



Magdalena Nowicka-Franczak
Uniwersytet Łódzki

Postfoucauldian analysis of the discourse on education. Workshop remarks*

KEYWORDS

postfoucauldian discourse analysis, Michel Foucault, discourse on education, middle school (Poland)

ABSTRACT

Postfoucauldian discourse analysis is a vigorously developing approach to discourse studies focusing on the analysis of power, discourse, knowledge and social practice. This comprises studies deriving from Michel Foucault's thought, reinterpreting it, however, with the aim at application to an analysis of empirical data, also from the field of pedagogy and education. The purpose of this paper is to present main concepts and categories of postfoucauldian discourse analysis (e.g. enunciation, discursive formation, discursive practice, procedures for the control of discourse, dispositive, regime of truth) and guidelines for conducting research on the example of an analysis of chosen public texts concerning the debate on liquidation of middle schools in Poland as a result of the reform of education carried out by Law and Justice' government.

Adam Mickiewicz University Press, pp. 171-198
ISSN 2300-0422. DOI 10.14746/kse.2017.12.10.

Remarks regarding the works of Michel Foucault can be found in almost every methodological work devoted to the discourse analysis, and many of the works may be regarded as annotations to the theory presented by Foucault. The enormity of reception and application of the methodological propositions offered by the aforementioned author may come as a surprise, as he, actually, did not analyse, in a systematic and adequate to the puristic criteria of scientific verifiability, any

* The following article is a result of a methodological workshop, conducted during the *Educational discourse. An interdisciplinary approach. Discourse Analysis Workshops (Dyskurs edukacyjny w ujęciu interdyscyplinarnym. Warsztaty Analizy Dyskursu)* Conducted in Bydgoszcz, in November, 2016. The author would like to thank the participants of the workshops, for their remarks and questions.

texts of culture, utterances or media messages. However, reducing his works to purely theoretical speculation on discourse, would be an unfounded reduction. A perspective of a discourse analysis theory, related to the postulate of a particular critical sensitivity of scholars, and polemically engaged towards the tradition of structuralist, hermeneutic and interaction research, emerges from Foucault's works and lectures. Foucault would often make textual statements, e.g. excerpts from scientific treatises, official texts or acts created by the authorities, as an empirical illustration of his speculation, or a starting point for formulating the general apprehension of social relations of power.

Foucault (1984: 42) discussed the issue of the method of analysing power, and the scholarly approach, determining the former, of "a permanent critique of our historical era", therefore, a critique deprived of a final destination, encompassing the methods and concepts, used to formulate the critique. A central issue within the methodological notions by Foucault, is the conceptualisation of the analytics of power, as reflection upon its emergence, non(continuity) and the dynamics of its strategic model, which "replaces the privilege of the law with the viewpoint of the objective, the privilege of prohibition with the viewpoint of tactical efficacy, the privilege of sovereignty with the analysis of a multiple and mobile field of force relations, wherein far-reaching, but never completely stable, effects of domination are produced" (Foucault, 1978: 102). The research regarding discourse would be an inseparable, however not an exclusive (see below) element of power analytics.

The indication is not sufficient for the explanation regarding the means of directly applying the method within empirical research. A specific completeness and autopoiesis of the approach, seems to render its application within current social contexts impossible. Along with the initial postfoucauldian analyses of discourse, a discussion has been launched, regarding the possibilities and limitations of the operationalisation of Foucauldian concepts for the purpose of discourse analyses; first, relatively systematically provided empirical data; second, regarding the research of the elements of reality, other than those that provided the concepts. A brief review of the polemical accounts is worth mentioning, published in a volume titled *Das Wuchern der Diskurse. Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse Foucaults* edited by Hannelore Bublitz, Andrea D. Bührmann, Christine Hanke and Andrea Seier (1998), and in a thematic volume titled *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung: From Michel Foucault's Theory of Discourse to Empirical Discourse Research* (2007), edited by Andrea D. Bührmann, Rainer Diaz-Bone, Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Gavin Kendall, Werner Schneider and Francisco Tirado.

In order to briefly summarise the three-decade long discussion, one can enumerate three accounts. The first is related to the emphasis of the instrumentality

and praxeological orientation of Foucault's theory, therefore, to the postulate of employing his concepts and categories as a specific matrix for empirical research, which is specified by each scholar in regard to the given empirical issue (Bührmann, Schneider, 2007). The distinctive feature of the second account, is the highlighted notion, that the Foucauldian proposal constitutes no method in a strict sense, cannot receive a standard and sequential description, however, despite the above, it serves as a method in its metaworkshop sense, regarding that which the critical analysis method should be, i. e. "a rather theoretical, or even philosophical approach" to conducting research (Sarasin 2003: 8). The third account represents the highest degree of scepticism regarding both the operationalisation of Foucauldian concepts, as well as, its treatment as a method of empirical research. In light of the third account, the influential thinker conducted a separate and historically located research method, and such an analysis of power may not be repeated, falsified or tested, using different material and empirical contexts of social studies, particularly the ones significantly remote from the source field encompassing i. a. mental disorders, body discipline, population governance or sexuality. The attempts to combine the Foucauldian perspective with the methods of qualitative studies are also met with scepticism, as the distinct feature of his critical attitude, was the questioning of a series of concepts regarding humanities and social sciences (e.g. attitudes, actions, interactions), therefore the combination of his approach with the accounts that he discarded, would deprive his perspective of meaning and its revolutionary aspect (Gehring, 2009; also see: Klemm, Glasze, 2005).

The proposals and notions presented in the article refer to the first account, which accepts the possibility of operationalising Foucauldian concepts within new fields. The presented account is positioned within a vast field of postfoucauldian analyses, i.e. the analyses that transform, re-formulate and complement the theoretical account of the philosopher in regard of the aim being the application within empirical studies. Therefore the aforementioned research perspective is regarded rather as postfoucauldian, than Foucauldian. However, the reduction of his contribution within these analyses, to general inspiration, would be unfounded.

The first section of the article is devoted to highlighting the aspects of Foucault's thought, related to educational issues, as well as contemporary ways of employing these speculations within educational studies. The second section is a review of the principal premises and concepts of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis, applicable within the research on education messages and messages on education. The third section is devoted to the presentation of an example analysis of selected empirical material, taken from the Polish public discourse of the argument regarding the abolishing of middle schools, as proposed by the Law and Jus-

tice (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, PiS) government reform. The summary is devoted to the listing of advantages and disadvantages coming from the postfoucauldian discourse analysis, particularly regarding education studies.

Foucault and pedagogy

The significance of Foucault's works, regarding pedagogy as a scientific discipline, as well as the essential nature of the pedagogical issues, present in the author's works, has often been emphasised on. As highlighted by Helena Ostrowicka, among others, "the issues of the power – knowledge – subject relation, determining the main points connecting the philosopher's works, are the central categories of pedagogic thinking", similar to the critical speculation, common for the perspective of Foucault and various contemporary pedagogues, regarding the phenomenon of discipline or techniques of ego management. The portrayal of the profoundness of Foucauldian critique of pedagogical knowledge, remains the object of the argument. Is the description of educational practice, as well as indication of its historical entanglement in social mechanisms of power over individuals and collectives, the goal of Foucault's speculation? Does Foucauldian critique go any further and allows to question the "basis of the pedagogical perspective as a scientific discipline and a profession, independently from whether one considers the traditional accounts in pedagogy that seem to assume an unidirectionality of educational influence, or interactive-dialogue, postulating the possibly symmetrical relations between the pupil and the teacher", as they are connected by the notion of shaping and/or subjectifying of individuals within or through a pedagogical relation (Czyżewski, 2013a: 83; idem, 2013b: 45–48)? The subject, within the theories of Foucault and some of his followers, is an object of significant critique, as a result of subjectification (Fr. *assujettissement*), and a creation of power, and his ability to resist power is determined by the character of power mechanisms that shape individuals.¹

A consideration of the symbiotic relation between power and knowledge, may provide assistance with answering the question regarding the status of pedagogic themes in Foucault's thought. Power, impersonal, dispersed and considered as

¹ In his article titled *Subject and Power* Foucault (2000: 331) lists two meanings of the term "subject" (Fr. *sujet*): "subject to someone else by control and dependence; and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to". The matter is expanded on in relation to subjective acts of stating truth in a series of lectures titled *On the Government of the Living* (2014).

a simultaneous grounding and a result of the micro- and macrosocial relations produces a situation of dominance, inequality and exclusion, due to the enhancement and legitimacy by the social authority of knowledge (particularly scientific knowledge). Knowledge not only describes and justifies and naturalises the mechanisms of the subjectification of individuals and rendering them subjects fit or unfit for the current shape of social order. Knowledge (or rather power-knowledge) is actualised within discourse, regionally and through relations, instead of, simply, in regard of its contents. Regionality of knowledge refers to the dynamic character of the legitimisation of knowledge, which does not dominate absolutely, but rather within a certain region of discourse or field of power. The relational nature of knowledge implies that knowledge is created and legitimised within a field of a network connecting various institutions (including educational institutions) and social practices, through which a given knowledge is applied and implemented within a strictly defined context (see: Foucault, 1980: 69–70; Ristić, Marinković, 2016: 31).

Similar to the genealogical reference of the emergence of sociology in the 19th century, to the will to knowledge of the enlightenment period, and the expansion of disciplinary power over the population, which rendered the abstract society concept visible, measurable and examinable (see: Ristić, Marinković 2016), we may relate the origins of pedagogy in a Foucauldian manner, to the enlightenment project of shaping independent humans and citizens, and afterwards, to the positivist strategies of normalising social behaviour, implemented also in an indirective manner, submerged in the emancipation rhetoric. The governmentality (Fr. *gouvernementalité*², see: Foucault, 2007, 2010) category, being a modern form of governing population and individuals with the use of indirective techniques, based on the pastoral power derived from Christianity (a priest's power of spiritual guidance regarding the self-development of an individual), became the framework for the analyses of contemporary pedagogical thinking and its prefiguration (Simons, Masschelein 2008: 391–396), despite the questions regarding the status of Foucauldian analyses regarding governing. As Nikolas Rose noted (1999: 19), they “are empirical but not realist”, are not concerned with social facts, organisations and processes, the essential objects of social sciences, but rather with the conditions of possibility of ruling. Therefore, according to Rose (ibidem), their role is “diagnostic rather than descriptive”.

² The issue of translating the term governmentality and *dispositif* to Polish is discussed in a different paper (Nowicka, 2011).

Lectures held by Foucault in Collège de France within the 1980-1984 period, particularly the following courses: *On the Government of the Living, Subjectivity and Truth*, *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*, *The Government of Self and Others* part I and II), dedicated to the ancient art of life, and governing the conduct of self and others, provide the most comprehensive insight into the critique of the processes of education. Foucault finds an impulse for the critique of pedagogy and education, already within Socratic dialogues. The author makes a distinction between education in a strict sense (latin: *educare*), that is “the transmission of theoretical knowledge or of know-how”, and an educational action (latin: *educere*), that is the extrication of an individual from one mode of being, towards a mode which is desirable according to the one who educates (see: Foucault, 2005: 134). Finally, the aim of the care about self, which the philosopher derives from the ancient motto: *epimeleia heautou*, and which leads him to the transmission of the emphasis from the analysis of power over population, to the analysis of the attitudes of individuals towards selves and others, would be to gradually liberate from the rule of teachers and moral-intellectual guides, and directing of individuals to themselves without the need (or maybe temptation) of being led by the educators, who represent the exterior mechanisms of affecting the ego (Fisch, 2011: 380–383).

Foucault outlines a subtle, yet significant, difference between the prescription of the care of the self and the institutional and non-institutional practices of directing the actions and conscience. The former is an attitude towards the self, the others, and the world, turning the ethical (therefore, non-narcissistic) attention of an individual to self, through consequent spiritual practice, resulting with an insight regarding the truth of the self, unavailable to the subject *per se*, however, with the subject being able to strive towards that truth, as a source of transcendent fulfilment or even salvation (Foucault, 2005: 4-19). During Roman times, a distinction is made between the care of the self and pedagogy, with the former becoming an art exercised throughout the entire existence, independent from educational prescriptions, social control, and politics (idem: 205-206). The care of the self is related to the conscious (therefore ethical) practices of liberty, transferring the plenitude of power regarding own ego to self, as well as taking care of others. However, such an approach of practising liberty highlights its elitist character, in opposition to the religious call to everyone, to take care of own salvation.

In the period of the expansion of Christianity within Europe, the practices of the self, according to Foucault (1988: 2) “were laid siege to, up to a certain point, by institutions: religious, pedagogical, or of the medical and psychiatric kind”. The practices were transformed from the practice of governing individuals, their consciousness, as well as, (within a Christian perspective) their souls. The necessary

condition of governing is a voluntary subjection of own will to the other – a guide, a minister, a mentor, etc. Instead of a coercion to receive education, subtle forms of cession of individual sovereignty are suggested, aiming to establish relations with the self, that would remain dependent on the aims of a political power. The relation consists of an internalised obedience, directing the conduct of an individual even at times, when no external instance gives orders or controls compliance (Foucault, 2014: 231-235, 274-275). In order to control self, an ability of self-exploration and self-evaluation is necessary, and it must be learned, therefore the crucial roles of Christian ministry and, later on, secular pedagogy. Foucault finds its prefiguration (2008: 217, 325) within old-Greek psychagogy, practising philosophy by the attitude towards the self and others. Pedagogy is different from philosophy, as its condition is the existence of recipients, who will or must listen to its prescriptions. The experience of philosophy is combined with its contestation, pedagogy, with overbearing resistance. Its practices, allow the individual to produce self-knowledge, not discover but create truth on self, that is “to apprehend the self within a discourse”. According to Foucault (2014: 314) subjectification is dependent on the “necessary link between the annihilation of the self and the production of truth on the self”, that is *de facto* denying the intimate relation to the self, for the sake of perceiving ego within discursive categories.

The weakness of transferring of Foucault’s speculation regarding the relations of power, truth and the condition of the subjects in the field of study of the empirical social practices, is the impossibility of their methodical verification (see: Gehring 2012), as well as the historical relativity and regionality of the discussed theory, meaning that its simple transfer within new contexts (e.g. the role of contemporary educational discourses) may be unfounded (see: Elden 2016). The question regarding the place of pedagogical knowledge, including the highly critical towards practices of subjectification, remains. A postulate of a minimal, however consequent critique of a necessary entanglement of education within the relations of power, may be an acceptable proposal for the scholars interested in the (post)Foucauldian critique that are, however, far from denying the identity of pedagogy as a positive knowledge and self-establishment practice. In one of his last interviews, Foucault himself (1988: 18) renounces the radical statements on the pedagogical power, and simply outlines a plan of a minimal critique: “I don’t see where evil is in the practice of someone who, in a given game of truth, knowing more than another, tells him what he must do, teaches him, transmits knowledge to him, communicates skills to him. The problem is rather to know how you are to avoid in these practices – where power cannot not play and where it is not evil in itself – the effects of domination which will make a child subject to the arbitrary

and useless authority of a teacher, or put a student under the power of an abusively authoritarian professor, and so forth”.

The postfoucauldian analysis resulted with significant scholarly achievements. A general methodological reflection upon the possibilities of application of the Foucauldian perspective within empirical research on discourse, was initiated in the 1980s of the 20th century, and a decade after, first textbooks that included methods inspired by the perspective of the French philosopher or, at least, encompassed the chapters devoted to the discourse analysis à la Foucault, were published (see: Nowicka-Franczak, 2017a). Within the last decade of the past century, scholars were given the works that directly related the concepts and categories proposed by the thinker, to pedagogy. Among the precursory accounts, one should highlight the attempts to establish a genealogy of pedagogical knowledge and educational institutions (i. a. Hunter, 1994; Marshall, 1996), as well as attempts to conduct, in a Foucauldian way, analyses of power regulating the field of education (initially focused on disciplinary power, i.a. Pongratz, 1989; Ball 1992). Soon a number of methodological works appeared, operationalising the Foucauldian perspective for the purposes of research regarding contemporary pedagogical issues (i.a. Pongratz 2004), as well as exegetical works on the classic texts of the aforementioned author, through the scope of selected themes (e.g. Ricken, Rieger-Ladich, 2004).

Considering the limited nature of the article, there is no place for a careful reconstruction of the postfoucauldian analyses regarding the studies on education. The rich amount of sources in Polish, English and German is presented by Helena Ostrowicka in her work titled *To consider the educational discourses on youth with Michel Foucault (Przemyśleć z Michelelem Foucaultem edukacyjne dyskursy o młodzieży)* (2015). Similarly as in terms of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis, in regard to pedagogy, much more research is conducted in English and German-speaking countries, than in Foucault's country, although France provides a number of valuable sources (e.g. Audureau 2003; Donzelot, Gordon 2005). Additionally, within Polish pedagogy, the reception and employment of Foucauldian concepts and postfoucauldian methodological perspective spreads increasingly. Among authors, who contributed to the introduction of this perspective within the academic speculation, one should mention i.a. (alphabetical order): Maksymilian Chutorński (2013), Agnieszka Gromkowska-Melosik (2004), Dorota Klus-Stańska (2015), Zbyszko Melosik (2009, 2013), Maria Mendel (2007), Astrid Męczkowska-Christiansen (2006) and Helena Ostrowicka (2012, 2015). Their works constitute not only an illustration of the broad issue oriented scope of the Foucauldian references within Polish pedagogy (from the research regarding institutional practice and discourses, the issues of construct-

ing sexual and cultural identities within educational discourses (including media discourses), to the analyses of normalising of lives of individuals through the mechanisms of biopolitics and securitisation, carried by the neo-liberal discourses, including the discourse of science legitimising or appropriated for the legitimisation of the current form of governing the society, to the reflection upon the possible strategies of resistance against an externally imposed model of subjectivity). They also vary in roles, played by the concepts taken from Foucault and postfoucauldian scholars, and assemble in a continuum from the essentially theoretical, to the strictly analytical application of these instruments (see: Simons, Masschelein, 2006: 421–422).

Within the postfoucauldian research, a meta-reflection regarding the reception of Foucault's works and the degree of adopting his perspective for the purpose of empirical analyses, is well established. In relation to the pedagogy in Poland, an approach, controlling the modes of using Foucauldian concepts within empirical research and in academic textbooks, may be found particularly within the monographs by Chutorański (2013) and Ostrowicka (2015). Without repeating the conclusions presented in their works, I shall focus on one methodological aspect of the postfoucauldian pedagogical research. They are, similarly to sociological and political analyses, affected by the "trends regarding Foucault". First, they explore, with the use of hermeneutic methods, wide concepts, such as disciplinary power, heterotopias, archive or simply discourse, without the consequent employment of the Foucauldian methodological approach, such as archaeology and genealogy. Second, they fit the buoyant studies regarding neo-liberal governmentality, whose significant representatives within the field of studies regarding education were (however, changing their emphasis later on) Maarten Simons and Jan Masschelein, productive authors, however, repetitive in their diagnoses of the neo-liberal expansion of educational practice involved in the creation of a new type of subject: "entrepreneur of the self". Finally the analysis of the dispositif is developing. Its essence, in a briefest manner, is the holistic qualitative analysis of the discursive, and non-discursive practices, which regulate the scholarly interesting aspect of social reality, and become an ingredient of a wider network of relations of power, viable for a limited, empirical study (Nowicka 2016). The analysis of the dispositif draws upon Foucault's categories (particularly from the later period) and the method of discourse analysis (Ostrowicka; 2012, Othmer, Weich: 2015). Within the field of education, independent postfoucauldian discourse analysis, particularly the discourse microanalyses, are relatively rarely conducted. Foucault conducted no microanalyses, however, attempts to transgress the original perspective, and discover new applications,

without avoiding modification, but maintaining the direction of Foucauldian critique of power. The aim of the following sections of the article is to encourage such attempts.

The main premises and concepts of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis

The essential premises may be extracted from the sole theory of discourse by Foucault. The theory evolved during the years and gradually, the discourse, as a main category in the 1961-1970 period, became a supporting category, remaining important, but as an analytical background for the emerging theme of techniques of governing the population, creating subjects and the relations between truth and power. The apprehension of discourse as a vessel of dynamic relations between social power and knowledge, which is inextricably linked to power (power-knowledge) remained unchanged. Foucault rejects the dichotomous distinction between the dominant discourse of power and the discourse dominated by power, highlighting the constitutive role of the game of meanings, whose boundaries determine the relations of power. Foucault perceives discourse as a “strategic field, whose elements, tactics and weapons continually pass from one camp to the other, interchangeably between adversaries, and standing against those who employ them” (Foucault, 2001 [1976]: 123). Discourse is a type of violence, a “weapon of power, control, subjugation, qualification and disqualification”, it is additionally intermingled with the unspoken, the manifested in a mode of being, within social relations (*ibidem*). In light of this theory, discourse is a rare, discontinuous phenomenon, which strictly filters experience and the evaluation of social reality, excluding or marginalising a variety of potential, alternative views.

What does such a vast view of discourse mean within the analytic perspective? Primarily, it is related to the postulate of the critical reconstruction of the **order of discourse**, the means of regulating the creation of statements included within a discourse, their selection, control, organisation and distribution (Foucault 1981: 52). Statement however, the basic unit of analysis within the postfoucauldian discourse studies, is not regarded as a grammatical structure, or a conventional act of speech, but as the measure of a text. It can be compared to a fragment of a discourse, a functional particle, recalling certain knowledge and means of classification of a described part or reality, or implicating a certain position of the speaker towards the object of the speech. In research practice, a text or its part (e.g. sentence, a section, a paragraph of a legal act), a graphic arrangement of sta-

tistic data, a slogan accompanied by an image, are regarded as the material form of a statement. Importantly, these minor instances of a discourse possess an ascribed enunciative function: they serve the purpose of i.a. diagnosis, argumentation or statement (see: Bacchi, Bonham, 2014).

Within the framework of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis, a methodological “treatment” of statements may assume different forms. Following Foucault’s early works, that explore the archaeological approach, the scholar follows the path of the sociolinguistic analysis and of the reflection regarding the historical nature of discourse and of the rules of its formation. The aim of **archaeology** is to describe the archive; this concept consists of a pool of rules determining, within a given period or region, what may be stated and may become a part of legitimate discourse, rather than an arrangement of statements that occurred within a particular temporal, cultural and social context. The archaeological perspective provides indirect insight into the order of knowledge regarding the social world, which creates that order, petrifies, but also transforms hierarchies and the balance of power between individuals and communities. The function of the order of knowledge, equipped with the order of discourse, seems convergent with the principle of pedagogical influence, both regarding the individual and the maintenance of the social order.

In the *Archaeology of Knowledge*, a regularly quoted, however difficult to interpret, statement appears, that discourse is a “group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation.” (Foucault, 1972: 117). That group of qualitative rules that determine the statements and entangle them in discourse, encompasses the aspects of 1) a convergent object (e.g. reform of education), 2) modality – the mode of authenticating the stated form of content, including the means of the speaker assuming a particular position towards the spoken (e.g. expert references to scientific knowledge, qualified or a parental initiation of emotion and knowledge coming from everyday experience), 3) the coherence of the concepts and classifications apparent within statements (e.g. reference to the educational progress/regress, creating equal opportunities for students of different backgrounds, school modernisation), and 4) a strategic aim, followed by the statement (e.g. the justification of the purposefulness of the education reform, judging the political opponents or the critique of government). The analysis does not settle for the search of regularities within a group of statements. An essential step is the indication of the fields of incompatibility, inconsistency, ruptures between statements and locating them within the constellation of social discourses, therefore, a reconstruction of interdiscursive relations of opposition, division, analogy and complementarity, revealing that which was excluded from the studied discourse (Koller, Lüders, 2004: 62).

Foucault would use the **discursive formation** concept with little restraints, both in singular and in plural. In an empirical analysis this ambiguity brings a question to light: should discourse be identified with one discursive formation, or is there a place for numerous formations within a given discourse? Considering the vastness of the very scope of Foucault's concept of discourse, I'm inclined to stand by the latter option, as discontinuity and change, generating **resistance** manifested within a discursive field as well, are the inherent features of discourse. The evolution of the pedagogical issues is also accomplished by the appearance of contents, concepts and aims, opposed to the currently present visions regarding how to teach, and what subjects to create. Therefore, within a continually moving discourse, determining the dynamic relations of power, a place may be found for more than one discursive formation.

The issue of discourse accidentality, mentioned within the archaeological approach, is significantly articulated within the genealogical perspective and the sociological-historical strand of postfoucauldian studies.³ **Genealogy** postulates the study of labile tactics and strategies of power, and, regarding discourse, the **discursive practices**. The term applies to both rules of formation, as well as the procedures for discourse control, internal and external in regard of the discourse as a result of the links between various power- knowledge instances. Genealogy means the broadening of the analysis horizon, with the aspect of the practical, not exclusively discursive, creation of a hierarchic and categorising perception and explanation of reality.

The consequence of the attempt of such a broad overview, is the clear inclusion (and within the late and final works by Foucault, centralisation) of the issue of a **subject**, as a fundamental creation of the power-knowledge mechanisms. The latter may be arranged from the apparent, vivid, related to the discipline of the body, and often manifested within the form of physical isolation and violence against individuals (e.g. corporal punishment, detention, school ostracism or the architecture and organisation of space in schooling institutions, allowing for effective surveillance of students), to the subliminal, subtle, however at times, more efficient in reshaping the human into a subject "caring for the self" in a particular way, aware of own influence on own well-being, position within a given society, and voluntarily accomplishing, the externally provided identity creation scenarios. An important theme, within the thought of the discussed philosopher and referring to the postfoucauldian pedagogical studies, is the fact, that the sciences, even

³ A strict distinction between research perspectives of archaeology, genealogy and the analysis of dispositif, seems unfounded. Most often their elements are jointly present within postfoucauldian empirical studies.

autocritical and sensitive to the mechanisms of power, contributes, via the critique of the previous state, to the view of practices used for the purpose of classification of the subjects and projecting a new type of subject: less objectified and more self-aware. The paradox does not omit the postfoucauldian analyses of discourse and dispositif, as they require signification of the subject and its types in order to justify the “weight” of their conclusions. While conducting empirical studies of discourse and dispositif, one should remember, that it is not the discourse that creates subjects, but the power and the order of knowledge and their associate practices (Schneider 2015: 28–29).

The **procedures for the control of discourse**, noted by Foucault (1981: 52-6171-72) serve that very purpose within the genealogical approach. The external, regarding discourse, procedures, consist of the exclusion of certain sentences and positions. It occurs due to the prohibition of uttering certain content: despite the circumstances, or within selected situation contexts, or by allowing the privilege of speaking only to certain types of subjects. Exclusion flourishes within the opposition between reason and madness, and the exclusion of contents regarded as irrational; as well as the opposition between true and false, supported by the authority of scientific knowledge of classifying contents as true/false. The procedures have a historical context, therefore, only an analysis of the long periods, or a comparative analysis, allows to conclude on the scope and form of exclusion.

The internal procedures for discourse control consist of commentary, author-principle (or author-function) and organisation of disciplines. The aim of the commentary is to provide such repetition or addition to the original statement, that would change their meaning, or direct its strategic reception. The author function is a strategy of selecting an assortment of statements based on their ascription to a particular author, not a person, but a function of a discourse, serving the purpose of “labelling” statements as seemingly homogeneous, integral (in terms of meaning, modality and the strategic aim), and allowing to be classified with regard of the author figure. The organisation of disciplines regards the regulation of the modes of formulating statements, so that they could be ascribed to a specific field of knowledge and regarded as legitimate. Moreover, Foucault mentions the procedure of rarefaction of the speaking subjects, by posing conditions regarding e.g. their knowledge, qualifications, and the context, in which given subjects would be functioning as authors of legitimate contents.

Nonetheless, it is the analysis of the materiality of discourse, that provides insight, although indirectly, into the order of knowledge and the mechanisms of social power. One should not treat the postfoucauldian discourse analysis and the reconstruction of textual structures, equally. A reconstruction of the order of dis-

course does not constitute a final aim of the analysis, but provides grounds for an abductive reasoning, regarding the non-discursive network of the relations of power, which determines the discursivised, within statements, descriptions of reality, speculation regarding the social phenomena, classifications and projects by individual or collective subjects. The primary task, achievable to a limited degree, is the description of the **regimes of truth**, unrealised (by individuals) resources and limitations of a legitimate understanding of the world. Regimes of truth are “the types of relations that link together manifestations of truth with their procedures and the subjects who are their operators, witnesses, or possibly objects (Foucault, 2014: 100). A sociologist or a pedagogue, trying to grasp the current shape of the regime of truth, falls into a trap, as the action of a scholar consists of proposing a legitimate diagnosis of reality within a given field of culture or social life (see: Audureau, 2003: 26), in this case, a diagnosis “directed” by Foucault’s concepts.

To summarise, the following scholarly questions are posed within the postfoucauldian discourse analysis: What truth, and in what way created, describes a given field of reality? **What concepts, modalities and argumentation strategies are employed for the aforementioned? What knowledge regulates the examined problem, what knowledge comes to mind in regard of the proposed solutions?** What subject may be a result of change, what is the subject speaking of the change? What was excluded from the discourse, what was invalidated, marginalised or entirely deprived of voice?

Discourse on education. The middle school case

The object of the review and illustrative analysis, is the argument regarding the legitimacy of the abolition of middle schools, and the return to the system of mass education, encompassing eight years of primary school, four years of secondary school, five years of technical school and two or three years of other types of secondary schooling. Implementation of the reform is followed by the necessity of developing of a new network of schools in Poland, the abolition of middle schools and the concerns regarding the reduction of middle school employment. Many commentators highlight the significant pace of the implementations of changes; the Education Act of 14 December 2016, published in the Journal of Laws on 11 January 2017, shall transform the school education organisation starting from September 2017. The issue of middle schools is just one of the aspects, of the reform implemented by Law and Justice, and is not the only point of conflict between the Ministry of National Education (Ministerstwo Edukacji Narodowej, MEN),

local governments, school headmasters, teachers, unions, parents and students. However, the issue of middle school abolition is focusing the attention of most argument participants and the reviewing audience. The public representation of the argument has been constructed regarding the issue of middle schools, and in this aspect other issues are raised and evaluated (i.a. teachers' wages and local government expenditures).

A majority of statements within the argument regarding middle schools, particularly the ones present in social and journalist media, is difficult to classify as the elements of the discourse of education or pedagogy in a traditional sense. The statements belong to a vast scope of the public discourse on education. It consists of expert voices, that translate the scientific language of knowledge, to an argument suitable for novices, enunciations that position the discussion within a purely political argument, or testimonies based on own experience (of teachers, parents, and students). Their similarity is based on the fact that they verbatim or indirectly present the problem of the system of education, as a social responsibility for forming knowledge and the character of young people. Therefore, the discourse on education can be analysed within a postfoucauldian perspective, as it regards the issues crucial to this analysis of power, as the government of an essential part of the population (children and youth) as well as designing "mature" subjects, for the purpose of particular social tasks. The example of the discourse on education, in this case the argument regarding middle schools, is related to the discursive and non-discursive practices of resistance against change within the system of education, and to the public acts of truth regarding the Polish school system, formulated by the conflict participants. The question about the truth and the legitimate modes of its expression, is the core of the argument, and its results lie in the creation of numerous competing "truths" set within a dynamic order of knowledge.

For the purpose of a workshop analysis, a modest assortment of messages (21) was collected, messages that appeared in national media and internet databases between September 2016 (the publication of the Education Act) to March 2017 (nationwide parents' and teachers' strikes). The criterion of the selection, was not the creation of a corpus exhaustive in regard of positions and types of argumentation, accordingly to their appearance within the argument. Formal and subjective criteria were established. The aim was to collect examples presenting different forms and functions of media messaging as well as various positions of speaking subjects, in regard of the given themes. The analysed collection consisted of: the Act project, information directed to a wide audience via the Ministry website, statements by an expert and a middle school teacher given to the press, journalist glosses, posts by a parent and various other people in social media, a chart with

the study results of polls, a protest banner, the resolution and the union letter, a fragment of the television show, a fragment of a radio interview with a parent, a record of the city Council proceedings, and the official statement by the Ministry, regarding the teachers' strike. In case of the relatively long and multifaceted sources, fragments were analysed, particularly those that explicitly related to the issue of the new education system, or could be ascribed with a particular enunciative function, in terms of the argument, mainly related to positioning in regard of the object and participants of the discussion. Therefore, the selection of statements was to a degree arbitrary, dictated by the workshop aspect of the following analysis and the focus on clear examples.

The issues encompass the general scholarly questions, characteristic of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis, presented in the previous section of the article. Additional questions are a result of the fact, that the textual statements under analysis, were generated within a particular temporal, political and social context. The questions regard: 1) the convergence and discrepancies within categories, concepts and resources of knowledge apparent in statements representing different standings within the argument regarding the middle schools; 2) observable, at the textual level, results of the procedures for the control of discourse (note: in the light of this perspective, the consequences of discursive practices are crucial, rather than the speculation on the intentions of the speaking subjects); 3) the relations between statements and references to other non-educational discourses, and finally, the forms of power over the population, being the basis of the production of these statements. Proposals of analytic interpretation of three example statements, are presented below, with the employment of the above-mentioned categories and concepts.

Example 1

A justification of the proposed changes within education law is a crucial component of the Act projects. It is also present within the Education Act, as of September 2016. The first part serves the purpose of classifying the hitherto education system as a failure, both in terms of the organisation of institutions, as well as in terms of the accomplishment of the *equal education opportunities* task, between urban and rural centres; the second is a description of the changes at different levels of public education. The Act is supported by qualified, scientific knowledge in the form of PISA (an OECD Programme for International Student Assessment) regarding the competence of Polish youth at 15 years old, in comparison to other students from different countries. The international character of the research is

highlighted, in order to additionally legitimise its results. The results of the PISA research, despite the popular pride regarding the results of young Poles, are presented as evidence for the claim, that middle schools do not contribute significantly to the increase of the student potential, and further increase the gap between the achievements of students within the same school. A hidden strategy of justifying the Act project, however kept at the level of a professional, bureaucratic and neutral modality, is the abolition of the discourse, presented by the previous government, regarding the modernisation success within Polish schools with the aims of creating a “knowledge society” by equipping the society with an adequate package of skills (see: Ostrowicka 2012: 194-198). That does not necessarily mean, that justification finds no place for economic rationality and for a game between groups of concepts typical for the neoliberal discourse (identified with the political opponents of the project authors) or for a non-liberal discourse of returning to traditional values. The assortment of concepts and categories that form the meaning of validation consists of i.a.: *innovative activity* (within schools) as well as the *adjustment of education in regard of the employment market; attitudes of creativity and entrepreneurship or participation in the civilisation achievements of the society* (among students).

The object of a detailed speculation, is a fragment of *Rationale* (*Uzasadnienie*), taken from the paragraph titled *Strengthening the role of school in building competence necessary to function in the modern world* (*Wzmocnienie roli szkoły w budowaniu kompetencji niezbędnych do funkcjonowania we współczesnym świecie*), which can be treated as a separate statement, as an axio-normative declaration by the legislator, a distinction between the new vision of education and the discourse supporting the *status quo*, and a call for particular subjects to implement change.

The main task of school, family and the society in the 21st century is to educate the young generation with the respect of values, responsibility and cooperation. Shaping the patriotic and civil attitudes, identity and national, cultural and individual consciousness, as well as the trait of creative thinking, the attitude open for seeking out new solutions, and the ability of efficient mobility within the changing, contemporary world, are all equally important. The accomplishment of such a task, requires partnership and responsibility as well as building positive relations between parents, teachers, and students.

Currently, as indicated by teachers, the traditional school model has lost its significance. In result, the authority of the school, as an institution has diminished significantly. In regard to the above, a series of changes within regulations regarding Article 1 of the Education Act, [that – editorial note] build the frameworks, for the efficient functioning of schools in the modern world, therefore, for rebuilding the social prestige and the authority of educational institutions. Imparting proper rank on the educational tasks accomplished in schools and education institutions, required emphasising its [i.e. education – editorial note] significance, by listing it among

the essential tasks of the education system. Such regulations indicate the primary role of education as well as the supportive and complementary role of preventive activity regarding the issues of children and youth (Rationale, 2016)

The statement begins with a catalogue of school tasks in relation to the obligations of family and the society as a whole. The order of indications is notable, implying a hierarchical order: schools should primarily shape patriotic, and secondarily civil attitudes, primarily the national and cultural identity, and secondarily, the individual. Finally, its function is to stimulate creative thinking and attitudes open to the new, as well as flexibility within a dynamic world. The terms that constitute the statement, seem to be a result of the circulation of the neoliberal educational discourse, whose parts were adopted by a traditional discourse, however, the emphases allow to recognise points of resistance against the former. The modality of the statement is *explicite* postulative, the aim is to build a symmetrical (*partnership*) and *positive relations between parents, teachers, and students*. The announced legal act is directive, it defines and **disciplines** the conduct of the aforementioned subjects. The rationale is a call for responsible subjects, i.e. those who will support and implement the change; and the aim of the legislation activity is the normalisation of educational practices within the population.

The statement contains a reference to scientific knowledge, or “true” knowledge, but regarded as common knowledge. A number of educators indicate a crisis of the traditional school model – there’s no information about their names, quantity and their positions within the argument, etc. The aim of the aforementioned reference is not to debate with different types of knowledge, but, by its diagnostic-mobilising character and the temporal references it is related to the **problematisation** (in a sense employed by Foucault [1978]: a historical emergence of certain matters as issues, objects of statements and objects of a game between the categories of truth and falsehood) of a lowering authority of the educational institutions, within society, as a problem that needs to be solved. The new law, that, at the discursive level, highly ranks the educational role of school (which traditional-neoliberal vector was indicated at the beginning of the statement) is supposed to be the remedy. What institutional and non-discursive practices follow the legal act, in order to change Polish schools beyond discourse on school, remains a question for scholars.

The analysed example ends with a remark on the *issues of children and youth*. This particular social group is considered by the rationale, both as the main subject of change (is supposed to educate self, in order to become a new kind of Pole and a new kind of citizen), as well as the most objectified subject, as a source of fail-

ure of the planned enterprise, and an object of prevention (see: Ostrowicka 2012: 177-180). To summarise, it seems that the discursive practices that determine the analysed statement, place it within the field of governmentality, as a non-directive form of governing the population. However, the institutional and non-discursive consequences of the postulated changes, may be a manifestation of disciplinary and normative power.

Example 2

In various phases of the argument “Gazeta Wyborcza”, a daily liberal-left paper, would systematically publish articles (interviews, glosses, information, and opinions) undermining the idea of middle school abolition. In terms of the object, terminology and the strategic aim, many of those articles are similar to the discourse of the critique of the Law and Justice government. Scientific knowledge and expert subjects are often employed to articulate a political statement, e.g. in an interview, from 18 October 2016, that Dr Maciej Jakubowski, economist, gave to Justyna Suchacka (a journalist specialising in education). An editorial note encompasses the political, professional and scientific identity of the author: *2012-14 Deputy prime minister of education, previously a member of a coordinative body regarding the PISA research for the OECD Paris branch. He worked as a consultant for the World Bank, OECD, UNDP and governments in Europe and Asia. Author of several dozen articles, books and reports.* The interview is determined by the **author function**: an opinion is voiced by an experienced, world renowned expert, associated with the previous government, therefore, a legitimate voice within the field of discursive formation of the interview. The first part regards a definitively positive evaluation of the reforms from 1999, which introduced the middle schools, the second serves the purpose of undermining the reason behind the current reform, whereas the third presents the expert’s thoughts regarding education, emphasising on the role of general education. Within the interview, the focal points encompass references to France, Netherlands and Scandinavian countries, as models to follow (and a model of progress); the research by PISA, presented as (contrary to example 1) as evidence for the success of middle schools; as well as a catalogue of general competence that, in the expert’s opinion, the young Poles should acquire, particularly, the *transversal skills, i.e. skills useful in a plethora of occupations* (e.g. self-development skills, life-span learning, project oriented work). The presentation is an intersection of the elements of the neoliberal discourse of education, including a Centre-Periphery outline and a normalising social project articulated within the expert discourse (see: Tomanek 2012: 111).

The object of the analysis is a statement taken from the intermediate part of the interview, placing the argument regarding middle schools within a political context and clearly referring to a particular order of knowledge.

Why are middle schools a menace to the government?

– I think that the political interest and ideology play a major role in the argument. Among the experts and scientists that I know, not a single one is in favour of abolishing middle schools and decreasing the term of general education. To my knowledge, the reform is supported solely by an ex-minister prof. Legutko and prof. Waśko from Kraków. However, they are not experts in the matter of education reforms. One of them is an expert in philosophy, the other, in Polish. They have it encoded in their heads, that the middle schools do not work. However, they cannot support it with any evidence, as they have not conducted any research on the subject. They are solely interested in implementing a “healthy” ideology within the education programmes. Additionally, they display nostalgia for the education system from the period of PRL, when only members of elite were admitted to secondary schools.

This anti-reform serves the purpose of measurable political benefits. It will cause enormous disarray prior to the local government elections. Dismissal of a significant number of teachers will be necessary, or else the local rural governments will go bankrupt. It is impossible for a rural gmina to survive a situation, where it would be lacking a one ninth of the educational subsidy and, at the same time, be forced to hire the same amount of teachers. This political aim, i.e. a disarray prior to the local government elections, and a reason to replace the school head and teaching staff, may be to Law and Justice’s liking. It is the only rational explanation, why the governing party insists on these changes.

This way, minister Zalewska is preparing changes inadequate to current needs. Whatever the governing party says, it is a return to PRL. Centralisation of education control, the return of the old school structure, and additionally, a regress regarding the perception of teaching.

Everyone is obligated to learn the same things, at the same time, within the same scope. They are meant to memorise facts, learn history, and memorise great poems. Moreover, they are distancing themselves from natural subjects. Mrs minister is killing them! Abolishing tests from these subjects in primary school means, that the children will not be learning them at all. Because, what for? If that happens, we won’t be having an innovative economy in 20 years.

The aforementioned political party treats teachers as bureaucrats, that need to be governed, and students, as little children. The changes proposed, lead to depriving schools of their autonomy. I fear that the next step, will be to deprive local governments of power (Jakubowski, Suchecka, 2016).

The statement, directed by the journalist’s question, begins with a pejorative diagnosis of the political and ideological motivation behind the project of the education reform. The principal argument in favour of such a classification of the government actions is a reference to opinions by anonymous, or known solely to the speaker, “true” scientists and experts regarding education, with the exclusion of academics who support the changes, as representatives of disciplines unfit for making legitimate statements regarding the issue of middle schools. One

could say that the argument is based on the **external procedures for the control of discourse**, consisting of, i.a. the **exclusion** of certain accounts by denying the privilege of speaking to certain subjects. Additionally, scholars, favourable to the government, are excluded from the legitimate field of discourse, in regard of the **opposition of truth and false** (expert must speak the “truth” against falsity of a political ideology, rooted in communism). Afterwards, the emphasis turns to the hazards that, according to the expert, appear along the reform introduced by Law and Justice, and result from the organisation-economic consequences of a new system of education. To a degree the statement is marked with the **opposition between reason and madness**. The expert claims that the planned change, cannot be explained rationally, as it would bring *disarray* and the *dismissal of a significant number of teachers*, especially in rural regions. Therefore, it must be supported with socially irrational motivation, being an element of a political-madness driven plan of the party in power. Afterwards, an anti-subject project, regarding the student, is presented. Within the new education system, the student will be educated in a regressive, non-productive, homogeneous way that will impede the development of the *innovative economy*, often treated as a fetish within the neoliberal discourse. Simultaneously the interview includes an indication that the objectification of teachers and students as objects of a disciplinary rule, as contrary to the vision of a non-directive, flexible governing of youth and educators, presented in the subsequent part of the interview.

Example 3

If the previous two statements, already at the level of linguistic accomplishments, provided premises that they could be objects of the postfoucauldian critique, the last example is not as clear. A letter by Sławomir Broniarz, head of the *Polish Teachers' Union* (*Związek Nauczycielstwa Polskiego*), addressing the parents of school age children, prior to the nationwide teacher strike, planned for 31 March 2017.⁴ According to the data provided by the organisers, 37% of school institutions participated, making it the largest strike since 2007. However, according to MEN, a significantly smaller number of schools participated (11%). It was also noted, that the strike did not receive support from the second largest teacher and education staff union NSZZ “Solidarność”. The aim of the letter below is to obtain the

⁴ The official postulates regarded the demands of wage and employment assurance, however, the fears regarding the consequences of middle schools abolition proved to be the impulse for the strike itself.

parents' support, using emotional and slogan-based indication of particular arguments. One should examine this statement in a broader context of the relations of power regulating the argument over middle schools.

Dear Parents!

On Monday, 31 March 2017, the education staff will appear at schools, but will not work. We are striking, because we care about education, and the future of our profession.

We decided on this, difficult for us – educators – step, knowing, that the strike of the education staff may complicate your family and career life. However, it is only one day. Meanwhile, the education reform will cause long-standing chaos, as it does not consist solely of the abolition of middle schools. Everyone will be affected by its negative effects: three year old children who will not find vacant places in preschool, as well as primary and middle school seniors. As the coalition of parents states “Say no to chaos in school”, this change is not intended to benefit the students.

Dear Parents,

On behalf of the striking teachers and education staff, we ask you to understand our decision. Support us on 31 March! Stand with us! (Broniarz, 2017).

The statement, maintaining an unofficial and mobilising modality, starts with an explanation of the reasons for the strike, and the understanding of its troubling consequences for the families. However, the aforementioned are rationalised using “historical consequences” of the reform: *long-standing chaos* affecting children and their parents, and an uncertain future of the teacher profession and of the education itself. Regarding the alarming and revealing character of the voice, as well as the context of the argument, in which it emerged (a few months after adopting the Education Act, and in consequence, rendering the protests “hopeless”) one can consider the parrhesiastic aspect of the voice, consisting of speaking truth, that is supposedly hidden away by the government, and revealed by teachers and parents: *this change is not intended to benefit the students*. Referring the voice to the central, in Foucault’s last lectures, **Parrhesia** category, one should highlight, that the case discussed does not include its radical variant, related to risk, including bodily risk, taken by the speaker, when uttering the unwanted truth regarding reality. Rather, the statement is an example of a quasi-parrhesia, or contemporary political parrhesia, a (democratic) execution of the right to speak the entire truth, inconvenient for the political power, whereas simultaneously the act of speaking the truth, would implicate assuming a position within the political field (see: Foucault, 2008: 141). An instrument of introducing a competitive knowledge and truth (against the knowledge of the government) regarding to the object of the argument, may be recognised in the discussed statement.

Within the plane of metadiscourse, there are several similarities between formations, that for the sake of the article shall be called ministerial and union forma-

tions. Both produce a model of a cooperative parent, caring for the future of the child; objectify students, by ascribing imprinting their fate on a particular vision of education and society, as well as deprive them – as children – of the right to speak on own behalf. One can risk a statement, that despite their opposing strategic aims, they both serve the aforementioned formation, as creations of a familiar **regime of truth**. The regime of truth is related to the call to speaking the truth regarding society, in terms of how youth is/should be governed, and of what project of the subject should youth establish for the purposes of society, economy and nation (content wise this “truth” may vary, but it is the sole mechanism of the act of truth that matters). The neoliberal discourse of education seems to be founded on a similar regime of truth. The difference between the union and ministerial, or expert formation is based on the few economic-optimisation references within the former. However, exclusion or marginalisation of these concepts and issues within the formation does not imply autonomy. Contrarily, such inconsistencies, in terms of the postfoucauldian perspective, may be received as a part of the game, played within the argument.

Summary

The extent of the article, allows no place for a careful description of the conclusions drawn from the workshop analysis of the remaining statements. However, one should mention a direction of the resulting general reflection. The majority of analysed statements, although varied in terms of modality and strategic aims, “speaks” a similar vocabulary, including i.a. the good of the children, subjectivity, educational opportunities, innovation, efficiency, the future of the society, studies, PISA tests. The terminological elements constitute the discourse set within a broader knowledge regarding the world, beyond the knowledge regarding school. A significant number of these terms is grounded within the economic rationality, which, however humanised and emphasising the individual and collective affections, consists of a postulate of a particular form of governing the population, by creating subjects more or less subtly directed to a stable catalogue of traits, that one should obtain for own and society’s sake. Within a dynamic field of argument, a significant number of intersections and circulations of the discursive formations is present. However, the formations are differentiated by their political affiliation, their employment of scientific knowledge and the place or lack of thereof for national and collective references.

The main subject of the planned change within education, or of the resistance against that change consists of: Central government, local governments,

teachers and parents, who resist and mobilise to support either of the sides. Where could one find a place for teenagers, present or unrealized middle school students, within this constellation? Within the student, and at times the child function, therefore within demographic-pedagogic categories, and sporadically as a speaking subject (only one source, concerning the youth defending their middle school, consisting of students' statements, was included within the analysed assortment). In the light of the knowledge regulating the argument over the middle school, students are meant to be governed, taken care of, but simultaneously, constitute the group that is most significantly excluded from the production of discourse, that refers to them substantially. The truth, or rather truths emerging from the statements regarding the argument over the middle school, carry a diagnosis of the crisis of Polish education or risks, or rather hazards regarding its reform, that should be neutralised. The forms of counteracting/repairing are still debatable, and cause resistance, whereas, at the time of the writing of this article, the argument goes on.

While summarising the described proposals and methodological remarks, one should remind, that the principal task of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis is the analysis of discourse in relation to the issue of power, knowledge and the subject, as well as an attempt of isolating the rules and conditions rationing the creation of discourse, resulting in a directing and narrowing of the spectrum of comprehension and classification of the social experience as well as the spectrum of undertaken practices. The accomplishment of the aforementioned task would be strengthened with the use of microanalysis (in a strict sense) of the collected material. A supplementation of the speculation is necessary, conducted with the use of Foucault's categories such as the techniques of text analysis, which are coherent with his general concept of discourse. I.a. the linguistic analyses, rhetoric, argumentation, narrative or conversation analysis may provide such supplementation, and such attempts are already being made (i.a. Baxter 2002, Nowicka-Franczak 2017b). Moreover, the study should draw upon a larger, more exhaustive collection of empirical material, and, apart from the descriptive analysis (with the paper constituting a part of thereof), include the historical analysis of the dynamics of a discourse or argument in question. A step worth considering is the opening to a mentioned analysis of the dispositif, and supplementation of the research set, with data concerning everyday educational and communication practice in middle schools, their infrastructure, work organisation and the space and symbols present within.

The weakness of the postfoucauldian discourse analysis lies in the fact, that its non-standard character may affect the arbitrariness of the scholar, regarding

numerous decisions, and encourage to select material fitting for a previously assumed hypothesis. In that case, the application of instruments of rhetorical, conversational microanalysis, etc. To the critical verification of conclusions, may put the scholar's choices to a test. An additional deficit of the postfoucauldian scope is the superficial interest with the affective aspect of discourse and the relations of power, i.e. the central issues of pedagogy. The issue of emotions has been undertaken just recently, however, rather as a research proposal, than its full **realisation** (see: Maesse 2011).

The postfoucauldian analysis does not settle, who is right within an argument, who states the truth or, who speaks in an ethical manner. Some scholars may find it disappointing, some may find it to be an advantage of the perspective, as it omits directive moralising, therefore the aspect of discourses on education, which is, within this perspective, one of the main objects of critique. Possibly, the most significant advantage of the aforementioned perspective is, that it forces one to think "outside the box", to travel beyond the categories of binary oppositions, dichotomies of power, and sensitises to the strategic dimension of the entirety of social communication. A distanced attitude, including a certain distrust regarding the conclusions of own analyses, proves to be the most difficult. One should mind, that the conclusions are not final and certain, and they may be subject to critique and questioning, including critique and questioning based on a similar approach towards the analysis of power. Likewise, this modest workshop proposal is but one of the possible postfoucauldian approaches towards the Polish argument over the middle school.

Bibliography

- Audureau J.-P. (2003), *Assujettissement et subjectivation: réflexions sur l'usage de Foucault en éducation*, „Revue Française de Pédagogie”, no. 143.
- Bacchi C., Bonham J., (2014) *Reclaiming Discursive Practices as an Analytic Focus: Political Implications*, „Foucault Studies”, no. 17.
- Ball S.J. (1990), *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*. New York.
- Baxter J. (2002), *Competing Discourses in the Classroom: a Post-structuralist Discourse Analysis of Girls' and Boys' Speech in Public Contexts*. „Discourse & Society”, no. 13(6).
- Bublitz H., Bührmann A.D., Hanke Ch., Seier A. (eds.) (1998), *Das Wuchern der Diskurse. Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse Foucaults*. Frankfurt-New York.
- Bührmann A.D., Diaz-Bone R., Gutiérrez Rodriguez E., Kendall G., Schneider W., Tirado F.J. (2007), „Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung: From Michel Foucault's Theory of Discourse to Empirical Discourse Research”, no. 8(2).

- Bührmann A.D., Schneider W. (2007), *More Than Just a Discursive Practice? Conceptual Principles and Methodological Aspects of Dispositif Analysis*. „Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung: From Michel Foucault's Theory of Discourse to Empirical Discourse Research”, no. 8(2), art. 28.
- Chutorański M. (2013) *Pojęcie i konteksty wychowania w pracach Michela Foucaulta*. Wrocław.
- Czyżewski M. (2013a), *Polityki publiczne w optyce postfoucaultowskiej. Zarys perspektywy badawczej*, [in:] Wojciuk A. (eds.) *Analiza polityki publicznej. Podejścia teoretyczno-metodologiczne*, Warszawa.
- Czyżewski M. (2013b), *W kręgu społecznej pedagogii*. „Societas/Communitas”, no. 2(16).
- Donzelot J., Gordon C. (2005), *Comment gouverner les sociétés libérales?*. „Esprit”, no. 11.
- Elden S. (2016), *Foucault's Last Decade*. London.
- Fisch M. (2011), *Werke und Freuden. Michel Foucault – eine Biografie*. Bielefeld.
- Foucault M. (2014), *On The Government of the Living: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1979–1980*. New York.
- Foucault M. (2010), *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*. New York.
- Foucault M. (2008), *Le gouvernement de soi et des autres. Cours au Collège de France. 1982–1983*. Paris.
- Foucault M. (2007), *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. New York.
- Foucault M. (2005), *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the College de France 1981–1982*. New York.
- Foucault M. (2001 [1976]), *Le discours ne doit pas être pris comme...* [in:] idem, *Dits et écrits II. 1976–1988*. Paris.
- Foucault M. (2000), *The Subject and Power* [in:] idem, *Power*. New York.
- Foucault (1988), *The Ethic of Care for the Self as a Practice of Freedom* [in:] Bernauer J.W. Rasmussen D. M. (eds.), *The Final Foucault*. Cambridge, MA.
- Foucault M. (1984), *What is Enlightenment?*, [in:] Rabinow P. (eds.), *The Foucault Reader*, New York.
- Foucault M. (1980), *The Order of Discourse*, [in:] Young R. (eds.), *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston-London-Henley.
- Foucault M. (1980), *Question on Geography*, [in:] idem, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, New York.
- Foucault M. (1978), *The History of Sexuality*. New York.
- Foucault M. (1972), *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*. New York.
- Gehring P. (2012), *Abseits des Akteurs-Subjekts. Selbsttechniken, Ethik als politische Haltung und der Fall der freimütigen Rede*, [in:] Keller R., Schneider W., Viehöver W. (eds.) *Diskurs–Macht–Subjekt. Theorie und Empirie von Subjektivierung in der Diskursforschung*. Wiesbaden.
- Gehring P. (2009), *Nachwort*, [in:] Foucault M., *Geometrie des Verfahrens. Schriften zur Methode*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Gromkowska-Melosik A. (2004), *Społeczne konstruowanie kobiecości i męskości w kulturach: wiktoriańskiej i globalnej*. Kraków.
- Hunter I. (1994), *Rethinking the School. Subjectivity, Bureaucracy, Criticism*. St. Leonards.
- Klemm J., Glasze G. (2005). *Methodische Probleme Foucault-inspirierter Diskursanalysen in den Sozialwissenschaften*, „Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung”, no. 6(2), art. 24.
- Klus-Stańska D. (2015), *Wyjść poza reżim imperatywu rozwojowego. Między inspiracjami Rousseau a wpływem myśli Foucaulta na współczesne studia nad dzieciństwem*. „Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji”, no. 1(28).

- Koller H.-Ch., Lüders J. (2004), *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse*, [in:] Ricken N., Rieger-Ladich M. (eds.), *Michel Foucault: Pädagogische Lektüren*. Wiesbaden.
- Maesse J. (2011), *Bilder ‚guter Kindheit‘ in Regierungsdokumenten. Endbericht einer Diskursanalyse*. „Educare Working Paper”, no. 2.
- Marshall J.D. (1996), *Michel Foucault. Personal Autonomy and Education*. Dordrecht.
- Melosik Z. (2013), *Kultura popularna i tożsamość młodzieży. W niewoli władzy i wolności*. Kraków.
- Melosik Z. (2009), *Uniwersytet i społeczeństwo. Dyskursy wolności, wiedzy i władzy*. Kraków.
- Mendel M. (2007), *Spółeczeństwo i rytuał. Heterotopia bezdomności*. Toruń.
- Męczkowska-Christiansen A. (2006), *Podmiot i pedagogika. Od oświeceniowej utopii do pokrytycznej dekonstrukcji*. Wrocław 2006.
- Nowicka M. (2016), O użyteczności kategorii dyspozytywu w badaniach społecznych. „Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej”, no. 1.
- Nowicka M. (2011), „Urządzenie”, „zastosowanie”, „układ”... – kategoria *dispositif*u Michela Foucaulta, jej tłumaczenia i ich implikacje dla postfoucaultowskich analiz władzy. „Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej”, no. 7.
- Nowicka-Franczak M. (2017a), *Postfoucaultowska analiza dyskursu. Przypadek sporu o Jedwabne*, [in:] Czyżewski M., Otrocki M., Piekot T., Stachowiak J. (eds.), *Analiza dyskursu publicznego. Przegląd podejść i metod*. Warszawa.
- Nowicka-Franczak M. (2017b), *Niechciana debata. Spór o książki Jana Tomasza Grossa*. Warszawa.
- Ostrowicka H. (2015), O badaniach „pedagogizacji życia społecznego” kilka słów z poznawczej perspektywy pedagogiki ogólnej. „Nauki o Wychowaniu. Studia Interdyscyplinarne”, no. 1.
- Ostrowicka H. (2015), *Przemysław z Michelem Foucaultem edukacyjne dyskursy o młodzieży. Dyspozytyw i urządzanie*. Kraków.
- Ostrowicka H. (2012), *Urządzanie młodzieży. Studium analityczno-krytyczne*. Kraków.
- Othmer J., Weich A. (eds.) (2015), *Medien–Bildung–Dispositive: Beiträge zu einer interdisziplinären Medienbildungsforschung*. Wiesbaden.
- Pongratz L.A. (1989), *Pädagogik im Prozess der Moderne. Studien zur Sozial- und Theoriegeschichte der Schule*. Weinheim.
- Pongratz L.A., Wimmer M., Nieke W., Masschelein J. (eds.) (2004), *Nach Foucault. Diskurs- und machtanalytische Perspektiven der Pädagogik*. Wiesbaden.
- Ricken N., Rieger-Ladich M. (eds.) (2004), *Michel Foucault. Pädagogische Lektüren*. Wiesbaden.
- Ristić D., Marinković D. (2016), *The Disciplinary Society and the Birth of Sociology: A Foucauldian Perspective*. „Družboslovne Razprave”, no. 83.
- Rose N. (1999), *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Oxford.
- Sarasin Ph. (2003), *Geschichtswissenschaft und Diskursanalyse*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Simons M., Masschelein J. (2008), *The Governmentalization of Learning and the Assemblage of a Learning Apparatus*. „Educational Theory”, no. 58(4).
- Simons M., Masschelein J. (2006), *The Learning Society and Governmentality: An Introduction*. „Educational Philosophy and Theory”, no. 4.
- Schneider W. (2015) *Dispositive überall und nirgendwo? Anmerkungen zur Theorie und methodischen Praxis der Dispositivforschung*, [in:] Othmer J., Weich A. (eds.), *Medien– Bildung–Dispositive: Beiträge zu einer interdisziplinären Medienbildungsforschung*. Wiesbaden.
- Tomanek P. (2012) *Ujarzmienie czy legitymizacja? Normalizacyjne aspekty dyskursów eksperckich*. „Studia Socjologiczne”, no. 1.

Analysed material

- Broniarz S. (2017), *List Prezesa ZNP do Rodziców*, http://www.znp.edu.pl/element/3034/List_Prezesa_ZNP_do_Rodzicow.
- Jakubowski M., Suchecka J. (2016), *Ekspert: Bez gimnazjów skrzywdzimy najsłabsze dzieci. Wygra na tym bogata elita*. „Gazeta Wyborcza”, 18.10.2016.
- Uzasadnienie* (2016), <https://legislacja.rcl.gov.pl/docs//2/12289958/12379225/.../dokument253146.pdf>.