Introduction:

Foucault writes prolifically about the exercise of power on the modern individual. He describes power as having a 'capillary' nature in that it operates through everyday myriad social practices to the extent that power is everywhere and in everyone. It is for these reasons that Foucault finds Marxist and neo-Marxist accounts of state-centred and/or economistic, political, ideological orientations of power to be problematic because they are depicted as being 'top-down', repressive forms of power (Fraser, 1989:26). Considering that Foucault offers an account of power which is creatively different, it is interesting that, in the Afterword of Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982:208), he states that the goal of his work...

...has not been to analyse the phenomena of power nor to elaborate the foundations of such an analysis. My objective, instead, has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made into subjects.

Thus he contends that it is the subject which is the central theme of his research. The critical effect of modern power to constitute people as subjects and then to objectivize them is what Foucault is especially concerned with, especially in his later works. This objectivization of the subject exemplifies the productivity of modern power. Explaining how modern power is productive, Foucault (in Morris and Patton, 1978:36) writes:

What gives power its hold, what makes it accepted, is quite simply the fact that it does not weigh like a force that says no, but that it runs through, it produces things, it induces pleasure, it forms knowledge, it produces discourse; it must be
considered as a productive network which runs through the entire social body much more that a negative instance whose function is repression.

One 'mode of objection' exercised by modern power is where the 'subject is either divided inside himself (sic) or divided from others'. This occurs through the effects of 'micropractices' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982:209) in institutional sites, such as schools. In Discipline and Punish (1977), Foucault provides links and analogies with schooling which are most useful to this analysis, although he does not set out to write a genealogy of the school. Foucault refers to such practices as 'dividing practices' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982:209). Dividing practices include examinations, testing, profiling, streaming, tracking which are at the very heart of school organisation. In short, dividing practices are central to the formation of scholastic identity on an individual basis (Ball, 1990).

Dividing practices stem from Foucault's notion of 'disciplinary power'. It is this form of power which has
become 'a technology of the body as an object of power, gradually formed in disparate, peripheral localizations' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982:134) and this is the main theme of Discipline and Punish. The growth of such technologies for the manipulation of individuals into docile bodies is undoubtedly linked to the rise of industrial capitalism where the working classes and the poor presented as a growing social problem which needed to be controlled (Jones and Williamson, 1979:61). Schools, along with asylums, prisons, hospitals, workshops became institutional sites for the exercise of disciplinary power since their potential productivity needed to be tapped (Foucault, 1978).

Just as disciplinary power is part of bio-power, so also is Foucault's notion of 'power/knowledge'. This is another important means of manipulating the human subject. Power produces knowledges which are used in practices of domination and inequality at local, specific levels e.g. manifested in dividing practices in schooling. So pervasive is power/knowledge that:

It is the whole nexus of such objects, criteria, practices, procedures, institutions, apparatuses, and operations that Foucault means to designate by
his term 'power/knowledge regime' (Fraser, 1989:20).

Local and piecemeal in application through 'microtechniques',

'micro-tactics' and 'micro-practices', power/knowledge is both synoptic and individualising. Foucault (1977) refers to its presence as 'le regard' or 'the gaze' (1977). An example of the kind of synoptic gaze which Foucault envisages can be found in Bentham's panopticon where the nature and effects of surveillance are so central to its operation. His comments about 'the gaze' and schooling are telling when he states that surveillance, defined and regulated, is inscribed at the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an additional or adjacent part, but as the mechanism that is inherent to it and which increases its efficiency (1977:176).

The 'efficiency' of schooling has been shored up by the deployment of the gaze through dividing practices. In this paper two specific dividing practices will be discussed. Firstly, the State Scholarship Examination, and secondly, standardised tests for 'vocational guidance' purposes. It is
not only the nature and function of these practices but also their part in producing individuality which will be a major focus.

MODERN POWER AND THE PRODUCTION OF INDIVIDUALITY

In *Discipline and Punish* (1977), Foucault writes of disciplinary power as a force which 'makes' individuals. He describes this power as the scientific technique that 'regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise' (1977:170). Through this emphasis on the individual Foucault calls into question the status of the individual in modern Western culture and furthermore, he attempts to demonstrate the ignoble origins of the modern individual. Although individualism has been a characteristic of Western culture since the time of the ancient Greeks, it only is only in relatively recent times - the last two centuries - that it has assumed its place of dominance in all aspects of our culture (Jones, 1990:81). Writing of the centrality of individualism to American culture, Cagan (1978:229) states:

Perhaps no other aspect of American social thought
and culture is as widely acknowledged and deeply felt as that of individualism. The moral and political primacy of the individual over the group in often presented as the cornerstone of democratic society.

At the same time, she acknowledges that '...individualism, shaped by capitalism, ... generates competitive, egotistic and atomised social relations'. Obviously her comments can be applied to Australian society which bears many similarities to American culture. Moreover it is the liberal, progressive rhetoric of schooling that heralds individualism as being desirable pedagogy with educators striving to cater for 'individual differences' in their treatment of children.

Thus it is a relatively recent phenomenon that individuals have been singled out for individualised treatment. In pre-industrial times, individualization of ordinary people was not common practice. Ordinary folk were part of a family, a community but not knowable in the sense of having an individual identity. It was those closest to the sovereign who were knowable individuals - the wealthy, the holy, the noble. These were the people whose lives were recorded. But
as Foucault (1977) demonstrates so clearly, it was the
individualizing gaze of the nineteenth century which
illuminated the entire social fabric, by shedding its light on
those previously obscured i.e. the mad, the indigent, the
delinquent, the criminal, the sick, the poor, the young, all
of whom were a problem to the new order. With the provision
of mass schooling in Western democracies it also came to shed
its light on the 'normal' population and in this instance it
was students in schools who were targeted. Thus the gaze was
designed to make knowable the entire population for it is only
through knowing that society can be tested for its ills and
solutions can be found. Interventions by way of the techniques
of 'moral statistics' resulted in new forms of social
investigation and political calculation (Hunter, 1988:53).
By knowing the individual, one could train, change, classify,
normalize, exclude, by the use of time and space (Foucault,
1977).

Individuals could be 'normalized' in institutional sites such
as schools as part of the disciplinary apparatus. This could
be done through detailed and continuous evaluation which
established a grid of codeability of personal attributes. They act as norms, enabling the previously aleatory and unpredictable complexities of human conduct to be charted and judged in terms of conformity and deviation, to be coded and compared, ranked and measured (Rose, 1990:133).

Such information could be recorded and stored so that each individual became a 'case' with a case history. It was as if a human sorting house were needed to assess individuals and determine to what regime they were best suited and also to organise individuals in occupations (Rose, 1990:133), for the value of individualism has become the norm (Henriques, Hollway, Venn and Walkerdine, 1984:11).

The individual was thus a target of social control mechanisms at the time when industrial capitalism and individualism fused. Turner (1988:60) describes this effect as the 'Foucault paradox', the point where individualism produces a double-edged impact because there are both benefits and disadvantages attached to the practical application of 'control' and 'individual behaviour'. This situation occurs when the self-regulating individual of the liberal tradition is undermined by bureaucratic regulation, termed 'individuation'. Furthermore, it is the separation of
individuals into 'calculable' people (Foucault, 1977) that invokes subsequent consequences for the individual through bureaucratic processes e.g. surveillance. Thus modern power as a capillary, intrusive, surveilling, disciplinary force is in fact more invasive than earlier forms of power. Yet practices/techniques of management of individuality do not work principally or exclusively to repress or dominate the individual but their effect is to create subjects of a certain form, because it by moulding, shaping and organizing the psyche, that subjects are produced with particular desires and aspirations (Rose, 1988:196). Thereby modern power, rather than being repressive on the body, produces individuals to the extent of constituting the 'very modern form of individuality' (Henriques, Hollway, Venn and Walkerdine, 1984).

Divide and Rule: The Effects of the State Scholarship Examination

As a dividing practice for almost a hundred years in Queensland education, the State Scholarship Examination needs
to be discussed in its socio-historical context, but firstly some time needs to be spent in analysing the notion of 'the examination' as a focal point of disciplinary power. Foucault (1977) refers to the examination as a 'slender technique' which combines the two aspects of disciplinary power, hierarchial observation and normalising judgement. This technique possesses a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. Moreover, it establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them (1977:184).

Hoskin (1982:213-236) traces the history of the examination, especially in the area of 'schooled science', as a technique of modern power. He sees the modern written examination as one of the most significant transformations in the history of educational practice and refers to the examination as a particular and special micro-technology which in Foucault's words 'combines the deployment of force and the establishment of truth'. The written material makes it possible to generate a 'history' of each student and also to classify...
students en masse into categories and eventually into 'populations' with norms (Hoskin, 1979:137).

It is this 'formalization of the individual within power relations' and the manner in which an individual is 'described, judged, measured, compared with others, in his (sic) very individuality' which Foucault abhors (1977:191). What is most insidious about the examination as a power/knowledge technology is that it is 'at the centre of the
procedures that constitute the individual as effect and object of power, as effect and object of knowledge' (1977:192).

The State Scholarship Examination is inextricably linked to the earliest forms of secondary education in Queensland where provision for its inception was provided for in the Grammar Schools Act of 1860. This was a remarkable piece of legislation in a new colony which was really nothing more than a 'motley assortment of 28 000 people' (Goodman, 1989:1), but it reflected the power base of the squatters who dominated both houses of parliament and who were anxious for secondary schools to be set up in the British tradition for their sons. In effect this act provided state aided education for a small, socially elite minority, at a time when even government funded elementary education had not been established at a level to meet the needs of all the Colony's children (Sullivan, 1974). At first a few scholarships were awarded in the sentiment of altruism, and these symbolised the 'scholarship road to success', for ordinary children who might otherwise not be financially able to have a secondary education in a grammar school (Research and Guidance Branch, 1951:33). This arrangement was in accord with the general nineteenth century social attitude that some poor but
talented children should have a chance of a secondary education. However apart from philanthropic initiatives and because the grammar schools in Ipswich and Brisbane were off to a shaky start in the struggling colony, they needed more enrolments. To meet this need, in 1873, an examination, thereafter commonly known as 'the Scholarship', was held for the purpose of selecting grammar school
candidates. The Scholarship, with some changes survived until 1962, despite criticism of its effects of individuals, on pedagogy and on the progress of education generally.

In contrast to the thrust for grammar school education for a social and academic elite, the provision of universal secondary education by the state followed a slow and circuitous route. In 1910, state secondary education began as an adjunct of the technical colleges, but it was not until 1912 that the state addressed the task of making state secondary education available to all Queensland children. To enter a high school with free tuition, one could either sit for the high school entrance exam, which was somewhat easier to pass than the Scholarship or the Scholarship itself, with its background of social and academic elitism. This alternative was provided for a short time to encourage ordinary children to participate in secondary schooling to some degree. In 1914, the competitive principle of the Scholarship was changed to a 'qualifying' one whereby an overall 50% of marks was needed for a candidate to be successful. Again, in 1923, a change was made when a compulsory pass in English and Arithmetic was part of the
requirements for an overall 'pass' (Goodman, 1968:270).

The Queensland government, despite some opposition, continued to be very protective of its grammar schools, because they were the preserve of the influential and wealthy. In addition, the educational significance of these schools lay in the fact that they exerted an hegemonic influence on secondary education. For instance, high schools and high 'tops' were opened in towns that did not have a grammar school. Furthermore, the academic curriculum of the grammar schools was handed on to high schools in its place of dominance, although, in the interests of national efficiency, vocational subjects were offered also. In 1925, at the Central Technical College in Brisbane, three distinct high schools were officially designated - the Commercial High School, The Domestic Science High School and the Technical High School - to provide vocational education at the secondary level.

This step is of significance because it marked the beginning of 'tracking' in secondary education in Queensland and the point where the Scholarship assumed a new importance as a dividing practice because it was instrumental in deciding which curriculum tracks children should follow. For all
intents and purposes, the Scholarship was operating surreptitiously as a test of intelligence by making the assumption that the 'brightest' children should pursue the academic courses which led to university and the professions, while the less clever should be placed in vocational courses. Boys and girls destined for non-academic courses were tracked according to gender, but boys, often at the expense of girls, were encouraged to choose the academic track, since this was the path to the professions. In fact 'Queensland was a man's world' and 'girls were not regarded as having the same place in high school education as boys' (Goodman, 1968:223). This reflected a wider societal view that education was to fit girls for home duties (Council for Public Education, 1918:252-3).

Despite the provisions for broadened curriculum offerings, most children still finished their education at the end of primary school. For instance, in 1914 secondary enrolments in Queensland were 2,284 compared to 1007,377 students in the State's primary schools (Report of the Secretary for Public Instruction, 1914:6). Retention at the secondary school remained low, although legislation had been passed as far back as 1900 making a scholarship tenable at state, grammar or
other approved schools (this was in recognition of the growth in Catholic secondary education). There was still a strong feeling that secondary education was for a select few, and for this reason many children did not avail themselves of their Scholarship.

The State Scholarship Examination, by dividing students along social and academic lines, was the critical filter of the Queensland education system at the entry to secondary education. It yielded largely class based results. A 'good' Scholarship mark depended heavily on 'good' schooling and 'good' family background. The prescriptive nature of the syllabus at the end of primary school was aided by efficient, experienced teachers who were most likely to be found in well established schools in large centres (Queensland Department of Public Instruction, 1928:37). The overall content of the syllabus reflected the cultural capital of the middle classes and hence the children of middle class parents were more likely to be successful because the subjects examined in the Scholarship were academic in orientation, and did not reflect working class culture to the same extent as middle class culture. All of this was despite the rhetoric of meritocracy that declared:
an industrious primary school pupil of average intelligence has awaiting him (sic) free tuition in ...
approved secondary schools,... if he (sic) care
to seize the opportunity (Queensland Department of
Public Instruction, 1928:39).

The percentage one gained in this examination came to be seen as a measure of one's intelligence and was central to the formation of one's scholastic identity. The fact that in any one year a large percentage of children would fail this exam and so be excluded from free state education [e.g., from 1913-1950 just over half of the candidates passed, (Wyeth, 1949:110-111)], coupled with the fact that teachers only nominated those whom they thought had a fair chance of being successful, together illustrate the power of this dividing practice not only to hierarchize and classify, but also to exclude. Rewards were given in varying degrees depending on one's success and simultaneously punishments were dealt out to those who did not gain a Scholarship. The social effects were immense.

Psychological Testing and Vocational Guidance as Dividing Practices
The next dividing practice to be discussed involves psychological testing and therefore at the outset, psychology needs to be placed in its context within the human sciences. Psychology was created as a science of the individual as an offshoot of psychiatry, one of the human sciences which emerged from the medical gaze of the eighteenth century (Venn, 1984:132). It is generally accepted that psychology, roughly in the period from 1875 to 1925, developed as a coherent and individuated theoretical field (Rose, 1979:6). However it is important to note that apart from the discipline of psychology, a 'psychological complex' has been established over time. Rose describes this complex which refers to the development of institutions and departments forming a specifically psychological community as:

A heterogeneous but regulated set of agents, of practices, of discourses and apparatuses which has definite conditions of existence and specifiable effects (1979:6).

As part of its far reaching effects, the psychological complex has claimed the right to produce and disseminate scientific
theories of intelligence which in turn have spawned theories of the science of individual differences and psychometric tests to measure these differences (Kamin, 1974; Blum, 1978; Gould, 1981). The psychological complex has been central to normalization processes in the wider society and in schooling. Furthermore the psychological complex has legitimated such treatment because normalizing actions have been supported by a general faith in psychology and its methods. In relation to schooling, psychology has had a very strong influence on educational policy and practice to the extent that psychology has 'captured' educational thinking (McCallum, 1985). Whilst it is not being suggested that psychologism has the inherent power to enslave individuals, it is being argued that the power of psychology on the public mind has ensured its acceptance as a legitimate means of producing and specifying particular individuals. As a result of this, according to Foucault (1977:193):

All the sciences, analyses or practices employing the root 'psycho-' have their origin in this historical reversal of the procedures of individualization.
Although psychologism developed slowly from the beginning of this century, it gained apace in schools from the 1930s. Rose (1979:194) sees the psychological test as the main technique use by the psychologist as a 'mini-laboratory for the inscription of difference' and also as 'a central procedure in the practices of objectification and subjectification that are so characteristic of our modernity'. It follows that teachers, like other members of the general public, have been influenced by psychology's ability to identify 'problems' and provide 'explanations' (Henriques et al., 1984). Of more consequence, is that they have been co-opted into acting as
'scientists in the classroom' (McCallum, 1990). In fact, the stranglehold of psychologism on educational practices continues to mean that 'no pupil escapes the amateur psychologising of teachers' (Kapferer, 1990:42).

Schools, in the period under scrutiny, taught not only obedience, conformity and the overt curriculum but in conjunction with it, they also 'taught' who was intelligent and who was not in the sentiment of 'difference with deference'. This focus on intelligence as an individual attribute stemmed from British and American leads and became apparent in Australia in limited ways from the end of last century, but more especially since the Depression of the 1930s. From that time onwards, testing procedures were used in schools for selection purposes in the interests of social efficiency, national efficiency, social cleansing and social control (Bacchi, 1980; McCallum, 1985; Miller, 1986; Lewis, 1987; Seddon, 1990). Normalization measures were first applied to the 'abnormal' and testing for placement in special classes/schools was promulgated as socially beneficial because there was thought to be a causal relationship between mental deficiency and poverty and crime (Lewis, 1987:6). The official descriptors used were 'dull or backward', 'border-
line deficient' 'feeble-minded or moron', 'imbeciles', 'idiots' (Cunningham, McIntyre, Radford, 1939:264). Queensland was later than most of the other states in making provision for the education of such pupils, with the first initiatives being taken after some teachers were sent to New South Wales to investigate methods used there (Wyeth, 1955:183). Following their report, two categories for separate classes of children were decided upon, namely for 'backward' and 'mentally defective' children. From 1923 onwards, psychological tests were used to determine entry and it is interesting to note that in 1926, the stigma already attached to these classes led to the official labelling of them euphemistically as 'opportunity classes' with teachers being reprimanded for using the term 'dunce's class' (Report to the Secretary for Public Instruction, 1926).

The influence of the psychological complex on educational matters was formalised in 1948, with the setting up of the Research and Guidance Branch in the State Department of Public Instruction. It was through this branch that psychological tests were administered, not only to those considered 'backward' or 'mentally defective' and who therefore needed to be excluded from the regular classroom, but to many other 'normal' pupils as well in their final year of primary school.
In fact, the main attention of the Research and Guidance Branch was devoted to the development of suitable psychological tests for use as instruments to guide students in their decision to leave school or to continue on to appropriate secondary schools (Logan and Clarke, 1984:6). In 1932, as a result of vocational guidance being accepted as a necessary adjunct of schooling from the late 1920s, pupils in four large metropolitan schools underwent tests of intelligence and of mechanical and clerical aptitude. Parents and students also completed questionnaires and a radio station provided a series of talks on guidance and occupations on a weekly basis (Research and Guidance, 1951:33).

The last year of primary schooling was the time when decisions had to be made about whether a child's education should finish or whether secondary education should follow. In this decision making, The Education Office Gazette (EOG) expressed the importance of the role which the Research and Guidance Branch was to play through vocational guidance:

The seventh grade year is a critical one in a child's schooling ... A choice has to be made between secondary education and immediate employment (51,4,1949:62).
The same EOG listed the following ways that guidance officers operated. It stated that in schools, guidance officers would apply a battery of psychological tests to seventh grade pupils and that they would provide information on secondary courses and on choice of occupation. Seventh grade pupils were to be interviewed by guidance officers and the guidance officer was to be present with the head teacher when parents were interviewed.

Locally devised intelligence tests were administered to many final year primary students as part of an intensive guidance program (McDonnell, Radford and Stauenghi, 1956). For instance, in 1954 educational and vocational guidance was provided to 2,460 pupils in twenty-six state primary schools and 740 students in metropolitan and country state secondary schools. Testing was supplemented with personal interviews, along with relevant data provided by classroom, talks, films and pamphlets. Apart from guidance officers visiting schools, guidance was provided to 960 students from country districts and non-government schools at branch headquarters (McDonnell et al., 1956).
Action based on psychological testing was endorsed by a prominent educator, Professor Fred Schonnell of the University of Queensland, who, in his address to delegates attending the 62nd Conference of the Queensland Teachers' Union, stated:

we are beginning to realize how much, for example, the stage is set or determined by the intelligence of the children we teach. We cannot do much about the degree of intelligence with which children have been endowed at birth, but we can, through our methods and our organisation, make effective provision for those differences (Queensland Teachers' Journal, 1952:11).

Thus intelligence as an individual attribute was to used to divide children since Intelligence Quotient (IQ) tests are 'procedures for the production of difference in an ordered form' (Rose, 1979:194), but the popular view put forward by the psychological complex to the wider community, and especially educators, was the fundamental need to cater for 'individual differences'. The very fact that such techniques as testing devices were in themselves producing difference
escaped notice in a society where underlying eugenicism was too valuable to discard.

A further example of the eugenicist influence on the interpretation that the psychological complex gave to its understanding of intelligence is obtained from a psychology textbook prepared especially for teacher trainees in Queensland. Its author strongly advocates the practices of vocational guidance, based on ideas of individual, innate levels of intelligence when he writes,

Each child who is given such vocational guidance is assessed with respect to his (sic) general intelligence, education standard, special abilities, special interests and hobbies, temperamental and moral qualities as well as his (sic) health and his (sic) general physical condition. Of these six factors general intelligence is usually the most important, because, if this is known, the choice of possible occupations is immediately limited to a certain range. This is possible because psychologists have arranged many key occupations in an order which shows the intellectual power that is
Haine (1961:190) then proceeds to furnish the outline used by psychologists to link occupations with the IQ level required for each. They range from 'university professors, doctors, highest posts in science at 133+' down to 'packer and sorter at 85+'. Most significantly, he emphasises the overall importance of IQ testing to 'predict with a very high degree of accuracy the range of occupations within which ... final choice will be made'. It is significant to note that Haine's textbook, Classroom Psychology (1961), was used for the next decade in Teacher Training Colleges in Queensland where all primary teachers in the state were trained and where a significant number of secondary teachers received the second year of a two year preparation course (Queensland Department of Education, 1966). Therein lies an example of how psychology influenced 'educational and pedagogical training and practice' which in turn led to 'the rise of the power of the experts' (Kapferer, 1990:42), to the extent that the discourse produced by the psychological complex seduced teachers into acting as amateur psychologists in the classroom (McCallum, 1990; Kapferer, 1990).
Queensland abolished the State Scholarship Examination in 1963. From an Australian perspective this was hardly an educational innovation since similar decisions to abandon entrance examinations to secondary schooling had been taken over ten years previously in the last of the other states (Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, 1954:433). But there remained the problem of selection and control. Without an entrance examination to secondary education considerable control over individuals and the courses they took was lost. The Scholarship had fulfilled two specific functions as a selection process; it identified which students should receive a free state secondary education and it helped sort successful students into secondary courses. It was a dividing practice par excellence for hierarchizing, classifying, and excluding students. It was also a most important milestone in a student's life, not only in determining life chances through schooling, but also in the production of scholastic identity and therefore as a key factor in the individuating process. The percentage one gained in Scholarship was viewed by teachers, administrators, parents, students themselves, the general public and employers as a specific, reliable measure of a person's worth in things academic. In other words, examinations, such as the Scholarship, introduce a new principle of individual accountability by affording a
numerical 'objective' judgment on the person, thus 'substituting for the individuality of the memorable man (sic) that of the calculable man (sic)' (Hoskin and Macve, 1986:107). For instance, it is evident that people, many years removed from their school days, remember and are remembered by others for their Scholarship mark. An example is provided by Hugh Lunn (1989:138-141) in his autobiography, Over the Top with Jim, where he discloses his very mediocre score along with an account of the terror felt by students as they prepared and sat for this examination. Lunn writes:

Overall I got 57.1 per cent, but in English I scored just 76 out of 150 ... one mark less and I would have failed and my name would not have appeared in the paper, because if you didn't pass English you didn't pass State Scholarship.

Lunn also writes of the consequences of all this for his initiation into secondary school where classes were allocated on the basis of one's Scholarship pass,

with the top passes going into the 'A' class, so they would not be held back by dumb boys; the next
group into the 'B' class, so they could all progress through the text books together; and all of the dunces into the 'C' class. So naturally, I was in the Cs.

The Scholarship was indeed an important milestone in young lives and set in train differing life chances. Fortunately it became increasingly unpopular, mainly for educational reasons, and finally was removed after 1962. Yet the efforts of the Department of Education to control high school entry were not entirely thwarted. In 1963 a program of testing of Grade 7 pupils in their second last month of primary schooling was introduced. It is interesting that teachers, and not guidance officers (because of the prohibitive costs of many personnel traversing the vast distances of this state, no doubt) were to administer the tests. Details of this program were first published in the EOG in August, 1963 (65,8:224-226). Here the purpose of the program was explained to school principals and teachers. The testing program in fact fulfilled a function left void by the Scholarship's abandonment. It provided information whereby secondary schools could sort the heterogeneous intake of students into homogeneous groups within the school for teaching purposes.
Although the first year of secondary schooling was organised as an 'exploratory year' in terms of curriculum (Goodman, 1968:363) the tests were able to supply the data by which schools could eventually place students in tracks (EOG, 65,8:224) and streams (EOG,66,7:229).

These tests became known as the October tests and continued to be used in one form or another from 1963 until 1990. By far the best remembered is an Australian Council of Educational Research (ACER) test called 'Test of Learning Ability 6' (TOLA 6). This test yielded a score out of 15 which was to be used as a reference, often recorded next to students' names in teachers' mark books. In addition a master sheet of results was sent to the Department to provide an indication of student achievement relative to others throughout the state. Thus the statistical nature of the testing program served to legitimate its use.

Unexpectedly, in August, 1991, the EOG (93,16:176) announced that the testing program would be discontinued. It is interesting that this information came as a surprise to primary school principals and teachers and that no rationale was given for the discontinuation of a testing program.
which had been in operation for twenty-seven years. Significantly, it appears that educational and social reasons were not major considerations, because, further the same EOG states:

Existing TOLA 6 testing materials (including test booklets, answer sheets, score keys and manuals) in primary schools are the school's property for disposal or use as required. Secondary schools wishing access to the materials should make arrangements with their local primary schools.

Whilst the test may not officially be given in the primary school, there is still scope for its use in the secondary school! In addition, it seems that there could be a coincidence in that plans for National testing plan are underway (Stanaway, 3rd September, 1991) and could well replace the function of the October tests.

Therefore what remains problematic is that teachers through the influence of psychology in their preparation courses and in its widespread acceptance in society involve themselves in the discourse of the psychological complex to the point where
they welcome standardised tests as a way to treat the uniqueness of the individual child. The individuation process and the issues of social justice and desirable pedagogy escape their notice in their quest to make each individual a 'case' where the acts of classifying, correcting, normalizing, excluding is legitimised. The individual, in terms of scholastic identity, is produced through schooling techniques and practices since difference is codified, mathematized and standardized (Rose. 1979:194).

Conclusion
Modern power operating as power/knowledge is productive through schooling practices and techniques such as those which are exemplified by the Scholarship and psychological tests. Dividing practices remain at the very heart of school organization and management and are instrumental in producing difference within, between and among individuals.
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