‘Smart’ states: Reconstituting creativity

STEPHEN HAY & CUSHLA KAPITZKE

Griffith University & Queensland University of Technology

Abstract

Rejecting notions of ‘creativity’ as self-realisation through free expression, this paper argues that discourses of creativity currently driving education policy within so-called knowledge economies has emerged as an intellectual technology for the production of student subjectivities in Queensland. Using a governmentality framework, it locates the conditions of possibility of the creative subject within dominant policy articulations of the global knowledge economy and emerging rationalities of risk and uncertainty. It locates the analysis by discussing a specific example of a school industry partnership developed between one Brisbane State High School and a multi-national corporation in aerospace. The paper explores how this partnership has emerged as a novel neoliberal space for constituting creative subjects in education facilitated by such hybrid figures of the enterprising teacher and the entrepreneurial student-worker. It concludes by arguing that the creative subject is functional to the devolved governing strategy of social investment which has sought to achieve a broad reorganisation of relationships between students, schools and industry in Queensland.

> Learning and innovation go hand in hand. The arrogance of success is to think that what you did yesterday will be sufficient for tomorrow. (William Pollard, *Soul of the Firm*, 1996, cited in Queensland Government, 2005: 4)

> Global competition was always a threat to Australia’s national integrity. Now information technology has put paid to the capacity of any government to protect its industries and economy from competition, or to control the flow of global capital into and out of the nation, or to limit the nature of the values children will learn. (Education Queensland, 2000: 6)

> Uncertainty makes us free. (Bernstein, 1998)

Introduction

Since the emergence of liberalism as the dominant form of government in Europe in the eighteenth century (Foucault, 1979), authorities have been confronted with the problem of devising policies aimed at securing the health, wealth, orderliness and happiness of national populations. They have achieved this by contriving inventive ways to guide and shape the self-governing capacities of individuals. Recent international policy anxieties coalescing around the need to enhance the competitiveness of national and regional economies in the context of globalisation have prompted authorities to focus on strategies aimed at securing competitive advantage by enhancing human capital resources. Thus, policy documents in recent years have urged people to be more productive by becoming innovative, enterprising and entrepreneurial.

A recent addition to this growing list of injunctions is the call for individuals to become more ‘creative.’ The focus of this paper therefore is on the emergence of creativity as a way of understanding, managing and transforming the self-governing capacities of modern subjects. In particular, it traces the conditions of possibility for the emergence of creativity as a new expression of the worker-citizen in the state of Queensland, Australia. It does this by mapping the incorporation of creativity as a prominent theme of

government policy discourse in Queensland. The discussion draws on the Queensland Government's *Smart Queensland: Smart State Strategy 2005-2015* as a case study example. By drawing attention to the subjectifying discourses in policy, this analysis seeks to explain how the creative self is fabricated out of particular truths that are told about the present and the obligations of the citizen worker that flow from this. The paper concludes by examining the 'Gateways to the Aerospace Industry' partnership in Queensland as a practical manifestation of that governmental strategy.

Subjectivity and government

A governmentality perspective is used here to explain the emergence of the creative subject in Queensland policy discourse. Governmentality, in a general sense, refers to activity directed toward the 'conduct of conduct' (Foucault, 1982; Gordon, 1991: 2). This refers to activity designed to guide or shape the attitudes and behaviour of others, or of oneself (Gordon, 1991; Rose, 1996). It is the 'contact between the technologies of domination of others and those of the self' (Foucault, 1988: 19). Thus, Simons (1995:36) has described governing as the connection between ethics and politics. Governmentality, in this sense, refers not only to the activities of sovereign governments but also to how governing is widely disbursed throughout society, infusing everyday relationships such as those between employer and employee, doctor and patient, teacher and student, parent and child (Miller & Rose, 1990; Rose & Miller, 1992; Simons, 1995).

Therefore, analysis drawing on governmentality is interested in exploring the relationships and interconnections between the actions of sovereign authorities at the macro political level and governing acts that occur in these disbursed sites (Gordon, 1991: 3). By adopting such a perspective, analysis is able to explore the emergence of the creative self across a number of dimensions including rationalities of government, governing technologies and ethics.

Rationalities of government

Governing rationalities relate to the epistemological or intellectual aspects of the art of governing (Rose & Miller, 1992: 179). This notion points to how, in various ways and at various times, authorities have reflected on the principles and practice of government. These have included questions of justification (who can govern), the objects of government, (who and what is governed), and the problems, goals and ambitions to which the exercise of authority should be legitimately directed (Gordon, 1991; Rose, 1996). An important aspect of governing rationalities is that they render the present in ways that make it amenable to governmental intervention or programming.

> For the government of an enterprise or a population, a national economy or a family, a child or, indeed, oneself, it is necessary to have a way of representing the domain to be governed, its limits, characteristics, key aspects or processes, objectives and so forth, and of linking these together in some more or less systematic manner. (Rose, 1988: 184)

This points to how acts of governing rely on particular forms of expertise (Rose, 1996). Acts of government thereby invariably involve particular knowledges, representations and expert judgements concerning the subjects and objects that are to be governed (Larner & Walters, 2004). A key argument of this paper is that the 'creative' subject is a figure that has emerged in the context of an historic transformation in liberal government in Queensland over the past decade. This transformation has entailed deployment of 'uncertainty' strategies adopted as a means of managing Queensland's transition to a globalised economy. The shift has been supported by a specific discourse on globalisation, which has problematised Queensland's position within the emerging competitive hierarchy of global knowledge economies.

Technologies of government

Technologies of government refer to the heterogeneous practical mechanisms and techniques by which connections are made between the aspirations of governing authorities and the self-formative capacities of persons (Rose & Miller, 1992). Rose describes these practical aspects of governing as 'technological' in that they attempt to maximise certain capacities and dispositions of individuals while constraining or negating others in relation to authoritative ways of knowing, including medical, legal, pedagogical, economic, and administrative ways (Rose, 1992: 144). In this way, individuals are guided to exercise their freedom through such notions as responsibility, duty, discipline, enterprise, and so on.

Significantly, technologies of government are not rationally designed mechanisms that derive from governing rationalities in any pre-determined way. Rather, they are the result of a 'complex assemblage of diverse forces' (Rose & Miller, 1992). This focuses attention to how technologies are improvised from the available social and cultural resources. They are often borrowed from other programs, reshaped and adapted for novel purposes (Rose & Miller, 1992). Our genealogy of creativity reveals how the concept has been appropriated in Queensland from corporate and public sector management disciplines (e.g., Florida, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Pollard, 1996), and constitutes the most recent version of a succession of salvation discourses for governments attempting to manage the demands of competitiveness in the emerging knowledge economy.

Ethics and government

Any theoretical investigation into the creative subject must account for how subjectivity comprises an ethical dimension. Foucault's notion of ethics corresponds to the practical ways that subjects relate to themselves and others in relation to certain truths concerning what is good and bad, esteemed or reviled, desirable or undesirable (Osbourne, 1998; Simons, 1995). These truths enable particular ways of evaluating and acting upon one's self and others, which in different historical periods have accorded different political value to certain performances of the self. Foucault associates the ethical dimensions of subjectivity with technologies of the self. These enable 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: 18). It is the practical programs of government that attempt to render programmatic particular ways of relating to the self (Rose, 1996). We argue therefore that governance of the population in Queensland through notions of creativity required that the concept be stripped of its association with rare and unusual talent, and rearticulated as a mundane capacity of individuals.

Like neoliberalism's enterprising subject, the creative self can be regarded as 'intrinsically ethical' because it establishes a set of rules for self-conduct that accord with the values of personal autonomy such as ambition, freedom, initiative, innovation, productivity, choice, risk-taking and personal responsibility (Rose, 1992: 146). It is argued, however, that creativity extends the notion of the enterprise self because it can embodies a particular position with respect to the market and a specific attitude toward futures that are framed as 'uncertain.' The remainder of this paper will explore how the creative subject has emerged in Queensland at the intersection of the three dimensions of governmentality outlined above.

From governing risk to embracing uncertainty

Debates regarding the threats posed by globalisation have tended to be dominated by considerations of risk, mainly due to the influence of social theorisations of risk society in the work of Beck (1992a; 1992b; 1998; 2006) and Giddens (1990; 1991; 1999). In preference to the exclusive theoretical focus on risk, several theorists have made the useful distinction between risk and uncertainty, arguing that risk is an inadequate

construct in terms of explaining how individuals have become oriented to managing problematic futures (O'Malley, 2000, 2004; Zinn & Taylor-Gooby, 2006). Alternatively, they have argued that risk and uncertainty should be regarded as systematically linked to account for the different ways beyond instrumental rationality through which risk is managed and governed (Zinn, 2006). O'Malley makes the point that risk theorisations such as those of Beck privilege approaches to risk that have to do with its avoidance or at least its management. The classical model of risk in this regard is that of actuarial risk which attempts to manage uncertainty by rendering the future as calculable or probabilistic events (e.g., motor vehicle accidents, mortality risk, workers compensation). What these accounts tend to overlook is how neoliberalism positively embraces uncertainty, recognizing it as an important stimulus to economic growth and a driver of enterprise culture and innovation (O'Malley, 2004: 5).

Thus, a more comprehensive account of risk would acknowledge the views held by gurus of the new managerialism who reject the restrictive and precautionary attitudes engendered by risk technologies (see Bernstein, 1998; Florida, 2002, 2006; Osbourne & Gaebler, 1992; Peters, 1987). Here, O'Malley (2000: 460) proposes that uncertainty 'represents a distinctive way of governing through the future, whose place in the formation of rationalities of neo-liberalism, and of 'enterprising subjects', is vital'. Following this, we argue that the governmental space in which the creative subject can be found is fashioned out of tensions in policy created by the need to simultaneously manage risk and preserve uncertainty. That is to say, on the one hand, good government requires that authorities manage foreseeable risks while maintaining uncertainty as one of the neoliberal conditions of production in a global knowledge economy. Construction of the creative subject provides a partial solution to this particular problem of government.

Despite the evident determinism that has characterised risk society rhetoric, we argue that notions of uncertainty and risk are sustained by particular knowledge producing practices and discourses that realise the present in particular ways (Roth, 1981). Here, policy discourse play a critical role in 'fabricating and mobilizing the new age' by translating the apparent anxieties and concerns regarding global uncertainty into 'a single narrative of change and adaptation' (Edwards & Nicoll, 2001; Nicoll & Edwards, 2004: 43-44). These discourses constitute the present through specific forms of spatial imaginaries together with the kinds of subjectivities that are assumed to productively inhabit such spaces (Larner & Le Heron, 2002; Larner & Walters, 2004). Queensland authorities associate creativity with neoliberal individuals who, according to Brockling (2007), resemble the successful investor who is able to maximize opportunity by speculating on the future.

> We can increase our productive capacity by applying new ideas — either as radical inventions, or as incremental improvements to old ways of making or providing products and services. New ideas that work — innovations — emerge in a culture of discovery, creativity, diversity and risk-taking; they flourish when skills and knowledge are encouraged and stretched to keep pace with change. (Queensland Government, 2005: 9)

Further, education is regarded as playing a critical role in developing future entrepreneurial citizens.

> We also need to raise the profile of enterprise education. In a world where many traditional jobs are disappearing, we need to encourage all people, but particularly young people, to see themselves as future entrepreneurs and wealth creators. Networks between industry and the education system must be developed so that our education system responds to the requirements of an ever-changing business world.

The quotation above points to how creativity, as a specific intellectual technology through which the capacities of the modern citizen/worker are constituted, can be understood in terms of how authorities imagine Queensland's transition to the global knowledge economy.

Imagining global uncertainty

Within this new configuration, economic activity that is associated increasingly with non-physical production has become deterritorialised. The proliferation of networked communications technologies, new circuits of international finance, capital mobility, and the increasing cross-border flows of people and commodities has meant that production is no longer co-extensive with bounded territories such as nation states (Larner & Walters, 2004: 497). Rather, economic activity is assumed to occur within the borderless self-organising spaces of globalised networks and flows. Moreover, the dynamic structure of networks means that nodes within them (including people, groups, regions and countries) may be selectively switched 'on' or 'off' depending upon their relevance to the goals of the network (Castells, 1996). As production and trade increasingly becomes 'dematerialised' and 'weightless,' corporations have sought to locate facilities in areas that offer competitive advantages with respect to taxation, regulatory requirements, and labour costs (Friedman, 2006; Macdonald, 2005; Porter, 1990). Kelly and Kenway (2001: 26) note that within the logic of network relations:

> … the predominance of 'timeless' and 'placeless' global flows results in the development of a 'meta-network' with the capacity to turn off 'nonessential' functions, subordinate social groups, and devalued territories.

Connection points or 'switches' thus represent both privileged positions within networks and instruments of power. Within this regime, competition and the conditions under which it manifests are assumed to be in constant flux due to technological innovation and obsolescence, changing consumer markets, and the exponential expansion of knowledge. To remain competitive means being orientated to the future by maintaining a commitment to perpetual and continuous innovation. This is required in order to develop a competitive margin by predicting future trends, identifying emerging markets, or envisaging novel applications for existing products.

In such an environment, advantage is purported to be increasingly dependent on the quality of human capital and investment in education, training, and on future-oriented activities such as research and development. Furthermore, such a context requires economic entities and worker-citizens with capacities to be flexible, innovative and creative (Fougère & Solitander, 2007). Creativity increases in value with greater levels of uncertainty. Creativity signifies the 'human potential to bring into being something new … to make the absent present … the capacity to realise the yet inexistent' (Brockling, 2007).

Grounding imaginaries of uncertainty: 'Smart' State strategy

In the case of Queensland, the problem of transition to the global knowledge economy has been characterised by discourses of uncertainty, instability and fear (Furedi, 2002). Queensland is a relatively small regional economy whose productive base is in a relatively narrow range of industries linked to the old economy such as mining and agriculture and to service industries linked to tourism (Schmidt, 1999). Given this context, authorities tend to position Queensland as peripheral to the 'centres' of global economy, recalling earlier concerns of geographic isolationalism in Australia. The growth of the knowledge economy was therefore thought to have potential to expose structural weaknesses in the Queensland economy.

The urgent need for Queensland to embrace enterprise and creativity at every level was underscored in the *Smart Queensland: Smart State* policy through discursive problematisation of Queensland's position within the deterritorialised space of the global. This policy emphasizes the need to manage uncertain futures by constituting a specific spatial imaginary that positions Queensland's population within the same competitive space as unidentified but 'knowable' and 'dangerous' others. Note the following exhortation.

> Continue to innovate or stagnate. That is the stark choice facing all Queenslanders as the 21st century starts revealing new challenges for societies throughout the world. We either continue to innovate and create the jobs of tomorrow for our children so that we maintain one of the best standards of living in the world. Or we stagnate as the State becomes little more than a beach for tourists from those parts of the world that have been prepared to innovate.
>
> We have a brilliant environment, great climate and an enviable lifestyle. Our economy is booming, and our unemployment rate is the lowest in more than a generation. ...
>
> So why do we need to continue changing? ...
>
> If we don't continue to change, the Sunshine State will still be a comfortable place in which to live. But we will be overtaken by those states and countries that are willing and anxious to change and embrace the opportunities the future offers. (Queensland Government, 2005: 2).

Such statements are characteristic of the noted ambivalence toward globalised futures that pervades policy accounts. While a globalised knowledge economy is clearly regarded as posing an immanent threat to Queensland's economy and society, there is an equally clear indication that there is no alternative but to embrace change (Hay & Watson, 2003).

Thus, the conditions for stimulating creativity and innovation in Queensland as a productive force are to be secured through nothing less than a reconfiguration of both private and public organisations based on the logic of global networks and flows.

> Strong local links and networks across sectors are crucial. Without them, our research advances may be exploited by other countries more quickly than they can be exploited domestically; Queensland's commercial sector may miss opportunities to adopt new technologies and become more competitive. The Queensland Government will work even closer with industry, business and university sectors in pursuit of these opportunities. At the same time, it is also important to capture the benefits of knowledge flows and technology transfer from other countries and states. The rest of Australia and the world provide a vast source of new ideas, new processes and technologies. Forging strategic alliances will help build critical mass, foster technological exchange, promote our respective capabilities and encourage investment. (Queensland Government, 2005: 23).

The foregoing discussion has highlighted how notions of creativity have been enabled by the emergence of specific rationalities of government in Queensland. It further reveals how the conditions of possibility for the creative subject have included ways of imagining the global present as a particular kind of space. The paper now turns to examine how policy discourse in Queensland has mobilised specific notions of creativity and the consequences of this for the ethical formation of the subject. It will conclude by examining how a school-industry engagement strategy has focused on the aerospace industry and emerged as a practical program for the engagement of creativity and enterprise.

The creativity imperative: Responsibility as ethical effect

It is important to note that the 'creative' subject represents a significant development to the enterprising self of a decade ago. Brockling (2007: 102) argues that 'entrepreneurship is the goal of all interpellations of creativity.' Nevertheless, the notion of the enterprise self is insufficient to explain the emergence of the

creative self even though both forms of the subject share the same developmental trajectories within neoliberal regimes of government. The work of Dean (1999) is helpful here in making the critical distinction between these two forms of subjectivity. Discussing what he refers to as 'reflexive government', Dean (1999) points to the extension of the market form to an ever increasing number of social domains for the governance and distribution of social welfare services. By exercising individual autonomy and 'choice' in decision making around life issues, the market becomes the mechanism through which individuals must first conduct themselves as consumers, and thus as their own entrepreneurs, in realizing their needs for employment, health and education.

Following this, the creative self is realised in the ceaseless cycles of innovation that are asserted as a permanent condition of the competitive knowledge economy. Therefore, unlike the enterprise self who realizes his or her subjectivity *through* the market, the market is both means and end of the ethical realization of the creative self. That is, the end-point of the enterprise self was a different self, namely, a more socially useful, value-added self. By contrast, the end-point of the creative self is an ontological state of permanent value-adding to the market. Because there is no limit to the degree of uncertainty that can be ascribed to social life within conditions of globality, nor a definable limit to the creative capacities of individuals, so there is always the possibility and anticipation of improved performance and profitability. This is the reason that Fougère and Solitander (2007) see in creativity the potential for escalating demands of work, personal productivity and declining job security. Ultimately, there is no social space outside of market logic, and the subject/citizen becomes superseded as the legitimate principle and focus for the formulation of public policy.

This change has entailed a discursive shift in the epistemology of creativity. Because governance — and especially the governance of uncertainty — entails the 'calculated supervision, administration and maximization of the forces of each and all' (Miller & Rose, 1990, p. 2), then policy must of necessity assert that the capacity to innovate and to be creative is the responsibility of all rather than the select few who once were considered extraordinarily talented or gifted. Creativity is no longer framed as an atypical and frequently transgressive phenomenon but is mainstreamed and domesticated as an attitude and skill in which individual citizens become self-investing and self-managing subjects through the ethical work of self-discipline and self-surveillance.

> The capacity *to think ahead* as well as respond and adapt to change is as much *an attitude* as it is *a skill*. Such an attitude of foresight, responsiveness and adaptability is strongest in a society that provides the safety and security of social stability at the same time that it *values the dynamism of creativity,* inventiveness and *the energy of the human spirit.* (Queensland Government, 2005: 44).

Creativity is here rendered a common-place phenomenon that is co-existent with 'the energy of the human spirit.' As noted below, nothing and no one is exempt from this imperative to be 'smart.' All are required to engage in lifelong learning for creative capacity building 'across all fields of enterprise.'

> Our ambitions are broad. We will elevate the importance of skills and innovation across all fields of enterprise. We want all Queenslanders to have the chance to learn, to discover, and to achieve. Smart Queensland reaches out to everyone: to the farmers across this vast State of ours, responsible for making Queensland such a great agricultural success; to today's parents of tomorrow's leaders, for whom education and opportunity are so precious; to scientists and artists, teachers and entrepreneurs, community workers and business people, plumbers and doctors. Whether you see yourself as a leader or team player, as a thinker or doer, whether you are an employee, a business owner, university academic or public servant, Smart Queensland needs you.

This exhortation to *responsibilisation* articulates with themes promoted elsewhere in Queensland policy. In these documents, investment in social capital through civic engagement, community participation and establishment of robust social networks are endorsed as important requisites to strong economies and liberal democracies within contemporary global conditions (see Rose, 1999; Warner, 2002).

> We must move with a new spirit of enterprise and new programs in our education, culture and industry, or we stand still and fall back. We have the willingness to do this. We need the skills as well. All of us have a *responsibility to contribute* our talents, our labours and our ideas – for the benefit of our great State. (Queensland Government, 2005:2) (Emphasis added)

Uncertainty is adopted here as a strategic orientation to the future. The foregoing text embodies a reciprocal responsibility of government and subject in a necessary politics of social investment. Policy is made here on the basis of probabilistic reckoning driven by uncertainty (O'Malley, 2005). Globalisation is the social imaginary (Taylor, 2004) that drives this discourse of inevitability and logic of uncertainty. Because of this, the orientation of policy is strategically focused on the future but in a way that problematises the present. These rationalities are implemented programmatically through discursive and material practices in local school sites which, in turn, realise the 'global.' In what follows, we examine how school-industry partnerships in Queensland have recently been reconfigured as a neoliberal space for governing the creative subject in education.

Aerospace Industry as creative practice

School-industry partnerships have emerged in Queensland as one solution to the challenge of managing pathways for youth within policy contexts of uncertainty governance (see Franklin, Bloch & Popkewitz, 2003). The formation by Queensland education authorities of school-industry partnerships with a number of key global corporate players is unique in the Australian educational landscape (Caldwell & Keating, 2004). Traditionally, state schools in Australia operated at 'arms length' from the private sector. Industry was, in the main, a consumer or 'end user' of the skills that education systems 'produced,' while having little input into the kinds of knowledge and skill students acquired from schooling. The recent emergence of formalized partnership initiatives on a large scale represents the most significant development in educational governance since the spread of mass secondary education in Queensland during the first half of the twentieth century.

Two recent policies, *Queensland State Education-2010* and *Education and Training Reforms for the Future*, have endorsed a specific commitment to the development of partnerships at local levels in order to meet the education and training needs of young people. These policies aim to secure collaboration across education and training sectors, industry and community organisations. The state government recently signaled long-term commitment to educational partnerships as a core governance strategy through establishment of a dedicated Strategic Industry Initiatives Unit. School-industry partnerships challenge educational institutions to work in novel ways and to develop new organisational structures for collaboration with industry. Potentially, they impact on all aspects of educational provision including curriculum development and delivery, pedagogy, schools administration and social justice outcomes (Popkewitz, 2003).

The model for implementation of the partnerships was established with the first initiative, *Gateways to the Aerospace Industry* project. Industry partners for this are Boeing Incorporated, Brisbane Airport Corporation, Aviation Australia and Smiths Aerospace. The project currently has 17 participating schools throughout Queensland, and the state's first industry-dedicated state high school, Aviation High, was launched in 2007. A Senior Syllabus for Aerospace Studies was developed by industry people and educators. Within a period of 3 years, partnerships have extended to include the Minerals and Energy (BHP Billiton, Rio Tinto), Wine Tourism, and Information Technology (Microsoft) industries. These are core industries of the Queensland economy and key elements of Queensland's *Smart State* strategy.

The imperative to combine schooling with creativity and commercial enterprise is evident in new forms of social space, organisational structure, curricular practices, pedagogical relations, and educational identities

around teaching and learning that are emerging. One such example is the Moreton High School Enterprise Team[1] which links high school students with students from local feeder primary schools for industry-based curricular projects. According to the project coordinator, the Enterprise Team comprising 18 students is 'run on true business lines.' Students undergo a rigorous selection process with a written application and 'a half hour grueling interview.' The latter is deemed to be 'very intimidating' because the questions are 'really different – you can't study for it or anything like that.' A 'senior HR consultant' from Boeing worked with the coordinating teacher to devise the interview panel questions. These questions 'link with the students' core values, which are to do with integrity, honesty, creativity, like enthusiasm – those sorts of things. So there's a question on every one of their key values.' These character traits such as 'creativity' are deemed psychologically intrinsic to the selected students who then become embodied nodes of networked governance reaching interstate and internationally.

The capillaries of this gift economy-cum-governance technology operate through everyday educational practices such as school competitions. Awards for these contests in which winning students and teachers are rewarded with financial prizes and sponsored trips to the United States embed the school and the community into globalised and globalising social and economic networks. The experiences obtained by the students launch them as novitiate mobile learners, workers and citizens (Seddon, 2006). Another example of a program that has positive educational outcomes for students is the Young Innovators award in which teams of students

> produce something that relates to aerospace in some way and they present a project. Each school puts one person forward and they present to a panel of Boeing people. The first year we won that and the kid [sic] got $250 as the school winner, then $750 overall as the overall winner.

There is also an annual 'Spirit to Boeing' awarded to a student 'who's very articulate [and] who's concerned with the community.' All students, not just Aerospace Studies students, are eligible for this award. The selection criteria is that the winning student must engage with 'community things within the school, out of the school, and be good academically. Everything that Boeing is: high academic achievement and good attendance. They're the criteria.'

This program signifies educational and corporate investment in the social capital necessary to 'third way' politics (Rose, 1996). The coordinating teacher of the Moreton High School Enterprise Team stated that Boeing saw the program 'as a fantastic way of giving to the community.' Two mentors appointed by Boeing had worked with the school throughout the Team's four-year period. For each project students are provided 'a team of Boeing executives who come out and brief the students.' Students are taught how to 'conform to business practices such as tendering, just like in the real world.' They 'put in a response to tender, and timelines and production schedules, all those things that are and were a part of the core business, just like business.' One project was to design and develop 'an employee manual or employee guide' for the maintenance section of Boeing's workshop at the Williamtown RAAF base in another state. It entailed

> revamping the existing manual information to appeal to the guys who are down there. So the students had to liaise with staff at Williamtown through phone calls and so forth. We had to get quotes [for printing and production] and there was a huge amount of computer work in it… the guy who designed the front foyer [of the school], he came out and spoke to the students about design layouts and so on. So it was really exciting.

The success of that project has since led to similar design projects with other partners. According to the teacher a related industry partner claimed:

> 'Oh this is great – why don't you do some work for us?' So we did an advertising campaign for them. We did advertisements for the [local metropolitan newspaper] and the regional newspapers. That was exciting, so that was totally different. We then had to design, they wanted t-shirts printed.

The learning that is occurring here is simultaneously different and conventional. That is, it is different because it is occurring in new educational spaces through and within different forms of educational governance. However, the learning and assessment tasks in and of themselves do not require special forms of creativity or innovation. The symbolic, material and literate practices entailed here occur in any well managed integrated curriculum classroom. What is different is that these students are learning how to conduct themselves as citizens and workers in a society that manages uncertainty through embedded practices of ethical self-formation.

Concluding remarks

This paper has argued that discourses of creativity currently driving education policy are technologies of government which seek to produce a form of subjectivity necessitated by the volatility of global capitalism. The emergence of the 'creative' self is shown to be an effect of tension in policy arising from the dilemma of national governments having to manage social risk whilst preserving the productive potential of uncertainty. The imperative to exercise individual choice, to continue learning ('lifelong learning'), and to be entrepreneurial and creative with one's life trajectory enables governments to abdicate responsibility for those unable to craft settled, successful lives under the pressures of contemporary capitalism. It is through such neoliberal imperatives that risk is increasingly realised as an individual concern.

Analysis was grounded in the strategic policy document, *Smart Queensland: Smart State*, and a curricular innovation within a school-industry partnership — the Gateways to the Aerospace Industry project — was examined. This initiative constitutes one manifestation of the planned programmatization of school-industry partnerships in Queensland which seeks to reconfigure relations between individuals, schools and industry in Queensland. In this way schools and their communities are integrated into devolved governance configurations for the management of risk. Notwithstanding the vagaries of local industries, schools are bedded down as instruments of government policy comprising critical nodes connecting individuals to the networks of the 'knowledge' economy. Despite the current policy popularity of school-industry partnerships, there is little research to date that demonstrates their long term efficacy as a strategy for managing transition risk for students in Queensland or their impact on the specific functions of schools (e.g, curriculum and pedagogy). However, the UK experience with Education Action Zones shows that partnerships can be contingent and fragile entities. The vagaries of the economy and dedicated vocational curricula can have adverse consequences for students and may lead in the long term to unexpected risks. A program of rigorous empirical research is needed to map and evaluate this transformation of education with respect to long-term outcomes for students and their local communities.

Notes

1. This school is identified by a pseudonym.

References

Beck, U. (1992a) From industrial society to risk society: Questions of survival, social structure and ecological environment, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 9, pp. 97-123.

Beck, U. (1992b) *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (Newbury Park: Sage).

Beck, U. (1998) Politics of risk society, in: J. Franklin (ed.), *The politics of risk society* (Cambridge: Polity Press) pp. 9-22.

Beck, U. (2006) Living in the world risk society, *Economy and Society*, 35:3, pp. 329-345.

Bernstein, P. (1998) *Against the gods: The remarkable story of risk* (New York: Wiley).

Brockling, U. (2007) On creativity: A brainstorming session, in: J. Masschelein, S. Maarten, U. Brockling & L. Pongratz (eds.), *The learning society from the perspective of governmentality* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Caldwell, B., & Keating, J. (2004) *Adding value to public education: An examination of the possibilities for public private partnerships* (Bundoora: Australian Council of Deans of Education).

Castells, M. (1996) *The rise of the network society* (Cambridge: Blackwell).

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society* (London: Sage).

Education Queensland. (2000) *Queensland State Education - 2010* (Brisbane: Education Queensland).

Edwards, R., & Nicoll, K. (2001) Researching the rhetoric of lifelong learning, *Journal of Education Policy*, 16:2, pp. 103-112.

Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life* (New York: Basic Books).

Florida, R. (2005a) *Cities and the creative class* (New York: Routledge).

Florida, R. (2005b) *The flight of the creative class* (New York: HarperCollins).

Florida, R. (2006) The future of the American workforce in the global creative economy. Retrieved September 15, 2007, from http://www.cato_unbound.org/wp-print.php?p=207

Foucault, M. (1979) Governmentality, *Ideology & Consciousness*, 6 (Autumn), pp. 5-21.

Foucault, M. (1981) Omnes et singulatim: Towards a critique of political reason, in: S. McMurrin (ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol. 2 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press).

Foucault, M. (1982) The subject and power, in: H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (Brighton: Harvester Press) pp. 208-226.

Foucault, M. (1988) Technologies of the self, in: M. Luther, H. Gutman & P. Hutton (eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (London: Tavistock).

Fougère, M., & Solitander, N. (2007 11-13 July) *The risk of creative governmentality - And how it's trangressing working hours, job security, politics and everyday strife*, paper presented at the Apollo Ante Portas! - Critical Perspectives on the Creative Age, Fifth International Critical Management Studies Conference, Manchester.

Franklin, B., Bloch, M., & Popkewitz, T. (2003) *Educational partnerships and the state: The paradoxes of governing schools, children and families* (New York: Palgrave).

Friedman, T. (2006) *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century* (New York: Penguin Books).

Furedi, F. (2002) *The culture of fear* (London: Continuum).

Giddens, A. (1990) *The consequences of modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Giddens, A. (1999) *Runaway world* (London: Profile Books).

Gordon, C. (1991) Governmental rationality: An introduction, in: G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf) pp. 1-52.

Hay, C., & Watson, M. (2003) The discourse of globalisation and the logic of no alternative: Rendering the contingent necessary in the political economy, *New Labour, Policy and Politics*, 31:3, pp. 289-305.

Kelly, P., & Kenway, J. (2001) Managing youth transitions in the network society, *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 22:1, pp. 20-33.

Larner, W., & Le Heron, R. (2002) The spaces and subjects of a globalising economy: Towards a situated method, *Environment and Planning D (Society and Space),* 20:6, pp. 753-774.

Larner, W., & Walters, W. (2004) Globalisation as governmentality, *Alternatives,* 29, pp. 495-514.

Macdonald, G. (2005) Schools for a knowledge economy, *Policy Futures in Education*, 3:1, pp. 38-49.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990) Governing economic life, *Economy and Society,* 19:1, pp. 1-31.

Nicoll, K., & Edwards, R. (2004) Lifelong learning and the sultans of spin: Policy as persuasion?, *Journal of Education Policy,* 19:9, pp. 43-55.

O'Malley, P. (2000) Uncertain subjects: risk, liberalism and contract, *Economy and Society,* 29:4, pp. 460-484.

O'Malley, P. (2004) *Risk, uncertainty and government* (London: Glasshouse Press).

O'Malley, P. (Ed.). (2005) *Governing risks* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Osbourne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley).

Osbourne, T. (1998) *Aspects of enlightenment: Social theory and the ethics of truth* (London: UCL Press).

Peters, T. (1987) *Thriving on chaos: Handbook for a management revolution* (New York: Knopf).

Pollard, C. W. (1996) *The soul of the firm* (Downers Grove, Illinois: The ServiceMaster Foundation and HarperCollins Publishers).

Popkewitz, T. (2003) Partnerships, the social pact, and changing systems of reason in a comparative perspective, in: B. Franklin, M. Bloch & T. Popkewitz (eds.), *Educational partnerships and the state: The paradoxes of governing schools, children and families* (New York: Palgrave).

Porter, M. (1990) *The competitive advantage of nations* (London: MacMillan).

Queensland Government. (2005) *Smart Queensland: Smart State Strategy 2005-2015* (Brisbane: Queensland Government).

Rose, N. (1988) Calculable minds and manageable individuals, *History of the Human Sciences,* 1:2, pp. 179-199.

Rose, N. (1992) Governing the enterprising self, in: P. Heelas & P. Morris (eds.), *The values of the enterprise culture: The moral debate* (London: Routledge).

Rose, N. (1996) Governing "advanced" liberal democracies, in: A. Barry, T. Osborne & N. Rose (eds.), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (London: UCL Press) pp. 19-36.

Rose, N. (1999) Inventiveness in politics, *Economy and Society*, 28:3, pp. 467-493.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992) Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government, *British Journal of Sociology,* 43:2, pp. 173-205.

Roth, M. (1981) Foucault's "history of the present", *History and Theory*, 20:1, pp. 32-46.

Schmidt, C. (1999) *Education and the economy* (Brisbane: Education Queensland).

Seddon, T. (2006) *Mobile learners: Networked governance and the embodiment of partnership*, paper presented at the AARE Conference, Adelaide Australia, 27-30 November.

Simons, J. (1995) *Foucault and the political* (London: Routledge).

Taylor, C. (2004) *Modern social imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Walters, W. (2002) Social capital and political sociology: Re-imagining politics? *Sociology,* 36:2, pp. 377-397.

Zinn, J. (2006) Recent developments in sociology of risk and uncertainty, *Qualitative Social Research [On-line Journal], 7*(1), Art. 30 Available at http:www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/31-06/06-31-30-e.htm.

Zinn, J., & Taylor-Gooby, P. (2006) The challenge of (how to manage) new risks and uncertainties, in: P. Taylor-Gooby & J. Zinn (eds.), *Risk in Social Science* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

