny Gore, James Ladwig and Stephen Webb.

THE STATE OF PLAY, OR THE ARGUMENT

I will put chaos into fourteen lines…
I shall not even force him to confess;
Or answer. I will only make him good
(Edna St. Vincent Millay, 1988, p. 154)

Writing is all trash,
People who leave the realm of the obscure in order to define
whatever is going on in their minds, are trash (Antonin Artaud, 1956, p. 75).

The production and reception of Samuel Beckett's play *Waiting for Gadot* at the San Quinten prison in 1957 raised profound and puzzling questions. As Martin Esslin (1961) ponders in the introduction to his seminal work on the *Theatre of the Absurd*, why did inmates at a maximum-security prison select this play to perform, and why did many of them identify and appreciate its subtle and blindingly discernible meaning? With minimal training in the art of literary criticism and a perhaps even less interest in the traditional literary canon or belle-lettres, what of this play sparked an affection for an avant-garde farce? As Esslin argues,

> If a good play must have a cleverly constructed story, these have no story or plot to speak of; if a good play is judged by subtlety of characterization and motivation, these are often without recognizable characters and present the audience with almost mechanical puppets; if a good play has to have a fully explained theme, which is neatly exposed and finally solved, these often have neither a beginning nor an end; if a good play is to hold the mirror up to nature and portray the manners and mannerisms of the age in finely observed sketches, these seem often to be reflections of dreams and nightmares; if a good play relies on witty repartee and pointed dialogue, these often consist of incoherent babblings (1961, p. 4).

It is perhaps the plight of prisoners and the demands of the audience of Godot that engenders its appeal. Perhaps, too, the unconscious awareness of the early 1960s which philosophical frames, such as Marxism, Structuralism, and Existentialism, undergirding the social sciences evinced as outdated and unsatisfactory. To be sure, residue of these and other philosophies diffused fractured throughout the discursive landscape. Yet, absent metaphysics, transcendental humanism, and positivism, the world loomed as an "Age in transition" (Esslin, 1961, p. 4), or to be

more descriptive, as absurd. And who better to indentify, embody, and reflect this absurdity than prisoners. Albert Camus's words are instructive here:

> A world that can be explained by reasoning, however faulty, is a familiar world. But in a universe that is suddenly deprived of illusions and of light, man feels a stranger. His is an irremediable exile, because he is deprived of memories of a lost homeland as much as he lacks the hope of a promised land to come. This divorce between man and his life, the actor and his setting, truly constitutes the feeling of absurdity (Camus, 1942, p. 18).

Who better to diagnose the current situation than individuals who have been via reason junked, or discarded from the "familiar world"? Who better to express their experiences of the modern human whose essence precedes their existence than those living in "exile"? Who better to resemble the most glaring plight of the human condition than the person whose body cracks asunder from his/her heart and verve? The daily Sisyphean activities which monontonises and disciplines the very elan of the human being. Man is lost, nomadic without the theology of religion, the beliefs in purity of metaphysics, and the stability of transcendental structures. Language itself remains wanting as contradictions, illogical constructions, and a dissonance between espousal and action persists. What remains is a critical engagement with the ontological being. Artists of the Theatre of the Absurd "…renounced arguing about the absurdity of the human condition; it merely presents it in being—that is, in terms of concrete stage images" (Esslin, 1961, p. 6). In the absence of language, the production and interaction with the fluidity of art stands as the most humanistic and reconcilable endeavor.

It is at this point, however, that we return to St. Vincent-Millay's pithy sonnet referenced at the beginning of this chapter. Her combative brawl with language to control it seems apt for our discussion. Language personified as Chaos reflects the pre-ontological moment preceding the composing process. The artist's limited tools tussle with the signs and significations of language to contain it, mold it into a sensible construction of intended meaning. The meaning-making formation matches a rivalrous round between contested foes. Those who seek to dominate the disarray. The composing process simulates a battle of wills. Further explication of her poem proves instructive here. She tries to force Chaos to submit to a specific pre-determined form of fourteen lines. The author strips Chaos of a voice, or a choice of the form. Instead, St. Vincent-Millay states, she put it into a box of fourteen lines, "And keep him there" (1988, p. 154). The narrator surmises that Chaos will, through "adroit designs" attempt to escape, with various strategies, or "twist, and ape/ Flood, fire, and demon" (p. 154). Its efforts, however, will prove fruitless in the "strict confines/Of this sweet Order" (p. 154). The narrator justifies the "pious rape" of Chaos with perfectly reasonable reasons. In fact, the word "pious" implies that the author restricts Chaos for its own sake. Once imprisoned, Chaos eventually molds itself to the "sweet Order" as the narrator contains "his essence and amorphous shape" (p. 154). St. Vincent-Millay's use of contradiction here implies the narrator possesses a lack of confidence in her abilities to grasp all of Chaos. Efforts to restrict Chaos to a certain form remain dubious from the

narrator's perspective. She never truly knows whether she has all of him. The narrator, however, continues in the composing process with the dubious assumption that she does. St. Vincent-Millay implies that the narrator must live with this belief in the ability to enclose Chaos into a meaning-making form in order to survive the process.

Remaining moderately consistent with the Sonnet form, line nine indicates a significant turn in the poem.[1] In this line, she writes, "His arrogance, our awful servitude" (p. 154). Once Chaos has submitted to his cast, or at least in the eyes of the narrator, and even though she excoriates his "arrogance" for resisting, the narrator merges with her protagonists to buckle to the form itself. She and Chaos, the narrator concedes, succumb to the fourteen lines. The poem itself ceases to be the authors, the narrators, or the essence of Chaos, but is merely the property of the configuration. In her moment of disillusionment, where control of language and texts in general elude her, the narrator capitulates and yields that even her presentation of Chaos is "simply not yet understood" (p. 154). The poem desists from being about Chaos and about the narrator's battle with him. In the final coup de grace, she doubles-down on her efforts to regulate Chaos and to not "force him to confess; Or answer", which means to silence him. The narrator's inability and impossibility to bridle Chaos forces her to bear down on his voice. She is assuming, yet again, that she possesses the abilities to silence him. Nonetheless, her labor to silence and govern Chaos results in the ultimate desire to "only make him good" (p. 154). In the end, if the very essence of Chaos, or language in general, is mercurial and intractable, and any attempts to govern it prove diffident, then the best hope for the author is to remain true to the form, censor Chaos, and depict him as "good." The constitution and demarcation of "good" writing is a contested area (see below). But St. Vincent-Millay's description of the warfare that is the writing process begs the question of why transforming Chaos, or language, into "good" writing is the author's only hope. Artaud's views on writing referenced above aids us here in this discussion. Theatre and Drama scholars, it should be noted, assemble Artaud's work within the Theatre of the Absurd. Artaud launches sharp acerbic appraisal of writing critics. Artaud, in short, speaks on behalf of Chaos.

If Chaos were to speak, he would begin by exclaiming, "writing is all trash" (p. 75). The metaphor of trash implies that it is used, easily discarded material. Writing is worthless, taken for granted, exploited, archaic, worn matter. It lacks any real necessity. To pilfer scum and waste in order to sift, examine, and evaluate it resembles the mind of a hobo, of a beggar, and a thief. Artaud's advises the narrator to remain in the "realm of the obscure" (p. 75), and attempts to leave it in order to "define whatever is going on in the minds, are trash" (p. 75). To the writer who tries to transfix language into a specific form with the hopes of generating a meaningful reflection of one's experiences or thoughts indicates an inhumanity. He states,

---

[1] See Abrams, M. H. & Harpham, G. (2011). *Glossary of literary terms*. Wadsmorth: Independence, Kentucky.

> All those who fix landmarks in their minds, I mean in a certain part of their heads, in strictly localized areas of their brains, all those who are masters of their own language, all those for whom words mean something, all those for whom there are currents of thought and who think the soul can be sublime; those who are the spirit of the times, and who have named these currents of thought, I am thinking of their specific tasks and the mechanical creaking their minds give out at every gust of wind, – are trash (p. 75).

To live with the assumption that specific ideas and experiences can be represented with language is chimerical. Those who believe that they can capture the essences of their minds, or who revere themselves to be the "spirit of the times" function in disillusionment. They (writers) relinquish themselves, their humanness to pieces of debris, to junk, to stuff to be rummaged through, to mere droppings. Implicit in his perspective is the notion that artists and individuals should not exalt writing in high esteem. Written expression is a partial, almost irrelevant, *ex post facto* bit of expression. Doing so replaces ambiguity, desire, the ineffable, for an incomplete abstraction. The push for certainty and stability in meaning mechanises the plurality of human essences and possibility. The beginning of composition historicises the ontological moment, and the quest to capture and contain that moment through linguistic representation for constancy and security are trivial. Instead of striving to enclose Chaos, or obscurity, into a "sweet order", Artaud recommends engaging with and producing art, as well as embracing one's absurd, alien existence, or at a minimum cease to use writing to encapsulate experiences. Chaos, it appears, may have the last "word", or the last laugh, if you will, despite the narrator's best efforts.

Artaud reserves the sharpest edges of his tongue for the "bearded critics" (p. 75).

> Those for whom certain words and modes of being have only one meaning, those who are so fussy, those who classify feelings and who quibble over some degree or other of their laughable classifications, those who still believe in "terms", those who stir the ideological pots that are in vogue at the time, those about whom women speak so well and the same women who speak so well and speak about contemporary currents of thought, those who still believe in orientation of the mind, those who follow paths, who drop names, who have pages of books acclaimed, – those are the worst trash (p. 75).

Clearly, he directs his wrath at critics, but he is also making a claim about the nature of critiquing writing, in general. To claim the univocal correspondence of "modes and words", to knit-pick over various "classification", and to use language and art to provoke political sentiment, or to believe that language represents superiority, or as a therapeutic to mold thinking and dispositions represent the most useless bits of dreg. Part of the reason for his sentiments about critics is that they primarily use trash to evaluate trash. Additionally, from his perspective, critics use specific types of useless materials to judge superior to other useless materials. To be crude, critics deem deluxe one composition of droppings over another. Their

petty discussions are akin to scoring a half-eaten sandwich from a fast-food restaurant found in a city dustbin reigns five-star over a twice-eaten slice of pizza from a local bodega. What is more, those who only eat the sandwich stand aloof among those who only procure the pizza. They clearly possess higher intellectual abilities, enjoy finer tastes, and assure divine providence in the whims of chance. Despite his best efforts to ridicule critics and dissuade them of their incessant need to micro-evaluate his use of structure, diction, and viewpoint, they insist on relishing in the stuff in the dumpster. To the critics who abrade Artaud for lack of advancement, he replies,

> Ah, these unnamed states, these superior positions of the soul, Ah, these periods in the mind, Ah, these tiny failures which are the stuff of my days, Ah, these masses teeming with facts. Still, I use the same words and yet my thoughts don't appear to advance much, but really I am advancing more than you, bearded asses, apposite swine, masters of the false word, despatchers of portraits, gutter writers, graziers, entomologists and scabs on my tongue (p. 76).

The critics best efforts to categorize, split, divide and clarify in order to render writing understandable will, in the mind of the critic, deliver Artaud's Chaos into a definitive form. Their victory is delusional, of course, and comes at a cost. If critics continue their efforts at their pace, Artaud surmises, than within ten years time, his

> "…eruptions will be understood, my crystals will be clear, they will have learnt how to adulterate my poisons and the play of my soul will be divulged. By then all my hair, all my mental veins will be melted in quicklime, then my bestiary will be noted and mystique will have become a cover. Then the joints in the stones will appear, fuming, and arboreal bunches of mind's eyes will set into glossaries and stone aeroliths will fall. Then lines will appear, then non-spatial geometry will be understood and people will learn what the configuration of mind means and they will understand how I lost my mind. Then you will understand why my mind is not here, then you will see all language exhausted, all minds dry up, all tongues shrivel up, all human figures will collapse, will deflate, as if drawn up by shriveling leeches. And this lubrifying membrane will go on floating in the air, this lubrifying, caustic membrane, this doubly-think membrane, multi-levelled, infinitely fissured, this sad, translucent membrane. Yet it, too, so sensitive, so relevant, so capable of multiplying, splitting, turning inside out, with its shimmering fissures, senses, drugs and its penetrating, noxious irrigation. The all this will be considered all right. And I will have no further need to speak " (p. 76).

Artaud employs irony in this passage to assert that the critic's quest for knowledge about his ideas, their persistent use of microscopic instruments to examine every bit of his body rapes him of his humanity. Their search to know and determine truth and meaning renders him speechless. He satirizes the position of the critic in this passage and embodies their perspective to show the extremes and ultimate outcome of their efforts. The critic's pursuit to make lucid the crystals, to mold the

"mental veins," to chart the "joints in stones" to glossary the circuitous "bunches of mind's eye" and to convert the "non-spatial geometry" of his thoughts into "lines" will verdict him insane. Furthermore, at the conclusion of the operation, his "poison" will be diluted, his being, or "mystique" will be camouflaged, his body florets in a catatonic state and "all human figures will collapse" rendering him unrecognizable. The critic's scalpel surgically examines the artist's body to expose his/her most intimate details, to note abnormalities, unreasonable desires, and to record his/her impetuous outbursts. Like "shriveling leeches" who insatiably consume, force form, or who attempt to put "Chaos into fourteen lines," the surgeon kidnaps the artist's body to devour it, deplete it, to exploit it, and indeed to dispose of it in an herculean effort to condemn it to be "right." It is only after all parts of the body can be known and recorded can it be deemed acceptable, usable, malleable, and disposable. Writing is trash and those who spend time in constant continual assessment of it are the trashiest of all. In his attempt to understand and make right, the critic dehumanizes the artist. Chaos embodied emerges unrecognizable, mechanical, and watered when it is forced to free in formation under the surgeon's lamp in the laboratory of science.

The reference to the "bearded" critic implies that Artaud is speaking to those convention bound traditionalists. One need not be old in number to be so. Instead, he harkens the youth, and states, "You are very free, young man!" (p. 75). To be free, according to Artaud means to assume that "…no works, no language, no words, no mind, nothing" can certify or solidify a stable self (p. 75). All that remains are "Nerve Scales," or "A sort of impenetrable stop in the midst of everything in our minds" (p. 75). He speaks to all human beings here; he implores us to be like the young, to be free. Those who speak the least, or compose the fewest linear phrases, or who refuse to adopt writing as an isomorphic exercise, or who dismiss critics who excavate their bodies, and unwittingly or unconsciously choose to live in the obscure or with chaos, are perhaps the freest of all. These artists refuse rationalism as truth, temper the comments of the critic, and clutch to the fluidity and relish in the play of their own subjectivities. For the most part, the authors used in this chapter exclaim the inadequacies of language as an appropriate or even desirable instrument to form reliable expression of an individual's experiences. One can only imagine how difficult and dubious it is, then, to attempt to assess, evaluate, or grade writing, which as many of us know, is a *sine qua none* practice of secondary English education. This chapter discusses this issue at greater length below.

The desire to make right, adjudicate good, eclipses play in much of the writing pedagogy in the secondary classroom. Efforts to transform writing practices from play to a scientific method abound throughout the history of secondary English. Composition studies persist as a staple in the secondary English curriculum, and although a great deal of research and scholarship has been produce on the various writing assessments used throughout its history, much of the literature focuses predominately on various writing activities to aid adolescents to improve on their writing abilities. The purpose of this introduction is not to berate teachers of English, to launch Artaudian epithets at them. The educational archives need not

yet another manuscript belying the efforts of teachers. These books personify the super-ego of the Artaudian critic. This book strives instead to contest some prevailing notions endemic in the history of secondary schooling and in English education in general. The English teacher is placed in an untenable position, one that even s/he may not recognize. No, the typical English teacher admires the dalliance of language and of the composing process, appreciates the difficulties involved in expression, and delights in the multiple possibilities of writing. Their efforts to relay these properties to their students stand as some of the most valiant and vital to those who maintain a profound belief in the creative spirit and the fluid ontologies of the human being. For it is within the gray area of language that the ambiguous and permeable shadows and strands of action materialize. The strains, energy, and resources of teachers should be applauded. This book does not take issue with teachers, per se; it does contest teaching practices, and the practices of writing assessment in particular. Preceding a teacher stepping into a secondary classroom, s/he is set to battle with a myriad of historical forces, and various moments throughout the school day represent an assemblage of strategies and tactics in a protruded and continual war over the property of the adolescent body. Even in moments of relative tranquility, liberty, and harmony, "in the smallest of its cogs, peace is waging a secret war" (Foucault, 1976, p. 50). This book seeks to partially unravel this play of forces among competing interests of power/knowledge in the area of secondary English education. Archaeology is our method and genealogy is our strategy.

The genesis for this research began with the simple question of, how did the portfolio emerge as a viable solution to the problems of writing assessment in secondary schools? Histories of writing assessment are few (Elliot, 2008; Zak et al, 1997) and they offer chronicles cloaked in social history to timeline how teachers have used assessment throughout the history of education in the United States. Collection of approaches for marking and responding to student writing also pervade the literature (Tchudi, 1997). They offer details of specific protocols and rubrics designed to aid teachers with their apparent anxiety about grading student work. The emergence of the portfolio represented an epistemological shift in assessment practices, and reflected a crisis in teaching of English. Portfolio assessment leaped to center stage as a solution to a particular problematic with the secondary population. As a writing instrument, it contested curriculum, the relationship between teacher and student, and what counts as knowable about the student. The institution of schooling provokes or coincides with questions of assessment. Although many assume that educators enter the school soaked with liberal-humanist intentions, this book argues that epistemologies of assessment and evaluation of the body, or corpus, ground the foundations of secondary schooling and writing pedagogy. Liberal-humanist intentions spawn from, are noticed by, and are previewed by conceptions and practices of assessment and evaluation. At its most rudimentary level, secondary schooling has the body of the adolescent as its target, which is preceded by or aligned with or consists of a collection of discourses and practices of assessment and evaluation. It is through the daily contestations of power/knowledge and practices of assessment that the ghost of

liberal humanism appears. This argument asserts that any notions of freedom chaperoned by utopian aspirations are poised to fail, and at their best reflect disillusionment and at worst expose pervasive sadism in every morsel of mortar of the schoolhouse. If our argument even remotely holds, than writing pedagogy functions as a satchel of scalpels and scissors constituted to cut, tear, dissect, examine, classify and catalogue. It merely functions as a tool of power/knowledge. As Foucault states: "knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting" (1977, p. 154). This book posits four secondary arguments. Composition studies attempts to pierce inside the adolescent body, to shed light on its most intimate shades in order to shape and mold its subjectivities. Second, writing practices and assessments emerge through a confluence of multiple and completing historical forces guided by problematics of the political to manage individuals and populations. The twin of writing and assessment operate as a series and assemblages of governmentality. As a form of governmentality, the "conduct of conduct" of the student negotiates and maneuvers the agonistic forces, which seek to demarcate the limits of freedom and leverage the body for specific political and economic purposes (Foucault in Gordon, 1991; Gordon in Gordon, 1991). The portfolio is no exception. Educators in the 1890s petitioned to have colleges and universities to accept the portfolio as a legitimate reflection of a student's writing abilities. They were refused for a myriad of reasons (see Chapter Three).

The acceptance of the portfolio throughout the educational landscape and later as a reliable exam for a high-stakes assessment in the state of Kentucky, indicates that certain forces of power/knowledge tilled the field for it to trump other forms of writing assessment practices. The linkages among governance, pedagogy, psychology, medicine and criminality make up the *dispositif* that illustrates the wrestling match that set the stage for the portfolio (Foucault, 2003; Fendler, 2010). This moment, however, does not indicate an endpoint. Instead, what this genealogy attempts to show is that the writing portfolio exploded, rather rapidly, into a technology. Portfolio technology laced with the residue of the discourses and practices of the *dispositif* reveal the movements of power/knowledge. Portfolio technology engendered assumptions about the adolescent self, about the role of the teacher, and the nature of schooling. We must be clear here. The discursive field of good and right writing pervades the secondary English discursive field. Yet, power/knowledge uses the twin figure of writing and assessment as whores; it quickly and strategically doles them out to every possible articulation. Power/knowledge cares little whether the subject is judged as good or right. Its only wish is to win, to continually strive to put chaos in that fourteen-line poem, or to dice the corporal membrane to build apparent truth about it. Chaos and obscurity execute a suicide pact once power/knowledge enters the stage. Like a leech, it (power/knowledge) only drops from the body once it is full. This book tells the story of the insidious shifts of leeches. And although educators wish to believe that the origins of the portfolio began as a collection of childhood artifacts, this book, while making no claims to an origin, puts forth the possibility that it germinated from an enema. The secondary English teacher may have humanistic intentions, but their tool and target is the body. What is more, the quest to produce good and

right writing has perplexed secondary teachers of English for over a century. Perhaps most notable is the Stark and Elliot (1921) study, which illustrated how teachers from different parts of the United States respond and grade various student essays. Yet, educators must concede on some level that if they stood crystal clear about the characteristics of good writing, the need for mounds of books and articles would settle dust in the annals of history. Many involved in education remain aware and reminded daily that these matters persist elusive. Let us elaborate.

Tom Romano (1987) opens his seminal text on writing with adolescents with a personal anecdote about his feisty teenage daughter, Mariana. To preview, he uses this example to highlight the dissonance between her writing for her ninth-grade English class and those done for herself. Romano begins with an observation:

> I had never seen my thirteen-year-old daughter display such uncharacteristic behavior. Hands folded upon her lap, she sat stiffly in a high-backed chair. Her riotous, curly blonde hair was pulled back in a tight bun. Her lips were unsmiling, her cheeks pale, her eyes expressionless. Occasionally, she blinked. That and one long, notable yawn were her only movements. The most uncharacteristic detail of all, and the most disturbing, involved her voice. It was silent (p. 1).

Romano focuses primarily on his daughter's body and countenance to dramatize her visceral response to a writing homework assignment. She appears almost unrecognizable as she morphs from a person exuding vitality (e.g riotous, curly blonde hair) to a lifeless, "bun" demeanor. Most importantly, she sat silent. The assignment rendered her body voiceless. Romano continues to describe the scene as his daughter strives to position her thoughts and ideas into the assigned form. Moments of inspiration turn into "The life faded from her eyes; the desperation turned to resignation" (p. 1). As she set to produce her piece of writing, Romano recalls, that she emerges as "indistinguishable from anybody else" (p. 1). Romano laments in disbelief in his reflection of this moment that this piece of writing reflected "the same blood of my blood who, in the years prior to her formal education, had taught me how to see anew through her richly metaphorical view of the world" (p. 2). The process of schooling stripped the young curious, provocative, and intelligent young lady of her voice. To learn more about the effects of writing on his young daughter, Romano conducts an experiment. He contracts with her to complete a piece of "nonstop, focused freewriting" for fifteen minutes on a topic that he determined for her. She agrees and the difference were both startling and revealing. The two compositions are posted below. The first one was written for her teacher, the second one for her father (Romano):

> I have always wanted to visit Italy. Much of my family is from Italy. I have been told stories, and have seen pictures of how beautiful Italy is. I would like to go to the small town of Naples, where my grandfather was born. I also love Italian food! I'm sure I'd get enough there! These are some reasons I would like to visit Italy (p. 1).

Romano's Writing Prompt:

> So, Mariana, you want to go to Italy?
> I bet. A likely story.
> But, if you really do want to go to Italy then convince me of it with words on paper.
> Time yourself—really. Fifteen or twenty minutes should do it. Talk straight and give me the specifics. *Papa* (p. 2)

Mariana's Response:

> Yes, I want to go to Italy. This should be easy!
>
> My family is from Italy, I would like to see where Gandpa and family is from. Liz told me that she loved it when she went, some parts are beautiful but the only problem (sic) is the people don't brush their teeth! (yuk!) I bet the dentists could make alot (sic) of money!
>
> You can't forget that I did my country report on Italy. I read about the mountains and the different places there are.
>
> I also think any place but the U.S. would be fun to explore, see and hear new things. Have an adventure (hopefully not like the Clipper Ship Adventure!)
>
> The food! Oh, real, authentic Italian food! Squid! Spaghetti, sauce, clams! Yum! We'll just find out how close America's Italian " is to the real thing!
>
> There are many places to see, Flourence, Venice with the water, Moddona Glace where Grandpa was born, Naples, Rome! So many new things to explore.
>
> I've always been proud of my Italian heritage so it would be great to see, her, explore, and taste.
>
> Now what's this likely story business? Have I convinced you? How about you convincing me? Maybe your wanting to go to Italy is a likely story also, eh? (pp. 2–3).

Romano notices a significant shift in his daughter's voice. The first one appears stale, vacuous, bloodless, while the second one is vivacious. He recognizes his daughter in the second piece; he imagines her articulating these statements, and he wonders, "How could she contain such diverse personalities?" (p. 3). Mariana's personality, or an apparition of her beingness, sprouts from the writing she completes for her father. The stark differences in voice propel Romano to discover the reasons for the distinct voices. In his interview with Mariana, he discovers that even though she got to select the topic, her teacher instructed her to write about a place she wants to visit and to include a "topic sentence" (p. 4). He probes her to explain the differences in her compositions and she states that the second one for her father was "free and the other was a form" (p. 4). Despite Romano's insistence that her teacher would have like the second one better because, "…it really sounds like there's somebody behind those words" (p. 4), she concedes that she "…wanted what I gave her" (p. 4). As an astute researcher, Romano realizes that further questioning presented the "danger of getting slashed" (p. 4) by his daughter, but he "decided to risk a cut" (p. 4) and followed up with, "What do you think you

learned about writing this year?" (p. 4). Mariana explained that she learned how to construct paragraphs, which she trusts prepares her for the high school term paper. She concluded the interview with an exasperated, "The teacher kept telling us we have to learn this this year!", while Romano inferred that his daughter produce the parts of writing that were "emphasized" (p. 4).

> I was certain that she could pick out "proper" paragraph from any objective test in the land. I was also certain that she would probably continue to write a great many dismally proper paragraphs in school because that is what she knew teachers wanted. Some teachers, no doubt, do want such lifeless writing. In fact, they actively solicit it. Instead of celebrating each student's unique personality, particular ways of seeing, and personal brand of English, these teachers neglect them in favor of stressing artificial writing forms and easy-to-follow recipes—pick a subject, any subject, exercise all the freedom you want, but write *this* way, use *this* form (pp. 4–5).

Romano's anecdote captures the state of play in secondary English education. While Mariana completed a writing exercise, Romano concerned himself with the writer. The transition from students as writing to the student as a writer represents a significant historical shift. Voice stands as the primary metaphor for this difference. Romano proclaims that the reader receives a tighter, more in-depth correspondence to the multiple personalities of the writer through free-writing with less attention to form. Although Mariana could produce a clear paragraph with a valid topic sentence, her personality disappears. The mechanical and technical aspects of the writing process, Romano surmises, force the writer to submit to its formations. Similarly to St. Vincent Millay, frustration with form compels the writer to strive to control chaos. The writer transforms into the prisoner who is at odds with, confined by, and shifted by the automated architecture of the institution. Romano witnesses his daughter metamorphise into uniform, unrecognizable state. To rescue her from these limits, Romano offers her free reign, to compose in her own way regardless of form. His exit ticket appears in an envelop with a challenge to compose an honest response to his questions. Romano refused to give her an "easy-to-follow recipe" (p. 5), and relied on his understanding of her personality. He knew how to motivate her to write. A feisty teenager usually enjoys a dare from an authority figure. And it worked! Mariana came alive on the paper. Romano's brilliant ruse duped his daughter into composing a valued response. He desired to experience his daughter's personality through her writing. Her composition substituted for her physical presence. The mode of voice functioned as the most prominent in the compositing endeavor. To fashion writing with personality via voice now trumps constructing proper paragraphs in formal tone. Ensuring students created the same voice receded and the desire to liberate them from the limitations of form in order to reveal their personalities ascended. However, adolescent learners, like Mariana, may respond exasperated about the absurdity of the very liberation her father and other educators profess. If educators concede that adolescents possess multiple personalities, and voice is the primary mechanism through which they express those personalities, then writing functions as more than

a grab bag of skills. Instead, pieces of writing reflect, or attempt to resemble, a direct relationship to those personalities. Individuals then must learn to use writing to reveal multiple voices. Pedagogy moves from producing formal, mechanistic objects to renderings of characters through voice. Students, thus, produce bodies of writing and ones that reflect or affect their own bodily compositions. The endeavor to compose a body reflects physical, metaphorical, and material production. The reproduction of one's phenomenological life represents a student's personality in the writing process.

In fact, in most current catalogues of "good writing", voice stands at the top of the hierarchy (Atwell, 1998; Calkins, 1986; Elbow, 1973; Elbow, 1981; Fletcher, 1996; Graves, 1983; Kirby, Kirby & Liner, 2004; Moffitt, 1981; Murray, 1985). Good writing, we are told, "talks to you with a real voice; it has the recognizable imprint of the author on it" (Kirby, Kirby, & Liner, 2004, p. 118). Every piece of writing contains a "voiceprint" akin to "fingerprints for identification" (Elbow, What do we mean when we talk about voice in Texts?). Furthermore, educators appreciate "multiple voices" in their students, but the most important element in voice is "honesty" (Kirby, Kirby, & Liner, 2004, pp. 118–119). Teachers must learn how to transform writing that is "stilted and dead" to those that encourage "one human being talking to another" and ones that "makes the reader believe" (Kirby, Kirby, & Liner, 2004, p. 117). Romano's example serves as an exemplar of this endeavor.

For many educators, voice seems like a reasonable and even a prominent characteristic of writing. However, apprehension occurs when voice comes under greater scrutiny. So often, educators push voice in their writing pedagogy, but consistently neglect to recognize the complexities involved in the metaphors of voice. Peter Elbow's typology of voice in writing proves instructive here, and quite germane for this book. Literal voice, Elbow proclaims, involves the body and any reference to voice in writing injects connotations of the body into writing. It does so by sound and manner. Elbow claims that when a reader hears voice in a composition, s/he "identifies and recognizes people by their voices" (p. 2). "Voiceprints" reflect the particular, rare, exclusive features of an individual's personality. Literal voice is also context dependent. This means that individuals alter their voices based on the situation. Voice offers a "naked or candid picture of how we're feeling" and reveals "our moods" (p. 2). It is easier, according to Elbow, to hide our subjectivities and produce self-conscious or "artificial" renditions of expression. And although it is more difficult to control speaking because it is more "autonomatic", "People commonly identify someone's voice with *who* he or she is—with their character just as it is common to identify one's self with one's body" (p. 3). Voice is produced with "breath," which is not necessarily part of the body, but is produced with the body and is "shared or common to us all" (p. 3). This means, too that voice gives life to text and blooms from "inside us and is a sign of life" (p. 3). This point leads Elbow to claim that sight is more rational and "tells us more about the outsides of things," while sound is "more about the insides of things" (p. 3). Speech, then, bestows the author with greater flexibility, with more tools to use to conjure expression:

> Spoken language has more semiotic channels than writing. That is, speech contains more channels for carrying meaning, more room for the play of difference. The list of channels is impressive. For example, there is volume (loud and soft), pitch (high and low), speed (fast and slow), accent (yes and no), intensity (relaxed and tense). And note that these are not just binary items, for in each case there is a huge range of subtle *degrees* all the way between extremes. In addition, in each case there are patterned sequences: for example, tune is a pattern of pitches; rhythm is a patter of slow and fast and accent. Furthermore, there is a wide spectrum of timbres (breathy, shrill, nasal, and so forth); there are glides and jumps; there are pauses of varying lengths. Combinations of *all* of these factors make the possibilities dizzying. And *all* these factors carry meaning (p. 3).

Writing, according to Elbow, lacks this range. Instead, the writer diligently works to craft his/her work to contain a modicum of possibilities to generate a variety of experiences for the reader. The writer must learn to "do more with fewer channels" (p. 4). For this reason, Elbow posits, greater distinctions among the various types of voice in writing necessitates further elaboration. He outlines five major types of voice in writing: Audible Voice in writing, Dramatic Voice, Recognizable or Distinctive Voice, Voice with Authority, and Resonant Voice or Presence. Voice represents a metaphor in writing which signifies the writer's personality and links the writer to the reader. We discuss each of these below.

Elbow purports that it is difficult to read a text without evoking a sense of an audible voice. He states, "All texts are silent, but most readers experience some texts as giving off more sense of sound—more of the illusion as we read that we are *hearing* the words" (p. 4). Readers "automatically project aurally some speech sounds onto the text" (p. 4) when they read. Texts compel readers to employ physical "nerve activity in the throat though to speak—usually even muscular activity" (p. 5). Normal reading practices educe sound and thus hearing. Readers, he proclaims, prefer texts that contain or provoke audible sounds, and when readers hear voices they can "benefit from all those nuances and channels of communication that speech has and writing lacks (p. 7). Even "artificial" or self-conscious texts that seek to strip it of a voice conjure pitch, tenor, tone, melody, and vibration. Obstructions to an audible voice in test occur, according to Elbow, when the writer selects arrangement of words and sentences that "resist our conditioned habit to hear (p. 5), and when the reader's cultural conditioning "inculcates in most of us a habit of working actively to keep the human voice out of our texts when we write" (p. 5). Put another way, when conditions privilege the vapid over the voiced. As he states, "But when written words are easy to say, especially if they are characteristic of idiomatic speech, we tend to hear them more; when written words are awkward or unidiomatic for speech, we tend to hear them less" (p. 5). Context, audience (i.e. intended), and form dictate much of what is written and what is heard. The reader maintains as much responsibility for producing an audible text as the writer. Whether meaning occurs, or whether a text is deemed a "good" piece of writing relies on the subjectivities of both the reader and the writer. A voiceless piece of writing remains nearly impossible, and from

Elbow's perspective, relatively undesirable. Regardless of what is composed, "we tend to read a human quality or characteristic into a voice" (p. 7).

Similarly with audible voice, dramatic voice too engenders a character. Even with unidiomatic language in texts, readers become surprised when it (texts) lacks voice, or the human qualities of a character because they hear speech when they engage with a text. Elbow's point here is that every text implies certain characteristics of an author, and readers depend on the character of the implied author to interact and understand it. Evoking the New Critics, Elbow states, "Where there is language…there is drama" (p. 7). Students, Elbow asserts, perform stronger compositions when they are asked, "What kind of voices do you hear in this essay or story or poem?" (p. 7); or to evoke William Cole's classic question, "Is that the kind of person you want to sound like?" (p. 8). Dramatic voice remains vital to the reading/writing process, and interpretive responsibility remains with both the reader and the writing in the meaning-making endeavor. Audible and dramatic voice rank essential to performing and understanding texts, and establishing a distinguished voice can emerge from practice, but not encouraged.

The quest to help students find their voices in writing belies the blueprint that Elbow constructs. To form a recognizable or distinctive voice stalls writing development. Habitual practice with writing produces a distinctive voice similarly as do continually walking or speaking in a certain manner. We can not dismiss the notion that human beings appear recognizable through consistent ways of behaving. Yet, the "mystique " (p. 9) of guiding students to find their voices defies the criteria of "good" writing, according to Elbow. He proclaims that to acquire the ability to "…be a protean, chameleon-like writer" is just as admirable as amassing an individual manner. In fact, Elbow argues, that great writers parlay their skills to construct texts for multiple purpose for various audiences, "But a really skilled or professional walker or writer will be able to bring to craft, art, and play so as to deploy different styles at will, and thus not have a recognizable, distinctive voice" (p. 10). A recognizable voice may not adequately reflect the identity of the person, or provide clear "pictures of what they are like" (p. 10). An individual may have a "laid-back" stroll, yet be "very uptight" in demeanor (p. 10). Elbow advances the idea to provoke readers to wonder whether a particular writing style aligns with the writer's personality, and to engage with students as to whether a certain emerging, distinctive voice is "helpful for them" (p. 10). Elbow dissuades his students from developing a distinctive voice because it potentially leads to "pretension and overwriting" (p. 10). Elbow remains true to the potential for voice to mirror human characteristics and its ability to be contextually shaped. Individuals speak and behave differently in different situations, and compositions should attempt to resonate those peculiarities. Voice with authority in writing occurs when the writer and reader correlate the voice with "their sense and our sense of who they are" (p. 10). The practices of reading and writing collapse in the search for voice. Although teachers promote the notion that students need to learn to write with authority, Elbow asserts that in so doing, they (teachers) makes students "more timid and hesitant in their writing" (p. 11).

Authority in voice illustrates a writer's ability to show "…conviction or the self-trust or gumption to make her voice heard" (p. 10). However, forcing students to assume an inauthentic voice, or to "role-play" the voice of an "invented character" can produce the opposite intended effects. Students may over-write and generate pieces that lack personal character and temperament, which "scarcely counts as real writing" (p. 11).

Elbow's fifth and final type of voice in writing tackles the issue of the relationship between compositions and identity. He claims that even though most would agree that texts engender audible voice, and degrees of dramatic, distinctive, authoritative voice may be debated, resonant voice remains ambiguous but present and essential to the interpretive process. To frame his argument, Elbow distinguishes resonant or presence with sincerity. The notion of resonant voice involves "…making inferences about the relation between the present text and the absent actual writer" (pp. 11–12). It does, however, present any assumption about "…any particular model of the self or theory of identity—and in particular it does not require a model of the self as simple, single, unique, or unchanging" (p. 12). Sincerity, on the other hand explains the gapless relationship between the "utterance and intention" (p. 12). It describes the robust relationship, or "fit between intention and conscious thought and feeling" (p. 12), and the "the relation between what people intend to say and what they are consciously thinking and feeling" (p. 12). Insincerity evokes gaps and comes off as "tinny" (p. 12), or mechanical. Writing with a resonant voice is quite difficult because it means to match words and syntax with thoughts, feelings, and the unconscious. And as Elbow, concedes, "discourse can never fully express or articulate a whole person" (p. 12) because they are "too complex and has too many facets, parts, roles, voices, identities" (p. 12). However, writers do manage at certain "lucky or achieve moments" (p. 12) to construct compositions that offer resonant voice:

> But at certain lucky or achieved moments, writers or speakers do manage to find words which seem to capture the rich complexity of the unconscious; or words which, though they don't express or articulate everything that is in the unconscious, nevertheless somehow seem to resonate with or have behind them the unconscious as well as the conscious (or at least larger portions than usual). It is words of this sort that we experience as resonant—and through them we have a sense of presence with the writer (p. 12).

Struggles to acquire sincerity or truth of the writer become secondary to engaging with a resonant voice. It (resonant voice) defies uniformity and homogeneity, and is exposed to "lying and gamey" (p. 12). Resonant voice "calls for these and other polyvocal or multivalent kinds of discourse" (p. 12). Furthermore, literary texts, according to Elbow, provide greater opportunities for the production of resonant voice than do other types of expository or formal writing genres. It promotes metaphor usage, stories, and "exploits the sounds and rhythms of language" (p. 13). Children, Elbow explains, stand as the writer's guide because they "…wear

their unconscious more on their sleeves; their defenses are often less elaborate. Thus they often get more of themselves into or behind their discourse" (p. 13). Cohesion in writing and in composing a self remains delusional and difficult. Keith Hjortshoj's quote in Elbow's article is worthy stating here:

> Cohesion, then, isn't always a cardinal virtue, in [physical] movement or writing….To appreciate fully the freedom, flexibility, and speed with which young children adapt to their surroundings, we have to remember that they continually come unglued and reassemble themselves—usually several times a day. They have wild, irrational expectations of themselves and others. They take uncalculated risks that lead them to frustration, anger, and fear in the space of a few minutes they pass from utter despair to unmitigated joy, and sometimes back again, like your average manic-depressive (Hjortshoj in Elbow, p. 13).

Writing provides individuals with the opportunity to assume the role of a child, to "experiment" with "hidden or neglected or undeveloped" parts of our selves. For teachers, this means instead of focusing on how sincere a student is being in his/her writing, but in "How much of yourself did you manage to get *behind* the words?" (p. 13). When readers notice that a writer injects more of herself in a composition, the reader experiences resonant voice, or "a bit more of what we sense is her self" (p. 13) and the writer projects more of her sensibilities into her piece. When readers notice these moments, Elbow proclaims, it is usually a sign that the writing itself is going to "…get worse before it gets better" (p. 13) because the writing needs revision in order to "realize the potential resonance that is trying to get in" (p. 13). This means according to Elbow "the physical voice is more resonant when it can get more of the body resonating behind it or underneath it" (pp. 13–14). Resonant voice is a more apt critical tool than authenticity or sincerity because it reflects the sounds the reader hears when s/he reads.

> Just as a resonant physical voice is not in any way a *picture* of the body, but it has the body's resources behind or underneath it, so too resonant voice in writing is not a picture of the self, but it has the self's resources behind or underneath it. The metaphor of "voice" inevitably suggests a link with the body and "weight," and this is a link that many writers call attention to. After all, the body often shows more of ourselves than the conscious mind does: our movements, our stance, our facial expressions often reveal our dividedness, complexity, and splitness (p. 14).

Resonant voices can be both sincere and authentic, but they should not be the teacher's primary pedagogical tools. Certainly, the reader plays a role in determining what constitute resonant moments in text. Elbow concedes that readers tend to notice resonance in texts that align with their sensibilities. However, consist declarations of resonances in texts verify its existence in texts. To say it another way, something more is going on when "readers of many different temperaments hear resonance in the same piece of writing—even a very idiosyncratic piece" (p. 15). The validity of resonances depends on how consistently various readers

identify it. Witnessing resonant voice is much easier with known and familiar writers. Yet, the chance for an "artful forger" (Sunstein, 1998) remains real, hence the focus on the orthropedics of writing and voice shape the fidelity of the resonant voice. When readers engage with a written text, they calculate when they can trust the speaker, or they listen "…for the relationship between the words and the speaker behind the words" (p. 15). Elbow argues that readers interact with texts by "strangers" in a similar way as they do with whom they are familiar. Even though the writer provides the reader with "fewer semiotic channels for nuance," the reader still makes inferences "from the writer's syntax, diction, structure, strategies, stance, and so forth" (p. 16). Readers rely on listening when they read alien texts. They determine whether the speaker sounds real, or feels right or whether the words "ring true" (p. 16). The best approach is to read multiple texts by the same writer. He states, "Because we are listening for relationships between what is explicitly in the text and cues about the writer that are implicit in the text, we can seldom make these kinds of judgments unless we have extended texts—better yet two or three by the same writer" (p. 16). Similarly to taking "our body to a doctor" (p. 16), individuals have to rely on the resonance behind, or the relationship between how things are said to what is being said, the text to decipher trustworthiness. This design, however, places the reader in a difficult position. S/he needs to compete with his/her own subjectivities and views of the writer in order to decipher the density of the resonant voice. X-ray technology, which permits the reader to see through the various possible veils of the writer would be quite useful. The writer needs to show enough of him/herself to allow the reader to determine the level of resonant voice in order to indicate authenticity and sincerity. A reader's response stands vital to recognizing and assessing the truth of the writer's voice. The reader reads the text and re-writes it with his/her own subjective positions, and relies on these subjectivities to calculate and adjudicate the truth of the writer. Density replaces volume in the calculus of truth in writing with resonant voice.

The notion of an implied author is fruitless for Elbow because it exposes discourse to artifice. Skilled rhetoricians can hoodwink readers into believing in a tight relationship between the actual and the implied, or s/he can cover up the gaps between them. Elbow's argument here is that readers always-already listen for the "cues about the actual person behind" the text (p. 17). Readers believe a dramatic voice if it aligns with the actual speaker/writer. Elbow concludes, "If *ethos* is nothing *but* implied author, it loses all power of persuasion" (p. 18). The music and the movement have to match to be persuasive and trustworthy. This does not mean, however, that timid, or shy individuals cannot produce strong emotions in their writing. In fact, Elbow maintains, that through practice with writing resonant pieces, students may evoke strong emotions, even those that may seem uncharacteristic for the speaker. However, the piece of writing will eventually showcase emotion that is perhaps idiosyncratic to a particular person. Writing allows individuals the opportunity to role-play and experiment with voice, particularly affections that may lay latent in the unconscious.

The process involves "playing in" a voice that "feels like one's own—and seeing it become more flexible" 9 p. 20), or "trusting oneself to use unaccustomed or even alien voices in the spirit of play and non-investment—and seeing those voices become more comfortable and owned" (p. 20). Play provides writers, Elbow argues, with the opportunity to relinquish the shackles of form for the adoption of one's one form of resonance. Flexibility and frolicking between moments where the writers feels as if s/he owns his/her voice and moments where the writer acknowledges that s/he is "…nothing but a ventriloquist playfully using and adapting and working against an array of voices we find around us" produces resonant texts. Yet, the writer must keep in mind, Elbow admonishes, that s/he interacts with a "…richly bundled connotations of the human voice" (p. 21). What is clear, moreover, is that voice is an essential metaphor for writing pedagogy, and thus it links the writer to the reader in the meaning-making enterprise. Voice typically bantered about as a taken-for-granted term by educators lacked specificity, and Elbow's typologies offer them a guide for how to utilize it in writing classrooms. Furthermore, Elbow contents that voice assumes a certain relationship to the beingness behind a text, which determines its trustworthiness. Readers rely on the degree of resonance to formulate the speaker's believability, even with unfamiliar texts/writers. Students can develop resonance through practice and play, but ultimately "real writing" occurs when both readers and writers certify credibility. Implied readers and writers lack persuasive value because they stint heartfelt articulation and expression. Complications emerge when cultural and idiosyncratic subjectivities guide assessments of the levels of resonance in a specific piece of writing. Judgments based on multiple samples for the same author, or similar conclusions about an author's resonances from a variety of readers, proffer the best chances for verifying a speaker's resonance. The extent to which an author reveals him/her self behind a piece of writing determines the level to which s/he channels or reveals his/her insides.

It should be noted, however, that the reliance and privileging of voice has not always been the case in secondary English studies. The 1890s, for example, relied on the production of compositions, on the syntactical relationships and the possibilities of connecting sentences to form rational pieces of writing. Educators valued the orthropedics of expression rather than the personhood associated with it. Furthermore, educators in the 1890s stood on alert for diseases and pathogens embedded in thought as signs of bodily and emotional disharmony. Written products offered pupils an opportunity to demonstrate their abilities to generate and reflect a healthy body. Multiple specimens in different genres failed to render valid evaluations because ambiguity and chaos perpetuated the potential for pathologies. It was not until the emergence of Child Study and advances in medical technologies that writing began to function as a mode of self-revelation and to make a case of one self. Child Study reappears in the 1990s in the portfolio. The thin line between a student's composition and his/her body measured one's health, not their personhood. Educators concerned themselves with averting sickness more so than with managing or expressing one's conscious or unconscious existence. Although most teachers of English have historically believed in the importance of

teaching adolescents how to write well have remained consistent, the purpose of writing in secondary classrooms has been quite diverse. Additionally, the effects of writing practices on students has also been historically multifarious, and despite claims that secondary schools prepare adolescents for their next life (i.e. university, employment, trade school, citizenship), how writing gets employed to service those functions have remained incomplete. To be sure, teachers who believe that secondary school prepares adolescents to secure employment in the work force can identify how constructing a proper business letter supports their students with this endeavor.

Similarly, teachers who believe they are to prepare all of their students to succeed in college can motivate their students to master the essay or the research paper. These endeavors, however, fail to associate writing with personhood, or with an ethical self-formation. Furthermore, many secondary English teachers unwittingly neglect to notice how daily writing practices and pedagogy serve governance, and by default notions of freedom. Writing strategies become instruments through which to pierce inside the adolescent body to manage, control and produce an adolescent self. The emergence of certain techniques, such as voice, writing workshop, and writing portfolio occur through a confluence of a host of competing, historically contingent practices and discourses related to pedagogy and secondary schooling in general.

To verify voice however, implies a certain axiology, or normativity in criteria for determining the value of a piece of writing. Practices of evaluation searching for disease with a reliance on sight are quite different from those that assess voice and multiplicity. Whereas educators in the 1890s fought to expel contextual features, such as slang, from the English classroom, those in the 1990s utilized those features. Teachers cannot divorce student writing from the student, as assessment should nurture the student's self-concept, self-esteem, and their self-confidence to write. The purpose of assessment is to nurture students to write in the future. As adolescents compose an emerging self, so too their writing and thus responses from teachers, nurture their development. As Romano (1987) explains, "My students are most concerned about now. I am most concerned about their writing future" (p. 109). Teachers need to operate in "good faith" (Romano, 1987, p. 113), which means to provide an honest appraisal of the student's work at that time with their writing futures in mind. When teachers, or anybody for that matter, critique student's writing, they are evaluating the student's "…voice, her passion, her thinking, her intellect, her labor, and on some occasions, her very soul" (Romano, 1987, p. 125). Teachers need to identify the student's "writing problems and help them work to master them" (Romano, 1987, p. 125).

Furthermore, writing assessment is inherently a subjective act. As Romano explains, "Evaluation of writing is necessarily a subjective act. Objectivity is impossible. Participate in one group grading session and you'll realize that. When many teachers evaluate the same paper, their judgments of its merit are diverse and astounding. So I am left with my subjectivity" (p. 113). Yet, to assemble an "interpretive community" to determine the quality and type of voice in a piece of writing as a verification mechanism seems like a reasonable approach. If everyone

in a group agrees with the evaluation, or interpretation of a text, then it must be true. To acquire even greater certainty, the logic goes, readers compile multiple samples from the same author, and if a group of readers agree on the evaluation, then it must be so. It seems rather reasonable to assume that a composition of readers can agree on the criteria and thus the scoring of a particular piece of writing. The portfolio tries to offer evaluators of student writing an opportunity to garner greater validity in determining a students writing abilities. A collection of different types of writing supplies teachers with a rather elaborate sample of the student body to calculate truth. Unless, of course, voice and all of its complexities described above becomes a center-piece of writing pedagogy.

If voice is intimately linked to the person, or writer, as Elbow and others exclaim, than schools can provoke students to show themselves in their writing and assess who they are as people. Secondary English classrooms can throttle adolescents with multiple writing assignments, encourage and compel them to use different literary genres, and assess their writing abilities and more important judge their personhood. Or to be less dramatic, judge their readiness to leave secondary school and enter society.

When educators fought to abandon the multiple-choice grammar tests and the timed writing essay as legitimate forms of high-stakes testing, they inserted chaos, obscurity, and ambiguity into the classroom. In their quest to liberate the emerging, narcissistic self from the shackles of form and rigidity, they unleashed complexity, instability, and chance in the writing process. When they removed the teacher from behind the desk, transformed her/him into another writer lacking no more expertise than the student, they forced the student to be free, to assume his/her own risk, and to responsibly maneuver the pedagogical marketplace (Ewald, 1991). When they could no longer settle for sight as the source for knowing the external, rational parts of the student body, they grabbed onto the portfolio as a way to hear the student's inner self, and as a means with which to identify and evaluate intimate abnormalities of the adolescent self. When they ceased to notice only writing skills, they introduced literariness into the assessment process. When they realized they could expose the most microscopic elements of the adolescent body, they ceased being troubled with the adolescent's health. Finally, when liberal humanists ideals guided by utopian versions of liberation urged secondary English teachers to impose a plethora of utensils to carve and bisect the adolescent body, they exposed it to a sense of freedom guided by anxiety, fear, and uncertainty. Finally, when secondary English teachers relied less on the immediate concern of their students and began to focus more on their apparent future, they constructed a collection of neoliberal colonies that would make any Benthemite marvel. If, as Elbow begins his piece, that "…instead of considering it our task to "dispose of" any ambiguity…we rather consider it our task to study and clarify the resources of ambiguity" Kenneth Burke (1969, xix), power/knowledge employs the secondary writing classroom as one of its chief sites to accomplish these tasks. Writing is not an ahistorical, sanitized, objective endeavor, but is a collection of devices strategically employed at the behest of power/knowledge.

Finally, if, as Romano (1987) exclaims that English teachers appear to be surrounded by "madness" with demands for "competency-based tests" (p. 14), standards, quantitative instruments designed to measure writing abilities, and a call for greater objectivity, then this genealogy illustrates how educators, while perhaps to their dismay, roam around the asylum as with their own versions of insanity. Indeed, to engineer spaces to force students to convert chaos into fourteen lines, to strip it of its essences, to silence it, and to judge extraneous, inadequate representations of expression transform teachers into prisoners who surrender to the absurdity of the educational enterprise. Disillusionment occurs in the pursuit of perfectly formed stories, familiar characters, tightly knitted themes, recognizable dialogue and speech, and endorsements of appropriate, normal, and natural lifestyles. It is the claims to liberal-humanism, to beliefs in a Golden Age of assessment, or the portfolio or pedagogical practices as more humane or civilized that this book seeks to contest. If nothing else, writing pedagogy floats in a vast field of historical contingencies, fraught with the fracas of a battle over the various bodies in schools among a highly sophisticated, complex, and subtle forms of power/knowledge (Baker, 2001, Donald, 1992; Hunter, 1994; Lesko, 2001). Foucaultian-inspired genealogies, or a critical history, strive to expose these contestations, while dismantling claims of agency, progressivism, conventionalism, and liberation, and similar to other genealogies, this book begins *in medias res (Kendall & Wickham, 1999; Prado, 1995; Ransom; 1997)*. Thus, our narrative begins at a hospital in Philadelphia in 1826.

CHAPTER 1

MATERIA MEDICA

> Physicians had always sought to see beneath the skin. What was it that constituted health and disease and what were the physiological processes that explained, perhaps constituted, life and death? (Rosenberg, 1987, p. 154)

A young candlestick maker enters a Philadelphia hospital in 1826 fussing about nausea, a head-ache, chills, and frail joints. Before seeing a physician, he is given the following treatments:

> Was bled till symptoms of fainting came on. Took an emetic, which operated well. For several days after, kept his bowels moved with Sulph. Soda, Senna tea, etc. He then employed a physician who prescribed another Emetic, which operated violently and whose action was kept up by drinking bitter tea (Case of George Devert, November 15, 1826, Hospital Casebook, 1824–27, PCA (Philadelphia City Archives) in Rosenberg, 1987, pp. 76–77).

To our modern sensibilities and experiences with doctors and medicine, the various remedies for this gentleman's symptoms may seem extreme, and may even warrant claims of medical malpractice. But to the early nineteenth-century physician, the solution to his problem, based on the patient's descriptions were completely appropriate. The epistemologies of medicine at this time warranted that the physician try to control and manage the movement of the patient's bodily entrances (e.g. mouth, food, water, air) and exits (e.g. bowels, perspiration, blood) because the physician possessed very limited access to a patient's body, and very little, if any, access to the internal features of the body. Instead, physicians believe that knowledge of the body could be on its surface, and treatment of diseases could be realized through the relationship among the patient's body, mind, physiology, moral character, and temperament. Indigestion, for example, could produce a headache, while lesions may indicate an imbalance in the blood, and cheating may cause gout. Diseases did not have particular characteristics, histories, or causes, but were instigated by corporal imbalances in one's diet, air, water, climate, emotions, or moral failings. The individual stood as the instigator and healer of diseases as physicians relied on the patient's honest and precise description on his/her lifestyle. The physician's diagnostic tools were limited for the most part to speculation and conjecture, and the balance of the whole body dictated the level of disease and health. Medicine did not have the large repository of knowledge about diseases, symptoms and pharmacological treatments like it does today. Thus, the physician's shallow connection to the external features of the body limited what s/he could and could not know about the patient's apparent illness.

The anecdote above may seem like a strange way to introduce a book about writing assessment; however, it speaks to the metaphorical relationship between medical discourses and secondary education of the nineteenth-century. The secondary teacher, like the early-century physician possessed limited access to the bodies of post-grammar school children, both literally and figuratively. The anxiety about the rising population necessitated the clamor to construct a secondary school and to institutionalize its curriculum. The secondary school emerged as a solution to a problem with a specific population. At the macro-level, educators considered where to channel the population, through industry, university, professional, or trade school. Additionally, educators spoke about how certain groups should be educated. Prior to the secondary school, those in the upper classes attended academies, which fed students into the universities. As the population grew by the middle of the century, educationalists wondered how the common school should educate the middle and lower classes. Hence, debates about curriculum and disciplines occupied reformists.

Historiographies of secondary education, specifically English education, focus primarily on the Committee of Ten (Eliot and Robinson, 1894) and the movement towards establishing secondary English as an important staple in the secondary education curriculum (Applebee, 1974; Krug, 1964). While much has been written about the relationship between economics (Nasaw, 1979) and the rise of the secondary school, very few studies have investigated the close connection between medicine and the emergence of secondary education. Research indicates, as evidence in this chapter, that educators employed rationalities and metaphors medicine to justify the purposes of secondary school, to describe the post-grammar school pupil and the teacher's role, to explain particular curriculum choices, and describe the types of pedagogy that should be used in secondary schools. The epistemological field of medicine and the relationship between the doctor and patient frame the contents of this chapter.

Limited views of diseases, treatments, and the body early in the nineteenth century gave way to more advanced practices at the Paris Clinic, and by the mid-century to the German influences of Laboratory medicine, microscopy, the germ theory of disease and microbiological revolution, and Roetegen rays (X-rays). As the epistemologies of medicine changed, so too did the epistemologies of education. What they both have in common is a focus on the body. Medicine focused on the physical body; maintaining its health and preventing or treating its diseases. Education, and in particular English education, focused on three different bodies: The first was the pupil's physical body as many believed the relationship between body, mind, temperament were crucial to maintaining health; the second was a focus on the mind, or the composition of the pupil's mental inner life; third, the product, or the written composition produced in school. The pupil's written composition reflected his/her mental faculties, or health, and gave students the opportunity to practice creating healthy thinking patterns (see Chapter Two). Both medicine and education desired to gain access to the living arrangements of the body, and both sought ways to understand disease. The Paris Clinic gave physicians the rationalistic approach to diagnosis as medical students correlated

diagnosis with autopsies. The dead body allowed physicians to acquire knowledge about health and disease, but it did not necessarily allow them to prevent it. German laboratory medicine with its advancement and proliferation of the high magnifying microscope along with Koch's postulates permitted physicians to isolate diseases when they were alive and watch them interact with their environment and other agents. Diseases possessed specific, even unique characteristics, and "life histories." The laboratory pedagogical practices became popular in the late nineteenth century for similar reasons (see below). Nonetheless, tracing the history of medicine reveals the discursive field occupied by educational reformers as they deal with a large influx of adolescents into secondary schools. To preview, the emergence of secondary school ushered in a whole host of biopolitical forces. Writing functions as a biopolitical tool to solve a problematic of population.

The reliance on major events (i.e. Committee of Ten) and prominent individuals (i.e. Charles W. Eliot) may have blinded historians to how educators in the mid-to-late Nineteenth century relied on medical discourses, specifically of health and disease, to speak and ponder about the importance of secondary education. Secondary education rose as a solution to a problem with a specific population, and economics, labor, the university, and conferences and association meetings certainly played key role in determining how this new school would be constructed. However, those are the surface facts about this period. The various discourses employed by individuals during this time and how they sought to shape and mold the secondary school body are more important than these historical facts because they explain how discourses of power/knowledge competed and operated at this time. As a genealogy, this book de-centers the subject and instead of relying on people and major events, it exposes the practices and rationalities of power/knowledge. It does so by unpacking the metaphors used to justify certain practices. In addition, the genealogy shows that writing is not an ahistorical, timeless, objective fact of schooling, but is also historically contingent and laced with matters of governance. The rationalities, epistemologies, and practices demarcated the space in which secondary education was to function in the community and the larger society.

This chapter illustrates how the medico-pedagogical apparatus arranged the secondary school. Medical discourses became dispersed throughout the educational landscape to prohibit, contain, and remedy various "diseases", and to promote, ensure, and maintain "healthy" students. An emphasis was placed on Laboratory medicine because the writing portfolio was initially described as a laboratory report, and the histories of the X-ray and fingerprinting are included in this book because scholars in the 1990s use these terms as metaphors to describe the portfolio. Furthermore, epistemological and technological changes in medicine mirrored those in the field of education. This is not to say that educators borrowed from medicine, but that the discourses of medicine pervaded the discursive field. They (medical discourses) were available among a host of other discourses. Educators used medical discourses prominently to express their views about secondary education. Thus, in the end, we assert the proposition (and possibility) that secondary education may be more indebted to the microbe and Germ Theory

than to Charles W. Eliot and the Committee of Ten. A review of contemporary historical perspectives of education in the late nineteenth century illustrates the reason for our position. Later, nineteenth century conceptions of health, the body, and disease as well as advances in medical technology (i.e. laboratory and X-rays) frame the discussion about the metaphorical relationships between secondary schools and medicine.

The purpose of this chapter is to lay the foundation for genealogical threads that appear in the present moment. Methodologically, we began by investigating a taken-for-granted practice endemic in secondary English studies, specifically writing assessment. We wondered about the emergence of portfolio assessment as a viable instrument to obtain knowledge about students' writing abilities, and later as a large-scale, high-stakes assessment practice. Our initial review of the literature revealed a dependence on visual epistemologies to justify portfolios in classrooms. More specifically, medical metaphors of X-ray vision and thumbprints used to describe portfolios instigated investigation of the history of medicine in the United States. Genealogically, we searched for an additional historical moment when secondary schooling and assessment practices were problematized. The late nineteenth century was such a moment. Articles from *School Review* proved to be subjugated knowledges as articles from this journal from 1893–1900 were left out of the grand narrative of secondary English. We place these documents in dialogue with Applebee's (1974) historical account to contest historical progressivism. Our genealogical study is an incomplete history, and is primarily concerned with the relationship between discursive and non-discursive entities. The history of the laboratory was included in this book because James H. Penniman pushed a portfolio-type college entrance exam in 1893. Fitzgerald (1996) likened the laboratory report endorsed by Penniman as a modern version of the portfolio. Educators, like physicians, have desired to get inside the student body to understand, account for, and tinker with it. The emergence of the portfolio, yarned with its genealogical threads, represents another iteration of education's long-standing and troubled history with the will to power. Writing assessment and pedagogy may stand as a subtle, dangerous, and perhaps deleterious effort to obtain certainty as it simultaneously (mis) measures.

RECENT HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

The relationship among the body, disease, health, and secondary education has largely been ignored in the historical scholarship of the nineteenth century in the United States. Instead, historians have focused their energies on capturing the general desires and perspectives of educators and reformers of this time, and on detailing the chronology of political and social events that influenced the emergence of the secondary school. The field of English education has relied primarily on Applebee's (1974) grand narrative of secondary English, which argues that English became a staple in the secondary school curriculum during this time period due to the Committee of Ten's report, and the scientific methodologies found in Philology. Indeed, appeals to science and scientific methodologies

became vital to justifying the secondary school, the content areas, and specific pedagogical approaches. However, "science" as a notion and as a collection of practices was ambiguous, and, thus, understanding the discursive epistemological field by examining the rationalities, practices, and technological advances of medicine helps us to understand how conceptions of science influenced the field of English education (i.e. content, pedagogy). This section examines these historical perspectives and presents contradictory archival evidence to contest many of the taken-for-granted notions of this time period.

As the economy in the United States changed from agrarian to industrial, the number of post-grammar school children entering secondary school rose exponentially. By the end of the nineteenth century, the number of students in public schools surpassed that of private schools. As an example of this change, Cuban (1993) reports that in 1890, 220,000 students attended approximately 2,526 high schools, and by 1900, 519,251 students enrolled in over 6,000 high schools. Herbert Miller (1893) argues that the disparity between the labor force and college-ready children prevents education from "adapting" (p. 419) to the needs of the country. He contends that the ratio between school-aged populations and the country's labor needs is unsustainable. Miller estimates that the 22 million work-force is comprised of agriculturalists (50%), artisans (25%), commerce (20%), and professionals (1%). Yet, schools neglect to meet the demands of the industrial economy. Miller estimates that of the 8 million students enrolled in schools (primary/grammar, high schools, college), 94 % are enrolled in primary schools, while a mere 5 % attend high school, and 1% enter college. Based on Cuban's data, more students would begin to enter into the secondary school by the end of the century. Finally, the increasing numbers of students dropping out of secondary school was a major concern of the Committee of Ten (see Taylor's article for numbers). Meeting the demands of the projected needs of the labor force provides one justification for the secondary school. What these numbers illustrate, however, is the anxiety and urgency many educators felt during this time period to build a secondary school.

The number of conferences and association meetings best characterizes secondary education in the mid to late nineteenth century in the United States because it shows the anxiety many experienced about the post-grammar school population. To provide a stable, uniform system of education was paramount, as adolescents became a target population to manage. A cursory review reveals that there was the Committee of Twelve, the Committee of Fifteen, the Holiday Conference of 1897, the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory School, annual meetings of the Michigan School Masters Club, the Annual Convention of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, The Boston Meeting (1893), annual meetings of the National Education Association, School and College Conference at the University of Chicago, and of course, the Committee of Ten, the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements (1895), and Committee on College-Entrance Requirements (1899) to name just a few. Secondary education was in a nascent phase at this time, and educators met to discuss how to organize it into a cohesive

system (Ravitch, 2000). Many, if not most, of these conferences and meetings spoke about the interests and concerns of college preparatory schools, which consisted of approximately three to four percent of the population. Some scholars (Stahl, 1965) contend that Committee of Ten is credited with recognizing and legitimizing English as an important discipline to be studied in secondary schools, and for unifying the subject, while others assert it was due more so to the relationship between colleges and secondary schools and the college entrance examination (Fitzgerald, 1996). Nonetheless, contemporary historians view the contentious relationship between the colleges and high schools as a vital one to describe this time period, and the Committee of Ten report as a watershed moment in the history of secondary education. Late nineteenth-century educational reformers, however, evoked the word "system" to refer to not just techno-rationalism, but references to systems of the body. A direct correspondence existed between education and health for many during this time.

Furthermore, historians have asserted that the high school emerged through a confluence of political and economic forces (Cuban, 1993; Nasaw, 1979; Ravitch, 2000; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). They claim that the primary purposes of secondary education for many reformers in the mid-to-late nineteenth century were to develop thinking and reasoning skills, instill "sufficient learning and self-discipline" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 25), to "build citizens" and provide students with the "skills needed to work in an increasingly complete industrial society" (Cuban, 1993), and to teach students about "inductive reasoning and objectivity" (Elliot, 2008, p. 3) to name a few. In short, the secondary school was built to "schooled to order" (Nasaw, 1979). To order adolescents, Cuban (1993) argues that the secondary school promoted conformity as exhibited by the bolted-down desks, organized in rows, facing the teacher and the chalkboard, and the constant questioning by the teacher. Such uniformity and homogeneity repulsed Dr. Joseph Mayer Rice in 1892 when he visited one New York City public schools, describing it as the "the most dehumanizing institution that I have ever laid eyes upon" because it lacked "individuality," "sensibilities," and "soul" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 21). Student-centered teaching appeared towards the end of the century with the works of Edward Sheldon, Francis Parker, and John Dewey, and occurred primarily in private schools (Cuban, 1993).

Finally, the most prominent individuals of this time period varied, but there were a few common ones. Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard University, chair of the Committee of Ten, and outspoken critic of G. Stanley Hall's psycho-biological approach to adolescence and schooling. Eliot vehemently opposed Hall's determinism arguing instead that a democratic society permits each pupil to do his/her "own prophasising about his/her future" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 47). Many historians revere William Torrey Harris, the first commissioner of education of the United States, as a seminal figure of this time period. He believed that pupils required guidance and support as they mature and railed against rote memorization, which causes "arrested development (a sort of mental paralysis) and discourages pupils from developing the "appetite for high methods and wider generalizations" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 33). Harris asserted that the purpose of education was to develop

self-dependence, and describe the educated person as one who, with a "trained mind" and disciplined will" (p. 35) will possess the abilities to "solve the practical problems of daily life" (p. 35). To be sure, Edward Thorndike, G. Stanley Hall, and John Dewey are important figures of this time, but they do not appear as prominent individuals in the emergence of the secondary school.

Philosophically positions of Herbert Spencer and Lester Frank Ward undergirded disputes about the purposes of education. They also injected bio-power and political economy into education. Spencer and Ward exemplified the range of educational thought of this time. Nature and the natural order of things ground Spencer's approach to education. His basic claim is that the purpose of education is to "produce a self-governing being; not to produce a being to be governed by others" (Spencer, 1963, p. 112). He proclaims that in general, an individual's character and moral direction cannot be ameliorated enough to expend the necessary resources demanded to foster the desired growth. He states,

> The notion that an ideal humanity might be forthwith produced by a perfect system of education, is near akin to that implied in the poems of Shelley, that would mankind give up their old institutions and prejudices, all the evils in the world would at once disappear: neither notion being acceptable to such as have dispassionately studied human affairs (p. 86).

Education, thus, can make minor changes to a person's character, but cannot fundamentally change it enough to alter society. It follows, then, from Spencer's philosophy, that institutional attempts to equalize the social landscape remain futile even with the herculean efforts of schools. Government accredited social services and legal prohibitions on business enslave individuals because they incentivize sloth and disincentivizes ingenuity and industriousness. Policies aimed to aid the poor, for example, waste money because one's biological predispositions restrict potentiality, and, what's more, they injure society because they incapacitate individuals to the point of sefdom. Spencer harbors an utopian visions for society within his philosophy, as Ward aptly notices:

> In his (Spencer) biology we are taught that organic evolution takes place through the joint action of differentiation and integration. Organic progress is measured by the degree to which organs and structures are multiplied to serve the various ends of higher and higher life, and by the degree to which these multiplied structures and organs are then subordinated to the directive influence of a more and more perfect nervous system, and ultimately to the absolute control of one supreme directive organ, the perfected brain. It is these two conditions, which constitute respectively organic differentiation and organic integration (Ward in Commager, 1967, p. 219).

The function of each smaller organ operates to support or produce the "perfected brain" via the "perfect nervous system." To make analogies to society, as Spencer frequently does, the lower life works, sacrifices, and dies in order to generate a fittest human being. Individuals are biologically determined to occupy specific spaces in society, and the role of the government institutions is to protect private

property and let the survival of the fittest to play itself out in all affairs of "universal warfare maintained throughout the lower creation" (Spencer, 1851, p. 149). Spencer stood for radical individualism and asserted that with regard to policy, general welfare of citizenry must be secondary to individual desires. It is natural, in his view, to rid society of defective individuals:

> Why, the whole effort of Nature is to get rid of such—to clear the world of them, and make room for better. Mark how the diseased are dealt with. Consumptive patients, with lungs incompetent to perform the duties of lungs, people with digestive organs that will not take up enough nutriment, people with defective hearts which break down under effort, people with any constitutional flaws preventing due fulfillment of the conditions of life, are continually dying out, and leaving behind those fit for the climate, food, and habits to which they are born (p. 205).

The best hope of education is to direct individuals to their particular station in society, and to prepare them to compete and/or survive in a war. Let nature take its course summarizes Spencer's views of the relationship between government and its citizenry. Attempts to moderate or modify biological determinates will prove to be chimerical in his eyes. It is no accident then, that Spencer endorsed the laboratory method of teaching learning, as one could argue that he viewed society as a laboratory where genetic pools battled for survival. Natural forces, much like the market, arrange themselves according to winners and losers. Diseased bodies die as antibodies and healthy ones endure. Those who adapt and reproduce win, while those who do not lose. Under Spencerian world-view, individuals fend for themselves, assume their own risk for survival, and conduct themselves accordingly.

Lester Frank Ward agreed that individual differences existed in society, but he viewed them as vital to social invention. He argued that the individual could alter the physical and social world, promoted egalitarianism and the role of the government in education, and denounced determinism. Spencer neglected to consider the psychological factors implicated in social mobility and government. He asserted, "There is no need to search for talent. It exists already, and everywhere. The thing that is rare is opportunity, not ability" (Ravitch, 2000, p. 29). The role of government is to protect individuals from the "egoistic domination of other individuals" (Ward in Commager, 1967, p. 223) and exploitation. Conversely to Spencer, Ward believed that social cohesion and equality trump individual desires. Social integration under the aegis of security promotes individual freedom and happiness. Social unrest is due to greater inequality and failure to provide the institutional framework for greater integration. Education, guided by the principle of "intellectual egalitarianism" (p. 409) can provide pupils regardless of social class, with an "equal amount of the essential knowledge that has been brought into the world" (p. 410). Every child, according to Ward, possesses the "native capacity for knowledge" (p. 410), while native capacities qualitatively differ, they may not quantitatively differ. Intellectual inequalities stem from the artificial creation of social classes, while humans

contain diverse abilities they possess the same capacity for learning. The role of government, then according to Ward is to minimize risk to maximize individual and state security.

To summarize, the emergence of the secondary school in the mid-nineteenth century occurred through political and economic contestations, and was necessitated by a population explosion of post-grammar school children. Initially, local school boards operated and controlled the secondary school, and although many desired a unified system of schooling, one never appeared. Uniformity, conformity, and rote learning best describe the teaching philosophy, and even though the purposes of secondary education, one consistent sentiment was that the high school should impose order on the adolescent population. Finally, although there were several important people that influenced the design of secondary education, Charles W. Eliot and William Torry Harris represent two of the most important, and philosophically, educators endorsed either social Darwinism or public welfare rationale for the secondary school. Bio-political forces designed to accumulate knowledge about the lifestyles of this unknown, unruly, and errant population concerned educationalists at this time. Furthermore, concerns about effects of education on the political economy ensued.

This brief and incomplete summary of the current perspectives on secondary education during the mid-to-late nineteenth century in the United States illustrates the prevailing views about this time period. Contradictory archival evidence suggest that the college and the various purposes of education put forth by reformers and the relationship between high schools and the entrance examination were more dynamic than perhaps we think.

PREVENTING LUNG DISEASE (SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND SOCIETY)

Despite claims that the colleges and universities held an asymmetrical relationship to the secondary schools, there was great uncertainty about what distinguished one from the other and how they functioned together in society. As enrollment in secondary school grew, greater concerns over how to manage this population increased. John Dewey (1896), paraphrasing John Carlyle (1720–1780), contends that the mark of a great society is exhibited by whether it has “lungs” or not. This means a society’s ability to utilize and distribute appropriately the skills and talents among its citizenry. For Dewey, the secondary school serves as that organ, breathing in, or accepting students as they are, assessing the students’ talents, and distributing them throughout the social body. How best to make this process more efficient was up for considerable debate. The secondary school had a large responsibility in this process.

Seth Low (1894), then President of Columbia University, describes this relationship between the three levels of education (elementary, secondary, college) as that of a whole body, with the colleges and universities as the “head,” and the other two as the “two feet” (p. 381). He argues that even though the higher institutions of learning have greatly influenced secondary and elementary schools, they too, are needed if the entire system is to function properly. He encourages the

New York state legislature to allocate more funds for elementary and secondary education due to the growing need for public schools. He recounts that as Mayor of New York City, he refused to give city funds to build more secondary schools, which resulted in the "flow of children through the whole public school system was choked at the outlet" (p. 382). The metaphorical consistency of the word "choked" indicates that a jam in the entire bodily system asphyxiated the air-flow (i.e. talent and skill) from ascending to the "head," or to the colleges and universities. The following year, however, he distributed the money to build more secondary schools and the result was that the "proper working of the system was restored immediately" (p. 383). If we combine the metaphors of Dewey and Low, we can see how the secondary school functions in the larger social body. The lungs serve as the distributing organ of skills and talent, which are vital for a proper functioning society, and the elementary and secondary schools function as the "feet" of the body, in which they propel society to progress and move in certain directions. Fit pupils ascend to the "head" of the body to colleges and universities, while others get distributed to other areas (i.e. perhaps the "hands" of trade-school, or "shoulders" of industry). Disease occurs when appropriate resources are not distributed in a timely manner to specific parts of the body, which creates a jam in the system, and subsequently damages other parts of the body. A dyspepsic element produces a diseased body, and can propagate dissemination of various diseases throughout the entire body.

While Low's understanding of how important it was for the entire school system to run smoothly, clear lines of demarcation about the role and purposes between elementary, secondary, and colleges did not exist. In many ways, we can conclude that the entire school system remained in a constant state of disease, or at a minimum, under the continual threat of disease. The composition of consciousness emerges as a prime target throughout this time period and throughout this book. It becomes a biopolitical concern as it relates to political economy of the adolescent body to manage populations and accumulating knowledge about them via pastoral, disciplinary, and bio-political mechanisms.

Opinions about the constitutional differences between a secondary school and a university varied to the point that, as Principal J.W. Ford of Pillsbury Academy stated, "we are in danger of using them (terms of secondary schools and colleges) as we read the labels upon the druggist's bottles and jars without actually knowing the properties of the contents" (p. 291). Yet, for many reformers, they did not know much about the students attending secondary schools and they did not know how to prescribe remedies for their diseases. They were in many ways in the same position as the early century physician who had to rely on multiple, even competing, factors to prescribe a treatment for an ailment. In early nineteenth-century, no conception of a single etiology in disease existed, even with what might be called infectious diseases. A person had to be made susceptible to a miasma through diet, habits, morals, mindset, weather, etc. Additionally, educators focused, much like the Philadelphia physician at the beginning of the chapter, on the inputs and outputs of the patient. The composition of the student body was relatively unknown. Adolescent population numbers and predicted labor needs

were widely known, but the academic acumen, temperament, and health of the post-grammar school population was quite limited. Typographies of the adolescent were quite rudimentary (see below) as educators resorted to a scale of three or four hierarchical markers (i.e. dull, lazy). Moreover, as Cuban (1993) stated above, the most prominent pedagogical strategy of this time were the recitation and the teacher's constant questioning, which indicates a preference for the inputs and outputs of student learning. The college entrance examination, also, is another practice used to reflect a preference for inputs and outputs. The candidate arrives with a repository of knowledge and skills that s/he performs on a timed-test in one sitting. Thus, the body of the student, as a living organism, was not part of the epistemological scheme, and the function of the secondary school remained ambiguous.

While many believed that the secondary school was necessary, they did not know precisely for what purpose it would serve and how it would be different from the college. For example, Herbert Miller (1893) argues that education in the "era of advancement" (p. 421) should adapt to the needs (i.e. labor) of the nation, and from his perspective, the educational system has been too focused on the roughly one percent of people who attend college. Miller contends that while twenty-five state universities opened at great expenses to state governments, very little was being done to educate the 94 percent of the total number of students who were enrolled school in primary and grammar schools. A frantic rush hovers over the many debates and discussions about the aims of education, pedagogy, curriculum, length of the school day, the appropriate amount of school work to give children, and how to situate their bodies so they can see the chalkboard and hear the teacher. Justifications for the secondary school were multifarious, Miller, for example thought they should be trade-schools, but educators generally agreed that the secondary school stood as the only chance for managing the rapidly growing adolescent population.

Another reason for this confusion is that it was difficult to determine when youth and adulthood ended or began. If the development were a series of "abrupt steps" (Coy in Jesse, 1896, p. 284) it would be much easier, instead growth happens as an "upward slope" (p. 284) where it is difficult to draw clear lines between elementary and secondary education. Another reason for this confusion is that the grammar school functioned in a similar way that many believed the secondary school should now assume. The elementary school should teach the child to be "self-supporting and be a safe citizen of the state" (Draper in Jesse, 1896, p. 288). These purposes worked well when children left school early, but not now as a growing population entered into secondary schools. To evoke Low's metaphor above, the body of the school system needs to flow continuously, as classroom work builds cumulatively. The purposes of education were various, as historians have noted. Order, self-discipline, reasoning, objectivity, and citizenship were tied to the body, health and disease. A clear, rational, ordered mind was akin to and reflective of an efficient, consistent digestive system with appropriate amounts of quality food, air and water, and a calm, attentive, and cheerful temperament, which allows the individual to produce useful, beautiful objects. An

imbalance in any of these areas exposed the individual to disease. The secondary school, thus, contained its own threats of disease.

The greatest threat of disease posed to the secondary school was not colleges and universities. The greatest dangers to the secondary school were "spurious colleges" (Jesse, 1896, pp. 274–275). In his view, it would be best for all involved if spurious colleges were "strangled" (p. 275). Spurious colleges have low admission standards, and admit students into medicine or law without the necessary preparation. They are a danger to the secondary school because they allow students the opportunity to by-pass secondary school. Not only do these low-grade colleges produce ill prepared doctors and lawyers with deleterious effects on the social body, they limit enrollment in secondary schools. Jesse implicitly argues that secondary schools could adequately prepare individuals for these professions, and thus improve the health of the social body. The greatest danger to the colleges and universities is a slew of unprepared freshman.

Paul Shorey (1897) claimed that the secondary schools do the colleges a disservice by not categorizing students based on fitness for college, and by not designing curriculum around those categories. He claims that the remedy for ill prepared students is not to debase the college curriculum, but to design a secondary education curriculum that provides for a focus on practical studies. In his mind, students can be categorized as dull, dreamy, menagerie (unsystematic collector), polyglot (fluent in many subjects), and malingerer (Fakes illness to avoid doing work). To ensure that none of these types of students gets accepted to college by "judicious cram and happy accident" (p. 223), Shorey asserts that the curriculum and pedagogy of secondary schools needed to stop focusing on the "central nervous system" (reception and retention of sense images) and provide students with the opportunity to make connections between the senses, perceptions, and ideas. The difficult work of thinking and synthesizing information prevents the mental faculties from atrophy. Daily exercises in obtaining, honing, and synthesizing the individual's "limited personal experience" (p. 227) will distinguish candidates for college and pupils destined for trade schools. Because the secondary school is unwilling to alter its curriculum and its position that every student deserves the same education, the colleges and universities manage a population of students who cannot complete college level work, and thus, pollute the entire student body. Additionally, encouraging a large number of secondary students to go to college would produce an "educated proletariat", or over educated workers who learned useless bits of knowledge. Thus, Shorey claims that the "remedy" for this threat, or "false tendency", and "misdirection", to the colleges is to give a "sound practical education in the public high schools" (p. 223) and to not expect colleges to lower their expectations. The dissipation, or disease, of the secondary school is its unwillingness to categorize students, which spreads the disease to colleges and to the social body as a whole.

Additionally, the relationship between colleges and universities and the secondary school remained ambiguous at best, or in a constant state of contention at worse. Claims that the university dictated curriculum to the secondary school may be overstated. Few writers, such as Clifford H. Moore, argued that the college

entrance examination system is "an adequate and satisfactory means of determining the qualifications of candidates" (1896, p. 312). Moore claims that the college entrance exam saves universities from dealing with poorly qualified students, and relieves the student of potential frustrations associated with failure. In his view, the entrance exam is the best way educators had to determine and predict a candidate's success at the university. Moore's "the best we have" assertion defied the common wisdom of this time.

For many, the college entrance exam did not do what it set out to do. College presidents insistently complained throughout the last decade of the nineteenth century about the poor writing abilities of its admitted students. Cornell University's President, J.M Hart, for example, reported at the Binghamton Conference in 1893 that the lack of proper English usage among college students was "deep and wide-spread" (Hunt, 1893, p. 296). President James A. Traux of Union University launched a similar complaint about students on his campus, but he faulted universities for not preparing and graduating competent teachers of the English language. Finally, Principal W.P. Thompson attending the same conference argues that the exam may not reflect the student's abilities because students lack motivation to learn English when "science calls more and more loudly" and that is the "way money lies" (p. 298). Even as late as 1897, administrators warned against the negative impact the entrance exam has on teaching and learning in schools (Dutton in Burnham, 1897). The fault with the college entrance exam, even if it is assumed to be the safest way to enroll prepared university students, may lie elsewhere.

For example, John Dewey (1896) contends that the secondary schools, not academies, compelled universities to change. He writes:

> There has been university extension by unconscious permeation, by indirect radiation. On the other hand, by practically compelling the college to adjust itself to the conditions of its preparatory constituency, it has served to break down the monastic and scholastic survivals in education, and to so modify the college aims and means as to bring them into much closer contact with everyday life (pp. 2–3).

The emergence of the public high school, Dewey argues, altered the university. Regarding the Academy, Dewey argues that reforms in the western part of the United States impacted preceded changes in universities in the East. A few of these changes included: coeducation, elective courses, and an "introduction of consultation and cooperative methods between high school and college (p. 4) to name a few. For years, universities in the East could rely on the Academies to supply them with students, while colleges in the West did not have such a luxury. They had to rely on students from high schools, who could decide not to attend college, but go into business or attend a trade school. Colleges and universities, including those in the East, Dewey claims, were "led out into the struggle for existence and must exhibit its fitness to survive" (p. 3). In short, they had to compete to remain open. Finally, Dewey asserts that secondary schools did not simply take orders from colleges and universities, and absorb their ever-changing

demands into the secondary curricula, they delegated some of it to the lower grades. For example, Dewey states that lower grades were teaching more geometry and algebra, and less "average arithmetic" (p. 5), reading entire works of literature instead of reading fragments, and introducing experimentation and observation in science. The secondary school disciplined the colleges, too. The secondary school forced colleges and universities to adapt as the secondary population grew. Dewey's analysis occurred right around the turn of the century, so the assert that colleges dictated curriculum to high schools earlier in the century appears valid, but it is also certain that general statements regarding the effects of colleges on secondary schools seems dubious.

HEALTH AND DISEASE

The nineteenth century witnessed a virtual cocktail of medical advances in France and Germany to an array of alternative health practitioners. Alternative health practitioners thrived in the United States, but not so much in Western Europe. In the United States, medical advances slowly made their way into universities and into common beliefs about health and disease. Early beliefs about that humoric imbalances caused disease and the vehement commitment to the notion of vitalism (the belief in the distinct, incontrovertible divide between chemical and living organisms) stalled the adoption of knowledge in the United States garnered through autopsies in France and laboratory experiments in Germany. Many of the important medical advances in technology and knowledge about health and disease were adopted by the beginning of the twentieth century, the ambiguity about medicine and healing practices in general pervaded much of the discussion about secondary education. Archival research for this book reveals that much of the distress concerning educating post-grammar school children in the mid-to-late nineteenth century related to issues of health, and more prominently to matters of managing disease. Health and disease serve as metaphors to describe matters of teaching, learning, curriculum, relationships with colleges, and school organization. To better understand these references, a trip through the bazaar of medical history in the United States is warranted.

The body for many in the mid-to-late nineteenth century represented both a physical object and a symbolic one. Characteristics of the body reflected whether a person was of sound mind, but also whether they contained diseases. The body and the mind functioned together as a unit, and, discussions about improving "efficiency" in education reflect a concern for health and disease; perhaps even more so than business. The terms used in educational discourses about secondary education and adolescence employ both object and metaphor interchangeably. Moreover, the individual's body represented or reflected the social body, the school body, community, and the political body. Thus, preventing disease and encouraging healthy living were vital to managing populations. Speaking of teachers during their monthly meetings, Atkinson (1900) states that the teachers often spend time discussing specific students (i.e. academic assistance, disciple) with the "zest equal to that of a body of physicians. Some principles of educational

diagnosis and educational *materia medica* (remedies used in medicine) have been brought to the front" (p. 381). Although pharmacological texts which noted the effects of treatments for specific maladies, nineteenth-century *materia medica* texts focused primarily on the effects of the remedy and not based on specific drugs or diseases. This is a significant point because it illustrates the early nineteenth-century preference for corporal external features and results while multiple causes of a specific disease remained. Physicians epistemologically possessed limited capacity to draw conclusions based on the physiological relationship between internal operations and external forces. They relied primarily on blood and urine, or to state another way, on bodily extractions and out-puts. Much of this would change when a few American doctors began studying at the Paris Clinic; however, during the early to mid nineteenth century, the understanding and ways of knowing the body, disease, and health of the patient were restricted.

Metaphors related to three bodily systems as well as mental abilities and temperament comprise the whole body of the child and society writ large. The brain represents rational, sound judgment, metaphors of sight, and truth; the digestive system includes metaphors of production, processes, and excretion, such as cramming, efficiency; nervous system refers to metaphors of temperament, such as laziness, hysteria, excitement; finally, reproductive metaphors refer to what one produces in relation to others, such as cooperation, and aloneness. The healthy body is one that is balanced, so moderation is vital. The body is prone to disease when it is in imbalance. For example, too much mental strain leads to mental "dyspepsia", or indigestion, creates nervousness, which leads to fatigue and depression (signs of disease). Thus, based on the conceptions of secondary school-aged children, we can see how many believed that they were diseased or at a high risk for various diseases. These diseases were not simply anthrax, or other bodily ones, but nervousness. Mental strain, could lead to gout, for example, or an unstable, chaotic home life may produce irrational thoughts, inattentiveness, and nervousness in a child. The strategies and ideas about secondary education, then primarily dealt with health. Subject matter and pedagogy were used as instruments to create healthy children, who would be able to ward off disease, in all of its guises, later in life.

MEDICAL MARKETPLACE

Early in the nineteenth century, phrenologists, homeopathic practitioners, hydro-therapists, regular physicians, and a variety of health practitioners vied for legitimacy in a crowded and competitive medical marketplace in the United States. In general, alternative medicine practitioners denounced modern living conditions and regimes as unnatural, and advocated simple living and a return to nature for cures. Homeopaths, on the other had, stressed personal hygiene, proper diet, fresh air, and temperance as the keys to proper health. They opposed the orthodoxy of "regular medicine" describing it as an "oligarchic closed shop" (Porter, 1997, p. 390), obscure, and grandiose. Moreover, they criticized regular medicine's predilection for relying on lots of drugs to cure ailments, and instead, homeopaths

diluted homeopathic medicines to the point that the disease was left to nature to cure. They criticized "regular physicians" for their rationalistic approaches (i.e. hypothesis, reasoning, and developing catalogues of diseases and therapeutics), and their preference for using bloodletting (blood-transfusion), purging, and mineral pharmacology to treat ailments. Although many alternative healers existed throughout the nineteenth century, this section will only focus on phrenology, homeopathy, and hydrotherapy. The ideas in these forms of alternative medicine provide a fold for how medicine in the nineteenth century change, and more important, we see how conceptions of the secondary school body varied and transformed during this time. The argument here is that there is a correlative relationship between medicine and education funneled through by the use of various medical rationalities and metaphors.

Phrenology studied human character by examining the "face, form, motion and expression" (Sizer, 1891, p. 9) of the brain. For the Phrenologist, the constitution and form of the skull displayed a virtual "jig-saw puzzle" of specific areas of the brain that explains a person's personality, and thus provides clues about a person's character and health. Phrenologists in the early to mid-nineteenth century detailed the constitution of the brain, wrote individual anecdotes of people's lives and made conclusions about the relationship between the form of the brain and an individual's character. Phrenology diagnosed ailments and character flaws and offered suggestions for correct behavior. The poor, for example, could make productive an almost entirely useless life, and a phrenologist could guide a vagabond to a stable, steady existence.

One of the more popular homeopathics, Samuel Thomson relied on an "armamentarium of vegetable preparations, prominently cayenne pepper and lobelia, which were typically prescribed in large doses along with a regimen of steaming the body to cause sweating" (Cassedy, 1991, p. 36) to cure patients. In addition, the general public possessed great skepticism about professions that professed expert knowledge. Most of this skepticism stemmed from the fact that no one school of health (i.e. regular medicine, phrenology, homeopathy) developed a definitive repository of knowledge about diseases, health, and treatment. No one method could consistently cure specific ailments. Within the medical marketplace, claims to special knowledge were seen as undemocratic. Thus, regular physicians maintained an epistemology of the common, which they believed would grant them greater legitimacy among the general population, and separate them from the other schools of thought of this time. Making medical knowledge and practices understandable to the common person would generate a healthier, more democratic social order. Conceptions and access to corporal systems influenced the general acceptance of the epistemology of the common regarding healthcare and healing practices. Physicians and health-care practitioners, regardless of the orientation, possessed minimal access to the inside of the body (i.e. the organs, the various systems), had a very limited understanding of the nature of disease, and thus relied mostly on conjecture and reason to prescribe treatments (Hahnemann, 1982).

Hydrotherapists surmised that injecting or taking "foreign objects" into the body causes disease, and disrupts the body's natural state of health. Diseases, or

imbalance in the body signifies the body's attempt to expel the foreign matter. To help the body, hydrotherapists prescribe water, or water treatments, such as perspiration, cold baths, and wet bandages (Porter, 1997, p. 392). The focus on water as a natural agent to cure diseases, or to help the body dispel elements that cause disequilibrium illustrates the importance of the entrances and exits for healing patients, and the corporal constraints of the healing therapists. Regular physicians and alternative practitioners both possessed limited knowledge and access to the body.

Part of the problem for regular physicians is that many commoners refused to believe that they (regular physicians) had any greater access or knowledge of the human anatomy. In many respects, the internal functions of the body stood as a mystery for many health practitioners, including regular physicians and alternative practitioners. Gaining legitimacy as a healer presented physicians with a series of problems. To diagnose an illness or ailment and then to treat it comprised a calculus of multiple and competing variables. What's more, medicine had not received the authority as a science. Thus, regular physicians operated under incredible scrutiny and received a large amount of criticism. Certainty about disease prevention and cures, for the most part, evaded many healing practitioners in the early-to-mid nineteenth-century. To be sure, physicians and alternative medical practitioners posed conjectures that were later validated by laboratory experiments and with the advancements in medical technology; however, certainties about disease, health and lifestyle remained elusive throughout much of the century.

Compounding the problem, medical education throughout much of this time resembled a trade school rather than an established, rigorous learning institution. Lax admissions requirements permitted ill-prepared students to become physicians; so much so, that many leaders of alternative medicine created their own training institutions. Additionally, one educator (see below) argued that medical schools plagued secondary schools because they allowed students to bypass the secondary school before entering into medical school. Medical schools, in general, were "poorly staffed and blatantly commercial, offering quick degrees on the cheap (Porter, 1997, p. 319). As Owen Tully Stratton recalls in 1895,

> I'd never had the advantage of practicing under a preceptor, never dressed a serious wound, had never given a hypodermic, had never been present when a baby was born. I had no bedside manner, since I had never attended a bedside in a professional capacity" (Porter, 1997, p. 319).

Medical education failed to prepare many students to compete in a highly competitive market. More important, Stratton's recollection reveals a focus on the theoretical aspects of medicine and a lack of emphasis on the practices of being a physician. Thus, in general, many physicians and alternative practitioners maintained that nature serves as the best guide to proper health. Obeying natural law would produce and prolong health. Proper living and consistent habits produced good health, while disease represented an ignorance or rebellion from nature. A clean, rhythmic, free-flowing, strong body represented good health, self-

control, and calm disposition. Moderation of mental or emotional well-being and physical well-being were the primary practices that one could use to protect oneself. Mental or emotional moderation included self-control and cheerfulness. Excesses in emotions included depression, nervousness, emotional outbursts, and inappropriate displays of emotions. The disagreement occurred with the treatment, or *material medica*. Regular physicians prescribed bloodletting, purging and mineral-based medicines, while alternative medicine prescribe sweating, herbs, and/or prayer. A balanced lifestyle spearheaded by an astute will promulgated a healthy body.

THE PARIS CLINIC

Changes in medicine and in medical technology, however, would gradually occur in the United States as research conducted in France and Germany slowly harbored to American medical institutions. Medical training and scientific research stood astern in the United States compared to the sophisticated research and training occurring in Western Europe in the mid-nineteenth century. In Paris, the reliance on books to prepare physicians endemic of the *ancien regime* gave way to an emphasis on the diseased body and the autopsy. The motto for the Paris Clinic was "read little, see much, do much" (Porter, 1997, p. 306). Clinicians matched symptoms of disease with postmortem autopsies to locate lesions located in the body to validate diagnosis. The purpose of medicine under this new perspective, aptly called anatomico-patholigical, was not simply to catalogue treatments or conditions, but to track pathological patterns using the objective "gaze" of the clinician. Lesions, not symptoms provided the guide to understanding diseases. As Bichat asserts,

> You may take notes for twenty years from morning to night at the bedside of the sick…and all will be to you only a confusion of symptoms…a train of incoherent phenomenon,…(start cutting bodies open) and this obscurity will so disappear (Porter, 1997, p. 307).

Medicine no longer existed as a theoretical endeavor, but consisted of observing and validating diagnosis. The autopsy and "cutting" into bodies relegated symptoms as secondary in determining medical knowledge. Many at the Paris Clinic sought to turn medicine into a science by utilizing objective observations and validating through correlation. Pierre Louis (1787–1872), for example, began quantifying the effects of certain treatments, and Hyacinthe Laennic (1781–1826), who invented the stethoscope, surmised that tuberculosis was a unified disease, which was later verified by bacteriologists in the 1880s. He also believed that "sad passions" caused tuberculosis, and that nature would provide the necessary elements for a cure. Evidence existed that depression and other mental health disorders weaken the immune system and make one vulnerable to tuberculosis. The invention of the stethoscope, moreover, provided clinicians with an entre into the body and legitimized diagnosis of various pulmonary diseases. Reliance on the

patient for accurate descriptions became minimal as clinicians "turned the morgue into a shrine" (Porter, 1997, p. 320).

Medical education consisted of developing one's ability to use the "sight, sound, smell of disease" (Porter, 1997, p. 312). Disease transformed from being a collection of symptoms to be a sign, as a "real things" (p. 313) with specific, localized conditions of its own. The ontology of disease changed from being an imbalanced condition of the whole organism to being identified and localized with lesions in organs and tissues. Finally, although F.J.V Broussais (1772–1838) vehemently argued against the clinical approaches to medicine, and contended that all disease emerged from an "excessive gastro-intestinal irritation" (Porter, 1997, p. 313), remedied only by bloodletting with leeches, his notion that disease and health existed on a continuum, or in "shades of grey" (p. 313) cemented the importance of considering the relationship between demographic (e.g. age, sex) and physiological features (e.g. blood temperature, ratio of white to red blood cells) when diagnosing patients. As Porter (1997) explains, "If the patho-anatomists were consumed with disease and death, Broussais' physiology opened windows onto the laws of life…" (p. 314). The laws of which still remain today; however, while the Paris clinicians erected the morgue as the center for generating medical knowledge to give it scientific legitimacy, physicians in Germany produced knowledge in the laboratory to witness and experiment with the life-histories of diseases.

Although many physicians in the United States studied at the Paris Clinic, most notably, Alfred Stille of the Philadelphia Hospital and Medical College, and they conducted research using the anatomico-physiological tools they learned, medicine in the United States during the early-to-mid-nineteenth century remained a carnival of medical practices. Regular physicians, including those who studied in Paris still competed with other health practitioners, and remained under heavy scrutiny and criticism. It is worth noting also that Charles Eliot, President of Harvard University and Chair of the Committee of Ten visited the Paris Clinic during his trip to Europe and reported that its empirical methods influenced his ideas on secondary education. Moreover, as stated above, he vehemently opposed G. Stanley Hall's recapitulation theory of human development, who, as we know, studied in Germany, like many physicians in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century. The generational split between those physicians who studied in France and those in Germany represented a significant shift in medical knowledge and medical education.

Death emerged as the ultimate archive of life. Disease produced knowledge about the body and validated conjectures about the patient's lifestyle. The frozen product of the moribund body and the detached stance of the clinician who utilized his phenomenological experiences to chronicle and chart the disease's trajectory throughout the body, verified life. Dissecting every vein of the body allowed the clinician to capture disease and rewrite the patient's life history. Knowledge existed through correlating and reading the signs of disease and rewriting the body via dissection.

CHAPTER 1

THE GERMAN LABORATORY

As French clinicians studied in the morgue and on the hospital floor, spending innumerable hours with patients and cadavers, German physicians constructed laboratories to experiment and study diseases and pathophysiology in a different environment. As Porter (1997) notes, the laboratory had been popular in medicine even in the seventeeth century, but what made the German iteration transformative was its use of the high magnifying microscope. German physicians believed that observing the living organisms under a microscope would allow them to measure, weight, and test organisms and thus acquire greater legitimacy as a science. Rudolf Virchow's admonition to students to "learn to see microscopically" (Porter, 1997, p. 320) sharply contrast to the advise given at the Paris Clinic. Experimenting in a controlled environment became vital to medical education because it "alone shows the specific phenomenon in its dependency on specific conditions, for the conditions are arranged by choice" (p. 320). The microscope became a standard instrument used in all medical school classrooms by the middle of the century. The laboratory, therefore, permitted physicians and students to complete vivisections and investigate chemical relationships among various organisms. Advancements in the microscope changed the way physicians viewed the body. Jacob Henle (1809–85) for example, likened the human body to an architectural structure, and studied the relationship between the macro-structure and the micro-components. He was the first to demonstrate that arteries contain a muscular membrane. Moreover, Justus van Liebig (1803–73) organized the human body according to physico-chemical systems and, as an example, measured the relationship between food, urine chemistry, and oxygen production. He still believed that diseases arose when a living thing came into contact with the agitated vibrations eminating from a wasted substance. This idea, revealing remnants of the theory of spontaneous generation, were later disproved by Louis Pasteur's experiments on Anthrax in France in 1860. Finally, cell biology originated in Germany at this time in the area of Botany. The notion that "living cells were basic to living things" (Porter, 1997, p. 330) posed a serious threat to the spontaneous generation theory, as Botanists argued that disease emerged due to the multiplication and dissemination of abnormal cells in the body. Laboratory medicine competed with the Paris Clinic, but by 1914 more than 15,000 privileged elite American doctors traveled to Germany for medical training.

The laboratory and Germ Theory represents the apex of medicine and medical education of the nineteenth century. After a long period of struggle to gain legitimacy among the larger population in the United States, the laboratory emerged due to the Flexner Report as a primary mode of acquiring medical knowledge and of training future doctors. Although the American Medical Association organized in 1847 in an attempt to marginalize homeopaths, even members within the "regular medicine" community did not initially accept the laboratory form of medicine. Generational differences in medical training and socio-political influences explain how the laboratory methods received prominence by the final decade of the century. Towards the end of the century, elite doctors

traveled to Germany instead of France, to further their studies. What new physicians shared with their progenitors was the view that a physician's performance would grant medicine legitimacy, not specialized knowledge. This meant that "regular physicians" would gain legitimacy among the common folks and with other health-care practitioners if it could consistently treat and cure illness of actual patients. Theories about diseases, or about treatments would not suffice.

A culture of professionalism emerged to help propel the laboratory as a vital place to acquire new knowledge and heal patients. The professional was someone who could recognize complexities and intricacies of social phenomenon that were unseen by the "untrained eye" (Warner in Cunningham & Williams, 1992 p. 135). Physicians gained professional status as they developed a repository of specialized knowledge and to the extent to which that knowledge could produce effective practices. The laboratory helped to produce clear, validated medical knowledge, precise medical procedures, and generate medical facts, which in turned gave practicing physicians an to understanding of the body, health and disease to more effectively treat patients. Whereas physicians trained at the Paris Clinic relied on the autopsy to apprehend the physiological intricacies, the laboratory gave physicians the ability to control and experiment with bacteria and virus to understand the nature and life span of diseases. Along similar lines, the laboratory permitted medical students to experience for themselves the connections between scientific methods and concepts in a controlled setting.

Greater access to the internal movement of the body, and the ability to see previously unseen entities altered the sayable and knowable of the late nineteenth century. Bruno Latour (1992) argues that laboratories are efficient ways to discipline students by keeping track of their activities, by giving them direction. The laboratory, in short, is a "strategy" (p. 300) that "discipline, simplify, reify, mobilize, all bodies of knowledge" (p. 301. The discourse, or the drive to locate and understand the inner-workings of the body spread into the field of education, and more specifically, in the manners in which the adolescent populations were to be managed. This last point raises the question, based on the historical overview of the laboratory, what are the implications for the suggestion by many educationalists to use the laboratory method of writing for the college entrance examination?

This question implies that the laboratory method is more than a pedagogical approach or a new examination, but is as Andrew Cunningham argues "never a mere instrument: it is also a practice which defines, limits and governs ways of thinking and seeing" (Cunningham in Cunningham & Williams, 1992, p. 224). The emergence of the laboratory in the late nineteenth century represented a new way of thinking and seeing, with epistemological and disciplinary considerations. The relationship between the laboratory and science is also an important one here. An investigation into the ascendance of the laboratory, its uses, and relation to science may tell us more about secondary education and English education more specifically (see below). The laboratory as a metaphor for writing and assessment practices tells us about the intricate relationship between education and medical discourses. However, the desire to see inside the body of the student, and the

mental processes of learning resemble the epistemological changes in medicine in the late nineteenth century.

GERM THEORY

Perhaps the most important development of the nineteenth century appeared in the rivalry between Louis Pasteur and Robert Koch in Germany. Pasteur initiated Germ Theory as a possible explanation for the origination, development, and transmission of diseases, and ultimately bacteriology. The theory considers the causes and spread of infectious diseases. Instead of the body being the locus of the gestation and proliferation of diseases, Germ Theory presumes that the spread of some diseases was due to microorganisms, or microbes in the air that were unable to be seen with the naked eye and thus without the aid of microscope. Additionally, it contests the generally held view at that time of spontaneous generation, which contends that non-living organisms can suddenly come alive. Elements of disease, in this view, spontaneously appear and then get transmitted through the air and into the body. For example, many believed that flies gestated from manure. However, Louis Pasteur's experiments with fermentation of wine, beer, milk, and later on cholera and anthrax, demonstrated that tiny microbes in the air promoted the disintegration of living organisms and thus caused disease. The very constitution, therefore, of an organism predisposes it to certain types of diseases. His work on vaccinations also proved to be quite useful to medicine. Finally, Robert Koch's research on Anthrax located the specific causes of this disease through a rigorous, scientific method. His method included the following steps:

1. The disease must be present in every organism
2. The host of the disease must be separated from the organism to isolate the pure form, or culture, of the disease.
3. Once separated, the same characteristics of the same disease must be evident when a healthy animal is inoculated with the disease.
4. The organism must be separated from the inoculated animal and identified as the same, initial disease.

Koch's methodology gave scientists and physicians a credible and secure protocol for isolating specific diseases and validating conclusions about them. The assumption that a host could be isolated from its elemental parts, and reactivated in another (living) organism to determine the disease's movements and interactions was revolutionary. Koch's postulate involved isolating a microorganism from a sick animal, growing the microorganism in a pure culture, putting the microorganism into a healthy animal and making that animal sick, and isolating the microorganism again. Disease suddenly became a living entity on its own, anthropomorphized with a personality, with a history, with probable, even predictable movements and reactions, and ultimately knowable inside and outside. The host's chemical composition, internal actions and reactions, as well as its interaction with outside, environmental agents became part of the knowable in medicine. These understandings about diseases changed the way in which

physicians viewed the body, how to maintain a healthy body, and about the potential for treating patients. These shifts in conceptions of disease transformed the epistemological field of the body, health, and the potential antidotes for specific illnesses. So much so, that towards the end of the nineteenth century, specific bacteria were being identified as causes for specific diseases. As King (1991) points out:

> The relation of specific bacteria to specific diseases was established, and now the characteristics and relationships of bacteria—what we might call their life story—were being studied. Variations in morphology (form and structure), including colony forms; attenuation of pathogenic properties; chemical reactions; cultural requirements and reaction to various culture media (soils); modes of differentiating bacteria that might seem similar; cellular reactions induced in the host; a rudimentary approach to immunity" (p. 178)

Diseases and their causes and characteristics were no longer considered amorphous entities hidden in the body, generated by a faulty will or poor disposition, or an imbalance in diet, lack of quality air, or inconsistent bowel movements. Though the work of bacteriologists, the aid of the microscope, and through laboratory medicine (see below), diseases now had a history, a "life-story", specific personalities and features, different, intrinsic, and even unique "form and structure", which can determine whether and which "groups" or colonies it forms, vital environmental features necessary for incubation, contextual features that influence its maturation and reproduction, and the influences locally by the "host", and basic, yet initial strategies for resistances to and protection from specific diseases. The knowledge of disease and bacteria grew exponentially with the emergence and gradual acceptance of laboratory medicine.

Koch's postulates regarding disease and health present an epistemological shift in medicine, and in implicitly in education. The notion to isolate abnormal, unhealthy corporal features saturated the field of writing pedagogy as it, to struggled in its battle against pathogenic forms of written expression (see chapter two). While the authors of this book make no causal claim between Koch's vital discovery and secondary education, we do entertain the possibility that such epistemologies found in Koch's postulate, similar to other medical discourses, banter about in the educational discursive landscape.

We make a similar methodological move regarding Roentgen Rays (e.g. X-ray). Later in this book, the reader will notice that scholars of the writing portfolio in the 1990s argue that it (the portfolio) offers teachers x-ray vision into the student's life. We resurrect this history to expose the epistemological and discursive components as plays of power/knowledge. Hence, instead of permitting students to reveal their authentic self, the history of the Roentgen Rays presents a much different, even dangerous affect of the writing portfolio on secondary students. As the reader reads the rest of this chapter, the authors would like to encourage him/her to consider the analogous relationships between medical technologies and the technologies of the portfolio.

CHAPTER 1

ROENTGEN RAYS

The discovery of radiation, or X-rays, further altered the epistemological field. The history of the X-ray is germane to this book because it illustrates how seeing through the body was a major development in medicine, and because the X-ray is used as a metaphor to describe the writing portfolio in the 1990s in the United States. This last point will be discussed more exclusively in chapter three.

Much like bacteriology and microscopy, X-rays appeared during a time of advances in medical technology. Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen announced his discovery of the X-ray on December 28, 1895 (Duffy, 1993, p. 198), and within a year, physicians in the United States began using it to diagnose patients; the first being Dr. M.I. Pupin, a Columbia University Physics Professor. By 1925, the X-ray stood in most hospitals in the United States.

Shortly after learning about the potential benefits, doctors began to use it for various medical practices, specifically, to locate bullets inside the body and to see the severity of a broken bone (Assmus, 1995). As a medical tool, the X-ray became a useful tool for locating all sorts of anatomical abnormalities located inside the body. Improvements in X-ray machinery, specifically "tubes and films that replace the original glass plates" (Linton, 1995, p. 27) allowed doctors to see bone fractures and the form of organs. Further advances allowed doctors to see even more micro-anatomical features, and thus produce more accurate diagnosis of previously obscure recesses of the body. Liquids, such as barium sulfate, ingested into the body allowed doctors to take X-rays of previous hidden parts, such as the "esophagus, stomach, and small intestine" and locate "strictures, blockages, ulcers, cancers, and other defects" (Linton, 1995, p. 28). These developments permitted the X-ray to expand its survey of the body; however, these instruments did not provide access to the entire body, as the shape of the tubes, films, liquids, and organs, regulated the space it could occupy.

Thus, X-rays, with their ability to pierce through the skin, or the most external layer of the body with the aid of liquids, allowed doctors to see even more clearly previously unknown anatomical features. This is not to assert that X-rays revealed every nuance of every bone and organ structure, but it did allow doctors to locate deviations in these formations. So much so, that physicians developed standard drawings of basic elements of many internal physiological features, which later became standardized and "systematic" into "anatomical stamps" (Howell, 1995, p. 129). With the aid of the X-ray, physicians could document normal form and function of specific parts of the body.

The discovery and subsequent use of X-rays represented a major shift in how doctors observed and diagnosed patients. Instead of touching the body and manipulating the fractured arm or leg, an X-ray revealed precisely where the fracture appears. Thus, instead of relying on the patient's description of the malady to determine the nature of the broken bone or fracture, the doctor can actually see the fracture without touching the patient at all. Howell (1995) points out that doctors could now rely on X-rays if patients couldn't "provide a reliable history of their injuries and symptoms" (p. 110). In many respects, the X-ray nullified the

patient's role in doctor-patient relationship. The X-ray could "tell the truth, even when the patient could (or would) not" (p. 110). The X-ray machine bracketed the patient. Doctors can "see through" the patient and "tell the truth" about the patient when s/he was "unable to provide a reliable history" or was "unable to recall" the specific history of the injury. For this reason, the X-ray became a symbol for "exact, scientific nature of medicine" (p. 116) as empirical evidence; there it was, you could see it right there, and this is what needs to be done. Thus, the connections between what the doctor sees in the X-ray and what s/he needs to do in order to heal the patient became clear. The physician could no longer consult with the patient for recommendations for treatment; instead the X-ray dictates the treatment for the patient.

Even though the X-ray provided the necessary access that doctors needed to the patient's body, the general public responded to its discovery with both anxiety (bordering on hysteria) and excitement. As Simon (2004) points out,

> The Roentgen photography year was characterized by wonder and fear, a reprisal of the public's reaction to the telegraph and electric lighting; amazement at the technology, eagerness to hear vast claims for its significance, popular enthusiasm for its use as entertainment—and resistance to its potential impact on the body and mind (p. 276).

Reports of the X-ray performing miracles on previously incurable maladies, such as blindness, became common place in the early days of its use (Simon, 2004). Although doctors refuted these reports, many still believed that since the X-ray could penetrate and photograph parts of the human body, that it must have the capability to do the same to the mind. There were even reports of professors sending lessons to students through X-rays (Simon, 2004). The concern with X-ray vision led some to lament that it would lead to a lack of privacy and to the prospect of perpetual and unescapable publicity" (p. 279)." Much of the anxiety surrounding X-ray vision was due to a lack of knowledge of its capabilities and limitations. Developments in modern medicine helped to ease some of those concerns.

Furthermore, the X -ray became a metaphor for the ability to see through the surface of things. A poem in *Life* magazine in February 27, 1896 illustrates the feelings about the X-ray at this time:

> To a Fickle Miss
> Not worth your while
> That false sweet smile
> Which o'er your features plays:
>
> Thy heart of steel
>
> I can reveal
>
> By my cathodic rays (Howell, 1995, p. 144)

The author of this poem contends that "cathodic rays" can see through the "false sweet smile" of the "Fickle Miss" to reveal the "heart of steel." X-ray vision can

see through the skin of the body to illuminate bone structures and can also give the individual the ability to see through human masks and facades to understand the "truth" of someone's "heart."

The emergence of X-ray vision allowed doctors to see previously mysterious parts of the body. They were able to see within the body, penetrating the skin to see bone structure, and later, organs with the use of liquids and other substances. The X-ray, it must be remembered appeared along with several diagnostic medical tools in the nineteenth-century, indicating the limits of what it can expose. Microscopic objects, such as germs, viruses and bacteria cannot be seen with a simple X-ray. Even if we took an entire X-ray of the entire body, parts of it would still be unknown. Nonetheless, we can not dismiss its worth to diagnose illnesses and anatomical dysfunction. The X-ray illuminated foreign objects, such as bullets, within the body. On the surface, the patient may cry out in agony from pain in certain parts of the body. Yet, the X-ray is able to show the location of the foreign object, and from that location, doctors would be able to induce how that foreign object may affect the rest of the body. Furthermore, X-rays, with the help of liquids, also displayed cancers and other anatomical maladies. Liquids illuminated previously mysterious, hidden structures. Finally, through exposing the body to X-ray vision, doctors were able to generate standardized anatomical "stamps", highlight foreign objects, abnormalities, and standardize physiological features.

The relevance of the history of medicine in the mid to late nineteenth century to education is that it exposes the epistemological underpinnings of conceptions and justifications for the secondary school. The emphasis on the external features of the body as exhibited by the various medical groups illustrate the limitations of the physician and his/her reliance on the patient to tell the "truth" about him/herself and about the nature of his/her malady. Physicians at the Paris Clinic relied on corpses, autopsies, and practice with patients to verify and justify medical reasoning. They began the investigation into the anatomy of the body and its relationship to disease. Medical advances granted German physicians with the luxury of watching diseases as live entities, which allowed them to experiment with them to see how they interact with their environments and with other agents. The laboratory and X-ray (as well as other advances) gave physicians the tools they yearned for in order to see inside of the body. This enabled them to bracket the patient and to no longer rely on his/her account of the disease. The X-ray in particular allowed physicians to standardize the body and correspond later X-rays according to this version, and perhaps most important, Roetegen Rays functioned as a metaphor to know the truth of an individual's intentions and motives. Metaphors of medicine flowed quite easily as descriptors about the body, the mind, and temperament. Health and disease became factual, empirical, and objective. Knowledge could be stored, collected, calculated, and employed to diagnose and treat patients. Education witnessed a similar trajectory; from examining the outside of the finished, dead products (i.e. a composition), to a desire to see the inner workings of the mind of the child. Educators by the end of the nineteenth century had developed a way to begin the movement inward with the development of Child Study; but they would have to wait some eighty or so years before their laboratory,

microscope, and X-ray would appear (see chapter three). Nonetheless, the education literature is replete with references to medicine and medical metaphors to justify the need for secondary schools and to describe students and their relationships with teachers. Specifically, the portfolio is described as affording students with the opportunity to map their fingerprints in their writing. Not to preview too much here, but the reader may remember the concern for voice in the introduction. Voiceprints emerge from the epistemologies of fingerprints. Resurrecting its (thumbprints) offers insight into the game of power/knowledge in the writing portfolio.

PORTRAIT PARLE AND DACTYLOSCOPY

To measure and catalogue physical features of the body was not simply restricted to medicine. The 1880s in France witnessed a surge of immigrants and poor people from rural areas migrating to urban areas. These groups produced a criminal class that resembled a "true social wound" (Cole, 2001, p. 33). Initially, police officials expunged criminals under the warrant to never return to the city, but many criminals ignored these warnings and returned to the city. Criminal recidivism of pauper populations emerged as a problem for French jurists and municipal officials. Alphonse Bertillon, a young police station clerk, utilized lessons learned as a young man from his famous and astute father and employed tools and metrics of anthropology and demography to develop a system to recognize repeat offenders. Anthropometry, the measurement of size and features of the body, informed his approach to locating criminals and predicting potential criminal behavior. The Bertillon system, or Bertillonage, became the first method of identifying fugitives and felons.

Bertillon's approach comprised of eleven corporal metrics to compose a "portrail parle" or a "spoken portrait" (Cole, 2001, p. 47) of the individual. The trained examiner would measure the person's "height, head length, head breadth, arm span, sitting height, left middle finger length, left little finger length, left foot length, left forearm length, right ear length, and cheek width" (p. 37). He surmised that these eleven features would remain stable even in the face of wavering environment factors, such as aging. Examiners precisely measured and recorded each feature on a Bertillonage card, which also included open space to describe the individual such as the convicts "eyes, ears, lips, beard, hair color, skin color, ethnicity, forehead, nose, build, chin, general contour of head, hair growth patter, eyebrows, eyeball and orbit, mouth, physiognomic expression, neck, inclination of shoulders, attitude, general demeanor, voice and language, and habiliments" (e.g. clothing) (p. 37).

Additionally, Bertillonage supplied the necessary descriptive language to ensure examiner consistency. He produced, in short, the range of potential descriptors (i.e., normal, regular, average), and how each substinative feature becomes categorized. He brought language to the body through measurement to indicate criminality and recidivism. Bertillon, in short, textualized the body to claim that it can uncover and determine the truth about an individual's past, present and future

behaviors. The crime transformed into the criminal and defying orders to return to the city transformed into the *recidivistes* (Cole, 2001, p. 51). The anthropometric portrait built a case and sought to render the "complete reduction of human identity to a language of notations which could be organized and accessed at will" (Cole, 2001, p. 49). Judicial certainty occurred when two separate Bertillion cards matched. As Bertillon states, "Anthropometry, which is a mechanism for elimination, chiefly demonstrates non-identity, while the direct identity is established by the peculiar marks, which alone can produce judicial certitude" (Bertillon quoted in Cole, 2001, p. 45). He believed in the uniqueness of every individual, asserting that

> Nature never repeats herself. Select no matter what part of the human body, examine and compare it carefully in different subjects, and the more minute your examination is, the more numerous the dissimilarities will appear: exterior variations, interior variations in the body structure, the muscles, the tracing of the veins; physiological variations in the gait, the expressions of the face, the action and secretion of the organs, etc (Bertillon 1896, p. 13).

He believed it was this uniqueness that could "link criminal bodies to themselves across both time (from one arrest to another) and space (from one locale to another)" (p. 49). Bertillion individualized and totalized. As the French jurist Raymond Saleilles stated in 1898, "The criminal would thus be studied much as the botanist studies plants…classifying and subclassifying them as soon as a new variety is discovered" (Cole, 2001, p. 56). His desire to see his method universalized across international boundaries, however, fell short. His approach came under great scrutiny as others, even proponents of his approach, began to implement his methods. Charges of inconsistency and reliance on general features resulted in searches for alternative methods of certainty in criminal investigations, such as fingerprint analysis. So much so, that Bertillion and the anthropometric systems lost favor by the turn of the century. This was not until, however, criminologists, police chiefs, and educators in the United States commissioned the Bertillion method in their research and security apparatuses.

Prison reformers in the United States, specifically at the founding of the Wardens' Association for the Registration of Criminals in 1887, for example, believed that Bertillion's method served as a more human approach to muting recidivism. Copious information about repeat offenders would help wardens determine the frequency of offenses as well as personality traits of certain criminals, which would ultimately aid in reforming them.

> By seeking to know the real desert of every criminal brought up for sentence, by knowing his parentage, his more perceptibilities, physical structure, habits of life when not in confinement, the temptations he failed to resist, and the causes that have driven him into criminal pursuits (Cole, 2001, p. 55).

Bertillion gave criminologists and wardens the ability to rely on the prisoner for accurate accounts of his/her life and crime. The hope was that the system would

provide detailed germane knowledge about the prisoner so that a warden could guide the prisoner into a better way of life.

A modified version of the Bertillon system exported to the Bengal colony in 1892 when it soon fell into disrepute for the reasons described above. Fingerprint cards replaced the Bertillon cards as the primary method to garner certainty. Fingerprinting had already been a part of the colonial landscape in Bengal. William Herschel required local contractors to guarantee their work with an inked handprint replica and he later solicited thumbprints to guard against pension fraud. But, Herschel neither contained nor presented evidence to support his hunch about the uniqueness of handprints or thumbprints. Instead, he capitalized on their ignorance, on his colonial authority to perpetrate a colonial ruse. Herschel exerted an administrative maneuver to trick Bengalis into believing that their handprints reflected their identities, and that the body exposed fraud. Henry Fauld's research in Japan in the mid-nineteenth century with the handprints of a Gibralter monkey and humans of different ethnic groups initiated interest in fingerprints. Fauld's inquiry regarding the evolutionary implications of fingerprints in a letter to Francis Galton, Charles Darwin's cousin, which brought expedited research in fingerprinting. Fauld's hypothesized that every individual possesses a unique set of fingerprints and thus could be used to explain hereditary features, such as potentially identify criminals. Galton asserted that fingerprints were the "most valuable anthropological data" (Galton, *Finger Prints*, London: Macmillan, 1892, p. 2) developed a point-counting method of recognizing individual fingerprints, and devised statistical models to illustrate the impossibility of similar prints. A specific number of similar ridges determined the examiner's accuracy. Galton's ten-point standard for identifying latent fingerprints became the standard for Scotland Yard in the late nineteenth-century. The police bureau added latent finger print identification in its arsenal of anthropometry of criminal identification and prosecution. Moreover, much like Hershel's ruse, initially fingerprints were a strategy to evoke confessions rather than establishing proof. As Cole (2001) explains, "Paradoxically, the value of latent fingerprint evidence lay not so much in its telling the truth, as in facilitating another truth-telling mechanism, one which may have had even greater legal and social credibility: the confession" (p. 154). Latent fingerprint evidence did not face legal scrutiny, or used as definite proof of guilt or innocence until 1905 at the Deptford murder trial.

Latent fingerprints contributed to securing a guilty verdict of two brothers charged with killing a merchant during a robbery. Although skepticism persisted about the readability of latent fingerprints, the jury found them quite compelling. Herschel's method via Galton guided examiners in this case, and Fauld's critique focused on the statistical certainty of latent fingerprints and Galton's method itself. Fauld's claimed that Scotland Yard's assumption of fingerprint's uniqueness rests on a faulty premise. The ten-point classification system catalogues based on aggregated cards. Thus, Scotland Yard's belief that they could match fingerprints was based on the faulty notion that no two sets of fingerprints were the same. To claim that no single fingerprints were the same, Fauld reasons, the cards would need to be individually catalogued and thus disaggregated. Furthermore, Faulds

argues that in order to prove that a criminal left a latent fingerprint, the examiner would need to first begin with the possibility that the smudge was not a fingerprint at all. Hence, smudges and smears on glasses and furniture could occur from a whole host of other environmental elements. The ten-point method is too simplistic, based on dubious statistical models, and neglects to consider other features of both the fingerprint and the environment. The methodological rift between Fauld and Herschel continues to haunt criminologists to the current day as Great Britain maintains the counting method, while North and South America consider fingerprint analysis as more holistic. The latter group reviews the location, size, characteristics of comparable points, the pores, and the composition of the ridges themselves. Ridgeology collects both qualitative and quantitative data to render a decision while Dactyloscopy, or counters, targets specific comparable points between two fingerprints. Despite advances in fingerprint technology and establishment of training protocols of examiners, latent fingerprint analysis alone failed to give criminologist the certainty they so desperately craved.

Similar assumptions framed the use of anthropometry in intelligence testing. Mental Anthropometry investigated the relationship between various external features of the body in order to determine the individual differences in people's mental capabilities. James Cattell's research at Columbia University in 1890 serves as an examplar of this work. His mental test included measuring the following:

- Dynamometer Pressure, or strength of squeeze
- Rate of movement
- Sensation areas, or the minimum distance between two points at which the skin senses them as two
- Pressure causing pain
- Least noticeable difference in weight
- Reaction-Time for sound
- Time for naming colors
- Bisection of a 50 cm line
- Judgment of a 10 sec time
- Number of letters repeated on one hearing (Sokal in Sokal, 1990, p. 29).

Cattell's research sought to discover that degree of inter-relationship among various parts of the body, specifically the ability to predict one item to another and how fundamental human traits, such as sense, influence mental acumen. He believed that his research could potentially be "useful in regard to training, mode of life or indication of disease" (Cattell, 1890, p. 373). Cattell's vision for anthropometric tests designed to measure psychological traits and intelligences proved unfounded as studies employing his program showed no correlation between sense, physical abilities, and intelligence. However, Cattell's research illustrates how researchers utilized various features and functions of the body to determine internal characteristics.

CONCLUSION

It is this desire to understand the internal mechanisms of the student by designing complex, dynamic, and in the case of Cattell, random, matrices to calculate a truth, that consumed medical practitioners (and educational reformers) in the late nineteenth century. Doctors seeking to understand health and disease textualized the body to correlate the relationship between words and things. Anatomical abnormalities remained mysterious and elusive as technologies advanced. The will to know about the internal features, to draw conclusions based on those features, to catalogue health and disease stood as the great obsession of power/knowledge of the nineteenth century. Health as a smooth, functioning machine always on alert for excessiveness of both the mind and body expounded an unobtainable ideal predisposing the body to pathogens and disease. The desire to grip certainty of assertions about disease produced the opposite effect. Germ Theory, while outlining a scientific protocol for studying diseases, and for disproving spontaneous generation theory, illustrated that the potential for disease and corporal disequilibrium reside in the retail and corporate bodies. Rather than a squatter, pathogens nest and saturate life in its various forms. The discourses of the clinical autopsy and laboratory medicine disseminate throughout the discursive field. Correlating the frozen language of a composition to the student's abilities and diseases resembles an autopsy, while isolating life forms to experiment and manipulate diseases appears in the writing workshop and the portfolio. The ruse of fingerprints and the anatomical stamps conferred from X-rays reflect the desire of power/knowledge to individual and totalize compositions.

Writing becomes an instrument for students to anthropomorphise themselves, to subject themselves to the subjectification of various epistemological fields in the name of health. Child-study and writing pedagogy illustrate the terminal points of these epistemological demands based on a problemitization of the adolescent population. Governing of the self and others becomes a matter of pedagogy and health.

The epistemological underpinnings and transformation in medicine spread to educational discourse in the late nineteenth-century in the United States. The relationship between medicine and education is not causal, however, but merely paints the porous discursive field. Making sense of diseases and physiological abnormalities based on external features of the body dictated the sayable and knowable in medicine throughout much of this time period. A similar matrix exists in education specifically in relation to the production of compositions in secondary schools. The adolescent body as well as the compositional body as an agent of showing academic acumen remained through interpreting the skin. Furthermore, corporal content oppugn with a priori beliefs about disease and health. The physical body subsists in an alert state of constant fear of mental, physical, and emotional entropy.

Developments in medical technology and scientific approaches sanctioned physicians to occlude physiological inner life. Laboratory science replaced corresponding autopsies with demographic and remedies. Bacteriology and X-ray

technologies along with advances in criminology and intelligence revealed the will to know the internal dexterity and composition. Researchers yearned for signs, marks, and indications that could predict specific abnormal behaviors. Latent fingerprints and the Bertillon Card represent these desires. Additionally, the verification of fingerprints proved to be more of an art than a science. Smudges used to contest a criminal conviction reappear in the 1990s portfolio. In fact, proponents of the writing portfolio champion the smudge as an indication of the author's authenticity. Smudges no longer present doubt but certainty against the clever liar posing as someone else. The quest to authenticate a body and a self against impersonators and gender-benders remains a consistent theme of the field of writing pedagogy during the 1980s-1990.

Finally, the obsession with disease and a harmonious body as an indication of health could only lead reformers to magnify elements of disease to preserve order and re-route potential pathogens. Koch's method of isolating and testing certain diseases provided the scientific basis and epistemological structure to isolate and manipulate the bios of pathogens. A body replete with potential diseases demanded certainty about antidotes. In effect, the brief histories of various medical developments reappear in educational discourses in the 1980s and 1990s in the portfolio. Chapter two illustrates and elaborates on chapter one by examining the medical metaphors in the discussions about school reform of secondary education and specifically with regards to secondary English and composition studies.

CHAPTER 2

BLOOD, BONES, AND THE VERBAL BODY

> The man is above all else, the mind of the man, and not only the mind as an organ of conscious thought, but the mind as an organ of bodily nutrition, and the mind as a vast theater for the interplay of contending forces that do not always recognize the personal consciousness as their ruler (James J. Putnam, 1899, Lecture presented at the Massachusetts Medical Society).

Were it possible for the human mind to take cognizance only of that which it chooses, much of the misery of existence might be spared (Angell, 1900, Lecture presented at the American Neurological Association).

Edward B. Angell, a neurologist for the Rochester City Hospital lectured to the American Neurological Association in 1900 on the mental illness "Imperative Idea," or obsession. He reviewed past research and explained treatments that have proved most effective for patients with obsessive disorders. He conceded that the "normal mind" competes with "recurring words, phrases, emotions or ideas" (p. 430) that often intrude and disturb the "logical course of mental activity" (p. 430). Patients with Imperative Idea disorders, however, insidiously receive a "center" that is unrelated to his/her "mental needs at the moment" (p. 432), lacks the ability to resist it, and ascribes interpretations to his/her emotional state based on the presence of the "center." What distinguishes, Angell argues, obsession from dissociation and delusion is the relationship the patient forms with the intruding thought, idea, or image. Patients who suffer from dissociation repel, spurn, and even forget the "center". Angell claims that dissociation causes the patient to forget usually traumatic events. Delusional patients, on the other hand, adopt and incorporate the thought, idea, or image into their personalities.

Finally, patients suffering from obsession try to resist the disturbance, but the will proves no match against it. The patient's life becomes a "waking dream" (p. 432) where reality and identity are skewed. Angell claims that while the obsessive patient's physical body mends, his/her mind is destined to "limp through life prey to morbid notions and erratic impulses" (p. 434). Remedies are, therefore, at this time, underdeveloped and tentative. They include hypnosis, dissociation, and change of daily schedules and venues. He suggests that in many cases "it is necessary to take charge for a long time of the distempered mind, and by constant advice and oversight direct its activities into a normal and healthful channel" (p. 437). Long-term care is necessary, he asserts, because patients have a difficult time with treatment. Patients may yearn to take contrary action or construct alternative thoughts to the "center", but the obsession is so strong that remedies feel strange or odd for the patient. Angell argues however, that what can be done to

help “idiots and feeble-minded” (p. 436), can be done to aid the “degenerate or the weak-willed” (p. 436) through the “process of education” (p. 436):

> Much may be done through a process of education; by mental gymnastics; by efforts at fixing the attention; by arousing in the mind antagonistic ideas, or by association of absurdities with the imperative ideas, or by association of absurdities with the imperative idea, the principle of dissociation through substitution or division (p. 436).

Additionally, he predicts that such methods found in education will “enter” the “sanatorium”, but in the mean time he suggests instruments that induce pain on the surface of the body to promote stronger ability to endure emotional influences associated with the “center”, such as “the cold douche, static electricity or the faradic wire brush” (p. 437). The remedy suggested here presents an additional illustration of how physicians, in this instance, psychiatrists, manipulate the external parts of the body to remedy an internal malady. His recommendation neglected to cure the illness, but simply enabled the patient to endure the psychological or emotional pain.

The lectures given my Angell and Putnam exemplify how scientists personified consciousness via the brain and mind during the late nineteenth century. The brain (mind) existed as part of an entire matrix of health and disease. Thoughts, words, images, and sensations (emotions), and physiology were also intricate components of the matrix because they were the embodiment or manifestations of the operations of the body and mind. They mark, sign, and indicate the degree, the location, and space of fitness. Moreover, the notion that the mind competes with multiple entities indicates the difficulty it is to acquire a sane and rational mind. The mind is blasted with an inordinate amount of ideas, emotions, sensations, all of which threatens consciousness’s sovereignty. Producing a rational thought, a logical, well-arranged idea takes an incredible amount of energy. To do so would involve recognizing illogical ideas and swatting them away. Putnam’s lecture, in particular, highlights the fragility and instability of an individual’s consciousness, under constant threat of disappearing or of being usurped. A person’s identity is fluid, almost whimsical, thinly tethered to a composition of other words, images, and sensations. It was as if the waking hours consisted of chaos and disorder in a virtual battle royal between the forces of madness and sanity. Disorder and insanity reigns as sanity and order appear in fleeting moments of reprieve.

Angell’s lecture reveals the sneaky and destructive nature of obsessive disorder. The mind latches onto an intruder, who positions itself as a squatter in the center of the individual’s mind. The individual’s will to dispel the trespasser remains impotent. The obsessive center enters the mind as a thief who steals the person’s normal mental functioning. It is a microbe that infiltrates and spreads paralyzing the mind, the will, and rational thought. The individual is powerless against it as it rearranges reality and prevents the patient from taking combative actions to jettison it from the mind. Here, the individual’s mind is constantly subject to disease, to infections of the very same words, images, and sensations that it relies on to organize its thoughts and interpret its experiences. The mind stands in a continual

defensive posture against the three horsemen of insanity, delusion, obsession, and dissociation. These three tricksters remain on stage as the theatre of consciousness unfolds.

The mind tries to acquire equilibrium as it strives to avoid, fantasy, capriciousness and paralysis. Consciousness dodges and parries microbes of madness preventing them from calcifying and usurping control of the mind. The ability to forget at will proves to be a useful strategy. Forgetting aids the obsessive as it rids itself of the "center" and assists consciousness by demarcating competing interests; it allows consciousness to focus. To tame or corral words, images, and thoughts is a necessary endeavor, yet a dubious and perilous one. It was, however, the task of secondary teachers of English in the late nineteenth century. The ability to compose proper English indicated a pupil's ability to forget the pathological expressions so that robust English would win. Pupils learned the component parts of English to experience variations of expression.

The expeditious changes in medicine and medical education in the United States during the nineteenth century altered the epistemological landscape for ways of understanding the body, health and disease. As reformers strove to build a system of education, injecting secondary education in the flow, they employed many medical metaphors to justify claims about adolescents, curriculum, administration, college entrance examinations, and pedagogy. Educational reformers understood the relationship between teaching, learning, health and disease. The school-house held as much responsibility to produce a healthy individual as much as the local hospital (Rosenberg, 1987). Many educators assumed that adolescents arrived to school with multiple and various "diseases" that required remedies.

Pedagogical adjustments and curriculum designs focused on *Materia Medica*, or treatments for pathological conditions. Criticisms of Formalist pedagogical approaches served not just to allure more students to attend secondary schools, but refigured the relationship and role between the teacher and the student. The keen interest in writing, then, may be due to its potential to capture sane moments of rational thinking. Compositions disrupt the chaotic flow of consciousness and grant a time-out in the virtual battle royal with the characters of madness (e.g. delusion, dissociation, obsession). If the logic holds that the mind-physiology-temperament reflect levels and magnitude of health and disease, then writing serves an alleviative function. Habitual practice in composing essays gives adolescents the experience of healthy thinking and healthy living. On the converse, too, composition writing can expose pathological features (both overt and hidden) of the student's mind-physiology-temperament. The body remains in a state of constant alert for potential pathogens that could ferment hosts of diseases.

For the field of English education, the entity of concern was the "verbal body," or the mind, which included developing the pupil's proper temperament and rational mind, both of which reflected health and disease of the student (e.g. moral, physical), and the health and disease of the verbal. Kellogg (1893) describes the verbal body in the following manner:

> A thought can hardly be said to have come to its birth so that its thinker can grasp it, certainly not so that others can see it, till it has been incorporated in

> the verbal body of a sentence. The thought and its verbal expression can then hardly be dissociated, vary either and you change the other (p. 154)

The thought precedes the thinker through the sentence (i.e. syntax, semantics, context), which gets absorbed into the "verbal body." Kellogg anthropomorphizes expression as thought transforms into the thinker and the sentence fuses into the verbal body. He links the thought to the verbal body indicating they reinforce and reflect each other, and by default, link the thinker to the sentence. This latter articulation emulates the logic that the person is the sentence; hence a pupil who composes a crooked sentence and a disjointed person are the same. The ties between language, composition, order, thought and thinker to the perils of the insane mind and diseased body were tightly knitted at this time. Composition became an important part of the English curriculum because it was through writing or speech that teachers could influence and remedy the various diseases endemic in the student body.

Literature also played a part in writing pedagogy. Greene (1893) argued that a student's writing could improve after a "long and loving intercourse with the master spirits of our literature" (p. 555). But teaching writing became secondary to literature for most educators. Many of the conference reports focused on reading lists. Denney (1898) proclaims that "microscopic examinations" of literary texts is useless if pupils do not learn to write. He argues that English educators leave the most "difficult part of school" (p. 341) to "chance." Thus, this chapter focuses primarily on approaches and ideas related to writing. Writing as a mode of producing health and revealing disease. English educators possessed tools that could heal the body, but recognized their limitations in doing so. Like physicians, many educators yearned for the time when they would be able to watch the inner workings of the student's mind. English, specifically composition, became the primary tool for educators to see and treat the intricacies of pupil's mind; however, as this chapter demonstrates, the abilities of English to treat disease remained quite limited. English educators had to negotiate the delicate relationship among emotions, intellect, and expression.

THE BRAIN, PASSIONS, AND DISEASE

The mind became a measurable object in the late nineteenth century because, as many physicians reasoned, it existed in the organ of the brain. Thought, which existed in the mind, was a collection of cells that operated as an important part of the various systems of the body. Physiological, behavioral, nutritional, and dispositional changes affected the brain and thus thoughts in the mind. Disequilibrium in any of these areas had the potential to produce disease, or insanity. The causes of insanity could include indigestion, excessive work, excessive passions, or inappropriate behaviors. Additionally, although many physicians believed that insanity existed, they did not agree on its categories. William A. Hammond, a surgeon, proclaimed that an individual was either categorically sane or insane, while George M. Beard (1870) asserted that "There is no definite line where sanity ends and insanity begins. The question of insanity is

to imply a question of degree….All disease is partial disease; until we reach death, we are partly well" (Beard in Fellman and Fellman, 1981, p. 63). There is movement beyond phrenology. Tracing thoughts into compositions replaced tracking the ridges of the skull. The line between sanity and madness, however, remained tenuous. The more reformers pushed for rationalism, a rational mind as exhibited in essays, the more insane adolescents seemed to become. Composition emerged as both the cause and antidote of adolescent insanity. Studying the English language presented no match to the tricksters of madness. In fact, dissociation, delusional, and obsession employed English too, and possessed their own rational logic. To needle-thread the fine line between madness and sanity because a dubious endeavor.

Physiological, emotional, and behavioral imbalances could also be symptoms of disease. J. Milner Furthergill, for example, explains that "whenever from undue excitement of any kind, the passions are permitted to overrule the reason, the result is disease: the heart empties itself into the brain, the brain is stricken, the heart is prostrate and both are lost" (Fellman & Fellman, 1981, p. 62). Individuals contained the ability to prevent, induce, and cure mental diseases through good habits and moderation of the senses. Part of the reason for this view of mental disease is due to what Fellman and Fellman (1981) call the "mercantile of the self." They claim that late nineteenth-century views of insanity stem from a belief that the various organs and systems of the body operated with limited resources. Taking an excessive amount of blood from the heart, or causing it to work too hard, causes a depletion of energy and resources from the heart. Over-excitement, or nervousness, forces the body to over produce in one area while causing a depletion and exhaustion in another area. This dynamic creates disharmony in the body and exposes it to disease. Hence, the amount of knowledge that one could store and access was limited, and in order to acquire more knowledge meant the forgetting of other bits of knowledge. The ideal occurred when "waste and repair compensated one another in a rhythmic balance" (Fellman & Fellman, 1981, p. 71). The quest for continual harmony and a natural rhythm to life as indicators of a healthy mind, or sanity preoccupied physicians and educators during the late nineteenth century.

HEALTHY VERBAL BODY

Consistent with views of a healthy physical body, the verbal body acquires, maintains and manages its health through moderation, appropriateness, and care. The healthy verbal body should also be able to recognize, thwart, and cure itself from "noxious" speech (Kellogg, 1893). In general, reformers believed that a healthy verbal body is one that can express itself, but to do so in a clear, concise, rational manner. To show a rational mind, pupils needed to possess the following characteristics in their essays:

> To write well means: to spell correctly, to discriminate in the use of words, to arrange words in proper grammatical relation, to group sentences in a paragraph organized around a central thought or opinion, to co-ordinate half

> a dozen or more paragraphs so as to indicate, approximately at least, some evolution of the thinking faculty (Hart, 1894, p. 38).

Proper spelling, carefully coordinated words, sentences and paragraphs indicated a pupil's ability to understand and employ the rules of the language, and more important, to display one's ability to produce a healthy mind. Practice at producing compositions in this way habitualized healthy thinking. As Kellogg (1893) states, "For not more certainly does clear thinking beget clear expression than does clear expression demand clear thinking as a condition precedent" (p. 98). Hence, for many reformers, lucid, coordinated, and attentive pieces of writing represent a fit mind. As we learned above, a healthy mind and body were intricately linked for many during this time. And they were for educators, too. Kellogg (1893) states, "What growth of judgment and of taste this constant search after a fit body to fit head develops" (p. 98), and Edwin L. Miller (1896) describes the relationship between thought and language as "two legs of the body that may stand metaphorically for the human spirit" (p. 39). Each one providing markers of health or disease at any time. Moreover, as we will see below, many educators assumed that adolescents arrived to school with a pathological mind—one that was incapable of producing an expression of rational thought. However, to return to the features of a healthy verbal body, a key feature of a healthy verbal body is the ability to use contextually appropriate language.

Educators and physicians both had profound concern for mental over-exhaustion. It (mental exhaustion) appeared in many forms, such as cramming and excessive studying, and it led many to conclude that mental strife potentially damaged the body more than physical labor. Extremes of academic work become fertile ground for disease. As Atkinson (1897) claims, "Liability of disease is closely related to a weakened or to an accelerate growth" (p. 646). Physicians admonished educators who tried to force knowledge into students because they believed doing so would stunt the development of the entire brain, which could lead to poor mental habits and temperaments characteristic of patients in the asylums. Great mental strife would cause the body to flood much of its blood supply to the brain, which would lead to a diseased temperament, mind, and body. Additionally, physicians chafed against mental laziness, arguing that inactivity in the brain would lead to "crumble" and produce anxiety and nervousness. Thus, late nineteenth century physicians and educators linked together the functions of the body, the mind (thought), and emotional dispositions.

The primary disposition physicians and educators concerned themselves with was nervousness. How certain factors affected the flow of blood throughout the body indicated the status of an individual's temperament. As Fellman and Fellman (1981) state:

> Blood supply and nerve force were, in fact, analogous and almost interchangeable metaphors for the life-enhancing, vital forces in the body and the mind (p. 67).

Discharges of the blood, how often it flows to that area, and the speed at which it runs affects an individual's temperament and their exposure to diseases. Spending too much time in cognitive work exhausts the entire system and lends too much emphasis on the nervous system because excessive mental work produces nervousness and anxiety. For many physicians in the late nineteenth century, nervousness was the primary cause and indicator of mental illness. Nervousness had the potential to rapidly produce disease, and could lead to other, more serious forms of insanity later in life.

> One cause of the increase of nervous diseases is that the conventionalities of society require the emotions to be repressed, while the activity of our civilization gives an unprecedented freedom and opportunity for the expression of the intellect; the more we feel, the more we must restrain our feelings" (George M. Beard in Fellman and Fellman, 1981, p. 66).

Too much emphasis on cognitive development and not enough on physical development damaged the pupil and thus potentially impaired society in general. Referencing the French psychiatrist Pierre Janet (1859–1947) "It will be a precious discovery for psychiatry that will enable us to create forgetfulness at will" (Angell, 1900, Lecture presented at the American Neurological Association). James Sully (1887) in his book *Teacher's Handbook Of Psychology, On The Basis Of The "Outlines of Psychology* warned, "The nervous system is the part of the organism which is to be the chief theatre of the ruin with which the race seems likely to be overtaken" (p. 38). Taking a different perspective, Martin Luther Holbrook (1878) exclaimed that genius was a "nervous disease" in that it "can only exist where all the nervous tissue is occupied with one class of thoughts to the exclusion of another class, both of which are necessary to mental health" (p. 45). Whether nervousness stages the decline of man, or focuses on one subject at the expense of others, it preoccupied the minds of physicians and educators. Developing a healthy mind as well as a healthy temperament became a profound concern for reformers designing the secondary school.

Educators were not just interested in making sure pupils learned certain skills, but were concerned about helping students develop clear thinking, appropriate style, and proper dispositions. They clearly understood that schooling involved producing a subject, and a healthy one. The task for secondary education, then, was to develop a system, curriculum, and pedagogy that meandered through these ideas of mental health and insanity. As, George Aiton (1897) stated, "Give him (student) a healthy body and a healthy mind, fortify him with right ideas and the young student is a monarch in his own right against whom evil counselors cannot prevail (p. 60). Systems, organs, and functions of the body and mind were interchangeable. Although each discipline tackled this challenge differently, it was especially difficult for the secondary teachers of English. To their plight we now turn.

Most reformers believed that to provide pupils with a collection of rules and grammatical processes without illustrating how to use them in real world situations was inadequate. Chafes at formalist approaches to teaching grammar and composition, for example, dominated conversations about writing pedagogy. One

reason for skepticism about formalist approaches was that many recognized the fluidity of the English language (see further discussion about this point below). Yet, such fluidity of language necessitates teaching adolescents how to express oneself "easily and gracefully in a style appropriate to the matter in hand, part of all its changes, varying as these vary, is the acquisition to be coveted" (Kellogg, 1893a, pp. 97–98). English educators believed that pupils need to learn how to use different aspects of English in particular settings, and the writing done in other subjects could help with this aspect of teaching English. English usage in other subjects should "match the other as the palm and fingers of the right hand meet, and mate those of the left" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 162). Marble (1893), for examples, argues that "every recitation out to be made a study of English" (p. 202) because pupils could learn that important relationship between the "form and fitness of the expression" (p. 202). Teachers in all subjects should reject "vague language" because it reflects "vague thought" (p. 202), and should make the "careful attention to language" the consistent and unabated aspect of education. Marble's assertion, however admirable and perhaps incontrovertible, is not quite as easy as it seems. In his same article, he claims that teaching students to compose contextually appropriate essays requires "much observation and practice, and a delicate sense of fitness" (p. 202), and requires moderation. For him, as with many English educators, appropriateness equates with moderation. He explains, "A taste too fastidious in the use of language makes the style still and stilted" (p. 2020). Thus, a fit verbal body is one that can match the appropriate words, sentences, paragraphs, and style for the particular written form, and shows thought in a clear, well-arranged order.

For some educators, appropriateness is a "test and measure of his [sic] culture", or the pupil is "known by the English he keeps" (Kellogg, 1893a, pp. 98), for others, it gives students an antidote to their diseased thoughts by habitualizing sane, rational thinking. However, what is apparent from the examples given above is that learning to write, and perhaps more importantly composition studies, is that how a student writes and the content of his/her compositions indicates more than his/her skills. Writing enacts dispositional qualities, characteristics of a pupil's thinking, and reflects his/her mental hygiene. Thus, for many educators, embodiment became the primary purpose for teaching composition in the secondary school.

> What subtile distinction between words and what care in placing them are demanded to create a verbal body that shall fitly incarnate the thought within, and be its apt and adequate expression! What growth of judgment and of taste this constant search after a bit body to fit head develops! What added power of lucid and correct thinking a struggle for luminous and accurate expression gives! For not more certainly does clear thinking beget clear expression than does clear expression demand clear thinking as a condition precedent. And what a troop of useful, everyday virtues this ceaseless striving to say the fitting thing fittingly nourishes—accuracy, truthfulness, painstaking, thoroughness, patience, justice! (Kellogg, 1893a, p. 98).

Embodying the elements of composition was an important theme for English educators during the late nineteenth century. In this literature, distinct relationship between the physical body, the mind, and the components of composition persisted. Greene (1893), for example, claims that pupils need to first learn a specific "class of words" intimately as they (pupils) know their "own faces" and "hearts" (p. 549). Additionally, he claims that students need to develop a relationship with them so that they (words) may appear on their "tongues" immediately. Embodiment of language involves instilling in the pupil a specific list of words that constitute the "inner circle of intimate indwellers of his mind" (p. 549) and teaching them how to use them. Implicit in his claim is that these new words replace the class of words many pupils learned on the streets or at home. Teachers of English compete with slang and other "harmful" word, so the challenge is to encourage practice, or "embodying this knowledge and working it into his practice (Kellogg, 1893, p. 156) with a different group of words. Doing so gives students a "gill-hold" on them so they (words) don't "slip through their intellectual fingers" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 157). In addition, when students embody language, s/he is more apt to look beyond the mere form, and perceive the immaterial essence (Marble, 1893, p. 202), which helps the adolescent appreciate it (language). As Marble (1893) explains,

> The student may study grammar indefinitely, but he will never really know grammar till he has used the language; and it is better for him to study the grammar in his language than to attempt to learn the grammar and then to conform his language to it. He may study rhetoric for years without appreciating fully what it is, unless he has put its principles in practice in actual writing;–not merely in inventing examples, and dissecting the examples of other people, which is generally worse than a waste of time (Marble, 1893, p. 206).

Pupils should be encouraged to perform speech as opposed to mimicking or regurgitating rules. They must be "doers" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 155) of English and apply what they learn to personal experiences. A healthy verbal body contains order, structure, proper usage, and voice. When students obtain the habit of producing a robust composition, they protect themselves against the "noxious" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 99) language of their parents and friends. Pupils provide their own antidotes to diseased speech, which makes it less likely for infection and decay. Finally, learning how to compose proper English teaches pupils how to appropriately use of emotions. Thurber (1900) proclaims that students cannot appreciate the "treasure of English" without intellectual or emotional acquisition" (p. 133). He contends that acquiring knowledge depends upon the amount of emotional energy the student commits to his/her studies. Their efforts at writing compositions, arranging and organizing ideas and thoughts, offers the pupil with the opportunity to manage his/her emotions. The healthy verbal body, however may have been just an ideal. Many teachers believed that students appeared at their classes with pathological speech.

CHAPTER 2

TEACHERS, PHYSICIANS, AND PATHOLOGISTS

Traditional approaches of teaching quickly gave way to calls for more dynamic and engaging pedagogical strategies. The "old" ways of teaching where "little was given and that little was thoroughly digested" (Atkinson, 1897, p. 651) represented a view of teaching and learning that had passed. By the final decade of the nineteenth century, many educators argued that advances in science compelled them to alter their views of the adolescent. Direct observation and intuition became the primary pedagogical strategies to engage with a "growing organism" (Jacob, 1897, p. 379) rather than constructing a "stately building" (p. 379). This change in perception of the student altered the ways in which teachers design their instruction, and how teachers prepare to teach. Instead of feeding "same mental food" (Atkinson, 1897, p. 650), which breeds "deformity" (p. 650), teachers must learn to study the individual student as s/he relates to objects and other individuals in order to shape and mold his/her "untamed spirit" (p. 378). If knowledge is to nurture the adolescent body, it must be fed to different students differently. The notion that each pupil contains individual unique talents and learning abilities prevailed during this time. Furthermore, the epistemologies of microscopic medicine appear here to indicate the necessity of isolating individuals in order to observe how they behave in natural settings, and to manipulate and experiment with them in order to witness their disease potential. Thus, teachers need to develop their abilities to "prescribe" (Atkinson, 1900, p. 381) and implement the most efficacious remedy for each individual student. Teachers need to learn everything they can about the student, including their home-life, how they spend their leisure time, and previous learning experiences in order to individualize instruction. Teachers, similarly to physicians, participated in "man-building" (Atkinson, 1900, p. 381) where matters of health and disease dominated. The logic of isolating and cataloguing various aspects of the adolescent's life resembles Koch's method (Chapter One) of determining specific diseases through isolation. Once specific bacteria can be identified and intricately understood, then quiescent antidotes can be found.

Many educational reformers believed that young, pre-adult pupil entered the secondary school already diseased and suffered from nervousness, but which individual pupil is nervous, to what extent, and the causes of his/her nervousness remained a matter of interpretation. Teachers study the "science of human character" (Atkinson, 1900, p. 381), which involves drawing inferences from both the physical and mental state of the student.

> If the inner life of some of our pupils could be known, and their physical and mental development observed and recorded, how many so-called dull pupils would become interesting, and the teaching of them, inspiring (p. 647).

Documenting growth prevents over or under exposure to academic work and will maintain a healthy mental and physical body as "every psychic process has it correlative in the physiological process" (Atkinson, 1897, p. 648). Nineteenth Century reformers sought ways to "know" the inner-life of the adolescent. The

logic, one similarly made on behalf of Germ Theory, once the physical and mental life of the agent is completely knowable, then it can be manipulated, experimented with in order to protected it from disease. If teachers could acquire this crucial information (i.e. inner-life), then they could individualize instruction and "inspire" them. The term inspire is an important one. The etymology of inspire is Middle English, to breathe upon or into. To breathe proper English into the pupil reflects the reformers will to know in order to combat madness and disease. Reforms express similar desires below when they wish to vaccinate children with good English. English educators acknowledge that English is in the "air" and is thus prone to pathogens, thus the aspiration to breathe or vaccinate illustrates their interest not simply in producing a proper citizen, or a good solder, but to yield an adolescent body capable of negotiating the hazardous pitfalls of an uncertain world.

The primary task of the teaching profession, then, was training individuals who possess a strong understanding of their content, who can design curriculum and pedagogy, and who can read individual student's temperament to engage them. But not necessarily in that order, as Atkinson (1897) explains.

> If we ever become a profession it will be by the development of a psychological intelligence; in other words, by the evolution of an intuitive power which will lay bare the mind of the pupil. Then the success of a teacher will be judged by his ability to diagnose individual mental conditions and prescribe intelligently and sympathetically variations of treatment. When this good time comes, and it is surely coming, although not in a day, we will not have so many mental abortions—minds failing to attain to maturity because unduly pressed and rubbed out, of flattened down (Atkinson, 1897, p. 648).

Content knowledge, curriculum design, and pedagogical acumen rank secondary to developing "intuitive power." This psychological trait conceivably will "lay bare" the student's mind and prevent "mental abortions", or those that fail to reach maturity, or dull, due to either over or under use. If teachers can develop this ability, then they would be able to "diagnose" and "prescribe," such as physicians. Much like the physicians in the nineteenth century, they relied on external features and products on which to base their pedagogical judgments and decisions. The hope for the teaching profession aligned similarly with the hope of physicians. Teachers would be granted legitimacy when they developed particular peculiar abilities that would render the body (mind) categorically knowable. What's more, the teacher, like the physician would be able to use acquired knowledge from the autopsy or the laboratory in practice with real patients (students). The teacher must learn to isolate characteristics of individual students and implement a treatment that cures or ameliorates the student's mental deficiencies. Writing functions as an instrument to strip the student's mind, deliver it naked to the intuitive teacher who can pinpoint maladjustments and rehabilitate them. Preparing teachers became vital to reforming secondary education.

The main concern with the teacher's character is that disease is pervasive and if a teacher models pathological behaviors or emotions, s/he perpetuates the disease and infects his/her students. Nightingale (1896) nosology of diseased temperaments reflects the concerns of many. He asserts that diseases can appear as the "dyspeptic" teacher, who is a "maniac", the "wizen-souled, torpid-livered man or women", and the "boorish" one whose "taste for the graceful and the beautiful has not been developed. These "patients" should not be permitted to be secondary school teachers. He asserts that

> In the very breeze that fans us as we walk the streets may lurk the bacteria of disease as well as of health. It is equally true and equally demonstrable, and without the aid of a microscope, that every person carries with him an atmosphere of good or evil, and far more eloquent and infinitely more impressive that all his precepts and all his professions, is the silent influence of his daily example (p. 136).

The ideal teacher, in fact, resembles the ideal student.

> The real teacher will always be a student. He will not spend his years in riotous living, his evenings in social pleasures, nor his leisure in flattering his own conceit by writing books for an already congested market. He will be furnished with an ever increasing library of his own, he will be a patron of the public library if one is at hand; he will be a social power in the community where he lives, the inspirational center of every literary circle, and more than a Delphian oracle to all the young people around him (Nightingale, 1896, pp. 134–135).

Thus, concerns about the health and disease potential of the teacher reflected a larger concern about the nexus between the body and education. Reformers did not simply advocate for teachers to possess stronger understanding of their content, or that they develop a plethora of teaching strategies. Their primary concern revolved around the potential for a pathological "silent influence" on the pupil. The ideal teacher models pure living that breathes life into the school and community. Physiological temperament correlated to physical conditions, and if the teacher plans to guide adolescents, s/he maintains a healthy constitution and remains alert to possible abnormalities. They must do so in order to indentify and remedy them in their pupils.

THE PATHOLOGIES OF ADOLESCENCE

> "…the whole system and course of education shall be made a ministry of health and cure" (Granville, 1882, p. 20).

Adolescence was still undefined in the late nineteenth century. Metaphors used to describe them were numerous. William H. Burnham (1897) claimed that adolescents were "pioneers and adventurers" who can exhibit "self control," but are, in general, rebellious, and are experiencing a period of "self-revelation"

(p. 659). Mortimer-Granville (1882) describes them as boy-man and girl-womenhood, while John Dewey (1896) described adolescence as the "natural age of introspection" (p. 9), when the adolescent discovers him/herself and adjusts the self to others. A common sentiment, however, during this time, was the notion that individual adolescents develop and learn differently. However, the lack of clear understanding of what constituted an adolescent reflected a larger fear in the social world. New ideas, new medical advancements, and new technologies contributed to the anxieties many felt in the late nineteenth century. To create a secondary school for a group of children not tangentially defined and characterized represented further evidence of the disintegration of society. To try to make sense of this group of children, educators began with the most immediate place: their bodies. As Fellman and Fellman (1981) contend, "People surely were eager for individual blueprints with social overtones by which to delimit and evaluate those elements of the world which they could touch—their own physical selves for a start" (p. 15). In addition to being the most immediate thing people could "touch," it also reflected an individual's temperament and health. The three topics that will be discussed are moderation, mental strain, and the will.

The physical, mental, and emotional health of the young-adult entering secondary school arrived with suspicion. Although definitions and descriptions of adolescents varied during this time, the general consensus among education assumed that they lived at the extremes, possessed scattered, potentially deranged minds, prone to immoderation (i.e. diet, sleep, exercise, temperament), experiencing new, unbridled sensations and energies that needed to be harnessed and managed, were inattentive, impatient, frequently lazy, easily bored, nervous, and at a high risk of spreading disease. A population with these characteristics could only be described as "special." As Albert Bushnell (1893), teachers are put in schools "…like doctors, to take people as we find them, and to make the best that we can out of everyone. A good physician treats a weak and sickly child as one requiring special attention" (p. 13). The body of the adolescent arrived at school as a diseased one, one that required special attention. Buschnell's description as "sick" is important here, because he was not simply referring to the physical body. Conceptions of health in the mid to late nineteenth century linked physical body with temperament and mental acumen. A pore of disease in anyone of these three indicated a flaw in one or many of these areas. To be more specific, the body breaks down into the systems (digestive, reproductive, and nervous systems), temperament is reflective of one's attitude (i.e. cheeriness), and mental acumen reflects one mental abilities. The three systems of the body directly influence the other two (mental and temperament).

The prevention of mental diseases became paramount in the late nineteenth century, and the relationship between medicine and education was pronounced. Morel and Henderson (1899) begin their article on preventing mental diseases by proclaiming that bacteriology and hygiene prove the importance of early intervention of various diseases, including "mental maladies" (p. 72). Observation provides only partial evidence of mental disease, instead, they argue, that physicians need to probe into the lives of children, including their relationships to

their parents, to fully understand the various influences of mental disease. The most pervasive disease among children is nervousness, such as "chorea, hysteria, epilepsy, hypochondria, neurasthenia" (p. 73). Nervousness needs to be confronted at its earliest signs, which include sleeplessness, irritation, and masturbation. They claimed,

> We should kindle affection for comrades and for animals, and repress egoism by all means. All precautions are necessary to conduct the child toward the education suitable to its nature. We must consider the fact that some children are precocious and are instructed with ease, while others are dull, slow, and interested in nothing. Both species of children must be regarded in mental pathology (p. 74).

Identifying a child and providing the necessary remedy for him/her can be tricky business. Morel and Henderson claim that even the "least emotion, ghost stories, hints of robbers, may produce irremediable evil" (p. 74). However, to aid in preventing mental disease, they assert that education can play a key role. Education of the child should not involve the formal ways of teaching that were dependent on memory and regurgitation, but should include "all the constituent parts of his being" (p. 75), and nervous students, and those predisposed to it, should be "guided in their early youth, as soon as any disturbance or irregularity presents itself in the course of their studies and education" (p. 77). Education needs to encompass the physical, mental, moral, and sensory components of the pupil's body. Additionally, teachers and parents need to honor the "natural tendencies of youth" (p. 76) and respect their decisions regarding whether to attend college or enrol in a trade school. The teacher should try to discover the student's "bent" (p. 77) and guide him/her along their chosen track.

Another cause of mental disease is masturbation. Morel and Henderson (1899) contend that pupils with low academic skills and unmoral behaviors are predisposed to masturbation. Their caution against the spread of masturbation in schools resembles what was known about micro-organisms in the spread of disease:

> But when many children are crowded together, the contagion of masturbation is much to be feared. One child instructs another in this vice, and a few bad spirits are enough to infect a whole school among the pupils who are ignorant of the terrible and dangerous consequences of masturbation. It is the imperative duty of the director of an establishment to keep his eyes open to repress this evil; and it is the duty of the parents to inform the teachers of the vices of their own children; and on both sides it is important to point out to vicious pupils the diseases to which they make themselves liable. The physicians also have a part to play in these circumstances, because the young people frequently have more confidence in their word than in the advice of parents and teachers (p. 79).

Finally, they advocate for balance in a child's life as a safe measure against mental diseases. Unhappiness is a predisposition to madness, and thus children should

avoid physical exhaustion, avoid temperature extremes, get plenty of sleep, and schedule limited hours to study. The adolescent, according to Morel and Henderson, need to be watched very closely because "the phenomenon (insanity) are more frequently manifested" (p. 80). Nervousness occurs due to the sudden spark of "internal and external excitement" (p. 81), and thus great strains should be made to prevent it at all costs. Proper guidance into a chosen field will ameliorate nervousness. For Morel and Henderson, the nervous system of the pupil's body is the most important feature to monitor and educate. Proper temperament developed in schools, with the aid of parents and physicians, can prepare adolescents to manage the difficulties in life.

The challenges facing secondary English teachers were greater than other disciplines because pupils arrive to the secondary school with a lot of experience using English. Unlike Algebra, for example, where "the soil of his (student) mind is virgin…and the teacher can thrust in his spade at the start and sow his seed at once (Kellogg, 1893a, p. 99), pupils have been using English all of their lives. They are tainted, many have been exposed to pathogens, or microbes that have either produced diseased language or dormant ready to be activated with the right combination of environmental and physiological conditions. In fact, Thurber asserts that children learn English "unconsciously" and that his/her English "takes care of itself", but is nonetheless an "exact correlate of the general mental content" (Thurber, 1900, p. 132). The secondary English teacher, as Kellogg (1893) laments, reforms and remediates, they begin their teaching in a deficit. The verbal bodies of most adolescents, then, are grooved, fashioned, fixed with habitual ways of expression. They are a collection of unhappy "accidents" that need mending. Secondary English teachers have to "make comely the uncouth in these productions, organize the inchoate, pile the heap, give definiteness to the vague, clear the obscure, tidy the slovenly, freshen up the tame, fill in the jejune, articulate aright the disjointed and the misjointed (Kellogg, 1893, p. 159). As Kellogg states, "The expenditure of energy is enormous—a pound of cure where, if it could have been administered, and ounce of prevention would have sufficed" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 152).

Yet, the English educator cannot control the prevention, s/he can only seek the cure. And, adolescences is the most important time to aid young men and women with proper expression as educators believed that they will "cease learning new words by the age of twenty-one" (Green, 1893). These pathologies of English exist in a double-bind. On the one hand, they necessitate English as a staple in the secondary education curriculum, and on the other, they illustrate the impossibilities of amending the verbal body. Kellogg (1893) illustrated the difficulty when he stated, "If only we could vaccinate children against vicious English; if only in their infancy we could get good English blood into their veins and good English phosphates into their bones so that they might grow up hale and robust of speech! (Kellogg, 1893, p. 152). The diseases of the verbal body produce and delimit the healthy one. Barring vaccination, the remedies are discussed in the next section.

The one constant among every post-grammar school student is that they have experience with and knowledge of English. The pervasiveness of English was both

a blessing and a curse. It was a blessing because it helped to legitimize English as an important subject to study; it was a curse because it was prone to disease. In fact, the logic of disease stood as the always-already of adolescence. Remedies varied for improving adolescent's use of English. Kellogg (1893) argued that the earlier educators "straighten the crooked sprouts" (p. 153) of disease, the better prepared the student would be when s/he entered secondary school. He also argued that textbooks were littered with poor English usage and were encouraged a "dire monotony of expression" (1893a, p. 104) and their "ill-digested the thought, careless the paragraphing; and what execrable spelling and capitalization, hit-or-miss punctuation, absence of selection in the words taken, and slovenliness in the sequence of words, phrases, clauses, sentences! How clumsy, uncouth, inchoate the whole production" (Kellogg, 1893a, pp. 101–102). As Greene (1893) states, "Too often far, the young man enters college still unacquainted with pure English speech. Most of the errors of his boyhood abide with him, mixed with others learned since, and a jumble of rules that confuses all…" (Greene, 1893, p. 550). Thus, by the time students leave secondary school, their knowledge of English resembles an historical mixture of words, rules and errors that results in confusion. Part of the trouble for English educators was that many believed that it was difficult to alter those "boyhood influences. Those deficiencies are "like a cut they leave a permanently visible scar, like a disease they forever enfeeble the organ affected" (Kellogg, 1893a, p. 101), and once the insidious influences infect the body, "the natural order of mental development has been wrenched out of joint, and the harm can never be repaired (Greene, 1893, pp. 550–551). Teaching English appeared to be a losing battle, but reformers understood their foes, and recognized that growth toward independent, autonomous thinking able to combat irrational thoughts was the best they could hope for.

Learning proper English involved "growth." Stated another way, "The twig is bent, and the future tree all but hopelessly inclined, when the pupil first comes into our hands. Before we can sow and harrow in the seed of good English, we must dig out the stumps of ugly habits that preoccupy the ground (Kellogg, 1893a, p. 98). Teachers, in many respects could only hope for mild improvements in their student's abilities to write well because growth included "diseased growth" and "irregular (Gleason, 1893, p. 302). Teachers assumed that students arrived to school with poor habits of speech, and they appear like "scars" or, as permanent and intractable marks that would endure despite the teacher's best efforts.

English educators fought, in many ways a losing battle against the many forces of misuse. Despite the deleterious influences from parents and peers, and the adolescent's blemished verbal body, educators argued that teachers should be held responsible for a student's grade. Like a "physician", who oversees the patient's well-being, the teacher is held accountable for the pupil's performance. The child, according to Search (1900) has the "divine right to healthy normal progress" (p. 225). Many educators would not contest his last point, but they may have difficulty swallowing his first one. Too many variables influence the student's success in an English classroom, and, more important, composing a correct piece of writing was

a trying endeavor. What further distressed English educators about teaching composition were the conditions and impediments of the English language.

DISEASES OF ENGLISH CORPUS

Many English educators assumed the existences of a pure English, many students did not acquire it, and many teachers did not know how to use it. Thus, disease was inherently embedded in English. Much like perceptions of a healthy body, healthy use of language reflected equilibrium, balance, and self-control were key characteristics for many English educators. Too much or too little usage may cause or reflect disease. Moreover, a sense of pure English protected the individual from "accidents" of expression. A standardized form of English guided English educators on the taming of chance (Hacking, 1990). As stated in chapter one, in moments of great change, people turned to their most immediate object to control: their bodies. And for many English educators during the late nineteenth century they tried to control the adolescent's verbal body. Writing properly represented the ability to create health, and reflected the extent the diseased body was becoming cured. English educators assumed, that sanity and insanity existed on a continuum, and that every body (verbal) consisted of microbes and was thus only partially healthy. The trick was to establish a school environment where the tools of English could remedy the body. The limitations of English, however, were quite substantial. Furthermore, dissociation, delusion, and obsession used the same linguistic tools and rationalities as the healthy mind. The difficulties with producing a healthy verbal body, perhaps, had more to do with the limitations of English than pedagogical approaches to teaching composition.

The corpus of English, as a discipline with specific skills and concepts, is prone to accidents, to being improperly used, within its very system, it is prone to disease. In the case of English, disease has the potential to flare up at anytime. Inappropriate usage, represents an unclear, illogical mind, and a diseased body. The notion that typical expression occurred by accident did not sit well with educational reformers during a time of radical changes to the economic and social fabric of the United States during the late nineteenth-century. Greene (1893) writes that the style of most people is "stilted, or it is commonplace; it is verbose or obscure; it is the natural result of no painstaking, or of effort misapplied in the capital matter of English style" (Greene, 1893, p. 548). Excessiveness at certain times in certain places, a lack of clarity in other places, stilted or jammed. English usage is out of rhythm, cacophonous, and jammed. It has gout, dyspepsia, and disease. Part of the reason many believed that the body of English was prone to disease is because they understood that mastering the language was impossible. Language was an invention, subject to "human infirmity and human caprice" (Emerson, 1897, p. 132). As such, even teachers of English are prone to inappropriate usage. As Kellogg (1893a) explains, "Who of us has not, when occasionally he has seen himself in the mirror of some one else's better English, been startled at some instance of his own ignorance. Happy is he if he has been startled out of it as well as startled at it! (pp. 100–101). The English language was

a living entity and constantly changing. Teachers and administrators did now always use proper English, or where ignorant of specific elements of the language, which subsequently rendered the teaching of proper English a difficult task. Proper English usage combated poisonous elements in an analogous way as germs transport pathogens.

The theme that English is or should be "in the air" was prevalent during this time. To position English as gases in the atmosphere indicated that it (English) could be both disease and cure for improper usage. As Thurber (1900) explains, "The child learns his English unconsciously. His English takes care of itself" (p. 132). As such, improper usage can be contagious and should be considered "dangerous" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 162). Thus, to learn proper English, pupils need to be draped in it throughout their school day. Aiton argues that the approach should be "aggressive" so that it will defeat "evil" to render them "dumb and powerless" (p. 162):

> We dread the presence of miasma. We loathe contagious disease, but do we fully realize that in the presence of air and sunlight and pure water and proper temperature the dread microbe is powerless? (p. 163).

He asserts that "pure" English taught at the appropriate level renders microbes impotent. Doing so allows the pupil to expand his mind and his ability to use English. As Thurber (1900) concludes, "if his intellect, his heart, make gains, his language also makes gains (p. 132). The problem, however, is that English contains both the pathogens and the antidotes simultaneously; the trick, it seems, is for teachers to distinguish healthy rational thoughts from irrational ones. Koch's method of isolating pathogens proves helpful here in that confining specific linguistic or mental maladies from others allows teachers to prescribe specific antidotes to particular diseases. What's more, documenting the inner mental and physical lives of adolescents along with specific maladies generates a body of pedagogical knowledge about adolescents. Despite the challenges, teachers need to be the "air", "sunlight", "pure water", and "proper temperature" for their pupils.

In addition to competing with multiple influences of speech, secondary English also competed with other foreign languages for a premium spot in the secondary curriculum. Because many educators believed that adolescents arrive to school with significant verbal deficiencies, they contested the relevance of learning languages such as Latin. Greene (1893), for example, argued that if schools cluttered a young person's mind with "sesquipedalian vocables", s/he would never learn to write proper English, and it would take a herculean effort to "purge his mind of this rubbish and fill the emptied chambers with right words" (p. 549). More important for Greene, when a young person tries to compose an essay, s/he will discover that the "body of the fabric is already fixed by a succession of educational accidents" (Greene, 1893, p. 550), lending the student no variation for expression, and thus stifled. Furthermore, studying foreign languages such as French and German for a couple of years in high school would not be as fruitful as close study of English,

> It would be far better to devote the time to the systematic study of English. The poorly mastered French or German will soon drop out of their lives, while proper English study will be fruitful in every mental life capable of bearing any fruit at all (Keyser, R.S., 1893, p. 136).

Regarding English instruction, combating poor English usage and instilling proper usage was no easy matter. Educator submitted multiple suggestions and ideas about how to education the post-grammar school child. As Hart (1894) points out, "The educational world appears to have awakened from its lethargy, to have discovered suddenly that it has been wandering from the safe path, and to be inquiring anxiously, "what are we to do? Things are in frightful disorder. Where is the remedy?" (Hart, 1894, p. 36–37). Hart complains that while many university presidents and professors contend that their enrolled students lacked the ability to write well, they could not "put the finger right on the root of the evil and say, Here it is and here it must be cured" (Hart, 1894, p. 37). Yet, that is precisely what secondary English teachers had to do. They had to develop strategies to locate the "evil" and develop a "cure" for it. While indifference persisted regarding the ability of secondary schools to prepare young men and women with the skills to succeed in college, and many students remained "incapable of penning a thesis, a report, even a letter that will not set the reader's teeth on edge (Hart, 1894, p. 37), secondary English teachers struggled to develop methods to help adolescents compose proper English, and if "Error does not die of lockjaw if she but scratches her finger," while "Truth may get well if she is run over by a locomotive" (Kellogg, 1893, p. 152), the life and death struggle between Truth and Error is especially contentious in English where the life of Truth is quite fragile.

PRODUCING REFLEXIVE BODIES

The limitations of English, its prone to misuse and disease, and the demands made on adolescents at school and at home remained at the forefront of educators as they developed pedagogies for composition. One would assume that they would privilege more formalistic approaches, the recitation, for example, or repetitive drills. But archival research reveals that many educators believed that learning how to write properly involved the lives and personalities of students, and many educators severely criticized formalistic, or the "so-called orthoepist" (Emerson, 1897, p. 135) approaches and even made illusions to issues of health.

> To require an active pupil to sit largely passive through the long recitation is bad enough indeed; but when this pupil rushes to school in the morning, half fed, because of inadequate time to breakfast, and then drags through five hours of sometimes unrelieved torture, to return home too late for the comfortable meal which others of the family have had, and then to be forced to do desultory study amidst the distracting circumstances of home life or by bad light through many evening hours, the situation, it seems to me, has little apology to offer to an intelligent board of health (Search, 1900, p. 226).

Additionally, formalist approaches for many educators sapped the life out of writing, decontextualize it, and rendered it limpid (Emerson, 1897). Teaching writing through memorization, imitation, and rules had more to do with disciplining the classroom than it did teaching the student (Kellogg, 1893). Thurber (1897) likens students in formalists classrooms as prisoners who receive no feedback from the teacher, which produces feelings of isolation, alienation, and futility. Thus, in order to teach composition well, teachers need to make sure that students have a "well-furnished mind conscious of having something to say" and a "a listening or reading public to which this something may be said with the hope of giving pleasure" (p. 12). Educators believed that learning composition should reflect life. As Barbour (1898) explains,

> If ever any spontaneity, freshness, life, power, are to find their way into the written pages of our high-school boys and girls, it will be when they write upon subjects in which they take a natural and lively interest, subjects suggested by their environment, their experiences, their investigations, their imagination, their reading,–subjects, finally upon which they have grown more or less eager to express their thoughts. The primary requisite to effective expression of a thought is to have a thought that you want very much to express (p. 503).

The logic here is that if teachers permitted students to compose essays on personally-relevant topics, students would be more likely to spend the necessary time to organize their thoughts, present them proportionally, or with equilibrium, reflect and revise drafts, in order to secure order to them (thoughts). The composing process accords students with the experience of forging harmony from chaos, symmetry to confusion, and regulation to jejune. Furthermore, many believed that as a language, English was not "logical but conventional" (Emerson, 1897, p. 133), and emerged through both "natural or artificial influences (Emerson, 1897, p. 133). Writing compositions had to matter to pupils and they had to contain matter, or relevant substance. Another reason to include the student's personal interest in the writing classroom is because as stated above, writing involved growth. As Marble (1893) claims, the "basis of all study of English should be the child's, or the student's own language by which he has expressed thought;–to show that the growth should be from within" (p. 209).

The Preparatory Course in English (1897) report also endorsed permitting students to write about personal interests. It argues that doing so provides students with the materials so they can write a composition, and can also serve as the basis for organizing it (composition). Other writers made similar claims. Kellogg (1893) argues that personal material can inspire students to organize their writing into a collection of coordinated and sub-coordinate heads and points, or into an outline. The outline serves as the "skeleton", or "framework" (p. 156) for the paper. Organizing his/her "jejune", the student recognizes how "fruitful of thought seemingly sterile subjects become under this treatment" (p. 156).

Finally, Emerson (1897) asserted that formalist approaches defy the practices of science. He asserts that encouraging students to "observe speech around"

themselves, to "study the laws of its (speech) existence and development", s/he acts similarly as a scientist (Emerson, 1897, pp. 135–36). He concludes, "I cannot believe that English studied in this way need be less lacking in interest and pleasure than the study of the other phenomena of nature and of life" (Emerson, 1897, p. 135–36). Considering these views of the student's role in learning how the write, the teacher had a difficult challenge. Barbour (1898) argues that students cannot learn to write and they learn "by not teaching it at all" (p. 502). Instead, he asserts that teachers will develop a "few plain pedagogical principles" but simply need to encourage students to "write, write, write, persistently, month by month, throughout their high school course" (p. 502). Marble (1893) on the other hand states that teachers need to "induce him (student) to reveal his inner self, his thought, and to delight in this revelation" because it teaches the student to "recognize the written language as another form of his thought" and s/he learns to "look behind the language, whether oral or written, for the thought that lies within (Marble, 1893, pp. 201–202). Despite these rather vague suggestions about how to teach composition in secondary schools, many educators offered suggestions and steps to helping adolescents improve their English usage.

Most English educators desired to instill in students the habits of proper English usage. The approaches for doing that varied somewhat; however, a constant focus on proper usage, teaching formal features inductively, and timely response from the teacher and the student's peers were prevalent. The notion to teach inductively squares well against the view that students learn proper English gradually. In addition, it corresponds to the desire to position English as a "science,"

> The best way to teach the subject is inductively, through exercises based on the text of some model of prose style. This principle is based on nature as well as science. All great writers begin by imitating their predecessors (Miller, 1896, p. 39).

Approaches to teaching composition maneuvered this fine line between science and expression. In fact, educators argued that by teaching writing as a system of linked parts, provided students with the ability to continue to breath life into their compositions. Knowing the constitutive parts of English language encourages students to "keep the expression fresh and forceful" because it illustrates how to make "substitutions", or the various composition moves an individual can take within the limits of proper expression. Kellogg (1893) explains,

> "He (student) will have learned from the sentences he has analyzed and those he has composed, how to keep the expression fresh and forceful by the endless substitutions, contractions, and expansions that save style from monotony—substitutions, for instance of adjectives, adverbs and nouns in the possessive, for prepositional phrases, and vice versa; of participles for infinitive phrases, and of infinitive phrases for participles; of direct questions and quotations for indirect, and of indirect for direct…" (p. 156).

Every part of the sentence is most effective when it is "yoked with their proper fellows" (p. 156) as English is "fluid" but not "without restriction" (p. 156).

He advises teachers to begin teaching composition by transforming noun into a subject. Kellogg claims that sentences will become more sophisticated as other parts of speech are added to the sentence, asserting that "perfect gradation is the *conditio sin qua non* of progress" (p. 156). Moreover, Kellogg, argued that teachers should teach vocabulary as a collection of "families" united by the "root out of which they grow (p. 158), which "colors the meaning of all its derivatives, and determines their use in the sentence (Kellogg, 1893, p. 158). Finally, he states that high school composition studies should involve intense study of the "mutual relations of the phrases and the clauses and their varied service to the thought" until the pupil has "approximately mastered" them (Kellogg, 1893, p. 155). J. G. Wright (1893), on the other hand, endorses daily writing assignments, peer-editing, re-writing essays repeatedly, and a focus on developing accurate paragraphs. He pushes teachers to create marking codes to be placed in the margins of papers, which indicate errors. Students should locate errors and discover the remedy for them. Teachers should allot class-time to review and correct inaccurate sentences, as well as model proper punctuation, and begin with smaller pieces of writing, which leads to longer, more sophisticated pieces. The purpose of composition in secondary schools according to Wright is to foster clear thought. When pupils understand the various appropriate relationships, or how to fasten certain parts with others, they stand a greater chance of producing healthy thoughts and defeating pathological ones. Composition studies consisted of the habitual transformation of deformed thought into healthy forms of expression. The rational mind remained in a battle with the tricksters of madness, but composition studies in secondary English classrooms afforded adolescents with the time and resources (i.e. teacher's feedback) to practice placing their experiences and thoughts into rational order.

Other approaches were more practical. Marble (1893) claims that students should learn to write through oral speech. He claims that students should speak on a topic, and write what they said on paper disregarding form, structure, and grammar. Once the student sits to write his/her oral speech, his/her focus shifts to thought, "notices the language only as it expresses his thought" (p. 203). After 15–20 minutes, Marble explains, the teacher folds the paper, sets on his/her desk where it remains until the next day. The student then re-reads the paper to him/her self and corrects and forms it however s/he chooses. The teacher then corrects the paper, provides a quick response to it, and offering suggestions to improve it. The approach here resembles input/output model of medicine. The student discharges, or vomits, the toxic speech, then exposes, reflects, revises, and orders it.

Most of the pedagogical approaches described above instituted to induce writing from adolescents aimed to help them prepare for the college entrance examination. While much of the focus from historians has been on the university's influence on secondary school curricula, the next section examines the laboratory method of teaching and its epistemological consequences for schooling. James Penniman's request to have students present a laboratory style report to colleges as part of the entrance exam remains relatively unexplored in recent historical accounts. We examine how laboratory pedagogy transformed or reflected the goals of the writing workshop and the implications on teaching of writing in secondary English

classrooms. The information presented below will be re-examined in later chapters in this book.

LABORATORY PEDAGOGY

The practice of writing a timed themed essay received criticism from the Committee of Ten on "theoretical and practical" grounds. The exam should test a candidates ability to recognize "offenses against good English", mistakes that are common among adolescent learners. Writers content that students may more accurately display their writing abilities if they are able to write about personal topics along with standardized ones. In addition, writers argue that while a passing score on the written exam may show an "accurate man" it does not reflect a "moral man." Jacobs (1896), for example, argues that exams test the "lowest form" of a student's knowledge, and

> It does not show how the concepts are formed in the mind, how they are related to each other for living activity. The concepts may be in the mind in good shape to pass an examination, and in very poor shape to from a man. After all it is of full as much importance how a thing is in a man's head and how it came there, as whether it is there or not (p. 676).

The desire to understand and see the inner workings of the active mind remained a constant theme at the end of the nineteenth century. Reformers utilized the logic of individualization and understanding the processes of thinking to buttress their argument for laboratory reports. They, in short, advocated for process rather than product. In many respects, the timed written test as an entrance exam had an epistemological problem, mainly that it was not a valid way to measure a student's writing abilities and therefore a candidate's fitness for college. The contents inside an individual's "head and how it came there" resemble the historical alternations the relationship that physicians developed with disease (see above). The laboratory as an institution functioned as a primary way for that relationship to occur. It is no wonder than that we see educators describe an alternative to the timed written examination as the "laboratory method," and the emergence of the laboratory as a pedagogical alternative to the recitation towards the latter part of the century.

The laboratory method of teaching and writing appeared in several places during this time. It was proposed as an alternative to the timed college entrance examination (Penniman, 1893), as a form of writing workshop (Eliott, 2008). Instead of ranking papers, classes that used the laboratory method were in a "veritable workshop, wherein, by systematizing daily drill, details are mastered one by one, and that unity of result is obtained which is more for practical use than for show" (Gunung in Eliott, 2008, p. 17). Kathryn Fitzgerald (1996), on the other hand, using a Foucauldian lens to argue the college entrance exam disciplined secondary English curriculum, describes the laboratory method in a slightly different way. She states that the laboratory method was initially introduced at the New England Association of Colleges and Professional School Conference in 1893. Their proposal to change the college entrance exam to a collection of documents,

produced both in school certified by a teacher's signature and during regular exam time, is akin to the "experiment book in Physics" (NEACPS Proceedings in Fitzgerald, 1996, p. 444). Our modern day version of these lab reports of experiments, she purports, is the writing portfolio. Fitzgerald claims that educators (i.e James Penneman) at this time who supported lab reports believed that associating with science would give the new examination more credibility, and would better demonstrate what students have learned. The portfolio, or the lab report, she surmises, faded because it was difficult to control, which would defy the purpose of creating a cogent, unified system for the college entrance examination.

Proponents of the laboratory method of writing advocated for students providing a collection of different types of writing and including some pieces of writing completed in the classroom guided by the teacher. W.F. Bradbury, W.C. Collar, and William T. Peck (1893) worry that preparing for the college entrance exam will cause students to develop a dislike of literature, and instead should be allowed to include prepared essays as part of their exam portfolio:

> Let the pupils in the preparatory schools after reading one of the books required for admission, write in a given time, under the eye of the teacher, in a blank book made for this purpose, write, I say, one or more essays, on topics selected from the subject matter of the book. Let this book be kept by the teacher, and given to the pupil only when he is required again to write an essay on some other topic, or some other book. When the candidate goes to the examination for admission to college, this book is now the case with the teacher's certification statement entered in the book that the work has been done under the eye of the teacher (p. 625).

Bradbury and his colleagues seek to alter the influence of time on the candidate's application. More important, they claim that a collection of written artifacts, certified by the teacher, builds a stronger "case" for the student's abilities. Multiple examples prove more reliable, they reason, than a one snapshot response. These reformers place greater responsibility on the "eye" of the teacher than most colleges were willing to grant them at this time. The "eye" of the teacher implies that the teacher would not help the student when s/he composed the essays, and merely stood as a gatekeeper of the final products. In short, the teacher moved to the margins of the classroom when students composed their essays for their college entrance application.

James Penniman (1893) makes similar suggestions. According to him the college entrance exam should comprise of written artifacts written prior to the exam and during it as well. It should include the following:

1. A composition on some simple subject, not necessarily connected with the books read, to be written in the examination in order to show the applicant's ability to express himself clearly and correctly.
2. Six or twelve compositions on the prescribed course of reading, prepared at school and certified to by the last English instructor as in his opinion the unaided work of the pupil. It is probable that this requirement would do much to

raise the standard of composition writing at the schools, and it is recommended by the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools.
3. A number of simple questions on the biographies and books read, avoiding dates as much as possible. The answers to these questions should be given at length.
4. The correction of specimens of bad English (pp. 467–468).

What in interesting about Penniman's writing pedagogy in secondary schools involves teaching narrative and descriptive forms of writing first, that students should compose essays on topics based on "personal experience and observation" (p. 465), and then students should write on a variety of topics of personal interest, such as "letting the amateur photographer write on photography, etc" (p. 465). Once students are able to produce clear writing, they should be able to "write plain English" and be ready to learn about "the beauties of force and style" in college (p. 465). Although he gestures to the committee that greater emphasis should be placed on the candidate's work throughout high school, the suggestion for students to experiment with writing is absent in the final recommendations. Even though his suggestions for changes to the college entrance examination were radical at that time, he withholds a vital component (personal experimentation) of his views on teaching writing. Instead of arguing that permitting students to composes pieces on personal interest topics would make them better writers, and more likely to succeed in college, he states that the laboratory method would compel students to read the prescribed reading list and compose an appropriate essay on the writing portion of the college entrance examination. Despite Penniman's rhetoric, and his appeal to science, the laboratory report did not garner enough support to supplant the timed themed essay on the writing portion of the college entrance exam. The laboratory report presented unprecedented administrative challenges, which defied the purpose of creating a stable system between the secondary schools and the colleges. Even with a small percentage of students applying for college at this time, it would have involved greater trust between colleges and secondary English teachers and it would have made the admissions process more complex. Perhaps, too, the epistemologies of 1893 prevented educators from recognizing and justifying the potential for the laboratory report. Limited conceptions of the student, the role of the secondary school as a feeder to colleges, and the purposes of writing may have restricted educators from adopting the laboratory report as a viable means to test a candidates proficiency in writing. However, epistemologies of teaching and learning the secondary student did change by the end of the century, and the laboratory as a pedagogical method signified the shift.

Writing about the laboratory method in Biology shortly after the appearance of Penniman's essay, Alfred James McClatchie (1895) argues that while very few Biology teachers in secondary schools use the lab as a primary tool to teach science, many should. He contends that secondary Biology students should be invited to be "original investigators" (p. 634), accompanied by a lab book and a reference guide. Teachers and textbooks should be secondary aids to the other two (i.e. lab book and reference book). If a student relies on the teacher and/or the textbook for information, s/he will develop a "belief in authority" and the "mind becomes serf" (p. 634), and "scientifically accurate thinking is destroyed" (p. 634).

Scientific thinking, for McClatchie teaches the pupil to see (observe) objects as they are, or truthfully, to describe what they see accurately, to represent what they see by creating drawings of what they see. The laboratory method allows students to learn these skills, develop higher order thinking skills, and use their imagination. The laboratory, with minimum aid from the teacher and the textbook, encourages students to "deduce laws from observed facts, and to make predictions as to future processes" (p. 639). The teacher who simply presents Biology as information fails to give students a chance to learn these important skills. Finally, learning the cognitive skills to appreciate Biology also supports a student's moral development because, according to McClatchie, they learn how to see, describe, explain, and discuss the truth in relation to nature. He states that teachers can use examples of "lower" animals to teach pupils about their bodies, and that exploring the "lower plants" can provide accurate information about sexuality. Learning scientific thinking, the knowledge, or content of science, and the moral implications of the individual to her/himself and the individual's relationship to others furnish the pupil with skills to tackle many of life's problems "in whatever occupation" (p. 64) are the purposes of studying Biology as laboratory in secondary schools.

Mostly due to advances in laboratory equipment, but by 1899, the laboratory was considered a vital part of secondary sciences education. Instead of spending time justifying why learning about science necessitated work in a lab, teachers began to explore ways to incorporate the laboratory with other methods of teaching, and design curriculum around the laboratory. Consistent ideas about the purposes of sciences and what it was supposed to "train" students to do persisted by the turn of the century. In general, studying science trains students to see (i.e. observe), to use descriptive language, and to use inductive reasoning to contemplate nature, and more specifically to consider "his own relations to nature's creatures and nature's laws, including, also, though not solely, his relations to his fellow man" (Newcombe, 1899, p. 301). The methods teachers used varied according to subject.

Writing about Botany in the high schools, Newcombe (1899) claims that as a biological science, students need to learn about the structure of plants to learn about the "accuracy of observation and description" (p. 303). To learn about the laws of nature and the intricacies of plant life, students need to learn about their development, relationship, and physiology of plants. Newcombe claims that high schools need to learn the basic structure first before engaging in the complexities of botany where the "inert plant becomes dynamic, and, therefore, tenfold more interesting" (p. 303). As a science of "things and their activities, and not of books" (p. 307), laboratory work should compliment courses in botany where the "work must be hard, but not irksome, requiring mental concentration and not frivolous" (p. 304). Textbooks should be used as secondary sources to help students review material learned in the laboratory. The lab work included in a Botany class includes descriptions and drawings. The observations, Newcombe proclaims, should be "close, in good English and complete sentences" (p. 306). If a student, he admonishes, has written too little, the teacher should give him more work to do, or give him "instruction in the art of narration" (p. 307). The drawings, on the other hand, must be "accurate" (p. 306). During the lab work, the teacher should

focus students by using questions and suggestions. It is more important that students learn how to think than it is for them to accumulate content about Botany. In his view, "If the mind is well trained, the pupil can gain outside of school and after he has left school much more information than he could ever acquire inside" (p. 307). The school, in short, is unable to teach the secondary student every little detail about Botany, but it can help the students develop mental capacities so that's/he can learn them on his/her own.

The laboratory method also appeared in Mathematics education. G.W. Myers (1903) argues that secondary mathematics instruction is, in general, decontextualized and is comprised mostly of busy work with an emphasis on product rather than process. To explain his first complaint, Meyers states that figuring out how much money a town needs to build a lot is less important than considering the social and moral implications of the mathematical problem. Mathematics teachers, according to him, spend too much time teaching content and not enough time on using methods to teach mathematics that would "make an over-all appeal to the student" (p. 734). The purpose of a secondary education, and specifically of learning mathematics is development of the "strong will, the healthy conscious, and the facile hand" (p. 733). These three characteristics are more important for Meyers than a "clear head" (p. 733). To address the second complaint, Meyers employs the metaphor of the digestive system (Mathematics instruction as busy work). He states that feeding the body of "chemically pure elements" (p. 735) reduces the body to a machine. Mechanizing mental processes of Mathematics the "process of separation, assimilation, and nutrition (i.e energy and digestion) produces "distaste, nausea, and ultimately in the atrophy of the mathematical faculties" (p. 735). For him, "connection and continuity" (p. 741) are vital to learning math, and a student's ability to make the connections and recognize the continuities occurs gradually. Teachers need to be patient, and provide steady and consistent guidance for the student throughout their Math education. To improve the teaching of Mathematics, Myers claims that the two primary features (as he defines them) of the scientific method should guide teaching methods. Those two characteristics are explained in the following manner:

> "Scientific method" connotes at least two important notions: Induction as a thought-process and laboratory instruction as an external agency in founding and facilitating this process (Induction) (p. 730).

The laboratory provided students the opportunity to complete the work on their own, or by his or her own initiative, under the impulse of his natural interests, and largely under the guidance of his own intelligence" (pp. 730–31), and gives him/her the "*sense* the difficulties to be overcome *as real* and *natural*, actually needing to be resolved and demanding a knowledge of the mathematical tool as a means of their resolution (p. 732). The laboratory method of teaching mathematics teaches students the "*how* and *why* he must use the mathematical tools to get on well in any line of study" (p. 732), engages the whole body, and relates mathematical tools to real world problems and situations (i.e. social, economic, industrial). Furthermore, it removes the teacher as the expert, and positions the

teachers a guide or as a supplement who is available to prod, provoke, or encourage the student to discover the material on his/her own. Additionally, the laboratory requires the teacher to view the content from the learner's perspective and gives the teacher more flexibility to adapt the requirements "of so wide a range and variety of conditions and situations" (p. 731). The teacher's primary concern, according to Meyers, is not whether students are accumulating a vast amount of mathematical information, but how can s/he "increase my efficiency in the discharge of my duties as a teacher of youth?" (p. 741). Thus, laboratory method supplants old, formalistic approaches to teaching math, which relied on isolation and abstraction of information, with experimentation and application of mathematical tools to the "world of reality" (p. 736). As he states,

> No amount of isolation of the mental food constituents of mathematical study, with a view to reducing to a minimum of energy of the digestive process, which we assume to be wasted in the work of eliminating from the system such irrelevant ingredients as are not needed and cannot be assimilated would be of service (p. 735).

The desire to discard "irrelevant ingredients" from the mathematical corpus, and to teach it as a series of individual morsels of "mental food" as an argument for energy efficiency of the "digestive process" does not serve the pupil's understanding of mathematics because it de-contextualizes mathematics, and, thus, does not allow the student be able to apply it when s/he exits the secondary school.

The laboratory method of testing and teaching represented more than an alternative assessment or a new strategy for teaching writing. It represents an epistemological shift in what could be known, how objects could be known, and how individuals showed what they know in teaching and learning. The student through induction reflects on their relationship to nature, to oneself, and to others. It taught students to be both reflexive and reflective. Laboratory pedagogy as workshop afforded students the opportunity to experiment with form, generating meaning to particular structures. It allowed students to make sense out of what is, and not as illusion or delusion. In short, laboratory pedagogy permitted students to practice combating the tricksters of madness (i.e. obsession, delusion, and dissociation) and to become "monarchs", or independent, autonomous, healthy individuals. Narrative and descriptive forms of writing prevented students from dissociating from their environment and measured imagination as to prohibit delusion. Exploring content as opposed to autonomizing it protected the young mind from obsession.

As a collection of artifacts of an individual's writing, as a regimented workshop that isolates and drills skills, designed to produce writing samples that are of "practical use" (real-world application; authentic), or as a portfolio guided by the principles of science, the laboratory in education signified a rupture in the ways of knowing in teaching and learning. Although many reformers believed that the laboratory liberated pupils from the constraints of the bolted-down desk, rote memorization, and the recitation, a closer look reveals that the laboratory method placed the student under greater scrutiny, indeed under a microscope. As described below, many educators assumed that adolescents arrived to secondary school as

"diseased." Isolating, experimenting, and producing a collection of artifacts across time gave the educator a glimpse into how the pupil interacts with the environment, introduces the pupil as a historical subject, and through experimentation, the teacher can identify elements of imbalance, deviance, and discord. Thus, the teacher embodies the epistemological stances of the bacteriologists, the physiologist, the scientist, and more important, the physician towards his/her pupils and to teaching and learning in secondary schools.

CHILD STUDY

The emergence of child study illustrates a shift from basic, hierarchical categorizations of adolescents to a more detailed, microscopic look at secondary school students. The individual child, as a living organism and gathering information about him/her, in all of his/her unique features, and how he/she interacts and is influenced by environment became the primary strategy for managing the adolescent population by the end of the nineteenth century. Reformers and advocates of child study believed that collecting detailed information about every pupil helped teachers, parents, and administrators to ensure that each child was successful academically. Moreover, notions about health and disease provided the structure and content of the child study questionnaires. Earlier concerns about whether teachers should know about physiology or psychology were dismissed as questions about the student's physiology, temperament, sleep habits, and leisurely activities were all included in the questionnaires. The humanistic rhetoric to acquire "… a deeper insight into the individuality…" of each student in order to gain "additional skills in estimating and judging the work, motives, conduct and aptitudes of pupils in general" (Scudder, 1899, p. 197) is quite convincing. The desire to garner and collect as much information about each individual student prior to entering the halls of the schoolroom to aid teachers in their scholastic treatments seemed to put teachers at an advantage to combat childhood pathologies. Power/knowledge, however, expanded its scope and distributed questionnaires to students' parents and previous teachers. In the letter to grammar school teachers, the principal exclaimed that supplying the school with the requested information would allow it to "adjust our efforts to their (students) needs will depend to some extent their physical, mental and moral welfare" (p. 198). The school's responsibility, the principal explains, is to encourage each child to "reach the possibilities of which they are capable" (p. 198), and authentic responses to the questions on the questionnaire assists the school to "deal wisely with them (students) when they are transferred to our care" (p. 198), and to build a supportive school environment that guards against "positive injury" (p. 198). What is of note here is the intense interest in the child's inner life even when college entrance requirements remained quite banal. In reality, how much of the child's personal information (e.g. leisure time, temperament, work ethic) really plays a role in his/her ability to compose a timed theme? In many respects, the request for this dossier equates to an opportunistic moment to expand the tentacles of power/knowledge to discipline, mold, shape, and make docile the

adolescent body. The logic inherent in Child Study is that more reporting from various sources increases reliability of information, creates a "better", more controlled environment, and produces better outcomes (i.e. college entrances). Although schools distributed variations of the same questionnaire to both previous teachers and parents, the target remained the same.

For teachers from previous schools, topics included the following

1. *Home conditions*: favorable, unfavorable
   Home discipline: firm, lax. Pupil is not held down to study. Do this pupil's parents visit the school or in any other way show particular interest in the educational welfare of the child?
   Comments:
2. *Physical condition*: general health ……..
   Grows rapidly; is nervous; has headaches; is defective in sight; hearing; Has attendance been irregular because of conditions of health?
   Comments:
3. *Characteristic traits*: bright, dull; quick, slow; ambitious, indifferent; self-confident, timid; methodical, careless; diligent, indolent; persevering, easily discouraged; self-controlled, hasty, headstrong; refined, coarse; polite, rude, impudent; straight-forward, sly.
   Comments:
4. What can you say of this pupil in respect to the following particulars?
   1. General information…..
   2. Outside reading…..
   3. Ability to memorize…..
   4. Ability to think…..
   5. Power to concentrate…..
   6. Ability in oral expression…..
   7. Written work…….
5. In what kind of school work does this pupil show greatest interest?
   In what things, if any, does the pupil excel?
   Note things disliked or that are distasteful
   Comments:
6. *General behavior:* In what respects may this pupil cause trouble or annoyance? In case of difficulty in governing or fault in behavior, what method of discipline will be found helpful?
7. *Outside interests and occupations*: Which, if any, of the following, takes the pupil's time to a considerable extent? House work, music lessons, paper route, other work, viz……In what other things does pupil show particular interest? Any specially marked talent or ability? To what extent, if any has pupil's school work suffered on these accounts?
8. *Remarks*

Upon receiving responses for 300 students, Scudder (1899) remarked, "What an insight into child mind and child nature these elementary school-teachers have!" An added benefit, of course, emerged for the secondary school teacher. Scudder explains,

> With questions like those on the blanks, telling teachers what to look for and laying stress on things that it is important to observe, a keener interest in pupils is induced; the contact between pupils and teachers becomes more harmonious; teachers what to look for and laying stress on things that it is important to observe, a keener interest in pupils is induced; the contact between pupils and teachers becomes more harmonious; teachers observe more shrewdly, and they can see more in a child; child nature becomes more intelligible. Therefore teachers are able to diagnose and prescribe better, with a tendency to become more just, more merciful, or more severe as the case may demand (for be it observed that severity is sometimes better than mercy) more long-suffering, far more tactful. It tends to invest school life with greater interest for the teacher. Indeed if one can enter into harmonious relations with child life or adolescent life it will go far towards making a teacher's life worth living. Aside from those whose ambitions are rewarded by attaining the higher administrative positions, teachers in general have little to look forward to unless they have that deep interest in children and knowledge of child nature that is the salt of a teacher's life, or, to drop our figure of speech, is an end in itself most worthy of attaining. It gives an objectivity to our work that is far more satisfying than the mere consciousness of having taught geography or algebra well (Scudder, 1899, p. 200).

What is surprising about the responses from grammar school teachers, or at least the examples printed in the *School Review* article, is their fixation for temperament. Teachers wrote very little about the pupil's academic interests and/or capabilities; and when they did, they provided terse, cursory responses. Only one teacher commented on a pupil's writing abilities. A couple of examples exemplify this point.

I. A boy: *Traits*: slow, careless, ambitious yet easily discouraged. *Ability in oral expression*: not good. *Written work*: poor. Excels in original work.

Remarks: This boy, all his teachers felt last year, is full of promise. In regular school work he was fair, and in English (i.e. grammar, spelling, penmanship, and the *mechanics* of written work) *incorrigibly* and *insufferably* poor. He is inclined to assume a dogged air and stop thinking, if he *thinks* he cannot understand a matter. But he has a fine appreciative mind, full of originality and piquancy. For instance, in debate he developed great readiness and resource. In composition he was of the best *as to the matter*, as to form, the poorest.

D. A boy: *Home discipline*: lax, both parents much interested in his education. He grows rapidly. *Characteristic traits*: bright, quick, careless, self-confident, yet easily discouraged, hasty, polite, straightforward. Needs personal and individual pushing, has been babied at home. *Power of concentration*: undeveloped. Penmanship poor, substance fair. *Conduct*: ready to take advantage.

Remarks: A promising boy. Needs to be toughened.

G. A girl: *Health*: delicate. *Traits*: dull, slow, timid, but methodical, persevering, and diligent. Not so much general information; does little outside reading, ability in oral expression poor. Work always neatly done.

Remarks: A delicate child whose mother died with consumption. A little old fashioned in the way of expressing herself because she is brought up among grown-up people, being the only child in the family. Extremely sensitive and *good*.

CHILD STUDY: PARENTS

A slightly different strategy was used in the letter to parents. The school's charge is to marshal young children to "form useful habits", to ward their health and nourish a "proper and reasonable enjoyment of life" (Scudder, 1899, p. 203). The most efficacious way to meet these responsibilities is to compile intelligence on the pupil's "health conditions, characteristic traits, and outside interests" (p. 203). To maintain veracity of responses, the principal instructed parents to refrain from disclosure and to answer "fully and frankly" (p. 203). The questionnaire is printed below.

Health conditions

Condition of health during the past year or two…..Any tendency to headache?..... Is eyesight or hearing defective? ….. Sleeps about how many hours? (from eight to nine hours is a desirable average)…..Is time enough taken to eat a good breakfast before going to school? …..Are sufficient recreation and exercise taken each day? …..Mention any injurious effects that seem to be traceable to school influences or requirements…..On returning from school is there any headache, nervousness, fretfulness, or low spirits? …..Does this appear more marked at the end of the week? ….(If so, and it becomes more noticeable as the term progresses we hope you will inform us of it.)

School Work

Care of health and the development of a strong physique, especially with girls, is fare more important than study. Considerations of health should always come first. But health permitting, plenty of good, hard study is one of the cardinal virtues of school life. Regular study hours at home should be established, and conscientiously observed.

> About how much time is spent in study at home in the morning? ….in the afternoon?.....in the evening?.....Are regular state study hours observed or is the studying done spasmodically?....Are lessons taken up willingly, or is there need of urging on your part?....Do you think too much is required by the school? …..Do you think more time could be spent in study without detriment to health? ….Which study, if any, is spoken of as the most difficult?....Which as easiest?
>
> **Outside interests**
>
> How much time is spent each day in work that is not school work?....kind of work?....Mention things in which particular interest is permanently shown …..Is any specially marked talent or ability shown?.....About how much time is present in reading books not connected with school work? ….To what extent, if any, is the public library made use of? (pp. 203–204)

A majority of the comments focused on teachers' dispositions and amount of schoolwork. Parents expressed preferences for certain teachers, recommended dietary regiments, and advantageous ways to motivate pupils. For example, one parent wrote that the student "has good general capabilities but needs continual urging and encouraging to keep up the application necessary to produce good results" (p. 205), while another denounced the inordinate quantity of required schoolwork. Most important, however, was the pronouncement of the distinction between school and home life. One parent, in particular, promulgated the discrepant beings children tend to be when they are at home versus when they are at school. The parent states,

> "The personal interest of the teacher is greatly to be desired. The mechanical recitations of the automaton are valueless. If an interest can be developed in the studies something will be learned. All school children (their elders likewise) lead two lives—the school life is one, the home life the other, both under different influences; the teacher knows one, the parent the other. I thank you for your evident interest and hope you will receive appreciative answer from all parents" (p. 204).

This response represents a seminal shift in the relationship between home and schools. Prior to the 1900, schools grappled with slang and other forms of street/home language usage. Much of composition studies focused on producing speech absent of external influences. English teachers ambitiously endeavored to quarantine student speech in order to treat, purify, and heal it. The reader may recall Kellogg's desire to "vaccinate" pupils with proper English. Toward the end of the century, schools recognized that children may potentially different people at school then they are at home; and that one may influence the other, but that one was not necessarily more pristine than the other. Finally, we see the inklings of

the adolescent as an individual with multiple selves, a theme which dominates the 1980s. Instead of selecting "cognizance of that which it (mind) chooses" as Angell (1900) suggests at the beginning of this chapter, or to resurrect a "ruler" or director in the theatre of consciousness as Putnam (1899) recommends, the parent in this Child Study report provides reformers with another option. That is, to applaud teachers to utilize the pupil's multiple selves in order to instruct them on ways to manage their inner world. Hence, instead of searching for a ruler to prevent interior misery, educators can embrace the motley crew that is consciousness. To assist teachers and administrators in secondary schools to guide adolescents, the principal distributed Child Study questionnaire to the students themselves. Thus, if you want to know what students need to manage their internal lives, just ask them.

CHILD STUDY: PUPILS

The Child Study questionnaire distributed to students consisted of a total of thirty-five questions regarding three different topics (see below). With rare exception, the responses on the questionnaire explicated contextual factors, which explain or justify poor classroom performance and behavior. Causes for inadequate recitations included peer distractions (i.e. whispering, helping, laughing), nervousness, and the teacher's critical disposition and sarcastic remarks. Moreover, students reported that the characteristics of their favorite teacher include, being "fair, just cheerful, jolly", "treats all alike," and "pleasant and honest" (p. 213). Conversely, pupils claimed that being able to "govern" (i.e. strict, good disciplinarians, have order, but not "cranky") the classroom. Although the questionnaire consisted of specific questions about the student's study habits and use of personal leisure time, most of the reported data pertained to teachers. In the end, it seems that the lives of students could be best be characterized by parents and grammar school teachers, while the adolescent's views on pedagogy and a teacher's character stands more reliable for the principal. Scudder (1899) reports that teachers interact with their students differently since the implementation of the Child Study questionnaire. One teacher claims that s/he no longer views his role as a doctor who is "hurrying along the street with his little black case, on his errand of healing" (p. 211). Instead, the teacher proclaims that s/he is "more likely than I was before to study his interests" (p. 211). The student's interest, according to this teacher, stands as the most important element of teaching, and if s/he can "help keep alive that worthy ambition of his" (p. 211), the pupil's schooling experience will be the "greatest possible benefit" to him/her (p. 211). Child Study merges medical epistemologies with psychological ones to flip or transpose the visual epistemologies that enable the student-teacher relationship to occur and to function. In short, the pedagogical discursive space has been altered.

TO THE PUPIL: Please answer all these questions frankly and honestly, and as fully as time will permit.

1. Personal Aims, Purposes etc.
    1. Why do you come to school? (Do not answer merely, "To get an education.")
    2. After leaving school what business, or occupation, if any, do you expect to follow? What circumstances influence your choice?
    3. If the way were open to you, what would be the goal of your highest ambitions in life?
    4. So far as you know have you a weakness or defect in hearing or sight? Have you consulted a physician in regard to this?
2. School life, and methods of study
    1. How much do you study at home in the morning? In the afternoon? In the evening?
    2. During study hours what things prevent close application to your books? How do you guard against mind wandering?
    3. Do you study in a room by yourself or where other members of the family are conversing?
    4. Do you study by yourself or in company with fellow students?
    5. In what ways do your parents show interest in your school work?
    6. What is the most pleasant feature of your high-school life? The least pleasant?
    7. What things, if any, interfere with your making a good recitation?
    8. What temptations or inducements to practice deceit do you find in school? Speak frankly.
    9. What do you think can and ought to be done to remove or correct these?
    10. As you advance in school do you find that you are gaining something practical and useful, or not? Give reasons for your opinion?
    11. Make any suggestions that would occur to you for improving the school.
    12. What suggestions would you make in regard to the methods of discipline in the school?
    13. Many drop out of school entirely on leaving grammar school. What reasons do you hear boys and girls give for not going to high school?
    14. Think of your favorite teachers; then, without mentioning names, put down the reasons why you like them.
3. Outside interests
    1. What kind of work, not school work, are you required to do? How much time does this take?
    2. If you are willing to tell us, we would be glad to know how you spend your leisure time.
    3. What musical instrument, if any, do you play?
    4. How often do you take music lessons?
    5. How much do you practice?
    6. With what organizations and classes (religious, literary, [including lessons

in elocution,] social, dancing, athletic etc.) are you connected?
7. How much time do you devote to these?
8. Mention other things in which you are especially interested.
9. What kind of manual or constructive work do you like best? What tools, if any, do you handle well? Mention things you have made or done with tools.
10. State what kind of collection (stamps, eggs, etc.) you are making, and tell how extensive it is.

4. Comments and suggestions

Child Study strived to document and record the inner workings of each child as a way to institutionalize individuality and to combat uniformity in the interest of deformity. Interest in the teacher's temperament and preparation gave way to the apparent needs and affections of the student. The purpose for Child Study, as *material medica*, was to garner as much information about the student so that teachers would be able to "prescribe" the necessary remedy for each student. The entire body of the adolescent was analyzed in an attempt to understand the whole child. Thus, "dull" and "indignant" no longer described the adolescents. Instead, various parts of the body, from time, temperament, to strengths, to habits, to relationships, received their own descriptors. Descriptions of the adolescent's body moved both horizontally, diagonally, and vertically, as well as both internally and externally. Reformers refused to passively wait until students arrived to school to treat their diseases. Instead, reports on students' habits, lifestyles, and tendencies represented a scouting report, or a Bertillion Card on the student to potentially prevent disease. This means, too, that the Child Study questionnaire represented an epistemological shift in the relationship between teachers, administrators, parents and pupils. Teachers no longer equated their work with that of a physician, but more as a psychologist, or a coach, or a facilitator. Child Study reflects much of the epistemologies of the laboratory. Here, physicians environmentally experimented on bacteria to trace its response to certain contextual features. Additionally, each pathogen's life history could be mapped and chronicled. Secondary students leaped to the center of the microscope as parents, previous teachers and themselves report on their most intimate and specific features of their bodies, temperaments and disorders.

Responders utilize induction to make assessments about pupil's demeanor and academic and social predilections. Clearly, laboratory science and pedagogy did not cause parents, students, and teachers to use induction; however, induction as an analytic tool emerged as a useful tool to review adolescent bodies. Much like laboratory reports, students provided drawings or visuals or a representation of themselves on the questionnaire, they describe their "things and their activities", and removes teachers as experts on their abilities and dispositions. Students learn to construct themselves as both subject and object of power/knowledge. Medical discourses remain in Child Study discourse, but we see a greater reliance on temperament as an indication of health. The Child Study questionnaire would be

the instrument the bacteriologist would have given the pathogen. Germ Theory applies here, too. There is a sense among reformers that jumbled bodies and temperaments can be altered with a consistent whiff of medicinal antidotes. Koch's scientific method will disseminate throughout education, as reformers will strive to isolate disorders, moments of jejune, and risky behavior to treat them and build a repository of typologies and doxa to control and predict multiple corporal bodies and individual behaviors. As evidenced above, very few responses specifically commented on a student's academic abilities, but more so on his/her personality traits. Moreover, Child Study reflects a greater elaboration of documentary evidence of bodily features and subjectivities to build regimes of truth about individuals. It illustrates that adolescence, which were once considered potentially hopeless lepers represented potential criminals. Although unclear at this point, we may discover that the harmless questionnaire of Child Study tilled the fertile ground of juvenile delinquency rather than the state judicial apparatus. The analytics of induction, description, explanation and experimentation aligned with the precision of the botanist (see relationship between Botany, criminality, and anthropometry) may have ushered in teenage dereliction. At a minimal, Child Study emulates a psychological test more than an academic test. Very little in the Child Study reports resemble a test of scholarly abilities and content knowledge. The questions needle the body from multiple angles, demanding pin-point depictions of moments of nervousness, situations that incite anxiety (i.e. recitation), and tasks that either over-work or under-work the student's body.

Finally, Child Study declared writing pedagogy as a failure up to the end of the nineteenth century. Habitual writing practice based on personal experiences and guided by the interconnectedness of syntax failed to prevent verbal disease; and more important, collecting writing samples emerged as an opportunity to amass the goods about the adolescent body and to expand to inquire about his/her lifestyle. Reformers starved for information about adolescence, and employed writing to become gluttons of power/knowledge. In their quest for more information to make appropriate and important decisions about the "common interest" of the child, reformers feverishly generated an almost indistinguishable picture with mounds of evidence that revealed a trace of truth. As unreliable and fortuitous as the anthropometry and dactylography, so too were the responses to Child Study Questionnaire.

Child study tried to give to education what the microscope and the X-ray gave to medicine; that is greater transparency of the body and wider expansion to previously hidden locales. Additionally, child-study strived to give education what Germ Theory gave to physiology and bacteriology; that is, a more in-depth understanding of the nature of certain diseases, how certain diseases spread, and greater legitimacy as a scientific discipline. Finally, child-study strive to give education what laboratory medicine gave physicians; that is, the ability to witness bacteria as a living organism with a "life-story", greater control over bacteria and disease, and the space to experiment with living organisms in specific environmental and cultural contexts in order to develop a repository of knowledge. Child-study, in a similar way as medicine, strived to give all of these items to

education in order to improve practice, to better educate the adolescent, and as with medicine, theories of teaching would be of no use if they did not help to produce an adolescent who would be a productive member of the social body, who would not jam the system, be self-functioning, independent, productive, reproductive, a maintain a healthy constitution. Acquiring access to the internal features and functions as well as the external influences of the body, and understanding the nuances of diseases were paramount to producing a productive citizen. If secondary education were to complete its purpose, it would have to do so with the aid of medicine and in the interest of the health of the student, the school, and society writ large.

CONCLUSION

For many educators, the laboratory method of teaching and learning became a primary way to ensure that secondary education completed its function. Although much is not known about the specific everyday teaching practices of this time, archival research indicates that interest in the laboratory method dominated the last decade of the nineteenth century. For the purpose of this book, the laboratory method represents an epistemological rupture in pedagogical practices of this time period. Also, and perhaps more important, the laboratory methods gets first introduced as an alternative to the writing portion of the college-entrance examination, and is described as the modern day version of the portfolio. Hence the epistemologies of the laboratory, as well as those of the X-ray and dactylography, serve as a nice fold for analysis of the portfolio later in this book. Strategies of science, induction, microscopy and autopsy, reappear epistemologically and in educational practices later in the 1980s and 1990s. Kock's precise method of determining germs and pathogens represents the gold standard for educational reformers, which eludes them to this day. English teachers understood the diseased nature of language and the inherently sick status of their students. They fought a losing battle, one that counted a timed essay as a success. A clear, focused, clean composition, one that expressed a personal experience illustrated a pupil's abilities to organize the jejune of consciousness, and potentially frustrate mental maladies such as obsession, dissociation, and delusion. Consciousness existed as a battle royale, one that demanded and yearned for a sovereign power to grant life and administer death. English roamed in the air, pure forms along with a whole host of tainted, disjointed, retarded, diseased, and malignant ones. The potential to produce bodies that incorporated proper, pure usage at all times forever remained an ideal quest, but one for which many did not strive. The hostility among health, disease, and orthopaedic bodies endured as a fierce battle. So much so, that by the end of the century, power/knowledge reversed its tactics and, instead relying on disciplinary strategies to form the students' bodies, it employed more pastoral ones. Most notably, Child Study.

Child study represented the epistemological collection of laboratory science, compositional studies, and pathology (i.e. bacteriology) to allure students to make a case of them. Instead of assuming a standard, one-size-fits all view of the

adolescent body, Child Study goaded adolescents, their grammar school teachers, and their parents, to disclose personal details about their academics, their physical health, leisure time activities, and overall temperament. Students, parents, and teachers take up induction to accumulate, synthesize, and render judgments about every student based on the results of this invasive questionnaire. Prior to Child Study, particular, specific features of the internal operations of the adolescent body remained a mystery; Child Study represents an epistemological shift in the instruments of power/knowledge. It is an attempt to pierce and prod inside the adolescent body, to acquire details about it, to individualize and totalize, to express one's personhood and compare it to others in an effort to predict and build a regime of truth about each adolescent. As physicians devised instruments to cut, carve, and collect specific parts of the body, so too did educators. Writing functioned as their primary scalpel.

Similar epistemologies and practices of schooling reappear in slightly different forms in the 1980s and 1990s preceding the portfolio, which, in our view, represents the progressive-humanists educator's penultimate form of writing assessment. The practice and epistemologies of Child Study disseminate throughout schools in the United States, and in particular, in writing pedagogy. Tempering bodies and accumulating details about personal pathologies transforms into a quest for the self, or for the capacity to manage multiple selves. English continues to disseminate as meanings and genres exponentially expand as modes of expressing plural selves. Concerns, epistemologies, and practices of health merge with a more in depth examination of the inner consciousness. Angell's supposition that educational mental gymnastics will manifest in posterity to aid the confusing consciousness against the evanescent forces that compete with its sovereign appear to have come to fruition in the 1980s. Teachers no longer had to rely on enemas and steam baths to reorient the insane.

CHAPTER 3

THE PROJECTED SELF

Because the self is constructed out of relationships with others and therefore involves the internalization of societal codes and conventions, it can be considered a miniature society within the individual. Just as the broader society guides the operations of its institutions, so the inner miniature society guides the behavior of the individual (Cashdan, 1988, p. 49).

At the turn of the century, German medical laboratory science had made its way into education, G. Stanley Hall's recapitulation theory dominated conceptions about the adolescent, and adolescents had started to compose case studies of themselves in the form of Child Study. The application of Atkinson's Child Study questionnaire represented a significant shift in educational practices, specifically in writing pedagogy. In this instance, writing is implemented as a confessional device to search the health of the pupil's whole body. Here, the questionnaire forces the student to subject him/herself to a confessional technology, which turns oneself into both an object and a subject. Health and disease remained a concern for educators and composition studies functioned as an instrument to investigate the condition of the adolescent's rational mind, balanced temperament, and fit body.

As much as late nineteenth century educators obsessed about the adolescent body, educators in the 1980s and 1990s in the United States sought to aid adolescents in developing a self. Writing pedagogy operated to mine the student's hidden, impervious, and almost mysterious inner life in order to help him/her better understand the self, to develop self-esteem, self-confidence, and self-worth, and to give meaning to the self. Pedagogy expanded Child Study and linked it to notions of the self, which were guided by the "broader society" and epistemologies of medicine. The body transitioned from a corporal entity textualized for health and disease to a mind-organism that resembled a miniature society. Freedom no longer appeared in the cloak of a sovereign, but as the emergence of the self. Compositions materialized as autopsies produced in the laboratory of the writer's workshop. Students learned to examine every microscopic specimen of consciousness' terrain to illustrate their decision-making capacities. Independence surfaced as the *telos* of writing pedagogy, as writing functioned as a bridge between the broader society and the miniature ones. The student's subjective world leaped to center stage in the secondary English classroom, and became the object of analysis for educators and students alike. Heuristics designed to structure writing pedagogy flowed from an inner, complex, rather chaotic world to external rationalistic forms of expression. The role of the teacher changed in this context. S/he played the role of a guide, a mirror, and a coach who posed questions and responded to student writing instead of venturing on an "error hunt" or delivering

too much "negative criticism". Teachers and students transformed into phrenologists, clinicians, laboratory technicians, pathologists, and psychologists. As this chapter illustrates, the teacher resembles a self-psychologist clinician. The topic of the self is so replete in the scholarship on writing pedagogy in the 1980s and 1990s that hints to the technical aspects of writing appear secondary to notions of the self. In other words, producing a self, or nurturing the adolescent to develop a self dictated writing pedagogy during this time. Writing strategies and activities served as instruments to creating a self.

This chapter begins with a brief discussion about the nature and emergence of the self in the late 1980s. It does so by focusing on the tenants of self-psychology, which emerged in the 1980s and had a profound impact on the field of psychology in general. Within this discussion, the chapter explores different views of the self in the late 1980s, and avows the divergent confines of Narcissism. Interest in Narcissistic tendencies and characteristics as they related to healthy psychosis developed during this era. Once considered signs of neurosis and mental illness, narcissism assumed additional significance in the mid 1980s. It also emanated in the literature on secondary writing pedagogy. An understanding of the dispersion of Narcissism in the psychology literature correlates to how it materializes in schooling. In brief, we can see the multiple relationships between technologies of psychology and technologies of writing to apprehend the competing ways power/knowledge move alongside the adolescent body. Students negotiate these discourses as they seek to shape and demarcate the space within which personhood may appear. This discussion grounds the rest of the chapter, which focuses on writing pedagogy in the 1980s prior to the emergence of the writing portfolio, and finally, the chapter concludes with an explication of the epistemological underpinnings of the writing portfolio as an assessment tool in secondary English studies. Practices and rationalities from the 1890s materialize in the 1980s.

SELF-PSYCHOLOGY

Louis A. Sass (1988) states in a seminal article in *Social Research* that the notion of the "self" returned to social science and humanities research in the mid-to-late 1980s with a "vengeance" (p. 551). Once dismissed as too ambiguous and unmeasurable, notions of the self began to drench research in psychology. The self, he asserts, imbued social discourse and self-hood became a "central obsession" for academics and researchers. Sass's Foucaultian-inspired archeaology/genealogy of the self in psychology in particular reveals the unacknowledged assumptions and contradictions inherent in notions of the self in psychological discourses of the late 1980s. The prevailing schools of psychology, Sass posits, combine a mixture of Enlightenment and Romantic notions of freedom and the individual to ground their theories. Notions of the self are founded on one of two models: 1. The self as a fully expressive, autonomous entity, capable of agency distant from external or natural constraints, and 2. The self as an autonomous entity capable of fulfillment through its interaction with external and natural forces. The first one, or the "expressionist" view of the self dismantled all boundaries between the mind, body,

emotion, imagination, and will. Expressionists believe that the individual's unique desires guide his/her expression, and that through self-expression, the individual realizes his/her self in a "natural process of self-unfolding" (p. 563). Growth occurs through multiple attempts at expression and experiencing one's true inner desires. Moreover, expressionists reject objectivist's view of the observer (analyst), and instead believe that psychoanalytic treatment occurs through a series of self-exploration and self-expression. Predetermined theories or interpretive approaches impede the analyst's ability to empathize with the analysand. Proponents of the second view of agency argue that the individual desires conflict with and contest external constraints and limitations. Freudian psychoanalysis is the exemplar here. While the latter view favors self-control, the former champions self-expression. The definition and implications of the self shift between these two ideas. Of interest to Sass, and perhaps more germane to this chapter, was the work of Heinz Kohut, the father of self-psychology.

Self-psychology dominated psychological research in the 1980s and 1990s particularly in the United States (Scharff, 1994). Kohut's notion of the self as an organic whole, or as the "the center of the individual's psychological universe" (Kohut, 1977—The Restoration of the Self-New York: International Universities Press—p. 311), stems from his belief that the individual's desires to explore his/her creativity should be the center of the therapeutic experience. He conceptualizes the innate self appears *in potentia* at birth when the mother seems indistinguishable from the infant. As separation begins, the self begins to form only to the extent that the child recognizes him/herself as an autonomous agent from the mother. Kohut places great responsibility on the mother for the child's self-unification. Her role is to "respond empathetically to the infant's presence and achievements" (Sutherland, 1994, p. 313). The infant garners a "sense of omnipotence and grandiosity" (p. 313), which becomes tempered and right-sized as s/he engages with the environment. Unlike Freud, who privileged the role instincts played in ego development, Kohut argues that the child develops fault-lines in the ego due to the parent's "oral, anal, or oedipal disorders" (p. 314). Thus, Kohut replaces drives for relationships as interpretive tools for helping patients. The self may be a miniature society in relation to others, but not necessarily a labidinal vessel passively accepting material. Kohut also diverges from traditional beliefs about the self, in particular, the importance of narcissism in self-development, and the role of empathy in the therapist-patient relationship.

Freud took a rather derisive view of narcissism in his schema of the self. According to Kohut, Freud's view that narcissism represents either a fixation on infantile identification, as an inability to separate from self and object, or as a withdrawal into oneself to escape the pains and perils (perhaps defeat) of the Oedipal battles seem short-sighted. Although primary narcissism in infants is normal, as an "intermediate stage between autoeroticism and object love" (Lessem, 2005, p. 12), Freud assumes, Kohut posits, that energy reserved or horded for self-interests diminishes one's ability to be in relationship to other object interests. One's level of self-interest investments restricts or influences one's ability to be interested or involved with others. Kohut exclaims that narcissistic energies need

to be nurtured and encouraged in order for the individual to develop a healthy self. He claims that narcissism need not necessarily hinder one's ability to be in relationship with others. Narcissistic tendencies and personality traits existed on a continuum, Kohut argues.

An individual exhibits healthy doses of narcissism when s/he exudes self-confidence, a strong self-esteem, fosters relationships which encourage growth and personal promotion, and when the individual rebounds from life's certain, and perhaps numerous, disappointments. Individuals with pathological narcissism exhibit an almost obsessive-like preoccupation with the self. They possess grandiose fantasies on their abilities and social standing, and contain a fragile self-concept and self-cohesion. Pathological narcissistic tendencies produce frequent occasions of shame, humiliation, alienation, and they tend to devalue others around them. Self-psychologists in general, and Kohut in particular, place premier importance to the experience of shame. Feelings of shame clearly indicate a fractured self and a disturbed narcissistic equilibrium (Kohut, 1971, p. 379). The cycle of narcissistic tendencies characterized by self-importance, superiority, perfectionism, which leads to shame, humiliation, and isolation, is a difficult one to break. Shame is a painful feeling about the whole self, and originated when a parental figure disapproved, rejected, or ignored the child when s/he (child) believed s/he was engaged in worthy behavior. The child also feels a sense of personal deficit in relation to what Kohut entitles our "shared humanity and alikeness" (Lessem, 2005, p. 22). Moments of shame cause the individual to withdraw from others into the self and produces compensatory coping mechanisms, such as the one's described above. Normal or healthy narcissism develops as a result of caring, attentive, enthusiastic parental figures, as well as competition and self-comparison with others. Therapy can help adults with severe narcissistic tendencies primarily by building an empathic relationship with the therapists. Here again, Kohut, as well as other self-psychologists, diverge from traditional psychoanalytic approaches.

Empathy is a central component of the therapeutic experience. Instead of relying on pre-determined theories, authoritarian (almost paternalistic) or approaches to the patient, empathy requires the therapist to become engaged with the patient. The therapist does not sit as an objective observer, collecting inordinate facts about the patient only to interpret and prognosticate the particular maladies. Rather, using self-psychology, the therapist initiates and perpetuates a "position of prolonged empathic immersion in the patient's subjectivity" (Lessem, 2005, p. 64). The analyst tries to approach each patient without preconceived or predetermined notions of the patient's condition. Empathy, according to Kohut (1984) means "the capacity to think and feel oneself into the inner life of another person" (p. 82). Derived from the German word *einfuhlen*, meaning to "feel or find one's way into another's state of mind" (Lessem, 2005, p. 63), as a therapeutic tool, empathy invites the therapists to step into the proverbial shoes of the patient in order to aid him/her (patient) in coalescing a unified self. The process of empathy involves first, the "emotional resonance that is holistic, immediate and non-verbal (p. 73), and second, the verbal "attribution of meaning by means of complex affective and

cognitive capacities (p. 73). Kohut compares the introspection required for empathy to a histologist:

> Just as the histologist uses a microscope as his or her tool to see blood cells, the analyst uses introspection and empathy to gain access to the feelings, thoughts, and wishes of the patient. Although the inner worlds of our patients cannot be touched or seen, we observe them in ourselves through the process of introspection and in others through the phenomenon of empathy (Lessen, 2005, p. 67).

Empathic relationships with patients allow the therapists to understand, consider, and meet their needs in order to re-establish narcissistic equilibrium. Omer (1997), who incidentally is not a self-psychologist, proclaims that therapy with empathy involves an active narrative construction of the patient's inner and emotional logic. The therapist seeks to locate the antecedent patterns that sparked narcissistic derailment in order to help the patient gain acceptance and acknowledgement of the adaptive modes s/he acquired to cope with the initial moment of shame. Ideally, the analyst hopes to hear the patient exclaim, "That's me!" in the therapeutic session. Empathizing with the patient's logic and adaptive modes allows their experiences to be placed into the "realm of the thinkable and knowable" (Lessem, 2005, p. 120), and can "increase ownership of one's experience and expand the range of self-experiences that falls within one's concept of humanness" (p. 121). These results in turn allow patients to develop greater acceptance of self and others, with particular greater tolerability for imperfectability and tolerance of differences.

Other self-psychologists criticized Kohut's version of the self as inadequate because it fails to take into account the role of instincts. The self may be a miniature society, but one propelled by natural survival and reproductive mechanisms. Sutherland (1994) argues that Kohut's theory lacks a "convincing meta-psychology," or "one that links psychological to the biological factors that must be present for the evolution of a structure of such comprehensive responsibility for behavior" (p. 314). Furthermore, Sutherland defines the self to include instincts:

> Just as anatomical growth with all its differentiation appears to be ordered by an organizing ground plan operating as an overall gestalt, so the development of the self must have a parallel gestalt integrating its interactions with reality. However, coherent its unity may be at the start, the self-system rapidly acquires divisions or subselves resulting from the incompatible affects associated with experiences. Even with all the limitations of present knowledge, the self can be at least regarded as an overall system in which experiences are brought into cohesion. The gestalt appears to have a "desired" state of positively toned affect that accompanies the interactions between the organism and the environment, with each affect having its own specific quality according to the particular features of any relationship (p. 314).

The unified self becomes divided when inherent, personal needs of the infant are not met by a warm, welcoming, and loving mother, but are met by a controlling, rejecting mother. The mother, according to Sutherland, "reflects her love and care for the child as a spontaneously developing, autonomous person" (p. 292). Doing so denotes to the child a sense of belonging. "The child sees and feels who he is by what is put into him by the mother and then by the other family figures" (p. 292). The self divides, remains unfulfilled and develops sub-selves that form a unified but fractured self. The sub-selves contain unmet needs that led to parental scolding or rejection with deleterious consequences. Adults revert to fantasy or closeted behaviors to fulfill these needs. Nonetheless, in general, then, self-psychologists maintain that instincts represent one factor among a whole host of ones that fosters a self, and that the self ultimately becomes divided and split due to unmet parental needs. How to help patients heal the fractured self becomes the role of therapy. One such hidden behavior is propelled by what Masterson (1993) called closeted narcissism.

Masterson (1993) originated a new type of narcissism called closeted narcissism while maintaining a belief in healthy narcissism. Healthy narcissism, or the real self, contains a consistent sense of competence, a preference for and ability to distinguish reality from fantasy, a concern for others and recognition of how one's actions affect others, and a confidence to tackle and complete tasks and missions. The "intra-psychic structure" (p. 12) of a person with healthy narcissism entails self-recognition distinct from objects (i.e. parental, love objects), and a balanced completion of infantile grandiosity and sense of omnipotence (p. 12). The self is whole and is able to appreciate both positive and negative aspects about one and others. Masterson expands the typology of the healthy individual, or the "real self" to include the following characteristics:

1. Self-Image: of being adequate, competent, based on reality, with some input from fantasy: Intra-psychic representation as whole—both good and bad at the same time.
2. Self-assertion—to identify and activate individual thoughts and feelings:
   a. Access to and expression of creativity.
   b. Support self when under attack.
   c. Act in a spontaneous self-supportive, adaptive, realistic manner regarding
      i. Taking physical care of self—diet, work, exercise, schedule, appearance.
      ii. Expressing self through work, recreation, relationships.
      iii. Soothing self when in conflict.
      iv. Autonomous function of sense of self.
      v. Identifying and expressing one's unique creative ideas and urges.
      vi. Seeing objects as they are in reality, both good and bad at the same time.
      vii. Being able to acknowledge one's own self-activation and to set self limits.
      viii. Maintaining self-esteem by coping with and mastering reality.

Materson's description of narcissistic tendencies resembles those of the other self-psychologist above, but he creates a new category called the closet narcissist. Characteristics include:

1. The closet narcissist's major emotional investment is in the omnipotent object rather than in the grandiose self. The patient projects this object on others, idealizing them as a way of regulating his or how own sense of grandiosity.
2. The closet narcissist cannot maintain the constant activation of defense, and therefore, exhibits the triad of self-activation—depression—defense seen in the borderline personality disorders, which often leads to a misdiagnosis of borderline disorder.
3. The closet narcissist may seem to respond to confrontation; however, the fact that there is no consequent change in affect or in the therapeutic alliance reveals that the response is not genuine, but a result of defensive compliance (pp. 24–25).

The emergence of self-psychology represents a major epistemological break in the general therapeutic approach to mental maladies and to the construction of the self. Self-psychology unapologetically focuses on the self as an entity in a person's character. Instead of relying on a priori systems of analysis, self-psychologists spotlight the patient's inner logic and world-view in an effort to empathize, reconstruct, and verify them. Healthy narcissism emanates as signs of proper relationships with others, and the ability to exert oneself based primarily on heavy doses of reality mixed with a splash of fantasy. Finally, self-psychology altered considerations of freedom. The patient's internal life supplants previous views, which relied on external features designed to shape and construct one's identity and ones that service the therapist with diagnostic insights. The patient leaped to the center of the psychological stage as an entity capable of autonomous existence, in spite of claims of self-integration and self-reconstruction. The analyst needs to empathize, mentally and emotionally with the patient to expedite the healing process. The patient determines the contours of normalcy, and meta-psychology relies too heavily on apriori interpretations fuelled by a deterministic strands (Sass, 1988). The therapists must never judge or instruct the patient to be a certain way or do a certain thing (regime), but should provide opportunities to mirror healthy living. Mental maladies and dysfunction occur not because the patient refuses to see the analyst's view, or to take certain action, but because the environment neglects to condone the patient's inner essence.

Sass (1988) criticizes self-psychology for its failure to encourage patients to examine his/her relation to the external world, and instead promotes a sort of indifference or dismissal of external factors that fail to mirror the patient's inner life. What's more, he contends that self-psychology espouses a "rapacious or possessive individualism and an attitude of selfishness and exploitation toward both the natural and social worlds" (p. 591). In short, the only reality for the individual is that which can be incorporated into the world-view, where the "external world was really only an illusory projection outward of the inner life" (p. 586), which leads to fragmentation, isolation, and solipsism.

These charges of privileging an unhinged self, destined to fulfill its every desire regardless of the consequences to others may be misguided. The relationship between the individual psyche and its relationship to itself and the world have preoccupied psychologists since its inception. Narcissism stands as the abject fold for normativity and health in the field of psychology. What distinguishes self-psychology from classical schools of psychology is its criticisms of Freudian reliance on a priori biological instinctive drives as the center piece of healthy mental development. Various approaches to self-psychology contend, in general, that Freudian and Neo-Freudian approaches fail to include the "whole" person in their analysis and stand at the office door with a set of pre-determined instruments ready to solve (interpret) and proscribe the patient's apparent neurosis (Scharff, 1994). Self-psychologists possess a much different view of the analyst-patient relationship.

Other critics of self-psychology argue against its foundational principle of self-cohesion. Cushman (1990) claims that due to schools of self-psychology the contemporary individual suffers from an "empty self", determined to be filled up with consumer projects, poor diets, and destructive and illusory personal relationships. Self-psychology, Cushman claims, hinders psychological development and healing instead of actualizing it. Other researchers challenged self-psychology from a different angle. Sampson (1985) argues that theories of personhood relied on the notion of a unified self. He contests the very desire to develop a unified self at all. He observed that, "the ideal maintains that a particular structure of personal identity is required so that order and coherence rather than chaos will characterize the individual's life" (p. 1203). Fractures within the self produced intra- and inter-psychic troubles that led to maladjustments and anxieties. Epistemological shifts in Physics, Literary Theory, and Political Science, he claims, indicate that a de-centered, and not a unified or ordered self, actually promotes order and control. Non-equilibrium theory in Physics illustrates, for example, that the universe functions through probability and chance. Copernicus Revolution and Newtonian Physics refigured humans' position in the universe. A once deterministic world solidified by divine order transformed into a chaotic one ordered through probability. Also, the entropy principles claims that greater homogeneity breeds greater chaos and disorder. These ideas, Sampson reasons, indicate that universe is "open-ended" (p. 1205) and it can only maintain its openness in a state of disequilibrium. The self can only maintain its order in an expansive space. Structures or systems that promote equilibrium actually promote disorder and cacophony, while ones that promote disequilibrium promote order and harmony because they perpetuate a generative system. The self in a system that fosters disequilibrium remains in process, or "alive, evolving, and orderly" (p. 1206). Sampson explains,

> We encounter a decentralized, multifaceted ensemble whose coherence as a being is sustained only by virtue of its continuous becoming. According to nonequilibrium theory, personhood does not derive its order from being a thoroughly integrated, singular thing but rather from its being a continuously

> evolving process whose evolvingness rather than its thinghood is its very essence (p. 1206).

Open systems remain in constant exchange with their environments, thus reducing the level of entropy, while components in a closed, or homogenous systems in a state of equilibrium disengage from one another. They are "hypnons, or sleepwalkers" (p. 1206). A collection of decentralized selves establishes order because it requires individuals to interact with each other and builds communities with interests rather than alienated individuals. Systems that promote homogeneity and equilibrium rely on coercive measures to regulate its members. As Sampson states,

> Our personhood ideal does not lead toward either individuality or freedom; it only catches us in a contradiction that produces frustration and slides us inevitably toward a socially self-destructive pattern. The freedom that self-organizing systems represent can never be reached from a self-contained stance about personhood. Only a decentralized, nonequilibrium conception of personhood that allows our multiplicity and interconnectedness a time to live can possible encourage the problem solving that is necessary to achieve the utopian dream we share (p. 1210).

Thus, if late nineteenth century educators believed that adolescents arrived to school with an irrational mind in serious need of order, educators in the 1980–90s in the United States believed that adolescents possessed an underdeveloped, or chaotic sense of self. As much, if not more, as health, body, and disease permeate the education literature on writing pedagogy, the word "self" permeates this scholarship. Commonalities about language, the adolescent, and types of writing pedagogies appear to be consistent between these two periods; however, a closer look reveals distinctions that make the contemporary period almost unrecognizable and unbelievable. Writing may foster a sense of self and it can project an authentic self.

SELF-WRITING/WRITING THE SELF

Psychological theories of learning and language acquisition underscored the notion that human beings possessed innate abilities to acquire and use language. Collaborating with the environment (i.e. mother), a child constructs the rules of grammar prior to even knowing how to employ those rules. They possess an "inner feeling" about how to use language, and through experience with the environment, and over time, the child develops a stronger conception of how to use language appropriately. The relationship with the environment, however, is tempered in contemporary understandings of language. Leo Vygotsky's work on learning and language dominated the field of English education in the 1980s, particularly, his idea of the inner ego-speech endemic in children. For example, William W. Wright, Jr. (1980) argues that writing can be a "way for us to understand self as well as make sense of the world" (p. 28). The self emerges through a confluence of

the broader social world and the individual's consciousness. Peter Elbow (1998) asserts that the "germ event" of writing consists of transforming a "nonverbal felt meaning" into a "piece of language" (Introduction, p. xviii). The "inward turn" in other disciplinary fields, such as literary theory, medicine, and neurobiology necessitates altering research on writing. Writing, Wright asserts, is a "complex, multidimensional" activity that helps the individual "think and understand" (p. 27). The process of writing is a self-reflective process, compelling the writer to review and transform the composition and content of self-expression. As such, it guides the individual in producing a self and in understanding the world. Wright contends that writing can serve the "Me Generation" in the "Age of Narcissism" by tapping into the student's "inner speech". Using the Russian psychologist's theory of inner speech, Wright (1980) rightfully points out that it (inner speech) is the last linguistic ability to develop. He states, "This movement from external "egocentric" operations to inner speech seems to parallel the movement in history inwards towards the self" (p. 29). Inner speech, Wright neglects to point out, involves a series of internalizations, most notably of cultural and interpersonal forms. Nonetheless, the dynamic interplay between a student's environment and his/her internal speech reflects the link between community values and individual desires. External factors and individual conceptions determine the lines of demarcation for self-fashioning.

Teachers of writing can aid with a student's self-fashioning primarily through 'freewriting' (Elbow, 1973). Freewriting allows students to be "free and relaxed" (p. 28) to externalize internal speech operations, which helps them make sense of who they are. Freewriting encourages students to discover the self, which is "important and healthy for all humans" (Wright, 1980, p. 29). Once a piece of writing is completed, it is responded to by an audience. Writing inner-speech, then, contains a personal and social function:

> This function of writing applies at the individual level as well as the social one. If the tales we exchange about our experiences have an evaluation function, then we can see that writing is a way of making sense of the world. This works in two ways: we write to see how others respond to the values we place on experience. We also read the writing of others in order to widen our experience. One feeds upon the other (p. 28).

According to Wright, writing inherently implies a reader, a response, and an evaluation. This relationship helps the student fashion a self, and allows the community to calcify its values. Writing, then, functions more than a tool to learn content, but as a means by which a student can establish a self. Moreover, Wright asserts, teachers of writing can help students establish a healthy self, one that is not too egocentric, or "feelie weelie" (p. 29) and exhibited by the "I-centered essays" (p. 29). As a reader of students' writing, teachers can be that external buffer and evaluator that forces the pupil to re-evaluate his/her self. Teachers can "expose 'egocentric self' through freewriting" (p. 29), which has "cathartic" (p. 29) and limitless potential for self-discovery. The self does not exist as a recluse. Language as a social convention links the reader/writer to broader social world. To be more

precise, reading and writing emerge as functions to be dispersed throughout the discursive landscape. Students read and write their consciousness to develop or understand the self, and inner-speech appears only through the instruments of social conventions of language. The mysterious recesses of consciousness blossom with language. How to reflect that inner life and the scientificity employed by English educators to excavate it are discussed in the next section.

English educators designed multiple approaches to capture and shape the inner life of adolescents. This mysterious, yet essential element of the self emerged as a prime target for writing pedagogues. The scientific processes designed to provoke and allure students to reveal their inner most selves egressed as the prime focus of scholarship during this time period. Grammar and mechanics dissipated as writing became an instrument to get at the interiors of the adolescent mind. Educators in the 1890s fought to dispel environment and slang from the classroom, while teachers in the 1990s invited them in order to manage the relationship between the miniature societies of the individual consciousness with the broader social order. The practices of reading and writing absconded for more anthropomorphic and phenomenological characters.

Technologies of sight, which dominated the late nineteenth-century, merged with sound, voice, and personal pronouns. Writing ceased to be a skill in the tradition sense, and emerged as a psychological instrument to understand, appreciate, and develop a self co-constructed with the epistemologies of the broader social order. The corporal body, once a material product prone to disease, converts into a confluence of intertextualities. The body, the self, and personality become textualized in a battle royale of signs and significations. The process of writing and the product of a composition illustrated the student's type of narcissism, and teachers, classmates, and parents act as self-psychologist clinicians to build an environment conducive for the student to reveal the logic of his/her inner life.

James Moffett (1979) asserts that the "heart of writing beats deep within a subjective inner life. While neither audible nor visible at the time the most important action is occurring, it governs all the choices that a composition course tries to straighten out" (Moffett in Wright, 1980, p. 28). This inner life, however, according to Moffett is invisible, almost inaccessible. The teacher's role is to try to get students to write from the place of this inner voice in order to help students make meaning about their selves and for themselves. Moffett (1981) describes how students can learn to write by going through a similar process. In the final chapter "I, You, and It" in his book *Active Voice: A Writing Program Across the Curriculum*, he begins by describing the experiences he felt while eating lunch in a cafeteria. In his description, he claims that writing is analogous process to filtering out a phenomenological moment:

> Consider, if you will, those primary moments of experience that are necessarily the raw stuff of all discourse. Let us suppose, for example that I am sitting in a public cafeteria eating lunch. People are arriving and departing, passing through the line, choosing tables, socializing. I am bombarded with smells of food, the sounds of chatter and clatter, the sights

> of the counter, the tables, the clothing, the faces, the gesticulations and bending of elbows. But I am not just an observer; I am eating and perhaps socializing as well. A lot is going on within me - the tasting and ingesting of the food, reactions to what I observe, emotions about other people. I am registering all these inner and outer stimulus. My perceptual apparatus is recording these moments of raw experience, not in words but in some code of its own that leads to words. This apparatus is somewhat unique to me in the way it selects and ignores stimuli and in the way it immediately connects them with old stimuli and previously formed conceptions. It is difficult to separate this sensory recording from the constant stream of thoughts that is going on simultaneously and parallel to the sensory record but may often depart from it. The verbal stream is the first level of discourse to be considered. The subject is what is happening now, and the audience is oneself (p. 140)

In this moment, the essential elements of discourse contain only the self. According to Moffett, the self observes, experiences, registers, selects, ignores, connects, departs and considers. The audience is absent; he is only experiencing this particular moment. The "verbal stream" is the primary way to capture this phenomenological moment. Moffett assumes that the individual experiences multiple thoughts, emotions, and stimuli, but can only select certain ones at any one given moment. The "verbal stream", however, implies an audience. He presents an Edenistic view of the individual's phenomenological experience. How one selects and verbalizes experiences involves the social conventions of language, which implies a broader social world. The mysterious inner world of the individual, or Chaos to evoke St. Vincent Millay, refuses to be corralled. Yet, what is most important and germane to this book is the focus on the inner consciousness and phenomenological experiences as the prime movers of the writing endeavor. The inner life of the student emerges as the prime target of power/knowledge, and it appears, much like the autopsy or pathogens as a viable text, of which writing pedagogy could induce to expose.

Now, pretend, Moffett suggests, what would happen if he were to tell the experience to someone else in a different time and space in a face-to-face conversation? Imagine if he were to describe these experiences to an "audience [that] is no longer face to face" but is "farther removed in time and space so that I have to write a letter or memo to him" (p. 141). Writing must replace the face-to-face interaction between people, which includes immediate feedback, "vocal characteristics and all physical expressiveness of gesture, tone, and manner" (p. 141). Instead, as a writer, he must use "vocabulary, style, logic, and rhetoric that anybody in that mass audience can understand and respond to" (p. 141). As a writer, he will need to pick and choose which details and experiences are important to tell. This experience and the various ways represent Moffett's schema for teaching writing: "inner verbalization, outer-vocalization, correspondence, and formal writing" each along a continuum "increasing the distance, in all senses, between speaker and audience" (p. 141). Moffett designs a four-stage theory of the symbolic representation of the "subject," which is "some primary moments of

experience regardless of how dimly they may appear in the discourse" (p. 142). They are best described through the relationship between the "subject" and the "verb" function, which "indicate(s) when events occurred in relation to when the speaker is speaking of them" (p. 142):

1. Subject as what happened: here the experience is being described as it is happening, not concerned with form and is the "lowest level of abstraction" (p. 142) and "correspond(s) most closely to the phenomenal reality" (p. 142).
2. Subject as what happened: here the experience is described in the past, but still contextualized as in the "cafeteria." To complete this level of abstraction, the subject must be described in the "order of events", is not an immediate response, and is not simply the "perceptual apparatus" but is "memory" (p. 142). Here the person will "choose to retain or reject, depending on which features of this scene and action I wish to bring out" (p. 142).
3. Subject as what happens: Here we see a greater level of abstraction where the person generalizes about such events, which the subject can do so in many ways. For example, the subject may state that "The food you get in restaurants is not as good as what you get at home," or "People don't like me," or "American's do not socialize as readily with strangers in public places as Italians do," or "the arrivals and departures within a continuous group create changes in excitation level comparable to the raising and lowering of electric potential in variously stimulated sensory receptors."
4. Subject as "what will, may, or could happen": This represents the "high-level inference entailing tautology" where the person develops a theory, "some combining and developing and developing of generalizations" (p. 144). Here the speaker makes inferences that are not present in the original experience, and can be used to develop an "anthropological" theory about the experience.

From these four levels of abstraction, Moffett creates his method of teaching writing to secondary students. He argues that the student must be encouraged to begin with personal "vocalization" and move discursively through the various forms of abstraction. Abstraction involves composing a text with regard to time and space of the audience. Memory, inferences, and generalizations involve knowing about the broader social world. Thus, the emergence of the self includes an understanding of the discourses within one's environment. Moffett's pedagogical approach illustrates how writing bridges, or even infringes on the inner life of the student, and shows how internalization of the various social discourses seek to shape the adolescent self. Writing functions as a psychological tool to form the inner life of the child. His approach is far more subtle, and perhaps more manipulative that Atkinson's Child Study or Bertillion's card designed to specify the details of every criminal in Paris. It is an insidious strategy of power/knowledge to expose, chart and shape the self of the adolescent. His suggestions for teachers further illustrate these points.

Most of his book outlines different classroom activities that teachers can use to support students through these levels of abstractions. The quickest way to understand Moffett's method, he encourages us to "imagine the trinity

discourse - first, second, and third persons - to be a single circle that separates into three overlapping circles which move out until they merely touch" (p. 146), hence "I, You, and It". The following chart from the text demonstrates the progression of assignments:

1. From vocal speech and unuttered speech to private writing to public writing.
2. From dialogues and monologues to letters and diaries to first-person narratives to third-person narratives to essays of generalization to essays of logical operation.
3. From an intimate to a remote audience.
4. From vernacular improvization to literary composition.
5. From immediate subjects to small time-space scope to remote subjects far flung in time and space.
6. From recording (drama) to reporting (narrative to generalizing (exposition) to theorizing (argumentation).
7. From perception to memory to ratiocination.
8. From present to past to potential.
9. From chronology to analogy to tautology.

The progression schema between the audience and speaker is as follows:

Thinking to oneself	Inner Verbalization
Speaking to another Person face to face	Outer vocalization
Writing to a known party	Informal writing
Writing to a mass, Anonymous audience	Publication

The progression schema regarding the "speaker-subject" relationship is as follows:

Recording what is happening	Drama	The chronologic of on-going perceptual selection
Reporting what Happened	Narrative	The chronologic of memory memory selection
Generalizing what Happens	Exposition	The analogical of class inclusion and exclusion
Inferring what will, May, or could Happen	Logical Argumentation	The tautological of transformation and combination

Moffett argues that teaching writing should begin with revealing internal voices and conversations and to move strategically to more detached, public voices, such as the "logical argumentation" in essays. What is more, Moffett extols the virtues of personal, inner-speech writing, to buttress the prevailing notion at this time that secondary schools need to prepare adolescents for the types of writing they may

encounter in the real world. Different literary genres can be employed to expose different parts of the adolescent body and his/her inner life. They permit and encourage students to complete autopsies of themselves, which in turn, permits teachers to microscopically examine parts of the body or self, and via Kock's postulates, isolate errors and deviations. Furthermore, writing classrooms resemble laboratories, or controlled environments designed to promote experimentation, employ induction, and reconcile truth based on "nature" or the broader social world. Instead, classroom layouts can mirror a writing studio (workshop), which emboldens students to simulate the life of "real writers." Furthermore, and much like educators in the 1890s, the primary reason, Moffett explains, for moving from inner speech, personal writing, to more rational forms, is to prepare students to succeed in college. As he states, "What I'm going to try to aim at here are the ways of doing justice to other kinds of writing that will at the same time prepare for what colleges want" (Moffett, 1981, p. 177). Colleges require students to know how to compose a proper essay. The purging of the inner speech via free-writing or journaling, structured through various other forms with their own audiences, voices, and formal features, all prove to be instruments to move students to a single, rational point of expression. Students learn to mold their inner life into rationalistic expressions. Repetition and practices were the strategies used in the 1890s, while starting in the 1970s and 1980s, writing pedagogy forced adolescents through a labyrinth of multiple selves arriving at the rational exit. Writing emerges as an instrument for students to demonstrate their abilities to appropriately express themselves using the correct voice and tone, but most importantly to illustrate how to make the jejune into the orderly.

The will to knowledge in secondary English Scholars in the field of the teaching of writing relied on phenomenology to sharpen their distinctions between discrete types of writers. For example, Flowers (1986) posited that advanced writers use more "reader-based prose" while naïve writers use more "writer-based prose." Using Vygotsky and Piaget as the foundation for her method, she surmises that students learn to write using their inner voices, or "egocentric speech" first and then progress to "communicate something to a reader" (p. 77). She argues that "good writing" is a "cognitively demanding transformation of the natural but private expression of writer-based thought into a structure and style adapted to a reader" (p. 77). Advanced, or proficient, writers recognize and converse with an audience and structure the writing to meet the audience's needs. When a writer connects to the reader through their work, they become "psychologically" more advanced or developed because they have surpassed "ego-speech," which is characteristic of a child. As psychological development advances the greater the adolescent can generate a self that aligns with the contours of the broader social order. Attention focused on the audience reflects the student's level of psychological maturity, which belies notions that writing assessment measure abilities.

Moreover, Carrol (1981) infects listening and speaking in the writing process, which expands the phenomenological process. She argues that students can learn to write better if they use speech as a primary supplement. She explains that students

can use four different types of speech/writing schemas to help their writing. They include: Alchemistic speech for prewriting involves a "talk, write, talk" pattern; Analytic speech for the "shaping stage" involves a "write, talk" pattern; Evaluative speech for the "editing stage" involves a "rewrite, talk, rewrite" pattern; and Closure for the "completing stage" involves just "talk" about the student's writing process (p. 100). Her strategies offer ways to expose the inner life of the adolescent and further rendering it (inner consciousness) as a bodily text. Furthermore, Linda Hunter (1980) also makes the "inside/outside" connection to writing. Using W. Timothy Gallwey's 1974 book *The Inner Game of Tennis* as an analogy to writing, she claims that students need to understand their own "lapses in concentration, self-doubt, and self-condemnation" that tennis players experience (p. 54). As the student tries to "avoid all the mistakes of the past, the flow of writing is dammed up completely" (p. 54), they must pay more attention to the "self #2," which is the "unconscious, intuitive natural self" (p. 54) instead of "self#1," who is the "analyzing, judgmental, critical self" (p. 54). To do this, Hunter recommends "a lot of journal and free writing" (p. 54). This will allow the writer to release the "flow of writing." She also recommends via Gallwey that the writer looks at their work "dispassionately" and "observe what is going on; program one's unconscious for better results; let it happen; observe what happened" (p. 55). Hunter converts writing practice as a psychological test for students to learn about the composition of their self. Finally, Goodwin (1983) argues that the brain operates between the right and left parts of the brain. Using Julian Jaynes' work *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind* (1976), Goodwin argues that the consciousness "translates" (p. 43) components of the external world into a "series of pictures, which are projected in an imaginary mind-space" (p. 43). Much of communication, including conveying the translation to an audience occurs in the mind of both the reader and the writer. Others advance the notion of multiple selves in the writing process.

Murray (1986) contends that teachers of writing must allow students to write for themselves first:

> The act of writing might be described as a conversation between two workmen muttering to each other at the workbench. The self speaks, the other self listens and responds. The self proposes, the other self considers. The self makes, the other self evaluates. The two selves collaborate: a problem is spotted, discussed, defined; solutions are proposed, rejected, suggested, attempted, tested, discarded, accepted (p. 165).

The relationship between the two selves, here, are analogous, according to Murray to reading and writing. But, it's not a typical relationship of "decoding" information, but a "sophisticated reading that monitors writing before it is made, as it is made, and after it is made" (p. 66). Monitoring, for Murray, is "significant" because it "involves awareness on many levels and includes the opportunity for change" (p. 66):

> The writer, as the text evolves, reads fragments of language as well as completed units of language, what isn't on the page as well as what is on the page, what should be left out as well as what should be put in. Even patterns and designs—sketches of possible relationships between pieces of information or fragments of rhetoric or language—that we do not usually consider language are read and discussed by the self and the other self (p. 66).

In Murray's schema, the reading self has a pivotal role in the writing process; it becomes a "map maker" (p. 66):

> The other self scans the entire territory, forgetting, for the moment, questions of order or language. The writer/explorer looks for the draft's horizons. Once the writer has scanned the larger vision of the territory, it may be possible to trace a trail that will get the writer from here to there, from meaning identified to meaning clarified (pp. 66–67).

The writer/explorer "stops, looks ahead, considers and reconsiders the trail and the ways to get around the obstacles that block that trail" (p. 67). The best way for students to learn the landscape of writing is for him/her to "go out in the bush" and write:

> Once the writer/explorer has read one map and made the trip from meaning intended to meaning realized, will the young writer begin to trust the other self and have faith it will know how to read other trails through other territories. The reading writer — map maker and map reader — reads the word, the line, the sentence, the paragraph, the page, the entire text. This constant back-and-forth reading monitors the multiple complex relationships between all the elements in writing (p. 67).

The "other self" possesses several roles in the writing process; it "gives the self the distance that is essential for craft," "provides an evolving context for the writer," keeps track of how each change affects the draft," "articulates the process of writing, providing the writer with an engineering history of the developing text, a technical resource that records the problems faced and the solutions that were tried and rejected, not yet tried, and the one that is in place," "is a critic who is continually looking at the writing to see if, in the writer's phrase, 'it works,'" and "also is the supportive colleague to the writer" (p. 68).

The student emerges not as a diseased body, but as a cartographer of the self, which is constantly negotiating and maneuvering the relationship between its inner life and the broader social world. The self releases and monitors; it accepts stimuli and translates it; it makes decisions and renders accurate, resonate, sketches; it criticizes and supports. The field of consciousness is a vast, complex dynamic field managed by the teaching tools of the writing pedagogue. One perhaps yearns for the days of dissociation, disillusionment, and obsession.

The teacher's role is to "activate" and play the role of the "other self" with the student so that they may develop it and work independently once they leave

school. In conferences, the teacher listens to the student and describes what needs to be done in the piece of writing. In doing, so, the teacher plays the role of the "other self" by asking questions, and guides the student in his/her writing; the teacher will "under-teach" so that the student can "over-learn" (p. 70). The student also exposes their "other self" in the conference by revealing the answers to the teacher's questions. This allows the teacher the opportunity to correct any "misunderstood instruction, inappropriate principles, or logical processes that did not work" (p. 70), such as generalizing their topic to meet a large audience:

> The instructor who wishes to teach the other self must discuss the text with the other self in less despairing or elated tones. Too often the inexperienced conference teacher goes to the polar extremes and offers the despairing student absolute praise and the confident student harsh criticism. In practice, the effective conference teacher does not deal in praise or criticism. All texts can be improved and the instructor discusses with the student what is working and can be made to work better, and what isn't working and how it might be made to work (p. 71).

Although the teacher has an obligation to not criticize the student, she/he will find that students can learn about the "other self" through the teacher's modeling.

> The students will discover, as the teacher models an ideal other self that the largest questions of content, meaning, or focus have to be dealt with first. Until there is a clear meaning the writer cannot order the information that supports that meaning or leads towards it. And until the meaning and its supporting structure is clear the writer cannot make the decisions about voice and language that clarify and communicate that meaning. The other self has to monitor many activities and make sure that the writing self reads what is being monitored in an effective sequence. Sometimes teachers who are introduced to teaching the other self feel that listening to the student first means they cannot intervene. That is not true. This is not a do-your-own-thing kind of teaching. It is a demanding teaching it is nothing less than the teaching of critical thinking (p. 72).

The idea is to see the student as an "apprentice at the workbench with a master workman" whose other self needs room to speak about the work, articulate its concerns and strength. The teacher can accomplish these goals by asking questions and listening. Another way to get the other self to speak is to have the student write a "brief statement about the draft" (p. 73). Although Murray finds this method "far less effective than conferencing" it can allow the student to discuss how she/he went about creating the piece of writing. The final step is having students speak about their papers in both small and large group sessions, and by publishing their work. According to Murray, this process allows the other self to become even stronger as they discuss what worked in the paper and what could be done next time.

The interiorization of the writing/reading "self" becomes the object of a disciplinary, scientific gaze beginning with the "fragments of language" and

"patterns and designs" that create a "map" of the "territory." Here, it appears, Murray utilizes her own experiences with writing to make her descriptions of how the writing process operates. We also see how the "technical skill" links to or is connected to "one's self-confidence, self-imaging, and self-growth." Thus we see how writing the body equates to writing the self. Guiding the scholastic body through various, yet limited "territory" will produce a specific "self". The disciplinary gaze, in this particular situation demonstrates how the teacher can guide the "map-maker" or the "reader writer" to "read other trails through other territories" the subject will eventually "begin to trust the other self and have faith" in it. The individual subject learns to "gaze" or monitor him/her self. Once the teachers model and guide students through the territories, and are able to produce a specific scholastic body, then they can trust their own "map reading" abilities, and thus be independent. They will, in short, be able to monitor their own scholastic journey, create their own scholastic bodies, but only do so in specific ways. Monitoring involves "editing," and "adding and deleting," which implies that particular texts need to be constructed in specific ways. This type of interiorization persists throughout the 1980s. We see pedagogical techniques use the technologies of disciplinary and pastoral powers.

These last examples represent the discourses and discursive practices that attempt to expose the internal operations of the "writer" and how the "writer" is produced. To move from an "ego-speech" writer to the "reader-self," "free-writing" must be used to release the "damn-up" "self#2." Moreover, we see the movement from "alchemistic speech," similar to Moffett's phenomenological moment in the cafeteria, through the "shaping stage" to the "completing stage." These types of schema acknowledge that writing the self is a dynamic process; however, it's that dynamism that demands such scientificity.

TEACHING IN THE AGE OF NARCISSISM

Tapping into that "inner voice" of the self that governs writing can be quite difficult. Teachers, however, developed strategies to do that in a secondary English classroom. Teachers of writing predominately focused on writing activities that began with the individual student and providing him/her with opportunities to compose pieces about personal experiences. John Kendall (1985) describes how he turned a school tragedy into a valuable writing assignment. When the Upper school building at Rutgers Preparatory school burned down, he encouraged his students to write about their favorite memories of the building. He states that his students, "turned to reconstructing their past on paper with the greatest sense of loss" (p. 60), and in doing so, they were "fireproofing" their school and "forever protecting a part" of their lives from permanent harm. Students who compose for more authentic, or real, purposes write with emotion and purpose (Rhea, 1986). Jane Krebs (1987) explains how writing short stories about family allowed students in his class to bond. He states, "In tying themselves to their histories, they had connected themselves to each other, too. Students do have something to say, and they do have the ability to say it well and with style" (p. 60).

Steven Grubaugh (1985) states that Spoken Word vocabulary performances gives students an opportunity to share their experiences and interests with their classmates, and allowed him to teach important vocabulary skills, such as dictionary skills and etymology. Students self-select a new word, understand its meaning and usage, and then design a performance that exemplifies the word. Memories of experiences can be real or imagined, but cannot be extemporaneously made up. Students perform the word in a story. He summarizes the experience this way: "The Spoken Words format offers a chance for teachers and students to become better acquainted as their words and stories reveal their lives, interests, hobbies, readings, etc. Spoken Words generates its own momentum as teachers and students together contribute to a learning climate where exposure to vocabulary concepts is enjoyable and valuable" (p. 67). Lin McKay (1986) argues that encouraging students to reflect on their previous written work fosters a sense of trust and responsibility in adolescents. She claims that as students review their own work, they develop a sense of independence and a greater dependence on others for feedback on their writing. As one student commented, "When I comment on my own paper, I feel really good. What it says to me is that you (teacher) trust us to be mature, and that means you believe in us, so also we will trust you" (p. 62).

McKay's work highlights the shift in the relationship between teacher and student in the secondary classroom. She gave students greater control over their learning about writing and fostered a sense of shared responsibility between teacher and student. Some teachers had a much harder time relinquishing control. Nancie Atwell (1985), for example, describes the difficulty she had giving up control of her classroom. Atwell states that she didn't know how to "share responsibility" with her students, and that she rather preferred being "in charge" (p. 36). However, when she relinquished control, prodigious results ensued. Students started to write about personal topics and for their own personal needs. They wrote using a variety of genres, and were more likely to revise, edit and proofread. More important, they became writers who took "chances" (p. 36), and began to understand the nature of "true authorship" (p. 36), which "begins with a thought that eventually becomes words on the page about an individual's interests and concerns" (p. 36). The teachers, Atwell asserts, need to provide a writing conducive environment replete with time, talk (i.e. conferences, with parents and peers), reading, and materials (i.e. writing folders). Once she moved from behind her "big desk," she learned that adolescents, "Given time and a conducive environment, these writers can rediscover their voices and ideas" (p. 37).

The relationship between the teacher and the student changed. Atwell learned to surrender a bit of her curriculum and pedagogical ideas about learning to write, and developed a more trusting relationship with her students. She became what Frazier (1986) described as more of a "coach". He contends that teaching and coaching adolescents are quite similar in that building relationships with students and allowing them to do the work are essential to being an effective teacher. Responding in an encouraging manner is more conducive to motivating students than piling on heaps of criticism. Sullivan (1986) claims that lots of criticism can paralyze students and prevent them from writing in school. Too much negative

criticism can "incapacitate" (p. 52) students because they are likely to "take criticism of their writing as criticism of themselves and their values" (p. 52).

Clark (1986) argues that if teachers "accept (his) rigorously unscientific measures of effectiveness"(p. 47), then the following three items will occur:

1. Students write more, much more, than they ever did before during an equivalent span of time.
2. They do it with little hassle, at least compared to groups I have taught in more traditional ways.
3. The writing is more interesting to read (p. 47).

His method consists of first meeting the student where she/he is, not simply to move him/her along a "continuum" but to "start with the student's perception of where she/he is" (p. 48). The student remains the focus of this writing workshop model. The idea is that students produce several rough-drafts on a variety of topics of their choosing. Students select and write about anything that they wish, and discuss these topics with the teacher during "what-do-I-write-about-conferences" (p. 50). The purpose of the rough-drafts is to play with voice. The teacher's job is to walk around the room and offer suggestions and advice, but always ending with "but you don't have to write that if you don't want to" (p. 50). Once students have written several rough drafts on several topics of their choosing, had conferences with the teacher, the student selects a "few of his papers (sic)" (p. 50) to revise and "polishes them for a grade" (p. 50). Once a student submits a draft, the teacher asks: "What do you think is the best thing about your draft?" (p. 51). Although Clark admits that having students in groups edit each other's papers is an "excellent idea" (p. 53), he much prefers the "constant informal swapping of papers that inevitably goes on when the teacher walks around the room talking with individuals" (p. 53). By the end of the drafting, conferencing, and "swapping of papers," the student will have "exhausted the possibilities for advice and suggestions from teacher and classmates and can be reasonably sure that his final draft represents the best work he is capable of" (p. 53). Clark concludes that writing cannot be "learned" but is intimately tied to a students' "growth":

> Writing, it seems to me, cannot be "learned" in the same sense as one can learn square roots or punctuation or typewriting. One never really completes the process of learning to write. The technical skill is intimately tied up with one's self-confidence, self-image, and self-growth. Somewhere in the school experience, every student needs to have the chance to experience that kind of growth (p. 54).

Several writing assignments and forms of writing emerged in the 1980s to support the portfolio's use in the classroom. We see, in short, a movement away from formalistic writing (Rico, 1988) arguing that teachers need to "honor the unique patterns of thought, unripe though they may be" (p. 58), such as "essays" and a movement towards "self-awareness" (McGuire, 1988) and "creativity" (Moore, 1982). McGuire's article (1988) reveals how asking students to reflect on their own writing process allows them to possess great control of their writing. Using

"teacher research" with her own classroom, she discovered that three types of writers existed: "Anxious," Euphoric" and "Normal." (p. 34). She concludes that, as students answered her questions,[2] she learned what "teachers usually know about through our intuitions" (p. 36), that allowing students the chance to express their "frustrations and growth" played a significant role in making "progress" and to "take control" of their "writing development and growth" (p. 36). Other such writing experiences include: writing about one's family (Krebs, 1987), having students write about "what appeals to them," including rebelliousness, destruction, and "tearful drama" (p. 63); she further argues that "Inside every poor writer is a good writer struggling to get out" (p. 62); using the "painted word" (McNeese, 1989) in an English classroom, arguing that different disciplines "feed off of each other" (p. 34); using television shows, particularly *The Cosby Show* to spark topics for writing assignments and to teach "values" (Blair, 1988); using the community in a small rural town in Alabama as topics for writing (Graham, 1983); using the "team approach" to teaching writing in the classroom (Kelly et al., 1984); and using experiences as a "coach" to better understand students in the classroom (Frazier, 1986). Each of these moments in the 1980's supports the emergence of the portfolio in the secondary English classroom.

Mimi Schwartz (1985) demonstrates that writing can be used for various personal purposes. In her discussion of journals, she argues that they can be used as a "daily log" which describes events of the day, or they may be used to "explore what could be, or should be, or might have been, as well as what is" (p. 7). Moreover in journals, students can "react to a book, political events, friends or philosophy" (p. 7). In short, they can be used for writer's block, to start over, and to "experiment" (p. 25). Furthermore, she claims that "letter writing" should invoke an audience where the "reader must feel the writer's presence, right there, as if they were talking face-to-face" (p. 29). The sign of an effective letter is if the "voice sounds honest and engaging" (p. 29). Letters can serve many purposes, to "explain" (p. 36), or "persuade" (p. 47), or as "fiction" (p. 53), but they all serve as a "bridge for crossing over from the privacy of the journal to the more public writing tasks of job letters, reports, and essays (p. 31). Finally, Schwartz argues that "essay writing," which is French for "try" (p. 62), involves presenting a "point of view—whether looking inward at experiences or outward to the world" (p. 62). Again they can be written for several purposes: "to analyze, instruct, express, persuade, or critique" (p. 62). The link through them all, however, is that the writer presents his/her view.

Scholars and teachers jettisoned traditional approaches to teaching grammar, including using grammar textbooks, and instead encouraged students to write continually for real-world, authentic reasons. Proper grammar, many reasoned, will be fixed if students know they are writing for a real purpose. Jean Sanborn (1986) states that grammar should not be required for adolescents until their final two

---

[2] Her questions include the following: 1. What things happen to you when you write?; 2. What things concerning writing would you like to know more about?; 3. How would you describe your own writing process?; 4. How has your writing changed so far this year?

years of high school. She claims that adolescents do not possess the mental capabilities (i.e. formal operations) to comprehend the intricate relationships inherent within a system of grammar. Sanborn argues that, like their "digestive system" (p. 74), children are born with a "language learning system" (p. 74), and they know how to use words in a similar way that they know what to do with "food" (p. 74). Studying grammar, therefore, asks students to embody a "self-consciousness" (p. 77) that requires adolescents to "step outside themselves" (p. 77) in order to investigate and explore a process (i.e. language making, meaning making) that they "perform unconsciously" (p. 77). When adolescents develop higher thinking abilities, studying grammar affords them the opportunity to "self-knowledge" (p. 77), but introducing the study of grammar earlier leads to "confusion and frustration" (p. 77). Teachers can teach grammar from the standpoint of "verb, noun, modifier" (p. 79), and give students opportunities to write on topics of personal relevance and importance.

Students took ownership of their own writing as the body of the composition was theirs. It was their reflection of their inner selves, and how it was "straightened out" became their responsibility. The error-hunt transformed into guiding questions, and formulaic, inductive pedagogical approaches transformed into free-writing and authentic writing prompts. Writing and learning to use English properly occurred organically through extensive and multiple opportunities to write and respond to writing. Students were taught how to "self-edit" (Rosen, 1987) and provide feedback to their peers in writing workshops (laboratories). Furthermore, a greater push to allow students to compose pieces in multiple genres trumped calls for standardized approaches to writing. Kearns (1985) argues that most English classrooms read a variety of genres (i.e. poetry, short story, novels), but allow students to compose in only a few forms. He claims that students need opportunities to "perform" in English, that is, read and write in all genres. Students develop a greater appreciation for a certain genre, Kerns reasons, if they compose in that genre. Moreover, he asserts, that different forms reflect a different part of the student's inner self. Granting students the opportunity to compose using a variety of genres allows them to illustrate the many facets of their selves. Finally, researchers underscored the idea that there was no one way or one process of writing. To develop fluency, students needed to learn the "range of options possible for a piece and then construct a piece suitable to specific demands rather than relying on any one formula to provide easy answers" (Bruton and Kirby, 1987, p. 90). To be sure, students need to feel comfortable with writing and harness enough words to "fill up the page," but to help adolescents become fluent in writing is more complex than simply free-writing:

> Written fluency is thus a multi-dimensional concept involving not only getting words on to the page but also marshalling a range of strategies, orchestrating the complexities involved in the use of such strategies, monitoring and adjusting all available options in a sophisticated, mature awareness of the demands of any particular piece of writing, and sticking with an attending to the interplay of processes necessary in crafting pieces of writing to meet varying demands (Bruton and Kirby, 1987, p. 92).

Straightening out the inner voice that governs writing in a fluent manner is a complex process; one that requires focus, decision-making, "mature awareness", and relational endeavor. Writing was an ambiguous, complex, recursive process that defied linear, process writing formulas (Rodrigues, 1985).

Writing for real world contexts also became an important part of writing pedagogy. Educators researched the types of writing students are likely to do when they leave secondary school. Terry Phelps (1986), for example, explains that English teachers need to consider offering students the opportunity to compose different types of writing, such as "legal opinions, guides, news releases, sermons, personnel appraisals, grant proposals, feasibility studies, brochures, catalogue copy, radio programs, political speeches, medical case histories" (p. 82) to name a few. Marilyn J. Hollman (1981) interviewed twenty-five members of the community to discover what and how the writing affects both their personal and business lives. She spoke with "business executives, scientists, persons in social service professions, journalists, and college professors, as well as some high school English teachers" (p. 26). Hollman discovered that professions do not write to learn how to "write a particular kind of paper or to fulfill an assignment," (p. 27) to complete a practical task. She claims that the item that influences their writing is the audience, meaning "Who's this for?" (p. 28). The answer to this question helps them to determine what they're going to say and how they're going to say it. Holland claims that teaching composition in high schools can detach students from their audience in an attempt to get students "ready," and thus, the audience is either "ignored," or "postponed" in their writing assignments (p. 28). Holland implies in her article that it's impossible to prepare or get students "ready" for every possible "range and subtlety of writing tasks" students may encounter when they leave school. Moreover, she discovered that professionals only focus on "correctness," such as grammar, spelling, and punctuation when "they're ready for an audience, either formal or informal" (p. 29), and that the writing process, including the "pre-writing or incubation time, writing, and revision" is more dynamic than the formulaic measures often taken in classrooms. Finally, she states that each profession possessed a different notion of what good writing means:

> "…the college professors, only one in English, were very concerned about the 'originality' of the content. 'None of these are publishable,' said one history professor about the student papers he had read. They were also most favorable toward papers with organizational patterns like those most composition textbooks try to explain. The scientists' concerns were for precision and credibility; they would sacrifice ease and grace for a new idea or for precise confirmation of an old one. No one sample was identified consistently as 'good' by these scientists.
>
> Business executives used 'efficient' frequently when they talked about effective writing for their work. Although several were careful to distinguish between brevity and efficiency, they liked brevity. Efficiency was served best if writers make their main point 'up front,' they said" (p. 30).

Thus, the privileged "characteristics" of writing determine what "good" writing actually is. Standards of "writing" became location specific and determined by the professional field, leaving Hollman to conclude that "evaluation is *not* controlled" (p. 31).

Joyce E. Killian (1981) contends that schools should use students' writing as a way to get parents involved in the school environment. Citing recent dismay at parental involvement and parental disappointment at the way that schools treat parents, specifically on "back-to-school" nights (p. 40), she states that schools should use students' writing as a way to get parents involved in schools:

> Like many English teachers, I ask my students to keep a portfolio of their written work. This folder is comprehensive, containing copies of the instructions given with each writing assignment, including criteria for evaluation; all student writing, from poetry and brainstorming to multi-paragraph themes and essay tests; all teachers' evaluations of assignments and student self-evaluations written at the end of each marking period, including assessment of strengths and weaknesses and plans for improvement. The portfolio became a logical focus for a PR program when I decided to experiment with ways of involving parents in the writing program (p. 40).

Discursive practices from Public Relations (PR) became a disciplinary technique to further expose the scholastic body to the parental gaze. Students, in the above situation, produce their own scholastic case histories in a "comprehensive" "folder" that has "all student writing," "teacher evaluations" and "student self-evaluation." The various types of "writing," including the topics and the form produce a specific scholastic subject (see above) where the parental gaze, with the various expert knowledge about being a parent, generate a "truth" about his/her child. If we link "self-esteem" (see above) with the portfolio, or scholastic case-histories, then we begin to see how power parcels out students based on particular discourses, in this case "self-esteem" and "writing portfolios" and produces knowledge about particular students and whole groups of students. The specific use of Public Relations demonstrates how the scholastic body comes under discursive surveillance(s) in an effort to produce a "docile" body, and a secure "public relations."

TECHNOLOGIES OF THE SELF, OR THE THEATRE OF THE ABSURD

We began this chapter with a look at notions of the self, the emergence of self-psychology as a viable research approach in the field, and the expansion of narcissism in the psychological literature. Consciousness in the 1890s resembled a chaotic underworld that required a sovereign to harness the plethora of competing forces. Building a Zeus to preserve it (consciousness) from the impetuousness of a Phaeton required schooling, and writing function to aid pupils in constructing rational thoughts in order to inhabit and maintain a healthy constitution. Angell's (1900) wish to inject pedagogy into the treatment of the mentally ill materialized in

the 1980s. Attention to the three-headed monster of dissociation, delusion, and obsession implicitly reappeared during the 1980s; and writing pedagogy functioned as an instrument to repel and combat these demons. Nonetheless, psychiatrists and educators position consciousness as a theatrical stage, which negotiates, manages, and performs an interior and an exterior. The distinction between interiority and exteriority is perhaps a ruse as the backstage and the diverse composition of the audience belie any calcified distinction set to stablize an identity, self, or relationship between the inner self and the outer expression. The dubiousness of this binary is best understood though an analysis of speech (vocalization), writing, and listening.

These phenomenological techniques as forms of pastoral power strove to allure students to expose and reveal the inner sanctum of their beings. The rhetoric portended to producing a sovereign self, once capable of managing the multiple voices and context so as to own one's own body. Moreover, maturity reflected in writing illustrated the level of narcissism in the student's body. In many respects, students displayed their abilities to practice specific brands of freedom. Inner speech writing activities encouraged students to be autonomous, but as they shaped and molded their writing, and met an audience, students learned to be an integrated self, one that influences and is influenced by the environment. In the end, regardless of the genre or type of expression, teachers ultimately assayed to train students to present rationalistic types of writing. However, educational reformers recognize in the 1980s (see next chapter) that post-secondary students needed to not simply be prepared to attend college, and thus compose an essay. They needed to be able to read, write, listen, and respond to a globalized world. Schools needed to prepare students to be chameleons in an ever-changing world, one where the social safety nets of governmental programs were beginning to be dismantled. The shifts in writing pedagogy exemplified one pitch-fork that helped to till the ground for the emergence of Neo-liberalism; however, before moving onto the next chapter, one last bit of analysis.

Educators in the 1890s conceded disease as an always-already element of the adolescent body. Strategic tricks to reveal and expose the disease necessitated pedagogical approaches that straightened a slanted body. Secondary educators primarily focused on the orthropedics of the body, aligning the skeleton, and orchestrating the flow of the written body. Topics of personal interests to the student served as a pastoral move to induce the vomiting of pathogens only to receive the teacher's diagnosis and treatment. Educators surrendered to the notion that diseased English pervaded the verbal landscape, and that a complete cure lingered as an impossibility. Proper usage and style appropriately employed in a variety of contexts simply remain chimerical. Induction, connecting parts to whole, appreciating the variety of English stood as pillars in the writing pedagogy of this time. The best teachers could hope for from their adolescent students was to produce rational thoughts, rational compositions, and rational, healthy bodies most of the time. Penniman's suggestion to diversify the college examination process by allowing students to produce a portfolio of written artifacts from different times in their high school careers fell flat not simply due to the colleges and universities'

dismissal of such an approach, but because it contained too many pathogenic bodies in the assemblaging of the portfolio. A diverse collection of written artifacts would not provide colleges and universities with any more relevant information than a one-time timed essay. In fact, rather than showing consistency, it would show complete dispersion of the adolescent mind, which contradicts the desires of educators at all levels during this era. University officials sought focus and order, not dispersion and ambiguity. Diseased English existed everywhere, and alongside healthy speech, so the real skill for the students was the ability to dismiss, collect and assemble a rational, well arranged stock of thoughts. A successful collegiante candidate who produced a clear, coherent essay illustrated his ability to produce a healthy composition, which for most at this time ranked as a true fete. The relationship between reading and writing remained fairly stark. The 1890s conceded to the chaotic nature of consciousness, and utilized writing strategies to corral them.

The 1980s and early 1990s took a different approach. Educators personified the various microbes and assigned them tasks. The literature on writing workshop that assigns each member a role in a group work editing process proceeded psychological theories about the self, or the role of multiple selves. In fact, one line of research could investigate the genealogy of the psychological condition of multiple personalities and the spread of its discourses to writing pedagogy. Educators in the 1890s possessed very few effective tools to harness consciousness, to understand the inner world of the mind and body, including temperament, and to dictate the proper course, or curriculum to make sense of it. They lacked the discourses to prick the mysterious ground from which microbes and disease emerge. The discovery of Germ Theory exacerbated the anxiety because this theory promotes the notion that germs and disease contain their own life histories, their own personalities, their unique subjectivities, and directly impact and interact with environmental forces. Pathogens and various diseases exists as an intricate part of the corporal field, and the diseases or signs of disease or the potential for disease in English floats around in the air in an analogous manner. The triad of Disease/health/treatment clamor in a continual agonistic field over and through the body of the pupil. Written products represent a short-term, *ex post facto* contrivance of their relationship within one student's body. Educational reformers appear to be under no illusion that pure English can vanquish disease in a final, decisive battle. The strategies of power/knowledge via the autopsy, laboratory, microscope, X-ray, and anthropometry, which ransacked the body to capture precise understanding of its interior world proved limited at best and counterproductive at worst. Physicians, like educators, discovered perhaps to their chagrin that scientific approaches would not stockpile truth in order to restore certainty. They unearthed a constellation of planetary arrangements and complexities that exceeded erudition.

In their attempts to govern and control the body, they hatched ambiguity, chaos, and diffusion. The fiercer laboratory technology converged on and experimented with specific bacteria and manipulated its environment, the more disease eluded science and subverted notions of health. The laboratory physician controlled and

managed the body only to discover the irrationality of it all. For educators in a similar situation seeking to assign treatments to a diseased verbal body, the *telos* of producing a monarch (Aiton, 1897) proved laughable as Child Study emerged as yet another strategy to pierce the body to find verifiable truth about the pupil. Criticisms of Formalist pedagogical approaches stem from a disbelief in an oxygenated remedy for all diseases. The proverbial one-size-fits all no longer held true in medicine as well as in education. Poking and prodding the body from various angles with multiple instruments failed to provide the necessary data to calculate "intelligence", health or self-cohesion. Catell's anthropometric methods failed to garner support in the psychological community, but his rationalities and approaches found a home in education via Child Study and in writing assessment practices. Yet, the epistemologies of Child Study disseminated in the 1980s; so much so that adolescents learned to make a case of themselves and to produce a Bertillion card of their unique (even abnormal) features. They learned to excavate and sever through every possible crevice of their inner consciousness to expose and produce a cohesive self. Technologies of self-psychology render the classroom a virtual laboratory for students to experiment with genres and to deemphasize environment as a containing factor to self-development. Personal experiences and subjectivities shot from the margins to become the primary material for writing. The dispersion of time/space and multiple tasks with various genres prove useful in secondary English classroom, most recently with the staging of the portfolio. Portfolio assessment positioned the adolescent search for self into the grid of governmentality, which both individualizes and totalizes subjects. The relationship between the broader social world and miniature societies of the self enter into the realm of political economy.

CHAPTER 4

THE PROLIFERATION OF ASSESSMENT

Most of the time we breathe in air without being conscious of it: like language, it is the very medium in which we move. But if the air is suddenly thickened or infected, we are forced to attend to our breathing with new vigilance, and the effect of this may be a heightened experience of our bodily life (Eagleton, 2008, p. 4).

In a certain sense I must recognize that no idea really belongs to me. Ideas belong to no one. They pass from one mind to another as coins pass from hand to hand. Consequently, nothing could be more misleading than the attempt to define a consciousness by the ideas, which it utters or entertains (Poulet in Tompkins, 1980, p. 44).

English teachers in the 1890s recognized the fluidity and instability of a pure language. English meandered around the schoolhouse colliding with diseased and pristine or rational forms. Kellogg's acknowledgement that even English teachers misuse or possess an incomplete knowledge of the language conceded composition studies to producing rational moments contained with each written essay. Penniman's efforts to introduce a laboratory method into the college entrance writing examination process proved useless in light of the limited abilities of English teachers to harvest reflections of a student's health. English, as a discipline, affirmed to be limited in its capacity to produce consistent, multiple specimens of salubrious writing samples that colleges and secondary schools settled for timed moments of clear, orthropedic, noticeable regurgitation of literary texts. English teachers, while shunning formalistic pedagogies, alighted with including personal experiences in writing practice, modeling syntactical relationships, and immediate responses to their teaching repetroires. To the extent that English floated in the air, English teachers endeavored to corral it with repetition and practice fuelled by the student's personal interests.

Chapter three of this book evidenced a turn toward the self in writing pedagogy in the 1980s. The teacher's expertise in writing shuffled to the writing workshop where students and teachers engaged in the process of writing as equals. Conferencing, drafting, editing checklists, ranked among the most prominent pedagogies of this time among teachers, students, parents, and administrators. Feedback, grading, assessing, and validating a piece of writing disseminated to other members of the child's life and no longer remained as the teacher's sole responsibility. In addition, students emerged as individuals with unique interests, talents, and abilities that should be nurtured at home, in the community, and certainly in the secondary English classroom. A child who prefers poetry to the business letter, for example, should be allowed to showcase his/her talents as part of the overall assessment of his/her writing abilities. It needs to be stated, however, that poets needed to learn how to be an essayists and a business-person, too. The

idea was that student talents needs to be included in the portfolio of their work in order to gauge an accurate, or valid, assessment of their true writing abilities. If secondary schools are to prepare them for the "real-world," then classrooms need to provide them with opportunities to experience real-world practicalities. In the world of writing pedagogy, this view entailed diagramming classroom spaces so that they mirrored the laboratories of "real writers." Polished, publishable pieces of compositions rarely occur on the first draft, and almost never emerge after a timed essay.

Yet, the relationship between language, the body, health, and disease, re-emerged as evidenced by Eagleton's quote above. Language persists as a *sine quo non* of living in much the same way as breathing, and is the "very medium in which we move" (p. 4). Language and breathing permit bodily life, consciousness, and flesh and blood presence. When the "air" that individuals breathe becomes "thickened or infected," they must begin to pay special attention to the quality of air (or language), to their bodies (thoughts, articulations), which may produce a "heightened experience of our bodily life" (p. 4). This last part means that becoming more attuned to diseased language may amplify the individual's corporal and phenomenological experiences. Death, again, dictates life in writing. Furthermore, Poulet's (1980) claim that ideas roam like "coins" in a complex and interrelated exchange of signs and signifiers. Readers of texts possess no greater certainty of meaning than the writer who grinds out words, sentences, and phrases on a piece of paper. The English language remains within the realm of St. Vincent Millay's character of Chaos, and possesses the capacity to pathogenic, thus threatens the body, mind, and temperament of both the writer and reader of texts. To determine the diseased or "thickened" part of the written body involves parceling, distinguishing, and assessing speech based on normative principles. To say it another way, to conclude that a part of speech is "infected" implies the presence of appropriate, or healthy speech. Often, the normative principles employed to assess pieces of writing are contextual, and based on social conventions, which as Poulet (1980) points out are bantered about like nomadic herds. Nonetheless, writers often rely on readers to help diagnose the health of the compositional body, to isolate the infected parts of speech and utterances, and to treat it with the fluid normative principles that pervade (and often escape) the discursive landscape.

Much of what has been written about the uses of assessments in secondary English classroom focuses on the inability for traditional tests (i.e. multiple choice, competency tests, essay tests) to reflect the students "real" or "authentic" writing abilities. Moreover, the scholarship on the assessment practices illustrates how specific grids or rubrics serve teacher's efforts to improve student writing. This chapter complicates the relationship between the student and the assessor by injecting Reader Response Theory in the teaching and learning process. First, this chapter describes how secondary English teachers in the 1980s abandoned traditional grading and assessment practices, including concerns for the adolescent's self-development. Second, it explicates two different approaches, which designed writing assessment protocols for entire populations of secondary

students. Although several attempts were made during the 1980s, these three function as exemplars for how secondary English teachers mustered to assess the corporal body of the secondary English student. The third section of this chapter explains the emergences and justifications for performance and alternative assessments, specifically portfolio assessment. Finally, the chapter concludes with an examination of the position of the assessor as a reader of text. This section utilizes various literary theories (e.g. New Criticism, Reader Response, Structuralism, and Post-Structuralism) to complicate the relationship between the assessor and the assessed. Although they primarily focus on literary texts (i.e poetry, drama, narrative), the injection of multiple genres (e.g. poems, plays, and stories) into the repetroires of writing pedagogy necessitates an examination of literariness in assessment practices and its effects on the assessor. The epistemologies of medicine discussed earlier in this book reappear in the 1980s and 1990s. The acceptance and implementation of multiple genres in the writing classroom along with the expansion of potential assessors of student writing, and the general appeal of portfolio and performance assessments illustrates how students were induced to offer multiple specimens of the body and self, which describe the writer's "inner" experience. The epistemologies of the Phrenology, the Paris Clinic, Germ Theory, and German Laboratory medicine merge to assess both the adolescent frozen products and their life histories.

BLOODLETTING

The invitation for students and teachers to incorporate personal and school-wide experiences into the writing classroom represented a shift in pedagogy of secondary school teachers. Cultural artifacts aligned with the general belief in the pluralistic writing self. Interiorizing the writing process matched with intimate accounts of personal experiences functioned to aid adolescents as they sought to devise and compose a self, discern the social world, and adjust and cope with chance events. The lines between interior and exterior selves along with the acts of reading and writing blur. Adolescents learn to read and write themselves almost simultaneously. Teachers relegate themselves to sojourners, equal in stature to students, and distend the range of acceptable genres permissible in the English classroom. To express oneself, students could use a poem, a play, a poster, or a host of other genres. Secondary English students controlled both the form and content of their written work and became owners of their compositional bodies, but allured to reveal the compositions of their miniature societies (self) and their "inner consciousness". A laissez-faire, or hands-off pedagogical approach by teachers encouraged students to create and produce written artifacts reflective of the student's self, which exposes the student to the vast uncertain pedagogical marketplace much like the patient in the late nineteenth-century. To introduce multiple genres within the framework of an identity with multiple selves granted pedagogues with access to the interior of the student's body they so desperately craved, but problematised their methods of evaluation. Demands to modify assessment practices in secondary English classrooms materialized simultaneously

as the pupil transformed into a divided, plural self and produced contrary effects than their intended purpose. The proliferation of assessment throughout the entire body of the adolescent occurs when educators focused on exposed multiple and various parts of the student's body. The employment of multiple genres in writing practices, and then permitting them to be assessed, equated to reflections of various parts of the body. Students learned to make a case of themselves, and perform autopsies of themselves only to be evaluated under the microscope of the assessors. What's more, the expansion of phenomenology in the writing process and in the assessments illustrates that educators no longer concerned themselves as much with formalistic features, but how well a student could produce a rendering of the self. Such intensification of assessment and evaluative measures demonstrates that compositions ceased being simply a reflection of skills and abilities, but a judgment of the adolescent's body and self.

The writing process is time consuming, recursive, and usually includes several edits based on remarks from multiple people. Furthermore, as an instrument to compose a self, writing different types of styles and genres presented students with the opportunity to inhabit diverse personas in manifold relationships and situations. Doing so, offers students the occasion to practice the potential situations they may encounter in their lives post-secondary school. It allows them to create meaning for themselves, closure to horrific events, and express themselves in appropriate ways. Writing became contextual, a practice for possibilities, and an experiment for the future. It transformed from a way of showing what the student knows to an anthropomorphic, psychological performance. The choice and voice trumped organization and rational thought as students dramatized their multiple personalities in mock real-world situations. Choice and voice construct the hermeneutics of authenticity, which emerges as a primary term used to describe writing. The relationships among reading/writing/assessing blur during this time. Whereas English teachers in the 1890s doggedly fought to reclaim a semblance of health, teachers in the 1980s descended from their desks to practice and perform the self, using writing as their primary instrument. The relationship between reader and writer merge during this time, and while assessment practices seemingly or rhetorically rescind, their intensity and density proliferate throughout the secondary English classroom. Less interest in vaccinating youth with proper English transformed into a greater need for opportunities to express evidenced by expanding the available genres accepted to reveal and reflect a self. The proverbial line between interiority and exteriority disappear in order to greater magnify the composition process of the emerging autonomous adolescent self.

Teachers no longer remained behind a big desk, as Atwell eloquently lamented above, but instead entered the learning arena as another student, or nothing more than a guide. Positioning the teacher alongside the student afforded teachers the opportunity to witness the student's unique, individual, perhaps even rare abilities and talents. Teachers now utilized the student's exclusive traits to engineer pedagogies that would develop young adolescents to construct a life, read the world, and compose a life. Along the way, teachers, guided by the discourses of self-psychology, would orchestrate writing assignments that permitted students to

foster, reveal, and assert a self. Assessment functions as micro-teaching conferred real-time evidence of a student's abilities, which provided the information they needed to make daily pedagogical adjustments. The original intent may have been to endow the student with a sense of individual freedom of expression, or to project their "unique thumbprint" (Rief et. al., 2000, p. 63) as literate beings; but it quickly reverted to a quest to align both the personal and writer self to external standards, or in the words of Sunstein, the portfolio provided "X-ray vision" into the student.

Teaching and learning become a different matter when writing becomes "evaluated," "assessed," and/or "graded." In the 1980s, we see how teachers began to take a different role with students in relation to grading and responding to student's writing. Teachers begin to abandon their role as an "evaluator" and outsource it to other staff members (Burnette, 1980). This involved students in classroom assessment practices (Choi et al., 1989) putting students in groups to "rank samples," encouraging students to tell the "story behind a piece of writing," which allows students the ability to reflect on their writing experiences, and "primary-trait scoring," which allows students to focus on specific "traits" of their writing and revise it accordingly. Furthermore, Posener (1987) stopped using "scan-tron" and "short answer" exams to move "beyond trivia games" and see if students actually understood what he was teaching. Probst (1982) challenges "competency tests" by arguing that it's difficult to determine a clear sense of "competency" and that the sort of competencies educators strive for are not represented in "multiple-choice, computer-scored test" (p. 24). He argues that a more "personal assessment" that "allows a detailed and careful look at many aspects of the processes of language" provides a better view of the student's abilities (p. 24).

Finally, Harmon (1988) contends that teachers need to withhold judgment of student's writing to encourage students to write. He claims that if teachers look for day-to-day growth in writing, they will be disappointed and damage student attitudes toward their own writing. He recommends that teachers should keep all of the student's work in a "folder" or a "portfolio" so that the teacher can get a whole view of the student's work:

> Withholding judgment on the texts allows the teacher to make evaluations on other aspects of the student's progress. For example, the teacher may evaluate the student's use of the writing process itself or, perhaps, the student's ability to meet deadlines (p. 79).

Harmon also recommends that the teacher should only evaluate specific texts at specific times. This will allow students the freedom to experiment with different types of writing styles and forms, which allows the student to "begin forming his or her own distinct style" (p. 80). Finally, he recommends that teachers need to "withhold judgment" of student's work. Using his ability to grow "peppers," he concludes the following way:

> Would I want my ability as a backyard gardener to rest upon a day-to-day assessment of my peppers? I think not. Nor would I want my peppers judged by the output of a single plant (Harmon, 1988, p. 80).

Harmon implies that it's not fair to base his ability to be a "backyard gardener" on the performance of one pepper, and that he should be able to submit his "very best work" to be judged. Yet, even a judgment on the "blue-ribbon" pepper isn't an adequate assessment of his ability to be an effective "backyard gardener."

Even though Harmon makes the point that it's difficult to assess one's ability based on performance. Administrative practices in education, however, demand that students, or "peppers," perform specific skills, teachers need to provide a rich soil for the writing to grow, and the teacher needs to assess how well the student grows in specific, precise ways.

Teachers abandon the "bloody red ink in the margins" and have the "freedom to express yourself" (Bartholomew, 1982). Others take a different angle to grading student writing. Brimmer (1982) demonstrates how "negative" feedback on writing assignments can "develop unhealthy attitudes about writing, about their work, or worse yet, about themselves, which may be irreparable" (p. 59); Concerns about the affects on the adolescent's self also occurred during this time. For example, Marylyn E. Calabrese (1982), argues, "Self-improvement begins with students becoming better readers of their own writing" (p. 28), and grading impedes that "self-improvement." This perspective liberates the teacher to simply be another reader and to respond to the "writing." This includes commenting and asking questions about the piece of writing. Calabrese contends that grades "reinforce the carrot-on-a-stick mentality" which "hampers independent learning where students internalize writing needs and teach themselves" (p. 28). Here we see a movement away from grading every piece of writing, and a move toward "assessing" whether the writing "works" or not. Thus, instead of placing a "blue ribbon," the teacher can now "comment and ask question" in order to foster "self-improvement." Compositional bodies get distributed based on their performance of "self-improvement."

English educators believed that writing also promised the opportunity to learn about oneself, to grow, to develop a self-concept, and harness self-confidence. Writing, as a form of expression, possessed many possibilities. Many of the activities described above equalized the relationship between the teacher and student; shared expertise, community engagement, and personal reflection subverted traditional, inductive, skill-based pedagogical approaches. Teachers of English designed pedagogical spaces to give students opportunities to embody the "real" writer, who writes for "real-world" contexts. "Outside" influences, once castigated from the classroom as poisonous bacteria in the 1890s, speak alongside formal speech. The line between in-school and out-of-school literacies blurs. In fact, individual linguistic idiosyncracies reveal "voice" and can provide teachers with opportunities to help students improve their work. Individual student's culture, personality, proclivities, tastes etc. become the composing clay with which students project themselves and construct themselves. Writing emerges as a technology to construct a life and compose a self. The dilemma arises, however, when teachers transform from being "helpers" to being "evaluators" (Burnette, 1980). Testing and assessing writing, while establishing and maintaining a student's sense of self complicated teaching practices in secondary English

classrooms. Although many teachers employed a variety of strategies to maneuver this dicey terrain, many embraced the portfolio as the best method of assessing writing and for managing their own "schizophrenia" (Burnette, 1980). The writing portfolio emerges due to the logics of expressionism, self-psychology, and measurement.

THE CORPORAL LABORATORY

Concerns about testing instruments and procedures became problematic in the 1980s and 1990s. Decades of sustained research on the effects of testing and cultural and economic shifts required educators to rethink the purpose of schooling contributed to the call for different types and uses of tests. Historically, tests sorted and distributed students according to knowledge and abilities. Due primarily to expeditious rises in school-aged population, tests functioned to streamline curriculum, maintain order, and slot students into career tracts for many financially strapped schools. As such, they excluded many children from receiving an education, excluding those who poorly performed on IQ tests. Extensive research illustrated how tests reproduced an all-ready racially fractured society. Throughout much of the history of education in the United States, tests institutionalized inherent, personal prejudices against specific ethnic groups. The practice of tracking, while intended to meet the needs of different academic abilities, consequently thwarted students from elevating their academic achievement. Students in the lower rail consistently received pedagogically lower-level materials throughout their school years. Thus, tracking achieved the opposite of its intent.

The most damning research-based criticism of tests however, materialized by unpacking the logic of the high school graduation, the penultimate moment of secondary schooling. Ideally, tests, or most specifically high-stakes standardized tests, measure an individual's ability to use certain skills, which qualifies them for employment or college. De-contextualized, objective tests supposedly bracket the student's subjective elements and isolate only those skills that reflect his/her measure of readiness. Such tests, however, neither predicts a person's future earning potential nor his/her employment prospects. Students who flop on these tests and subsequently fail to graduate from high school, however, more likely allotted for the unemployment line and stationed at the resident welfare office (Darling-Hammond, 1994). Tests tend to gauge a student's understanding of basic skills in a disinterested context; they miss the opportunity to witness a student's abilities to complete "real-world" tasks, and disregard his/her circumstances that may infringe on learning (i.e. culture, socio-economic status).

The efficient one-size-fits-all testing model transformed into a seasoned belief in adopting and developing tests that trace the student in the process of learning. Glaser (1981) claims that educational testing practices in the United States need to remodel themselves to meet the needs of the looming "helping society" (p. 924). To ameliorate this projection, Glaser implies that schools need to promote independence subject and an autonomous self. Tests can no longer be used to simply predict an individual's future public status, or reproduce social

stratification, but fundamentally be fastened to daily instructional practices and personal temperament. At the time of his article, Glaser (1981) appealed for more research that investigates the capacity of tests to guide pedagogy to be done. Schools need to become more flexible, accounting for the child's personal historical background, and a pronounced emphasis on meta-cognitive reflection and self-regulated learning.

Procuring new tests in schools demanded that educators modify their notions about the purposes of testing and revise their underlying beliefs about the conclusions that can be drawn from them. They must contain "consequential validity" (Darling-Hammond, 1994, p. 11), or "the extent to which an assessment tool and the ways in which it is used produce positive consequences both for the teaching and learning process and for students who may experience different educational opportunities as a result of test-based placements" (Darling-Hammond, 1994, p. 11). Speaking specifically about alternative assessments, such as portfolio assessment, Darling-Hammond enumerates that changes in assessment tools will not necessarily usher in a new era of educational equality. She implores educators to refashion their views about test results:

> "…from sorting mechanisms to diagnostic supports; from external monitors of performance to locally generated tools for inquiring deeply into teaching and learning; and from purveyors of sanctions for those already underserved to levers for equalizing resources and enhancing learning opportunities" (p. 7).

The pivotal perceptual shift transpires in the differences between testing and assessment. Darling-Hammond (1994) claims via Glaser (1990), that while testing's predictive function serves to parcel and sift students "prior to a course of instruction" (p. 11) assessment's outcome-based role relies on educational results. Assessment concentrates on content validity rather than predictive validity; it matches the results with course content to gauge student performance. Tests designed as assessments more likely reflect tasks, cognitive abilities, and skills ubiquitous in the "real world." Thus, they more accurately indicate a student's actual abilities. Assessment tests, while lacking predictive value, embody consequential validity.

Among the English education ranks, confusion about both the quality and quantity of grading papers persisted. Scholars tussled over distinctions between evaluation, grading, and assessing. Evaluation entailed comparison and judgment, assessment appraising in-process projects, and grading calculates a "vast array of data and condenses it into a single symbol, that, in itself, doesn't communicate very much" (Tchudi, 1997, Introduction). Teaches of writing extolled the virtues of assessment, while de-emphasized the utility of grading (Kirby, Liner, Vinz, 1988).

> My predominant impression has been that [writing classes] are fantastically over-evaluated. Students are graded on everything they do every time they turn around. Grades generate anxiety and hard feelings between [everyone]. Common sense suggests that [grades] ought to be reduced to the smallest possible number necessary to find out how students are getting along toward

> the four or five main objectives of the program, but teachers keep piling them up like squirrels gathering nuts (Diederich in Kirby et al, 1988, p. 215).

Grading insights trepidation, infringes on the writing process, and inhibits the development of writing fluency. Scholars recommend encompassing the writing process as a significant part of the final grade (product) (Mandrell, 1997) and, as a matter of fairness, include students in the development of grading criteria. As Atwell (1987) explains, "If evaluation is to be valid, I can't turn around at the end of the nine weeks and impose 'objective' standards for 'good' writing on pieces in their folders" (p. 114).

Despite the pedagogically sound reasons for implementing localized evaluation and grading procedures, specifically to encourage students to freely compose without threats of reprove or castigation, secondary English teachers faced a mighty foe in terms of state assessment practices. Monroe (1987) proclaimed, "Tests are political weapons" primarily designed to illustrate to taxpayers that their money is being well spent. To further exemplify his point, he employs medical metaphors to argue that companies that design state tests and politicians benefit primarily from large scale, high stakes assessments.

> To use a different metaphor, tests are the thermometers, which measure the health of educational institutions. We are, however, so busy taking student temperatures that no one has stopped to monitor the patient's status. Tests are used to diagnose symptoms and cure ailments the body might rectify on its own if given the chance. Before schools, and the professionals in them, have had the chance to treat themselves, political bodies rush in, scalpels in hand, and begin slicing away anything they think is malignant. While the patient suffers, the companies (commercial test developers) that manufacture the scalpels grow fat and the doctors who wield them (politicians and educational do-gooders) righteously perform elective educational surgery (p. 24).

The medical metaphors are instructive. Monroe's states that various "political bodies" with scalpels in hand rush to sever the adolescent body based on limited amount of information. They gauge the "temperature", or health and disease of the body, and scurry to perform "educational surgery" before the student has the opportunity to heal him/herself. In terms of writing practices, Monroe asserts that companies that manufacture tests and other "physicians" (politicians and educational do-gooders) wheel the adolescent composition to the operating table when they (student) may have the case of influenza. Implicit in his argument is the notion that more data is needed prior to the commencement of surgery. Teachers and other educational professionals should be allowed to collect more specimens from various parts of the body, including internal elements before diagnosing the whole body of the adolescent. One measure neglects to offer the appropriate amount of information needed to conduct such a major operation. Multiple genres and the portfolio gave educators the diagnostic instruments to properly examine the adolescent's compositional body and the constitution of their self. Instead of

restricting the scalpel to a small group, they dolled out the scalpels to several individuals, including the student him/herself.

Several scholars and teachers implemented assessment approaches that sought to combine pedagogical idealism with political realities. They recognized that testing adolescent writing abilities emerged as a "national obsession" (Peckham, 1987, p. 30) emphasizing multiple-choice tests focusing on mechanics. The California Assessment Program (CAP) created writing development teams of twenty teachers to coalesce criteria to develop guides and train teachers in order to increase inter-rater reliability. They also expanded the range of genres students could use in their state assessment tests, excoriating essay writing for more personal modes first than "..climbing up and down the ladder that begins with narrative incidents and ends with generalizations supported by logical arguments and specific events" (Peckham, 1987, p. 31). CAP represented a "giant step away from multiple-choice competency and toward read writing" (p. 33), and more important, for teachers, it serves as an appropriate measure; one that permits them to teach to the test because "they know this is one test to which they can teach" (p. 33). Although grammar, punctuation, and syntax remained as essential parts of the scoring criteria, teachers concentrated on audience, permitted students to use different modalities and genres to exhibit their writing capabilities (Peckham, 1987). A general disdain existed for multiple-choice tests as sufficient measures of writing acumen. In general, they (multiple-choice tests) fail to capture the dynamic learning process, how students process and synthesize information, and the process with which students engage as they compose. These concerns propelled researchers to develop ways to better and more properly assess students' writing abilities.

In addition, Stock and Robinson (1987) argue that such assessment usually serve administrators and suffer from two fallacies: 1. They assume that they can detach the "human" element from the writing, and 2. They assume that "criteria" can be detached from "local circumstances" (pp. 94–95). They argue that testing should be designed and completed by "teachers" who understand both of these assumptions. Moreover, they assert that teachers, who design tests, based their design on knowledge of writing pedagogy, and with the assumption that "the individual is a meaning-maker, but a meaning-maker who must use an inherited language in order to make meaning in communities with other human beings with similar knowledge, interests, and values" (p. 100). As such, students should be able to write about what they know and about their own experiences within their communities to understand how well they write. In their study to use "thoughtful teachers" (p. 100) and the "school's district coordinator of instruction in the language arts, and four University of Michigan faculty who served as a research team to assess the writing of the district's eleventh-grade students (approximately 1000 students) in their English classes" (p. 98), they designed a writing exam for students that reflected the communities view of what should be tested and how. In doing so, they wanted students to write under the conditions that "normally prevailed" (p. 107); hence their writing assessment took place in the classroom. They devised the following grading scale:

Score	*Characteristic*
	Authenticity/Voice/Engagement
4	Expression strongly reflects the writer's emotional and/or intellectual involvement in the topic. Strongly engages the attention of the reader.
3	The writer is engaged in the topic and engages the reader.
2	Interested, not engaging, perfunctory
1	Writing seems to be a mechanical exercise. Marked by clichés, hazy generalizations, meaningless expressions
	Focus/Organization/Development
4	Focuses on one main idea. Has clear beginning, middle, and end. Well organized and well developed through examples that give reasons for the unfairness.
3	Focused and organized but may have a flaw in coherence or incomplete closure. Incomplete development. Explanation is strongly implicit.
2	Lack of clear focus/organization/development. Narrative but no explanation
1	Disorganized. Undeveloped. Unconnected generalizations.
	Sentence Mechanics/Language
4	Few mechanical, usage, or sentence errors. Language used with fluency and variety
3	Some minor mechanical, usage, or sentence errors. Language used competently to express ideas.
2	Enough usage errors to attract attention away from content. Sentences understandable, but unconventional.
1	Language and mechanical errors impair meaning

Figure 4.2. Assessment rubric for students essays in Stock and Robinson, 1987, p. 110.

These researchers understood the connection between writing the word/writing the self. They relied on Ann Berthoff's definition of composing to support their work. In her definition she claims that composing a written work is analogous to composing one self:

> When you see what is happening or understand what has happened or imagine what might happen, you are composing: figuring out relationships, working out implications, drawing conclusions. What is currently called "getting your head together" used to be known as "composing yourself" (p. 107).

To score these pieces of writing, fifteen teachers from five schools assembled, and they "discussed and negotiate" (p. 112) each other's markings. Through a sort of round-robin with each other, they collectively devised a "common sense" (p. 112) of their scoring criteria and built "consistency" (p. 112). So much so, that their scores, in general matched, which the following table demonstrates:

Characteristic	Same Score	Differed by One	Differed by Two	Differed by Three
Authenticity/Voice/Engagement	53.5%	40.8%	5.5%	0.4%
Focus/Organization/Development	51.2%	43.2%	5.5%	0.1%
Sentence Mechanics/Language	58.6%	38.2%	3.1%	3.1%

Figure 4.3. Scoring accuracy between teachers who graded essays in Stock and Robinson, 1987, p. 115.

After this study was completed, later in 1985, teachers from the Ann Arbor Public Schools and The University of Michigan "with extensive experience and/or special training in working with students who are too frequently unsuccessful in school" began to work with these student to help with their writing, and later, teachers in English and Social Studies began to work with science teachers and their writing/assessment practices. We see how these rationalities get dispersed throughout the schooling landscape.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

By the middle of the 1990s the epistemological justifications and practices of portfolio assessment firmly resided in many secondary English rooms. Modifications remained and persisted, but the concentration on the self and the offensive for refined assessments, ones that adjusted to changes in schooling, stabilized classroom teaching and writing pedagogy. Portfolios furnished teachers and students with actual evidence of student work, and leveled their relationship. After all, assessment is Latin for assidere, which translates to "to sit beside" (Stefanakis, 2002, p. 9). Alternative and performance assessments also contained greater reliability than timed standardized tests. One two-hour performance may inadequately emulate an individual's abilities. Results from multiple performances in diverse situations contain greater reliability than one source. Wiggins (1992) explains the situation this way:

> One performance, even by professionals, is often a risky basis for inference about general ability. Think of a football team. You watch them play a game, and they score 37 points. Is that typical of what the team can do? You don't know; you need more games played against different opponents under differing conditions.

One opponent on one night is insufficient to forge a valid assessment, or to draw a conclusion, about the team, and one opponent is less likely to be a reliable indicator, while multiple games evinces consistency levels. Similarly, Wiggins argues, that one essay may not be a valid indicator of a student's "generalize(d)" (p. 36) writing abilities, while multiple samples would produce stronger validity. He asserts, "Those who've studied the problem suggest that students may need to do at least six different tasks of a similar kind to make sure our inferences about overall mastery are valid" (p. 36). Reliable scoring processes comprise of utilizing several different people to ensure inter-rater reliability, continual practice and refining of scoring procedures, and establishing core standards for specific writing assignments. The portfolio, or alternative assessments, materialized when the soiled adolescent body transformed into the chaotic self, when writing cease to function principally as an organizational tool to "straighten" the "crooked sprouts", oppugn the jejune, remedy the contaminated, and instead revised into a self-fashioning outlet of expression; and when the predictive value of tests endemic of a by-gone era diffused into assessment practices formulated to fuse with pedagogy to yield greater validity and reliability emblematic of a "helping society."

A necessary agreed upon standard, however, structures student growth as they travel to construct a life, read the world, and compose a self. Compositional specifications advise teachers about student's current abilities and about how to navigate students to the desired spot. Assessment, unlike testing, provides teachers and students with opportunities to study writing in a series of "episodes of learning" (Wolf, Bixby, Glenn, & Gardner, 1991, p. 57). Criterion-referenced assessments divulge upfront the evaluative characteristics of writing assignments. Unlike norm-referenced tests, which slot individuals onto a pre-determined curve, based solely on answers, assessments grant teachers and students with access to the proverbial answer-key in advance. Teachers can utilize the criteria in their lessons and arrange daily exercises for students to practice them. Each assignment contains the possibility to augment instruction. They (assessments) display the student's thinking processes, or logics, toward each writing task, which avows the teacher to restructure the student's thinking processes and his/her (student) writing. Presenting the evaluation criteria and reflecting on it throughout the teaching and learning process frames the pedagogical endeavor and traces student growth:

> Key to this change (from selection to performance) is a move from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced evaluations of student learning in what students can and cannot do is clearly stated. These descriptions have to be anchored at one end in the capacities most children bring to school and at the other end in the capacities all high school graduates should possess. Between these endpoints, moments of major conceptual reorganization have to be cited and described. The point of these developmental sequences is that a student's real, rather than relative, skills can be assessed both for the adequacy and the fullness of his or her learning (Wolf, Bixby, Glenn, & Gardner, 1991, p. 52).

New metrics of evaluating students and their real abilities oblige educators to modify their views of intelligence and cultivate measures that examine "student profiles, both across and within domains" (p. 63). For example, they contend, it is important for teachers to know whether a student can generate a focused topic for an essay, but is unable to organize it. Composing "differentiated portraits" (p. 63) of students will transpose evaluation from a measuring tool to an informing instrument. Finally, they implore educators to enlarge the items of analysis. Instead of focusing on disaggregated or aggregated data points, Wolf, Bixby, Glen and Gardner (1991) endorse appraising more "complex units" of teaching and learning:

> We need measures of the quality of classroom discussion or the functioning of a heterogeneous group of students working out a problem in economics or history. We also need to understand the kind of scientific modeling students can accomplish given computer support or the kind of writing a student can do given word-processing training and support (p. 17).

To rigorously capture a student's true abilities, assessments based on criteria need to be ingrained in pedagogical practices. Furthermore, to transform schools from a testing culture to an assessment culture, data points need to be expanded in order to

air an accurate image of the student. Established standards of performance along a varied range of characteristics shape the pictorial emanation, which grade from a sketch to a realistic photograph. Educators may nostalgically recall Child Study in light of these efforts to individualize and to totalize adolescents. To be more precise, alternative, performance, portfolio assessments grant pupils permission to expose their inner most selves, only to normalize those selves within a distinct standard. Shifting epistemologies of testing to those of assessment transformed the adolescent self from a conventional norm to within a diffuse grid of technologies of normalization. The portfolio may have initially possessed innocent intensions (Herbert, 2001), and the writing portfolio contained advantageous pedagogical incentives; however, the writing portfolio occupied deleterious affects as it retained many of the antiquated features it sought to expel. In general, as educators excoriated standardized tests for its reliance on produce, they herald the importance of examining the student's writing process as a vital element to evaluation. Nonetheless, despite their insistence, portfolio advocates inserted a neo-behaviorist tendency in the process-product model. Forcing the focus onto the writing process did not expunge the techno-rational epistemologies from assessment; instead, it widened the scope of the measurement's lens into a more vast territory of the student's body.

THE INVISIBLE ASSESSORS EXPOSED

Louise M. Rosenblatt begins her seminal book on reader response theory by arguing that throughout the history of literary criticism, the reader has been relegated to the margins of the interpretive process. The relationship between the author and the text stood as paramount as a work of art either represented as a mirror or sacrosanct. The New Critics, she contests, believed that the literary text stood alone as a collection of "self-containted patterns of words" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 3). The critic according the New Critics objectively interpreted the text and bracketed the artist's life and the reader's experiences. I.A. Richards and the American New Critics argue that through induction readers can obtain an objective, or real interpretation of a literary text. Misunderstandings occur when the reader spackles understanding to parts of texts which twist the intended meaning. Richard's now infamous study with his Cambridge students indicated to him a failure of the reader to appropriate the correct meaning.

Later literary scholars viewed this incident more as a failure of Richards to consider the role of the reader in the interpreting process. The reader, Rosenblatt claims, "has seldom been acknowledged as carrying on his own special and particular activities" (p. 4). Instead they have been viewed as a passage agent, even a tabla rasa, who awaits for content. The text, however functions as a stimulus for the reader as s/he reads. As s/he reads, the reader may illicit memories and siphons through various and competing emotional experiences and cognitive thoughts. As Jonathan Culler (1980) states, "Reading is not an innocent activity. It is charged with artifice, and to refuse to study one's modes of reading is to neglect a principal source of information about literary activity" (p. 116). The reader remains as *homo significans*, or as a "maker and reader of signs" (Culler, 1980, p. 117). The process of

reading is a recursive one and consists of "many levels at once, for the text has 'backgrounds' and foregrounds', different narrative viewpoints, alternative layers of meaning between which we are constantly moving (Ingarden in Eagleton, 2008, p. 67). Language functions, then, as an "impersonal medium" (p. 37), which coalesces the reader's emotional responses with the presumed "literal meaning" (p. 37). As Holland (1980) explains, "Each reader, in effect, re-creates the work in terms of his own identity theme" (p. 126).

> The annexation of my consciousness by another (the other which is the work), in no way implies that I am the victim of any deprivation of consciousness. Everything happens, on the contrary, as though, from the moment I become a prey to what I read, I begin to share the use of my consciousness with this being whom I have tried to define and who is the conscious subject ensconced at the heart of the work. He and I, we start having a common consciousness. Doubtless, within this community of feeling, the parts played by each of us are not of equal importance. The consciousness inherent in the work is active and potent; it occupies the foreground; it is clearly related to its own world, to objects which are its objects. In opposition, I myself, although conscious of whatever it may be conscious of, play a much more humble role content to record possibly all that is going on in me (Poulet in Tompkins, 1980, p. 47).

The reader, in short, interacts with the text in an "active, self-ordering and self-corrective process" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 11). The text self-corrects the reader as the reader questions, selects, and rejects various textual stimuli. The text becomes a "poem" when it assumes an active reader and "refers to what he makes of his responses to the particular set of verbal symbols" (p. 12). Readers, however according to Rosenblatt, should restrain from projecting unwarranted or indefensible meanings onto the text, but at the same time meaning is found through a transaction between the reader and the text. The transaction between the reader and the text is not a linear one, but "an ongoing process in which the elements or factors are, one might say, aspects of a total situation, each conditioned and conditioning the other" (p. 17). Furthermore, the transaction exists as a particular time and includes past and present experiences. The text, then, is not simply an ahistorical object revealing transcendental truths, but is an active, living process.

> The paradox is that he (reader) must call forth from memory of his world what the visual or auditory stimuli symbolize for him, yet he feels the ensuing work as part of the world outside himself. These physical signs of the text enable him to reach through himself and the verbal symbols to something sensed as outside and beyond his own personal world. The boundary between inner and outer worlds breaks down, and the literary work of art, as so often remarked, leads us into a new world. It becomes part of the experience, which we bring to our future encounters in literature and in life (p. 21).

Nonaesthetic reading, or efferent reading focuses on the "residue" after reader; or what information will the reader extract and carry with him after he finishes the

text. Aesthetic reading, on the other hand, the primary concern is what is happening to him as he reads. “In aesthetic reading, the reader’s attention is centered directly on what he is living through during his relationship with that particular text” (p. 25). Different readers can experience different aesthetic readings at different times. “If a literary work of art is to ensue, the reader must turn his attention as fully as possible toward the transaction between himself and the text” (p. 28). The transactional process occurs as a continual recursive process as the reader engages with textual stimulus as well as concentrates on his own experiences, both emotional and cognitive as he interacts with the text. The distinction between efferent readings and aesthetic ones is the latter relies primarily on gathering information, while the latter hones in on the subjective experiences. The efferent/aesthetic reading experiences exists on a continuum, and the text provokes toward which end the reader engages with the text, the reader’s personal condition dictates the interpretive endeavor. An interpretation guided by an aesthetic reading merges emotive and cognitive components and produces a “full lived-through fusion with the texts” (p. 47). Thus, the main purpose of the reader is to engage and consider the full range of textual possibilities.

Regarding valid interpretations, Rosenblatt explains that readers must establish a specified pre-determined set of criteria before any claims to trustworthiness can be asserted. Although we must concede and champion a plurality of interpretations, at the same time, a diversity of criteria must be tolerated. Groups of readers may interpret texts similarly, but they must acknowledge that judgments and evaluations are formed from readers who possess their own frameworks and subjectivities, and are thus not definitive or universal. What is most important is the reader’s aesthetic experiences with the texts, and the evaluator must concede their own experiences guide the literary interpretation. Inadequate readings emerge when the reader considers only parts of the texts or produces a reading that is indefensible. A valid interpretation then must involve the reader’s interpretation of his/her own feelings when s/he reads the text. Finally, Rosenblatt expresses concern about the potential for restricting literary interpretation to those highly trained literary critics. She argues that the transactional approach to interpretation champions the aesthetic experiences of common readers, who may generate meaning from literary texts that propels the reader to alter his/her life, has a new experience, or acquires a new perspective on themselves and the world. The critic’s veil of neutrality need not compel them to develop new schemes of objectivity, but to embrace neutrality as a fiction, and to recognize that the multiple texts comprise the fluid self (Michaels, 1980).

Reader Response theorists, however, in general, maintain a grip on a normative basis for literary interpretation. Although they privilege the reader in the interpretive enterprise, they hold that a common understanding or reading of a literary text is possible, even if it is just from a group of readers who share a similar cultural heritage. The sanctity of the text, and the codes and signs guide the reader, even when the reader experiences an aesthetic reading. They rely primarily on the literary form and interpretive communities to stablize meaning. Yet, regardless of their focus on the reader’s experiences with literary text, Reader Response theorist must concede that the fluidity of language dictates the range of

potential interpretations. "Misreadings" emerge when disagreements ensue, but invalid interpretations may not simply provoke textual clarification, but may represent a larger challenge to their theory as a whole.

Linguistic ambiguities belie the origin of meaning endemic in the normative project of Reader Response theory. Structuralism strove to offer a solution to such ambiguities. Advancing Kantian concerns about skepticism and Chomskian linguistics about the child's innate ability to grasp universal, a prior grammatical structures, Structuralists hold that texts induce a specific network or system of reading which confines the range of potential interpretations of literary texts. Structure's *a priori* conditions restrict the reader in his/her capacities to read and thus interpret texts. Readers need to practice reading with regulative matrices to develop into a "competent reader" of literary texts. Structuralists rarify literary texts with their own sets of structures, which inherently guide the reader's interpretation of them. As Norris explains, "Theory is assured of its methodological bearings by claiming a deep, universal kinship with the systems of meaning that it proposes to analyse" (1991, p. 3). Furthermore, while structuralists concede, like Kant, that knowledge of the material world escapes representation via language, which means that it is difficult, even impossible to know the material world in an unmediated state, they clutch to the notion that readers assume a dialogue with a priori truths, or the deep, universal regularities that guide the interpretive process. Finally, Structuralism believes that it can moderate interpretive relativism by providing a general theory of interpretation that encompasses "…all the various means we possess for making sense of literary texts" (Norris, 1991, p. 5). Thus, the purpose of interpretation is to generate "order and intelligibility among the manifold possible patters of sense which the text holds out to a fit reader" (Norris, 1991, p. 5). Literary interpretation of a text using Structuralism showcases the interplay among various a prior conventions and patterns.

It is important to note, at this point, that aligned with Chomskian linguistics, readers are not necessarily consciously aware of all of the potential a prior patterns and conventions. The reader discovers them as they select thematic patterns within a text while also discarding less relevant ones. The "competent readers" develops the capacity to recognize the multiple universal structures, or patterns, to produce a valid literary interpretation. S/he assumes that fundamental codes of reading guide the interpretive process, and the text reflects its own intuitive, and naturalizes the manner of understanding the literary text. The preference for deep, hidden, yet natural structures and patterns to guide text strives to manage the chaotic arrangement of linguistic signs and signification. Binary oppositions arranged into hierarchies illustrate privileged patterns endemic of a synchronic moment. Thus, readers, in general, according to structuralists, interact, engage, reflect on, and interpret texts in pretty much the same way. Even the reader's supposed response to literary texts endeavors to illustrate the a priori structures pervasive in the interpretive, universal field. Reader Response theorists, in general, place the reader at center stage in the interpretative process, while structuralists, with their quest to bring order to chaos, contend that the reader utilizes and emulates universal, natural, a priori structures and patterns, to render meaning.

Structuralists relied primarily on the work of linguists, Ferdinand de Sausaurre's view that language exists as an arbitrary convention, and attempts at representation meandered through an intricate matrix of signification of difference between signifier (i.e. c-a-t/B-a-t) and signified (concept of cat or bat). Knowledge and interpretation are conventionally bound within a system between signifier and signified, where meaning asserts itself in a continual flow of difference among various signs. Habitual patterns of same and difference permit the reader to develop hierarchies, structures, and catalogues to produce potential meaning among various readers/interpreters. Structuralism strives to manage the inherent relativity of difference pervasive in language by endorsing the notion of a priori structures and patterns which guide and direct literary interpretations. Roland Barthes, for example, claims that while structuralists readers present a "metalanguage" to articulate the codes and systems to guide all possible literary interpretation, they remain blinded by the fact that they too, reside in the matrix of linguistic difference between signifiers and signified. Saussure asserted that linguists, and subsequently Structuralism, linguistic play could be studied scientifically by focusing on a synchronic moment, and by investigating the relationship between an utterance, or *parole*, and a general system of iterative relationships, or *la langue*. Moreover, Barthes claims that arguments for inherent structural guides for interpretation, "…forgets or suppresses its own provisional status" (Norris, 1991, p. 9). The characteristic of linguistic play exists everywhere, Barthes claims, despite the best efforts of Structuralism to control interpretive dalliance. Attempts to demarcate "competent reader" or to validate a literary interpretation remain dubious, and blinded by temporal and representational features of language. The role of deconstruction, specifically in the works of Jacque Derrida, expose critical approaches that seek to develop a priori modes to control the interpretive endeavor. Finally, deconstruction illustrates that linguistic free play subvert privileged positions and readings within an interpretation, rending universal claims and competent readers incompetent.

Derrida does not dismiss all of Saussure's project, but subverts his privilege of speech over writing. Derrida agrees with Saussure that language exists in a network of difference and that there is no self-evident, unmediated correspondence between the signifier and the signified. Language exists in a *diacritical* relationship, or a "structured economy of differences, which allows a relatively small range of linguistic elements to signify a vast repertoire of negotiable meanings" (Norris, 1991, p. 25). Derrida challenges Saussure's preference for spoken texts over written ones, which he (Derrida) claims is at the heart of Western metaphysics. Derrida argues that writing, instead of being an afterthought of speech, stands as a precondition to speech. Speech, and its antecedent voice, exists as a metaphor of truth and authenticity, as a source of living presence.

Writing, on the other hand, eradicates the notion of authenticity and thus truth. As Norris explains, "It (writing) obtrudes an alien; depersonalized medium, a shadow which falls between intent and meaning, between utterance and understanding. It (writing) occupies a promiscuous public realm where authority is sacrificed to the vagaries and whims of textual 'dissemination' (1991, p. 28). He

contests the very notion of "writing" in general. Derrida argues that writing is an unstable constellation of free play within every linguistic system, and defers stable, unified meaning, and "self-authenticating knowledge" (Norris, 1991, p. 29). Language operates in a collection of relays of differential traces, which can never be completely captured within a governing system. If language, Derrida contests, could obtain self-referential certainty, it would function as a compliant medium of thought. Writing is not necessarily the normal or privileged mode of expression, but that claims to push writing as transposing, or translating agent are dubious in light of Derrida's assertion that writing and speech persists in a vast linguistic field of free-play. Unified interpretations from competent readers emerges with blindness, the linguistic sign and compositions exists in an over-determined field of linguistic play. Definitive meanings produce inherent contradictions within their readings, which subvert dominant, or common understandings of literary texts. Meaning, thus is always deferred as texts imply an ensemble of supplementary readings, codes, signs, and significations. Dominant readings deconstruct when the reader shows how secondary component is employed to buttress the privileged reading pre-condition or produce the opposite effect. Attempts to privilege one component over another, nature over culture for example, prove useless as claims for an origin or stable meaning, because supplemental elements implicitly appear in those claims and subvert any notions of primacy. Stable interpretations exist as *Aporias*, or as "…impasse of thought engendered by a rhetoric that always insinuates its own textual workings into the truth claims of philosophy" (Norris, 1991, p. 49).

The assessor, or reader, of students' compositions sits as literary critics in the institution of the school. The insertion of various genres into writing pedagogy and into assessment practices necessitates an investigation into the nature of language, literariness, and the relationship among the text, the author, narrator, reader, and self. Despite their best efforts, teachers as assessors proliferate the very thing they sought to expel. If the assessor resembles the New Critic, then s/he functions as a phrenologists, reading the tea-leaves of the text, bracketing his/her subjectivities in order to appreciate the objective meaning of the literary text. The problem with this approach, however, is that the critic uses the very tools it seek to unravelthe meaning of language. Language instrumentalized to render an objective interpretiation or representation of a collection of signs proves dubious in light of the constellation of difference endemic in linguistic systems. The very notion that misreadings occur when the reader refuses or neglects to consider the whole text in order to stablize an interpretation belies the very characteristics of language itself.

If, on the other hand, the assessors views him/herself as a reader response critic, then the assessor focuses on whether s/he approaches the text as an aesthetic or efferent one. This means that the assessor concentrates on their intimate, personal responses to the text as s/he reads it, and seeks guidance from the arteries directed by the given forms and structures within the text. Although reader response critics maintain that the text does not co-opt the reader's consciousness, they concede that normative readers direct and sway the reader as s/he reads. The text itself, or the students' compositions, instructs potentialities and valid interpretations. The reader

response critic, and thus the assessor, relies on the community of readers to support normative interpretations. This point is most explicitly clear in the Michigan study, but even here, readers have a 50/50 chance of garnering agreement. Moreover, they maintain the position that the assessor assumes a normative, or universal understanding of the terms in the scoring grid, but yet again, they fail to recognize, like reader response critics, that the very tools they use to render their evaluations remains language. The reader him/herself cannot experience the text with an unadulterated, unmediated position. Thus, the assessor him/herself remains within the dalliance of language.

While structuralism tried to resolve this conflict, the desire to manage chaos and fluidity in interpretation, its faith in a prior structures to dictate meaning prove unreliable in Derridian deconstruction. Stability in meaning deconstructs when supplements of a disparaged characteristic seep into the very articulation of those assumed naturalized structures. Binary oppositions fail to offer certainty when the privileged element fails to realized, or is blinded by, the notion that it is caught within its own self-reflexivity. The preferences for voice and authenticity collapse when the written self is caught in difference and the supplementarity of linguistic play. Thus, the emergence of multiple selves, voice, authenticity, and context seek to release the student from the limits of traditional forms of testing, but they insert these very mediums within the alternative pedagogical and assessment practices. Assessors rely on normative perspectives of these criteria to adjudicate the adolescent self. Traces of the orthopedics of writing remain from the nineteenth-century, and even though these components appear to be not as important in the grading process, their epistemologies actually guide and inform the assessor's evaluations of the student's authenticity and voice. Assessors revert to the one-size-fits-all mentality even as they insist on authenticity and individual voice.

Finally, to privilege voice exposes assessors and writing pedagogues to the same critic that Derrida launched at Western Metaphysics. That is, as they relegate writing, for the free play of signification, they neglect to witness the supplementarity of writing in their privileging of voice. Voice, the subject, the student, and the assessor do not inherently exist, and they are not ahistorical, transcendental, universal, absolute entities. The binaries between techno-rational and authentic, present forms of expression that are not absolute and fail to offer security, certainty, and security in the assessment process. They are produced through a confluence of multiple, competing, historical, and linguistic forces. The quest for truth through voice results in disillusionment. Writing pedagogues must concede at this point that they flounder in their attempts to liberate the student from traditional testing procedures in order to permit him/her to reveal his/her inner life in classroom writing activity. They, in fact, expose the student to a multiplicity of assessments, ones that persists as *Aporias.* Furthermore, assessors evoking literariness in the evaluation process unleash writing, as the free play of linguistic difference, which defies any claims to truth and authenticity. Hence, the results from assessments illustrate the assessors struggle to impose limits on the literary texts, which as Poulet states at the beginning of this chapter, is quite "misleading" (Poulet in Tompkins,1980, p. 44).

CONCLUSION

Assessment practices seek to determine the health of a consciousness based on its performance utterances. They utilize language to understand and evaluate the language in the written text. Language itself represents a crisis of representation, and thus represents a crisis of axiology, which as Hernstein-Smith maintains, is "doomed to fail." Misspellings and poor grammar may indicate corporal or cognitive lesions, and disjointed organization can spell an abnormal skeleton, but as Eagleton proclaims, such jejune can produce greater bodily awareness. Moreover, and much like the physicians in the late nineteenth-century, advances in medical technology permit greater access to the recesses of the body, but absolute or certain knowledge of the entire body escape the scope of power/knowledge. Teachers, like physicians, collect multiple specimens and calculate a potential diagnosis of the compositional body. Furthermore, consciousness as a text, whether as an inner consciousness or a miniature society, is fluid and mysterious. Written artifacts propelled by pedagogical strategies to express oneself in free-writing or through multiple genres offer several distinct reflections of the student's inner life, but side-streets and inhabitable enclaves persist as consciousness shifts and remains evanescent and completely unknowable. It is the coordination between the broader social world and the inner life of the adolescent that produces the viable self. The assumption of normative principles of life, however destined to shape the adolescent through writing pedagogy, that stands as the always-already discourse in the secondary classroom. The stabilized reading lens functions as the physician, as the bacteriologists, as the guard against abnormalities and diseases. However, the assessor as a reader exists in a similar role as the writer. They contain a consciousness and use language and discourses to make sense of and adjudicate the students' compositions. The implications for the assessor are similarly as perilous as the writer in a writer's workshop.

To promote and encourage secondary students to utilize a variety of genres to express or represent their experiences or self repositions as both the writer and the reader. The very form of a genre, and the potential tools at an artist's disposal redefine the relationship the reader has to the work of art. The demands made of the reader change depending upon the type and style used by the author. Reading a poem, for example, makes different demands than an essay. Likewise, an author selects a specific genre to reflect the thoughts and feelings the author wishes to convey. More important, to permit students in secondary schools to use various literary genres as valid indications of their abilities to compose represents an important epistemological shift in writing pedagogy. It indicates that the very ontologies of the student, his/her subjective experiences can be rendered in multiple ways; that his/her multiple selves call for the potential use of literary forms that, in theory, reflect their subjective, and unique experiences. What is valued is the student's abilities to meander the multiple competing voices and to select which way to illustrate the self. The self emerges, then, as a collection of literary genres. This means, then, that the relationship among speech, writing, and reading blur. What is important to note here is that by introducing the literary as a

viable form of expression to be assessed and evaluation, the secondary English teacher injects ambiguity into its practices. The assessor sits as art critic with all of the complexities it implies.

The role of the reader in relation to a literary text along with critiques of structuralism complicated the meaning-making process in the act of reading. The phenomenologies of meaning-making renders the demarcations among speech, writing and reading almost indistinguishable. The floating significance of English belies any sort of normative hermeneutics (Crusius, 1991) or axiological project (Hernstein-Smith, 1988). Nonetheless, the ability to respond and interpret literary texts involves the reader. The inability for language to adequately or even partially reflect experience or intension has not kept scholars from seeking an objective reading of literary text.

> Reader response theorists place a greater focus on the reader's response and their abilities to make sense of literary texts. The text itself represents merely a blueprint, or at best, a collection of maps to guide the reader in his/her path to literary interpretation. The quest to witness, investigate, and assess the inside of the pupil's body occurs, and the most brilliant progressivist writing pedagogies have their day in the sun. It is within this milieu that the Neoliberal entrepreneurial student emerges from the ashes of history. S/he appropriates the progressivist logic of play, liberty, diversity, individuality, and experimentation and knots them to a network of rationalities of rule that ultimately renders the modern lineage of utopian-based educational philosophies silent and disillusioned.
>
> The normative axiological project of secondary English pedagogy, despite blinded by the supplementarity of writing, grip to stability in language, and in the next chapter transpose the adolescent body to the matrices of governmentality. It exposes students to the rationalities of rule that seeks to individualize and totalize the body to garner truth about the student. In this chapter, the metaphors of the X-ray and fingerprints illustrates how epistemologies of medicine and criminality prevalent in the mid-to-late nineteenth century reappear to shred the body, standardize it, and pursue its most aberrant features. However, in its quest to normalize the adolescent self, pedagogues produce multiple lines of resistance to disciplinary and governmental powers it employs. The adolescent is produced not necessarily to be a proper, productive citizen, but to exists without the aid of state welfare programs. The genealogical threads describe in the previous chapters link to Neo-liberal rationalities to induce an independent subject able to manage a self and maintain a life capable of negotiating their own risk and security in a free-market economy. The technologies of portfolio assessment plays a vital part in this development, and is thus not an ahistorical, objective, humanistic attempt to liberate the adolescent from the confines of traditional approaches to teaching and learning. Instead, the character of the entrepreneur, once feared and loathed, emerges as the *sine qua non* of secondary English education.

CHAPTER 5

THE TECHNOLOGY OF PORTFOLIOS: X-RAYS AND THUMBPRINTS

Power is war, the continuation of war by other means (Foucault, 1997, p. 15).

Portfolios offer the teacher a window into the learner's mind and a format for tapping into each learner's strengths; a sample portfolio illustrates how to create a profile of each learner by looking at collections of student work, gathered from best-practices teachers in Cambridge. (Stefanakis, 2002, pp. xxviii–xxix).

Derridian deconstruction and post-structuralist thought in general, with its exposure of difference into claims to interpretive totality subvert commonly held and privileged beliefs in the stability of a unified, *a priori*, natural meaning. Supplementarity persists despite methodological approaches to place significations into hierarchies and catalogues. Primacy of meaning induced by a prior, unconscious structures crumble in the face of linguistic dispersion and free play. Michel Foucault furthers Derrida's claims about language and Western Metaphysics to the areas of history, knowledge, power, and the subject, and perhaps more germane to our work in this book, the area of politics.

In his first lecture in 1975 at the College de France, Foucault commences his year-long accounting of his research with a trenchant commentary on the impact on complementarity on social theory. He locates changes in perceptions of unified theories within his specific historical moment. A rather "strange efficacy" (p. 5) in the last fifteen to twenty years where disqualified, lower forms of discourses began to contest taken-for-granted common sensical notions of the human being and the unified theories that function as "…a theoretical production that does not need a visa from some common regime to establish its validity" (p. 6) materialize to contest and critique, or to offer a "hoarseness into the whisper that had been passing from couch to armchair without any interruption for such a long time" (p. 6). Attacks on the scientificity surrounding psychiatry and other pseudo-sciences prevalent in the Human Sciences, as well as strikes against the judicial and penal institutions to critique traditionally held views about morality and sexuality actualized. Thus, for Foucault, the 1960s and early 1970s witnessed a proliferation of the "…criticizability of things, institutions, practices, and discourses; a sort of general feeling that the ground was crumbling beneath our feet, especially in places where it seemed most familiar, most solid, and closest [nearest] to us, to our bodies, to our everyday gestures" (p. 6). Grand theories, such as Marxism and psychoanalysis serve their purposes of offering explanations of social and personal phenomenon and experiences, but a concentrated effort to accept their cohesive form and structure dissipated. Foucault argues that such global theories can work at the local level when the "theoretical unity of their

discourse is, so to speak, suspended, or at least cut up, ripped up, torn to shreds, turned inside out, displaced, caricatured, dramatized, theatricalized, and so on" (p. 6). Foucault qualifies his position by stating that he does not mean to imply that the scholars promote "…soft eclecticism, opportunism, or openness to any old theoretical undertaking, nor does it mean a sort of deliberate asceticism that boils down to losing as much theoretical weight as possible" (p. 6). Instead, and in much in line with Derrida, global theories remain over-determined and exists within a fast field of signification, and thus offer scholars an array of analytical tools to use in their analysis. Knowledge production, thus ceases to rely on a stamp of approval to legitimate a particular reading of a social phenomenon.

Contesting unified, global theories for Foucault is what he calls the "return to knowledge" (p. 7), or more specifically, subjugated knowledges. This term means the confrontation between verified interpretations and "…historical contents that have been buried or masked in functional coherences or formal systematizations" (p. 7). The "functional and systematic ensembles" of grand historical narratives hid or shunned subjugated knowledges as they coalesced historical materials into a unified historical, progressive sketch. Furthermore, Foucault claims that subjugated knowledges represent local knowledges that get deemed as "below the required level of erudition or scientifitity" (p. 7). Knowledge that the is "what people know" (p. 7). Not common knowledge or common sense, but local knowledges that remain differential and defy consolidation:

> Well, I think it is the coupling together of the buried scholarly knowledge and knowledges that were disqualified by the hierarchy of erudition and sciences that actually gave the discursive critique of the last fifteen years its essential strength (p. 8).

Grand theories about social relations and individual consciousness proved dubious to people's lived experiences. Claims to truth about the human being and his/her relationship with others and oneself privileged aspects of human beings that appeared apocryphal in light of shadows that pervaded and escaped their analysis. Unified, global theories of human beings evinced impotent and incomplete. The immunity and prerogative of knowledge over the subjective, unbridled sway of power illustrates Foucault's assertion that any claims to an origin, objectivity, and purity in knowledge cloaked in the shield of science is poised in relation to power, and is infused with multiple strategies of power. Power and knowledge are not distinct entities, and despite protests that true knowledge yields at the expense of power, Foucault shows how knowledge and power move throughout the discursive landscape in discontinuous and purposeful (dis) harmony. Traces of power seep into the objective and pure claims to knowledge, truth, and science, and subjugated knowledges emerge as power's greatest ally. Genealogies describe the struggle between subjugated knowledges and calcified knowledge to contest truth-claims produced by unified theories of government of the self and others, or governmentality.

The purpose of this chapter is to expose the claims in the secondary English classroom, and specifically writing pedagogy, to relegate power to the margins of the classroom in the interest of generating "real" knowledge about the adolescent.

It should be noted that in many respects the self-psychologist's emphasis on the patient's inner logic represented a move towards appreciating and validating their (patient's) lived experiences, illustrates efforts to contest a prior traditional therapeutic perspectives. Yet, as this chapter illustrates, the analyst and the analysand, and thus the writer (student) and assessor (teacher, parent, classmates) exists in an expansive field of signification, which is unable to produce certainty and stability of or about the subject. Furthermore, the rhetoric of moving the teacher from the authoritative position behind the proverbial desk to beside the student to equalize power relations between the student and teacher in order to generate authentic, "real" knowledge about the student is also dubious. Power as a supplement to knowledge persists, and does so with greater acuity, intensity, and subtlety. The adolescent self is produced through an intricate, evasive, and complex matrix of multiple forms of power/knowledge.

Finally, and more important, this chapter explains how the subjugated knowledges of X-ray and fingerprint technologies invade the practices and rationalities of portfolio assessment. The epistemologies of medicine and criminality comprise the thick genealogical threads of portfolio technology. The term technology as used here refers to practices and rationalities used to produce truths about individual subjects and populations. We argue that the technology of portfolio assessment via medical epistemologies individualizes the student's body and totalizes the wholesale student body. As Foucault states, "I think that the main characteristic of our political rationality is the fact that this integration of the individuals in a community or in a totality results from a constant correlation between an increasing individualization and the reinforcement of this totality (Foucault 1988, p. 162). Furthermore, although he presents four different types of technologies, he claims to primarily focus on two of them, technologies of power, and technologies of the self. The relationship between these two technologies comprises his analytics of governmentality. Technologies promotes "…certain modes of training and modification of individuals, not only in the obvious sense of acquiring certain skills but also in the sense of acquiring certain attitudes (Foucault, 1988, p. 18). We use Foucault's analytics of governmentality to describe the individualizing and totalizing aspects of the technologies of portfolio.

There can be little doubt that power/knowledge claims the truth about the adolescent body and self produce, promote, and foster resistances to those claims. Strategies and tactics of power/knowledge are doomed to fail in their quest to corral chaos and ambiguity, and despite the best efforts and humanists intentions of educators, specifically English educators to liberate the adolescent from the confines of the techno-rationalities of traditional testing procedures, they expose the student to a greater amplification of scalpels to dissect, lacerate, and prick the adolescent body in order to garner knowledge and truth that both individualizes and totalizes the corporal body. The first part of this chapter explicates Foucault's notions of power and specifically describes how Foucault's analytic of power materializes in the classroom. The second part explains the rhetoric of the portfolio as an assessment tool. The third part places the subjugated knowledges of the X-ray and fingerprinting technologies in dialogue with the practices and

rationalities of the portfolio in order to show how the portfolio functions as a instrument of governmentality which both individualizes and totalizes. The fourth section describes resistances to portfolio assessment, which is followed by a conclusion. It may be worth stating, that even though the rhetoric of the writing classroom promised more empathy and concern for the student, Foucault reminds us that "In the smallest of its cogs, peace is waging a secret war" (1997, p. 50). This chapter reveals the mechanisms and strategies of this secret war.

WAR, POLITICS, AND POWER/KNOWLEDGE

To assert that genealogies describe the struggles between local and global knowledges implies that they (genealogies) investigate force relations, or power. To illustrate Foucault's contribution to conceptions of power, he fails to offer a "theory" of power. What this means is that his perspective on power can not be used as explanative material to spackled onto social phenomenon. Although unified theories of power, such as judicial and Marxists forms examine force relations, their views of power are limited and anneal it into a composite structure. Judicial forms maintain that power exists in the form of rights, or as a contract to hold or surrender, while Marxists claims argue that economic structures reproduce dominate class relations. Foucault holds that power is not a commodity and does not necessarily lead to alienation. Moreover, in terms of Marxists forms of power, he argues that power relations do not necessarily reproduce class relations and power relations exists beyond structural economic concerns. Oppression-repression, represents as an abuse of judicial and Marxists forms of power as it seeks to prohibit certain individuals and groups from exercising or gaining access to their "rights," as well as dominate them in order to perpetuate class systems. Foucault contends that if the study of power looks into the various play of forces, it must also include elements beyond economics and commodification.

To frame his views of power, Foucault inverts Carl von Clausewitz's proposition, "War is a mere continuation of policy by other means….War is not merely a political act, but also a truly political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means" (Foucault, 1997, p. 21). Foucault argues that power is "war, the continuation of war by other means" (Foucault, 1997, p. 15). Power operates as a war throughout relations and continues even when politicians declare an end to combat operations and sign the peace treaty. The purpose of political power is to "…perpetually to use a sort of silent war to reinscribe that relationship of force, and to reinscribe it in institutions, economic inequalities, language, and even the bodies of individuals" (Foucault, 1997, p. 16). Moreover, even in times of apparent peace, relationships of force continue, and reversals, struggles, and disequilibrium pervade the social landscape. Power, thus is not necessarily always-already negative or prohibitive, but in Foucaultian terms, productive or positive.

Genealogical analysis seeks to expose power/knowledge games of truth in their positivities. Power, thus must be analyzed in its manifold relationships as an agonism which circulates throughout the social body. It is rarely if ever possessed

as something to grant to an individual or group, or as an object or structure to wield to oppress, but functions as a "net-like organization" (Foucault in Gordon, 1980, p. 98) where the subject is both subjected to and exercises multiple forms of power simultaneously. Finally, Foucault's power and thus his genealogical investigations serve as an anti-science in the sense that they refuse to contrast the "abstract unity of theory with the concrete multiplicity of the facts" (Foucault, 1976, pp. 8–9). They do not reject knowledge or proclaim to champion an "immediate experience that has yet to be captured by knowledge" (Foucault, 1997, p. 9), but recounts and discounts the unifying effects of claims to science through the various mechanisms of power/knowledge.

Compared to the attempt to inscribe knowledges in the power-hierarchy typical of science, genealogy is, then, a sort of attempt to desubjugate historical knowledges, to set them free, or in orther words to enable them to oppose and struggle against the coercion of a unitary, formal, and scientific theoretical discourse. This project of these disorderly and tattered genealogies is to reactivate local knowledges…against the scientific hierarchicalization of knowledge and its intrinsic power-effects (Foucault, 1997, p. 10). Forms of power strive to mark, categorize, accumulate knowledge about individuals and populations in their everyday lives and attach truth-claims about them as subjects maneuver and function with the circulation of power/knowledge and exercise it as the same time. The subject is both a conscious being living daily lives and subjected to multiple and competing forms of power/knowledge. The subject exists as an apriora within and through the circulation of power/knowledges. This means, then, that the subject is not outside of power/knowledge as a passive agent awaiting to receive power, but exercises it as well. The subject, then, cannot absolutely tell the truth about itself as power/knowledge operates through the subject's body and lifestyle. However, it directs, guides and resists specific certain forms of power/knowledge throughout its daily existence. Power, thus operates only on free subjects in the sense that they contain the capacity to interact, reject, and move within the net-like organization of power/knowledge formations.

Power/knowledge operates as an "action upon an action" in an agonistic relationship between various multiple and competing forces. As such, it problematizes individuals or populations through a series of fluid and practical strategies and tactics. Power/knowledges establishes a "system of differentiation" where an other is created as a target to be acted upon in specific ways. This system opens up a whole field of relationships to appear and knowledges compete to disqualify and establish normative regimes. Another is established through various mechanism and can be based on "...shifts in the processes of production, linguistic or cultural differences, differences in know-how and competence, and so forth" (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983, p. 223). This system also generates or produces aberrations or abnormalities, which demand greater access, control, and management. Moreover, power/knowledge utilizes several means to rationalize its use, and disperse several institutionalize mechanisms to carry out its particular function. Thus, multiple systems and approaches proliferate to objective certain subjects. Finally, power/knowledge reflects on its abilities to appropriate, control,

and manage individuals and populations. Foucault remarks that, "The exercise of power is not a naked fact, an institutional right, nor is it a structure which holds out or is smashed: it is elaborated, transformed, organized; it endows itself with processes which are more or less adjusted to the situation" (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983, p. 223). Power/knowledge circulates in a network of difference and adjusts and transforms itself to accomplish its goals. Knowledge's desire to accumulate data on subjects and populations is endowed with an assemblage of power formations, and while it claims to science indicates its humanistic desire to determine and know truth, its claims to objectivity transform into a series of agonistic relationships that attempts to produce a fluid subject and instigates a variety of resistances. Genealogical analysis in its description of the struggle between different forms and claims of knowledge contests notions of objectivity in science and scientificity, and ultimately the rhetoric of humanism. There is no inside/outside of power, individuals who possess authoritative positions do not bracket themselves or cloak themselves in the garment of objectivity, but exists in an arena fraught with strategies and tactics of power/knowledge, and do battle with other forms of power/knowledge. Thus, the teacher who sits beside the student to allure him/her to express him/herself shifts strategies to instigate a continuation of war.

Foucault's genealogical studies seek to expose the various forms of power/knowledge and to illuminate their regimes of truth. In particular, he describes disciplinary power, pastoral power, bio-power and governmentality. Disciplinary power's purpose is to normalize the body and make it docile. Through various codes, expert knowledge, and strategies for accumulating knowledge, disciplinary power hierarchicalizes different parts of the body to place it under direct and indirect forms of surveillance:

> Discipline not only consists in a way of organizing social life according to rational thought, exactitude, and supervision, it also embraces a mode of personal existence within such practices. It entails a training in the minute arts of self-scrutiny, self-evaluation, and self-regulation ranging from the control of the body, speech, and movement in school, through the mental drill inculcated in school and university, to the Puritan practices of self-inspection and obedience to divine reason (Rose, 1989, p. 226).

Disciplinary power operates on the micro-physics of the body and is perhaps the most efficient form of power because it functions without overt force. Subjects internalize normative principles and practices, and concede to the warden of the Panopticon even when s/he does not exist. Of interest, Foucault asserts that in schools, the examination works as a disciplinary strategy because it strives to differentiate, judge, and establish truths about them. As such, it transforms the pupil into a "whole field of knowledge" (Foucault, 1977a, p. 186). The student's body gets placed into an entire "economy of visibility" (p. 188), and transforms the student into a "subject to be in constant objectification" (p. 198) to be analyzed. The examination also produces an accumulation of knowledge about the student and renders him/her "describable" (p. 189). The student makes a case of

him/herself as s/he reflects on his/her performance as it produces a paper trail of its abilities and capacities. Finally, the examination generates a body of knowledge about an entire population of students as it homogenizes and normalizes groups of students. Through its normalizing gaze, disciplinary power exposes the student's body to constant surveillance, and strives to prevent it from hiding in the shades of power/knowledge (resistances). The primary strategy of pastoral power is the confession. Confessional technologies function to save the soul of both the individual and group in order to prepare it for the next life. Obedience of the individual to the leader (shepherd) is paramount and practiced not necessarily to adhere to specific laws but as a result of the leader's relationship to the individual. The leader's will functions as the operating force of pastoral power. The leader, whose primary responsibility it is to ensure that the flock gains admittance into the next life, demands to know the inner most details of the individual's consciousness and desires. The leader requires an "in-depth individual knowledge of each member of the flock" (Dean, 1999, p. 75), and thus the individual must practice continual self-examination, accept the leader's guidance, and stay obedient to him/her. The leader continually differentiates the flock between those who are certain to survive the next life and those who are "at-risk." Strategies of power/knowledge in the form of pastoral power adjust to return maverick sheep into the entire flock.

Governmentality focuses primarily on the "conduct of conduct" of populations. The term conduct refers to a conductor orchestrating the music of a symphony and the conduct as in behavior. The forces that move and shape the behaviors of populations and individuals, or the relationship between the government of the self and the government of others illustrate the manifold relationships of governmentality. Rationalities of rule undergird practices of governance within and through populations, as it seeks to accumulate potentialities within groups including the possibilities of risk and mechanisms of social insurance (Castel in Burchell et al, 1991; Ewald in Burchell et al, 1991. Bio-power is intricately link to governmentality, as it seeks to assess the lifestyles within calculations of risk and insurance. Bio-power is concerned with the management of lifestyles, specifically to bodily health and disease.

To conclude, forms of power operate within a network of power-knowledge, often times merging with each other to achieve its purposes. Pastoral power, for example, utilizes strategies of disciplinary power to ensure that members of flock survive in the next life. Each of these forms of power/knowledges circulate throughout the social body, and subjects exercise and succumb to various forms of power/knowledge. Germane to this book, various strategies of power/knowledge produce portfolio technology, which seeks to produce a certain adolescent subject. The portfolio individualizes and totalizes as its technology proliferates throughout the educational field. While it claims to help students to become better writers, and releases them from the oppressive and repressive forms of tradition writing pedagogies and testing practices, it perhaps unwittingly exposes them to a whole host of power/knowledges and instigates resistances to those manifold forms.

CHAPTER 5

FORGERY AND TRUTH IN PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

The portfolio appeared as a response to traditional testing methods cloaked in the rhetoric of liberation and "real" expression. Techno-rationalities for authentic expressions exist in the fold of the portfolio. Portfolios collected truth articulations and actual evidence of the writer's compositional abilities, and perhaps more important, a reflection of the student's veritable self. The portfolio illustrated precisely what students have learned and revealed who they are. Portfolios allow for a more "honest" and "authentic" reflection of learning and identity, and thus guarded against the student's desire to simply write to receive a good grade. The portfolio functions as an instrument of power/knowledge to combat resistances endemic in traditional testing and writing assessments, such as cheating and guessing on competency exams (i.e. grammar tests), and compositions that reiterate what the teacher wants, or as James Albright claims, "plays the teacher".

Educators employed the rhetoric of science, specifically words such as real, authentic, legitimate, trustworthiness, and reliability to allure students to express themselves and disclosure the inner consciousness. They designed the writing classroom as a workshop in the camouflaged of an empathetic space to dismiss the teacher's customary authoritative role in order to exonerate the student from traditional performance pressures and liberate them to vent and purge their inner voice. What may appear as a quest for knowledge at the expense of power however, transforms that classroom into a place where power/knowledge disseminates and truth about the student calcifies. This means, the strategies and tactics employed by teachers informed by humanistic intensions produces a grid of intelligibility about the student that intensely creeps into the multiple organs of the student body and self in order to collect data in the interest of building and verifying regimes of truths about the adolescent.

Perhaps this is no more apparent than in the drive for greater truth about the student. Forgery, falsehood, trickery, and uncertainty drive the desire to implement portfolio assessment in the secondary classroom. Bonnie Sunstein (2000) recalls an absentee note she received from one of her eleventh-grade students, who she proclaims, had mastered this genre, down to using the right stationary and diction. The concluding sentiment, "Luv ya, Mrs. Smith" gave Sunstein a clue that her student was an "artful forger" (p. 3), or someone who can mimic an artist's subject, style and form, but usually leaves a "fingerprint" (p. 3). In this case, the mis-spellings and use of slang revealed her student's fingerprint. Sunstein explains that there are three types of forgers in writing: 1. The artful forger imitates the original piece of art, but again leaves a fingerprint, which gives away its fallacious and bogus legitimacy. 2. Expert forgers impersonate the master artist's style and attempts to sell it for a profit. 3. Innocent forgers ardently attempt to meet a set of pre-determined criteria in order to receive high marks from external reviewers. Painting by numbers comes to mind here. Innocent forgers care less about producing a personal style, but attend more to criteria and final judgment. Each of these types of forgers, Sunstein claims, strive to assume the "soul" of the master artists and sacrifice "…authenticity, experimentation, development, or soul" (p. 5).

The imitator can only produce superficial renderings of the master's work, and thus lacks the "subconscious conviction of a truthful purpose" (Burroughs,in Sunstein, 2000, p. 5). Writing assessment, Sunstein proclaims needs to change from creating writers as imitators, or forgers, to producing writers who possess an "artists soul." Instead of striving to meet external standards, students need to learn to express themselves so that they practice meeting those standards and not "adjust" to them:

> With clear stakes, drawn lines, and lots of practice with convention and techniques, our students learn not only how to value their own work according to the standards we set for them, but also how to sell their work successfully 'back' to us. We do not encourage them to set their own standards or goals within a set of curricular options. Their job is to meet, not adjust to, standards set by an outside curriculum or a set of outside assessors (p. 5).

Students, like artists, must work in a classroom that fosters experimentation and practice. Persistent and continual rendering and re-rendering, the student learns how to be "satisfied with the soul of the work—his unique 'signature,' his fingerprint, which shows through in his finished product and identifies his art" (p. 6). Imitators, on the other hand, capture the surface nature of the painting, and thus lack the invisible effort and "soul" of the original. Art sleuths utilize an array of techniques (i.e. spectroscopes, X-rays, gamma rays) to see beneath the surface of a painting to reveal its authenticity. Most original paintings show the artist's experimentation and revising of the piece, while counterfeit ones do not. Sunstein claims that although teachers cannot send a student's paper to the X-ray machine, they can question their pedagogical strategies when they use the writing portfolio. Teachers can be "reflective" (How can we help students authenticate their work?), "reflexive" (What techniques can students use to recognize and display authenticity?), and "beware" (How do we know how to ask? And how do we avoid getting only what we ask for?) (Sunstein, 2000, p. 7).

The capacity to reflect on one's artistic piece is a learned practice. It offers the student to look beneath the composition to reveal the process of writing. Much like the artists whose final product contains edited versions and re-renderings, reflections allow the writer to describe his/her approaches to the completed artifact. It also confers an accounting of the writer's choices and endows the teacher and writer with a recollection of the learning experience. To aid students with proper, authentic reflection, teachers must learn how to pose proper questions to illicit appropriate reflective response and to combat "vapid" "self-indulgent" ones. A few include, "What do you know that you didn't know before?", "What can you do that you couldn't do before?", and "What do you do that you couldn't do before?" (p. 8). Sunstein shows three exemplars of a proper reflection, the one written by an eighth grader is printed below:

> I feel like I have a lot of strong points in my writing. I can pick a topic and expand on it without swaying off the subject. I am very orderly in my writing, and I can create stories off the top of my head. Following the writing

> process is another one of my strengths. But tagging along are also some weaknesses. I sometimes shave weak openings and my endings don't conclude my thoughts. I also need to improve my vocabulary and spelling (p. 10).

After students reveal the experiments, risks, and strategies taken to compose their pieces, Sunstein argues that students must turn away from the self and reflect on how their work and learning meets external criteria. The portfolio should show "look at me, here I am and here are my fingerprints" and it should show "this is how I meet (exceed, adjust) your expectations of me" (p. 11). Students should learn not to rely on teachers to assess their work, but develop the capacity to illustrate how their fingerprints align with external criteria. Teachers need to learn through questioning "…to assist students to do it (assessment) themselves, according to the particular expectations of our class, school, district, or region, with reflection and reflexivity as tools" (p. 11). Questions include: "What do you want your work to say (to others) about you? What does your work say about you? What are the differences?" (p. 11). These types of questions guide the students into looking at themselves and their own writing processes.

Furthermore, they promoted a certain type of reading the self in that they ask students to consider how their rendition reflects (or not) who they are or what it says about who they are. Such questions, laced with pastoral power, converts students from being subjects to being the object of the subject. Adolescents are now induced to make an object of themselves, and to employ representational language as their primary instrument to show who they are. The position of the student, in many respects, seems quite unfair. How well they succeed in rendering their inner selves depends so much on the reader and the context in which the composition is written. Furthermore, language itself fails to capture the true, authentic nature of ones self; it can merely offer a sketch at best and a smudge at it worst. For the teacher, however, these questions about the student's work provide them with a tool they have yearned for about a century. The technology of the portfolio (i.e. personal topics, multiple-genres, reflection, object/subject) endows teachers with X-ray vision into the student's soul.

> With X-ray vision, we can watch as a student tours us through her process and explains each critical moment of the drafting of a piece, the making of an artifact. For the student, the portfolio is not only the frame and the canvas for a finished piece; it holds the early sketches, the experiments in composing, the erasures, stops and starts, rearrangements, coverings. Only the student knows how those processes unfolded, and she ought to have the authority to explain and document her work as it stands in relationship to required standards" (p. 12).

By giving students the "authority" to journey the teacher through her writing process, the student negotiates and maneuvers a series of strategies laced with pastoral and disciplinary powers to reveal who they are to the teacher. The teacher, in turn, surveys the inner workings of the student with X-ray vision to locate

abnormalities and foreign objects that harm or disease the adolescent's compositional body. Reading the student's portfolio and listening to the student's description of her writing process involves a normative horizon; this means that teachers read and listen for orthropaedic alterations of both individual and whole corporal portions. Authentic and personal topics are the keys to the combination of pastoral and disciplinary powers working in the technology of portfolios. Below is how teachers can "Beware" of inauthentic forms of writing,

> We (teachers) create the market for forgery in writing when we encourage superficial adherence to style and form. By privileging the surface features in students' writing, we create a demand for a superficial kind of product, a forgery of sorts, using curriculum guidelines to shape student texts and ideas (p. 13).

If teachers provide a supportive learning space for students to compose intimate, personal pieces about their inner lives, then they (students) can report on the complexities of their learning "like master painters" (Sunstein, 2000, p. 13). Teachers need to remain constantly vigilant against any smudge of forgery in the students work. The reader may recall that in the late nineteenth century, teachers remained on high alert for diseases and unhealthy temperaments, but during the early 1990s, teachers were obsessed with authentic expression that reveal the student's true identities.

Portfolios transformed the student's work into a reincarnation of the student's body. The collection of artifacts emerges as a body of its own, and the teacher function more like a Bertillon criminologist who excavates the entire body hunting for traces of phoniness, fabrication, and fraudulence. The difference here is that the teacher, with the aid of reflection and reflexivity, possesses X-ray vision to examine both the surface features and internal characteristics. In short, writing pedagogues can now peruse the students' "authentic self-portraits" (p. 13) in order to steer them to " work with passion and a discernable soul"(p. 14). The humanist intentions are inspiring here, but troubling from a Foucaultian perspective.

Students acquire greater responsibility with both the content and the composition of their portfolios. The student is no longer a passive, secondary recipient of their work, but is the primary source of materials. The reversal from regurgitation to ownership occurs due to a desire to see inside of the student; from the desire to show what one knows to owning oneself emerges as a desire to move beyond the surface of things to the hidden, underexposed features of the student's body; the desire to privelege portfolio assessment instead of multiple-choice testing appears from a desire to shape the interior of the student; to pierce the skin of the exam, and get at what's underneath a student's abilities, their character, their processes and their multiple selves. Students, thus, bring a "history" with them to the learning experience, and teachers need to just allow them to show themselves

as "literate human beings," or their "plaster hands".[3] By letting students expose themselves in the various practices of the portfolio, the teacher gets to see with "X-ray vision".

By raising the history of the X-ray, we can problematize portfolio as an "authentic" form of assessment. In addition, we can see the infinitesimal ways that portfolio assessment operates as a dividing practice, as an "assemblages" of various discourses and practices, and as a strategy of power. This paper wishes to show how X-ray vision becomes embedded within portfolio assessment as a metaphor to describe how it (portfolios) functions with students. As a metaphor, the X-ray becomes a discourse (O'Farrell, 2005) that is used to shape the space from which teachers see students and for how students view themselves.

THE TECHNOLOGIES OF PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT

Although there is no clear origin of the portfolio, in fact, a genealogical analysis reveals that multiple, competing threads cleared the space for it to arrive center-stage as a viable approach to assessing student writing. However, the portfolio seems to be consistently aligned with the child's body. Here, the reader may recall Child Study as the transformative inklings of the portfolio. Elizabeth A. Hebert (2001), for example, states that portfolios are "reincarnations" of a collection various school projects:

> Those of us who grew up in the 1950's or earlier recognize portfolios as reincarnations of the large memory boxes or drawers where our parents collected starred spelling tests, lacy valentines, science fair posters, early attempts at poetry, and (of course) the obligatory set of plaster hands. Each item was selected by our parents because it represented our acquisition of a new skill or our feelings of accomplishment. Perhaps an entry was accompanied by a special notation of praise from a teacher or maybe it was placed in the box just because we did it (p. ix).

Innocent in its recollection, Herbert outlines the precise characteristics and potential effects of the portfolio. It is a collection of personal artifacts, which reflect the child's idiosyncracies, and function for nostalgic purposes. Each artifact contains its own form and content, while the collection reflects the child's real abilities, talents, and personality. To be blunt, the portfolio offers enough evidence to render a truth about the child. It represents an opening of the body for everyone to examine and marvel. In the case of the writing portfolio, such expose, or regime of visibility persists in a similar manner. This point is no more apparent than in the quest to expose the "artful" and "innocent" forgeries endemic in writing, and the portfolio functions as the apparent antidote to these apocryphal texts. It compels the student to perform operations on itself (i.e. body, soul, behavior) for specific purposes (i.e. independence, autonomy, happiness, liberation). If to assess means

[3] See A. Herbert (2001) quote above.

to sit beside the student, we may discover that the teacher does so with the mind of a humanitarian, but the heart of a booking agent at a local police states. The teacher grabs the hand of the criminal, douses it in cheap ink, and pounces the student's hand on a fingerprint card. The portfolio places each individual's proclivity within a matrix of difference to others.

The use of metaphors related to fingerprints and thumbprints offer in-roads into the potential epistemological and material effects of portfolio assessment. We want to put forward the notion that the metaphors of fingerprints and X-rays combine to place students within a matrix of governmentality. The thumbprint individualizes the adolescent body, while the X-ray totalizes them. Within the matrices of governmentality, manifold forms of power/knowledge, specifically pastoral, disciplinary, and bio-power mingle and interact. The pedagogical rhetoric of the portfolio promises self-expression and greater certainty of student's writing abilities. It also propagates the notion that students can learn via the portfolio to conduct practices of the self (i.e. self-concept, self-improvement, self-confidence) to foster independence, autonomy, and awareness. Unpacking the epistemologies of anthrompetry and X-ray technology, the humanistic guides fashioned to liberate the student turn into a rather sophisticated ruse.

The reader may recall from chapter one that the Bertillon system of identification emerged as a result of a perceived problem with criminal population. Bertillon believed a compilation of intricate, specific details, or *Portrat Parle*, or spoken portrait for each individual criminal. The Bertillon Card recorded physical features (i.e. beard, lips, height, weight), and personality traits (i.e. attitude, language usage, voice). The identification of criminals involved matching characteristics on the card with the physical and personality ones of the live criminal. The interpretive function of the criminologist connected or checked off elements of the card to those of the criminal. Detailing the micro-physics of the body were essential for Bertillon due to the profound risk for masquerades and impersonators. Furthermore, Bertillon believed that corporal minutia exhibited greater individual diversity. Individuals acquire their uniqueness in their exiguous elements. As criminals advanced, so too did resistances to those advances. Recidivistes who trespassed the municipal limits of Paris through disguise or props, Bertillon reasoned, would be identify due to the details accounted for and accumulated on the Bertillon Card. The anthropometric system endeavored to organize human identity through a "language of notations" (Cole, 2001, p. 49). Criminologists used the Bertillon Card to collect information about the criminal's context, his/her lifestyle, decision-making process, personal habits, and parental influences. The Bertillon Card collapsed when it failed to garner inter-rater reliability. Police officials wavered in their confidence in it when the match between card and criminal proved unreliable. We may surmise that resistances to the Paris law produced the adverse effect of increasing recidivism, not less. This would mean that the Bertillon card ultimately contained so much information about the criminal's body, that it ceased to function, or to state another way, it collapsed. The desire for power/knowledge to accumulate knowledge and determine truth

over-extended itself to the point that it generated more uncertainty rather than more stability.

Fingerprints developed as an alternative to the Bertillon system, but it endured a similar fate. Much like the Bertillon Card, scientists believed that individuals possess their own unique fingerprints, which could be used as a form of identification. The assumption of uniqueness, however, never withstood scrutiny, and thus fingerprints were used as a ruse to control local workers in order to maintain colonial power, and to induce criminals to confess, even if s/he did not commit the crime. Methods used to determine individual fingerprints rely on quantity (i.e. 10-point method) or a combination of quantity and quality (i.e. smudge, environment). Thus, fingerprints failed to give scientists and criminologist the certainty they desired.

The portfolio emerged as a potential solution to a practical problem with a specific population. Traditional testing methods failed to consider the contextual and processes characteristic of the writing classroom. Furthermore, the educators believed that promoting students to be reflective and reflexive, teachers could be aware of compositional forgeries, which mimic the masters, but lacks his/her soul. Secondary English teachers desired real expression, no impersonators and no criminals. Revealing the micro-physics of the student's body illustrated their differences from others, and hence, their uniqueness. Authenticity resides in the micro-physics of the body.

To review, the discovery of the X-ray allowed doctors to see previously mysterious parts of the body. They were able to see within the body, penetrating the skin to see bone structure, and later, organs with the use of liquids and other substances. The X-ray, it must be remember appeared along with several diagnostic medical tools in the nineteenth-century, indicating the limits of what it can expose. Microscopic objects, such as germs, viruses and bacteria cannot be seen with a simple X-ray. Even if we took an entire X-ray of the entire body, parts of it would still be unknown. Nonetheless, we can't dismiss its worth to diagnose illnesses and anatomical dysfunction. The X-ray illuminated foreign objects, such as bullets, within the body. On the surface, the patient may cry out in agony due to pain in certain parts of the body. Yet, the X-ray is able to show the location of the foreign object, and from that location, doctors would be able to deduce how that foreign object may affect the rest of the body. Furthermore, X-rays, with the help of liquids, also displayed cancers and other anatomical maladies. Liquids illuminated previously mysterious, hidden structures. Finally, through exposing the body to X-ray vision, doctors were able to generate standardized anatomical "stamps". We see the rationalities of exposing the insides of the scholastic body, highlighting foreign objects, abnormalities, and thus standardizing the body in the writing portfolio.

In a similar way as the X-ray, portfolios allow teachers to place parts of the student's body under intense scrutiny in order to expose its internal features. Once it is able to do this, it is able to bracket the patient and use the portfolio to determine the student's maladies or dysfunctions. The teacher doesn't need to rely on the student to tell him/her whether s/he can perform certain tasks, but can do so

with various writing assignments. In addition, the teacher doesn't need to rely on the multiple-choice test to understand how well a student can write; again, s/he can do so with the writing portfolio. The teacher searches for "bullets", or foreign objects, or "cancers" as in writing errors and mistakes that can eat away at the body to render it incomprehensible. Foreign objects can appear in many forms, whether incorrect spelling or misunderstood content material. The need to correct English has not disappeared; it has gone underground and has been outflanked by the need to receive detailed, inter-personal information about each student. One doesn't need the portfolio to see how a student fails to spell correctly or use proper punctuation; however, the portfolio provides a more reliable assessment because it provides several documents, thus, searching for and calculating regularities within the body. Like the physical body, the health of the scholastic body is determined by "multiple and related samples" (Brian Huot, 1994, p. 329) from various parts of the body.

Getting inside of the body, positioning the X-ray in multiple-positions allows the teacher to acquire a more reliable sample of the student's work, thus discerning the health of the student's work. As such, with such reliability and with the search for "bullets" and "cancers", the portfolio produces anatomical or scholastic "stamps" of writing. One could see how the teacher, in fact, begins with "stamps" in mind before the student even begins to reveal him/herself; hence, the teacher doesn't read the portfolio as an objective observer. In fact, we see how the teacher perceives the portfolio with specific lens.

Discourses of X-rays allows the audience to discern the mechanics of the student's body and does so that it may attempt to shape and mold his/her subjective experiences in a "logical", "cohesive," "rational" manner to ensure that it (scholastic body) doesn't possess any "bullets" or "cancers." In doing so, X-ray discourse provide educationalist with the ability to generate medico-pedagogical stamps, attempting to mold, shape, and indeed discipline (Foucault, 1977) the student's personal, subjective experiences; and continue to care for the student until s/he can exhibit and reveal an appropriately looking and properly functioning academic body. Here we see the clear link between matching the student's individual subjectivities to another's "expectations." Such views further demonstrate how the discourse of X-rays influences the space teachers use to encourage students to mold their (students') subjective experiences, and to discern how they (students) correspond or "exceed" those "expectations". Rationalities of X-ray vision became a metaphor in human interactions to expose the hidden and devious intensions of another individual. This section does not want to make the claim that this metaphor and, thus portfolios, only depicts malicious motivations. Like the X-ray, which is designed to reveal as much as it can of the internal features of the body, so too is the portfolio designed to expose personal, internal characteristics of the student.

Prior to the emergence of the X-ray, doctors relied on the patient's recollection of the events leading up to an injury and on their ability to describe pain. After the X-ray, and other diagnostic equipment, doctors no longer primarily relied on the patient's recollections or descriptions of past events. Instead, the X-ray increased

the possibility that a precise cause of the pain, thus, allowing for greater certainty of diagnosis and prognosis. X-rays provided a more "reliable history" of the patient's background. We see, then, how the emergence of the cathodic rays as a medical tool allowed doctors to bracket the patient in order to locate anatomical deviations. It is the relationship between the patient and doctor via the X-ray that we see in the relationship between students and teachers via the portfolio. Often, teachers provide students with the assignment to complete a portfolio with specific guidelines to that assignment. The portfolio assignment then, necessitates a desire to get inside the student, and to provide a more "reliable" view of the student's work and their "selves."

CONCLUSION

The rubrics commonly employed to assess portfolios parallels the spoken portraits of the Bertillon Cards and Galton's ten-point fingerprint identification system. Students produce specimens from their bodies initiated from their inner selves. The documents simulate live characteristics of various parts of the adolescent's body (e.g. temperament, health, order). The rubric operates as a quantifying checklist of specific features, which guides the marker in their assessment of each individual sample and of the entire corporal heap. Quantity determines quality and judgment. If the body contains enough consistent number of orderly, well-structured, properly characterized (i.e. voice) features, then the total body exceeds the standard. The rubric, much like Galton's method, brackets external or extraneous circumstances that may influence the composition of the specimens. It's as if the classroom transforms into the laboratory, or at worst, the classroom is veiled as a laboratory couched in humanistic-pastoral rhetoric. Remove teachers from their position of expertise, place them on the margins as facilitators of a supportive, encouraging environment and let the students explore, experiment with the classroom as microbes would under a microscope. Students compose their own Bertillion Card, their own spoken portrait of themselves via the portfolio, exposing various elements of their subjectivities only to be totalized in the form of a counting system that markers appraise in a modified objective manner. The historical thread of the portfolio and hence the contemporary secondary student, emerges from a problematic of the potentially deceitful Bengalise laborer, the Paris criminal, and Galton's dubious, yet persuasive ten-point fingerprint identification system. A significant different, however, is American educational reformers plastered the adolescent identities in the form of a portfolio.

Students, it appears can no longer "hide in the shade" of power (Foucault 1977). They can neither cheat on exams nor guess on questions. Instead, they must reveal their learning processes, expose their intimate ideas, match their abilities to specific measures and reflect on how they met certain criteria. "Good" or "Bad" performances are determined based on how students meet specific criteria spelt-out in rubrics and standards. What we see is the intensification and internalization or incorporation of the multiple-choice test. Teachers use the portfolio to capture the

"students' often sophisticated ability," based on specific criteria. To describe student work as "sophisticated" is to assume some criteria that students must match. They must select or choose the most "sophisticated" ideas and present them in the appropriate ways. That process, in short, demands that teachers "read" and "see" the portfolio pieces in specific ways according to rubrics, exemplars and external standards, students write their pieces in specific ways, and teachers monitor how and what they put in their portfolios. Discourses of X-ray technology in portfolio assessment, allows teachers, parents, administrators, and students with inside information about the student's abilities. They provide a safe-proof way to empirically and incontrovertibly know how students work and what they think about. Yet, we have to wonder if Sunstein's criticism of the teacher is really a straw-man: perhaps the issue isn't necessarily providing students with a format to authentically reflect, perhaps what we need to be questioning is how we "see" students and the historical emergences of certain rationalities, such as X-ray technology which impact how we "see," and produce the subject.

If there is one item that seems to dominate the rationality to move toward using portfolio assessment instead of traditional testing in schools, it is the desire to see within the scholastic body. This shift in visibility from the external dots to internal subjectivities, indicates not simply a "game" made better, but a "different game." Portfolio assessment, through their historical emergences, and with the aid of the rationalities of X-ray technology, provided a way for educationalists to excavate the scholastic body, and place it under constant surveillance with the hope that all parts of the body become illuminated and not "hide under the shade of power." Indeed, the "fear of darkened spaces" propelled the emergence of portfolio assessment, in an effort to get at and get into the scholastic body and to shape individual student's experiences in specific, rational, organized forms. Yet, as Foucault (1973) demonstrates "The gaze that sees is the gaze that dominates (39), indicating that the various assemblages of discourses, terminating in rubrics and external standards provide the lenses for the gaze that "dominates" which produces the student and determines what the student knows.

Flynn (1993) argues that this shift from the modern, "universal" forms of knowing to the postmodern emphasis on surveillance and multiple forms of rationalities represents a transformation in how time and space are utilized, so much so that "bodies…were rendered supple and docile" (281). It's worth reiterating, at this point, that Foucault does not argue that one is more rational than another, but that they exist within a strategic game. As the rationalities and practices of time and space shift so too does the object, which in this case is the student. We witness a shift in time and space in the shift from multiple-choice testing and portfolio assessment. The multiple-choice test is a one-time opportunity for students to show what they know, representing a minimum, yet efficient form of surveillance, while the portfolio allows the student to show in a variety of genres their own writing process, where during that time, students monitor themselves, their classmates, and their teacher. This surveillance, which according to Foucault is "hierarchical observation," normalizes the student's soul, and later makes a "case" of the student.

What's different about portfolios is that they are invited to make a case of themselves by exposing their own personal experiences,which are constantly under "revision" and supervision. Furthermore, assessment becomes embedded in classroom practices. As Giselle O. Martin-Kniep (1998) argues that "assessment is intrinsically tied to what teachers value, to what they teach, and to how they teach" (p. 88), and traditional forms of assessment, such as multiple-choice testing do not allow teachers to "see more of what they were thinking, what they understood, and what they were struggling with" (p. 88).

It would seem, ostensibly, that this constant surveillance of student work would represent the apex of effective pedagogy. In fact, who could argue with providing students with constant guidance on how to perform successfully at school. Yet, if we combine the discourses of X-ray technology with portfolio assessment, we might see something else. If the analogy between X-ray technology and portfolios works, then we see how current assessment practices place students under greater pedagogical scrutiny than they were when they sat for one-time multiple-choice tests. What's more, teachers monitor not just student's writing abilities, but their private matters; their experiences, likes and dislikes, and their relationships. Portfolio supporters argue that allowing students to write about such personal matters motivates them to really show what they know; hence linking the subjective with the empirical.

However, subtle forms of power breed subtle forms of resistances. Students act as "artful forgers," who construct those "personal" moments to match what the teacher wants to see. They shift their strategies and tactics to match the game. If we think of the emergence of portfolio assessment as a battle of various discourse (multiple-choice test, X-ray technology, portfolio assessment, subjectivities of students) appropriated for specific purposes, played out in the field of the classroom, then we can see how power works and moves. Power as an "action upon an action" (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983, p. 220) and as a strategic game of various forces, then we see that portfolios emerge through historical trajectories, and that they don't necessarily liberate the student, or produce an "authentic voice." Authenticity and liberation become problematized "with history" with such a view. The goal of portfolios, it appears, is to standardize those selves, but what we see is that students negotiate the various discourses embedded within the portfolio in order to "prevail" in the game; the student's multiple selves become employed as strategies to negotiate the schooling and assessing games.

What's dangerous about the X-ray, then, is dangerous about the portfolio: it's an invasion of privacy, piercing through the external skin and exposing the most intimate and detailed parts of the scholastic body, but doing so only based on what is initially highlighted. The liquid used to make opaque anatomical features has been transformed into the rubric used to make opaque subjective features of the scholastic body. As a result, and just like X-rays, each student gets evaluated based on the same set of criteria, and therefore become standardized "stamps;" hence students suffer, perhaps, from over-exposure to assessment technology, whereby their personal, subjective, and private parts are exposed to constant "guidance" by

the teacher, who then evaluates them based upon a set of external, predetermined set of criteria. The multiple-choice test remains, goes inside, and continues to evaluate students; but instead of looking at the surface areas, it spreads, like a cancer, throughout the scholastic body, seeking to standardize each and every form of expression. Perhaps we might place in abeyance the claim that portfolios work to produce an authentic voice, or that they liberate students to do so. We can also place in abeyance on what we think we're assessing when we're "assessing" because what we may claim to be "X-actly so" may not be at all. The writing portfolio was an instrument that reformers in the 1890s yearned for, but could only crave, or at best hallucinate.

CHAPTER 6

ENTREPRENEURIALISM

> Each individual is referred to himself. And each of us knows that our *self* does not amount to much (Lyotard, 1984, p. 15).
>
> "…the study of economic growth over long periods and among widely different societies—the concept of capital and capital formation should be broadened to include investment in health, education, and training of the population itself, that is investment in human beings. From this point of view the concept of capital formation followed here is too narrow" (Kuznets, 1961, p. 390).

The implementation of the portfolio in the secondary English classroom produced some unwitting effects on schooling practices. Promises of authentic, real productions along with accurate appraisal mechanisms proved misguided and even misleading. Educators who believed that the portfolio would offer students a more empathetic space to display their talents and abilities in a personal, proper form ventured to push dominate, negative forms of oppressive power out of the classroom. Traditional testing methods instigated trepidation, generated conflicting results, and were prone to guessing, cheating, and disguising. What occurred, however, and despite their best efforts, power/knowledge did not leave the classroom door, instead, it began to circulate. The pedagogical moves made by teachers, administrators, and scholars were strategic ones made at the behest of multiple forms of power/knowledge.

The portfolio failed to expunge the classroom of power in the interest of producing more authentic, real knowledge about the student. The writing portfolio disseminated power/knowledge like glitter throughout the classroom. Power/knowledge abducted the writing classroom in very subtle, insidious, and heterogeneous ways. It proliferated to the micro-details of the student's self, and indeed his/her soul. Writing activities functioned as confessions for the student to express his/her most inner self, and to collect a body of work in a portfolio that contained his/her unique fingerprints on a Bertillon Card. Deviations and idiosyncracies revealed the student's rare and uncommon features. X-ray technology searched the interiors of the composition to standardize and naturalize bodies. The orthropedics, once the concern for the late nineteenth-century pedagogue, re-appeared in the portfolio. X-ray technology was essential to the classroom at this time. Teachers needed an instrument that could reveal the inner authenticity, the work behind the painting, to show the multiple edits and revisions, and to illustrate how it meets school, district, and state standards. Possessing X-ray vision permitted teachers to expose various parts of the body in order to locate abnormalities, diagnose and treat patients, and standardize the body. X-ray

technology is most primarily noticed in rubrics and responses to student's work. Power/knowledge and its technologies of developing truth-regimes drives and undergirds portfolio assessment, not liberation, emancipation, and a desire for objective forms of "actual" knowledge.

This chapter begins an investigation into the political rationalities of rule pervasive in the United States in the 1980s to explore the effects of portfolio technology in secondary schools. Portfolio assessment technology took on new meaning when it emerged as the prime instrument to measure students in a large-scale, state-wide assessment school reform movement. The portfolio garnered all of the humanistic, liberationary, scientific cache at this time but our work shows that it employed genealogical threads that had more to do with political economy than with fostering a sense of self. The chapter gives a brief political background of the United States in the early 1980s. The purpose of this is to function as a fold to a more detailed analysis of the large-scale portfolio assessment used in Kentucky beginning in 1991. A description of the transformations of portfolio technology illustrate that conceptions and practices of capital accumulation trump concerns about narcissism and self-esteem, or put another way, from miniature societies to the promotion of the entrepreneur.

THE NEOLIBERAL SPRING

The early 1980s witnessed revolutionary political change throughout the industrialized world. The elections of Ronald Regan in the United States, Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom, Pinochet in Chile, and Deng Xiaoping in People's Republic of China usher in a new era of civic engagement. These leaders rearranged the contours of government and altered its role with respect to its assumed responsibilities to its citizenry. Deregulation and privitization of governmental programs became the motifs of national and international policies. Thatcher denied the presence of the social, while Regan rendered government as the problem instead the answer to the problem. Regan refused to enforce the Sherman Anti-trust Act (1890), which cleared the way for multi-national corporations to devour small business and defeat competitors. Business accelerated global expansion as mergers and acquisitions became the niche *de jure*. Trade unions suffered smashing defeats as workers struggled to maintain healthy living and accumulate wealth and security in a fast, globalized economy. Laissez-Faire economic theory propelled business, guided government legislation, and convoyed international relations and trade. Removing traces of government from fiscal transactions became the *raison d'etre* of legislative and judicial bodies. While few described their pro-business, anti-government stance as Neo-Liberal, this economic theory, undergirded by the philosophy of Frederick Hayek, ruled the discursive landscape beginning in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

The surge of Neo-liberal principles and policies in the late 1970s followed the collusion of multiple historical, socio-economic, and cultural occurrences. Responses to the aftermath of Second World War converged on the imperative relationship between the state and the welfare of its citizenry. Countries eager to

aid Europe's reconstruction established the incontrovertible consequence of abusive state-power dismissive of the socio-economical conditions of the population. Additionally, leaders from industrialized nations, including the United States, maintained that stable nation-states stabilize Europe, and an accord between capital and labor classes would fortify security and peace in the region. State actions to promote employment and economic growth on behalf of its working class lessened the perhaps uneven advantages of capital over labor. Heads of states justified such responses to market fluctuations and inadequacies as attempts to nurture tranquility. Government contained within its scope the ability to manipulate economic markets in order to perpetuate high employment rates and generate prosperity. In the United States, this period showcased the institutionalization of labor laws, increased social welfare programs and the rise of unions and the expansion of forcible political parties, specifically on the left. The state subsumed class conflict, or as David Harvey (2005) explains, "The state in effect became a force field that internalized class relations" (p. 11).

Not everyone shared the view that state intervention in economic affairs necessarily lessened the probability of domestic revolts or feuds between nation states. Devotees of Fredrich von Hayek political philosophy formed the Mont Pelerin Society (named after the Swiss spa) in 1947 to protest state interference in the market (Peters in Peters et al, 2009). . These academics extolled the values of the free-market and its "invisible hand," to organize society and motivate individuals, and government intervention, such as public assistance, public housing, and social security incentivised sloth, mediocrity, and ultimately "serfdom". Governments could never be in a position to obtain complete, indisputable information about the movement of the market and, thus, they feared, political and social groups would influence state economic policies. Neo-liberals alleged that states would rely on inadequate data, inveigled by interest groups, and would harvest an enslaved, subservient populace. Scrapping government intervention for an unfettered market based on price, supply, and demand of products and labor would propel individuals to realize their potential, be creative, or entrepreneurial, and produce a society based on individual responsibility. Milton Friedman sat among this group of disgruntled academics. For many, he fathered the Chicago School of Neo-liberalism along with a coterie of brilliant graduate students, who, like Friedman went on to win Nobel Prizes for Economics. What's more, in the early 1970s, many of his students traveled to Chile and other parts of the world to test their long dismissed, and marginalized, theories of deregulation, privitization, and individual control. In industrialized nations, such as the United States, Great Britain, and China, neo-liberal principles laid dormant until the late 1970s and early 1980s. Social and political factors also contributed to the rise of Neo-liberalism. David Harvey (2005) claims that social protest movements aimed at subverting traditional, canonical, and institutional regimes while promoting individuality, originality, and alternative lifestyles, tilled the ground for Neo-liberal rhetoric of freedom from authority, regulation, and normalization to blossom.

Harvey (2005) posits that post-modern theories, popularized during this time, buttressed the Neo-liberal demands for globalization. The post-modern condition, the fractured self, the plurality of identities, and the blurred boundaries, exuded the Neo-liberal world-view. Lyotard (1984) describes it this way: " the temporary contract supplants permanent institutions in the professional, emotional, sexual, cultural, family, and international domains, as well as in political affairs" (p. 66). The preference for the transient and the temporary over the potential and the permanent represents a shift in the ethical relationship between the individual and the collective, and feeds the free-market, Neo-liberal machine. Harvey's excoriation of Lyotard is of particular interest because of his analysis of science, knowledge, education, and narration. Instead of lamenting the dawning of the global economic changes, Lyotard embraces and critiques the "computerization of society." Fiscal policies lend one approach to analyzing the rise of Neo-liberalism. Lyotard investigates the nexus between advanced technologies and language. Information processing machines, computers, data-bases, informatics, cybernetics, induced modifications in conceptions of knowledge, the transferability of knowledge, constitutions of science, and the configuration of institutions of higher learning. "Language games" replace anachronistic notions of language as forms of expression or the unequivocal conveyance of meaning. Multiple nodal points and engagement in language games replace notions of the social as either a unified whole or a fragmented group distinguished by class struggle. Accumulation, hoarding, and subsequently access to information reshape the purposes of teaching and learning. Learning involves locating information, organizing it, and representing it with the most appropriate and germane "statements."

The distribution and consumption of information, as input/output models, characterize the postmodern learning condition. The professor's role as an expert, as a steward of the field, and a legislator of its prevailing principles is handed over to a "composite layer of corporate leaders, high-level administrators, and the heads of major professional, labor, political, and religious organizations" (p. 14). The pedagogue morphs into the technocrat; a manager of space which promotes "free" expression and "authentic" experiences in order to collect and hoard various bits of data. The most pressing question, Lyotard exclaims, with regard to knowledge is "who will have access to the information these machines must have in storage to guarantee that the right decisions are made? (p. 14). Clearly the answer to this question hinges on how one defines the term "right decisions." However, the amount of data at ones disposal shapes the legitimacy and level of performance of an "utterance" (p. 47). Nonetheless, Lyotard persuasively makes the case that knowledge in the "computer age…is now more than ever a question of government" (p. 9). The state, however, as a reified entity, no longer stands as the most formidable force in the political terrain. Multinational corporations position capital to acquire data and information on consumers and competitors with little to no regulations regarding its use. State governments settle as one potential consumer of information in a vast, and expanding market place. Corporate power

trumps national sovereignty. Knowledge circulates in a similar fashion as money. Payment Knowledge refers to units individuals use to acquire job security, or "survival" (p. 6) and Investment Knowledge, which refers to units that individuals use to improve, or "optimize a project" (p. 6).

The most important variable in the knowledge/information marketplace is value. Individuals must be able to figure out what knowledge is most valuable, which means most useable. Knowledge as a governmental concern refers to the capacity to acquire mounds of data and information, granting individuals access to it, and making decisions that affect other people. What's more, for Lyotard, the knowledge entails an ethical component in that it refers to how the individual responds in a fluid, highly digitized postmodern world. Rather than being an isolated, alienated "self," Lyotard argues that every individual exists "at a post through which various kinds of messages pass" (p. 15). The social functions as a collection of diverse language games. Thus, the postmodern condition, rather than dismantles social bonds, expands them and makes them mobile (see Human Capital Theory below) . Society, however conceived, is construed within different language games. Society functions as an arrangement of linguistic agonisms, or as a series of moves and countermoves, not just a system of communication. Furthermore, institutions primarily depicted to standardize procedures in a compact, efficient bureaucratic shop, and restrict the type of statements (games) and the form of enunciation of statements, subject to the provisions of the various contests. In short, institutions appear solid and firm, but function as molten and watery.

Modernists' epistemologies of scientific knowledge, which rely on proof, evidence, and consensus blunder with a small dose of skepticism, such as "What I say is true because I prove that it is—but what proof is there that my proof is true?" (p. 24). This means that the many instruments designed to stablize truth claims or inject certainty in truth claims sit dubious in light of the multiple, strategic language games and corporal positionalities endemic of the postmodern era Traditionally, the consensus among epistemic members of the scientific community, or verification, and sans contradictory evidence, or falsification, a proof is assumed to be true. As Lyotard explains, "Not every consensus is a sign of truth; but it is presumed that the truth of a statement necessarily draws a consensus" (p. 24). To be well versed in scientific discourse entails producing (or reproducing) "true statements about a referent" (p. 25), and to be scientists, or expert of scientific knowledge, means to be able to endorse or verify statements restricted for experts. To be a student of science involves both didactic and dialectic relationships. Didactic relationship means that the student relies on the teacher to transmit the memory or history of "indisputable truths" (p. 25) of science. Once the student's abilities and knowledge of science improves, then s/he can learn the dialectics of research, or the "game of producing scientific knowledge" (p. 25). The assumption is that through this process, the student will become as able to produce and verify scientific knowledge aligned with the accepted, synchronic statements of the field. Lyotard contrasts scientific knowledge with non-scientific, or narrative knowledge. This move reveals that

both types of knowledge operate as language games, and, despite the scientific community's repudiation and disdain of narration, their interrelatedness has the potential to resurrect science from the industrial pile and into the postmodern, narrative times.

Science's obsession with the accumulation and reproduction of denotative statements via proof and falsification present an almost mythical, even delusional view of knowledge. Lyotard explains that knowledge consists of a collection of "competence-building measures" (p. 19):

> But what is meant by the term knowledge is not only a set of denotative statements, far from it. It also includes notions of "know-how," "knowing how to live," "how to listen, [*savoir-faire*, *savoir-vivre*, *savoir-ecouter*], etc. Knowledge, then, is a question of competence that goes beyond the simple determination and application of the criterion of truth, extending to the determination and application of criteria of efficiency (technical qualification), or justice and/or happiness (ethical wisdom), of the beauty of a sound or color (auditory and visual sensibility), etc. Understood this way, knowledge is what makes some one capable of forming "good" denotative utterances….it is not a competence relative to a particular class of statements (for example, cognitive ones) to the exclusion of all others. On the contrary, it makes "good" performances in relation to a variety of objects of discourse possible: objects to be known, decided on, evaluated, transformed…from this derives one of the principal features of knowledge: it coincides with an extensive array of competence-building measures and is the only form embodied in a subject constituted by the various areas of competence composing it.

Non-scientific, or narrative knowledge relies on the diachronic evaluations of specific groups to determine the nature of "good". Stories endorse and encourage correct, or good, behaviors (know-how, know-how-to-live, know-how to listen) through the hero's journey. Criteria for narrator's competency are minimal and people authorize the narratives authenticity not an outside agency. Pedagogically, narratives legitimate certain performances, expand the playing field of utterances, and create social bonds through the act of recitation. Finally, rhythm structures narratives rather than accent (historical archive, or knowledge base of scientific knowledge). Stories function as social specters without the desire to library historical accounts. Narratives function as present reminders of past heroes to guide the individual's doing, living, and listening, or their competencies. Geopolitical forces distend traditional perimeters results in a hightened concern for and insistence on local competencies, performances, knowledges, and narratives.

The claim that Lyotard wishes to make is that scientific knowledge legitimates itself with narrative knowledge and instead of denouncing it, science should employ more of the flexibility of narrative knowledge into its "metalanguage." The myth of isomorphism and instrumentalism hinders the regime of scientific knowledge. Instead of a universal metalanguage that evaluates and justifies scientific conclusions, Lyotard claims that new "moves" within a field's language

games and establishing new rules and hence new games within science produce a flexible, inconsistent metalanguage that encourages invention (not innovation). Reliance on principles of performance (stable system, calculable phenomenon, input/output models) is chimerical because to obtain a complete picture of a system, or a starting point for analysis within a system is dubious; second, attempts to control a system, or a part of a system simultaneously stifles it; third, precise measures do not necessarily produce certainty or clarity of results; fourth, explanations or conclusions based on evidence are at best expressed in terms of probability; fifth, the multiple variables in a specific contexts determines the level of stability within that context. This means that generalizable variables are the exception rather than the rule. Postmodern science, then, sprints to the "discontinuous, catastrophic, non-rectifiable, and paradoxical" (p. 60).

Paralogy replaces performance, local narratives replace grand narratives, the spirit of skepticism replaces exclusion and "terror". The principle of performance removes complexities from the system in order to guarantee efficiency, and compels individuals to align their needs to those of the system. Additionally, performance transforms everyday events into a form of "self-citation" and "self-knowledge" (p. 62) where the individual assumes responsibility to measure and match subjectivities according the level of the system's efficiency. The trick is to be able to decipher, or to read and write (perform) oneself strategically in specific, shifting time/spaces. In this manner, a system based on performance normalizes, redefines individuals, and operates as a "vanguard machine dragging humanity after it, dehumanizing it in order to re-humanize it at a different level of normative capacity" (p. 63). Those privileged to obtain access to mounds of data and information mount themselves as the guardians of this new technocratic society. They hoard information, restrict access to it, and "terrorize" players by discarding or threatening to silence them in the language game. The postmodern condition belies any attempts at a consensus or a "totality of meta-prescriptions regulating the totality of statements circulating in the social collectivity" (p. 65). Verification instruments and strategies stand diffident in multi-modal, agonistic geographies of statements-practices-competencies. Agonistic language games, spurned through narratives, and parology, that disrupts, disorients, and unsettles particular rationalities and logics converts the social field from an all-or-nothing, zero-sum game, to a spirited, generative, fluctuating sphere. Free access to information is required to shift the field from a state of terror to one of possibility. The economic epistemologies of knowledge (i.e. investment and payment) appear most prominently in the theory of human capital.

THEORY OF HUMAN CAPITAL

Scholars also note the rise of unemployment and inflation in Great Britain and the United States, the OPEC embargo, and a saturated labor market as factors that ushered Neo-liberal theories into the political landscape (Harvey, 2005; Peters et al., 2009). Statists economic policies that had worked for thirty years appeared to be failing, as many gawked confused when high inflation did not produce low

unemployment, rather the inverse began to occur. Many argue the early 1970s spelled the death of Keynsian economics. Nonetheless, Neo-liberal economic theory fundamentally altered the relationship between the state and its citizenry, the states responsibility to preserve and foster peace, and the individual's place in society. More important, Neo-liberalism harnessed social, political, and economic conditions to stage an ideological *coup d'etat* and roll out a new lexicon for governing of the self and others. When government once in-tuned with the needs of the people abandoned its responsibilities, shifts priorities to privilege capital over labor, and coercively blunts welfare programs and political groups (i.e. unions), the role of the individual in society dramatically changes, and, despite Lyotard's claim that the social is an always-already of the postmodern world, the purposes of education in a society constructed from an amalgam of disparate, dispersed, and diverse individuals shifts. Students cease to be groomed for citizenship, but are seduced and prepared to manage the treacherous terrain of a globalized world sans social safety nets, but as entrepreneurial subjects. Indeed, knowledge more than ever is a matter of government.

The theory of Human Capital initially sought to understand specific paradoxes in economic theory. Scholars at the Chicago School of Economics, specifically Theodore W. Shultz, investigated the puzzling relationship between low productivity and high growth. Shultz (1962) posits that even though production (i.e. structures, equipment, inventories) declined relative to income, which normally would stagnate the economy, capital growth increased due to greater investments in human capital. Disparities in income distribution, Shultz maintains, are attributed to rates of investments in human capital. Thus, distributive tax policies aimed at equalizing wealth accumulation tend to be "weak factors" (p. 2) in affecting income disparities. Human Capital theory argues that improvements in an individual's capabilities impact the quality of the labor force, economic growth, and income distributions. Investments can include education, health care, on-the-job training, preventative health-care, information that arrests anti-social behavior or ones that hinders ones ability to be productive in the marketplace. Human capital investments typically aim to improve future earning potential or future well-being outcomes.

Another component of human capital theory includes cost-benefit analysis. Individuals consider decisions about the future based on the potential relationship between the costs (i.e. time, emotions, effort, money) and the potential benefits (i.e. cultural, non-monetary, promotion). Incentives for certain behaviors or outcomes play a critical role in the decision-making process. Thus, impoverished decision-making can lead to meager earning potential.

Relevant findings from human capital research can help explain the relationship between neo-liberal rationalities and portfolio assessment. Although most studies show that investments in education receive a high rate of return, efficient employment of energy tends to favor on-the-job-training (Mincer,1952). Becker (1962), moreover, shows that employees keen to "firm-specific" knowledge are more likely to be promoted, obtain longevity, and are the least likely to be fired or laid-off. General knowledge skills are transferable to other firms, while firm-

specific knowledge is limited to just one. An application of human capital theory to marriage reveals that men and women decide to marry or divorce based on a calculation of increasing welfare (i.e. income, division of labor, old-age support). Individuals weigh the cost to the potential benefits to decide to marry, have children, and/or get divorced. Wealthy couples, then, are less likely to divorce than poor ones. Unemployment increases one's chances for divorce. Moreover, fertility rates tend to decrease in industrialized countries. The explanation of this result centers on expenditures for children. If parents appropriately invest in their child's human capital, the less likely they are to birth above their means. Greater investments equal greater costs, less children, and fewer large families. Costs associated with raising children provide disincentives for producing more offspring.

The quality and quantity parents contribute to their children's human capital reflects parental calculations regarding potential future returns. Parents who invest in a child's education, health-care, and skills, in general, garner a high rate of future return. Early contributions to children increase indirect savings, mostly for old age. Becker (1992) surmises that through cost-benefit-return analysis, parents bank on investing early and often for the potential for assistance later in life. Assistance includes emotional, financial, and physical. As Becker (1992) states, "Through its assumption of forward-looking, the economic point of view implies that parents try to anticipate the effect of what happens to children on their attitudes and behavior when adults" (p. 49). Findings from this research reveals that even parents who are "not very loving" (Becker, 1992, p. 50), tend to invest in their children's human capital if they (parents) perceive that their children will assist them in old age. Guilt can also be an effective instrument parents use to encourage children to help them. However, guilt, primarily used by parents of low socio-economic status who invest little in their children's human capital, which impacts the parent's wellbeing as they age. Guilt may be an effective approach in the immediate, but the costs related to it be quite high. Parents of all classes may instill in their children such dispositions as love, loyalty, respect for elders, and service, which greatly improves their chances of help from their children in the future. Government welfare programs that apportion aid to lower income elderly incentivizes kindred disintegration and fragmentation. Becker (1992) explains, "This means that programs like social security that significantly help the elderly would encourage family members to drift apart emotionally, not by accident but as maximizing responses to those policies" (p. 51). Government welfare programs, according to human capital theory, sponsors families to physically and emotionally amble. What's more, Becker argues that technological advances (i.e. transportation systems, economic growth) and social modifications (i.e. higher divorce rates, smaller families, government health-care programs) have elevated common living standards, but with the high cost to personal relationships. Thus, public schools would greatly strengthen familiar ties if it could nurture self-reliance, self-knowledge, and self-improvement. Implicit in the theory of human capital is the notion that adolescents should learn to function on their own in the future, manage themselves, adjust to the complexities of a rapidly changing world, gather and

make sense of personally germane information (i.e health, nutrition, financial, retirement). Dependence breeds serfdom, stifles innovation, and breaks community ties.

Finally, human capital theorists have also investigated the rationalities of crime and punishment. They assume that motivations and thought-process of criminals followed those of other people, and that criminal activity entailed a calculation of multiple factors, such as personal morals, time, energy, the likelihood of being caught and/or convicted, police force, local perspectives on crime, demographics, the quality and quantity of retribution, and alternatives to criminal behavior (i.e. schooling). Becker (1992) shows that the chance for conviction, rather than types of punishment deters criminal behavior. This logic suggests that state the measure the police force and number of courts against the probability of conviction. This means, to be efficient, municipalities would reduce police and courts to the level of conviction liability. Fines, Becker exclaims, rank as the most efficient forms of punishment because it increases state revenues at low cost and punishes offenders. Nonetheless, human capital theory investigates how human improvements affect economic growth, production, and value. It assumes that individuals amass multiple factors to calculate choices that "maximize welfare *as they conceive it*" (Becker, 19920), and not just self-interest or material accumulation and consumption.

Human Capital Theory converts the human being from being simply a laborer but also as a collection or assemblages of commodities and capital. Individuals can reinvent themselves, acquire skills, learn more (i.e. higher learning or on the job), build relationships, to build capital which allows them to be independent, acquire wealth, expand options and opportunities, and less reliant on government welfare systems. Individuals possess multiple selves, which they manage to negotiate and maneuver through polyhedronic time/spaces. Bodies are not simply disciplined to be appropriate, docile, and useful, but are strategic entities acquiring investment knowledge and disbursing payment knowledge. The fluid self replaces the stable identity. Managing the inordinate stimuli of the theatre of consciousness replaces the desire to erect a sovereign consciousness, which can straighten the jejune and treat the diseased. Individuals learn to inject a rational cost/benefit analysis into their decision-making process, which calculates the amount of time and energy expended against the potential benefits. Chance, once the property of the sovereign and God, leaks into every pore of the modern subject. To manage chance, risk, and responsibility, individuals learn to be entrepreneurs. Secondary schools in the 1890s resembled a hospital; however, in the 1980s and 1990s they espoused epistemologies reflective of a business school, more specifically, the Chicago Business School.

ENTREPRENEURIALISM

The word entrepreneurship in German means "the person who both owns and runs a business" (Drucker, 1985, p. 25). The economist J. B. Say claimed that an entrepreneur "shifts economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of

higher productivity and greater yield" (Drucker, 1985, p. 21). For Say, the entrepreneur represented a counter-position to the prevailing economic idea that a stable, equable marketplace equals a healthy economy. He viewed the entrepreneur as a rebel, as a provocateur, and by 1911, the economist Joseph Schumpeter argued that the entrepreneur functioned as a vital catalyst of economic disequilibrium to generate growth and produce a healthy economy. The entrepreneur as apostate transforms her/him into a risk-taker (Brockhaus, 1980). Although various historical associations and characteristics of the entrepreneur appear in scholarly literature, common features remain. Drucker (1985) defines the entrepreneur as an individual or group who "always searchers for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity" (p. 28). Entrepreneurship is both behavior and practice and not an innate personality trait. He diminishes the social-welfare state of the 1970s and 1980s, and covets an "entrepreneurial society" and innovated approaches to developing technologies, which could alter social and economic relationships.

> Since the end of World War II, however, the model of technology has become the biological process, the events inside an organism. And in an organism, processes are not organized around energy in the physicist's meaning (e.g. speed, temperature, pressure) of the term. They are organized around information (pp. 3–4)

Thus accumulating, sorting, prioritizing information is a key ingredient of an entrepreneur. This means, too, that in an entrepreneurial society, the individual will work several careers and must continual learning, or practice an ethic of "life-long learning". The individual assumes responsibility for the relearning, retooling process because "Tradition, convention, and 'corporate policy' will be a hindrance rather than a help" (p. 264). The entrepreneur relishes change, embraces it and capitalizes on it. S/he is a flexible, adaptable, strategic opportunists, who is able to generate personal wealth, weave together a social network, direct affects appropriately, and manage information flow. The entrepreneur is an autonomous, independent owner of his/her self, welfare, production, and lifestyle. An entrepreneur is willing to "find solutions that are 'roughly right' rather than consume time developing an analytically correct, but slow, answer" (McGrath & MacMillan, 2000, p. 2). Concomitant with these characteristics, the entrepreneur is an astute manager. In fact, Drucker (1985) maintains that the rise of entrepreneurship in the 1990s stemmed from the emergence of the field of management.

The word management derives from the Latin word "hand", or "bringing to hand," which implies control. Industrialization and the subsequent need to control the flow of products and labor brought practices of management to the fore. Throughout the history of management, scholars have identified five periods of theories of management. For our purposes here, contingency theory of management typifies the modern, or most contemporary school of management. Contingency theory assumes that multiple, even competing variables belie any effort to capture a total understanding of the internal and external environments that impact a business's success. The key is to locate as many variables as possible,

design a model, and make the best decision based on that model. Luthans and Stewart (1977) define it this way, "…the contingency approach is defined as identifying and developing functional relationships between environmental, management and performance variables" (p. 183). Normative and universal claims about how to properly operate a business are dubious in the contingency approach. Business situations resemble more of a game with strategies than a system with routes. Managers, thus, learn to be adaptive, creative, thoughtful tacticians. Contingency theory of management plays an important role in how the teacher's and student's position changes in the Kentucky classroom. They become, in short, managers of contingency.

Research on entrepreneurship after 1985 has focused primarily on how to develop an entrepreneurial character in an individual. This endeavor involves developing a typology of the entrepreneurial characteristics and strategies to foment entrepreneurship. In short, research has concentrated on the psychology, pedagogy, and behaviors that generate and encourage entrepreneurialism. Also, researchers have taken a special interest in nourishing entrepreneurship in at-risk teenagers. Scholars concede that there is no innate or genetic predisposition for entrepreneurship, even though individuals may exhibit or even harbor special talents that favor the likelihood that a person will become a successful entrepreneur. Entrepreneurship is a learned behavior, mental attitude, and a continual practice. It is important to note that the research in this field is still nascent. The limited review of texts below represent exemplars in the field, and are utilized in this section to illustrate how discourses of entrepreneurship became attached to educational matters, and more specifically, to writing assessment. A comparison to the late 1890s, then, become quite illustrative to our current, taken-for-granted, prevailing views of the purposes of writing and the assessment of students. It is worth repeating at this point, that such discourses, along with this genealogical treatise, contest the various and prevailing views of writing pedagogy.

Entrepreneurs, in general, possess a propensity for risk, independence, and opportunity (Brockhaus, 1980). They strategize how to use resources to their benefit, and rely on services and help when they promote personal wealth and growth. The guiding world-view of the entrepreneur stems from an ardent belief in self-reliance. The individual human being stands capable to make rational decisions, take action, organize one's environment, be responsible to create one's life. Such a view does not spurn collective action or group projects, but the entrepreneur only invests in such activities when they can support his/her own wealth and growth. The entrepreneur owns every component of his/her life and livelihood. An entrepreneurial society fosters individual expression, fines few taxes, knifes the relationship between government and economics, and relegates governmental apparatus to a defensive and judicial posture. The individual trades skills, dispositions, relationships, and information contingent on value rates of a vast marketplace. Thus, the individual markets, manages, advertises, produces, distributes, repairs, and recreates the self as supply and demands for his/her various good and services vacillate.

Researchers have investigated the personality traits of an individual who is willing to discard financial and personal security for self-reliance and high-risk behavior. Early research focused on developing a typology of entrepreneurial characteristics. Kets de Vries (1977) admonishes that while common lore romanticizes the entrepreneur as the "last lone ranger, a bold individualist fighting the odds of the environment," his research indicates that entrepreneurs suffer great emotional and psychological harm.

> We are usually introduced to a person with an unhappy family background, an individual who feels displaced and seems a misfit in his particular environment. We are also faced with a loner, isolated and rather remote from even his closest relatives. This type of person gives the impression of a 'reject', a marginal man, a perception certainly not lessened by his often conflicting relationships with family members. The environment is perceived as hostile and turbulent, populated by individuals yearning for control, with the need to structure his activities. We observe an individual who utilizes innovative rebelliousness as an adaptive mode with occasional lapses toward delinquency, ways of demonstrating his ability to break away, to show independence of mind. Due to these reactive ways of dealing with feelings of anger, fear and anxiety, tension remains since 'punishment' in the form of failure may follow suit. Failure is expected and success is often only perceived as a prelude to failure (p. 35).

After interviews and life histories of a large sample of these "creative destructors", he paints a rather grim picture of the psychological composition of the entrepreneur. Although he concedes that a new breed of entrepreneurs is emerging, he found that most of them possess a disoriented sense of self and anti-authoritarian world view which stems from a remote father, a controlling mother, unstable home throughout childhood, distrust of people in general, which leads to several short-term employment gigs, and volatile work-place environments. Success coupled with an impending belief in failure turns into a self-fulfilling prophecy. The work environment the entrepreneur establishes in his/her new business simulates a "spider's web" (p. 53) as the entrepreneur changes allegiances in order to keep employees in a "state of confusion and dependence" (p. 53). Although the entrepreneur can present him/herself as an independent, self-directed, highly motivated individual, personal life stories of entrepreneurs reveal that repressed anger originating in childhood experiences drive their ambitions. Kets de Vries (1977) claims that researcher's "benign neglect" of the entrepreneur can be detrimental to companies and businesses. Furthermore, since his research, strategies to aid the entrepreneur with his/her ventures exploded in the scholarly and popular literature.

Entrepreneurs must be psychologically prepared to enter and succeed in the vast, contingent, and uncertain arena. Researchers and consultants give budding entrepreneurs with readiness instruction. Some of these suggestions involve practice ones, such as when and how to advertise, how to select a public relations firm, and how to interact with customers. However, the major of them deal with dispositional or the "inner game" of entrepreneurship (Guzik, 1998). Developing consistent work

habits, managing emotions, and achieving "synergy" (p. 169) build an effective inner toolbox to manage the complexities of entrepreneurship. Others admonish burgeoning entrepreneurs guides show how to be authentic, be yourself, listen to your intuition, radiate your qualities, to name a few (Bulger, 2002). Finally, researchers purport that entrepreneurial education needs to focus on the connotative process of becoming an entrepreneur as much if not more than the cognitive and affective features (Ruohotie & Koiranen, 2000; Socket, 1988). Several writers on entrepreneurship subsidize their ideas with specific, guided writing assignments. Moreover, recent studies in entrepreneurial education rely on writing tasks to assist the entrepreneur to understand the self, the business, to build networks, and to construct a successful business (Hackbert, 2000). Finally, researchers in entrepreneurial education have investigated the relationship between teaching entrepreneurial skills to adolescents and at-risk teens in the United States (Bevill & Glasgow, 2009; Dale, 2008; DeBerg, 2000; Sorgman & Parkinson, 2008).

Attention to a declining population pervaded many of the published reports regarding the failing system of education in Kentucky. Solutions varied, but for the most part, reformers promoted the notion that schools development student's ability to harness and boost their human capital. Similar to Becker, the primary considerations of human capital for reformers included high delinquency rates, teen-age pregnancy, and the potential future burden for governmental expenditures. Nonetheless, entrepreneurism structured the *telos* of secondary schooling in the 1990s, specifically in Kentucky. Hence, the potential origin of the entrepreneur is as a social misfit, who is rebellious, yearns for attention and validation, yet prone to selfishness and self-fulfilling failure.

The logic of independence from dependence dominates school reform in the 1980s; the fertile ground with which the portfolio emerged as a viable option of writing assessment practices may not have been simply for humanistic, progressive, or liberation purposes. The technologies of portfolio assessment merged with neoliberal rationalities of rule to produce a specific, historically contingent school subject. One that students negotiated, resisted, and strategically maneuvered to achieve a competitive advantage in globalized knowledge economy. The portfolio, however, proved to be a flaccid tool in the face of the competencies of most adolescents. Secondary students learned how to be strategic entrepreneurs who could exhibit specific capacities and perform compulsory freedoms. The portfolio failed similarly as power/knowledge; it works too well and resistances persist and pervade to the point that dissemination, multiple identities in a post-modern world no longer become desirable. Instead, greater cohesion, fewer elements in the calculus, and shrinking the scope emerge as valuable.

Couched in similar humanistic rhetoric, the strategies of power/knowledge shift, only to essay to compel subjectivities, to adjust the *telos* in order to produce a different student body, and embolden forces of resistance. The battle over adolescent bodies continues. As Foucault (1997) states, "In the smallest of its cogs, peace is waging a secret war" (p. 50). Progressive educators who peddled and perpetuated portfolio assessment may have had peaceful intensions. Certainly we can say they had liberation in mind, but they did not realize they inserted a

technology in a vast, historically contingent war over the adolescent body. To further Foucault's logic, even peace with its strategies and technologies exists in a war. What appeared on the surface to be an innocuous pedagogical strategy, which gave students more choices regarding topics and genre emerged genealogically from a strand of not so innocent or guiltless beginnings. To advance this argument, the next chapter describes the effects of portfolio assessment as it merged with neoliberal rationalities of rule.

CONCLUSION

Neo-liberalism continues to function as the prevailing political and socio-economic theory to the current day. It promises individual freedom, little responsibility to the collective, and immunity from the shackles from the imposing reach of the state. Neo- liberalism holds an almost cult-like grip on the emend-value of the free-market. An unfettered market adjusts, coordinates, and groups a society because supply-demand, value-devalue, scarcity-surplus forces structure the ways in which individuals live their lives. The market actuates value; if people purchase or value a certain item, price increases with higher demand for that item. The reverse occurs with less valued commodities. What's more, everything exists i*n potentia* for the market in the Neo-liberal frame. Items, ideas, individuals as human capital (Becker) all live in a market-space; to be traded, bought and sold as commodities in an ever-expanding discursive contours of private enterprise. Commodification ripe with scarcity remains paramount in the Neo-liberal construct as it spurs competition, devalues community, and promotes individuality.

The resolution of class conflicts may not occur on a political battlefield of competing discourses that are based on a unifying narrative. The symbolic representations of historical idealism, which undergird the political and social realms, are inadequate when they compete with neoliberal political rationalities. Structural analysis that seek to reveal the unconscious of the symbolic components of class contradictions as a way to illustrate the subversive approaches in the extensive and carnivalesque (not dialectic) dance between ideologies neglect to uncover the technologies and their historical threads which reveal the agonistic, heteroglossic battles between discourses and practices pervasive in daily lives of individuals. Genealogical analysis does not assume culture, but historicizes specific practices in the present to reveal fissures in power-knowledge forces in an effort to unveil additional, alternative passageways for moments of freedom from the various forms of universalizing logic. Genealogy refuses an investigation into the unconscious, in its various guises, and instead digs through the "archive" to uncover subjugated knowledges that expose and disturb the historical limits of the present moment in an effort to contest and alter the political, social, economic, and linguistic (representational) fields. Additionally, genealogical analysis does not necessarily abjure modernism, but assumes its fluidity and essential component of post-modern beliefs. Jurgen Habermas's criticisms of post-modern approaches to social science research lie closer to Harvey's view. Habermas proclaims that post-modernity's rejection of modernism presents a space for the rise of new "social

conservatism." His views could be aligned on this matter with Foucault's later work on governmentality, but their battle plans remain quite different and even more distant. Foucault disturbs and unsettles, Habermas dissolves and collects. Finally, the field of education relied of Marxism to expose the structural factors that reproduced educational inequality and opportunity, and identity politics to present the ideological and hegemonic underpinnings that shackled minorities and marginal groups for millenia. As these vital social-academic projects progressed, American Neo-liberals reshape the field of economics by redefining its terms and originating new ones.

The portfolio, as a viable solution to the problematics of population, springs to center of the educational stage, as an instrument comprised of Neo-Liberal technologies. Chapter Three outlined how writing pedagogy turned "inward" toward the student to aid him/her in creating and establishing a sense of self, and widened the lens of measurement to micro-teach and micro-manage a student's development. These practices set the stage for the portfolio to appear as a Neo-Liberal form of schooling with one exception, or more specifically, an addition. The self transforms into a subject, one capable of living independent from the state welfare institutions. The technology of the portfolio functions as an audit on the adolescent population. To project potential at-risk students, or those at-risk of demanding government services in the future. The role of secondary school was not just to create a healthy body, or a stable self, but to produce an entrepreneurial subject; one capable of problem-solving, innovation, and being on ones own (Besley and Peters, 2007; Peters, 2005). In other words, to evoke Herbert Spencer, of being able to compete in a globalized "survival of the fittest" world. The chapter focuses on the installation of portfolio assessment as the large-scale, high-stakes practice in the state of Kentucky. Portfolio technology inculcated with Neo-liberal political rationalities to turn the quest for the self to the insurance of an entrepreneurial subject. Due to a class-action lawsuit and a decree by the Kentucky State Supreme Court, Kentucky institutionalized the portfolio as their primary mode of assessing students and auditing public schools. Although other states attempted to implement statewide portfolio use, most notably Vermont, Kentucky remains the only state to keep the portfolio for an extended period of time. The portfolio remained a staple in the state education system for eleven years. It was removed in 2002. The portfolio is not just socially contextual; but is genealogically contingent.

CHAPTER 7

NEW PATERNALISM

In different ways, the problem of freedom now comes to be understood in terms of the capacity of an autonomous individual to establish an identity through shaping a meaningful everyday life. Freedom is seen as autonomy, the capacity to realize one's potential through one's own endeavours, to determine the course of one's own existence through acts of choice (Rose, 1999, p. 84).

If the economy is doing badly, it is because you are no longer up to taking risks—businessmen afraid to export, the unemployed who sit and wait for the dole instead of starting new businesses, cosseted state employees; we need to get the market to work again, to send school children on placement to industry so that they learn what their work is all about; above all, we need to stop thinking the State owes us a living (Meuret, 1981, p. 35).

Governmental intervention into economics had taken its toll in the mid 1970s throughout most of the industrialized world. Governments expanded their role into the social and fattened its payrolls to compensate social welfare programs. Economic policy to maintain sustained growth through governmental programs and dispensing money resulted in greater inflation and unemployment. Welfare programs designed to aid individuals and communities from "cradle to the grave" eventuated dependence, domination, and stagnation. In order to create a new ethic between government, its social responsibilities, and the individual, an alternative perspective emerged. Gordon (1991) states that instead of perpetuating and incentivizing state attachments, "the whole ensemble of individual life is to be structured as the pursuit of a range of different enterprises," or to put it more succinctly, the individual's life becomes "the ethos and structure of the enterprise form" (p. 41). Self-actualization and greater social cohesion did not come about through governmental programs and interventions, but as a result of the dispersion of risk, responsibility, and individual pursuits. In many respect, the anti-government, pro-individual liberty policies characteristic of Neoliberalism align with the tenants of self-psychology. Authority and government produces neurosis and depression; the antidote is to govern better by governing less. Instead of an active state orchestrating the body politic, autonomy springs as the new mantra. Rose (1999) characterizes this phenomenon in the following manner:

> To govern better, the state must govern less; to optimize the economy, one must govern through the entrepreneurship of autonomous actors—individuals and families, firms and corporations. Once responsibilized and entrepreneurialized, they would govern themselves within a state-secured framework of law and order. The state can never have the information to enable it to judge and plan each micro-event in a free-market society. Only

> individual economic actors possess the information to enable them to make the best judgments on risks and potentials in order to guide their conduct; they must be freed to choose according to the natural laws of the free market on the one hand and human nature on the other (p. 139).

The state should only be responsible for law and order, but should refrain from participating in the decision-making process of the individual. The days of the government acting in locus parentis are over. Social safety nets, stable employment, and regimented daily and life trajectories transposed into a space of individual pursuits, multiple-jobs throughout one's life, continual retraining and education (i.e. Human Capital), assuming personal responsibility, and managing personal risk. As Rose (1999) explains,

> The state is no longer to be required to answer all society's needs for order, security, healthy and productivity. Individuals, firms, organizations, localities, schools, parents, hospitals, housing estates must take on themselves—as 'partners'—a portion of the responsibility for their own well-being (p. 142).

A society built on less state intervention and greater technologies to engender entrepreneurialism and responsibility fosters freedom in terms of self-realization through individual exertion and hustle. The economic destinations of each individual disentangle from state burden; in fact, the prime way to serve one's country is to pursue one's economic and social advancement and well-being. Flexibility and financial insecurity acquire paramount status as they generate creativity, ingenuity, desire for greater human capital, innovation, and entrepreneurship. Risk disperses, social insurance diminishes, and competition reigns supreme in the new entrepreneurial order. As Rose (1999) explains,

> The ethics of lifestyle maximization, coupled with a logic in which someone must be held to blame for any event that threatens an individual's 'quality of life', generate a relentless imperative of risk management not simply in relation to contracting for insurance, but also through daily lifestyle management, choices of where to live and shop, what to eat and drink, stress management, exercise and so forth….The culture of risk is characterized by uncertainty, plurality and anxiety, and is thus continually open to the construction of new problems and the marketing of new solutions (p. 160).

Anxiety, risk, and uncertainty spawn ingenuity and promote freedom. The state never could contain the necessary amount of information to dictate to the individual what was best for him/her; or how s/he should live his/her life. When state safety nets crumbled, the individual assumed the mass of risk and instability for themselves in an ambiguous, precarious, disordered social world. Entrepreneurial subjects did not emerge as provocateurs who stimulated a dull economy. Pupils could no longer afford to be educated with the mesh of governmental programs available to bail them out, or redeem them from a poor, ill-advised decision. Secondary students needed to be educated to be entrepreneurs

who embodied self-reliance, self-responsibility, and self-security. In the early 1980s, the state of Kentucky unwittingly incorporated several neo-liberal rationalities of rule into their education policy, especially entrepreneurship.

HUMAN CAPITAL: THE PATH TO A LARGER LIFE

For several years, the state of Kentucky sat at or near the lowest rung of every measure of educational achievements. In the early 1980s a ground swell of local businesses, community leaders, politicians and the media joined to demand a stronger educational system. Local media exposed on-going and consistent nepotism and corruption, local businesses foresaw a "black cloud of doom" in the labor market, and politicians bemoaned that a weak labor force inhibited their abilities to import new businesses to the state. Projected state population growth indicators show that between 1990–2020, people between the ages of 40–64 would grow 50%, while those in the age ranges of 0–17 would grow by only 1.6%. This disparity in the working-age group demonstrated the paucity of the labor market (Essential Skills, 1998, p. 4). A lack of education and poor preparation for industry compounded the problem. Furthermore, non-profit organizations sprung in the middle of the 1980s to assist the poorest, and thus lowest achieving regions of the state. Many of them fostered close relationships with parents and strengthened ties among schools, communities, and parent groups. They implemented workshops designed to show parents how to guide their children with homework, tests, their portfolios, and with nurturing skills. State-wide forums, organized by the Prichard Committee, funded by Ashland Oil, and advertised by the media generated public awareness about poor conditions of education in the state, as well as provided individuals a platform to express their concerns and grievances.

The Prichard Committee report (1985) opines that while many Kentuckians "want to look to their children's futures with optimism, hoping they will be prepared for the most healthy, productive, and rewarding lives their abilities permit them to achieve (p. 16)," the educational system inadequately meets this outlook because it neglects to adapt with historical and social changes in the state. Factors such as globalization, the "informational revolution" (p. 17), drug and alcohol addictions, shifting labor markets, poverty, and alternative family structures implore schools to adjust. The economic, educational, and political health intertwines which necessitates systemic changes to education, and thus the entire educational system, from pre-school to teacher education programs to vocational schools mesh into a "seamless web" (p. 22). Sweeping changes proposed by the Prichard Report obliges citizens to shed a history of low standards and expectations, as the "strength of our system will be determined by its weakest strand" (p. 22). More importantly, the committee affirms the role of citizens to participate and forge these changes. Although taxation and public expenditures can improve education, the committee contends that the "…key to change is increased public commitment and successful citizen involvement in the schools" (p. 18). Below, this chapters details others sections of the committee's report. However, along with the *Rose v. Council* lawsuit, these two entities prove to be the most

significant organizations in the history of Kentucky's educational reform movement.

Reformers in Kentucky recognized that future economic prospects for the state remained bleak if there were few or no changes to the educational system. The inverted pyramid of population growth, decade-long of poor performance on state and national indicators, complaints from the business community alerted reformers that education needed to change with the changing times. The globalization of the US economy and the "computerization of society" behooved educators to redesign curriculum and performance measures to reflect future labor demands. Grievances to the Supreme Court energized citizens and concerned groups to reorganize education. Rose afforded guidelines for implementation, based on amicus briefs, most notably from the Prichard Committee. How to restructure an entire public school system to meet constitutional requirements, prepare children for a globalized world, improve state economic conditions, and increase student performance nationally. We argue that in order for the state of Kentucky to undertake such a complex endeavor, reformers emended the purpose of education from creating citizens to producing entrepreneurial subjects adroit at sharpening their human capital (Becker, 1962; 1992, Shultz, 1962). School ceased to be a cultural experience and became a capital investment. Much of the curriculum and assessment measurements instituted in the new educational system catered to business, or economic interests, while many support decreasing the influence of government in education. A high rate of return on investments in children will reverse generational cycles of inadequate education, reduce state welfare expenditures, and improve Kentucky's economy. Students now develop capacities and learn to have ingenuity, industriousness, and self-knowledge. The student transforms from being an expressive self to being an entrepreneurial subject.

Reformers pinpointed fertility as a primary issue regarding education. They understood that increasing population bolstered their chances of rectifying their grim economic situation. Appropriate marriages and a two-parent households cradled the seeds to the solution. The Prichard Report (1985) indicates that 68% of all offenders in correctional facilities dropped-out of high school, illegitimate births among teenage mothers increased by 40%, and 40% of single-parent homes live in poverty (p. 51). The Report argues that social institutions, such as schools and prisons, bare the future burden of inadequate family structures, and eventually pay the social costs in "unemployment, welfare and health costs, high school dropouts, crime and poverty, remedial education in high schools and colleges, and many other ways" (p. 54). Teenage pregnancy is a major cause. The Report cites an economic report of Mississippi indicating that teenage pregnancy hinders state development and investments. The ratio of 1:3 exists between money invested in information and preventative programs and projected future government social service expenditures. Schools can do their part by offering prenatal and day care. More importantly, the Report states that schools can help students procure a "positive attitude about their futures" (p. 59) and "provide programs which encourage and support desirable goals if these goals and programs are supported by the community, families, and parents" (p. 60). Thus, the Report called for

investments in preschool education, childcare, and for programs that deterred teenage pregnancy, as well as ones that modeled proper parenting skills.

The focus on fertility and family structure illustrates the anxiety many felt regarding the future population composition. Very few reports paint the adolescent in a negative light; in fact, what is so striking about the literature of this period in Kentucky is how reformers spoke very little about the definition and characteristics of adolescents. A couple of common refrains threaded the literature. They include:

> At the high school level our (Prichard Report) recommendations emphasize motivating students, engaging them actively in learning, and taking advantage of youth's natural urge to assume responsibility and to be treated with respect (Prichard Report, 1985, p. xxiii).

> We (Prichard Report) also recommend that the high school experience be complemented by a period of youth community service, taking advantage of adolescents natural urge to get involved and make a contribution, to take responsibility, to learn about work, and to learn the lessons of experience (p. xxiii).

A general sentiment that adolescents are, in general, good people, yearning for responsibility and respect also appears in the case law of this time period.

The view that adolescents desire responsibility places much of the responsibility for faulty education on schools. The Prichard Report concedes that many factors contribute to poor education, but even they argue that schools need to expand their role and reach out to parents, community institutions, and business owners. Schools render adolescents "passive and docile" (p. 28) instead of harnessing their "active and aggressive" nature (p. 28). School officials and teachers often consider adolescents as "truant, late, irresponsible" and unable to "figure things out for themselves so we tell them things" (p. 29), and, as a result, enable a "happy dependence." (p. 29). The business community also imputes schools. Business leaders report that the Kentucky workforce is replete with low-level skills, they also charge that many entry-level workers lack "soft skills," such as "how to get along with other people" (Ready for work, 1998, p. 3) and fundamental dispositions for being a good employee:

> We will give employees specific training. What we need from them is general knowledge about what to do when you come to work: how to get up on time, how to come to work on time, how to dress appropriately, and basic customer skills, basic mathematics skills (Ready for Work, 1998, p. 3).

The solution lay with education. In addition to basic work-related aptitudes and attitudes, schools can prepare youth for a rapidly changing, technological world by teaching them "entrepreneurial" skills. These skills include: the ability to be creative, innovative, adaptable and independent, as well as the ability to problem-solve, analyze systems, and know how to learn. In addition to teaching basic math, English, oral and written communication, schools need to prepare young adults to

"show enthusiasm about work," to be "punctual," and "honest," "respond appropriately to conflict," "work well in a group or on teams," "identify and solve problems," and be "willing to learn new things (Ready for Work, 1998, p. 14). Companies report that they need applicants with a strong work ethic who are "reasonably intelligent" (p. 13) more than they need applicants with specific job-related skills. Organizational flexibility, pedagogical variation including projects for the "real world", parental cooperation, and student ownership of academic work formed the strategic nexus for producing entrepreneurial subjects imbued with human capital and will generate economic growth and lessen "happy dependency" on state welfare institutions. The Prichard Reports summarizes the situation in the following manner:

> It is widely known that individuals change jobs several times in their working lives. Specific technical skills can help a person acquire the first job, new or different skills may be required for subsequent jobs. But these skills can be learned in many places, not just schools. The numbers of providers of continuing training have expanded rapidly in the last generation—businesses and corporations, libraries, universities, professional and trade associations, and corporations train millions of working American adults each year in new skills and techniques. In this vast world of educational offerings what makes schools unique is that they can have an impact on all people for at least twelve years of their lives. And what schools should uniquely provide, to all people, is the frame of mind and the mental tools to respond and to adapt to new circumstances (and new jobs) and to continue to learn throughout life (p. 22).

Perceptional shifts in conceptions of the adolescent, purposes of schooling, and intended goals for secondary education entailed adjusting views about pedagogical approaches, the teacher-student relationship, and the role of the teacher in the secondary English classroom. Multiple sources of training and skill development situate the public school as one entity in the vast marketplace of knowledge providers. The business community exhorted schools to teach entrepreneurial, relationship, and professional skills. Regimented learning approaches diminished in favor of ones that fostered entrepreneurialism. As Edward F. Prichard, Jr. explains, "In an information-directed, service oriented, high technology economy the prize will go ever increasingly to those who can seize it with brains, with learning, with training" (The Prichard Report, 1983, p. 73). It is a given, reformers note, that students will change jobs multiple times in their lives, and be trained and re-trained for specific, "firm-knowledge". The role of the public school is to give students the general knowledge foundation, the critical thinking skills, and personal relationship skills to adapt to the company's needs. The teacher's role, then, is to provide students with opportunities to exhibit these skills, and, perhaps more important, exhibit entrepreneurial capacities and dispositions. The portfolio functions as a measure of basic skills and entrepreneurial thinking.

THE FUTURE SELF OF THE ADOLESCENT OR, THE NEW PATERNALISM

Conceptions of adolescence remained germane in the 1980s in comparison to those of the later 1890s. In many ways, the contemporary school consists of a complex configuration of a divergent judicial apparatus, frustrated collection of pedagogical discourses, therapeutics, and epistemologies of medicine. The architecture of the porous configuration of the Secondary subject abides in the contentious battle of the forces of power/knowledge over and through its body. The conflict receives a different tenor in the 1980s. Specifically, the legal discourses which target the adolescent body, its movements, its ability to take responsibility for itself, and for life itself. Similar epistemologies of freedom reappear and merge with pedagogical discourses, in particular with the limits of the teacher in the secondary writing classroom.

The freedom in the mid-to-late twentieth century involved a devaluation of paternalistic, state-welfare institutions to a new paternalism where individuals were forced to be free in mutual contractual obligation with society. The "new paternalism" excoriated dependency and promoted policies and perspectives that advanced self-reliance. Individuals, specifically those at risk for being on the state's dole, needed to learn how to be make proper choices that would sustain him/herself and contribute to society. The core of the state dissipates and becomes indistinct because the contractual relationships between the individual and the social drive the social order.

> The state is 'hollowed out' because, first, the social becomes immanent in individual's psychology, and thus individualized, and second, the state's presence as government becomes a rather indistinct one, at least from the standpoint of the individual's whose welfare is at stake. For these individuals, government no longer appears in the form of a standardized, one-size-fits-all bureaucratic approach (Yeatman, 2000, p. 165).

Individuals are promoted to be economically self-sufficient and capable enough to develop networks on their own to sustain them. Although psychological characteristics and make-up are important to policies based on the perspective of "new paternalism", the primary goal is to nurture individuals to contribute to the economy, to be active participants in the market economy. This means to innovate modes of production, to judiciously consume, and to be self-reliant in order to be compelled to be free.

Governing less means governing better initiates a new paternalistic future that adolescents in the 1980s-1990s had to anticipate. The focus on producing self-reliant, autonomous, independent subjects, capable of managing their responsibilities and freedoms, improving their human capital, and presiding over their risks and securities pervaded secondary schooling at this time. To better accentuate the role of the new paternalism, the next section examines a review of articles in the Kentucky Law Review that explicitly discussed adolescents in their journals.

Legal opinions composed in the 1980s in the Kentucky Law Review illustrate the legal apparatus among the entire network of competing practices and

discourses that configured the "adolescent." Relevant issues of governance illustrate how matters of the state discharge into more complex circuitries between both governmental and non-governmental activities and rationalities of rule. Governance used here references the strategies, tactics, and procedures employed for "controlling, regulating, shaping, mastering, or exercising authority over others in a nation, organization or locality" (Rose, 1999, p. 15). While we do not dismiss claims of hegemony or ideology, the purpose of this genealogy is to illustrate the subtle pressures exuded to endeavor to guise, frame, and stamp a specific type of governable subject, who is ultimately muscled and cajoled to think, act, desire, and be in certain manners in local time/spaces. Legal discourses extracted from the Kentucky Law Review contribute to this effort.

An exhaustive, yet incomplete analysis of articles pertaining to adolescence in the Kentucky Law Review reinforces these beliefs. In the 1979–1980 volume of the Kentucky Law Journal, John H. Garvey argues that the amount of freedom children have exists in relation to how adults conceive of freedom for themselves. In his analysis, Garvey begins by posing the following three "variables" of freedom:

> The variables may be stated as the freedom of a particular subject (X) from a particular constraint or set of constraints (Y) to undertake a particular course of action or cultivate a certain condition of character (Z) (p. 2).

Parental perspectives on limits and liberties of freedom cast the permissible space of freedom for the adolescent. Garvey's view implies a variation of views of parental views will influence how certain adolescents practice freedom. Governance along these lines involves multiple strategies, tactics, and resistances that vary from household to household. One constant, however, in Garvey's equation is the variable of the constraint. The equation collapses without the necessary constraints; or to put it another way, prohibitions are necessary (emerge along with; along side or; as a result of; due to) to conceptions and practices of freedom. Additionally, restrictions and limits lift and promote a discernment of character, one that entails a graduated process and a constant negotiation among various discourses and actors. Regarding the legal discourses, Garvey asserts that that courts have typically relied on enforcing laws that influence the z-factor primarily because the incarcerations of freedoms diverge in certain situations and locales. Although the courts, in general proclaim that notions of good are individually determined, a sense that autonomy and law merge to inform choices and decisions regarding which practices of freedom creates the best chance or the most optimal space to fashion a person of character. Legal restraints only play a role in the life of an individual when they emerge as variables in a person's deportment. This means that if a subject cannot conceive of taking certain actions, and the law forbids it anyhow, the restraint of that action is not a limit to freedom. But what about cases where the individual does conceive and takes certain actions? Garvey cites two pivotal court cases that help us make this distinction clearer.

In *Bellotti v. Baird* (1979), the United States Supreme Court ruled that neither a parent nor a judge could prohibit a pregnant minor from having an abortion even if

the former thought that it was in her "best interest." Moreover, *Meger v. Nebraska* (1923), describes legal freedoms based on the limitations of "private interference:"

> [Fourteenth Amendment liberty] denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscious, and generally to enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men (sic) (p. 813).

The general perimeters the law sets for individual freedoms does not mean that both subjects are completely free to do as they wish, and that at times those individual liberties as spelled out in *Meger v. Nebraska* are not further limited. As Garvey notes, some liberties can be limited for a "social purpose" (p. 813) such as adult curfews, which does not prevent subjects from wandering the streets in the early morning hours. For children, the perimeters of freedom are mediated through the parent(s); for the adolescent, as we will learn below, is the ability to determine one's future self.

Garvey (1979–1980) explains that the freedoms of children are unique in that they are in constant relationship to both the parent and the state. And the state, it appears from the law, captures the responsibility of the child when the parent is unable to do so. The case law, illustrating judicial practices, indicates where and at what times this event occurs. However, there is an element of choice in the freedoms of children, but the parent and the state have proxy over them:

> When we speak of the child's right to freedom we are likely to set to one side those traits of character which would lead him to make foolish choices if he were left to his own devices, and which we are inclined to regard as no part of his "real," rational, mature or future self. And in doing so we permit ourselves to recognize as the child's own, a choice, which is, in fact made for him by someone else [sic] (p. 815).

This child, then, is not seen as someone who is free to "choose" completely. As in the *Bellotti v. Baird* (1979) case, where the pregnant minor was able to make a rational choice on her own behalf, children are not given such privileges. Instead, choices are made for him/her. Moreover, children are not viewed as able to possess the foresight to see their "real" or "future self" in order to make sound choices about how to impact that self. The parent serves as the "restraint" in order to shape the child according to a particular vision of the child's "future self." The *Bellotti* case, however, involves the minor's body, where she should have the ability to choose what happens with one's body. A more important element of each of these situations, regarding the freedoms of children is where the restraints occur and who gets to set them. Finally, there is little discussion in the *Bellotti* case about the subject's "future self." One may infer from this that the distinction between a "minor" and a "child" is the ability to make choices for the "real" and "future self." If this is the case, then, schools and the way that we assess students impact those

choices. According to Garvey, the "compulsory educational laws" are not seen as a restriction or limit to a child's freedom, but the state's duty to provide schooling is "liberating the child from the confinement of his undeveloped state" (pp. 815–816). Child labor laws contain a similar rationale. They help the child to "develop physically and mentally, free from the hazards of dangerous occupation and overwork, to prevent juvenile delinquency and to supplement the operation of compulsory education laws" (p. 816). This means that both schools, with the help of childlabor laws liberates the child from being exploited so that they may develop properly both physically and cognitively in order to be free from their current "undeveloped state." The state, in short, acts in the "best interest" of the child; and it acts in the best interest of the state, so the logic goes, because if it allows the child to develop and emerge from its "undeveloped state" than it will potentially prevent juvenile delinquency. Schools, it seems, bare the burden of producing subjects that are beneficial, and subsequently, not a burden for the state. But what happens if they are? Meaning, how does the state intervene in the freedoms of the child.

The legal view of the adolescent then, which is distinct from children, is that strong family and community ties protect the burgeoning individual from poor decisions, and they also enable the adolescent to rebound from potentially harmful choices that affect their future happiness. Adolescents begin to assume more and more responsibilities:

> The individual, bit by bit, assumes responsibility for making his own choices, and we are gradually more inclined to see his "real" self that which is manifest in his own words and actions. By the same token we begin to speak of his own interests rather than of things, which are in his interests, and to think of them as those avenues, which he should be free to pursue rather than as a means to *eventual autonomy*. As he becomes more able to choose his own interests he has less need of an intermediary in making demands against restraints by the state (sic) (pp. 819–820) (my italics).

Fewer parental restraints (legally) structure the limits of the adolescent as s/he assumes more responsibilities and begins to profess and defend his/her needs and desires. Through less parental restraint and more responsibilities, the juvenile becomes more developed and about to "see his 'real' self." Of interest is the gradual release of parental restraints that permit the adolescent to morph into an adult. Shedding the necessary restrictions in place in his/her interest in order to embrace personal subjectivities that are of his/her interest. The operational ambiguity cedes to produce a plethora of strategies and techniques used for the (non) release of these parental constraints. The adolescent, however, progressively learns to negotiate and manage personal interest in relation to parental, societal, and legal limitations. Thus, the adolescent is defined by how s/he manages him/herself in multiple, competing liminal spaces demarcated by various discourses and practices of autonomy. As Dean (1999) argues,

> The exercise of authority presupposes the existence of a free subject of need, desire, rights, interests and choice. However, its subjection is also a condition of freedom: in order to act freely, the subject must first be shaped, guided and moulded into one capable of responsibly exercising that freedom through systems of domination. Subjection and subjectification are laid upon one another. Each is a condition of the other (p. 165).

Parents and schools play seminal roles in shaping this liminal space. Individuals (students) meander through in different spaces where they become simultaneously normalized, scripted, and empowered. Freedom can function as a means of losing restrictions while concurrently monitoring, measuring, and standardizing. If the adolescent morphs from the push and pull of the proverbial parental reigns, it does so through an intricate network of practices and technologies of freedom. Freedom, much like peace (see previous chapter), is far from being a total release to pursue personal interests, but is also a series of strategies in a "secret war" (Foucault, 1997, p. 50). Finally, theories of freedom (see chapter three) prefer to reify it rather than investigate it. Freedom's calculus involves innumerable variables, each of which function as both tactics and strategies in a complex game designed to subdue chance and muster an ounce of certainty in a very unstable, ambiguous world.

PATERNALISM

The state is cautious to intervene on the rights of the child in order to preserve the family unit. Again, the child and to some extend the adolescent mediates their ability to practice "freedom" through the parent. It does so, however, in very innocuous ways, such as limiting who can attend "drive in movies" and other social locations (perhaps a more current example would be who can attend rated "R" movies etc.), and in more direct ways, such as the incapacitation of the parent, or the criminal conviction of a crime. We may imply, here, that limiting children and adolescents from seeing rated-R movies, or drinking alcohol could impact the development of their "future self." The state will infringe upon the rights of children when she/he commits a crime, or when the parent is unable to care for the child or when the parent abuses their responsibilities for the child as in the case of abuse or neglect. However, the court will attempt to prevent a future "stigma" on the child that may hinder future employment or educational opportunities. In this way, then, the courts try to preserve the relationship between parent and child until it must intercede on behalf of the child, but not to hurt the child's future prospects. The parents maintain the lion's share of the responsibility for developing the child into an autonomous being. They must ensure that adolescent functions on his/her own at the point of adulthood. State institutions, such as public schools, function in a similar way (see below). When the parent blunders, the state interjects.

Kentucky's Unified Juvenile Code[4] states that the two most important areas that demanded "statutory reform" were "the care and treatment of dependent, abused

[4] See Kathleen D. Patterson's (1981–1982) article in the Kentucky Law Journal.

and neglected children and the treatment of juveniles who commit serious offenses" (p. 343). According to chapter 620 of the Proposed Code, the child possesses the following rights:

> It must…be understood that children have certain fundamental rights which also must be protected and preserved. These rights include, but are not limited to the rights to adequate food, clothing and shelter; the right to be free from physical, sexual or emotional injury or exploitation, the right to develop physically, mentally, and emotionally to their potential, and the right to educational instruction and the right to a secure, stable family. It is further recognized that upon some occasions, in order to protect and preserve the rights and needs of the children, it is necessary to remove a child from his or her parents (pp. 345–346).

The child, in addition to possessing the basic necessities, must be granted emotional, physical, and mental safety, and the state is willing to take the child away from the family if any of these rights are violated. However, Patterson, in the rest of the article, discusses at great length the problems with defining such terms as "emotional" harm. There seems to be much judicial discretion about such definition in particular court cases, which she recommends. It is clear that the court wants to preserve the child's rights while simultaneously maintaining the family unit. The courts, in short, separate child and parent from each other only as a last resort and only when clear evidence can be shown that the child is in danger. One of the biggest problems with determining if a child has been or is being abused is the reporting of it. Often times, people don't want to believe that a parent would abuse the child; but in the Proposed Code, requires that "any person who knows or has reasonable cause to believe that a child is an abused or neglected child…immediately cause a report to be made" (p. 347). The courts shifted responsibility to reporting such offenses to schools under the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA).

Under KERA, teachers are required to report specific types of abuses to specific state agencies. In fact, in the portfolio, "Alert Papers" are papers submitted, and chosen, by students that have abuse as a topic. Thus, creating a paper trail for students, who are at-risk for dropping-out of high school. The teachers are to state that the appropriate steps were taken for the student, and that the student chose to put the document in his/her portfolio. This event clearly shows how the monitoring of certain abuses moved to the school system. However, having this type of procedure with portfolios that encourage students to complete personal writing with a "voice" represents a shift in how students represent what they know, who they are and what administratively is done with that information.

Even in the cases of neglected children, the court will only remove the child from the home "if there were no alternatives which would adequately protect the child from harm" (p. 351). Thus, the court does its best to preserve familial relationships, acts on behalf of the child to preserve their "rights" and their "future selves." A similar response from the court appears with "status offenders." These

are children who have not committed any criminal offense, but "who does not subject himself to the reasonable control of his parents, teacher, guardian or custodian, by reason of being wayward or habitually…truant…from school" (pp. 362–363). A whole administrative apparatus existed to move "offenders" through the system. Once the child is detained, a Court Determined Worker (CDW) determines where the case should go in the court system. Often times, CDWs "refer(s) the child and family to appropriate services without the coercive force of a court order" (p. 367). Other places may include "treatment programs" or "educational programs" (p. 367). If these programs are not successful, the child may be committed to the Department for Human Resources, where they will "consider all appropriate local remedies" and could "bring an action against the parents for failure to cooperate or to participate in treatment or social service programs" (p. 368). Here we see how judicial discourses intervene and hold the parents responsible for their child's actions.

The CDW also plays a key role in the "Public Offender," whose definition is legally vague, but isn't someone who commits a felony, but isn't just missing school or running away from home. They are someone whose offenses "which if committed by an adult would be a crime" (p. 370). The CDW, once the crime is reported, would need to determine what "purview" of the legal system. An agreement could be met between the CDW and the child, called a "voluntary diversionary agreement" (p. 373), where one of the following outcomes could occur:

1. An informal plan of services provided by the court or its staff
2. Referral of the child to a public or private organization or agency
3. Referral to a community service program
4. Restitution (p. 373)

This agreement could not exceed six-months, and once it's completed, the child is dismissed from the court. If no agreement is met, then the child enters the "rules of criminal procedure" and may be detained by the court, where the outcomes are a little more severe. These ideals appear to be congruent with the mission of public education in Kentucky.

Yet, there is another issue regarding the child-parent-state relationships. This one involves the issue of "consortium," which "consists of several elements, encompassing not only material services but such intangibles as society, guidance, companionship, and sexual relations (Kentucky Law Journal, 1995–1996, p. 173). As of 1980, a child could not sue for parental consortium due to third-party neglect. That slowly began to change throughout the 1980s and early 1990s in Kentucky, due to some changes in the case law. Consortiums were made in the loss of child and loss of spouse, and children had a claim against a third-party under the wrongful death statues in Kentucky but not for incapacitation. When a parent is unable to fulfill its "pre-incident" duties, the child has no legal recourse.

This began to change when courts in surrounding states began to change their laws regarding this matter and when the courts began to recognize "…the importance of certain relationships beyond mere economic ties" (p. 174). Two

particular cases illustrate this change. The first involved a wife's consortium claim in the third-party neglect of her husband. In *Hiffaffer v. Argonne* (1950), the District of Columbia Circuit Court ruled that there was "no basis" for letting the husband file for consortium but not allowing the wife, reversing this precedence. The second ruling that caused the slow change of consortium for children was the case of *Shockley v. Prier (1975)*. This case allowed parents to sue a physician for negligence and for consortium due to causing her to go blind. The court made the following statement:

> [O]ne needs little imagination to see the shattering effect that [the child's] blindness will have on the relationship between him and his parents. The loss of enjoyment of those experiences normally shared by parents and children need no enumeration here (p. 178).

Thus, even though the parents, wife and husband can claim consortium in the event of third-party negligence, the child doesn't possess such protection. This is due in part to the definition of consortium as relating to husband and wife. However, as the author notes at the end of his article, that fourteen jurisdictions (state) defied *stare decisis*, or the "policy of courts to stand by precedent and not to disturb settled points" (p. 178). Perhaps the most influential case occurred in Wisconsin in the *Theama v. Kenosha* (1984) case. The court in a unanimous decision granted two children damages for their father's consortium due to his injuries suffered from a deep pothole in the street. Again, defying *stare decisis*, the Wisconsin court reasoned that the "parent-child relationship was the most deserving of compensation" (p. 191) because the monetary damages may be the only way to lessen the loss of the "parent's society and companionship" (p. 192). This court also drew a new line for recovery for consortium to the child but also limited it from spreading to other members of the family, which was a claim made by previous courts; that if children were allowed consortium damages, then the case load would explode with other claims from other family members. The court, citing a "scholar" reasoned this way:

> The distinction between the interests of children and those of other relatives is rationally and easily applied. Most children are dependent on their parents for emotional sustenance. This is rarely the case with more remote relatives. Thus, by limiting the plaintiffs in the consortium action to the victim's children, the courts would ensure that the losses compensated would be both real and severe (p. 192).

However, as of 1989, children were not able to sue for parental consortium. The law in Kentucky only allowed for spouses to make such claims.

The child-parent-state relationship demonstrates the state's commitment to preserving the relationship between the parent and child, but not yet willing to take the step that fourteen other jurisdictions have in giving children claim to parental consortium. Moreover, the courts are willing to intercede on behalf of the child

when the parent is abusive or neglects the child, and when the child commits a crime.

HAVEROSE V. COUNCIL

Concerns about the public education system brewed in Kentucky prior to the Rose v. Council lawsuit in 1989. Council consisted of a collection of sixty-six property-poor rural school districts that contested the legislative's constitutional obligation to provide an equitable school system. The initial claim focused mostly on disproportionate funding methods, but the state Supreme Court of Kentucky, in their decision, declared the entire public school system to be unconstitutional. The next section describes the legal history involved in this case. The community's attention to education culminated in a lawsuit against the General Assembly in 1987. Knowledge had indeed become a matter of government, and, more importantly, what occurs in the state of Kentucky illustrates the arrival of the governmentalization of knowledge in Neo-liberal form.

The original claim of Rose v. Council filed in Franklin Circuit Court in 1987 alleged the following:

> The complaint included allegations that the system of school financing provided for by the General Assembly is inadequate; places too much emphasis on local school board resources; and results in inadequacies, inequities and inequalities throughout the state so as to result in an inefficient system of common school education in violation of Kentucky Constitution, Sections 1, 3, and 183 and the equal protection clause and the due process of law clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution. Additionally the complaint maintains the entire system is not efficient under the mandate of Section 183 (*Rose v. Council*, p. 3).

Council's legal argument rests on the relationship between the tax levy system and efficiency. How laws designed to fund public schools throughout the state directly determined the efficiency or inefficiency of the entire, or corporate educational system. Inadequate financing schemes produce "inadequacies, inequalities, and inequalities throughout the state". An inadequate and unequal system cannot, *Council* claims, be efficient. This particular word, "inefficient," becomes an important piece to determining the outcome of this case (see below). The defendants argued that any changes to laws concerning school financing should be sought through the legislative branch, not the judicial. To this point, they claimed that recent legislation rectified the apparent inequities in local tax levies for education. Recent laws, however, forged minor changes, leaving the primary systemic levers intact. The trial court sided with *Council* and rejected *Rose's* argument that no remedy could be given via the judicial system. Additionally, the court, in its ruling maintained that communities possess the legal right to grieve the legislature if it fails to fulfill its constitutional obligations. The Circuit Court judge asserted that an equality and adequacy define efficient:

> "Efficient," in the Kentucky constitutional sense was defined as a system, which required "substantial uniformity, substantial equality of financial resources and substantial equal educational opportunity for all students." Efficient was also interpreted to require that the educational system must be adequate, uniform and unitary (Rose, 1989, p. 4).

An "efficient" common school, then according to the Circuit Court judge meant that the school system was "uniform" possessed an "equal" financial system, and created "equal educational opportunity" for every child in the state. According to this definition, a claim to sue the General Assembly was appropriate because it creates laws that structure the tax levy and collection system. The circuit court held, that indeed, due to the inequities in the tax levy and collection system, as implemented by the General Assembly, students in "property-poor school districts" received a "minimal level of educational opportunities" (Rose, p. 5). The Circuit Court appointed an advisory group to make legislative recommendations regarding the tax code, and proposed that available resources, facilities, materials, and curriculum needed for a proper education needed to be included in the definition of efficient of Section 183 of the constitution of Kentucky.

Although Rose appealed the lower court's decision, the Supreme Court of Kentucky heard the case and ruled in favor of Rose. The Majority Opinion in the appeal to the Supreme Court of Kentucky agreed that the previous legislative attempts to ameliorate inequities in the tax levy and collection system remained inadequate for the General Assembly to meet its constitutional obligations. Furthermore, they denied Rose's claim that Council as "creatures of the state" disposed them of legal recourse.

> This corporate body politic is specifically granted the power to do "all things necessary" to carry out its duties and responsibilities, including exercising its right to sue and be sued. Nowhere in the statues can one find a restriction on the right of the local boards to sue (p. 15).

Even though the Supreme Court of Kentucky dismissed the class-action lawsuit on legal grounds (not a civil case), it charged that public institutions, such as schools, retain the right to sue governmental bodies that devise laws that affect them (institutions). Despite Justice Gant's recommendation in a separate Majority Opinion to provide accountability measures to ensure the legislative branch would properly restructure the educational system, the Supreme Court refused to provide the legislature with a *writ of mandamus*. The Majority sided with Justice Wintersheimer, also composing a separate majority opinion, who asserted that due to the enormity of the legislations task to fix the educational system, the Supreme Court could only provide certain, general recommendations to the General Assembly. For him, money insufficiently resolves educational disparities. For him, parents bare the bulk of responsibility for educational deficiencies, and the "fractured fabric of the family" (Rose, 1989, p. 40) breed poor academic performance. A "joint venture" among financial arrangements, parents, students, and schools may fix unequal opportunities in education. Justices Vance and

Leibson dissented from the Majority Opinion. Justice Vance wrote a lengthy and well-reasoned dissenting opinion. He argued that the Majority Opinion provide any remedy for the local and state tax and levy system, which is the heart of the inequities and inefficiency of the public school system. This contradicts the Majority's belief that the state should provide both an "equal educational opportunity for children throughout the Commonwealth" (Rose versus Council, 1989, p. 41):

> Primarily, it is the levy of these taxes by local school districts, which produces greatly disparate revenues in richer counties than in poorer ones, that has caused the great disparity in school funding per child in the various districts throughout the Commonwealth (Rose versus Council, 1989 p. 41).

In brief, the inequity in tax levy and distribution system creates an "inefficient" school system. Moreover, citing Delegate Becker at the 1897 debate about Section 83 in the Constitution Convention, Vance argues that Becker is the only delegate to recommend "adequate" and "efficient" but only the word "efficient" made it into the Constitution. If this is the case, as Vance reasons, the current system is not unconstitutional, meaning that based on the evidence presented in court, the current system is neither "under-funded" nor "inadequate" (p. 43). Finally, Vance argues that the charge that the Majority Opinion has given the General Assembly is an impossible task:

> I cannot agree with the majority that the constitution requires the General Assembly to monitor the school system to insure that schools are operated with no waste, mismanagement, or political influence. It is not possible for the General Assembly to oversee the day-to-day operation of schools. In my view, the General Assembly has discharged its duty when it has provided by law for a school system, which, if properly administered, will result in substantially equal educational opportunity throughout the Commonwealth. The administration of the school system is not a legislative responsibility, and if the system, because of waste, mismanagement, or political influence, fails in its purpose, the failure is not to be charged to the General Assembly (Rose versus Council, 1989, p. 44).

Vance also states that the "seven goals" of each school are too "vague" and impossible for the General Assembly to monitor, and not the responsibility of the legislative branch. What's missing from his opinion is the constitutionality of the school. Students have a "right" to a proper education. How that gets implemented becomes the role of the General Assembly as the representative body of the people.

Justice Leibson, also dissenting, argues that the current case does not "present an 'actual' or 'justiciable' controversy" (p. 46), which is a standard for presenting a case to the Supreme Court. In order for there to be a "specific controversy," three characteristics must be met:

1. A justifiable issue
2. Involving the legal rights
3. Of adverse parties (Rose, 1989, p. 38)

This particular case doesn't meet any of these criteria according to Justice Leibson. Moreover, there must be some "specific relief" that the court must be able to recommend in order for there to be a "justifiable issue." If the Majority cannot provide a "specific relief," than the court can't hear the case. In his opinion, the Majority of the Supreme Court has exceeded its role as the judicial branch, which will as a result, "open the doors of the courthouse to a host of new lawsuits by litigants seeking a forum to argue questions of public policy which are incapable of specific judicial resolution" (p. 46). Here we see the opposite Complaint as Justice Gant, who argued that the Supreme Court needed to issue a *writ of mandamus*. He argues instead that the Supreme Court has no justifiable role in this matter and that it should not have accepted the case. Nonetheless, the Majority Opinion argued and expanded the use of the term "efficient" to mean that all children occupy a constitutional right to attend a free, uniform, public school that fosters satisfactory education opportunities regardless of geographic or economic conditions. Moreover, the General Assembly possesses sole responsibility for the preservation and fiscal solvency of public schools, and are obligated to safeguard against waste, duplication, mismanagement, and political influence to secure a satisfactory education for every child. A satisfactory education involves augmenting seven capacities:

1. Sufficient oral and written communication skills to enable students to function in a complex and rapidly changing civilization.
2. Sufficient knowledge of economic, social, and political systems to enable the student to make informed choices
3. Sufficient understanding of governmental processes to enable the student to understand the issues that affect his or her community, state, and nation
4. Sufficient self-knowledge and knowledge of his or her mental and physical wellness
5. Sufficient grounding in the arts to enable each student to appreciate his or her cultural and historical heritage
6. Sufficient training or preparation for advanced training in either academic or vocational fields so as to enable each child to choose and pursue life work intelligently
7. Sufficient levels of academic or vocational skills to enable public school students to compete favorably with their counterparts in surrounding states, in academics or in the job market (Rose, 1989, p. 26).

The Supreme Court charged the General Assembly to revamp the system and make it "efficient" as defined by the Supreme Court in accordance with Section 183 of the Constitution of the state of Kentucky. So how did they do this? Within one year of the Supreme Court's decision, the Governor signed the Kentucky Education

Reform Act, or KERA into law. Initially, the portfolio was part of the Kentucky Instructional Results and Information System (KIRIS), but it was replaced in 1998 with CATS. The speed with which this legislation passed through the Kentucky legislature is a testament to the years of studying education reform and the efforts of both educationalists and the business community to improve education in Kentucky.

FROM SOVEREIGN RULER TO THE LITTLE PRINCE

The introduction to the curriculum guide, *Transformation: Kentucky's Curriculum Framework* (1990) begins with an episode from St. Exupery's *The Little Prince*. It begins with the Little Prince's request to the aviator to "Please sir, draw me a sheep." After several lame attempts to draw the sheep, as "One sheep is too old, another too sick, and another won't do because it is a ram" the pilot steers the little Prince to look into a three-holed box. When the little Prince gazes into the box, he exclaims with excitement "…that is exactly the sheep he needs" (www.education.ky.gov). Developers employ this allusion to explicate the spirit of the curriculum guide. The Little Prince in this scenario represents school districts and administrators who require imagination to apply the guidelines (the box) appropriate to their school body (sheep). Administrators and local districts can find the precise sheep they need if they glance into the box (curriculum guide) and use their imagination. The sheep is an ideal, as a future entity produced in the present via the various divers components of the curriculum guidelines. The guidelines reflect the various influences described above. The next section presents and analyzes them in relation to economic theory, human capital, and entrepreneurialism. We begin with part two of Transformations because it outlines how to design the classroom space to inspire learning and provides rationale for alternative teaching methods.

Education in Kentucky was at a crossroads, and reformers took this opportunity to refashion its entire system as mandated by the Kentucky Supreme Court. Traditional pedagogical approaches and school administrative and organizational structures no long worked in a changing, post-modern society. Distributive measures, such as tracking, resembled an outdated management approach, and flexible learning environments with the understanding that students learn differently, reflected the potential world students would encounter post-secondary school. As writers of *Transformations* explain,

> Many educators realize a need for change founded in the demands of the 21st Century, demands which a system designed for the 19th and 20th centuries cannot meet. Others see a need for change as they look at the vast number of students who have been failed by the present system. They realize that society cannot bear the expense or the social pressures caused by disenfranchising large segments of a developing, restless, and demanding underclass. Another group is inspired to change by the possibilities of a future which is vastly different from the present, a future which is marked by advances in virtually every field of human endeavor. There may be different

> motives behind the change, but the need is overwhelming; *now* is the time for change (p. 4).

Reformers in Kentucky recognize the need to alter the prevailing philosophical foundations of education in their state. However, they believe that inadequate changes prevail if teachers neglect to alter their teaching practices. Thus, reformers understand that to measure change, they need to manage how teachers teach. Driven primarily by technological advances and concerns from the business community, the writers of Transformations admonish educators to teach with the assumption that all children can learn at a high level, and that each student learns differently and possesses unique talents. To support this view, the writers of Transformation purport that teachers need to provide students with "expanded opportunities" (p. 10) to demonstrate their high-level abilities, and design real-world, authentic assignments, and performance assessment to reflect their talents. Students also become responsible for their learning when teachers relinquish control over the curriculum, but manage the classroom space. As the writers indicate, "It (students taking responsibility) is dependent upon the establishment of an atmosphere of trust and collaboration between teachers and students" (p. 11). Finally, instead of assessing students in a final exam, which provides a "snap-shot" of the student's abilities, the writers recommend that teachers incorporate assessment into teaching and learning practices. Doing so, provides teachers and students with continual feedback, which allows teachers to adjust pedagogy to meet the student's needs as students progress towards meeting state standards. State standards as outlined in the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) are detailed in part one of *Transformations*. The six learning goals of KERA include:

1. Students are able to use basic communication and mathematics skills for purposes and situations they will encounter throughout their lives.
2. Students shall develop their abilities to apply core concepts and principles from mathematics, the sciences, the arts, the humanities, social studies, practical living studies, and vocational studies to what they will encounter throughout their lives.
3. Students shall develop their abilities to become self-sufficient individuals.
4. Students shall develop their abilities to become responsible members of a family, work group, or community, including demonstrating effectiveness in community service.
5. Students shall develop their abilities to think and solve problems in school situations and in a variety of situations they will encounter in life.
6. Students shall develop their abilities to connect and integrate experiences and new knowledge from all subject matter fields with what they have previously learned and build on past learning experiences to acquire new information through various media sources (Transformation: Volume I, pp. 5–9).

Each of these goals has subsections and details about how to accomplish them at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels. What's most interesting about these curriculum goals is that although specific goals exists for specific disciplines such

as mathematics, science and social studies, there aren't specific goals for English. For example, there's no push to for teachers to teach specific content in English, meaning that English teachers don't necessarily have to teach William Shakespeare or Charles Dickens. There's only one curriculum goal that relates directly to teaching specific content. Goal 2.24 reads "Students have knowledge of major works of art, music, and literature and appreciate creativity and the contributions of the arts and humanities." All of the other Arts and Humanities curriculum goals make reference to sight. Some examples include students creating works in order to "convey a point of view," "recognize that although people are different, they share some common experiences and attitudes," and "students show that they understand how time, place, and society influence the arts and humanities." Secondary English teachers, although given teaching techniques and tools in the Guidebook described above, are perhaps teaching students how to see and be seen. It's important to remember that students produce five pieces for their 12th grade portfolio, where at least one of the pieces must come from a subject other than English. The curriculum guide provides the avenues that students need to take and provide the specific ways they should see their experiences.

"ALTERNATIVE" ASSESSMENT

Physicians in the early to mid nineteenth century clamored and yearned to witness the inner world of the human body. Phrenologists developed ridgology, a hermeneutical science of reading the skull's exterior surface, to diagnose and treat ailments as well as offer advice on lifestyle choices (i.e. diet, water, cleanliness). Hydro-therapists relied on balance of water in the body, and using steam, water temperature, and a legion of different types of bathes to treat physical diseases, mental imbalances, and temperament excesses. The physician relied heavily on the patients' descriptions for treatment, and the space for such an encounter may have resembled the one found between secondary teachers and students in the portfolio projects in the state of Kentucky. The teacher is relegated to the margins, or the exterior of the student's compositional body (i.e. portfolio) in a similar way as the physicians were in the mid- nineteenth century. What is more, they possessed no more expertise or certainty than the students, or patients. In fact, in Kentucky, and in most portfolio classrooms, teachers were viewed as potential pathogens that could infect and taint the adolescent body. Teachers retained their diseased status; in fact, in the 1980s reformers conceded that teachers were the primary causes of student's illness and the best way to treat them is to separate them from teachers. In the 1890s, reforms pressed the need to remove students from the streets, their homes, and peer-groups to perform *Materia Medica*. In the 1980s teachers emerged as the primary carriers of pathogens and germs that need to be quarantined and disembodied from the adolescent. Teachers became a necessary evil, but their position in relation to students shifted greatly relegated to the outskirts of the city of Paris.

Great efforts were made to exclude the teacher as much as possible from the student's portfolio to the extent that secondary English teachers were restricted

from touching students compositions; and even in terms of correcting the mechanics of a paper, an expertise that parents or other students may not have, teachers were instructed to make a notation on the margins of the paper. Students would then try to figure out on their own the jejune, disjointed, or the inchoate parts of their own body. Students, much like patients in the early nineteenth century were relegated to meander through the medical marketplace to obtain and maintain a semblance of health. Teachers, much like physicians, were de-professionalize, and as evidence below, they ranked on the same level as a "peer tutor." Atwell and others (see chapter four) removed themselves from behind the desk to join the students in a laissez-faire writing workshop, only to find themselves relegated to the edges of the classroom, of the adolescent body, with their expertise minimized to only a whisper and transparency. Adolescents in the portfolio generation then learned how to negotiate a market place ripe with risk, doubt, anxiety, potential ingenuity and innovation; in short, entrepreneurialism. Students learned in the portfolio process that freedom is situated, and not an absolute, an ideal, or a future event, but composed in the present.

Ayn Rand, the American philosopher declares that while "a social environment can neither force a man to think nor prevent him from thinking," it (social environment) can "offer incentives or impediments; it can make the exercise of one's rational faculty easier or harder; it can encourage thinking and penalize evasion or vice versa" (Rand, 1988, p. 102). Who manages, constructs, and facilitates a social environment exercises great power over production composition. A clear example of how the teacher is pushed to the side and prevented from directly interacting with the student's body is the *Code of Ethics for Writing Portfolios* (Administrative Code, 1999). The handbook establishes the limitations of pedagogical practices, and more important, disciplines the teachers' bodies in relation to the pupil's portfolio production. The appropriate measures involve primarily arrangements of space and time. For example, teachers may provide multiple occasions to write every day and permit students to have time to organize their portfolios. In addition, teachers may consult with students about the particular pieces to include in their final portfolio, tag specific errors in the paper with a mark in the margins, and review the scoring criteria of the portfolio. Finally, teachers may assign peer tutors and encourage students to cultivate their writing at home. Students are to compose every piece in their portfolios, and any individual who helps the student must receive special training based on the *Code of Ethics (*Administrative Code, 1999).

Student ownership of the portfolio is the most important feature of the *Code of Ethics* (Administrative Code, 1999). The teacher's primary role is to boost self-ownership and dissuade any element, which may hamper the student developing ownership of the portfolio. Hence, the teacher should not offer any assistance that may depreciate the student's proprietorship of the portfolio, including modifying documents or official state certificate indicating authenticity of the portfolio's contents. Students are the only ones authorized to make changes, including mechanical errors, as the handbook states**, "**no one other than the student shall

make direct corrections or revisions on a student's work that is to be included in the student's writing Reference" (Administrative Code, 1999, p. 10). Along these same lines, the peer tutor and the teacher's roles and responsibilities remain the same. They may not add or subtract to the actual body of the document, but may simply make suggestions on the margins.

Here we see the teacher's role shift. Although their job is to provide the most opportunities to write, teachers are limited in their capacity to respond to student's writing. This moment represents a shift in pedagogical tactics. Instead of correcting every "error" on the scholastic body, teachers now "indicate the position of error" or "assist" or "assign peer groups." Teachers are not allowed to make significant alterations on the body or make "direct corrections or revision." In short, the teacher has been marginalized, left to provide opportunities, and merely guide but not directly alter the scholastic body. This reflects a shift in the pastoral role of the teacher in that the shepherd can only question, or point out faults, or "errors" but not directly shape or mold the student. To produce an "owner," the shepherd must leave the student alone to make his/her own choices, and live with those choices. Moreover, previous pedagogical techniques, such as using that "bloody red ink" (Bartholomew, 1982, p. 33) all over the scholastic body to purify the product. We don't sacrifice it in order to resurrect a more perfect paper. The red pen has been taken out of the hands of teachers, and shifted that authority to "peer groups," parents, and "others" in an effort to keep the scholastic body as pure as possible, and minimizing the teacher's (re)marks. In short, the teacher may offer several paths to take, but not tell the sheep which one to take.

The state performance guidelines presented to teachers of English in secondary public schools in Kentucky reflect a shift in their social environment. Epistemologies and discursive practices of pedagogy shifted from teachers as experts to teachers as managers. To make this point, the next section explicates the state teaching guidelines through a managerial lens. Although educators employed many of the "best practices" illustrated in Chapter Three, they also relegate teachers to the margins of the classroom, restrict their teaching practices to spatial planning, organization, and counting, and discourages them from influencing the student's body of work. To illustrate these points, this section examines the *Kentucky Writing Helping Students Become Proficient Writers: Writing Development Teacher's Handbook* (Wilhoit, 2003) .

The writers of the guidelines for teachers on the teaching of writing endorsed the "writing process" as an effective theory to engage adolescents in writing. Not withstanding the methodological debates about the writing process, the process consisted of pre-writing, drafting, conference, editing, revision, publishing. Strict protocols on the perimeters of the social environment, of what teachers can say and do in relation to the student during each step of the writing process. Fostering a sense of autonomy, independence, and ownership were the stated goal of the portfolio, and for writing in general in the state of Kentucky at this time. Reformers recognized the teacher as the prime authority in the room, so demarcating the teacher's space stood critical to producing an entrepreneurial subject, one capable of self-management, ingenuity, and creativity. Throughout the

entire writing process, students hold the decision-making power over every piece of writing s/he composes; the teacher arranges, or manages the space. Ownership, in summary, means that the writing is the "student's own" and although others may pose questions, the decisions made in the writing are the writers; students "determines and defines" the writing and what's in the portfolio; finally, ownership means that the writing is not a "canned response" to a classroom activity, but shows "originality, individuality" (p. 25). Authenticity, on the other hand, means that the writing is the "student's own, done for a realistic purpose and readership and in a realistic form that logically fit the purpose and audience or situation" (p. 25). Authenticity and ownership are the two key concepts for how to teach writing in schools in Kentucky. Yet, these espoused ideals beg the question of how does "best practices" of writing pedagogy embody or seek to embody regimes of rule? To state the question in another way, how do writing practices enact certain forms of governmentality?

To answer this pressing question, the next section examines how suggestions for teachers on how to teach the writing process to students in their portfolios creates a space for neo-liberal governmentality to take hold. In brief, the confines of the teacher demarcate a spatial arrangement designed to equalize opportunities for self-regard, self-sufficiency, and self-reliance. Entrepreneurial dispositions practiced in the laboratory of the classroom, or in the writing workshop trump, subvert, and ameliorate, or so the theory goes, years of poverty, poor education, and personal circumstances. The always-already in neo-liberal governmentality is the strident belief that every individual possesses an inherent desire to be independent from governing forces, and once the individual is given the opportunity, or is released from compounding authorities, to be self-sufficient, s/he blossoms into a self-realized human being capable of making rational decisions about one's personal well-being capable of contributing to the general economic marketplace schemed for optimal growth. Throughout the entire writing process, the governance of teachers restricts their abilities to act as experts on writing, and the student remains deserted in the pedagogical marketplace to fend for him/herself. It is within this environment that the student learns to build the capacities to function appropriately in a neo-liberal world sans "passive welfare dependency" (Yeatman, 2000, p. 156). The arrangement of the classroom reconfigures the traditional teaching and learning space, perhaps couched in the guise of constructivism, from group work to a social based on radical individuality. The classroom represents the virtual public square where employment equals citizenship, and contribution via production of personal artifacts indicates solvency and the renunciation of dependency. Market liberalism functions as the great equalizer in the preparation of young adults for a globalized economy depleted of social welfare safety nets.

The confinements of the teacher in the portfolio classroom represent not simply a space for the students to explore themselves, or to play with writing, but reflect a form of governance designed to prepare them to live in a social with radical individualism without social safety nets. The pedagogical architecture of the every stage of the writing process is framed to limit the teacher's access to the pupil's

compositional body. The process includes, pre-writing, drafting, conferencing, revising, editing, and publishing. According to the KIRIS guidelines, pre-writing needs to enable every student to become independent generator of ideas, as teachers allow students some choice but most importantly "…not depriving students of either ownership of their writing or opportunities to improve their writing abilities" (Wilhoit, 2003, p. 32). To that end, students select their own topics and the appropriate writing strategy to convey their intended message to the intended audience. To foster "ownership," the Handbook (Wilhoit, 2003) states that ownership means that the writing is "…the student's own; it is not the work done by someone else (p. 25). The writer "determines or defines the writing" and produces not a "canned response" of class notes or "repeats what the teacher has said to do" (p. 25). The student's responses must show "originality, individuality" (p. 25). In short, the writer, "…reveals an effort to communicate genuinely with awareness of authentic readers" (p. 25).

Although teachers can guide students on the topic selection and provide writing strategies from whole-class instruction to clustering, brainstorming, labs, field trips, observations class discussions, they cannot do so in such a way that impedes the student from selecting both pre-writing strategy and paper topic. The curriculum and instruction should promote students to be the independence as they are the arbiters of which strategies to use to help them (students) produce their own work. A similar relationship between students and teachers occurs in the drafting phase, too. The purpose of drafting is to galvanize sentences and ideas into a cohesive whole. Theoretically, this stage involves fostering a more profound level of thinking than during the prewriting stage. The teacher's acts preserves a supportive learning environment bolstered by experimentation with a vast array of copious resources and ample time to draft (Wilhoit, 2003). The student needs to learn how to consider the reader in their compositional pieces with special attention to literary genre, topic, and length of piece. This means the writing embodies the student's ability to make decisions about how to construct their work, or about their decisions to adhere to the scoring criteria. What perhaps gets reflected in the writing is the student's ability to make these sorts of decisions. So far in the process much of the work is conducted by the student, yet even in the conferencing phase, the teacher is greatly restricted in both the quality and quantity of aid.

Conferencing involves getting feedback from teachers, peers, parents, and "others"; however, the student is to maintain complete ownership of his/her work and there should be no sign of any others involvement in the text from anyone else. The writer decides both what to include and exclude from his/her work. The "responder" (i.e. teacher, peers, parents, and others) may interact in the following ways:

- Question rather than dictate
- Coach rather than correct
- Model rather than rewrite
- Critique rather than criticize
- Encourage rather than edit
- Guide rather than direct
- Suggest rather than impose (Wilhoit, 2003, pp. 32–33)

The marketplace of potential responders with whom to conference expands. The teacher (much like the physicians in the nineteenth century) ranks with peers, parents, other teachers, and other individuals. The community takes an active role in shaping and prodding the becoming adolescent, giving him/her responsibility "bit by bit" with the intention of being able to emerge as an autonomous self capable of self-reliance and potential independence from the "…self-destructive reliance on unearned economic support" (Yeatman, 2000, p. 161). They not only become ways to help the parent support the child's writing but also a way to parent the burgeoning independent child.

While conferencing can occur throughout the process, students also revise their work. The purpose of revising their pieces is to "reshapes and reorder the text to match as closely as possible the new ides in his or her head" (Wilhoit, 2003, p. 33). Again the student decides what to "add, delete, or change" (p. 33). Responders, in a similar vein as conferencing, may pose questions, offer specimens of revisions, demonstrate how students can edit each others' papers, provide revision guides, but the author makes the final determination on the revisions. Students are to revise based on their intended meaning, not according the portfolio rubric. The teacher's role is to "design revision checklists" to "use with their own writing and in conferencing with peers" which may (probably) reflect the portfolio rubric. Yet, the emphasis is not on some external standard, but on the individuals intended meaning.

Again, reiterating how the student practices independence and how well they can communicate their ideas to an "audience." What becomes problematic is if the student contends that the writing communicates what she/he wants to say but the teacher knows that the portfolio won't score well. Through "guiding" and "questioning" the student's writing, they will be able to re-write it in such a way that they will pass the portfolio. However, as the final criteria states: "Teachers and students should ensure that authors have the final say in the revisions they make in their writing" (p. 33). This represents the terminal end of liberalism; complete independence and decision-making on behalf of the pedagogical subject where the state, as represented here by the teacher, only sets the perimeters of the space for the subject acts responsibly and with appropriate freedom. The student may exercise his/her freedom and decision-making capacities, as represented in his/her writing.

During the editing stage, the student produces the best paper s/he can muster using self-assessment and decision-making processes. Teachers continually assess each student's individual writing process in order to create pedagogical strategies that address only the mechanics of writing; however these pedagogical moves promote the notion that the student is the sole proprietor of his/her work, and they may not "any time actually do the writing or make direct corrections on student work (Wilhoit, 2003, p. 33). Teachers may present mini-lessons, encourage peer-editing, delegate "class experts" (Wilhoit, 2003, p. 34) to aid with certain grammatical principals, complete "transparency editing," which involves displaying errors on a transparency for the class to solve, place marks in the margins where grammatical errors occur, and offer pristine models for students.

Teachers may employ the following teaching "strategies" in order to support students in the editing process. On this last point, the following admonition is given.

- Teachers should be sure that every piece of their own writing they share with students is as accurately edited as possible. When errors do occur in teacher models, these errors should be used to facilitate a mini-lesson focusing on the specific skills.

  (Wilhoit, 2003, p. 34))

Finally, although students produce several pieces, they select the final six to submit in their portfolios.

THE PORTFOLIO

The writing portfolios have been assessed during the 12th grade, and the format of the portfolio hasn't changed since its inception. The portfolio, it appears, monitors not just student work, but "local curriculum and instruction" and illustrates the "strong connection to student's classroom experiences and the strong involvement of teachers" (KIRIS, Chapter 12). The portfolio was designed by a "committee of Kentucky English/Language Arts educators" and was meant to expand student writing from the "traditional" forms of writing, such as "reports, essays, research papers," to "personal experience writing; imaginative writing; reflective writing; and, trans-active writing for real-world purposes and audiences" (Wilhoit, 2003, p. 36). Instead of being a one-time writing task, the portfolio is a collection of student's work over time. The *Guidelines for the Generation of Student Work for Writing Portfolios* (Wilhoit, 2003) to help teachers work with students in developing their portfolios and also has the "benchmarks" which teachers use to score their own portfolios outlines five goals for the writing portfolios. They are as follows:

- Provide students with the skills, knowledge, and confidence necessary to become independent thinkers and writers
- Promote each student's ability to communicate to a variety of audiences for a variety of purposes
- Document student performance on multiple tasks over time
- Integrate performance assessment with classroom instruction
- Provide information upon which to base ongoing development of curriculum that is responsive to student needs (Wilhoit, 2004, p. 24).

The portfolio is designed so that students are the "owners of their work, " where "any intervention from teachers, peers, and/or others should enhance rather than remove or diminish that ownership and should be offered in the spirit of helping students re-assess their own work" (p. 24). Teachers are to serve merely as "colleagues, coaches, mentors and critics" (p. 24) and parents, friends and classmates, "assume roles of listeners, responders, and encouragers" (p. 24).

Here we start to see legal discourse around adolescent reappear in pedagogical discourse. Students are learning how to exercise their freedom and responsibilities "bit by bit". Teachers are placed completely at the margins of the scholastic body, where their role is simply to "guide" and "model." The Christian pastorate moves into the classroom but possessing a different function. They are not to directly change or alter the scholastic body, but merely provide questions and distribute information so that the student can decide on his/her own the best course to take. The teacher is no longer given a direct hand in the production of the child's work, but is disciplined to stay out, or to monitor their own roles with their child. They act as recorders of the child's choices and progress, guiding through questions and through "listening."

Students have the opportunity to re-write their papers before they put them in the scored portfolio, thus it is seen as their "best works." Portfolios are "holistically" scored in the following categories:

- Purpose/Audience Awareness
- Idea Development/Support
- Organization
- Sentence Structure and Variety
- Language (Word Choice and Usage)
- Correctness (Spelling, Punctuation, and Capitalization) (Kentucky Department of Education, www.kde.stay.ky.us/KDE).

What is the purpose of these portfolios and what kind of student are they meant to produce. To answer that question, we will examine the "benchmark" and staff development documents given to teachers to help them prepare to score them.

CONCLUSION

The classroom space for the production of portfolios can best be described as governing best by governing least. In the new classroom, we see the emergence of a new paternalism based on a contractual obligation of welfare recipients (i.e. students) to contribute to society and obtain specific dispositions (Yeatman, 2000). In exchange for state services, students are plunged into a pedagogical marketplace where they reject dependency, strive to be self-reliant, learn to govern oneself within a social system, assume risk and security, and based success on efforts in the market economy; as producers, consumers. Students are forced to be free in order to be recognized as a certain subject, and to prepare them to be specific governable citizens. Equality exists in theory in terms of opportunity; each student contains equal access to the teacher, whose pedagogical acumen equalizes among a whole host of others who share similar abilities. As Yeatman (2000) explains, "…the new discourse of self-reliance is non-discriminatory and egalitarian in its assumption that each individual would prefer to be self-reliant if they could be" (p. 158). Governmental welfare programs based primarily on the social contract of "mutual obligation" grounds its political theory on the basis that the government possesses a pivotal role in promoting and securing self-reliance. Governmental

interventions arrest descent into poverty based on depleting skills, ill health, or unfortuitous events. Government intervenes on behalf of the individual and the "social" when markets fail. Like the physicians in the late nineteenth century, teachers in Kentucky classrooms possess minimal unique, specialized expertise. They function more as technocrats.

Finally, unlike their nineteenth century colleagues, teachers in the portfolio classroom exist under strict restrictions and prohibitions from the adolescent's compositional body. To ensure that young-adults generate an autonomous self, bit by bit, they need to make decisions about their futures while they are enrolled in secondary school. The genealogical threads, albeit porous and incomplete, reveal that the writing portfolio circulates in educational spaces in a dispositif consisting of various, multiple and competing discourses of medicine, criminology, pedagogy, pathology, neoliberal political economy, including liberal rationalities of freedom, human capital theory, and new paternalism, the judiciary, psychology, and economics. It is important to note, that despite claims that the late nineteenth century secondary school functioned more to prepare for industry, many of the other discourses listed above often outflank and even silence discourses of economics. Writing pedagogy and their assessments defy ahistorical claims. Assessment practices are not objective measures, and although the portfolio proclaimed to release students from the confines of object tests, it introduced and exposed the secondary student to an intricate network of power/knowledge. Writing veiled by its liberal-humanistic promises released an array of more subtle, manipulative, and insidious collection of powerful forces.

CHAPTER 8

WHO ARE WE *NOW*?

> Foucault makes the distinctive assumption that the subject is not the condition of knowledge, but that knowledge about the subject is one of the historical forms through which subjective experience is constituted. The subject is not an invention of philosophy, but a historically constituted entity problematic enough to give rise to philosophical controversy (Rajchman, 1985, p. 101).

For someone like me, brought up as a provincial petty bourgeois, you drink learning in with your baby formula before even getting to primary school. When I say that I've been splashing around in knowledge, I mean it in the sense that I would really rather try to dispense with it. But since I can't do that, deserves to be (Foucault, 1996, p. 133).

The reader at this point may demand solutions and protocols for writing assessment. If assessing student writing is as bad as this genealogy purports, then what are teachers supposed to do about it? Foucault's position, which is ours as well, is that assessments are not necessarily good or bad, but dangerous. Parched for formulas, the secondary English teacher may respond to this genealogy with an exasperated sigh and wonder about how s/he should proceed to teach writing tomorrow morning when they meet their adolescent learners. Models and scripted curricula for writing assessments and for doing a Foucaultian-inspired genealogy even with the "best of intentions" eventually become "instruments of oppression" (Foucault, 1983, p. 10). Rather than offering models of assessment, Foucaultian-inspired geneaologies seek to "…show people that they are much freer than they feel, that people accept as truth, as evidence, some themes which have be build up at a certain moment during history, and that this so-called evidence can be criticized and destroyed" (Foucault in Martin et al, 1988, p. 10). Foucault maintained an ardent belief that his readers could use his books as a toolbox to be used to debunk evidence employed to determine the truth about the subject. Moreover, Foucault argues that humans do not need to link ethics to scientific knowledge that offer draconian directions and orthropoedic solutions intended to limit and constrict the subject has s/he relates to him/her self. For Foucault, there exists a "treasury of devices, techniques, ideas, procedures, and so on, that cannot exactly be reactivated but at least constitute, or help to constitute, a certain point of view which can be very useful as a tool for analyzing what's going on now—and to change it" (Foucault in Rabinow, 1997a, p. 261). The technologies of the self imply a specific, purpose working and modification on the self. Many of these technologies escape the confines of science and power/knowledge, and a descent

into history expands strategies for caring for the self and knowing the self. We do not need to rely on a priori, formalistic knowledges to be ethical creatures. In fact, Foucault seeks to reveal the contingent nature of knowledge claims of the subject in order to eradicate them, or at least to complicate them. The reader of this genealogy must settle for a sense of dizziness, vertigo, or confusion about writing assessment practices in the present moment and their effects on the adolescent body. The urgent desire for solutions to assessment practices perpetuates the positivities of scientific inquiry, and theories of assessment, which seeks to offer generalizable, objective instruments to assess all students contradict the purposes of doing a Foucaultian-inspired genealogy. Our intentions are less grand, less useful, more material, and more immediate.

We wish to learn from Foucault about the purposes of writing from a philosophical perspective in order to debunk liberal-humanistic claims about secondary education, and to suggest ways in which writing pedagogy can be used to not produce a self, but to escape self and experience ecstatic thinking. We do so by examining the philosophical views of Foucault's archaeological/genealogical style (not method), describe what we consider to be Foucault's craft in writing genealogies and thus composing otherness, and finally, we explain how writing pedagogy can function as a means of the care of the self, or one that fashions the self. This chapter, thus, investigates Foucault's claim that he was not an historian, not a philosopher, or an intellectual, but a "teacher" (Foucault in Martin et. al., 1988, p. 9). Instead of arguing for his methodologies, we remain content with the perspective that Foucault's pedagogy reflected more of style than a particular compilation of methodological approaches (Osborne, 2008).

Our basic argument in this chapter is that endeavoring to complete a genealogical study based on the methodological sprinkled throughout Foucault's lectures, studies, interviews, and essays, provides alternatives to writing pedagogy that encourages individuals to get out of oneself instead of composing a unified, calcified identity, or self. If, as Foucault (1978) argues, we have become confessing animals, this genealogy illustrates that schools have transformed into modified versions of hospitals, churches, and laboratories, and the multiple strategies and modes of confession have been induced to assess adolescents. We have indeed become assessing animals. Educators poke and prod the adolescent body from multiple angles and at a furious pace. Students are constantly assessed, and are encouraged to assess themselves at a rate the reformers in the late nineteenth-century could only wish for. Educators no longer wish to vaccinate students with proper English, but seek instead to produce live autopsies of bodies to excavate and adjudicate the micro-features of the mind, body, and self.

CAUTIONARY TALES

Secondary, English studies finds itself webbed in a mesh of discourses and practices that chime echo, even as the rhetoric for writing pedagogy shifts and moves. Ardent, even stubborn beliefs that liberal-humanistic ideals precede pedagogy and assessment practices appear diffident in light of this genealogy. In

fact, we show how discursive epistemological conceptions and practices of assessment undergird and dominate those very ideals. Educators, to their chagrin, cannot escape axiological, normative, and disciplinary tendencies even as they move from behind the proverbial teacher's desk to become a writer among other writers. Classroom writing activities are not simply a collection of skills that students need to know how to use when they leave secondary schools. Complaints from the business and university communities about the lack of compositional skills remains a consistent theme, and the capacity to generate inter-rater reliability among teachers regarding "good writing" becomes even more complicated when students are encouraged to express themselves with different genres. The proverbial "you know it when you see it" mantra for how to recognize good writing does precious little for the young man or women who is trying to pass a state examination. Especially, when educators abandon them to the pedagogical marketplace to assume their own risk, care for themselves, and become owners of their work in a Neoliberal workshop. Writing pedagogies produce subjects, and subjects negotiate and resist the power/knowledge dynamics embedded within them. If power is everywhere, at least as a relation of various forces, as a game, and an action upon an action, then what are the alternatives to the current state of play? In brief, if individuals cannot exist outside of power, and writing pedagogy remains an instrument of power/knowledge, how can writing be used in the secondary classroom differently?

Although we refuse to offer any solutions to assessment, and we remain neutral on the issue of effectiveness of specific assessment practices, we appreciate and recognize that assessment is endemic in schooling; it is virtually impossible to separate epistemology from assessment practices and schooling. Liberal-humanistic intentions materialize and become realized couched in a normative calculus, and the telos of such idealisms is a normative, docile body, or an entrepreneurial subject who is forced to be free, which comprises its own network of normativities. We argue that writing can be used to get free of oneself, to know oneself differently, to experience ecstatic thinking, and to fashion a care of the self.

The question of "Who we are now?" inheres a skeptical stance towards current taken-for-granted practices (Foucault in Rabinow, 1984). Instead of assuming that certain practices or ideas are universal, normal, or transcendental, the way things have always been done, a critical ontology of ourselves problematizes current practices that seek to normalize, naturalize, and essentialize truth claims about individuals and groups. Who we are now is profoundly linked to a historically contingent collectivity that cannot be relinquished, but can be changed through an investigation of "our particular historically given practices" (May, 2006, p. 16), and through the various ways that we are encouraged to know about things and ourselves. Archaeological studies seek to reveal the porous rules that permit specific forms of privileged knowledges to emerge and determine regimes of truth about individuals.

Historians of education seem stuck in terms of knowing what to do with grading and assessment practices in secondary English. Although grading remains essentially linked to epistemologies of schooling, previous forms and their

rationalities seem best to be chronicled. This genealogy attempts to do something quite different. It tried to demarcate an historical discursive landscape in the late nineteenth century and the late twentieth century that influenced the emergences of specific, nominal writing assessment practices. Medical epistemologies pervaded the discursive landscape of education in the late nineteenth-century, and many re-emerged in the late twentieth century. Moreover, concerns about the consciousness and body of the adolescent remained a consistent theme throughout these periods, but different discourses merged with others in an effort to produce specific types of adolescent bodies. The notion of the self trumps health-related matters, but ways of textualizing and reading compositional bodies remained. The yearning to see inside the adolescent, and the pedagogical strategies to fulfil this need occurred through the confluences of multiple-competing forms of power/knowledge. The scalpel and the portfolio stand synonymous, and their approach to cut inside the body in order to catalogue, accumulate, and detect their deficiencies. The writing techniques employed in Child Study converted to the writing pedagogies in the 1980s, and while Germ Theory strongly influenced the epistemologies of writing and schooling in the late nineteenth century, the notion that signification and free play abounded in the 1980s, only to be adopted in the secondary English classroom.

We have tried to show how assessment practices focused primarily on the surface points of the adolescent compositional bodies. Influenced by various medical discourses, educational practices strove to understand and know the internal functions of the pupil's body, but settled for the cranium and lesions to determine their health and disease. The mysterious play of disease and pathogens remained as always-already in the discursive landscape. To combat the pervasiveness of disease emerged as the primary role of writing pedagogy. The adolescent body existed in a permanent pathological state, and to produce a rationalistic, orthopoedic body stood as a Herculian fete. Assessment practices converted the mind, body, and temperament into a spectacle in the sense that surface, external features performed in compositions, reflected the internal health of the adolescent. In their attempt to tap into the inner consciousness of the body through writing, the educator induced students to give an account of themselves.

GIVING AN ACCOUNT OF ONESELF

The emergence of the self as a target of power/knowledge in the early 1980s raises questions about the usefulness of language to explore, represent, and compile a self, and the role of education and specifically writing pedagogy in relation to the adolescent self. Postmodern theories, perhaps best explicated by Lyotard, dismisses the stable self and calcified identities as simply traps of essentialism, and renders the subject as mere automatons, scripted, programmed machines fulfilling predetermined pathways. Genealogical analysis, like the one here, de-centers the subject, and aligned with Foucault view of the subject and agency, it contends that the multiplicity of selves, specifically due to its reliance on language, makes the self of little use on which to build a pedagogical foundation. The notion of self is far to over- determined and too literary to offer a solution to assessment woes. The subject

may lack a solid, essential, metaphysical foundation, but maintains personal and social responsibility. It is the opacity of the self that engenders its ethics. Judith Butler (2001) makes this claim in her seminal work. The recognition of the self by an other relies on a "normative horizon" (p. 22) and a "critical opening" that possesses the possibility to alter and challenge "established regimes of truth" (p. 22).

The normative horizon exists as "impersonal and indifferent" and potentially disorients the subject's perspective. The other is a necessary component for the constitution of the subject, but also lacks a necessary privileged position that transcends the recognizable subject. The apparent normative horizon constrains the other's viewpoint, too.

> There is already not only an epistemological frame within which the face appears, but an operation of power as well, since only by virtue of certain kinds of anthropocentric dispositions and cultural frames will a given face seem to be a human face to any one of us. After all, under what conditions do some individuals acquire a face, a legible and visible face, and others do not? (Butler, 2001, p. 23).

Thus, the encounter between the subject and an other is preceded by an assemblage of historically contingent practices and ideas that demarcate the limits of n (un) recognizability. How one gives an account of oneself is limited by the very unconscious rules of engagement and practices of the speak act. How one becomes a "visible face" is a highly contingent, unstable, and risky enterprise. The subject as well as the other unwittingly understand the opacity of the face and the sketchiness of its contours, but nonetheless relies on them in order to garner and give recognition and acknowledgment. Human beings are always-already thrown to exposure to each other. Visibility is the *sine quo non* of human relationship. The question, *Who are we now?* then implies a contested relational field of recognition grounded in an limited and necessary opacity of the subject in relation to a series and assemblages of others, which is precipitated by a series of historically contingent practices and rationalities. This means that the relationship between the subject and other is rarely the same. Or to put another way, some of us receive recognition from others while some do not, and some to a greater or lesser degree than others.

The account that someone gives of themselves, the story about themselves that they tell, is never completely their own. Conditions, historical, social, contextual, psychological etc, constitute both the content and form of the accounting. In addition, giving an account implies a relinquishing of the story to someone else, which means that ceases to be the sole property of the subject.

> The "I" cannot tell the story of its own emergence, and the conditions of its own possibility, without in some sense bearing witness to a state of affairs to which one could not have been present, prior to one's own becoming, and so narrating that which one cannot know (Butler, 2001, p. 26).

Personal stories and identities contextually shift, alter, and change. More important, giving an account of oneself belies an origin and always begins *in*

media res. As Butler explains, "I am always recuperating, reconstructing, even as I produce myself differently in the very act of telling. My account of myself is partial, haunted by that for which I have no definitive story. I cannot explain exactly why I have emerged in this way and my efforts at narrative reconstruction are always undergoing revision. There is that in me and of me for which I can give no account" (p. 27). It is the blindness to oneself that necessitates the recognition and relationship to the other, and generates an ethic that maintains personal and social responsibilities despite postmodern claims of the absent, unstable, unrecognizable subject. This ethic instigates a sense of humility, patience, and generosity in the common plight of opacity. Forgiveness for what the subject cannot know and what the subject could not have fully known, and for others who exists in a similar, common plight. As Butler explains, "By not pursuing satisfaction, and by letting the question (Who are you?) remains open, even enduring, we let the Other live, since life might be understood as precisely that which exceeds any account we may try to give of it" (Butler, 2001, p. 28).

The recognition of the other, however, does not necessarily lead to satisfaction in the sense that a complete or solid understanding of the other exists in this moment. The historical and opaque residue of the subject remains constant, floating, and present in the instant of recognition. This experience of the unknowable and loose attachment between the subject and other perpetuates a desire to want to know and experience more of the other and of oneself. Once the subject thinks s/he knows the other, and proclaims, "Oh, now I know who you are," s/he ceases to know or recognize oneself. Thus, it is only through the other that one knows and gives an account of oneself and participates in an ongoing desire to fashion oneself.

Believing that one knows an other or oneself runs the "risk of arresting desire, and of putting a certain end to life" (p. 30). Desire drives the need to be recognized and offer recognition, which lingers as a dance in a free play of signification. Within this framework, forms of judgments halt recognition and, more important, provoke violence on the subject and the Other. In fact, Butler argues that recognition implies that individuals suspend judgment in order to engage in recognition of oneself and an Other. As she states, "We sometimes move too quickly to summarize another's life, and think that the ethical posture is, and must be, the one that judges, that can show not only that it can and will make judgments, but that it can justify the judgments that it makes" (p. 30). Forms of judgments are modes of address, which conditions those renditions. If, however, individuals suspend judgment, then they can consider the condemned's personhood as a reflection of the range of human possibilities in order to "prepare ourselves for or against such possibilities" (p. 30). Condemnation and judgment, then, neglects to recognize its own opacity and limitations and offers "no felicitous basis for a reciprocal recognition of human beings as constitutively limited" (p. 31). Recognition must suspend judgment in order to perpetuate life and provide a lens through which ethical reflection can occur. Forms of judgment and condemnation prohibit these elements from occurring. Furthermore, forms of pseudo-sciences, such as psychology, fail in their ethical responsibilities when they strive to offer

therapeutic tools for the analysand to create a cohesive self in light of Butler's analysis. The impossibility of constructing an identity or a self belies the condition and situation in which most individuals exist.

To give an account of oneself, then, involves a contextualized form of address between an assumed, incoherent, historically contingent subject and an assumed, incoherent, historically contingent Other. The "you" as other is an "imaginary domain" (p. 31). Speech works as a "conduit for a desire, and as a rhetorical structure that seeks to alter or act upon the interlocutory scene itself" (p. 31). Language, thus, does not simply convey information (if it could do so at all) but functions as a collection of metaphors transporting the speaker's desire to the Other. Speech acts operate as means to reveal oneself, as in a confession, and at times simultaneously as transference to the Other. The purpose of transference is not to help the patient (or student) to compose a life, or construct a rational, progressive, explanation for veritable, past occurrences, but to "enact what cannot be narrated, and to enact the unconscious as it is relived in the scene of address itself" (p. 33). Thus, rather than a coagulation of the self, transference implies a certain dislocation of both the subject and the Other. Telling a cohesive life story or an episodic encounter composed in a narrative essay remain important projects, but they can with several limitations:

> It may even be that to hold a person accountable for his or her life in narrative form is to require a falsification of that life in the name of a certain conception of ethics. Indeed, if we require that someone be able to tell in story form the reasons why his or her life has taken the path it has, that is, to be a coherent auto biographer, it may be that we prefer the seamlessness of the story to something we might tentatively call the truth of the person, a truth, which, to a certain degree, and for reasons we have already suggested, is indicated more radically as an interruption. It may be that stories have to be interrupted, and that for interruption to take place, a story has to be underway (p. 34).

If we take Butler's claims that the prevalence of the unknowable nature of the subject, and its this very opacity that promotes the ethical enterprise, then encouraging secondary students to compose writing that reflects, assembles and codifies a unified self seems misguided. The ever- constant relation of oneself to the other perpetuates life, and an continual (re) enactment of the self. The individual, in short, fashions a contextualized self from the historical residue of discourses and practices that seek to shape it. Responsibility lies in recognizing the transference that occurs in a communicative exchange and potential for the subject to live with incomplete information about itself, about the world, and about the Other.

Indeed, the available lexicon for students to use in their compositions was in many respects handed down to them; students are essentially thrown into specific historical, socio-cultural moments with a collection of available words, grammar, and syntax in which to express themselves. Codifying the self represents a form of violence in that it seeks to demarcate, to imprison the self and thus restrict the

possibilities for the very ontology of the human being (Hacking, 2002). The consciousness of the subject may be mysterious and unknown, but it is certainly not a blank slate. In fact, what may be present in the conscious and unconscious of the individual is an assemblage of historical constructs and positions that the student enacts. Relying on the tools of the present archive to express the self in order to generate a sense of liberation seems unreasonable and even foolish. Judgments and evaluations of self-sketches in writing prove harmful not just to the subject, but also to the person judging in that they limit and restrict the possibilities of human experiences. It is only through engagements with an Other that one sees or experiences oneself. Perhaps writing in secondary schools could be used as a means of care of the self for the individual. A care of the self that belies a unified subject, or one that seeks to compose fictions as an escape from the self, or the self built on a variety of regimes of truth. The practice of geneaologies can serve as a means through which students can compose a care of the self. The next section unpacks this notion further.

CARE OF THE SELF

We wish to make the claim that writing pedagogy can become a technique of the self and as one that fosters a care of the self. This position does not fail to take into account the importance of knowing oneself, but within Foucault's problematics of the subject, he explores the intersections between knowing oneself and caring for oneself. In his investigation he explains that knowing oneself trumps caring for the self during the "Cartesian moment" (Foucault, 2005, p. 17). Foucault exploration into the techniques of caring for oneself is not a nostalgic attempt to return to a golden moment of the subject, and neither is it an attempt to develop a theory of the self or the subject, but as a way to problematize current a priori formalistic schools of the subject (e.g. psychology) and to give weight to the hidden, unknown ways that individuals care for themselves as a way of knowing themselves and to develop the truth about themselves. Truth does not come in the form of a priori construct that help individuals develop a unified self, but in the ways in which one cares for oneself does one discover the truth about oneself. The point is that for Foucault caring for oneself involves escaping oneself, or engaging in fictions as a means to transform the experiences of one's subjectivity. Forms of subjectivity emerge historically, and as such demand a critical encounter with discourses and practices to shift the everyday experiences of individuals. Subjectivities remain in a constant state of change, and are thus malleable, but not through the use of the same historical archive or lexicon, but through a descent into history to investigate how certain forms emerge as means to tell the truth about a subject.

Subjects begin with historical limits, and exploring the historicity of these limits not so much by what power/knowledge are (i.e developing a theory of power), but by what they do, and their effects on how subjects relate to themselves. The notion of an ethical care of the self as an escape from these historical limits of the self, precipitated by scientifism in the domains of life, language and labor, opens up a space for the practices of freedom and a flight from the self. Humanism made the

absolute demarcations of man its absolute project with irrational effects. Knowledge of man ultimately turned against itself, belying the ambiguous and chaotic components of the self. Thus, the need to escape "…those prisons of thought and action that shape our politics, our ethics, our relations to ourselves," (Bernauer, 1990, p. 179) summarizes Foucault's intellectual and personal project. The ecstatic experiment presents a critical, agitated ethos, one designed for permanent provocation of the ways and means of relating to oneself in one's historical moment. As Foucault states, "What can be the ethic of an intellectual—I accept the title of intellectual which seems at present to nauseate some people—if not that: to render oneself permanently capable of getting free of oneself" (Foucault in Bernauer, 1994, p. 69). Instead of encouraging the subject to coalesce a self, ecstasy occurs through at "series of critiques that aim not at an Absolute Emancipation but rather at experimental transgressions of the self" (Bernauer, 1990, p. 180). Foucault urged for new forms and practices of relating to oneself, and rather than promoting self-absorption, he contends that these forms emerge through an agonistic struggle within historical contexts rather than through isolated experiences. The self is not decontextualized, but self-determining "…only through a struggle with and a stylizing or adaptation of those concrete possibilities that present themselves as invitations for a practice of liberty" (Bernauer, 1990, p. 181). This struggle is, for Foucault, a work of art rather than the implementation and re-enactment of a specific protocol. The force and effort of the work of art is an ecstatic experience, not in the sense that one can become transcendent or self-actualized, but to realize that once God and man are dead, we do not need substitutes for them, and we do not need violent forms of codification that dismiss the chaotic, mysterious, and unknown features of man. As Bernauer (1990) writes, "In an analogous way, his (Foucault's) last writings acknowledge our impatience for liberty and our passion for ecstasy, but direct these not to the pursuit of some messianic future but to an engagement with the numberless potential transgressions of those forces that war against our self-creation and our solidarity" (p. 183).

In many respects, then, to create an ecstatic experience, the care of the self via writing involves composing fictions. Fictional texts can offer modifications to the complex interrelationships between knowledge-power-self as an investigation of the historical struggle of regimes of truth. A fiction, according to Foucault, provides language that connects "that which does not exist, in so far as it is (Foucault in O'Leary, 2009, p. 87). A fiction is not outside of truth, but is rather interested in the creative force it generates within a historical context. What Foucault is most interested in is texts that produce transformative experiences which are fictions. As O'Leary states, "The experience that the book makes possible is founded on the truth of its findings, but the experience itself is a new creation which may even, up to a certain point, destroy the truth on which it is based" (O'Leary, 2009, p. 88).

A transformative experience via fiction offers the possibility for an alteration of the ways in which individuals perceive, think, and behave in the world and with oneself. They, in short, modify the subjectivities of the individual. Experiences are fiction in the sense that they provide ways of engaging and interacting with the

world. Liberation movements buttressed by scientificity of man seek to determine through legal and religion, to develop an ethic based on the codified self and identity politics, but have fallen short for reasons that should be clear by now. Yet, Foucault's interest in the techniques, modes, and strategies for caring for the self offers no solutions or alternatives to current concerns with the subject. Instead he is more interested in problematizing notions of the self that exceed quests at determining the strict limits of the self. As he states in his 1981–1982 lecture:

> For centuries we have been convinced that between our ethics, our person ethics, our everyday life, and the great political and social and economic structures, there were analytical relations, and that we couldn't change anything, for instance, in our sex life or our family life, without ruining our economy, our democracy, and so on. I think we have to get rid of this idea of an analytical or necessary link between ethics and other social or economic or political structures (Foucault in Rabinow, 1997a, p. 261).

Ethics as one's relationship to oneself involves a collection of a multitude of techniques of the self, or how one constitutes oneself as a moral subject through techniques of the self. Techniques of the self are often hidden, or unknowable and are often linked to ways to govern others, or proscribe methods of taking care of oneself in specific ways. Knowing oneself, for Foucault, is important in the taking care of oneself; one can take care of oneself simultaneously as one knows oneself, but this occurs through a variety of techniques of the self that are not based on "…a priori theories of the subject in order to analyze the relationships that may exist between the constitution of the subject or different forms of the subject and games of truth, practices of power, and so on (Foucault in Rabinow, 1997a, p. 290).

Foucault argues that there are four aspects of the relationship to oneself that defy predetermined, formulaic theories of the subject. They are

1. Ethical substance: Which part of myself do I focus on to alter or shape in order to be an ethical subject?
2. Mode of subjection: How am I invited or encouraged to fashion myself in a certain way to be an ethical subject?
3. Self-forming activity: What practices do I engage in order to fashion myself as an ethical subject?
4. Telos, or goal: What kind of being do I want to become?

It is important to note that Foucault's aspects of the self are open-ended questions. Ethical self-fashioning involves a continual practice of testing oneself, one's thoughts, ideas, behaviors as one relates to oneself and with others. Answers to these questions are not necessarily predetermined or standardized, but involve a constant questioning of oneself. Moreover, these questions need to be posed to oneself in different contexts. The fluid self fashions itself in certain situations and in specific historical instances. For example, individuals fashion themselves as teachers, as partners, as professors etc. Historically contingent discourses and practices inform how one fashions oneself. However, instead of offering a script

and a guidebook on how to fashion oneself, individuals answer these questions through the process of becoming a teacher, a partner, a professor etc. Specific technologies of the self are nontotalizing, nonessentializing, without a normative horizon, and do not offer positive knowledge about the nature of human beings, or to be prescriptive to determine deviancy, abnormality, or at-riskness. Fashioning the self through the axis of care of the self and to know the self is an ongoing process of becoming and often slips through the grips of the scientificity of power/knowledge. We argue that engaging in a Foucaultian-inspired genealogy functions as a care of the self, as an ethical self-fashioning, and a way to know oneself.

THE PEDAGOGIES OF THE GENEOLOGICAL ANALYTIC

If there is a solution to the woes of secondary English teachers, it is found in Foucault's genealogy. Foucault's admonition to Jana Sawicki to stop talking about him and to do genealogies implies that he implores his readers to practice an ethical self-fashioning through the process of wading in the grey area of the genealogy (Macey, 1993). A researcher could not but change or alter oneself to complete the research and complete the writing of a genealogy. The assumptions and methodological precautions of the Foucaultian-genealogy destablize the genealogists as s/he suspends commonly held beliefs and thoughts. When one abandons metaphysics, normative hermeneutics, and a cohesive theory of the self, one can only descend into history with a polyhedronic perspective in order to contest current taken-for-granted practices. For Foucault, there are three types of genealogies:

> First, a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to truth through which we constitute ourselves as subjects of knowledge; second, a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to a field of power through which we constitute ourselves as subjects acting on others; third, a historical ontology in relation to ethics through which we constitute ourselves as moral agents (p. 262).

The genealogical analytic offers some inroads into technologies of the self that may be employed in secondary schools. Moreover, the genealogy helps educators think differently about the purposes and effects of writing in secondary English classrooms. The first type of genealogy investigates the ways in which regimes of truth emerge in order to determine the truth about a subject and how those regimes of truth encourage the subject to relate to oneself. A priori theories of the self, which espouse truth about the subject can be shown to be unstable, apocryphal, and even fictions. The second type of genealogy examines the ways in which the subject converts and relates to oneself as an object in the manifold power relations. Here the subject is not simply a passive agent, but negotiates and maneuvers these power relations in a strategic game between different forces. Disciplinary strategies employed to render the subject docile and the technology of the examination in schools designed to normalize students are clear examples of this form of genealogy. Finally, the third type of genealogy descents into history to consider the

various ways that individuals are encouraged to relate themselves in relation to others. Ethics refers to the rapport one has with oneself, such as diet, habits, sexual practices, and how these relate to how one relates to others. Foucault's work on the technologies of the self in his 1981–1982 lectures at the College de France investigate the technologies of the self outside of current regimes of science is an example of this type of genealogy. Each of these types, however, we contend function as a work on the self for Foucault, and can offer a different perspective on writing pedagogy in schools. The idea is not to use writing forms that the Greeks used to fashion themselves, but to complicate current practices and discourses of writing pedagogy. The next section explicates the assumptions of the Foucaultian-inspired genealogy and the choices we made in this one. Our genealogy is predominately an example of the second type of genealogy.

Genealogies do not search for an origin to concepts or major historical occurrences, instead it focuses on the chance events that are dismissed or neglected from grand narratives. Moreover, they seek to show dispersion of events and practices rather than cohesion and progressive development. The body is the primary focus of genealogical investigations, and the ways in which power/knowledge cuts, deciphers, catalogues, and builds truths around both wholesale and retail parts of the body. It does not seek to reveal or describe the whole historical picture, but begins with a problem in the present; hence, genealogies are histories of the present. They are so, not in the sense that the genealogists returns to the archive in order to find a progressive narrative, one that ends with the proclamation that the present moment is the best we have, or the most civilized, or the most humanistic. Instead, they describe the contentious battles among various practices and discourses in order to problematize current practices and ways of relating to one self and each other. Rather than unifying historical data, genealogies seek to inject the notion of chance in both historical events and in current regimes of truth.

The managing and manipulating of the body through normalizing practices and discourses, through pastoral care which seeks to shape the individual into a specific codified self, but as a means to offer different perspectives on current taken-for-granted practices, which impact how a person interacts with themselves and with others. Power/knowledge therefore, is not necessarily negative or prohibitive, but is productive in that it produces a certain subject. Spatial arrangements demarcated by contentious forms of power/knowledge that emerge historically delimit the area of the sayable, knowable, desireable, and doable within a given context. Genealogies are "relations of power, not relations of meaning" (Foucault in Gordon, 1980a, , p. 114).

Genealogical analysis poses the question of how certain practices emerge over others at specific historical moments to dictate and determine the ways in which an individual relates to him/herself and how individuals are encourage to interact and relate to others. Rather than heralding certain practices as unique to the current historical moment, the genealogist operates from a position of suspicion about those practices and the rhetoric of liberation and humanism that engulf them. Foucault's concern about practices with humanistic intensions and promises of

liberation stems from his emphasis on power relations as endemic to most communicative acts and encounters. The technologies of power grease humanism with forms of domination and control, with the body as power's central target.

The rise of human sciences couched in humanistic rhetoric and the promises of liberation represent the current historical moments at obtaining freedom. Knowledge of man and his predilections and plights equip individuals with schema and priori guidebooks to help shape their lives with normalization equating to liberation and happiness. Foucault's suspicion of traditional historical narratives that seek to offer explanations and cohesive accounts of past events represents his rejection of uniform, uncontested notions of time. His use of temporal displacement provides himself and the reader with a view of history and the present moment as an assemblage of the "economy of power" relations that persists in a vast historical field. Strategies of power/knowledge and technologies of the self merges with other forms, go underground, re-emerge in later periods with different discourses and practices.

Foucault offers no clear methods textbook on how to complete a genealogy. Instead what he offers are methodological precautions and specific assumptions the researcher needs to consider when s/he tackles a genealogical project. Our purpose for including these in this section is to support our argument that writing genealogies is a care of the self event. Because Foucault is suspicious of essences, claims to naturalness, and most claims totality and unifying thought, the genealogist operates in a nominalist stance. S/her problematizes a specific taken-for-granted practice in the current moment and reveals the historical play of power moves on the body of that specific practice. As Flynn notes, "It is the historian's task to uncover discursive and nondiscursive practices in their plurality and contingency in order to reveal the fields that render intelligible an other wise heterogeneous collection of events. There is no foundational principle, no originating or final cause" (Flynn in Gutting, 1994, p. 40). The event for Foucault is not necessarily revolutions or the election of a president, but a "reversal of a relationship of forces, the usurpation of power, the appropriation of a vocabulary against those who had once used it, a feeble domination that poisons itself as it grows lax, the entry of a masked 'other.'" (Foucault in Bouchard, p. 154). The randomness of events allows the genealogists to inject chance into history and into the current moment. There are no origins and no final moments to history, to subjectivities, and to human potentialities, but historical struggles over the body and its most minute features. In response to traditional historians, Foucault remarks that they had relied too much on the communicative capacities of language to relay and convey meaning and that the logic used to construct ideas in specific historical moments preserved their logic. Traditional historians, Foucault proclaims,

> "…ignored the fact that the world of speech and desires has known invasions, struggles, plundering, disguises, and ploys. From these elements however, genealogy retrieves an indispensable restraint: it must record the singularity of events outside of any monotonous finality; it must seek them in the most unpromising places, in what we tend to feel is without history—in sentiments, love, conscience, instincts; it must be sensitive to their

> recurrence, not in order to trace the gradual curve of their evolution, but to isolate the different scenes where they engaged in different roles. Finally, genealogy must define even those instances where they are absent, the moment when they remained unrealized (Plato, at Syracuse, did not become Mohammed) (Foucault in Bouchard, 1977, pp. 139–140).

To employ the Foucault's geneaological analytic as a care of the self, the scholar needs to remain vigilant about pursuing historical origins of practices and suspicious of grand narratives and totalizing histories. The purpose of composing a genealogy as a care of the self is to fictionalize one's experience, to escape the historically contingent regimes of truth that seek to instruct and guide how one relates to oneself and others, and to insert chance in everyday life and notions of the self. The genealogist is not focused on concepts to provide an intellectual history of a certain practice that emerges in the present, but exposes the power moves that inform the scientificity of subjectivity. The subject is de-centered, and is not necessarily the uncontested author of his/her experience, but is both the subject and object of the genealogy. In fact, genealogies investigate how the subject turns oneself into an object in ethical self-fashioning.

The genealogist problematizes a taken-for-granted practice in a specific context in the current moment. When an object "enters into the play of the true and the false and constitutes it as an object of thought (whether in the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, or the like" (Flynn in Gutting, 1994, p. 37), and seeks to show dispersion and fluidity rather than continuity and stability. S/he examines texts from multiple sources as the genealogists excavates the discourses and practices that strive to control and dominate bodies in an attempt to influence ethical self-fashioning (McWhorter, 1999). The body is the target of power/knowledge, is discloses the inscriptions of historical events. Reveals fissures in logic, historically deconstructs humanistic rhetoric and progressive notions of liberation.

Looks for the moment of arising when certain practices and discourses employed to determine truth about a subject, or encourage the subject to interact with him/her self in relation to truth. Pit local knowledge with unified knowledge—using the archive and history to resurrect subjugated knowledges to contest or challenge unifying theories or truth telling or determining theories. To contest typologies and hierarchies of knowledge that places subjects within certain logic and regimes of truth. The genealogists searches for power at the extremities, within networks that circulate, and as ascending rather than from above. Power produces subjects, it arranges spaces and determines the sayable, knowable, doable, and desirable within a given context. As Foucault states, power "is the production of effective instruments that form and accumulate knowledge" (Foucault, 2003, p. 30). The degrees of rationalization (degree of effectiveness); rationalizations as an "instrumental and relative meaning (Foucault, 1994b, p. 229). This means that we want to see how rationalities "inscribe themselves in practices and systems of practices, and what role they play within them—because it's true that "practices" don't exists without a certain regime of rationality (Foucault, 1994b, p. 230).

The genealogy for this book began with an initial question of how did the portfolio emerge as a viable form of assessment of secondary students. The portfolio leaped to the center of the educational landscape in the early 1990s and trumped most other previous forms of writing assessment. We decenter the subject in the sense that we did not believe that the idea of a writing portfolio did not spontaneously appear due to the brilliance of any one educator, but was made possible due to a confluence of multiple historical factors many of which remain unknowable. In our investigation of portfolio assessment, several items appeared. We noticed that it was positioned in humanistic, progressivist rhetoric. Claims that the portfolio affords students the opportunity to show their real selves, interact with real, authentic writing activities, which in turn allow students to show what they know more accurately and more clearly. The desire to move beyond traditional assessment practices to include a variety of genres and forms of expression instead of strict rational approaches such as the expository essay, shows the progressivist tendencies. The humanist-progressivist rhetoric mediates forms of power/knowledge over the adolescent body. We maintained that forms of assessment strive to mold and shape the pupil's body as humanist-progressive rhetoric persuaded educators to implement the portfolio into secondary schools. The portfolio transformed into a technology of assessment that proliferated, diversified, and modified as it raced throughout the halls of all educational institutions. To us, the portfolio represented a spreading out of the adolescent, as an autopsy, and as an attempt of power/knowledge to poke and prod the adolescent body from various entry points. Where multiple-choice, and essay tests failed, the portfolio opens up the adolescent and encourages students to make a case of themselves. The failures of traditional testing, such as guessing, and regurgitating the essay formula appeared to be adjusted for in the portfolio. Writing about personal experiences in a portfolio showcased what the student could and could not do. Multiple samples, or specimens, provide reliability and validity that is akin to a physician's diagnosis.

But a genealogy is not simply a discourse analysis of current practices. Instead it is comparative and uses history to offer a critical reflection on present taken-for-granted practices. Reading grand narratives of secondary English, assessment, and grading of student writing, gave us the perspective of assessment as a continuous, progressive form. In our research, we located another historical moment when the limits of secondary education, writing assessment, and adolescents in general were problematized. Documents from the journal *School Review* from 1893–1900 were neglected from Applebee's grand narrative of secondary English education. We resurrect those subjugated knowledges from this corpus to contest traditional, progressive historical perspectives of secondary English education. Although there were several articles about a variety of aspects of secondary education, we focused on articles that dealt primarily with secondary English education, and more specifically with composition studies.

A review of articles from *School Review* revealed that educators in the 1890s scattered to corral the post-grammar school population. Curriculum battles and school organization and administration had more to do with health than labor.

Concerns for the adolescent body proved paramount as medical metaphors dominated the epistemologies of schooling and writing pedagogy as evidenced in the first two chapters of this book. Medical metaphors have been completely dismissed in the grand narratives of secondary English education, writing assessment, and writing pedagogy in general. Resurrecting those subjugated knowledges revealed that epistemologies of medicine greatly influenced the discursive landscape of secondary education in the late nineteenth century. The adolescent body remained the target of power/knowledge during this time period. Descriptions of students and teachers were positioned using medical discourses. Moreover, organizational concerns and administrative matters of secondary school were couched in terms of health of the adolescent body. These revelations about the epistemological relationship between medicine and secondary education propelled us to investigate the history of medicine in the United States. We do not present a complete history of medicine, but use history that focuses on ways of knowing the health and disease of the body. Disease emerged as a dominant theme in this section due to the many metaphorical references in the documents in *School Review* (see chapter two).

Medical metaphors in artifacts from School Review compelled us to investigate the epistemological changes in the history of medicine in the United States. We began by looking at the position of the physician in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. We relied on several sources to assemble chapter one of this book, but it is important to note that we kept the body as our target. We wanted to show the analogous relationship between the medicalized body and the adolescent, scholastic body. Conceptions of disease and health of the mid-to-late nineteenth century porously seeped into educational discourses. Moreover, instruments and operations designed to know more about the life and death, health and disease of the body appeared in educational discourses. Attempts to calculate the causes of disease and the maintain health soak the discursive space of secondary education. Writing assignments in schools seeks to aid reformers with preventing or ameliorating disease. The first two chapters of this book employ archaeological elements in the sense that we were looking for the epistemic rules that structured the sayable and knowlable of education in the late nineteenth-century; however, we focused on the body and the ways in which power/knowledge shifted in order to get inside of the adolescent body. Medical researchers performed autopsies and tracked the paths of diseases and educational reformers strive for similar accomplishments. To this end we see the emergence of individualized instruction, laboratory pedagogy and Child Study as epistemological shifts of power/knowledge. Again, power/knowledge greased by progressive-humanist intensions scrambled to locate and verify instruments to get inside the adolescent body and accumulate knowledge about them both wholesale and retail. Epistemologies of assessment, evaluation, and judgment undergird these instruments with the intent to normalize and control individuals and whole populations.

This archival work, however, would prove useless on some level if it neglected to offer a different perspective on the present historical moment. What we found in

our research on portfolio assessment is a reliance on medical metaphors to describe the effects of portfolios. The epistemologies of medicine re-emerged in the 1980s in the writing pedagogy scholarship. Most overtly, the portfolio was described as giving teachers X-ray vision of the student's unique thumbprint. These metaphors sparked research into the history of fingerprinting and the discovery of Roetegen Rays (e.g. X-rays). Archival research revealed that advances in medical technology and criminology occurred in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. The will to power to know the human being by documenting external, physical features, and by getting inside the body consumed educators, medical practitioners, and criminologists. The quest to accumulate knowledge, to calculate, categorize, catalogue, and to normalize, indeed to standardize the microphysics of the body became the great obsession of this time period. Entering the body from a variety of angles using multiple instruments and resources emerged as a means to garner reliable evidence in which to make valid inferences about the body. Child Study, again, is our exemplar here. Nonetheless, writing activities in secondary schools became artifacts of the student's internal composition and as a reflection of the adolescent's present health and potential for disease. Producing rational compositions afforded students with the opportunity to have moments of fitness in a space bathed in microbes and germs. Even the English language was pathologized. Hence the reliance on rational forms of writing indicated and reflected health.

Concerns for health did not leave the discursive landscape of education. Some discourses went underground, while others emerged with other discourses and practices. Specifically, our research indicates that medical metaphors merge with self-psychology and the Bertillion Card to inform the portfolio. Medicine, criminology, and psychology impress the space of writing pedagogy in the late 1980s in the United States. As a genealogy, or as a specific, nominalist history, these are not the only ones; they are the ones we found in our research. Discourses and practices from these three areas offer a polyhedronic perspective of writing assessment. Notions of the self dominate writing pedagogy and portfolio assessment, and the relationship between the teacher and the student shifts during this time. Self-psychology emerges in the late 1980s and trumped other traditional approaches. This research shows an analygous relationship between the tenets of self-psychology and the secondary English classroom; in particular, the relationship between the individual and external environment. Here we see the teacher move from behind the proverbial desk to become one writer among other writers in the secondary English classroom. Writing becomes an instrument to produce a cohesive, unified self, and as a way of learning and knowing oneself.

Consciousness, once seen as a chaotic underworld in need of a sovereign in the nineteenth-century, transformed into a miniature city in need of a governor who could manage the multiple neighborhoods. The portfolio sought to expose those areas of the inner consciousness of the adolescent. Free-writing, the development of voice, authentic expression, conferencing and journaling all emerged as pedagogical strategies to get inside of that world and expose it to a normative horizon. The subject in the secondary English classroom was viewed as unique,

complex, and in need of order and direction. Producing an identity consumed secondary English teachers in the mid-to-late 1980s and early 1990s. Samples from different areas of the adolescent's inside world provided reliable evidence of their abilities to write and capacities of personhood. The portfolio emerges as an instrument of power/knowledge to induce adolescents to relate to themselves in certain ways, and as historical subjects, students enter the classroom to face a whole host of historical contingent discourses and practices that delimit the space of the classroom and the limits of the individual's subjectivities. Indeed, writing portfolios produce a certain subject.

The subject as an identity transformed into the production of the entrepreneur when the portfolio develops into a high stakes assessment in the state of Kentucky. Neoliberal discourses mediate the injection of the portfolios in schools, but this time the purpose of the portfolio is to produce an autonomous subject capable of assuming and negotiating its own risk and security, as well as promoting and improving its human capital. The teacher is placed at the margins in the classroom as the pedagogical free-market reigns. Power/knowledge moves the teacher from the front of the room, to the student's chair, to the margins of the classroom. The purpose of expanding the pedagogical market place is to encourage adolescents to practice being owners of themselves; or to state another way, to be Neoliberal subjects. The composition transforms into an untouchable, sanctified rendition of the student's real self, as his/her capacities to produce independent, autonomous sketches that demonstrate his/her abilities to negotiate and maneuver the pedagogical market-place undergirded by laissez-faire, neo-classical economic policies based on growth models. Human capital theory proposes that adolescents need to learn to continue to grow, change, and fashion themselves based on their personal needs and ambitions and the economic conditions they are in. The adolescent becomes more than *homo economicus*, they emerge as entrepreneurs capable of taking care of themselves without the social safety nets of welfare institutions. The portfolio functions as an instrument of a political economy based on Neoliberal principles of governmentality (Carlson in Peters et al, 2009).

CONCLUSION

Our genealogy however, is merely a fiction. It seeks to offer a different perspective on a singular taken-for-granted practice. As a fiction, it does not dismiss historical inaccuracies, or perpetuate progressive historical narratives, and fails to offer solutions to writing assessment practices in secondary schools. Genealogical writing and research functions as a care of the self in that it provides an escape from oneself, it requires a change in perspective on a normal, common sense practice of schooling. More important, it offers a few inroads for how to resist the normalizing features of assessment. Composing a genealogy is an act of resistance; and reading one can serve as a springboard for other ones. The process of researching and writing a Foucautian-inspired genealogy involves a work on the self. And, much like failures of power/knowledge, despite its best efforts to X-ray it, the characteristics and elements of this process remain unknown and belie

captivity. The ambiguous and chaotic components of the ontology of ourselves remain. Producing a genealogy allows one to become someone else by the end of it. The ethical issue in teaching writing in secondary schools may not necessarily be how to tweak and modify assessment practices so that they better capture the student's true abilities, or reflect his/her authentic self.

The ethical issue may involve suspending judgment and evaluation in order to promote technologies of writing that foster a care of the self through experimentation in order to know the self. Secondary schools for decades in the United States have focused primarily on ways of knowing the self, and endorsing instruments that foster the adolescent to know his/her identity. This approach in light of this genealogy appears to be misguided at best and harmful at its worst. Various techniques of writing can be used as experimental features of an individual's approach to fashioning his/her self, which does not necessarily involve predetermined rubrics set forth to evaluate and judge their abilities of caring for the self. Epistemologies are already invested in practices of schooling and pedagogy in particular.

Whether a person practices a certain care of the self, or employs writing as a practice on the self belies a prior theories of the subject, or liberal-humanistic notions of schooling. Instead, they involve a continual practice on the self to constantly experiment and test oneself, your thoughts, behaviors, and desires in order to produce new subjectivities that expand the possibilities of the human being. Technologies of the self operate in consultation with others, and engender a responsibility to others in the sense that the Other offers a window into the self's composition and the potentialities of being human. Foucaultian ethics does not promote nihilism or relativism, instead it provokes a constant provocation with the various and competing regimes of truth that attempt to dictate how one should relate to oneself. Moreover, the point is not that there is no meaning, but that meaning is over-determined and that knowledge production is over-developed. The point is not to instill more knowledge to students, but to foster a space for them to care for the self. Writing can serve as one technology among many to achieve this endeavor. Suspending adjudication, promoting a descent into history to reveal dispersion, chance, opportunity, discontinuity as grounds for the emergence of certain practices to emerge at specific historical moments offers a continual practice that generates ecstatic thinking and opportunities for freedom as one learns to know oneself through caring for the self within regimes of power/knowledge truths. Such an approach induces life into schooling that provokes the vital question in this historical moment of, *Who are we now?*, and embrace the artful forger in each of us.

REFERENCES

Administrative Code for Kentucky's Educational Assessment Program (1999). Kentucky Department of Education, http://www2.fortthomas.kyschools.us/SP_KDE_Forms/AdministrationCode.pdf

Aiton, G.B. (1897). The purpose of English in the high school. *The School Review, 5*(3), 146–170.

Albritton, T., Turnbull, P., Yeazell, C.D., & Dolan, C.P. (1985). Facets: The role of the English teacher in the development of moral values. *The English Journal, 74*(8), 14–17.

Amodeo, J. (1998). Rising to the challenge of high-stakes assessment. In Giselle O. Martin-Kniep (Ed), *Why am I Doing This?: Purposeful Teaching Through Portfolio Assessment* (pp. 121–133). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Angell, E.B. (1900). *Imperative ideas in the sane and their management*. Read at the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the American Neurological Association.

Applebee, A. N. (1974). *Tradition and reform in the teaching of English: A history*. Urbana, Illinois: National council of Teachers of English.

Assmus, A. (1995). Early history of X-rays. *Beam Line*, *25*(2), 10–24.

Atkinson, F.W. (1897). Child study in secondary schools. *The School Review, 5*(7), 461–466.

Atkinson, F.W. (1897a). The capacities of secondary school students. *The School Review*, *5*(10), 641–652.

Atkinson, F.W. (1900). How can the public high school reach individuals? *The School Review, 8*(7), 377–387.

Atwell, N. (1985). Everyone sits at a big desk: Discovering topics for writing. *The English Journal*, *74*(5), 35–39.

Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Approved Course of Study for High Schools and Academies in the State of New York. *The School Review*. *7*(1), 58–60.

Badiou, A. (2007). The event in Deleuze. *Parrhesia, 2*, 37–44.

Baker, B. (2001). *In perpetual motion: Theories of power, education, and the child.* New York: Peter Lang.

Barbour, F.A. (1898). English composition in the high school. The School Review, *6*(7), 500–513.

Bartholomew, B. (1982). A student learns to write. *The English Journal*, *71*(1), 32–33.

Besley, A.C. & Peters, M.A. (2007). *Subjectivity & truth: Foucault, education, and the culture of self.* New York: Peter Lang.

Becker, G.S. (1962). Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Political Economy,* 70, 9–49.

Becker, G.S. (1971). *The economics of discrimination* (2nd edition). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago press.

Becker, G.S. (1992). *The economic way of looking at life*. Nobel Lecture, December 9, 1992.

Bernauer, J.W. (1990). *Michel Foucault's force of flight: Toward an ethics for thought*. Amherst, New York: Humanity Books.

Bernauer, J. W. (1994). Michel Foucault's ecstatic thinking. In J.W. Bernauer and D. Rasmussen (Eds.). *The Final Foucault* (pp. 45–82). Cambridge and London: The MIT Press.

Bertillon, A. (1896). *Signaletic instruction: Including the theory and practice of anthropometrical identification* (trans. R. W. Mcclaughry. Chicago: Sharp and Smith.

Bishop, P. A. (1996). Promoting student self-knowledge through writing portfolios. *Middle School Journal*, *28*(1), 33–36.

Blair, C.J. (1988). Writing about "The Cosby Show." *The English Journal*, *77*(6), 61.

Black, L. et al. (Eds.) (1995). *New directions in portfolio assessment: Reflective practice, critical theory, and large-scale scoring*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.

Bradbury, W.F., Collar, W.C., & Peck, W. T. (1893). The New England Association of colleges and preparatory schools. *The School Review*, *1*(10), 587–667.

REFERENCES

Brimmer, L.D. (1982). The effects of praise and blame on writing. *The English Journal*, *71*(1), 58–60.

Boyd. R. (1998). The origins and evolution of grading student writing. In Zak, F. & Weaver, C.C. (Eds). *The theory and practice of grading writing: Problems and possibilities* (3–16). Albany: State University of New York Press

Brown, V.E. (1987). Seizing the moment. *The English Journal, 76*(3), 24–25.

Brockhaus, R. H. (1980). Risk taking propensity of entrepreneurs. The Academy of Management Journal, *23*(3), 509–520.

Bruton, D.L. & Kirby, D.L. (1987). Research in the classroom: Writing fluency: didn't we do that last year? *English Journal*, 76(7), 89–92.

Buchan, V. (1964). Empathy. *The English Journal, 53*(5), 318.

Bulger, G. (2002). *The enlightened entrepreneur: A spiritual approach to creating and marketing a company.* New York: Marlowe and company.

Burke, K. (1969) *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burnette, PE. (1980). Staff grading as an alternative to schizophrenia in composition class. *The English Journal*, *69*(8), 32–36.

Burnham, W.H. (1897). Suggestions from the psychology of adolescence. *The School Review*, *5*(10), 652–683.

Bushnell, A.B. (1893). The teacher as a professional expert. *School Review*, 1(1), pp. 4–14.

Butler, J. (2001). Giving an account of oneself. *Diacritics*, *31*(4), 22–40.

Calabrese, M.E. (1982). I don't grade papers anymore. *The English Journal*, *71*(1), 28–31.

Callahan, S. (1997). Kentucky's state-mandated writing portfolios and teacher accountability. In Kathleen Blake Yancey and Irwin Weiser (Eds.) *Situating portfolios: Four perspectives*, (pp. 57–71). Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Camus, A. (1942). *The myth of Sisyphus*. Paris: Gallimard.

Carlson, D.L. (2009). Producing entrepreneurial subjects: Neoliberal rationalities and portfolio assessment. In M. A. Peters, A.C. Besley, M. Olssen, S. Maurer, and S. Weber (eds). *Governmentality Studies in Education.* Rotterdam, Boston, and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Carrol, J.A. (1981). *The language game: Talking through the writing process*. The English Journal, *70*(7), 100–102.

Cashdan, S. (1988). *Object relations therapy: Using the relationship*. New York and London: WWNorton & Company

Cassedy, J. H. (1991). *Medicine in America: a short history*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Castel, R. (1991). From dangerousness to risk. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (eds). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 281–298). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cattell, J.M. (1890). Mental tests and measurement, *Mind*, *15*, 378–371.

Cazden, Courtney, Cope, Bill, Fairclough, Norman, Gee, Jim, et al. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–93.

Chapman, Valerie-Lee. (2003). On 'knowing one's self' self writing, power and ethical practice: Reflections from an adult educator. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 35*(1), 35–53.

Choi, K.T, Parypinski, P, Kimball, S., Grotewold, S., Wenzel, M.C., and Hill, M.H. (1989). The round table: Involving students in evaluation. English Journal, *78*(7), 75–77.

Clark, W.A. (1986). How to completely individualize a writing program. In T.Newkirk (Ed) *To compose: Teaching writing in the high school* (pp. 47–54). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cole, S. (2001). *Suspect identities: a history of fingerprinting and criminal identification*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Cole, S. A. (1998). Witnessing identification: Latent fingerprinting evidence and expert knowledge [Special issue]. *Social Studies of Science*, *28*(5/6), 687–712.

Cole, S. (1999). What count for identity?: The historical origins of the methodology of latent fingerprint identification. *Science in Context, 12*(1), 139–172.

Cole, D.J., Ryan, C.W, & Kick, F. (1995). *Portfolios across the curriculum and beyond*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Commager, H.S. (1967) (ed.). *Lester Ward and the welfare state.* New York: MacMillian Publishing Company.

Copeland, E. (1973). The several-circled search for self. The English Journal, *62*(8), 1139–1144.

Corti, V. (trans.) (1968). *Antonin Artaud: collected words* (volume one). London: John Calder.

Cruikshank, Barbara. (1993). The will to empower: Technologies of citizenship and the war on poverty. *Socialist Review*, *23*(4), 29–55.

Crusius, T. W. (1991). *A teacher's introduction to philosophical hermeneutics*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms 1890–1990*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Culler, J. (1980). Literary competence. In J.P. Tompkins (Ed.). *Reader-response criticism: From formalism to post-structuralism* (101–117). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cunningham, A. & Williams, P. (eds) (1992). *The laboratory revolution in medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Cunningham, A. (1992). Transforming plague: the laboratory and the identity of infectious disease. In Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams (eds), The laboratory revolution in medicine (pp. 209–244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cushman, P. (1990). Why the self is empty: Toward a historically situated psychology. *American Psychologist*, *45*(5), 599–611.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Performance-based assessment and educational equity. *Harvard Educational Review, 64*(1), 5–30.

Davis, M. (1985). Becoming: A course in autobiography. *The English Journal, 74*(3), 34–36.

Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London and Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Dean, Mitchell. (2002). Liberal government and authoritarianism. *Economy and Society, 31*(1), 37–61.

Denney, J. V. (1898). English requirements. *The School Review*, *6*(5), 339–343.

Detrick, D. W. and Detrick, S. P. (1989) (eds.). *Self-psychology: Comparisons and contrasts*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: The Analytic Press.

Dewey, J. (1896). The influence of the high school upon educational methods. *The School Review*, *4*(1), 1–12.

Donald, J. (1992). *Sentimental education: Schooling, popular culture and regulation of liberty.* London and New York: Verso.

Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Drucker, P.F. (1985). *Innovation and Entreprenurialship*. London: Heinnemann

Duffy, J. (1993). *From humors to medical science: a history of American medicine (2nd edition).* Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Eagleton, T. (2008). *Literary theory: An introduction (Anniversary Edition)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1994). What do we mean when we talk about voice in texts? In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 1–35). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: techniques for mastering the writing process (2nd edition)*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1993). Ranking, evaluating, and liking. *College English, 55*, 187–205.

Elbow, P. & Belanoff, P. (1997). Reflections on an explosion: Portfolios in the 90's and beyond. In Kathleen Yancey and Irwin Weiser (Eds.), *Situating portfolios: Four perspectives* (pp. 21–34). Logan: Utah Stated UP.

REFERENCES

Elbow, P. & Bernard-Donals, M (1998). Differences of opinion: An exchange of views. In Frances Zak and Christopher C. Weaver (Eds.), *The theory and practices of grading writing: Problems and possibilities* (pp. 67–74). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Elbow, P. (1998). Changing grading while working with grades. In Frances Zak and Christopher C. Weaver (Eds.), *The theory and practices of grading writing: Problems and possibilities* (pp. 171–184). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eliot, C.W. & Robinson, O.D. (1894). The work of the Committee of Ten. *The School Review*, *2*(6), 366–372.

Elliot, N. (2008). *On a scale: A social history of writing assessment in America*. New York: Peter Lang.

Emerson, O.F. (1897). The teaching of English grammar. *The School Review*, *5*(3), 129–138..

Esslin, M. (1961). *The theatre of the absurd*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Evans, F. J. (1993). *Psychology and nihilism: A genealogical critique of the computational model of mind.* Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Ewald, F. (1991). Insurance and risk. In g. Burchell, C.Gordon, and P. Miller (eds.) *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 197–210). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fellman, A.C. & Fellman, M. (1981). *Making sense of self: medical advice literature in late nineteenth century America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fendler, L. (2011). *Michel Foucault: Continuum Library of Educational Thought* (series editor: Richard Bailey) vol. 22. London and New York: Continuum.

Fitzgerald, K.R. (1996). From disciplining to discipline: A Foucauldian examination of the formation of English as a school subject. *A Journal of Composition Theory*, *16*(3), 435–453.

Flowers, L. (1986). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. In T.Newkirk (Ed.) *To compose: Teaching writing in the high school* (pp. 76–103). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Flynn, T. (1993). Foucault and the eclipse of vision. In D.M. Levin (Ed.) *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision* (pp. 273–286). Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

Flynn, T. (1994). Foucault's mapping of history. In Gary Gutting (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault* (pp. 28–46). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In Donald F. Bouchard (ed.) *Language, counter memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault* (pp. 139–164). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1977a). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality (volume 1): An Introduction.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977 (pp.78–108)*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980a). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (ed.) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977 (pp. 109–133)*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1983). The subject and power. In Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P., *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208–226). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1983). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P., *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 229–252). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). What is Enlightenment? In P. Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader* (32–50). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L.H.Martin, H. Gutman, and P.H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16–49). Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, M.. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (eds.) The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault (pp. 87–104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1994). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics, subjectivity, and truth (volume one)* (pp. 254–280). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1994). The ethics of the concern of the self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Ethics, subjectivity, and truth (volume one)* (pp. 281–301). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1994b). Questions of method. In J.D. Faubion (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Power* (pp. 223–238). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (1996). Talk Show. In Sylvere Lotringer (ed.) *Foucault Live (Interviews. 1961–1984) (pp. 133–145),* New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. (1997). "Society must be defended" Lectures at the College de France, 1975–1976 (trans David Macey). New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (1997a). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow (ed.) *Michel Foucault Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* (pp. 254–280). New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2001). *The hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the College de France, 1981–1982*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2003). *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the College de France, 1973–1974* (trans. Graham Burchell). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Frazier, A. S. (1986). Teaching-Coaching. *English Journal, 75*(1), 69–70.

Foucault, M. (2005). *The Hermeneutics of the subject: Lectures at the College de France, 1981–1982 (*trans. Graham Burchell). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Galton, F. (1892). *Finger prints*. London: Macmillan.

Garvey, J. H. (1979–1980). Children and the idea of liberty: A comment on the civil commitment cases. *Kentucky Law Journal*, 70, 809–844).

George, Susan. (1999, March). *A short history of neo-liberalism: Twenty years of elite economics and emerging opportunities for structural change*. Conference on Economic Sovereignty in a Globalizing World, Bangkok. Retrieved from http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/econ101/neoliberalismist

Gibson, W. (1980). Authors, speakers, readers, and mock readers. In J.P. Tompkins (Ed.). *Reader-response criticism: From formalism to post-structuralism* (1–6). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Giroux, H. A. (2010). Dumbing down teachers: Rethinking the crisis of public education and the demise of the social state. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *32*, 339–381.

Glaser, R. (1981). The future of testing: A research agenda for cognitive psychology and psychometrics. *American Psychologist*, *36*(9), 923–936.

Glaser, R. (1990). Testing and assessment: O tempora! O mores! Pittsburgh, PA: *University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center.*

Gleason, C.B. (1893). On teaching English. *School Review*, *1*(5), pp. 301–302.

Goodwin, N. (1983). Dancing on the stage of your head. *The English Journal*, *72*(2), 43–45.

Gordon, C. (ed.) (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: an introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, *The Foucault effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 1–52). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Granville, M. J. (1882). *Youth: Its care and culture; an outline of principles for parents and guardians*. New York: M.L. Holbrook Company.

Graham, B. C. (1983). They won't write? Turn them loose on their town. *The English Journal*, *72*(7), 54–57.

Greene, J. (1893). The mastery of English. *The School Review*, *1*(9), 546–557.

Grubaugh, S. (1985). Spoken words: Quality exposure to vocabulary concepts. *English Journal*, *74*(1), 64–67.

Guzik, R.E. (1998). The inner game of entreprenuring: 10 steps to mastering the small business challenge. Chicago, Illinois: Upstart publishing Company.

Hackbert, P. H. (2000). Team journal writing in the entrepreneurship curriculum. Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 3, 41–59. Retrieved from http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economics/laureates/1974/myrdal-lecture.html

Hacking, I. (1990). The taming of chance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hacking, I (2002). *Historical Ontology*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hahnemann, S. (1982). *Organon of medicine*. Blaine, Washington: Cooper Publishing.

Harmon, J. (1988). The myth of measureable improvement. *The English Journal*, *77*(5), 78–80.

Hart, J.M. (1894). The outlook for English. *School Review*, 2(1), pp. 36–39.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, H. (1972). *Between Harvard and America: the educational leadership of Charles W. Eliot*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heller, S. B. (2001). Speaking my mind: Dealing with "senioritis". *The English Journal, 90*(5), 17–18.

Herbert, E. (2001). *The power of portfolios: What children can teach us about learning and assessment.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Hernstein-Smith, B. (1988). *Contingencies of value: Alternative perspectives for critical theory*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

Herschel, W. J. (1974). *The origin of finger-printing*. New York: AMS press.

Holbrook, M. L. (1878). *Hygiene of the brain and nerves and the cure of nervousness: With twenty-eight original letters from leading thinkers and writers concerning their physical and intellectual habits*. New York: M.L. Holbrook & Co.

Holland, N. N. (1980). Unity, Identity, Text, Self. In J.P. Tompkins (Ed.). *Reader-response criticism: From formalism to post-structuralism* (41–49). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hollman, M. J. (1981). Learning about writing from the public. *The English Journal, 70*(3), 26–31.

Horn, C.H. (1899). Professor's Barbour's paper on English composition in the high school. *The School Review*, *7*(5), 309–311.

Howell, J. D. (1995). *Technology in the hospital: Transforming patient care in the early twentieth century*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hunt, L. R. (1893). The Binghamton Conference. *The School Review*, *1*(5), 296–300.

Hunt, T.W. (1894). Promising tendencies in the study of English. *Modern Language Notes*. *9*(7), 193–196.

Hunter, L. (1980). The inner game of writing. *The English Journal*, *69*(8), 54–55.

Hunter. I. (1994). *Rethinking the school: Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Huntington, T. F. (1899). English in the high school. *The School Review*, *7*(2), 92–96.

Huot, B. (1994). Beyond the classroom: Using portfolio to assess writing. In Black, Laurel et al. (Eds.), *New directions in portfolio assessment: Reflective practice, critical theory, and large-scale scoring* (pp. 325–333*)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.

Jacob, W.B. (1897). The training of teachers for secondary schools. School Review *5*(6), pp. 375–386.

Jensen, J. L., Northrup, J.M., Alejandro, A., Arnold, L.K., Coffey, K. (1989). Adapting the i-search: A potpourri of topics and practices [A Symposium]. *The English Journal*, *78*(5), 39–45.

Jesse, R. H. (1896). What constitutes a college and what a secondary school. *The School Review*, *4*(5), 274–300.

Johnson, N. C. (1899). Habits of work and methods of study of high school pupils in some cities in Indiana. *The School Review*, *7*(5), 257–277.

Kaufman, B. (1973). Composition starters [Workshop]. The English Journal, *62*(9), 1281–1284.

Kearns, E.A. (1985). Practicing what we teach in writing. *English Journal*, *74*(6), 28–33.

Kellogg, B. (1893). On teaching English. *The School Review*, *1*(3), 152–162.

Kellogg, B. (1893a). On teaching English. *The School Review*, *1*(2), 96–105.

Kelly, P., Hall, M.P., & Small, R.C. (1986). Composition through team approach. *English Journal*, *73*(5), 71–74.

Kendall, G. P. (2003). From liberalism to Neoliberalism. In Bradley, Rebecca, Lyddon, Jeff, & Buys.

Kendall, J. (1985). Fireproof your school with writing. *English Journal,* 74(1) , 59–60.

Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's methods*. London and Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1977). The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the crossroads. *Journal of Management Studies, 14*(1), 34–57.

Keyser, R.S. (1893). The readjustment of the school curriculum. *School Review*, *1*(3), 131–140.

Kiillian, J. E. (1981). Students' writing as a PR channel. *The English Journal*, *70*(3), 40–41.

King, L. S. (1991). Transformations in American medicine: from Benjamin Rush to William Osler. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kirby, D, Liner, T., & Vinz, R. (1988). Inside out: Developmental strategies for teaching writing (second ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) (1990). Kentucky Department of Education www.education.ky.gov.

Knoblauch, D. H., and Brannon, L. (1984). *Rhetorical traditions and the teaching of writing*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boyton/Cook.

Koch, S., Rottink, K., & Stokes, R. (1974). This world of English. *The English Journal, 63*(2), 20–21.

Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self: A systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.

Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.

Kohut, H. (1985). *Self-psychology and the humanities: Reflections on a new psychoanalytic approach*. New York and London: WW Norton & Company.

Kohut, H. (1987). *The Kohut seminars on self-psychology and psychotherapy with adolescents and young adults*. New York and London: WW Norton & Company.

Kraft, W. T. (1974). *A psychology of nothingness*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Krebs, J. P. (1987). Connections: Writing about family. *The English Journal*, *76*(6), 58–60.

Krug, E. A. (1964). *The shaping of the American high school*. New York and London: Harper & Row Publishers.

Kuehn, K. W. (2008). Entrepreneurial intentions research: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, *11*, 87–98.

Kuznets, S. (1961). *Capital in the American economy: Its formation and financing (a study by the National Bureau of Economic Research)*. Princeton, New Jersey: University Press.

Latour, B. (1992). The costly ghastly kitchen. In Andrew Cunningham and Perry Williams (eds), *The laboratory revolution in medicine* (pp. 295–303). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laurie (Eds.) Social Change in the 21st Century, 21 November 2003, QUT, Brisbane. (Unpublished).

Lessem, P. A. (2005). *Self Psychology: An introduction*. New York: Jason Aronson.

Lesko, N. (2001). *Act your age! A cultural construction of adolescence.* New York and London: Routledge Falmer.

Linton, O. W. (1995). Medical applications of X-rays. *Beam Line*, *25*(2), 25–34.

Low, S. (1894). The place of the high school in an ideal scheme of public education. *The School Review*, *2*(6), 379–384.

Lowe, A. (1995). The basic social processes of entrepreneurial innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, *1*(2), 54–76.

Luthans, F., & Stewart, T. I. (1977). A general contingency theory of management. The Academy of Management Review, *2*(2), 181–195.

Luther, M.H., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P.H. (Eds.). (1988). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Macey, D. (1993). *The lives of Michel Foucault.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Mahoney, J. (2002). *Power and portfolio: Best practices for high school classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Macrorie, K. (1974). *A valuable teacher*. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book Co.

Mandell, L. (1997). Zen and the art of grade motivation. *The English Journal*, *86*(1), 28–31.

Marble, A. P. (1893). The study of English in the public schools. *The School Review*, *1*(4), 198–209.

Marcus, H. (1984). The writing center: Peer tutoring in a supportive setting. *The English Journal*, *73*(5), 66–67.

Martin, B. (1988). Becoming students to become better teachers. The English Journal, *77*(4), 41–44.

Martin, R. (1988). Truth, power, self: An interview with Michel Foucault, October 25, 1982. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, and P.H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 9–15). Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Martin-Kniep, G. O. (1998). Why am I doing this? *Purposeful teaching through portfolio assessment.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Masterson, J. F. (1993). *The emerging self: a developmental, self, and object relations approach to the treatment of the closet narcissistic disorder of the self*. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers.

May, R. (1983). *The discovery of being: Writings in existential psychology*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.

May, T. (2006). *The philosophy of Foucault.* Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McClatchie, A.J. (1895). Biological work in secondary schools. *The Popular Science Monthly*, *46*(3), 634–640.

McKenzie, Jamieson. (1984). Accordion Writing: Expository composition with the word processor. *The English Journal, 73*(5), 56–58.

McGrath, R. G. & MacMillan, I. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset: strategies for continuously creating opportunity in an age of uncertainty*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

McGuire, G.S. (1988). Self-awareness: Toward greater control for young writers. *The English Journal*, *77*(2), 34–36.

McKay, L. (1986). Gaining control through commentary. *English Journal, 75*(3), 58–62.

McNeese, T. (1989). Raiders of the lost art: Using the "painted word" in writing. *English Journal*, *78*(3), 34–36.

McWhorter, L. (1999). Bodies and Pleasures: Foucault and the politics of sexual normalization. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Meader, E. I. (1899). A high school course in English. *The School Review*, *7*(8), 473–477.

Meuret, D. (1981). Political economy and the legitimation of the state. *I&C*, *9*, 29–28.

Michaels, W.B. (1980). The interpreter's self: Pierce on the Cartesian 'subject'. In J. P. Tompkins (Ed.). *Reader-response criticism: From formalism to post-structuralism* (185–200). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Michel, E.L. (1982). The curse exchange. *The English Journal, 71*(3), 29–31.

Miller, H. (1893). The differentiation of the high school: The coming movement. *The School Review*, *1*(7), 418–422.

Miller, E.L. (1896). School and college conference at the University of Chicago. *School Review*, *4*(1), pp. 23–45.

Mincer, J. (1952). *Income and wealth of the United States.* Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, Ltd.

Monroe, R. (1987). Testing: A political scalpel. *The English Journal*, *76*(8), 24.

Moffett, J. (1981). Active voice: *A writing program across the curriculum*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Morel, J. & Henderson, C.R. (1899). Prevention of mental diseases. *The School Review*, *5*(1), 72–97.

Moore, C.H. (1896). The examination system of admissions to college. *The School Review*, *4*(5), 309–318.

Moore, M. (1982). Evaluating creativity. *English Journal, 71*(8), 33–35.

Morton, B.K. (1977). Listening: First steps in developmental drama. *The English Journal, 66*(5), 68–73.

Murphy, S. & Smith, M.A. (1992). *Writing portfolios: A bridge from teaching to assessment.* New York: Pippin Publishing Limited.

Murray, D. (1989). *Learning by teaching: Selected articles on writing and teaching*. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Boynton/Cook

Murray, P. (1989). Teachers as readers, readers as teachers. In Bruce Lawson (Ed.), *Encountering studenttexts: Interpretive issues in reading student writing*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Murphy, S., & Smith, M. A. (1992). *Writing portfolios: A bridge from teaching to assessment*. New York: Pippin Publishing Limited.

Myers, G. W. (1903). The laboratory method in the secondary school. *The School Review*, *11*(9), 727–741.

Nasaw, D. (1979). *Schooled to order: a social history of public schooling in the United States*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Newcombe, F.C. (1899). Equipment and administration of the high school botanical laboratory. *The School Review*, *7*(5), 301–308.

Newell, G.E. (1977). The emerging self: A curriculum of self-actualization. The English Journal, *66*(8), 32–34.

Nightingale, A.F. (1896). Preparation of teachers for secondary schools. School Review, *4*(3), pp. 129–139.

Norris, C. (1991). *Deconstruction: Theory and practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

O'Farrell, C. (2005). *Michel Foucault.* London and Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

O'Leary, T. (2009). *Foucault and fiction: The experience book*. London and New York: Continuum.

Osborne, T. (2008). *The structure of modern cultural theory*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Patterson Kathleen (1981–1982). Juvenile code. *Kentucky Law Review*, 70, 343–394.

Peckham, I. (1987). Statewide direct writing assessment. *English Journal, 76*(8), 30–33.

Penniman, J. H. (1893). The study of English in school and college. *The School Review*, *1*(8), 462–470.

Peters, M.A. (2005). The new prudentialism in education: Actuarial rationality and the entrepreneurial self. *Educational Theory*, *55*(2), 123–137.

Peters, M.A., Besley, A.C., Olssen, M., Maurer, S., and Weber, S. (Eds.) (2009). *Governmentality studies in education.* Rotterdam, Boston, and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Peters, M.A. (2009). Introduction: Governmentality, education and the end of Neoliberalism. In Peters, M.A., Besley, A.C., Olssen, M., Maurer, S., and Weber, S. (Eds.) *Governmentality studies in education* (pp. xxvii-xlviii). Rotterdam, Boston, and Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Porter, R. (1997). *The greatest benefit to mankind: A medical history of humanity*. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Company.

Phelps, T.O. (1986). What will they really write? *English Journal*, *75*(3), 81–82.

Prado, C.G. (1995). *Starting with Foucault: An introduction to genealogy.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Prepatory Course in English. *The School Review*, *5*(7), 445–455.

The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence, the Path to a Larger Life: Creating Kentucky's Education Future (1985). Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.

Probst, R. E. (1982). Competency testing in English. *The English Journal*, *71*(6), 22–25.

Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1969). *Tea ching as a subversive activity*. New York: Dell Publishing Companty.

Posner, R. (1987). Life without scan-tron: Test as thinking. *The English Journal*, *76*(2), 35–38.

Poulet, G. (1980). Criticism and the experience of interiority. In J.P. Tompkins (Ed.). *Reader-response criticism: From formalism to post-structuralism* (pp. 41–49). Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rajchman, J. (1985). Michel Foucault: The freedom of philosophy, New York: Columbia University Press.

Putnam, J.J. (1899). Not the Disease Only, but also the Man. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, *26*(1), 770–778.

Rabinow, P. (1994). *Michel Foucault: Ethics, subjectivity, and truth (volume one)*. New York: The New Press.

Rajchman, John. (1988). Foucault's art of seeing. *October*, *44*, 88–117.

Ransom, J.S. (1997). *Foucault's discipline: The politics of subjectivity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of battles over school reform*. New York and London: A Touchstone Book.

Ready for work: Essential Skills for Kentucky Jobs. Frankfort, Kentucky: Diana Taylor Communications, March, 1998.

Rhea, P.L. (1986). Writing for natural purposes. *English Journal*, *75*(2), 43–50.

Rico, B. L. (1988). Against formulaic writing. *The English Journal*, *77*(6), 57–58.

Rief, L., Finnegan, M., & Gannett, C. (2000). Who's the teacher? In Bonnie S. Sunstein and Jonathan H. Lovell (eds.), *The portfolio standard: How students can show us what they know and are able to do*, (pp. 62–76). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rodrigues, R. J. (1985). Moving away from writing-process workshop. , *74*(5), 24–27.

Romano, T. (1987). *Clearing the way: working with teenage writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rose v. Council for Better Education, 790 S.W. 2d 186, 60 Ed. Law Rep .1289, 1989.

Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self.* London and New York: Free Association Books.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosen, L. M. (1987). *Developing correctness in student writing: Alternative to the error-hunt*. The English Journal, *76*(3), 62–69.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work.* Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenberg, C. E. (1987). *The care of strangers: the rise of America's hospital system*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ruohotie, P., & Koiranen, M. (2000). In the pursuit of cognative constructs into entrepreneurship education. Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, *3*, 9–22.

Russell, J.E. (1897). College entrance requirements in English. *The School Review*, *5*(6), 332–342.

Sampson, E.E. (1985). The decentralization of identity: Toward a revised concept of personal and social order. *American Psychologist*, *40*(11), 1203–1211.

Sanborn, J. (1986). Grammar: Good wine before its time. *English Journal, 75*(3), 72–80.

Sass, L.A. (1988). The self and it vicissitudes: An 'archaeological' study of the psychoanalytic avant garde. *Social Research*, *55*(4), 551–607.

Schultz, T.W. (1962). Reflections on investment in man. *Journal of Political Economy, 70*(5), 1–8.

Scharff, J.S. (Ed.) (1994). *The autonomous self: the work of John D. Sutherland*. Northvale, New Jersey and London: Jason Aronson.

Schwartz, M. (1985). *Writing for many roles*. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Scudder, M. T. (1899). A study of high school pupils. *The School Review, 7*(4), 197–214.

Search, P.W. (1900). The larger high school. *The School Review*, *8*(4), 220–229.

Sheehan, P. J. (1969). Theatre of the Absurd: A child studies himself. *The English Journal, 58*(4), 561–565.

Shorey, P. (1897). Discipline vs. dissipation in secondary education. *The School Review*, *5*(4), 217–230.

Simon, L. (2004). *Dark light: Electricity and anxiety from the telegraph to the X-ray*. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Sizer, N. (1891). *Forty years of phrenology: Embracing recollections of history, anecdote, and experience*. New York: Fowler & Wells Company.

Smith, N. Another revolution is possible: Foucault, ethics, and politics [Editorial]. (2007). *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 25,* 191–193.

Sockett, H. (1988). Education and will: Aspects of personal capability. *American Journal of Education*, 96(2), 195–214.

Sokal, M. M. (1990). James McKeen Cattell and mental anthropometry: Nineteenth-century science and reform and the origins of psychological testing. In M.M.Sokal (Ed.) *Psychological testing and American society:1890–1930* (pp. 21–45). New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press.

Sokal, M.M. (1990) (ed.). *Psychological testing and American society.* New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press.

Spencer, H. (1851). *Social statics: or, the conditions essential to happiness specified and the first of them developed.* London: John Chapman.

Spencer, H. (1963). *Essays on education and kindred subjects*. London and New York: Everyman's Library.

St. Vincent-Millay, E. (1988). *Collected Sonnets*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Stefanakis, E. H. (2002). *Multiple intelligences and portfolios: A window into the learner's mind*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Stahl, D. (1965). A history of the English curriculum in American high schools. Chicago: The Lyceum Press.

Stock, P.L. & Robinson, J.L. (1987). Taking on testing: Teachers as tester-researches. *English Education*, *19*(2), 93–121.

Sullivan, P. (1986). Responding to student writing: The consequences of some common remarks. *The English Journal*, *75*(2), 51–53.

Sully, J. (1887). Teacher's handbook of psychology, on the basis of the "outlines of psychology". New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Sunstein, B. S. & Lovell, J.H. (Eds.) (2000). *The portfolio standard: How students can show us what they know and are able to do*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sunstein, B. S. (2000). Be reflective, Be reflexive, and beware: Innocent forgery for Inauthentic assessment. In Bonnie S. Sunstein and Jonathan H. Lovell (Eds.), *The portfolio standard: Howstudents can show us what they know and are able to do*, (pp. 3–14). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sutherland, J. D. (1994). The self and object relations. In J.S. Scharff (Ed.) The autonomous self: The work of John D. Sutherland (pp. 285–302). Northvale, New Jersey and London: Jason Aronson.

Sutherland, J.D. (1994). The autonomous self. In J.S. Scharff (Ed.) The autonomous self: The work of John D. Sutherland (pp. 303–330). Northvale, New Jersey and London: Jason Aronson.

Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing genealogies: An exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *20*(2), 201–217.

Tanner, D. E. (2003). Multiple-choice items: Pariah, panacea, or neither of the above? *American Secondary Education*, *31*(2), 27–36.

Tchudi, S. (ed.) (1997). *Alternatives to grading student writing*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Terwilliger, J. S. (1997). *Portfolios and classroom assessment: Some claims and questions*, paper presented at AERA meeting

Tierney, R. J., Carter, M. A. & Desai, L. E. (eds) (1991). *Portfolio assessment in the reading-writing classroom.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Thurber, S. (1900). An address to normal school teachers of English. *The School Review*, *8*(3), 129–145.

Thurber, S. (1897) Five axioms of composition teaching. *School Review*, *5*(1), 7–17.

Thurber, S. (1894). The conditions needed for the successful teaching of English composition. *The School Review*, *2*(1), 13–21.

Thurber, C. H. (1898). English as it is taught. *The School Review*, *6*(5), 328–338.

Tompkins, J. P. (1980) (Ed.). *Reader-response criticism: From formalism to post-structuralism*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tovatt, A., & DeVries, T. (1966). This world of English. *The English Journal*, *55*(1), 95–97.

Tovatt, A, & DeVries, T. (1967). This world of English. *The English Journal, 56*(3) 481–483.

Tovatt, A., & DeVries, T. (1971). This world of English. The English Journal, *60*(3), 392–395+407.

Tovatt, A., Jewett, A., & Jarrett, T.D. (1962). This world of English. *The English Journal*, *51*(5), 340–345.

REFERENCES

Transformations: Kentucky's Curriculum Framework (1990). *Kentucky Department of Education*. www.education.ky.gov.

Tyack, D.B. & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

Underwood, T. (1999). *The portfolio project: A study of assessment, instruction, and middle school reform*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Uniform Entrance Examination in English Language and Literature. *The School Review*, *2*(9), 562–567.

Vickers, T. (1893). The high school and its enemies. *The School Review*, *1*(2), 83–96.

Wiggins, G. (1989). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *70*(9), 703–713.

Wiggins, G. (1989). Teaching to the (authentic) test. *Educational Leadership*, *46*(7), 41–47.

Wiggins, G. (1992). Creating tests worth taking. *Educational Leadership*, *49*(8), 26–33.

Wilhoit, G. (2003). *Kentucky writing helping students develop as proficient writers: Writing development teacher's handbook.* Frankfort, Kentucky: Kentucky Department of Education.

Wilkes, J. (1978). Science writing: Who? what? how? *The English Journal, 67*(4), 56–60.

Williams, T. (1990). The gift of writing groups. *The English Journal*, *79*(4), 58–60.

Wolf, D., Bixby, J., Glenn, J., Gardner, H. (1991). To use their minds well: Investigating new forms of student assessment. *Review of Research in Education*, 17, 31–74.

Wright, J. G. (1893). First year English in the high school. *The School Review*, *1*(1), 15–23.

Wright, W.W (1980). Teaching writing in the age of narcissism. *English Journal*, *69*(8), 26–29.

Yancey, K. B. & Huot, B. (1998). Construction, deconstruction, and (over) determination: A Foucaultian analysis of grades. In Zak, F. & Weaver, C. C. (Eds). *The theory and practice of grading writing: Problems and possibilities* (39–51). Albany: State University of New York Press

Yeatman, A. (2000). Mutual obligation: What kind of contract is this? In P. Saunders (Ed.), *Reforming the Australian welfare state* (pp. 156–176). Melbourne, Victoria: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Zak, F. & Weaver, C. C. (1998). *The theory and practice of grading writing: Problems and possibilities*. Albany: State University of New York Press

INDEX