Teach First as affective governmentality: the shaping of the hyper-performative, affected and committed teacher

Patrick Bailey
email: patrick.bailey@ucl.ac.uk
UCL Institute of Education, London. UK

Abstract: This article presents a Foucauldian and neo-Marxist analysis of the education charity and social enterprise, Teach First. It explores some of the affective, creative, and immaterial practices/ technologies whereby this influential organisation *creates* or fabricates, and attempts to *secure,* a world of objectivity and meaning, posing and activating corresponding forms of subjectivity and conduct. The analysis addresses some of the diverse forms and modalities of power from which emerges a version of the post-Fordist, neo-liberal teacher subject – an iteration of the teacher characterised by new forms of subjectivity and social relations, which are bound up with changing economic and cultural practices. Moreoever, this article explores Teach First as a form of «affective governmentality», and situates this influential organisation within ongoing, global transformations in the governance of teacher training.

Keywords: Governmentality, Affect, Power, Foucault, Teach First, Teach For All, Governance, Performativity, Teacher Subjectivity.

1. Introduction

Teach First: the teacher training equivalent of a bungee jump; an exhilarating, frightening, all-or-nothing experience that is not for the faint hearted. The six week training period, known as «Summer Institute» is like standing on the edge of a great precipice, fear and trepidation consuming your every nerve and sinew. As you look out across the cavernous maw before you, you stare blindly ahead, desperately hoping you will make it back alive. When the first day of school arrives in September and you can finally take the leap you have been worried about all summer, you are suddenly thrown into the air and are whipped about in the breeze, flailing around like a ragdoll, unable to breathe.

> My two years are drawing to their close. I am now hanging upside down, dishevelled, delighted that I survived and determined to keep going, to do it again, but this time, to do it even better. I am by no means a great teacher. I've spent the last year realising exactly what I *don't* know, which is a strangely motivating force (Teach First participant).

This article presents a Foucauldian and neo-Marxist analysis of the education charity and social enterprise, Teach First. It explores some of the affective, creative, and immaterial practices/technologies whereby this organisation *creates* or fabricates, and attempts to *secure,* a world of objectivity and meaning, posing and activating corresponding forms of subjectivity and conduct. By commenting on the affective dimensions of government - or «affective governmentality» – in this social space, this article aims to contribute towards what is sometimes called the «affective turn» (Zembylas, 2014; Moore, 2018) in social and cultural studies. Moreover, the analysis addresses some of the diverse forms and modalities of power from which emerges a version of the post-Fordist, neo-liberal teacher subject – an iteration of the teacher characterised by new forms of subjectivity, which are bound up with changing economic and cultural practices. In this sense, what follows contributes to an existing body of research (see, for example, Olmedo, Bailey and Ball, 2013; Bailey, 2013; Bailey 2015) which explores the implications and effects of ongoing, global transformations in the governance of teacher training.

In what follows, I attend to two interrelated forms of immaterial labour (Lazzarato, 1996) which can be observed in Teach First, what I have termed *affective activation* and *aesthetic solicitation*. This will involve exploring what it means to *be* a participant of what Teach First and the wider global policy network, Teach For All, of which it is a leading member, describe as a «movement» or «mission» for educational and social change. This includes some of the «affective technologies» which function and aim, I will argue, to channel, produce and secure the *commitments*, but also the emotions/affects, *fears* and *(dis)beliefs* of the individual and the community. Lazzarato (2008) describes this as the production of a «disposition to act». This will involve exploring some of the ways in which Teach First fabricates, by articulating discourses and practices which pre-date but are available to it, a particular form of «human kind» and teacher subject – what I term the «*archetypal Teach First participant*» which in part takes the shape of a neo-liberal subject of human capital and performativity. This form, or assemblage, is identified below as it emerges in various «immaterial» practices of the organisation, and through different media (publications, website, words, images, competencies, bodies, etc.). Importantly, these practices perform «a solicitation, an order which are in themselves valuations, judgements and beliefs about the world, oneself and others» (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 189).

By drawing particularly on the work of Lazzarato (2004; 2009), Teach First is explored in relation to «post-Fordist» or «post-industrial» capitalism and some of the related «changes occurring in the organisation of labour» (Duzenli, 2006, p. 47). This includes the intensification of *immaterial labour* in the work, organisation (division of labour) and «creative» strategies of the contemporary Enterprise, broadly conceived. Deleuze (1995, p. 181) refers to this ontology as the «company with a soul», for which «marketing has become its strategic centre» (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 189). It is an

instance and aspect, moreover, of what Thrift (2005, p. 1) calls «knowing capitalism», or of how «Capitalism has a kind of crazy vitality. It doesn't just line its pockets. It also appeals to gut feeling. It gets involved in all kinds of extravagant symbioses. It adds into the world as well as subtracts» – a modern form of creative destruction.

Over the course of the analysis, my aim is to illustrate how Teach First solicits an *aesthetic of existence* which attempts to *secure*, at least in part, a neo-liberal ontology, including the participant as a «capital-competence», or «molecular fraction of capital» (Lazzarato, 2009, p. 121). As I will argue, the *aesthetic* of the Teach First world and at least one of its correlated anthropological forms – or ways of living and being – anticipates and is underpinned by an affective governmentality comprising a number of interrelated and symbiotic elements: *inequality*, *individualisation*, *insecurity*, *depoliticization*, and *financialization* (Lazzarato, 2009*).* These are principles and strategies, moreover, which underpin a more general «neo-liberal social policy to undermine the principles and practices of mutualisation and redistribution that the Welfare State and Fordism had promoted» (Lazzarato, 2009, p. 109).

The analysis draws on data from a qualitative study of Teach First, which combined ethnographic methods and Foucauldian discourse analysis. It builds upon previously published work (Bailey, 2013; 2015; Olmedo, Bailey and Ball, 2013) within which I have explored this influential organisation as an example of new forms of governance in education, and especially the emergence of new voices and actors in (global) policy processes. The analysis is informed by interviews with Teach First participants, field notes and various ephemeral texts, such as the Teach First website and recruitment brochures. While this paper focuses on the English version of the programme, it has been noted that Teach First is a leading partner of a global policy network, Teach For All, with similar yet context specific recruitment, training and placement programmes in a number of countries worldwide in both the Global North and South (there are currently 52 Teach For All affiliated organizations - https://teachforall.org/).

2. The Teach First world: a risky, moral and affective business

> The company producing a product or services produces a world. In its logic, the service or the product, just as the consumer or the worker, must correspond to this world; and the world in its turn has to be inscribed in the souls and bodies of consumers and workers (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 188).
>
> Unlike emotions, which are mental phenomena, affects refer equally to body and mind. In fact, affects, such as joy and sadness, reveal the present state of life in the entire organism, expressing a certain state of the body along with a certain mode of thinking. Affective labour, then, is labour that produces or manipulates affects such as a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement, or passion (Hardt and Negri, 2004, p. 108).

The basic idea of the Teach First model is to firstly attract and then to train and place «exceptional» graduates in «challenging» urban schools for at least a two-year commitment. Successful applicants become known as «participants» and

receive six weeks of training at a Summer Institute before taking on a timetable of teaching duties of the same intensity as that of a Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT). The programme in different national contexts is underpinned by a «mission» to transform the life chances of disadvantaged young people by raising their test scores and aspirations.

Teach First expends considerable effort, energy and expense on creating a world. That is to say that the organisation dedicates (recognised and unrecognised) labour to the «creation and realisation of the sensible (desires, beliefs, intelligence)» (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 188). It does so by carefully managing its brand and public relations, including on its website, in glossy publications, in its research activities, at public events, and even at the «Summer Institute» (see below). I suggest that these are all means through which, and policy sites where, this «immaterial», «affective» and «aesthetic» world is produced and transmitted. These are also discursive spaces and practices which enable the transmission and articulation, amongst other things, of the corresponding form and profile of the *archetypal Teach First participant* which, in part, takes the shape, I will argue at least, of a molecular neo-liberal subject. This is a world, as I will try to illustrate in a moment, of risk and responsibility, of fear and loathing and moral indignation that *anticipates and solicits,* and *secures* and *activates* the conduct of the hyper-performative, neo-liberal teacher. More broadly, it is an affective world which aims to secure the economic, moral and responsible subject of neo-liberal governmentality, that is, the *new homo œconomicus*.

3. Immaterial labour

Immaterial labour is an increasingly prominent aspect of contemporary capitalism and the related work, strategies and operations of the contemporary Enterprise. It comes in many forms and guises, though part of its ontology is referred to by Deleuze (1995), as noted, as the «company with a soul», and described by Lazzarato (2004, p. 188) as «the company without factories». Broadly speaking, these images serve to convey something of the shift from *Fordist* to *post-Fordist* forms of production and consumption.

Very briefly, this refers to the move from industrial and standardised mass production and consumption (Fordism), to *post-industrial*, flexible and «just-in-time» production, indexed to the demands (both economic and consumer) of the market. Put simply, post-Fordism involves the intensification and generalisation of the *enterprise form,* and does so in three ways. Firstly, as Hall (1988, p. 24) observes, in terms of changes to the economy: the decline of the traditional manufacturing base and the rise of the service economy and new information technologies; flexible accumulation and production; privatisations and contracting out of services; greater emphasis on product differentiation and the fluctuating wants and tastes of *individual* consumers; and the globalisation of financial markets. Secondly, because it is associated with new «cultural patterns» of economic and social life (Amin, 2000, p. 4), that is, «it is also associated with greater fragmentation and pluralism, the weakening of older collective solidarities and block identities and the emergence of new identities associated with greater work flexibility, the maximisation of individual choices through personal consumption» (Hall, 1988, p. 24). Thirdly, because it is related to the

increasing strategic emphasis that the contemporary Enterprise places on creative and epistemological functions and capacities (see below). This is an ontology which is perhaps «emblematic of a deep transformation within capitalist mode of production» (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 188), and also within (global) education policy.

Teach First is a good example. It fragments and diversifies teacher education, cultivates an *individualised, entrepreneurial* and *flexible* teacher subjectivity, and concomitantly makes up a new kind of *post-Fordist* teacher. As I develop later, the relationship between Teach First and its participants also constitutes something of a *post-Fordist* organisation of labour. It is also worth pointing out that Teach First is not simply a teacher training agency (of which much of the training is *outsourced*), but also demonstrates marketing and «creative» capacities similar to profit-making enterprises in the private sector, and on which in various ways it models itself. This reflects, moreover, the economisation of the education state, and of the intensification of the enterprise form. That is, of the public sector learning to be more like the private sector, what Ball (2012) calls the «neo-liberal curriculum of reform».

As noted, immaterial labour comes in many forms (of which *affective labour* is one sub-form, itself coming in many different guises). It includes (but is not limited to) work which produces «the informational and cultural content of the commodity» (Lazzarato, 1996, p. 133), or «labour that produces an immaterial good, such as a service, a cultural product, knowledge or communication» (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 290) – «service with a smile» being one of its more emblematic and mundane forms. Here, I want to focus on two interrelated forms of immaterial labour that can be observed in the practices of Teach First. Dant (2003, p. 59) identifies these as, firstly, «the passing on to the worker of the work of organising production» (*affective activation*), and secondly, «when the productive work is of something in itself immaterial – language, images, ideas», or in other words, «communicative products» (*aesthetic solicitation*). These forms are not mutually exclusive, however, and need to be taken both separately and together.

Before separating them out a little, I should emphasise that both forms involve «creative» activities and technologies, such as marketing, advertising and branding, training, social engagement and Human Resource Management (HRM). These are practices which present and solicit the necessary and the sensible, and which are designed to appeal to, and activate, sensibilities and sensitivities. They manifest, establish and are the product of power relations, and include technologies and «spaces» (conferences, magazines, human competencies, mission statements, training centres) which, as Thrift (2005, p. 134, citing Rose, 1999, p. 4) puts it, «can be used to produce collective bodies and identifications «through the inscription of particular ethical formations, vocabularies of self-description and self-mastery, forms of conduct and body techniques»». These are techniques and technologies for *capturing,* or better *securing* bodies and subjectivities, and for producing and establishing affective and productive relationships between the individual, their work, and the objectives of the Enterprise (and capital more generally – see below). Lazzarato (2004, p. 188) notes that «[w]ithin contemporary capitalism the company does not exist outside the consumers or workers who express it. Its world, its objectivity, its reality merges with the relationships enterprises, workers and consumers have with each other».

In order to develop this analysis, I want to partially separate out the two forms of immaterial/affective labour that I noted above: *aesthetic solicitation* and *affective activation.* In terms of the latter, I will explore some of the affective technologies which aim to establish and maintain a social (productive and governmental) relationship with the participant. Firstly, however, I want to illustrate the kinds of bodies and subjectivities – the conducts and forms of life – which are solicited in the creative practices of Teach First, that is, the «incorporeal transformations» (Delueze) which it poses and seeks to secure within the conducts of the participants and, more broadly, the education state. In doing this, my aim is to outline the form and profile of the *archetypal Teach First participant* as solicited and securitised in different practices and artefacts (including the Teach First competencies and values; recruitment brochures; the website; events). In doing this, however, it is important to bear in mind that power diffracts through and constitutes the subject in multiple and contingent ways. Dean (1996, p. 224) cautions:

> there is no single mode of subjectification corresponding to an age, an epoch, an institution or even a single individual. We are obligated differently according to different regimes of governmental and ethical practices. The same individual may find him- or herself obligated by various governmental-ethical regimes as citizen, mother, breadwinner, worker, entrepreneur, manager, health-conscious individual, consumer, taxpayer, juror, voter, patient, client, member of a neighbourhood or community, and so on.

4. Aesthetic solicitation

> Publicity, in a manner of «event», organizes first the ways to feel so that it can solicit a way of living; it actualizes and organizes the way to feel and to be felt in the souls to be able to realize them in bodies … Incorporeal transformations produce (or would like to produce) first and foremost a change in sensibility, a change in our way to value and perceive. Incorporeal transformations have no referent, they are self-referential. There are no preliminary needs, no natural necessities that their production would satisfy. Incorporeal transformations pose valuations and their object at the same time as they create them (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 189).

The image, form and profile of the *archetypal Teach First participant* poses an «incorporeal transformation» which, in the last instance, may be more or less realised in the body and the soul, if at all. It is a subject position loaded with meaning and programmed with certain expectations and obligations. Its archetypal form poses a way of living and being, that is, it authorises an *aesthetic of existence* which is underpinned by a number of principles, objectives, rationalities and subjectifications, inherited from the long (dis) continuities of power. Only a partial analysis will be provided here.

The different «faces» and «states» of the archetypal form can be discerned from a number of sources (under spotlights at events; in Teach

First communications; the media). The Teach First *selection competencies* – designed in consultation with «the best headteachers in London … [and] with the recruitment departments at some of our largest business sponsors» (Wigdortz, 2012, no page), break this form down into some of its molecular parts (see Figure 1.0.). Teach First describes the individual fabricated in these competencies as follows:

> You'll need to be someone with bright ideas, gritty determination, awesome communication skills and a desire to defy convention. You'll combine a strong work ethic and self-discipline with warmth, empathy and humility. And you'll have to be resilient – very resilient … In short, you'll need to be someone special, and that's just the beginning (Teach First, website).

How We Work (Teach First Values)	What We Look For* (Selection Competencies)
Collaboration	Interaction
Commitment	Knowledge Resilience
Excellence	Self Evaluation Planning & Organising
Integrity	Humility, Respect & Empathy
Leadership	Leadership Problem Solving

*Our values shape the culture of how we operate at Teach First and our competencies allow us to determine your potential to be an impactful teacher.

Figure 1.0. Teach First's Core Competencies and Values

The archetypal participant, then, is a «special» subject, an «exceptional graduate». The participant is bright, enterprising and innovative (bright ideas, problem solving, defiant of convention), and a «proactive» *leader* who «strives to achieve above and beyond expectations» (Teach First website). Moreover, the form embodies the asceticism of the good puritan (strong work ethic and self-discipline), and the caring and cultivating qualities of the secular pastor (interaction, warmth, empathy and humility):

> We look for those that can build relationships quickly, giving value and respect to others to get the best out of them.

The archetypal form is also *resilient*, or rather, *very resilient*, referring to a subject who is particularly tough, strong and pliable in the face of adversity and uncertainty (gritty determination). Resilience (and agility) is considered a desirable (and anticipated) human capital for survival in uncertain, competitive and risky environments and circumstances, and, indeed, in the competitive-performative

environment of the school (see, for instance, Bailey, 2015; also see, O'Malley, 2010; Reid, 2013). This resilient and agile self, as the discourse prescribes, is prepared and able to withstand, negotiate, exploit, and reinvent itself according to the rhythms and perils of «restless capital» and economic globalisation, and, in an educational context, the demands of performativity and datafication. Gillies (2011, p. 215) notes: «The sustainability of this neo-liberal paradigm is that any enterprise may, and does fail but the resilient, entrepreneurial self can always renew itself in new contexts. Market failure besets, but thus need not defeat, the agile self».

As demonstrated in the extract at the top of this article, the Teach First experience is like being «thrown into the air and whipped about in the breeze», and left «flailing around like a ragdoll, unable to breathe». The *resilience* to survive this physical and emotional barrage, but also the *will* and the *determination* «to keep going, to do it again, but this time, to do it even better», are qualities and obligations which together articulate and secure the good neo-liberal subject of *enterprise*, *competition* and *risk*.

Figure 1.1. Teach First Graduate Recruitment Brochure: Front Cover

Figure 1.1. shows the front cover of a Teach First graduate recruitment brochure (2013). It is interesting because it immediately appeals to the *new homo œconomicus*. It poses an *aesthetic solicitation* which invites and securitises the competitive spirit («The challenge starts here») and responsibilisation of «economic man». It also articulates the secular pastoralism (the worldly Salvationism) of the post-modern teacher and the spirituality of the Teach First journey («Change their lives and change yours»). Here I concentrate on the former, but the latter warrants further attention.

To *challenge* is «to call someone to participate in a competitive situation or fight to decide who is superior in terms of ability or strength». It is «a task or situation that tests someone's abilities» and even, in medicine, «to expose (the immune system) to pathogenic organisms and antigens» (Oxford English Dictionary Online). The Teach First world is thus (marketed as) a competitive game of *human capital*, in which one must rely on one's own capacities for (economic and ethical) self-management – a responsibility to self – to get the most out of the experience and the opportunities presented for self-investment.

> How your journey develops will be down to you but Teach First will provide you with support and the opportunities to progress rapidly and individually, while always staying focused on engaging with our vision.

The recruitment brochure even persuades, solicits and subjects the reader by profiling a number of Teach First alumni, or *ambassadors*, detailing amongst other things their «impact» in the classroom, their tips for surviving the programme, and the successful careers they have gone on to secure after their «two years». The (instrumental) economic journey is down to the choices, decisions and the calculations of the individual, who is activated by, and authorised, as we will see again later, in relation to the Teach First «mission».

> Laura: The mission …
>
> Maria: Yeah.
>
> Laura: It was nice to be a part of something that I was doing that was, kind of, social impact rather than just having an ordinary job for the sake of just the salary. That was really appealing, to be involved in something that seemed quite significant.
>
> Rebecca: I mean when you look on the Teach First website, for me personally, they really sell it to you: you do your two years and they will do as much as they can to help you find your career afterwards and that appealed to me. I liked the idea of teaching but *it was the mission that sold me because I was like I don't know exactly what I want to do and then they will help me afterwards*. I don't know actually how accurate that is now, I feel, but it did seem like they would really really help you afterwards…

The world is also (marketed as) a competitive game of *survival,* where to stay «alive» one must again rely on one's capacities for self-management, that is, on one's *resilience*, wits and reactions. To survive as a teacher, for example, one must keep pace with the metronomes of *performance* and their incessant and shifting demands, accents and time signatures – failure to do so and one is letting down oneself, the school and the programme. Some of the competencies, like problem-solving and resilience, even read a little like instructions for participation and survival in a game, and which in themselves solicit something of an entrepreneurial way of being:

Problem Solving

Every day you will face new challenges and will have to come up with considered, effective and appropriate solutions in response. Whilst drawing on resources and logic you will also need to use creativity and innovation to be successful.

Resilience

You will need to be hungry for a challenge, using patience and endless energy to persevere through the difficult times. When faced with obstacles you will need to be tenacious and versatile and maintain a positive mindset.

Figure 1.3. Teach First Competencies: Problem Solving and Resilience[1]

These kinds of qualities, skills or capacities, I should add, are not, in themselves, worthless. However, as Kelly (2006, p. 29) argues, «within the frame of entrepreneurial selfhood … [they] are narrowly imagined in relation to the performance of exchange relations in the extended order of capitalist markets». Indeed, the participant is exchanged under a *guarantee to perform*, or a *performative promise* (an *obligation* or *debt)* to «transform the life opportunities of children and young people» (Teach First) – i.e. improve performance, increase competitiveness. But this guarantee – whilst a form of *activation* and *identification* (see below) – can also be experienced as a burden, and can secure existential *precarity* and *anxiety* into the working life of the participant:

> … Do you feel like you're different? Which can add a lot of pressure sometimes because you feel that you are put in this situation where you are supposed to be exceptional sometimes or people are looking to you to always perform at your best and then any slip is just like «oh, well» or, you know, «well, that's Teach First, you can do it, you can handle it» (Monica, participant, interview).

> I'm very lucky to be in the school that I am in because I know of primary participants who are friends who have really had it hard because they've had absolutely no support and far too high expectation on them without any training (Sam, participant, interview).

---

[1] http://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/application-selection/requirements

Of course, there is added risk and insecurity here. On the one hand are the inequalities and inequities of the market («lucky to be in the school I am in»). On the other is the fact that, as we discover in the graduate recruitment brochure:

> Only one in ten teachers would consider teaching in a challenging school.

Whilst we are left to assume why this might be the case, and even the validity of this statement, it is accompanied, rather suggestively, by various *vital statistics* on educational disadvantage, and its relation to individual and school (performance) failure, and the latter's relation to future *indispositional* conducts such as crime, and malignant subjectivities like NEET[2] . This is both *affective activation* and *aesthetic solicitation*. The brochure appeals to sensibilities and sensitivities, that is, it induces and solicits fear both of and for the *other*, of and for the *self*, and of and for the present and future vitality of the «city» (society, the economy, the nation). In this sense, we see here a manifestation of what Foucault calls «biopolitics», and in particular the city-citizen/shepherd-flock game:

> Educational disadvantage limits students' futures and damages our society
> – it's not right; it's not fair; and it can't be allowed to persist.
> Join us and take up the challenge (Recruitment Brochure).

One participant described the Teach First experience, rather tellingly, as «extreme teaching». The participant takes a risk (takes up the challenge) by practising in a context and space which is fabricated as *malignant* and *abnormal*, and with only limited training and, in many instances, limited teaching experience. At the same time, however, they are challenged and put to the test of risky conditions, and offered the possibility of exhilaration and salvation:

> It's a bit like extreme teaching … I suppose it is like extreme teacher training. I really fancied the challenge of being thrown into a very challenging environment and having to learn on the job (Kim, participant, interview).

The archetypal participant, then, is bold and courageous, and craves individual responsibility. They are prepared to take a chance and seek a thrill whilst always calculating the costs and benefits of their actions and choices. In this way, the archetypal form is the good neo-liberal «subject of risk», who embodies the dual image and obligations of «the responsible (moral) and of the rational (calculating) individual» (O'Malley, 1996, p. 199).

> I've always thought that I would never have done, like, a PGCE[3] … because I think I wouldn't have enjoyed «A» going back to university and having to do all the theory stuff, even though I did that with Teach First and I had to do it on my own. But what I enjoyed about Teach First was having the responsibility from

---

[2] Not in Education, Employment, or Training.

[3] Post-Graduate Certificate in Education.

day one over my own classes … So I'm glad I went through Teach First and I … from day one I was just left on my own.

And I knew it was going to be a challenge because I knew, like, they'd always tell me from Teach First… «it is gonna be difficult»… And it is really difficult, extremely difficult but … but I knew it, I'd prepared myself for that…

It's that much more rewarding that I've got through something that people consider to be really intense and really difficult … it's given me the experience that someone who's only been teaching for a year and a half… I've got more experience than someone who would have done a PGCE for example, a lot more experience and I'm sort of at a position now I think where if I'd done a PGCE or something different I wouldn't have this much responsibility or this much experience. I feel like I'm 3 or 4 years down the road but I'm only a year and a term into it (Richard, participant, interview).

This «intense» and «difficult» world, which, upon entering, is like «standing on the edge of a great precipice», is at one and the same time a potentially «rewarding» and satisfying world. We get a sense of this risky and individualised form in the above account: the participant's *will* for individual responsibility, and their *desire* to be left alone to make personal provisions against risk («I'd prepared myself for that»). There is a calculation, a projection and a rationalisation of the costs and benefits (both economic and personal) associated with taking up the challenge of the programme («3 or 4 years down the road»; «I knew it was going to be a challenge»). O'Malley (ibid, 1996, pp. 199-200) argues:

The rational individual will wish to become responsible for the self, for (albeit via some neo-liberal manipulation of the environment), this will produce the most palatable, pleasurable and effective mode of provision for security against risk. Equally, the responsible individual will take rational steps to avoid and to ensure against risk, in order to be independent rather than a burden upon others.

The Teach First world is, in one register at least, a precarious and individualised encounter described by a number of my interviewees in terms of «sink or swim». The participant – both actual and perceived – is left to fend for him/herself, to survive or to perish. One aspect of this is the ways in which they are individually contracted to their schools as trainees, with little room for negotiation and manoeuvre upon encountering any problems or difficulties. Their sense of insecurity and isolation is implicated in their own governance, as explored more fully below, and is just one outcome of the contractualisation and monetisation of education policy. Ball (2010c, p. 126, citing Yeatman, 1996, p 285, and citing Foucault, 1977, p. 194) notes:

Contracts bring about a re-shaping of the culture and structures of governance … and of service relationships and of the commitments of public service workers. At heart this is a process of disaggregation and individualisation both of governance itself and of service relationships which are increasingly «conceived as a series of cascading contracts linking principals and agents» …

The body politic is replaced by what Foucault calls «mercantile society», which is «represented as a contractual association of isolated juridical subjects».

It is perhaps understandable, and also a touch ironic – bearing in mind the image of the archetypal form – that the most common criticism of Teach First amongst the participants I interviewed was the «lack of support» that they received:

Rebecca: The answer is «well we told you they were going to be a struggle, we told you it was a challenging school». That's their answer: «this is what you signed up for» … They just tell you that «you applied for a challenging school, you can do it. You're changing lives, keep going, end of».

Janet: And the reason for that is because ultimately they are hiring us to be teachers straight away. We are under contract and therefore they don't have the legal right to take us out. (Group interview).

Once you come into the school you're not really … you don't really have Teach First's support. So you come into a school and you have to fight your own battles and I suppose in a way that's positive because that's life and you should be able to do that, but in other ways you'd expect maybe to be given some advice from Teach First and maybe kind of directed and inspired a little bit more… Maybe that's a good thing; it's difficult to know at the moment (Sheila, participant, interview).

The irony here is that the cultivation of the entrepreneurial self and, moreover, the *hyper-performative* teacher (Bailey, 2015; Bailey, 2013), are correlates of a form of government which in part aims to displace the collective and socialised securities of the welfare state, and to infiltrate and disband «enclosures of expertise» like the teaching profession by subsuming them «to new formal calculative regimes» (Dean, 2010, p. 197). The entrepreneurial self (and the participant as an individualised transformational force), is a self-managing and self-maximizing unit, who bears the responsibility for his/her own protection as the mechanisms of social government and security are withdrawn.

Having explored the form and profile of the *archetypal participant*, next I take a closer look at how their productive capacities and commitments – their «disposition to act» (Lazzarato, 2008, no page) – are «activated» and governed by means of a range of affective technologies.

5. Affective activation

The company not only has to create a world for the consumer … but also for the worker. To work within a contemporary organization means to belong, to adhere to its world, to its desires and beliefs (Lazzarato, 2004, p. 194).

Put rather prosaically, *affective activation* involves the responsibilisation of the subject (worker) in the processes of production. It «includes the activities of workers who participate in [and design, manage] quality circles, team-building exercises and preparing mission statements, and who fill in suggestion forms and contribute to «away days» and other activities that reflect on and redesign the nature of their work» (Dant, 2003, p. 59). The Teach First teacher is, significantly, a *participant*, which is an *active* subject position (an *aesthetic solicitation*). The individual is hailed as a vital force in the productive (performative, cultural, transformational) and moral ends of the enterprise (the mission). A good place to start is the *Teach First Summer Institute,* which is where new participants receive six weeks of initial training prior to being placed in schools:

> There was a lot of like … it's hard to explain it but there is a lot of buzzwords used by Teach First. There are a lot of videos that are designed to be highly emotive. And there was something faintly American about it. There was a lot of like «you are going to address educational disadvantage, you are the future». Like all this kind of rhetoric around you as an individual and around the mission … There was a big emphasis on educational disadvantage and what that might look like… There was a big emphasis on understanding where these children come from and understanding how sociological factors effect behaviour and effect attainment (Kim, participant, interview).

> Some of it was quite cheesy at times because they'd have all these very like motivational videos, and chant the mission and … but then actually it was really lovely to see the whole mission really, with all its participants in one place really and all the people who are there for the right reasons who have been accepted, all like-minded people, all there for the same reasons and it was actually quite a sort of a bonding and sort of a focussing time really to think «oh yeah this is why I'm doing it».

> The main idea of it I suppose was probably just to unite us all together and to, sort of, show everyone how important this movement was and what we were gonna be doing was. I think most of it was actually probably just to pump us up and get us ready for September, not necessarily to teach, but to be motivated and to be … yeah to be willing and to be energised and passionate about what we were gonna be doing because ultimately it's going to be the passion and the motivation that's going to get us through these hard times. Because when you're knocked down so many times in the first year you need to have that to be able to pick yourself up again basically, that resilience (Michelle, participant, interview).

> We went out into a few classes, a few classrooms, and taught practice lessons and did a few practice lessons and, yeah I guess that they … they do really drive their mission as in: «the reason why you're here is this, keep that in mind all the time. You are going to find that there are going to be tough points, there is going to be highs and lows, but ultimately this is why we're here» and that you're part of like a massive sort of movement of change; that was always reiterated. Ultimately when you're going into the classroom you're not qualified and I don't think anything really can prepare you for that (Emily, participant, interview).

The Summer Institute is a technology of affective government. Whilst it involves some training and professional preparation, perhaps its main function and purpose, as we can see above, is to secure the commitments of the participants, and to build a common sense of identity, affiliation and purpose («to unite us all together»). It is an *affective technology,* then, which aims to establish a *social* and *productive* relationship (pumped up, motivated, passionate) with the individual and the collective.

«This is why I'm doing it; this is why I'm here». A number of affective technologies and techniques can be identified here: the emotive and motivational videos; the mission (even *chanting the mission*); the cultivating of an identity and community («all likeminded people, all here for the same reasons»); the foretelling of «tough times» and «danger»; the diagnoses of the vital realities and *indispositional* conducts of the poor and disadvantaged (their behaviour and sociology); the perpetuation of fear and the moral indignations; and the manufacturing/securing of hope and (dis)belief. These are technologies programmed to activate, in the words of one of the participants above, a *willing*, *energised* and *passionate* subject. That is to say, they aim to secure the commitments and the fears of the individual and the collective – their vital capacities and senses – and to mobilise them towards the fulfilment of the performative and cultural ends of the organisation. They can thus «be defined as the capacity to activate and manage productive cooperation. In this phase, workers are expected to become «active subjects» in the coordination of the various functions of production, instead of being subjected to it as simple command» (Lazzarato, 1996, p. 135):

> I was actually really excited … no reservations except for just wanting to do a really good job and I think the pressure and wanting to do well for the school but also for myself and then also for the programme. So just feeling the pressure, but no reservations I don't think (Ada, participant, interview).
>
> At Teach First they try to inculcate this feeling that you're a separate breed, not of teacher necessarily, of, like, human and this is your identity. Part of your identity is Teach First and the ethos and the – what are they supposed to be, not the commitments, the … I don't know the six attributes that you are supposed to have – which as a Brit and as someone who is not a total moron it was easy to distance myself from and be critical about, but emotionally I have invested in (Kim, participant, interview).

To be sure, there are other technologies at work here, constituting the participants as governable subjects: what Dean (2010) calls technologies of *agency* and *performance*. The former «seek to enhance or deploy our possibilities of agency», whilst the latter, as I have already explored, are «technical means for locking the moral and political requirements of the shaping of conduct into the optimization of performance» (Dean, 2010, pp. 196-197). The participant as an *active subject* and *hyper-performative teacher*, as noted previously, bears an agency which in large measure is produced and consumed by obligations to perform, or a performative debt.

It is interesting to note that this kind of *affective activation* is an ongoing process, occurring in different spaces and through different media. The subject is prompted

and governed through the «Hertzian flows» as Lazzarato (2004, p. 190) puts it, «of information and communication within which [they] are immersed». Teach First tries to maintain «contact» with the participant in a number of ways:

> Teach First really does try and kind of promote this idea of, you know, we are trying to make, you know, we are trying to change the game basically. We're trying to make it so that everything is fair for everybody, its equal opportunities for all children and things like that. And every single event I go to, I get fazed and then I'm like – it was really terrible actually – this Summer Institute when we went back, kind of, I was so resentful of going back. I was knackered, I'd had a really tough year and then, you know, three days in they changed my mind-set again and I was like oh this is all ok again, I'm really interested by education again and it's all interesting. So they do kind of like indoctrinate you basically (April, Teach First participant, interview).

Firstly are the events like the Summer Institute and the annual conference. The interviewee above describes how going back to the Institute after a «tough year» – despite reservations – resulted in a «change of mindset *again*», a realigning of their productive capacities and spiritual energies to the moral and necessary business of the mission. But there are other examples of this kind of «affective nudging», including the Teach First *e-blasts*:

> Rebecca: They make you feel like you are amazing to be on here. I can't remember what word, what tag line…
>
> Maria: Exceptional.
>
> Rebecca: … exceptional. They tell you from the beginning that this is an exceptional grad scheme and you will be exceptional. And there's this confidence feeding off something that makes you feel like no actually I'm quite good, I'm quite good … And it's constant. You regularly get … you get an email every Friday telling you you're an exceptional graduate and then giving you loads of details about it, so you can't help but feel like yeah OK …
>
> Maria: On the really bad days.
>
> Rebecca: … yeah I will do this because I'm part of this big movement that's trying to make educational change. I'm part of that, I'm gonna ask for this.
>
> Maria: Keeps you on a high.
>
> Rebecca: Yeah so I think they're really good at keeping you on a high.
>
> Interviewer: Do you get this email every Friday?

> Rebecca: You get an email; it's called an *e-blast*, every Friday […] every other Friday and it just tells you about opportunities within Teach First and, externally, opportunities for your students, for you, and just to kind of keep, I guess, to keep that affinity going (Group interview).

The *e-blast* is an affective technology designed to «keep you on a high». It *reminds* the participant of their *worth* («you are exceptional») and *moral duties* («part of this big movement to make educational change») and *authorisation* («I am part of that, I'm going to ask for this»). The image of the «exceptional graduate» is an incorporeal transformation – a solicitation – which I have already discussed. But there are also overtones of evangelical religious fervour here, a missionary zeal and form of pastoralism which affirms the legitimacy of the subject and their actions upon themselves and others. Indeed, we can say that these affective technologies are about «keeping that affinity going», or in other words, securing a social and governmental (and pastoral) relationship with and amongst the participants:

> Maria: It's also like the branding, because if you say you're a teacher «Oh I'm a teacher too let's have a discussion». It is almost like, yeah … I might see someone on a train and they've got Teach First on them and you're like «oh you're a part of Teach First» and you automatically feel connected …
>
> All: Yeah (chorus).
>
> Rebecca: *Like an affinity.*
>
> Maria: … Yeah it is like an affinity, it's more than just being a teacher. You know, I meet teachers and …
>
> Laura: It's a perspective on …
>
> Maria: … share your experience. But if you're part of Teach First it's like you're part of Teach First …
>
> Laura …. the mission …
>
> Maria: … and it probably is because of the mission (Group interview).

Teach First is a values and competency based organisation (as above). It is through these kinds of technologies that ways of living and being are solicited and presented as common-sense and necessary. But the specification and fabrication of the participant – their qualities, commitments, obligations and motivations – also forms a kind of register of identification («all like-minded people») and a source of affiliation, and which may, as we see in the example below, be embodied, or «become part of your natural way of working»:

Maria:	My own head of department is like «yeah I noticed you Teach First walk around with your hard-drive everywhere» …
Rebecca:	Yeah.
Maria:	… and you're like «yeah because *that's what we do*, *we share resources*», like «oh you've got a whole scheme of work on this. Great, plug me in» ...
Rebecca:	Yeah. […]
Maria:	But that's one of our values, collaboration …
All:	Yeah.
Maria:	… and you find that the values – it's so cheesy – but it becomes a natural part of your way of working (Group interview).

The apparent *ownership* of these values and competencies («*our* values», «that's what *we* do»), and the identification with and embodiment of the *brand* («having the Teach First name on your back»; «if you're part of Teach First it's like you're part of Teach First»), are indications of at least two things. On the one hand, we can see the increasing *individualisation, fragmentation* and *commercialisation* of the teacher (and teacher education) (see, for example, Whitty, 2014). On the other, as Lazzarato (2003, no page) puts it, we can also see that «the paradigmatic body of our societies is no longer the mute body moulded by discipline, but rather it is the bodies and souls marked by the signs, words and images (company logos) that are inscribed in us». As Lazzarato (1996, p. 134) argues elsewhere, and noted already, «what modern management techniques are looking for is for «the worker's soul to become part of the factory.» The worker's personality and subjectivity have to be made susceptible to organization and command», and conducive for exploitation and capital (and performative) accumulation. It is a matter of securing «the individual's function, as a molecular fraction of capital» (Lazzarato, 2009, p. 121), and, more locally, the participants' function as a molecular fraction of Teach First.

I have covered a lot of ground and gone in a number of directions here. Next I want to take stock of things, get a sense of the lay of the land, and think more broadly and critically about the ontology of the Teach First world and its place within «the neo-liberal universe» (Lazzarato, 2008). I also want to think more directly about how all of this can be viewed as an instance of neo-liberalisation and affective government, and in terms of a molecular transformation of the education state.

6. Concluding Discussion: The Teach First aesthetic of existence

The ongoing transformation of the education state is being enacted through dual processes of what Ong (2007) calls big «N» and small «n» neo-liberalism. That is, the opening up of new opportunities for economisation and profit, and the production

of willing, self-governing and entrepreneurial selves (Ball, 2012). To be more precise, this is a transformation which is underpinned by six interdependent and symbiotic principles and «states of being» (Ball, 2013): *inequality*, *insecurity*, *individualisation*, *depoliticization*, and *financialization* (Lazzarato, 2009). These principles together «constitute a «politics of the social» and an ontological framework that displaces the principles of the welfare state» (Ball, 2013, p. 133). Although I have referred to some of these principles in isolation, I want now to point up more directly how they are secured in the Teach First *aesthetic of existence,* and manifest in the conducts and subjectivities of the participants. I will take each more or less in turn, and attend to some of their interrelations.

Inequality is a necessary condition of neo-liberal government. Theoretically speaking, it constitutes an incentive for individual endeavour, striving and competition. As Lazzarato (2009, p. 117) puts it: «appetites and instincts are not given: only inequality has the capacity to sharpen appetites, instincts and minds, driving individuals to rivalries», although, as Ball (2013, p. 134) elaborates, «market theorists, like Hayek, argue that these instincts are «natural»». Attempts to alleviate inequalities – which had been pursued, to some degree, in the politics of redistribution (in terms of both money and social property) characteristic of the governing of the state of welfare – are viewed by neo-liberals as counter-productive and counter-intuitive as it is only within such an environment that the individual (and the organisation) is driven to self-maximisation (rather than dependency and inefficiency). The principle of *financialization* is also relevant here as its effects have been responsible for widening social and economic inequalities, enacted via a shifting of the tax burden «away from corporations towards individual wage earners» (Peters, 2001a, p. 59) and a «reprivatization of money and a critique of anything (such as the New Deal) that encroaches on the «sovereignty of money»» (Dean, 2013, p. 218).

Although Teach First is a social enterprise which aims to tackle educational disadvantage, alleviating broader structural inequalities is not one of its objectives: such a mission would be antithetical to the dominant mode of thought which constrains its practices, and its solicitations of the common-sense and the necessary. As I have already suggested, there is a fundamental difference between addressing disadvantage and *advantage*. In fact, Teach First *secures* the principle of inequality by anticipating and soliciting the *new homo œconomicus*, that is, the human kind formed in the image of the competitive market. The *archetypal Teach First participant* – as solicited in various immaterial practices, and also as evident in the accounts of the participants themselves – is, in part at least, «a calculating, solipsistic, instrumentally driven, «enterprise man»» (Ball, 2013, p. 132), and a good neo-liberal subject of risk. Moreover, the performative strategy of the organisation is in part about rendering the populations upon which it intervenes *more competitive*. In this sense, Teach First aligns the conducts of the governed (the citizen, the teacher, the disadvantaged child) with conditions of inequality, within which each and all are considered to be (and must consider themselves to be) in states and relations of «equal inequality».

The principle of *insecurity*, moreover, serves to intensify and augment the state of inequality. Put simply, as the state retracts and transforms its mechanisms of social security – the shift, for example, from «welfare to workfare», the *individualisation/*

financialization of work and state pensions, the breaking up of collective solidarities (including the professions) and the related undermining of secure and long-term employment – the individual is made increasingly responsible for their own protection and survival. As Ball (2013, p. 134) puts it, «insecurity is the basis for both responsibility and enterprise. We must take responsibility for our own needs and for our own well-being … we can no longer rely on the state».

> The outcomes of the transformation in the regime of accumulation [- the shift from industrial-managerial to post-industrial-shareholding capitalism -] include the asymmetrical effects of financialization and new forms of inequality, the necessary and functional growth of insecurity and «precarity» among wage earners and the monetarization of state administration. The latter has two goals: to implicate employees, via their pension funds, in the regulation of social expenditures and to prevent alliances between employees and beneficiaries of social services (Dean, 2013, pp. 218-29).

As I have tried to illustrate, the Teach First experience is itself a precarious kind of encounter («risky», limited preparation and training, «lack of support»). It is an «extreme» form of teaching compared to a «bungee jump». The «jump» may consume one with fear and trepidation «down to every nerve and sinew», but it may also fulfil one's thrill-seeking disposition, and lead to «exhilaration», «delight» and a sense of «pride».

In terms of the former, Teach First solicits, stimulates and secures fear and insecurity, both in terms of the participants' conditions of contract (employment based training; performative promise), and by articulating dangers associated with the «challenging school» and uncertain futures (i.e. through affective technologies like the Summer Institute, the mission, the emotive videos, vital statistics, etc.). As will be addressed in future work, the organisation also solicits the fears of the governed in relation to the *indispositional* conducts of the poor and threats to the vitality of the liberal way of life.

Teach First therefore in some ways «introduce[s] degrees of insecurity, instability, uncertainty … and existential precarity into the lives of individuals» (Lazzarato, 2009, p. 119), and thus evinces and secures something of the «affective basis» of neo-liberal government. As Ball (2013, p. 134) notes: «We are made fearful and therefore active ... Our emotions are linked to the economy through our anxieties and our concomitant self-management … [T]he state becomes the site of minimal provision and last resort». This is what Lazzarato (2009, p. 120) calls a «micro-politics of little fears» which forms the underside of a «major organised molar security». Of course, «It is not the same insecurity for everyone whatever the level and conditions of employment, yet a differential of fear runs along the whole continuum» (Lazzarato, ibid, p. 120). As Gilson (2013, p. 115) argues, «given that the demands of the market are unpredictable and continually changing, being a good-enough entrepreneurial subject entails constant awareness that one is never good enough and must also be increasing, maximizing, and developing one's capacities». Importantly for the case of the *archetypal Teach First participant*, as Gilson (ibid, p. 115) continues, «[e]ven for the most aspirational of entrepreneurial subjects, the dangers that accompanies

neo-liberalism inculcates a sense of insecurity», and I have tried to give some examples of this through the voices and experiences of the subjects of the research.

> Everyday fear, Foucault argues, is the correlate of neo-liberal freedom. Neo-liberalism defines freedom as the right of individuals to act according to their personal interest, as rationally indexed to the needs and opportunities of the market economy that sustains them … The market as a self-regulating system is metastable: it achieves provisional equilibrium, within limits and between thresholds, dogged at each step by conflicts of interests, irrationalities, and deviances, little dangers that might suddenly combine weights and tip the system into chaos (Massumi, 2005, pp. 1-2).

Indeed, problematizations of *government* and *security* in liberal regimes of rule are underpinned by a more general affective basis, and also involve a great deal of affective labour. The «war on terror» (a quintessential problematization of liberal security) and «performativity» (a quintessential form of neo-liberal governmentality) are forms of government which are both rendered «affectively effective» through the activation of the governed, and that is through their senses: their fears, perceptions and (in)securities of and in everyday work and life. Importantly, these fears are produced and secured *by* civil society, or what Dean provocatively terms the «liberal police». As Bell (2007, p. 62) notes, «fear is not merely reflected but is also *produced* and *reproduced* by civil society. This is to say, the security moms … are themselves invested in fear and so reproduce it in their communities and children and so forth». Foucault's (2010, p. 66) point is particularly apposite here:

> [W]e can say that the motto of liberalism is: «Live dangerously.» «Live dangerously», that is to say, individuals are constantly exposed to danger, or rather, they are conditioned to experience their situation, their life, their present, and their future as containing danger. I think this kind of stimulus of danger will be one of the major implications of liberalism.

But the fear and uncertainty associated with the Teach First experience, where «realising what you don't know is a strangely motivating force», also offers the possibility to succeed or to survive an experience or an encounter where others (including friends, colleagues) have struggled, failed or defaulted. Insecurity thus interacts with the principles of *individualization* and *depoliticization*: the determination to keep going, the delight when one hasn't wilted or perished in the brutality of the encounter, and the will to go again and, perhaps, to go with more certainty and to do it even better. This is the *Damoclesean* angst and precarity of performativity, its tendency to promote *individualization* and *depoliticization,* and the material and affective opportunities it presents for *self-investment* and *self-valorisation*. The Teach First programme and its associated terrors and thrills also offer personal opportunities for investments in the self, which is another aspect of enterprise. Performativity is a quintessential technology of affective government, where one's governing concern is with, as we saw earlier, «doing well for myself, my school and the programme». Whilst performativity «is

enacted through measures and targets against which we are expected to position ourselves but often in ways that also produce uncertainties about how we should organise ourselves within our work» (Ball, 2012, p. 31), perhaps the *affective activation* of the Teach First participant is a *vital, biopolitical technology* which in some ways securitises these insecurities («it has given me security»). These affective technologies work to appropriate, maintain and valorise the productive capacities of the participant – their «willing», «passionate» and «active» minds and bodies – towards the fulfilment of organisational (performative) objectives and, of course, the objectives of the state. The participant overcomes the «micro-fears» associated with performance, the economy and «risky teaching» through their own striving and aspirations («pushing on through it»), their strong sense of the certainty and of the rightness (or righteousness) of what they are doing, and hence also through their affiliation with the mission and their identifications with the other participants and the archetypal form («a collective aspiration»). This affective, individualised and depoliticized form of identification perhaps serves to subvert the possibilities for a more collective identification and sense of «shared vulnerability» (Gilson, 2013, p. 115) with the teaching profession more generally («not just you in your classroom, in your school, but like you're part of a collective group of people») and arguably delimits the possibilities for alternative modes of thinking and practice. The affective technologies which Teach First deploys thus in some ways serve to secure the «methods and terrors» of performativity within the education state. As Ball (2013, p. 134) argues, «depoliticization acts in parallel to [insecurity], sometimes rendering collective conditions of experience into personal problems, sometimes displacing political and economic decisions into individual failings and responsibilities».

At the same time, as active and transformational subjects of educational reform, the participants are to spread the word of this neo-liberal normativity, to proselytize on this (individualised, depoliticized and instrumental) neo-liberal relation to self and others. They are molecular neo-liberal subjects who strive in conditions of insecurity and inequality, who «go above and beyond expectations» and who can achieve – in the words of the title to the founding and now former Teach First CEO Brett Wigdortz's book – «success against the odds» (2012). The participants embody the aesthetics of the Teach First world – its visions of the good life and of the necessary and the sensible – and are tasked with the duty of enlightening others of the fruits of its gospel. They are also tasked with «inculcating» this aesthetic and its undergirding principles into their schools:

> And I also think it's very interesting in terms of psychologically the self-talk that can lead to outcomes in that … I think that's an interesting moral as a teacher when your job is to motivate children to push themselves as hard as they can go, to do things they don't believe they can do, to have aspirations beyond aspirations they currently hold for themselves. I think it's an interesting testament to self-talk. And in that way it kind of models what they want you to achieve in the classroom in that it models the creation of an ethos, of a team spirit, of a collective aspiration which they then I suppose expect you to inculcate initially in your classroom and then in your school (Kim, participant, interview).

Finally, I have already pointed up some of the implications of the principle of *financialization* and how it interrelates with some of the other neo-liberal «states of being». Perhaps most significantly for my present concerns, however, is that the participants embody and perform an aesthetic which is conducive for capital (and performative) accumulation. This is to say that the archetypal form and profile of the Teach First participant,

> allows us to understand the role of capitalization as one of the techniques in the transformation of the worker into «human capital» in charge of his/her own efforts to manage him/herself according to the logic of the market … Capitalization is consistent with the view that the individuals function, as a molecular fraction of capital, is not that of ensuring the profitability of labour but the profitability of capital as a whole. The individual becomes a «capital competence», a «machine-competence»; he or she cannot become the new *homo œconomicus* without being «a lifestyle», a «way of being», a moral choice, a «mode of relating to oneself, to time, to one's environment, to the future, the group, the family» (Lazzarato, 2009, p. 121, citing Foucault, 2004, p. 271).

7. References

Amin, A. (2000). Post-Fordism: Models, Fantasies and Phantoms of Transition. In A. Amin (Ed.), *Post-Fordism: A Reader* (pp. 1-40). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Bailey, P.L.J. (2013). The policy dispositif: historical formation and method. *Journal of Education Policy*, *28*(6), pp. 807-827.

Bailey, P.L.J. (2015). Teach First as a dispositif: towards a critical ontology of policy and power. Doctoral thesis , University of London. Available at: https://discovery. ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1546650/

Bailey, P.L.J. (2015). Consultants of conduct: new actors, new knowledges and new «resilient' subjectivities in the governing of the teacher. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *47*(3), pp. 232-250.

Ball, S. (2013). *Foucault, Power, and Education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Ball, S.J. (2010). New Voices, New Knowledges and the New Politics of Education Research: the gathering of a perfect storm?. *European Educational Research Journal, 9*(2)*,* pp. 124-137.

Ball, S.J. (2012). *Global Education Inc. New Policy Networks and the Neoliberal Imaginary*. London: Routledge.

Bell, D. (2007). The Politics of Fear and the Gospel of life. *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory, 8*(2)*,* pp. 55-80.

Dant, T. (2003). *Critical Social Theory: Culture, Society and Critique*. London: Sage.

Dean, M. (1995). «Governing the unemployed self in an active society'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 24 (4)*,* pp. 559-583.

Dean, M. (1996). «Foucault, government and the enfolding of authority'. In A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose (Eds), *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neoliberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 209-229). London: UCL Press Limited.

Dean, M. (2007). *Governing Societies*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. (Second Ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Dean, M. (2013). *The Signature of Power: Sovereignty, Governmentality and Biopolitics*: Sage.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972-1990*. (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2004). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). London: Athlone Pess.

Duzenli, F. E. (2006). *Re/presenting Labor: Economic Discourse, Value, and Ethics*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, M. (2004). *Naissance de la biopolitique*. Paris: Gallimard-Seuil.

Foucault, M. (2010). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978-1979*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gillies, D. (2011). Agile bodies: a new imperative in neoliberal governance. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(2)*,* pp. 207-223.

Gilson, E. (2013). *The Ethics of Vulnerability: A Feminist Analysis of Social Life and Practice*: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1988). Brave New World. *Marxism Today (Special Issue)*, October 1988, pp. 24-29.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. London: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and Democray in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin.

Kelly, P. (2006). «The entrepreneurial self and «youth at-risk': Exploring the horizons of identity in the twenty-first century'. *Journal of youth studies, 9*(1)*,* pp. 17-32.

Lazzarato, M. (1996). Immaterial Labour. In M. Hardt and Virno.P. (Eds), *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics* (pp. 133-147). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lazzarato, M. (2003). Struggle, Event, Media. [Online]. *Transversal* (May 2003). Available at: http://eipcp.net/transversal/1003/lazzarato/en.

Lazzarato, M. (2004). From Capital-Labour to Capital-Life. *ephemera: theory and politics in organization, 4*(3)*,* pp. 187-208.

Lazzarato, M. (2008). From Knowledge to Belief, from Critique to the Production of Subjectivity. [Online]. *Transversal* (April 2008). Available at: http://transform. eipcp.net/transversal/0808/lazzarato/en.

Lazzarato, M. (2009). Neoliberalism in action inequality, insecurity and the reconstitution of the social. *Theory, Culture & Society, 26*(6)*,* pp. 109-133.

Lazzarato, M. (2012). *The Making of Indebted Man*. (J. D. Jordan, Trans.). Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Massumi, B. (2005). The Future Birth of the Affective Fact, *Conference proceedings: Genealogies of Biopolitics*.

Meenaghan, T. (1995). The role of advertising in brand image development. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 4*(4)*,* pp. 23-34.

Olmedo, A., Bailey, P., & Ball, S.J. (2013). To Infinity and beyond …: Heterarchical Governance, the Teach for All Network in Europe and the Making of Profits and Minds, European Educational Research Journal, https://doi.org/10.2304%2Feerj.2013.12.4.492

O'Malley, P. (1996). Risk and responsibility. In A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose (Eds), *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 189-208). London: UCL Press Limited.

O'Malley, P. (2010). Resilient subjects: Uncertainty, warfare and liberalism. Economy and Society, *39*(4), pp. 488-509.

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

Reid, J. (2013) Interrogating the neoliberal biopolitics of the sustainable development-resilience nexus. International Political Sociology, *7*(4), pp. 353-367.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Thrift, N. (2005). *Knowing Capitalism*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Whitty, G. (2014). Recent developments in teacher training and their consequences for the «University Project' in education . Oxford Review of Education, *40*(4).

Wigdortz, B. (2012). *Success Against the Odds: Five Lessons in How To Achieve the Impossible: The Story of Teach First*: Short Books.

Yeatman, A. (1996). The New Contractualism: management reform or a new approach to governance?. In G. Davis and P. Weller (Eds), *New Ideas, Better Government*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.