

In the name of freedom

Governmentality, cognitive behavioural therapy and the will to activate¹

Magnus Dahlstedt & Andreas Fejes

Full reference:

Dahlstedt, M. & Fejes, A. (2015) In the name of freedom: Governmentality, cognitive behavioural therapy and the will to deliberate. In G. Hellestatter Jacobsen (Ed.), *Rights of children in the Nordic welfare states: Conceptual and empirical enquiries*. Copenhagen: NSU Press, pp. 51-71.

The focus of this chapter is on education as a social right and particularly the formation of 'active citizens' through cognitive behavioural techniques adopted by schools across Sweden. On the basis of interviews with staff from two different schools, as well as manuals, the analysis focuses on two therapeutic programmes. The theoretical point of departure is the theorization of governmentality developed in the wake of the work of Michel Foucault. The various techniques initiated within these programmes make a certain kind of governing possible – 'governing in the name of freedom'. Overall, the teaching within these programmes can be viewed as expressing an advanced liberal governance, which involves educating children into active citizens, with the responsibility for developing their own future and both willing and able to take responsibility for their actions, rather than into passive bearers of rights.

Introduction

With the transformation of the welfare state that has taken place in recent decades, the notion of ‘active citizenship’ has become prominent in a variety of policy areas in the Nordic states, as well as in European and other countries (Dahlstedt, 2009; Hvinden & Johansson, 2007). The current ideal citizen is active, motivated, and able to take responsibility for herself and her welfare. With these ongoing transformations, new forms of governance are developing, based on new relationships between the institutions of the welfare state and its citizens, between citizenship rights and responsibilities.

The focus of this chapter is the formation of active citizens through various cognitive behavioural therapy techniques, which is a specific kind of welfare policy intervention that has recently become more widespread in a variety of institutional settings in the Nordic countries – including education, social work, and criminal justice. Particularly, we analyse a set of cognitive behavioural techniques targeting children in school (Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013). Although the focus of this chapter is on Sweden, similar developments are visible in other Nordic countries also (Gundersen & Svartdal, 2006). On the basis of interviews with staff from two different schools, as well as manuals, the analysis focuses on two therapeutic models (Social and Emotional Training, SET, and Aggression Replacement Training, ART) that have come to be increasingly adopted in schools across Sweden.²

The various techniques initiated within these two programmes make a certain kind of governing possible – *governing in the name of freedom*. These programmes are in a way typical of the time in which we live, reflecting ongoing changes of the welfare state and a range of contemporary problem conceptions and ideals, with a focus on the individual and her emotional and social deficiencies and merits. Overall, the teaching conducted within these two programmes can be viewed as an expression of an advanced liberal governance (Rose, 1999), which primarily involves educating students to become democratic citizens in accordance with the demands, expectations, and ideals that dominate the contemporary

labour market. According to this formula of governing, individuals are not only bearers of certain rights, but first and foremost, they have the responsibility to make their own future, make active choices, and take responsibility for the choices made – in other words, to be well-adapted to life in an advanced liberal society.

Education and the Swedish model

Since the late 1980s, the exercise of power in the Nordic and many other countries has been gradually changing *from* a largely state-centred welfare regime, with the focus on the state, collective responsibility for both the welfare of individual citizens and for societal developments in general, with state interventions geared to a distribution of social and economic resources and to levelling social and other gaps in society, *towards* a regime with an ever-greater focus on decentralization and market solutions, autonomy and individual responsibility, and partnerships between governmental and nongovernmental actors (cf. Langergaard, this anthology). ‘Elements of individualization, decentralization, more reliance on family and kin, and market solution are pushing Scandinavia closer to principles governing the other European Union welfare models’ (Abrahamson, 2010, p. 81). These changes in welfare policy have occurred also in Sweden (Boréus, 1994; Ryner, 2002), not least in the area of education policy.

Several of the changes occurring in the Swedish welfare model since the 1980s have also left clear impressions on education policy (Arnesen & Lundahl, 2006). From having been regarded as a public good, a collective social *right*, education has come to be seen more as a private good, an individual *responsibility* (Englund, 1994). The focus has been shifted to individual choice, parental responsibility for education, efficiency and competition, and the development of individual competence as guiding principles of how schools should be run. The principle of equality, in the sense of equal *outcomes*, has gradually been replaced

by the principle of equity, in the sense of *opportunities* (Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). The terms of schooling are dictated more and more by the demands and expectations of the labour market (Beach & Dovemark, 2007).

Education, democracy, and deliberation

At the beginning of the 1990s, there was a growing interest in the issue of how to educate good democrats. Not since the 1940s had the role of the Swedish school system in democratic education been the focus of such frenzied attention as it was during the 1990s (Boman, 2002; Lindensjö & Lundgren, 2000). One important notion in the discussion of democratic education of the 1990s is the notion of the school as a *democratic arena*. The question of how students are to be educated to become citizens of a democratic Swedish society is said not only to be about how schools convey the ‘right’ sort of knowledge, in the form of knowledge about the democratic form of government, the philosophical roots of democracy, and the rights and responsibilities associated with democratic citizenship (educating *for* democracy). In addition to such necessary teaching efforts, schools should also be organised in such a way that they also, in practice, constitute *schools in democracy*. The school itself must be organised according to democratic principles (educating *through* democracy) (Biesta, 2003; Öhrn et al., 2011).

In the mid-1990s, a consensus was established in Swedish education policy focusing on democratic values as proceeding from dialogue between people. At this time, the language of Swedish education policy was strongly influenced by a *deliberative* conception of democracy, which has gained ground in both the academic community and the public debate (Dahlstedt, 2009). According to this particular view, democracy is maintained in and through dialogue between people (Englund, 2003; Roth, 1998). The deliberative research tradition is often characterized by a powerful normative undercurrent, manifested not least in

a desire to define both an *ideal deliberative subject* – with a certain set of characteristics, values and abilities – and the conditions for an *ideal deliberative situation*, where deliberation occurs beyond hierarchies and relations of power in which such subjects can be created.

In the field of education policy, a deliberative conception of democracy can be seen to permeate a large number of policy documents and reports from the 1990s onwards. The Swedish National Agency for Education noted, for example, that it is by means of deliberation that everybody's 'understanding of themselves and others is developed' (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2000c, p. 58). Dialogue is thus seen as the very lifeblood of democracy. It is said to be through dialogue with people in their surroundings that individuals are schooled to become responsible, tolerant, and listening citizens. One important challenge in the work of democratic education is – in other words, that of creating a *will* to dialogue among the students.

In this context, schools are viewed as constituting one of society's most central *meeting places*, arenas where different people come together in dialogue on all kinds of different questions. In the work with democratic core values, what is required is to arrange a dialogue situation that in the best way possible corresponds with the criteria for good deliberation – inclusion, openness, and the will to learn (Swedish Board of Education, 2000b).

The capacity and the will to dialogue is said to be central to the continued existence of democracy, but it is more than merely an end in itself. Competence in dialogue is also viewed as being of major value to the individual him/herself, among other ways by contributing to the individual's social development and health. It is further strongly linked to the idea of lifelong learning, where competence in dialogue is viewed as being able to contribute to enabling the individual citizen to deal with a complex and unforeseen future (cf. Fejes, 2008).

The acquisition of this key competence, in other words, appears to solve many of the challenges faced by society today.

The therapeutic culture

The gradual, increasingly heavy emphasis placed on working with democratic core values has opened up schools to all kinds of moral-pedagogical techniques teaching students the art of social intercourse and democratic deliberation. In these efforts to try to develop the school into an arena of democratic deliberation, the idea of deliberative democracy tends to merge with a therapeutic framework – as they both emphasize the need to change the individual's thoughts and values in certain ways, making them more socially, emotionally, and democratically competent. Many of the moral-pedagogical techniques initiated in the school have similarities with therapeutic working models that have become increasingly widespread since the turn of the millennium in such fields as psychiatry and social work. In schools, therapeutic models of various kinds are more and more often used in the ongoing pedagogical work.

These models can be located within a wider framework in which the social problems of young people are presented as an increasingly pressing and important problem for society at large. The social problems of the young are in turn linked to what is claimed to be a general increase in the level of mental ill health among children and youth, particularly among what are referred to as *youth at risk* (cf. Riele, 2006; Wishart et al., 2006). This image of worsening mental health among youths is part of the general trend in today's society, whereby individuals are increasingly encouraged to work on themselves, to find their 'real selves', to become more aware of themselves, their limitations, and abilities, to improve their self-confidence, and to learn to manage their emotions, referred to by Furedi (2004) as a 'therapeutic culture' based on a psychological view of both individual and society.

One model that has had a particularly large impact on the contemporary therapeutic culture is CBT, or cognitive behavioural therapy. The focus of this therapy is directed at the individual. The primary focus of CBT is basically the same as the focus of the deliberative notion of democracy – in other words, reforming the subject. CBT can be applied in different ways, but the method always involves a therapist employing a range of techniques to get the patients themselves to want to work on themselves and their inner lives, to improve their social competence, to work with their feelings, and to develop their moral reasoning (Andersson, 2008; Hörnqvist, 2007).

CBT is based on a traditional behaviourist view of people's behavioural repertoire as a result of repeated and reinforced learning. The basic idea is that the therapist, by means of a series of interventions, actively supports a set of desirable behaviours, while the individual's undesirable behaviours gradually abate or are extinguished. The key to success, according to the CBT concept, is thus to continuously focus on possibilities, on what is positive, and not on difficulties and problems. Even though it is not always stated explicitly, the ideal – desirable patterns of values, emotions, and behaviours – emerges first in the encounter with something problematic, undesirable, or deviant.

Social and Emotional Training, SET, and Aggression Replacement Training, ART, are two CBT-based programs inspired by American sources. The use of these and similar programmes has in recent years become widespread in schools in Sweden (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011), as in many other countries (Feindler & Weisner, 2006; Gundersen & Svartdal, 2006). The idea of these programmes is to protect children and youths against various risk factors that are said to lead to antisocial and undesirable behaviours. In both cases, such risk factors are viewed as being eliminable through the development of various types of protective factors. One essential difference between SET and ART, however, is that the latter is first and foremost directed at students who are said to be *at*

risk – in other words, students growing up in difficult social conditions, in environments that are disadvantaged economically, socially, and in terms of status – whereas SET as a rule focuses on all students in school.

The implementation of each of the two programmes initiates a broad repertoire of techniques whose objective is to stage students as democratic – in the sense of responsible, active, and reflexive – subjects. However, the programmes and the various manuals for each programme do not constitute complete, ready-made packages but rather offer a wide range of different techniques from which the teachers put together a special set that they think is appropriate specifically for themselves, their school, and their students. Here, it is also possible for teachers to combine ideas and techniques not only from ART and SET but also from other therapeutic programmes. By reading interview transcripts and text manuals concerning ART and SET, we have identified a number of techniques of citizen education, two of which we will focus on here: *acknowledging* and *calculating*. But first we will briefly introduce our analytical framework.

Analytical framework

The starting point for our contribution is the theorization of *governmentality* that has been developed in the wake of the work of Michel Foucault (Dean, 1999; Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999), primarily the ways in which the concept of *governmentality* has been related to issues of learning and education (Fejes & Nicoll, 2008; Popkewitz & Brennan, 1998). Conceptually, the term itself, in combining the two words ‘govern’ and ‘mentality’, captures more complex forms of governing than those usually referred to in a conventional understanding of government (Rose, 1999). According to Foucault (1991), governing does not originate from or belong to the state apparatuses. Governing is rather made up of a broad repertoire of

technologies of government operating throughout the entire social field. Governing is productive as well as restrictive (Dean, 1999).

According to Rose (1996), today we are living in an advanced liberal society, which ‘does not seek to govern through “society”, but through the regulated choices of individual citizens, now constructed as subjects of choices and aspirations to self-actualization and self-fulfilment’ (Rose, 1996, p. 41). In the advanced liberal society, governing is based on the principle of *responsibilization* – in other words, the formation of free and responsible citizens, responsible for carving out their own life trajectories on the basis of their *own* ideals, circumstances, and ambitions. The object of this formation is ‘implanting in citizens the aspiration to pursue their own civility, wellbeing and advancement’ (p. 40) – in other words, the creation of individuals who are, by their own efforts, *motivated*, *willing*, and *able* to take the initiative. The ideal citizenship is here conceptualized in terms of ‘active citizenship’ (Cruikshank, 1999; Rose, 1999). Thus, the idea of an equal school, where each citizen has the right to a high-quality education as preparation for life, turns into a duty for each citizen to take responsibility to acquire the skills necessary to function as a good, well-behaved citizen.

This is quite different from the classic formula for exercising power within the welfare state. According to Rose (1996), the classic formula consisted of making the state into a centre that would be able to form, guide, and control events and people from the centre. Here, ‘persons and activities were to be governed *through society*, that is to say, through acting upon them in relation to a *social* form, and constituting their experiences and evaluations in a *social* form’ (p. 40). However, the character of this historically specific formula has gradually changed over the latter part of the 20th century. Another type of power formula is emerging, characterized by increasingly neo-liberal technologies of government.

As already mentioned, governing operates through different technologies and techniques. Foucault (1988) differentiated between *technologies of power* and *technologies of the self*. One technology does not rule out the other; rather, the different technologies are often intertwined (Dean, 1999). While technologies of power ‘determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends of domination’, technologies of the self relate to people’s self-formation, the way they produce themselves as citizens. These techniques

permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality. (Foucault, 1988, p. 18)

One of the more important technologies of the self is confession. This was one of the technologies of the self, studied by Foucault, and it is closely related to Christianity and the idea that we must all confess our sins (cf. Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013). To be able to disclose one’s self (to show the truth about oneself), one had to renounce oneself. One of these techniques is verbalization. Through the human sciences, verbalization has become even more important. It has been inscribed in a variety of practices so as to constitute a new self, without the need to renounce oneself. As we will illustrate, the deliberate idea of dialogue is a site where confession as technology of the self intersects with technologies of power.

In the following, we introduce two of the main techniques identified in our analysis: the art of acknowledging and the art of calculating.

The art of acknowledgement

One of the fundamental principles associated with SET and ART, as with a range of other CBT-oriented models, is that effective teaching should focus primarily on the positive rather than the negative, on possibilities rather than problems. This message is underlined strongly both in our interviews and in programme manuals (cf. Brilje et al., 2006; Kimber, 2001b). All informants emphasized that teachers should consistently acknowledge – praise, encourage, and reinforce – the behaviours they perceive as positive rather than punishing various types of transgressions and undesirable behaviours. This is due to the fact that all forms of attention tend to spread, either in negative or in positive circles. One way of strengthening desirable behaviours may be to give rewards, both individually and in the group.

All the informants speak of the value of using different reward systems for the purposes of acknowledgement in their teaching. Among other things, Malin describes how she and other ART teachers at her school consistently apply a reward system in order to improve the motivation and propensity of the students to participate in the teaching. However, the reward system functions not only as a way of working on the students' motivation but also as a means of staging and maintaining the norms and rules associated with the teaching. In the ART group, the teachers use heart stickers to acknowledge desirable behaviours. Students who do well are acknowledged by means of symbolic hearts, while those who do not do so well are left without. When the students have collected a sufficient number of hearts, they can choose the reward they desire. At the end of every lesson, says Malin, the students are asked whether they feel that they deserve a heart – in other words, whether or not they feel they have done well.

We work with the hearts of course, and if you do well, you get a heart. And then it's about that you . . . do well in lessons. And then it's we teachers who set the limits for . . . I mean doing well is a bit . . . you know, who does well and who doesn't do well?

But it's we teachers who decide, and as a rule every lesson finishes with a round of the class where we ask: 'Do you think you deserve a heart for this lesson, why and why not?' But they know what it's about. . . . It's about sitting still and working. Then you get a heart. And if you get a hundred hearts, you can choose between a cinema ticket and a massage.

Thus, it is essentially the teachers who decide which students have and have not done well, on the basis of their assessments of what is right and wrong, desirable and undesirable. The situation of negotiation described by Malin could thereby be viewed as a way of getting the students to feel that they are participants in the decision-making process – in other words, involving them in the process so that that they are motivated to participate in the lessons. This is in spite of the fact that – in the final analysis – it is the teachers who decide which students have done enough to merit a heart and which have not. Thus, this can be seen as a technology of power, where the teacher assesses, compares, and categorises the pupils as either good or bad.

However, what is really central in the process at the end of each lesson, in which the students are involved in defining whether or not they deserve a heart, is not the negotiation itself. The negotiation process can in itself be viewed as a kind of confession, a process whereby the students are encouraged to reflect upon themselves and their behaviour, abilities, and qualities and, in certain cases, to define their own inadequacy or deviance. The confession, both for oneself and in the face of one's surroundings, functions here as a deliberative pedagogical technique focused on also involving the students in the teachers' work of continuously evaluating the students' performance and acknowledging those behaviours that are regarded as desirable.

In one sense, the logic seems quite contradictory to the idea of focusing attention first and foremost on that which is viewed as positive and desirable, and not on inadequacies and problems, since the negotiation also opens the way for negative assessments – in other words, that individual students do not live up to the requirements for good conduct. In the context of the negotiation, however, it is up to the students – not the teacher – to assess whether or not they live up to these requirements. If a student assesses that he or she for some reason or other has not done so, then this assessment is the student's – not the teacher's – even if the students may have come to regard themselves from the perspective of the teacher's definition of good conduct. In this way, the confession also functions as a technology of the self, whereby the students are made to reflect upon themselves, individually and in dialogue with others, as a means of changing themselves in the direction of that which has been defined as the ideal condition. The ability to continuously reflect upon oneself in relation to the surrounding world, and to share these reflections in dialogue with others, is one of the most central characteristics of the democratic subject that the teaching has the objective of fostering. One particularly crucial question here is that of the capacity to calculate, which we will discuss in the following section – in other words, the capacity to reflect upon the possible consequences of one's behaviour and how it may be perceived in various situations.

The art of calculating

Both SET and ART explicate the importance of focusing on possibilities rather than limitations, not least by reference to the fact that a focus of this kind turns students into active subjects rather than passive objects or victims. 'It's very important to concentrate on what actually works', noted Birgitta Kimber (2004, p. 41), for example, 'instead of focusing energy on what doesn't work. . . . In this way you create possibilities, instead of becoming a

victim'. For the teacher, argued Kimber, it is important in this context to show that he or she trusts the students. One way of showing trust, she continued, is to give the students options, to teach them that they always have a choice, in school as well as outside school, whether they choose to make an active choice or not. By learning that they always have a choice, and that every choice has different consequences, which they themselves have to deal with, the students simultaneously learn that as social beings they are not passive victims but instead it is always they themselves who govern the paths they take through life.

All the informants emphasize the capacity to make choices and to reflect carefully over the possible consequences of choosing one thing or the other, as one of the greatest challenges in the context of the teaching. The students are regarded as needing to learn to calculate – in other words, to see and manage their lives, not only in school but also in their lives outside school – as a more or less infinite series of choices, both large and small. In this regard, the informants spoke of the students needing to be made aware of the fact that they can always act to change the world. Nobody is a victim of circumstance. It is important to get the students to both see and accept the consequences of their own actions, to assume responsibility themselves and not pass responsibility on to others. One way of teaching the students to take responsibility may be to draw parallels with, and take examples from, everyday situations also outside school as a means of showing the students the importance of thinking for themselves in a range of different situations. It is the teachers' task to constantly emphasize the students' responsibility for calculating the risks and consequences of various actions on a day-to-day basis, even when these consequences will not become visible until much later.

Malin describes the teaching in the ART group as a process in which the students gradually learn to use the right strategies in order to get attention. During lessons, thinking about consequences is staged, among other ways, in the following way: Each student

starts by talking about what s/he wants to be. Then the teachers ask questions on the basis of their experience of each individual student and how s/he usually reacts in different situations. The students are thus faced with different scenarios that they might hypothetically find themselves in. Malin argues that there may be a pedagogical point to pushing individual scenarios to their limits in order to get the students to really understand the importance of thinking carefully about their behaviour here and now.

One of them wants to have a garage of his own. Okay, then we look at that. Okay, then you have to think that if you get into an argument with someone now, then it might be someone who will be buying your services later on. . . . As far as possible, we try to cover everything so that they try to think about their behaviour now, that it has consequences far into the future.

In other words, SET and ART mobilize reflection as a technique whereby individuals are encouraged to reflect and evaluate their own abilities and their conduct in relation to future scenarios. By disclosing their defects and faulty choices to themselves, better citizens should be moulded. Such citizens are themselves made responsible for the setting and realization of goals that are in line with what is deemed a normal and good citizen. Even if schools, and the pedagogical techniques that are mobilized in schools, create opportunities for the students to become the citizens that are prescribed by the norm, it is, in the final analysis, up to the individual to make use of the opportunities that are provided. As has already been mentioned, this assumes both that the individual is active a priori and, at the same time, that this is also the effect of participating in the schoolwork.

Concluding reflections

Given that the role of schools is to educate future citizens, what we can see in school is prevailing ideals with regard to democracy and citizenship, how rights are balanced against obligations, which civic qualities, capacities, or characteristics are viewed as desirable and as undesirable and in need of retraining. Summarizing the main findings in this chapter, we argue that the CBT programmes that have increasingly been adopted in schools reflect a series of contemporary perceived problems and ideals. Out of our analysis of both interviews with staff working with the two CBT programmes and from programme manuals, we draw the following conclusions: Firstly, in both programmes, we see essentially a common view of the problem, based on a therapeutic understanding, with a focus on the individual and her emotional and social deficiencies and merits. Secondly, on the basis of this particular understanding of self and society, both programmes develop similar working methods mobilizing a wide range of confessional practices. Our analysis focused on two of these: teaching the art of acknowledging and the art of calculating. Thirdly, in both programmes, similar views of what constitutes an ideal democratic citizenship are developed, normalizing certain ways of being and thinking – with a strong emphasis on activation, responsibility, and capacity for dialogue. Fourthly, the teaching conducted within both programmes reflects wider developments in welfare policy in Sweden at the turn of the millennium, towards a more advanced liberal welfare regime, where welfare is gradually turned into a commodity for the self-interested individual or consumer to choose, rather than a social right.

When defining the problem, firstly, both programmes proceed from the kind of therapeutic framework described previously in this chapter. The central focus is the specific individual's inner life. In accordance with the basic therapeutic idea, several of the challenges and problems faced by society are defined in terms of mental ill health, deficient social competence, and a deficient capacity to manage one's emotions (Bartholdsson, 2007; Furedi,

2004). The individual is viewed as both the problem and the solution. Problems such as disturbances and disorder, school difficulties, and unemployment are largely understood as the result of a set of risk factors, and then particular individual deficiencies or incompetence of various kinds, rather than as a result of societal conditions, such as family circumstances, poverty, structural inequalities, and social relations. The recurrent message in both interviews and programme manuals (cf. Larsdotter, 2009) is that the students who participate in the teaching both can and should change themselves, in the sense of working on themselves. Everyone can achieve success in life. Even those who are at risk have potential. All they need is a little help along the way to find and refine this potential. In other words, in order to get the students to change externally (how they dress, relate to people, behave, present themselves), what is needed is to work on them internally (their motivation, drive, desire, ambition).

Secondly, when it comes to the working methods developed in both programmes, our analysis has pointed to two different techniques mobilizing dialogue as a way to foster desirable subjects: the art of acknowledging and the art of calculating. These are connected to both technologies of power and technologies of the self. For example, the teachers' scrutinizing gaze and decision making in relation to the distribution of hearts is a mobilization of a technology of power. At the same time, students are invited to scrutinize themselves in order to better themselves, and thus there is also a mobilization of a technology of the self. In the end, these techniques shape the same kind of subject (an active, democratic, and responsible subject). A democratic subject is one who can live a productive and well-behaved life without any aggressive or ill-placed behaviour. Such a subject is contrasted to how these students are positioned today: as deviant in certain situations, antisocial, or undesirable in one or another respect. As a way to shape such desirable citizens, the CBT programmes do not work through coercive techniques that determine behaviour. Rather, they

mobilize techniques that shape, foster, and elicit subjectivity. This is, for example, done by motivating the students to take responsibility for their actions in school. This, in turn, is assumed to make the students more willing and able to take responsibility also for their actions outside school, later in life, not least when it comes to their future career in the labour market.

As in the deliberative conception of democracy that has recently had a major impact on, for instance, education policy, dialogue is seen as an important element in the work of democratic schooling. Through dialogue, students are encouraged to express their opinions about ethical and practical issues at school. Dialogue is mobilized when the teachers acknowledge the students for good behaviour. The students are themselves asked if they think they deserve a heart representing good conduct. Thus, they are invited to dialogue, and through this, they need to scrutinize themselves and their behaviours and make this visible to others. By doing so, they turn themselves into an object to be compared, inspected, and evaluated in relation to what is deemed desirable. This is both a process of objectification and subjectification through which the students come to know who they are (Foucault, 2005). Similar processes take place when students are invited to dialogue about what they want in the future. Here, life in school, here and now, is related to life outside school, there and later on. The students are invited to share with others their inner desires in life, and by doing so, they need to scrutinize themselves in terms of conduct and abilities. These are then compared to those presented by the teacher as necessary to get to where they want to go. In this dialogue, students are trained to calculate risks and consequences of different kinds of actions in certain situations.

The above summary points to how confession, through dialogue, is a central part of CBT programmes that aim to modify conduct. However, this is not forced upon the students. Rather, they are invited to act on the basis of their freedom. We thus have what

Foucault (2007) called the ‘conduct of conduct’, where students are conducting their own behaviour at the same time as they conduct the behaviours of others. By regulating themselves, changing their selves into what is deemed desirable, they are reproducing the norm of good behaviour and thereby participating in regulating the conduct of others.

Thirdly, for the ideal democratic citizen constructed in both programmes, capacity for dialogue constitutes a key civic competence. Through dialogue the student is assumed to acquire the characteristics of responsibility, flexibility, and autonomy. For it to be possible to educate students to become democratic citizens, it is necessary, however, to create a desire to engage in dialogue. The therapy-like teaching conducted in SET and ART thereby attempts, in its constant endeavour to motivate the students and increase their awareness, to strengthen their self-confidence and to deepen their insights, an expression of a paradoxical *will to empower* (cf. Cruikshank, 1999). The teaching may well be motivated by the best of intentions (to liberate, activate, strengthen, and motivate students to take responsibility for themselves), but it nevertheless constitutes an intricate form of governing, based on normalizing certain ways of being and thinking as a citizen and presenting them as self-evidently normal and desirable, while they are simultaneously distinguished from that which is regarded as abnormal and undesirable – activity is contrasted with passivity, autonomy with dependency, the civilized with the primitive (Dahlstedt, 2009). Through the mobilization of a range of confessional practices, the students are worked on in relation to the norm of the good citizen. Here too, the point of departure is the individual and his/her autonomy, which constitute the means by which the norm relating to what is desirable and undesirable is reproduced.

Fourthly, the increasingly marked presence of CBT programmes in the educational landscape – as well as in the welfare state more widely – is in many respects a sign of the times (cf. Fejes & Dahlstedt, 2013; Furedi, 2004). These programmes can be

related to what Rose (1999) has referred to as governing the advanced liberal society. Essentially, therapy-like teaching consists of educating students to become democratic citizens in line with the demands, expectations, and ideals of the contemporary labour market. Responsible, flexible, and active subjects are highly valued on today's labour market (Dovemark, 2007) – and such ideals are normalized in the CBT programmes in school. Although the traditional social democratic welfare model, in Sweden referred to as the 'Swedish model', has not been replaced by a completely *new* welfare model by the developments of the 1980s onwards, it is nonetheless possible to discern a development towards a new – and in several respects, more advanced liberal – welfare regime, based on other premises than the traditional social democratic welfare model. Here, welfare is gradually turned into a commodity for the self-interested individual or consumer to choose, rather than a social right (Dahlstedt, 2009). This development is visible not only in Sweden but also in the other Nordic countries (Abrahamson, 2010; Langergaard, this anthology). In this transformation, the ongoing developments within the area of education are of great importance in making citizens governable in novel ways and educating citizens of a certain kind, for a certain kind of society (Arnesen & Lundahl, 2006). As we have shown in this chapter, children are today educated into active citizens, with the responsibility for developing their own future and both willing and able to take the responsibility for their actions, rather than into passive bearers of rights; in other words, education (as other kinds of welfare) becomes primarily a responsibility for the individual, rather than a collective social right. Analysing the different challenges of educating children of today into such citizens of tomorrow is very important in trying to understand some of the challenges for the future in governing society of tomorrow.

References

- Abrahamson, P. (2010). European welfare states beyond neoliberalism. *Development and Society*, 39(1), 61-95.
- Arnesen, A. L., & Lundahl, L. (2006). Still social and democratic? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 285-300.
- Andersson, K. (2008). *Talking violence, constructing identity*. (Doctoral thesis). Department of Child Studies, Linköping University, Sweden.
- Bartholdsson, Å. (2007). *Med facit i hand*. (Doctoral thesis). Department of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University.
- Beach, D., & Dovemark, M. (2007). *Education and the commodity problem*. London: Tufnell Press.
- Biesta, G. (2003). Demokrati – ett problem för utbildning eller ett utbildningsproblem. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 12, 59-80.
- Boman, Y. (2002). *Utbildningspolitik i det andra moderna*. (Doctoral thesis). Department of Education, Örebro University.
- Boréus, K. (1994). *Högervåg*, Stockholm: Tiden.
- Brilje, I., Strandberg, L., & Kliba, D. (2006). *Tanke, handling, konsekvens*. Malmö: Ungdomsalternativet/UngArt.
- Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The will to empower*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dahlstedt, M. (2009). *Aktiveringens politik*. Malmö: Liber.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.
- Dovemark, M. (2007). *Ansvar – hur lätt är det?* Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Englund, T. (1994). Education as a citizenship right – a concept in transition. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 26, 383-399.

- Englund, T. (2003). Skolan och demokratin – på väg mot en skola för deliberativa samtal?. In B. Jonsson & K. Roth (Eds.), *Demokrati och lärande* (pp. 49-73). Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Feindler, E. L., & Weisner, S. (2006). Youth anger management treatments for school violence prevention. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety. From research to practice* (pp. 353-363). Mahwa, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fejes, A. (2008). To be one's own confessor. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29, 653-664.
- Fejes, A., & Nicoll, K. (Eds.). (2008). *Foucault and lifelong learning*. London: Routledge.
- Fejes, A., & Dahlstedt, M. (2013). *The confessing society*, London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Luther, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self* (pp. 16-49). London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1991). On governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect* (pp. 87-104). Brighton: Harvester.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *The hermeneutics of the subject*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Furedi, F. (2004). *Therapy culture*. Routledge: London.
- Gundersen, K., & Svartdal, F. (2006). Aggression replacement training in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 63-81.
- Hvinden, B., & Johansson, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Citizenship in Nordic welfare states*. New York: Routledge.
- Hörnqvist, M. (2007). *The organised nature of power*. (Doctoral thesis). Department of Criminology, Stockholm University.
- Kimber, B. (2001). *Livsviktigt*. Solna: Ekelunds.

- Kimber, B. (2004). *Att främja barns och ungdomars utveckling av social och emotionell kompetens*. Solna: Ekelunds.
- Larsdotter, S. (2009). *ART i skolan*. Malmö: Epago.
- Lindensjö, B., & Lundgren, U. P. (2000). *Utbildningsreformer och politisk styrning*. Stockholm: HSL.
- Popkewitz, T., & Brennan, M. (1998). Restructuring of social and political theory in education. In T. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Foucault's challenge* (pp. 3-35). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Riele, K. (2006). Youth 'at risk'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21, 129-145.
- Rose, N. (1996). Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne, & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and political reason* (pp. 37-64). London: Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roth, K. (1998). *Democracy, education and citizenship*. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.
- Ryner, M. (2002). *Capitalist restructuring, globalisation, and the third way*. London: Routledge.
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2000b). *En fördjupad studie om värdegrunden*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2000c). *Med demokrati som uppdrag*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011). *Utvärdering av metoder mot mobbing*. Stockholm: Swedish National Agency for Education.
- Wishart, D., Taylor, A., & Schultz, L. (2006). The construction and production of youth 'at risk'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21, 291-304.

Öhrn, E., Lundahl, L., & Beach, D. (2011). *Young people's influence and democratic education*. London: Tufnell Press.

¹ This chapter is a further developed argument based on a chapter in Fejes and Dahlstedt (2013).

² The staff work at two schools in the compulsory education sector, Central and Nygård, located in a medium-sized Swedish town. Susanne is a supervisor and Malin a teacher at Central; Lena is a supervisor and Anna a teacher at Nygård. Central is located in the centre of town, while Nygård lies in a stigmatized neighbourhood located a small distance away from the centre. Central has a broad catchment area and attracts students from varied social and cultural backgrounds. At Nygård, the majority of the students have an immigrant background and parents who are not used to studying. At Central, the teaching in ART is conducted in the form of a special resource group, a small group of students with a relatively large number of teachers. At Nygård, 'Life-skills' (Livskunskap), the teaching that proceeds from the SET programme, is an obligatory subject scheduled for one hour per week from preschool to year nine. The programme manuals analysed are, firstly, a series of ten SET manuals for teachers and students respectively, *Vital (Livsviktigt)*, developed by Birgitta Kimber (Kimber, 2001), and secondly, two Swedish ART manuals, *Tanke, handling, konsekvens* (Brilje et al., 2006) and *ART i skolan* (Larsdotter, 2009).