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PREFACE

The substantive matter of this thesis just happened to occur at a time which coincided with my thoughts on the suitability of contemporary deviance theory for conceptualising social control in education. It was not until a considerable amount of data had been gathered in the form of interviews that documentary evidence, including access to the full text of an Education Department enquiry, became available. For this I would like to acknowledge the efforts of one Education Department official who must however remain unidentified since the condition of access to official documents was that anonymity of personnel be retained and that the thesis not be published.

In order to meet these conditions a system of coded initials has been devised. In addition a considerable amount of material which would have lost much of its sense in coding and which identifies places, times and people, has had to be included in a set of separate appendices which will be made available to the thesis examiners. The separate appendices will remain with the author.

The separate appendices include personal referential details of code initials and thus make much easier one aspect of the thesis which at times is unavoidably irritating. Throughout the text, however, wherever a protracted section deals with a particular sub-group of participants, some indication will be given of their relationships one to another. In conclusion it should perhaps be stressed that the sociological focus of the thesis is on types of social control and the production of social order; to this end matters of historical detail and particular biographies are seen to be irrelevant.
INTRODUCTION

Over a period of some four years, the X3 school (as it is now known) was involved in a series of upheavals and dislocations to its collective life which included changing both its name and location on at least three occasions.

Via a case study of a set of participants' perspectives produced during part of the history of this particular alternative school, it is proposed to produce a theoretical understanding of the production of social order and control within a particular school when the general institution of education is conceived as a 'cultural repeater'.

Of all the upheavals in the life of the school that have already been alluded to, perhaps the most traumatic was the formal closure of the X2 (as it was currently titled) in December Year III. The order for the closing down of the school came on the recommendation of the Minister for Education and the announcement was made some three days before the formal ending of Year III. Prior to the announcement of closure, prolonged consideration within the Education Department (over a period of months) had been given to the report of a Departmental Enquiry into the school. Neither the findings nor the recommendations of the report of enquiry have ever been made public. The report remains a classified document.

1 The school name is not used in the thesis in order to preserve the anonymity of the institution and those people involved in the events that will be outlined in due course.

2 The notion and usage of the term 'alternative school' is, of course, very vague - alternative to what? However, the term captures quite nicely contemporary preoccupations within education in particular but of sociology and society more generally, of changing understandings of the sources of power and authority. Cf. B. Bernstein, 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge', ch.2, in M.F.D. Young (ed.), 1971, Knowledge and Control, Collier-Macmillan, London.

Between December Year III and January Year IV, a great deal of popular media publicity occurred concurrently with strenuous efforts via a sub-committee of supporters of the school to have the closure decision revoked. As a result of a decision made by the Minister for Education at a meeting of parents and some other interested parties late in January Year IV, the school was granted permission to re-open in a different location, with a different name and under the guidance of a new coordinator who was mutually acceptable to the Minister and the X2 school's sub-committee. (But not necessarily to Education Department administrators.)

Despite the agreement in principle to establish X1 as an 'alternative' to regular secondary schools, differences of opinion arose and became so salient that a Departmental Enquiry was held. It will be argued that analysis of events and issues within the school community will support the proposition that conflicting (even though sometimes implicit) views or theories of knowledge and the connections between knowledge and social order - were reflected in the reactions and mutual sense of outrage of member-groups of the school community.

It will further be argued that it was not the sense of outrage, nor the simple fact that there existed a number of viewpoints, the protagonists of which failed to comprehend one another's position, which are of theoretical significance. Rather, it will be these things in themselves that will be seen to be in need of explanation since not only were mutual misunderstandings extended, but the subsequent appeal to political authority resulted in still further amplification of previous misapprehensions. The importance attached to the events segmented for this thesis will be related theoretically to the nature of schools as places where 'society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public [which in turn] reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control'.

Traditionally, sociological approaches to education, and the school in particular, have emphasised the process of socialisation.

---

1 B. Bernstein, 1971, op.cit., p.47.
This concept carries within it the recognition that in highly differentiated contemporary industrial societies, one function of the institution of education is to ensure the transmission or reproduction of a complex culture. However, on the one hand the early recognition and distinction between the instrumental and expressive cultures of the school has culminated in the demonstration of the uselessness of explanations which are adequate within the instrumental culture, to perform explanatory functions within the expressive culture. While, on the other hand, within the realm of sociological theory the connection between power and the complementary notions of social order and social control, first elaborated by Horton and Dawe are now being integrated into a body of theory addressing itself to the relationship between knowledge (defined very broadly) and social control.

The thesis approaches social order as a phenomenon which is essentially constituted in members' categories of thought and understandings of social interaction. That is, order cannot be assumed by the sociologist to be pre-given and something to be taken for granted. This requires that the researcher establishes a connection between the critical elements of social interaction as they appear to interactants, and the sociologist's categories of analysis. In addition, the suffusion of members' accounts of social interaction with moral criteria, implies the need to incorporate an analysis of the connection

1 'Sources of consensus and disaffection in education', ch.1 in B. Bernstein, 1975, op.cit.
2 Henry Nathan, 1974, Stable Rules : Science and Social Transmission, SLS, CERI, OECD. Shows the inability of learning theories to contribute to understanding of cultural transmission.
5 See especially, introduction to M.F.D. Young, 1971, op.cit.
6 The question of 'accounts' and 'accounting' will be discussed in the chapters on theory and methodology.
between members' constructions of abnormality, impropriety or non-respectability and sociological accounts of deviance. Throughout the short historical span of the X school to be covered in the thesis, almost all key formal organisational positions associated with the school and its administration were filled over and again by different individual people. Yet despite this, there was persistent incipient conflict paradoxically associated at times with surface agreement and consensus. A history of the X school is thus merely a basis for analysing in a problematical way, the connections between the moral components of members' accounting practices, the sociological ramifications of the social construction of deviance and the wider political economy of social control.


CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Problems Amongst the Zoo-Keepers of Deviance

It has been said that all humans are involved in a fundamental struggle to define or be defined by others in a manner most suitable to one's interests. 'Equality in human relations is like the ideal gas of the physicist: a model impossible of actual realization. One must be definer or defined; one cannot be neither or both...'\(^1\)

Davis encapsulates this point in the assumption which underlies the development of the social control perspective of deviance, 'Power exists, and causes all observed deviance.'\(^2\)

This quotation from Davis gives a clear indication of the direction in which the following theoretical review is meant to travel. It is in the work of Davis, Rock, Rock and McIntosh, Manning, Douglas and Taylor Walton and Young that the strongest arguments have been advanced about the need to supersede the sociology of deviance and to substitute theories which take more account of the role of power, politics and social control in the production of deviance and deviant populations.\(^3\)

As Manning remarked in 1975, 'A diffusion and redefinition of the focus of deviant analysis seems to be in progress which may lead to concern with historical substance, legal content, authority, its rise and legitimation, and contextualised studies of moral

---

1 T. Szasz, 1974, The Second Sin, Anchor Press, USA, p.61. Szasz's comment, through oversimplification, only hints at the complexity of the problem. Because individuals are simultaneously 'definers' and 'defined', the problem becomes one of investigating the relationship between 'defining' as an activity, and the constraints of the surrounding contexts - social structures, historical and physical circumstances.


and political meanings. \(^1\) Conflict amongst researchers in the field of deviance has been not simply theoretical but paradigmatic, many products of research are consequently incapable of being evaluated in terms of one another's methodology or results. It is out of the theoretical conflicts that many useful concepts have been derived. In fact new and fuller appreciations of the notions of social order, power and social control have only been possible as a result of the specification and clarification of concepts in deviance research.

Given the crucial importance of moral rules in constructing social order in our Western societies, it is also easy to see why Western sociologists have taken social morality and its violations, which they have called 'deviance' for the last decade or so, to be a second crucial problem, the solution to which they considered essential to solving the problem of social order. As a result, the sociology of deviance has formed much of the core, the foundation of sociology.

It is to be expected, then, that any significant attempts to reconstruct fundamental sociological theory will take as a crucial part of their task the thorough re-examination of the nature of moral meanings and their relation to the construction of social order. This is a primary reason why the sociology of deviance has for some years been the most creative and turbulent area of sociological theory. \(^2\)

After all the turbulence which developed under the general rubric of 'deviance' there has occurred a fragmentation in theory and research accompanied by much more specialised and narrowly focussed empirical work. This tendency has in turn tended to minimise or pass over the serious theoretical problems of specifying links between levels of analysis. In other words, the need to connect the sort of analysis which sets out social structural constraints and their relationship to social control, its forms and effects, with 'micro' levels of interpersonal interaction - is theoretically specified but not empirically investigated. Putting it crudely - Marxist analyses, for example, tend to withdraw to structural accounts and phenomenological accounts, for instance, to interpersonal symbolic exchange; each can criticise the other but the necessary bridges between them are not

---

1 P. Manning, 1975, 'Deviance and Dogma', *British Journal of Criminology*, vol.15, no.1, p.17.

built in actual pieces of research. By electing to produce an analysis in the form of a case-study, an attempt has been made to ensure that these difficult problems are not 'specified out', in advance. The events and circumstances of the formation of the X school, its social evolution, its formal investigation by education authorities, the subsequent closure, re-opening and the accompanying mutual adjustments, negotiations and interpretations by various participants; all these form the 'natural boundaries' of a social phenomenon. It is for this reason that the analysis produced here cannot itself constitute either 'an explanation' or 'the explanation'. Rather it is fairer to say that here is an analysis of the structuring of members' explanations, an account of constraints which lead to some things becoming more significant (for participants) than others. This will be more of an unravelling of the social production of what various interest groups see as theoretically salient. All of which is not to deny or ignore the constraints of less 'social' phenomena such as the mundane considerations of the size, type and style of physical accommodation at the X school. It is merely to assert the usefulness of one collection of many possible collections of explanations, but in this case a collection of explanations which is informed by sociological theorising especially as this has developed in recent years in the field described as the sociology of deviance.

Because many of the critiques of different theories of social deviance have pointed up durable theoretical issues and positive developments, as well as weaknesses, it will be necessary to introduce the theoretical material via a process that is both selective

1 Such difficulties at the level of theory frequently issue from questions of epistemology and hold implications for methodology in research such as this. The pressure is to 'fall back' to a more descriptive than analytic approach.

2 It has been in the field of deviance theory as much as anywhere, that there has been a recurrent theoretical/methodological injunction to preserve the intrinsic qualities of 'natural social phenomena' (see especially the work of David Matza, 1969; also J.D. Douglas, 1971, p.324 '...the overriding idea of the theoretical perspective I have developed here is the necessity of remaining true to the phenomena.' (italics in original)). There will be more to say on this point elsewhere, but at this point the injunction is invoked for the specific purpose of underlining the connection between the theoretical problems approached and the choice of a case-study format.
and critical. Selection of theoretical material for critical
discussion will be on the basis of what will later be referred to or
developed in analysis of data sections and which is not largely self-
 explanatory or self-contained. It will be assumed, for example, that
those readers not familiar with the ideas contained in Goffman's
article on 'Cooling the Mark Out', will find it adequate for a source
reference only to be cited. On the other hand, since extensive but
brief references will be made to Bernstein's concepts of classification
and framing, more detailed consideration will be given to these.

Some Issues from Deviance Theory.

Although within the discipline of sociology the term
deviance is a relatively new one, nevertheless the phenomena with
which it deals have been central to sociology from the time of its
intellectual origins. Whether the terminology has been that of social
pathology, social disorganisation or social problems, the issues have
revolved around the fundamental questions of social cohesion and
social control.¹

Since the early 1960s, with the publication of works by
Lemert and Becker,² definitional issues in the theory of deviance
became acute enough to stimulate radical reappraisals. It is not
necessary to rehearse the polemics of what came to be described as
the societal reaction or labelling perspective as it affected what
can loosely be described as the 'normative' theory of deviance. Quite
full and critical accounts can be found in the work of Davis, Taylor,
Walton and Young and Gibbs.³ In the first of his two critical

¹ N. Davis, 1975, op.cit. Davis takes a sociology of knowledge
approach which allows account to be taken of historical and
intellectual contexts, and their influence on theories of deviance
and social problems.
³ N. Davis, 1972, 'Labelling theory in deviance research: A Critique
447-474; N. Davis, 1976, ch.7. I. Taylor, P. Walton and J. Young,
1973, especially chs 4, 5 and 6. J. Gibbs, 1966, 'Conceptions of
deviant behaviour: the old and the new', Pacific Sociological Review,
o.9, Spring; 1972, 'Issues in defining deviant behaviour', ch.2
articles, Gibbs identifies first of all the importance of normative rules and the difference between norms and social reactions to norm infraction, and secondly the need to keep both of the issues as separate ones when discussing social deviance. Stated differently, Gibbs was claiming that to imply that 'societal reaction' was a cause of deviance was illogical. This illogicality was nowhere better illustrated than in Becker's own concept of 'secret deviance'. ¹ Secondly, although Gibbs could see the importance of making detailed analyses of the function of societal reaction in the wider processes of deviance generation, such an enterprise was initially hampered by the failure to specify what a 'societal reaction' was, and how it could be identified. The problem was to avoid a tautological linking of a 'deviant act' and a 'societal reaction' at the same time as bypassing the confusion implied when researchers speak of a 'mild reaction' to deviance. ² On the one hand, evidence was accumulating that challenged what had previously been taken for granted by sociological researchers. This was the view that all official statistics from agencies of social control, such as the police, were 'real' and reflected a social 'truth'. Work by Sudnow and Skolnick, for example, ³ demonstrated the possibility and need for sociological investigation of official rates of deviance, but they also illustrated the possibility and the extent to which factors of social and relational contexts could break down assumptions of normative absolutism.

In Gibbs' second article ⁴ he acknowledges the problems of theorising about deviance where in fact there is little or no social consensus about what constitutes a norm. Whereas Gibbs' discussion led him to a rather inconclusive postulation of 'normative elements', it did at least point up once again the need for a theoretical

---

¹ H.S. Becker, 1973, op.cit.
² J. Gibbs, 1966, op.cit.
⁴ J. Gibbs, 1966, op.cit.
resolution of factors of social structure (norms) with factors of social process (interaction or social reaction as it occurred within particular social contexts).

On the other hand, theorists concerned with producing more detailed specifications of what was implied in 'labelling theory', were developing a number of lines of research. The first of these was an increasingly strong acknowledgement of the need to theorise the part played by 'power' in societal reactions and social structural elements in the creation of deviance. Warren and Johnson, Douglas, Denzin, Thio and Schervish all took the labelling perspective to task for its limitations in this direction. However, it was Davis who attempted a systematic theoretical formulation revolving around the relationship of deviance to power and we will return to this material at a later point in the chapter.¹

In another line of thinking, Robert Scott began with the notion of deviant behaviour as 'labelled' behaviour - but Scott moved to a position where he argued that the attribution of labels was an essential process of symbolic arrangement. Such symbolic arrangement was such a constant and essential social process, Scott suggested, that the phenomenon of deviance was an essential property of social order.²

In reconsidering labelling theory in 1973, Howard Becker first suggested that his interest had never primarily been one of etiology of deviance and that furthermore he saw the effects of 'societal reactions' as remaining a strictly empirical question.³ The question of secret deviance had been raised by Becker in order to specify two phenomena for investigation. Firstly, since 'secret deviance consists of being vulnerable to commonly-used procedures for

² R. Scott, 1972, 'A proposed framework...'
discovering deviance of a particular kind, of being in a condition where it will be easy to make the definition stick' then Becker is calling for empirical investigation of 'the collectively accepted character of the procedures of discovery and proof'. 1 Secondly there is a need to investigate the phenomenon of ex post facto construction of social rules. This refers to situations where a 'person could not have been deviant, secretly or otherwise, because the rule did not exist. Yet he might well be defined as deviant, perhaps when what he might have done becomes public and someone decides that if there once was no rule against it, then now there ought to be. Was he then secretly deviant before?' 2 Such social mechanisms are not rare and as Becker himself notes, they relate to situations of social rule-use which only occasionally lead to the manufacture of deviant labels and identities and which also frequently 'occurs when one party to a relationship is disproportionately powerful, so that he can enforce his will over others' objections but wishes to maintain an appearance of justice and rationality.' He quotes as examples the relationships of parents and children, and teachers and students. In other words, Becker in this article is moving towards an analysis of the relationship of power to social rules in the institutions of the family and the school. It appears that even for Becker it is the mechanics of social rules that is of prime importance, the association of certain types of rule-use with the creation of the social category 'deviant' is of equal importance but it is the forging of a connection between 'normal' and 'non-normal' in the use of rules which is of prime sociological significance. 3

Hepburn elaborated the notion of secret deviance in a systematic way by distinguishing between variant acts and deviant behaviour. Deviant behaviour (as distinct from deviant identity) is only accorded after negotiation between actors, significant others and audiences, with respect to the meaning of situations. The underlying assumption is that 'rules are not absolute; they are

1 Ibid., p.187.
2 Ibid., p.188.
3 Ibid.
relative or situational, making the prediction of deviance problematic in that "deviance" is a meaning constructed by participants in interaction'. Thus the focus becomes that of the problematics of all social interaction.

Deviant behaviours and deviant actors cannot be defined in terms of objectively specified norm-violations; deviance is problematic. If an act has no recognized effect, if it is not perceived, it has no meaning. The meaning of any social act is problematic until it is responded to by an audience. Because each actor is armed with an undetermined number and variety of interpretive schemes by which the definition of behaviour is constructed, the meaning of any situation is problematic. Deviant behaviours, deviant actors and deviant identities are the result of negotiation.

By referring to 'an undetermined variety of interpretive schemes' and the importance of social negotiation, Hepburn systematically eliminates the possibility of a priori specification of deviance-manufacturing conditions or situations. All social interaction has potential -

...to acknowledge the construction of deviant definitions and the emergence of deviant identities thus directs attention to the basic interaction process. A growing literature concerned with impression management processes, such as deference and demeanour and excuses and justifications indicates an awareness that deviant identities, like all identities, arise out of continued interaction.

An elaboration of the nature of this continued interaction as it relates to the production of deviance is presented by Pollner, and is based on a critique of Becker's concept of 'secret deviance'. Pollner argues that people (members) 'theorise' deviance in everyday social interaction using an absolutist model of deviance. At this everyday level, the absolutist conception of deviance is necessary in order to account for the facts which 'everybody knows'. Everybody knows that police, for example, can never catch and have convicted every law breaker. Since the act of breaking the law necessarily constitutes the deviance (for this theoretical approach), then there logically must exist an unknown number of secret deviants. Pollner


2 Ibid., p.398.
calls this the model 1 (or common-sense) theory of deviance. This model 1 theory argues Pollner, is itself a constituent feature of the process for which deviance is the gloss. Sociological, or model 2 theories of deviance are relativist and necessarily so in order to generate explanations of how everyday theorising produces the phenomena it theorises. Methodologically, the task at the X school was to point to members' accounts as these theorised deviance and then to illustrate the effect of this deviance-production within a particular configuration of power and social control.¹

At this stage the following summary points can be made about what has already been said. In the first place, social deviance is neither just a result of 'societal reaction' (whatever that may be). Secondly, norms are continually made, altered and affirmed and social deviance - as a part of this process - contributes to elements of both change and stability. Deviance, in other words, is intimately related to normal social routines (both large and 'impersonal' and small, face-to-face encounters) as they unfold the possibilities of social order. Thirdly, within all social interaction there are crucial deployments of authority and power. Such power includes the possibilities of redefining the meaning of events and identities which have already occurred and been established. Fourthly, these powerful social exchanges are especially significant in institutions of socialisation such as the home and the school. Fifthly, social deviance is connected with power and control in complex ways because it has to do with the deployment of an 'undetermined variety of interpretive schemes'. Part of this thesis will involve the attempt to specify some 'interpretive schemes' and their social determinants.

Ritual and the moral character of face-to-face interaction.

One of the tasks of the thesis which will be frequently alluded to will be the theoretical connecting of aspects of what Goffman has called 'public order' but which he could equally have termed microsociology, proxemics, face-to-face interaction, human

ethnology etcetera,¹ with wider social structures and patterns of social organisation and control. In fact it was Goffman who pointed up the importance of analysing micro-order (instead of using it as a graphic resource which could be taken for granted) and who focussed on the importance of ritual or expressive elements of communication in patterns of social organisation and control. What he had to say was often paralleled by deviance theorists such as Jack Douglas in their examination of social rules and moral meanings.

It was Goffman who argued that analysis of micro-order was important if only because 'social order' is a term which ignores the obvious degrees of order as well as the possibility of a variety of orders.

When persons engage in regulated dealings with each other, they come to employ social routines or practices, namely patterned adaptations to rules - including conformances, by-passings, secret deviations, excusable infractions, flagrant violations, and the like. These variously motivated and variously functioning patterns of actual behaviour, these routines associated with ground rules, together constitute what might be called a 'social order'...[however]...It should be apparent that thinking about social orders has been subject to a conservative bias, a bias that many would see as operative in the very selection of the topic and title. There is the political doctrine that order is 'natural', that any order is good, and that a bad social order is better than no order at all. There is also the belief that the rules of an order are such as to make mutual dealings possible. And in truth, the rules of an order are necessarily such as to preclude the kind of activity that would have disrupted the mutual dealings, making it impractical to continue with them. However, it is also the case that the mutual dealings associated with any set of ground rules could probably be sustained with fewer rules or different ones, that some of the rules which do apply produce more inconvenience than they are worth, and that some participants profit considerably more than others from the order. It is also the case that a large number of infractions are compatible with maintaining an order and that the issue of how many this might be is a nice theoretical problem that has exercised passions not minds. Finally, in a complex society the disorganization of a social order is a breakdown in but one component of the whole, and the whole is not so closely integrated as to break down because of this.²

---

There was thus a need, in looking at the events of face-to-face interaction, to use them not so much to illuminate other things as for the 'explication of their own generic character'.

One of the consistent themes in this analysis of the generic character of face-to-face interaction has been Goffman's delineation of the ordering functions of ritual. Despite, or even because of, an apparent decline in ritual elements of daily interaction, it is sometimes imagined that ritual functions have disappeared. Goffman argues a contrary view - 'Only our secular view of society prevents us from appreciating the ubiquitousness and strategy of their location [i.e. personal rituals], and in turn, their role in social organisation.'

Basing his work on Durkheim's analysis of the sacred and profane, Goffman argues that rituals institutionalise ceremonial rules which in turn are expressive communications having important functions in the evaluative regulation of social interaction. It is ritual which for Goffman provides the moral component of the rules of interaction which Jack Douglas and others are intent on analysing.

'A ceremonial rule' argues Goffman, 'is...a conventionalized means of communication by which the individual expresses his character or conveys his appreciation of the other participants in the situation.' Such ceremonial messages may be transmitted as part of an activity that is primarily substantive (how a waitress serves a cup of coffee involves a communication in addition to the 'substantive' meaning of the action), but such messages may be transmitted linguistically, gesturally etc. as well as being task-embedded.

It is the moral component of ceremonial rules, their maintenance and breaking, that Goffman draws out so well. In other words, his contribution, in this instance, is firstly a delineation of the ordering functions of face-to-face interaction rituals and secondly an account of the implications of fracturing such symbolic orders. In his own words 'The general capacity to be bound by moral rules may well belong to the individual, but the particular

1 Ibid., p.89.
set of rules which transforms him into a human being derives from requirements established in the ritual organisation of social encounters. And if a particular person or group or society seems to have a unique character all its own, it is because its standard set of human-nature elements is pitched and combined in a particular way.  

In his paper on 'Remedial Interchanges', Goffman notes that since social norms are typically couched in general terms, people are pressed towards a practice of reading singular acts as symptoms which evidence 'the actor's general relation to a rule and, by extension, his relation to the system of rules of which the one in question is a part. And, of course, such information often is taken as relevant for an appraisal of the actor's moral character.' However, in everyday interaction such attributions about the actor's moral responsibility are made in vastly different ways than is implied in legal definitions of responsibility and in legalistic formats of social control.

Thus, social situations are not seen as places where rules are obeyed or secretly broken, but rather as settings for racing through versions in miniature of the entire judicial process.  

So that in the realm of public order

...it is not obedience and disobedience that are central, but occasions that give rise to remedial work of various kinds, especially the provision of corrective readings calculated to show that a possible offender actually had a right relationship to the rules, or if he seemed not to a moment ago, he can be counted on to have such a relationship henceforth.  

All of which relates to a special approach in daily interaction to the question of responsibility.

1 E. Goffman, 1972, 'On face work', op.cit., p.45.  
3 E. Goffman, 1971, op.cit., p.137.  
The kind of responsibility we will be concerned with might be called moral. Involved are the notions that he who fails to guide himself by a particular rule has done so at best because of momentary lapse, at worst because of faulty character, and that although he has not conformed, he is capable of doing so, should have desired to conform, and, in any case, ought now to conform. Note that this sense of the term responsibility is intrinsically diffuse since it combines into one concept the notion of why the individual acted as he did, how he could have acted, how he should have acted, and how in the future, he ought to act. It is as though the concept itself somehow were designed to bind users to a belief that a single issue is at stake, when, in fact, essentially disparate elements are involved.\(^1\)

Goffman is suggesting that the imputation of moral responsibility is an everyday affair which deals with minor as well as magisterial acts, that this imputation carries its complex and diffuse elements closely bound together in such a way that they remain unacknowledged in everyday interaction. It is to this operation of moral evaluation in apparently minor interaction that McHugh also turned when he elaborated a 'common-sense conception of deviance'.

McHugh sets out to show

...that the sociological import of deviance is its expression of two kinds of common-sense actions: first, a deviant act is an act that members deem 'might not have been', or 'might have been otherwise'; second it is an act the agent of which is deemed to 'know what he is doing'. For the observing member, in other words, a deviant act must occur in a situation where he can conceive that there were alternatives to that act; and it must be committed by an actor who knows what the alternatives were. By invoking these two common-sense rules, a member comes to depict the circumstance or situation in which the act takes place and the agent or person or group committing the act respectively. This is the process, much elaborated below, by which deviance is conferred upon an act.\(^2\)

McHugh in his elaboration develops the concepts of 'conventionality' and 'theoreticity'. Both McHugh and Goffman are elaborating the idea that it is in everyday interaction that moral rules are created, sustained and changed; that the processes of everyday interaction

---

1 Ibid., p.128.
are intrinsic to the creation of deviance. Where McHugh asserts that 'Moral rules not only permit but create and require the possibility of argument, denial and disconfirmation', Goffman refers to 'occasions that give rise to remedial work of various kinds'. He then elaborates a conceptual structure of remedial interchanges based on 'accounts', 'apologies' and 'requests'.

Goffman and McHugh have focussed on everyday interaction in such a way as to show that there do exist a multitude of minor but important exchanges which are non-rational (in terms of means-ends schema), but which relate to the question of social order via their value as indicators towards ceremonial rules. Ritual is non-rational yet very importantly available for moral evaluation and attribution. Parsons summarises Durkheim on this point. (Goffman frequently acknowledges his debt to Durkheim on the questioning of the functions of ritual.)

In Durkheim's view...it is through the agency of ritual that the ultimate-value attitudes, the sentiments on which the social structure and solidarity depend, are kept 'tuned up' to a state of energy which makes the effective control of action and ordering of social relationships possible. The phenomena of deviance and deviant identities occur at the level of face-to-face interaction, and occur with the failure to interact within a framework of what Goffman has called supportive and remedial interchanges. By applying criteria of responsibility (outlined by Goffman and McHugh) people concur about the breakdown of those ritualised social collusions which produce predictable interaction and predictable identities in interaction.

What has been established in the preceding sections is the possibility of analysing 'micro' interaction as part of a moral order which is sustained via the ordering concept of social deviance. Deviance and social control even in 'micro' interaction are formed

1 Ibid., p.85.
and exhibited as moral boundaries and are affirmed in the use and application of ceremonial rules and ritual. However, it is necessary also to show theoretical connections between the micro-orders of interaction ritual and wider social structures and the ordering processes on which they rely for their stability.

Ritual, Anti-Ritual and Social Structure

Having spent considerable space in elaborating the connection between interaction, ritual and forms of social order, it is now necessary to turn to an examination at a more 'macroscopic' level, of the theoretical relations of ritual and social structure. This in turn can provide a fruitful opening to theorising links between forms of social structure and forms of social control. After this the phenomena of deviance can be set into a conceptual framework which can be divided into 'levels' of interaction.

Mary Douglas, in her book Natural Symbols, sets out to 'treat ritual forms, like speech forms, as transmitters of culture, which are generated in social relations and which, by their selections and emphases, exercise a constraining effect on social behaviour'. However, one important preliminary exercise for Douglas was to rescue the term ritual itself from certain sociological usages. In referring to Merton's use of the term to signify a routinised act diverted from its normal function, Douglas suggests that such usage leaves theorists 'without convenient terminology for describing the other kind of symbolic action which correctly expresses the actor's internal state. It would be decidedly cumbersome to use anti-ritualism for the positively committed use of symbolic forms in order to keep ritualism in its pejorative, sectarian sense' and further 'It is fair enough that "ritualized" ritual should fall into contempt. But it is illogical to despise all ritual, all symbolic action as such. To use the word ritual to mean empty symbols of conformity, leaving us with no word to stand for symbols of genuine conformity, is seriously disabling....' Douglas'

2 Ibid., pp.20-21.
first task then, was to re-establish the term ritual as referring to
the genuine use of 'live' symbols. Such developments have been
especially noticeable in one of the 'sacred' (in the Durkheimian
sense) institutions of industrial society, namely the institution of
education. It was through the analysis of ritual (in Douglas' sense)
within schools that Bernstein developed concepts which allowed a
connection to be made between different approaches to ritual in
education and different conceptions of social order, deviance, and
social control. What Mary Douglas has to say about the revolt
against ritual by the New Left, is relevant in the context of the
'revolt against ritual' of the social changes associated with
'alternative' schools.

Those on the New Left who are in revolt against empty
rituals do not readily see themselves walking in the footsteps
of Wycliffe and ardent Protestant reformers. Yet if we can
make the leap from small exotic cultures to our European
religious tradition, we can make the easier transition between
anti-ritualism in a secular and a religious context. We are
then able to see that alienation from the current social values
usually takes a set form: a denunciation not only of irrelevant
rituals, but of ritualism as such; exaltation of the inner
experience and denigration of its standardized expressions;
preference for intuitive and instant forms of knowledge;
rejection of mediating institutions, rejection of any tendency
to allow habit to provide the basis of a new symbolic system.
In its extreme form anti-ritualism is an attempt to abolish
communication by means of complex symbolic systems. We will see,
as the argument develops, that it is a viable attitude only in
the early unorganized stages of a new movement. After the
protest stage, once the need for organization is recognized,
the negative attitude to rituals is seen to conflict with the
need for a coherent system of expression. Then ritualism re-
asserts itself around the new context of social relations.1

Douglas' implicit suggestion is that in contemporary
societies ritual remains, in part because of its power to order
social relations which we have seen through Goffman's detailed work.
But although ritual remains it does so at times despite social
currents which Douglas describes as 'anti-ritualist'. Although
rituals and their meanings are learned phenomena, these cultural
symbolisms are more properly described as being 'transmitted' in
order to distinguish the learning mode from the more common and readily

1 Ibid., p.40.
understood psychological and educationally-based theories referring to the learning of 'knowledge', to the acquisition of bits of specialised information and instrumental skills. The fact is that these two modes of learning necessarily cohere in the two important socialising institutions of the home and the school. However, the separate analysis of cultural transmissions, knowledge/skill learning - and their interrelationship - is a difficult exercise which has rarely been attempted. Mary Douglas' work attempts a theoretical connection between forms of ritual and cosmology, between systems of symbolically meaningful behaviour and those overarching social theories of world-meaningfulness which provide all societies with the conceptual principles and tools with which to 'make sense' of phenomena which might otherwise be threatening to order due to their apparent incipient chaos. By providing a conceptual framework - in the notions of 'grid' and 'group' - Douglas provides a means for relating forms of ritual to forms of social structure as well as the possibility for predicting forms of order and attitudes to ritual under conditions of social change. Hence her reference to the work of Berger and Luckmann. '...though it is agreed that reality is a social construct [Berger and Luckmann], no convincing order has been discerned in all the multiple kinds of reality construable'.

Douglas' work then, offers the means for conceptually ordering the multiple possibilities of reality construction elaborated by Berger and Luckmann. Furthermore, with a typology of cosmology constructed, Douglas is in a position to hypothesise what types of social structures will be related to symbolic orders of social control; what are likely to be the manifestations, vis a vis ritual (and therefore certain changes in forms of social order) when social change occurs and symbol boundaries and categories are challenged, or rendered meaningless. Douglas specifically links the loss of power of ritual or anti-ritualism to situations of social change. 'The whole history of ideas should be reviewed in the light of the power of social structures to generate symbols of their own.'

By arguing

1 Ibid., p.174.
2 Ibid., p.185.
that 'anti-ritualism is...the idiom of revolt', that this anti-ritualism leads to a cosmology of 'undifferentiated human solidarity', Douglas is able to point to situations where symbolic meanings are in conflict or decline and to give theoretical salience to elements of the confusion as well as to make predictions about the efficacy of certain actions as well as the likelihood of these actions occurring and from whom. Anti-ritualists, 'those who have the sense of living without meaningful categories', are likely to 'reject social differentiation and propose programs to enhance the sense of individual worth, human warmth and spontaneity. They pay tribute to these values, announce their final triumph'. However, 'Anyone who tries to correct the unfeelingness of the bureaucratic machine with a revolution of feeling gives up control of the situation to natural symbols. After attacking definition as such, differentiation as such, ritual as such, it is very difficult to turn back and seek new definitions, differentiations and rituals that will remedy the case' in fact 'To throw overboard differentiating doctrines and differentiating rituals is to reach for the poison that symbolizes the ill.'

It is in the sacred institution of education that many of the symbolic orders have been challenged and it can be argued that anti-ritual is best exampled by aspects of the 'free' and 'alternative' school social movement. Rather than attempt to look at a phenomenon so diverse and rather than using Douglas' concepts of 'grid' and 'group', we will instead be focussing on significant events in a particular alternative school and depending conceptually on Bernstein's concepts of 'classification' and 'framing'. Both writers have acknowledged the debt to one another's work. It is partly because Bernstein's concept of 'framing' differs from Douglas' notion of 'group', and partly because it is Bernstein who has analysed the notion of ritual specifically within education that the typological detail will stem largely from Bernstein. For our purposes the main point is that Douglas and Bernstein have provided a typology which allows the differentiation of social structures (educational ones in

1 Ibid., pp.183, 186, 187.
particular) which relate social structure to the dynamics of symbolic orders as they relate to power and social control. In particular, the frameworks relate ritualism, social control and (implicitly) deviance. Because Douglas' investigations use a comparison of religions, theological terms occur but in essence Douglas' interests are social. In the first chapter of Natural Symbols, Douglas relates the efficacy of symbols and symbolism to the nature of rule-breaking in a propositional way.

Where symbols are highly valued and [therefore] ritualism strong, then the idea of sin involves specific, formal acts of wrong-doing; where ritualism is weak, the idea of sin does not focus on specific external actions, but on internal states of mind.1

If these propositions were to be freely translated into the context of contemporary education they would indicate that where a sense of order is mediated via the power of a symbolic order, then social control will operate against acts of symbol violation ('You're not wearing your school cap and tie, son'). However, where symbols are less valued, social control will focus not on acts but on intentions; not on behaviour but on motivation.2 The emphasis on acts and behaviour within a system valuing ritual will tend to impersonalise authority relations whilst authority will be highly personal in a situation which looks to an individual's motives and justifications.

Theorising Educational Change: Power and Social Control.

The way a society categorises the forms and contents of what it calls 'knowledge' and the way it regulates the transfer of these things to various groups of people, is reflected in the shape that educational knowledge takes as it is institutionalised in

1 Ibid., p.27.
organisations devoted to the creation, maintenance and transfer of public knowledge. At times of social change it sometimes happens that different philosophies or principles underlying the selection and arrangement of educational knowledge come into conflict. The fundamental nature of this clash entails an investigation into the relationship between the social order and the purposes of those institutions specialising in 'knowledge'.

Bernstein has attempted to develop a sociological theory that will relate changes in society to the organisation of educational knowledge in schools. The theory developed along with, and out of his work on socialisation into sociolinguistic codes. 'It is possible' he writes, 'to see how changes in the distribution of power and the principles of social control affect the what, how, where and with whom, of school learning. Thus the realizations of elaborated codes varies with the form of their institutionalization...the sociolinguistic thesis attempted to demonstrate how the class structure affected the social distribution of privileged meanings and the interpretive procedures which generated them. It is also the case that as the organizational structure and "knowledge" properties of the school change, so does the nature of the processes and the procedures of communication.' He goes on to say, 'we can begin to see that if we are to discuss curriculum we have also to consider pedagogy and evaluation....The selective organization, transmission, and evaluation of knowledge is intimately bound up with patterns of authority and control. I distinguished between two forms of the transmission of educational knowledge, "collection" and "integrated", and I speculated on their effect upon the formation of identities, concepts of property, the relationships between teachers and pupils, and upon the distribution of power and the principles of social control.¹

The principal focus of Bernstein's theoretical concepts of 'classification' and 'framing' is the strength of boundaries between categories. The idea is to examine how well subject matter, roles, activities, sets of ideas, etc., are kept insulated from one another. Within the school it is not the content of subjects that is of

interest in this case so much as its degree of separateness from other subject matter and the importance which is placed on who maintains the boundaries and the 'how' of this maintenance. Classification relates to the strength of the boundaries themselves whilst framing is concerned with the locus of control in the boundary-maintaining procedure. Strong classification need not necessarily involve strong framing. For example, subjects may be clearly defined and taught quite separately from one another, but within these strongly insulated sets of meanings, pupils and teachers may have considerable latitude in negotiating the pace of presentation as well as the sequencing of the material and the form of evaluation to be used. On the other hand, classification may be weak and framing strong. Subject matter described as human ecology (which cuts across many of the boundaries of traditional subject matter areas), if presented via a machine in programed learning, may allow no latitude in the sequencing, pacing, selection or evaluation of the subject matter.

It is too simple and not very interesting, however, to say that a school with strong classification will teach traditional subjects and to leave it at that. Strong classification describes the nature of the boundaries between people as well as just knowledge. Roles are segregated so that adults describe themselves as in administration, or guidance or as being a mathematician (specialising in pedagogy). Children identify themselves as in science, or art, or the vocational stream ('commercial') or 'not in anything' (a 'comprehensive' one might say). Relationships and identities are legitimated and circumscribed in terms of what falls within the knowledge-content boundaries. The point to be stressed is the extent to which the person's consciousness of an identity derives from and is realised in terms not just of their usual categories of thought, but the way these categories are maintained.

In order to illustrate the use of his concepts of classification and frame, Bernstein contrasts aspects of two contrasting educational knowledge codes; these are ideal types which he describes as the 'collection' (hierarchical and highly insulated) from the 'integrated' (a program in which teachers cooperate across traditional subject boundaries). If classification refers primarily
to curriculum (that is traditional school subjects), framing to pedagogy and the combination of classifications and framing relate to evaluation; then in a collection educational knowledge code there is a 'deep structure' whose strong boundary maintenance has the effect of creating control from within and through the formation of specific identities....A sense of the sacred, the 'otherness' of educational knowledge, I submit does not arise so much out of an ethic of knowledge for its own sake, but is more a function of socialisation into subject loyalty: for it is the subject which becomes the linchpin of the identity. Any attempt to weaken or change classification strength may be felt as a threat to one's identity and may be experienced as a pollution endangering the sacred. Here we have one source of the resistance to change of educational code.¹

In terms of pedagogy in the collection code, the typically strong framing means that there is a gradual movement from the 'facts' at the 'surface' to the principles coordinating these facts at the level of a 'deep structure'. The emphasis is on 'discipline (which) means accepting a given selection, organisation, pacing and timing realised in the pedagogical frame'.² The effect of such an arrangement in the presentation of knowledge is that you have to get to the end before you can really understand the interrelationship of most of the information that came at the beginning. For example, the algebraic quadratic equations taught in my third-form schooldays only 'make some sense' when they can be seen as highly abstract ways of integrating sociological data - perhaps. The point is that for those who never make it to the end (and that, in many cases is not the end of school, nor even perhaps the end of an undergraduate degree), the learning experience may largely be not only lacking in any utility but also quite meaningless. In Bernstein's words, 'the collection code may provide for those who go beyond novitiate stage - order identity, and commitment. For those who do not pass beyond this stage, it can sometimes be wounding and seen as meaningless - what Bourdieu calls "la violence symbolique"'.³

¹ Ibid., p.239.
² Ibid., p.241.
³ Ibid., p.243.
At different times, various groups and individuals associated with the X school were interacting with one another on the basis of implicit assumptions about knowledge and social control whose effects may be summarised by using Bernstein's concepts of classification and frame. It is only thus conceptualised that it is possible to understand the implicit nature of conflict between people who approached one another 'with the best of intentions'. It is only with some such conceptual framework that it is possible to understand the sense of confused affront that was frequently conveyed in members' words and actions. The implicit nature of the conflict was due to unarticulated assumptions about the nature of the link between social structure, power and legitimacy. In part this was a case of conflict implicit at a level more complex simply than that of assumptions, it involved the inability to articulate the nature of the problem because it was at the level of what Mary Douglas calls ritual and anti-ritual, or what Goffman has described in his analyses of the ordering functions of ritual. It is in the work of Mary Douglas, and more particularly of Bernstein, that the conceptual apparatus is provided which makes possible the beginning of an analysis of that form of conflict founded in competing cosmologies. What links the diverse theoretical traditions covered in these last pages is the idea of groups adhering to implicitly-held views of the propriety and impropriety of certain types of social boundaries and social boundedness.

It is in Bernstein's discussion of forms of order in collection and integrated educational codes, that the implications of ritual in the production of competing everyday definitions of deviance (hinted at earlier by Mary Douglas) are clarified. Douglas suggested that where ritual was strong, there deviance would be located in particular actions and specific behaviour; where conversely, ritual was weak, there deviance would be identified with personal intentions and motivations.

For Bernstein strong ritual and symbolism defines the collection educational code

Where knowledge is regulated by collection codes, social order arises out of the hierarchical nature of the authority relationships, out of the systematic ordering of the
differentiated knowledge in time and space, out of an explicit, usually predictable, examining procedure.¹

Bernstein continues by saying that a sense of order in the integrated code is problematic and contingent, unless certain conditions are achieved 'integration may produce a culture in which neither the staff nor pupils have a sense of time place or purpose'.² Firstly, 'it may be that integrated codes will only work (in the sense of creating order) when there is a high level of ideological consensus among the staff'.³ Secondly, by contrast with collection codes, 'with integrated codes, both the role and the form of the knowledge have to be achieved in relation to a range of different others....The collection code is capable of working when staffed by mediocre teachers, whereas integrated codes call for much greater powers of synthesis and analogy, and for more ability to both tolerate and enjoy ambiguity at the level of knowledge and social relationships'.⁴ Thirdly, since evaluative criteria are likely to be less explicit and measurable in integrated codes, committees will need to coordinate and monitor these processes. Finally, since evaluative criteria in integrated codes may be weak as they refer to specific cognitive attributes, but stronger in relation to dispositional attributes, pupils may produce new defences against the more penetrating and intensive socialisation of the integrated codes. Bernstein summarises this:

The overt structure of organic solidarity of integrated codes creates through its less specialized outputs mechanical solidarity. And it will do this to the extent to which its ideology is explicit, elaborated and closed, and effectively and implicitly transmitted through its low insulations. Inasmuch as integrated codes do not accomplish this, then order is highly problematic at the level of social organization and at the level of the person.⁵

Bernstein does not set out a methodology whereby variations in strength of ritual might empirically be investigated. An additional problem is

² Ibid., p.64.
³ Ibid., p.64.
⁴ Ibid., p.65.
⁵ Ibid., p.66.
that in contrasting 'strong ritual', where deviance is located in
'specific behaviour' with 'weak ritual' where deviance is identified
with 'personal intentions and motivations', there arises the difficulty
of how personal intentions and motivations are actually established,
either by members in everyday interaction, or by sociologists for
whom actors' motives are tied to a different set of relevancies. In
this thesis 'motivations' and 'intentions' are evidenced in actors'
accounts of their own and others' actions. This then requires a more
detailed specification of Bernstein's distinction between behaviour and
motivation, between order from hierarchical authority and order from
ideological consensus. Given the equation of motivation with
members' accounting procedures, the question becomes what character­
istics will distinguish members' accounts as they reveal conceptions
of social order within a collection code as distinct from an
integrated code? In the case of the collection code, the burden of
Bernstein's argument is that members' accounts will point to the
strong framing with the implication that the symbols 'speak for
themselves'. If a member's account points to the 'lack of a proper
timetable' or to an 'undisciplined approach to subject material' or
to 'inadequate forms of assessment', then the member is asserting
that strong classification and framing of time, knowledge and
assessment is social order, no further justification will be seen as
necessary. As a corollary to this, the absence of the symbols of
order will signify the absence of order itself. In the case of the
integrated code the symbols of order are not obvious since they are
immanent and dependent for their emergence on a degree of ideological
consensus amongst the staff. Since social order in this case is
problematic and contingent, members' accounts would in any case have
a less predictable range of symbols, with the degree of order stemming
more from indications of the degree of ideological consensus.

In terms of Bernstein's typology, the X school was attempting
to work within the framework of an integrated code. For this reason
alone it was predicted that special difficulties could make social
order within the school problematic. Ideological consensus,
socialisation of staff, feedback on flexible criteria of evaluation
and assessment - all created special possibilities of dis-ordering.
What Bernstein's theory deals with in only the most cursory fashion,
is the wider social reaction to a school identified as a social problem.

I suggest that the movement away from collection to integrated codes symbolizes that there is a crisis in society's basic classifications and frames, and therefore a crisis in its structures of power and principles of control. The movement from this point of view represents an attempt to declassify and so alter power structures and principles of control: in so doing to unfreeze the structuring of knowledge and to change the boundaries of consciousness. From this point of view integrated codes are symptoms of a moral crisis rather than the terminal state of an educational system.¹

Legitimation and radical critique.

In the same way that Bernstein theorises competing codes of educational transmission, but offers little in the way of methods for their investigation, Berger and Luckmann also deal with the integration of systems of knowledge, and with the conceptual machineries for controlling aberrant ways of knowing, but they deliberately refrain from discussing methodological approaches to analysis of the phenomena.² Nevertheless it is in the work of Berger and Luckmann that a theoretical framework is spelt out which links the process of social institutionalisation with complementary processes of legitimation. These legitimations are linked together at the most abstract level in what Mary Douglas calls cosmologies but which Berger and Luckmann call symbolic universes. The problem of legitimation only arises when the institutional order needs to be transmitted from one generation to the next. The process of institutionalisation at this point no longer remains a matter of individual recollection of matters essentially biographical,

¹ Ibid., p.67.
² P. Berger and T. Luckmann, op.cit., p.210. 'We have expressly refrained from following up the methodological implications of our conception of the society of knowledge'. For a discussion of the 'equivocal negativism' of these two authors see P. Filmer, 'On Harold Garfinkel's Ethnomethodology', in P. Filmer et al., 1973, New Directions in Sociological Theory, MIT Press, Massachusetts, esp. pp.203-5.
there are required 'explanations' or justificatory accounts of the institutional tradition. Legitimation is thus not a matter of values alone, it also implies a special knowledge as well.

Legitimation not only tells the individual why he should perform one action and not another; it also tells him why things are what they are. In other words, 'knowledge' precedes 'values' in the legitimation of institutions.¹

There are levels of such knowledge ranging from the categories of language itself through proverbs and moral maxims ('first show the class who is boss and then you can relax the discipline on your own terms'). A third level of legitimation involves explicit theories relating to particular institutional sectors. The institution of education has produced a differentiated body of knowledge including theories of pedagogy, educational administration, ability, measurement and evaluation, etc. This differentiation has proceeded to the point where the terms educator or educationist are used to distinguish the role of the specialist in legitimation-theory from the role of teacher whose work is generally assumed to proceed at a level which takes for granted the prevailing theories of legitimation. A fourth level of legitimation, that of symbolic universes 'are bodies of theoretical tradition that integrate different provinces of meaning and encompass the institutional order in a symbolic totality'.²

It was at the third and fourth levels of legitimation that the operation of the X school appeared to threaten various sets of legitimating assumptions, and with them the sense of order which derived from the associated hierarchy of legitimating knowledge. Berger and Luckmann indicate that since legitimations, at all levels, are ultimately the constructions of men, there are always circumstances which may bring a critical focus onto even the prevailing symbolic universe, the most abstract level of legitimation. It is in the process of transmission, both to children and in response to 'idiosyncratic' adults' questions that the possibility exists for deviant versions of the symbolic universe to be developed, and at

² Ibid., p.113.
the same time the necessity for the legitimation of conceptual machineries of repression. In examining the first issue - the approach to conceptual-control (and subsequently social control) stemming from questions of behaviour inimical to the prevailing symbolic order, Scott argues for the phenomenon of deviance as a social construction which is itself an element of social order.

In presenting deviance as an element of social order Scott writes:

This property [deviance] is conferred upon an individual whenever others detect in his behaviour, appearance, or simply his existence, a significant transgression of the boundaries of the symbolic universe by which the inherent disorder of human existence is made to appear orderly and meaningful. More simply, the property of deviance is conferred on things that are perceived as being anomalous when they are viewed from the perspective of a symbolic universe. Initially we can identify at least two different conditions under which this property can be conferred, which conditions can be distinguished in terms of the amount of ambiguity that is found in any part of the over-all outline of the symbolic universe or in the boundaries of the categories within it. The first condition arises when the boundaries and outlines are clear and evident, in which case phenomena are easily identified either as anomalous or normal; in the second condition, an event or thing may be labeled as anomalous in order to mark more clearly the outlines of the symbolic universe when they have become obscure or ambiguous.1

Scott goes on to delineate three important circumstances of deviance conferral. In the first case, deviance may be conferred if an individual is identified as no longer adequately sharing in the prevailing symbolic universe or sub-universes. Such people are seen as literally having moved into 'another world'. Secondly, people who are of 'another world' due to their being cultural outsiders may be seen as threateningly deviant. It is in reference to this point that the question of power is raised by Berger and Luckmann. When alternative symbolic universes confront one another this 'implies a problem of power' and outcomes 'will depend more on power than on the theoretical ingenuity of the respective legitimators'.2 Finally, there is the case of those who despite their own acceptance of the symbolic universe are regarded as being 'in' but not 'of' the system.

It will be a central argument of this thesis that the X school came to be regarded as 'in' but not 'of' the system. The reference being to the system of the societal symbolic universe and sub-universes of meaning especially as these are related to questions of education as cultural transmission. That is, the passing on from generation to generation of the symbolic universe. It is therefore appropriate to look at the deployment of mechanisms for the maintenance of symbolic universes. Such mechanisms help to specify more clearly the meaning of deviance.

Scott, in speaking of a process of 'genuine' misperception does not quite do justice to Berger and Luckmann's account of mythology, theology, philosophy and science as 'conceptual machineries of universe maintenance'. The point is that these 'conceptual machineries' can be portrayed as social theoretical analogues of Thomas Kuhn's scientific paradigms. When individuals or groups apprehend events derived from an alien symbolic universe, their own normative conceptualisation (whether it be ontologically based on mythology or science etc.) will allow a 'genuine misperception'.

'Therapy', 'Nihilation' and 'Normalised Repression'

In grouping Berger and Luckmann's examples of universe-maintaining machinery ('therapy' and 'nihilation') with Gouldner's concept of 'normalised repression', the purpose is to return to the question of power and deviance and the proper theoretical accommodation of one to the other. Berger and Luckmann suggest that whereas 'Therapy uses a conceptual machinery to keep everyone within the [symbolic] universe in question, nihilation, in its turn, uses a similar machinery to liquidate conceptually everything outside the same universe.'

4 P. Berger and T. Luckmann, 1971, op.cit., p.132. Almost the whole of Mary Douglas' 1966 Purity and Danger : An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo, Penguin, Ringwood, is given over to explicating the functioning of 'nihilation'.
Although the question of power is acknowledged elsewhere by Berger and Luckmann ("He who has the bigger stick has the better chance of imposing his definitions of reality")\(^1\) nevertheless power is not well integrated theoretically with the notions of 'therapy' and 'nihilation'. The effect is to give the concepts a descriptive and abstracted quality. Both 'therapy' and 'nihilation' are presented in individualistic terms but the concept of 'nihilation' could be translated into a discussion of conceptual control machinery for ideologies of social groups. Nihilation may simply involve the attribution of a negative ontological status to deviant phenomena. It may also however, involve

...the more ambitious attempt to account for all deviant definitions of reality in terms of concepts belonging to one's own universe....The final goal of this procedure is to incorporate the deviant conceptions within one's own universe, and thereby to liquidate them ultimately. The deviant conceptions must, therefore, be translated into concepts derived from one's own universe. In this manner, the negation of one's universe is subtly changed into an affirmation of it. The presupposition is always that the negator does not really know what he is saying. His statements become meaningful only as they are translated into more 'correct' terms, that is, terms deriving from the universe he negates.\(^2\)

Such an explanation readily 'makes sense' when put in the context of some 'alternative' schools, where individuals and groups may be attempting to articulate different social forms (with their implications for new forms of social control), but who nevertheless find themselves suffering forms of 'nihilation'. At X school we find people attempting to explain their preparedness to 'compromise' because for a 'rules and regulations man' radical change is 'unfeasible'. However, both 'therapy' and 'nihilation' take for granted the relative power of those standing within the ambit of the society's symbolic universe, its conventional social reality. Such a conceptualisation does not explain the difficulties involved in setting out a systematic challenge to the symbolic order which necessarily derives from it at the same time as attempting to transcend it. Berger and Luckmann

---

2 Ibid., p.133.
do hint at the nature of such problems when they characterise the
mystifying effects of modern science as it effects the formulation
maintenance or challenge to symbolic universes and sub-universes.

Modern science is an extreme step in this development and in
the secularization and sophistication of universe-maintenance. Science not
only completes the removal of the sacred from the
world of everyday life, but removes universe-maintaining
knowledge as such from that world. Everyday life becomes bereft
of both sacred legitimation and the sort of theoretical
intelligibility that would link it with the symbolic universe
in its intended totality. Put more simply, the 'lay' member
of society no longer knows how his universe is to be conceptually
maintained, although, of course, he still knows who the
specialists of universe-maintenance are presumed to be. The
interesting problems posed by this situation belong to an
empirical sociology of knowledge of contemporary society and
cannot be further pursued in this context.¹

The institution of education is in this respect an especially
confusing one. Much of the literature of modern education is couched
in the language and rhetoric of empirical science and technology.
Concepts such as intelligence and aptitude are derived from within a
philosophy of positivistic natural science and the effect is to
preclude the possibility of analysis of the institution itself from
the point of view of the maintenance of symbolic universes. Essentially
what is being argued is that deviance is a sociological concept which
provides the possibility of linking actors' consciousness with power
and morality, but that much conventional work in the field of
education by focussing, for example, on learning theories, eliminates
the basis for a study of cultural transmissions.²

While 'nihilation' speaks to the problem of deviant categories
being 'lost' through incorporation within the symbolic universe they
challenge, and the accompanying translation effectively affiriming
established moral boundaries, nevertheless the concept by-passes the
combined effects of customary power and conventional morality.

¹ Ibid., p.130.
² On these points see B. Bernstein, 1975, op.cit., introduction and
passim. H. Nathan, 1974, op.cit. M. Roche, 1973, Phenomenology,
Language and Social Sciences, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, chs
7 and 9.
Not only does every social system involve a certain 'slippage' between its values and accustomed conformity to them, but in fact there is frequently a recognition of the systematic failure of some to meet normative ideals. Children are socialised to expect that moral demands fall more heavily on some people than on others. Furthermore, children and adults, come to realise that the power to enforce moral claims is itself unequally distributed. Gouldner puts it thus:

The level at which moral default comes to be stabilized is, in large part, determined by the relative power of the groups involved. The more powerful are, in consequence, both ready and able to institutionalize compliance with the moral code at levels congenial to themselves and more costly to those with less power. Power is, among other things, just this ability to enforce one's moral claims. The powerful can thus conventionalize their moral defaults. As their moral failure becomes customary and expected, this itself becomes another justification for giving the subordinate group less than it might theoretically claim under the group's common values. It becomes, in short, 'normalised repression'.

If morality seems co-existent with power, it is not only because power influences the levels at which conformity to moral values becomes conventionalized, but also because power can actually shape the definition of what is moral....Morality fits power, therefore, because the powerful have the Procrustean ability to mold morality while not creating the moral code out of the whole cloth, they can cut and tailor it to suit themselves.1

The concept of normalised repression links at a theoretical level, power, morality and the structuring of social consciousness.

Whereas Berger and Luckmann, through the concepts of therapy and nihilation describe the mechanisms by which universes of meaning are maintained in their integrity - it is Gouldner's concept of 'normalised repression' which places such mechanisms within a context of established social relations and which illustrates the social force of conventional views and the inertia of confusion that needs to be overcome in moving across social and symbolic boundaries. In such a movement the bases and sources of social legitimacy and being are attacked often in a way which is implicit: thus the fundamental questions of cultural change may not be available for articulation.

Hence the necessity in the ensuing case study to attempt to present explanations within social contexts, to identify accounts as vocabularies of motive and to present ideologies as responses of interest groups to their perceptions of social problems (deviance).

**Power and Deviance**

The question of power has long been a vexed one in sociological theory and given the revived connection between social organisation, social control and deviance, inevitably the issue of power intrudes itself. This work cannot be devoted to the question of power or sociological theories of power, however, in using an interactionist-based approach to deviance to investigate patterns of social order, there has to be recognition of the intimate link between power and authority, influence and domination, legitimation and ideology and the creation, maintenance and functions of deviance.¹ A recurring problem in an investigation which deals with changes in conventional patterns, is that analytic distinctions lose their force and relevance. (Hence the recourse to Bernstein's concepts of classification and frame, hence also the difficulties in analysing varying levels of social phenomena.) The material already presented on the analysis of ritual has been necessary in order to analyse changing role relations in X school and to point to the buttressing of new patterns of social interaction with the power immanent in new ceremony and ritual. However, at the level of the school as a formal organisation, operating in an environment of organisations, it is necessary to move the analysis away from power as it emanates from patterned face-to-face encounters. Instead we will use a theoretical approach to deviance which makes certain assumptions about power at an organisational level. It is in the work of Davis that there is an attempt to explicitly link power and deviance via a series of propositions.²

---


² N. Davis, 1975, op.cit., esp. ch.8.
Although Davis provides little elaboration of her concept of power or its sources in theory, nevertheless there are a set of propositions linking power and deviance, recognising the significance of legitimacy and attempting to span individual consciousness, formal organisations and social organisation or institutionalisation. We would assert that there is a connection between Berger and Luckmann's concept of legitimation and Davis' discussion of legitimate and illegitimate power. Members carry understandings of the processes of organisational legitimation. In other words, at Berger and Luckmann's third level of legitimation (the level below that of symbolic universes), members learn those theories which relate how social organisation within particular institutions is supposed to work (and members by implication form views about how social organisation is supposed not to work). We take Davis to be arguing, inter alia, that power, conflict and ultimately 'deviance', must be traced through members' understandings of the propriety with which theories of institutional knowledge are interpreted in social action.

If we leave aside the internal social organisation of the X school and view it from the point of view of its place within an administrative system of education, it will become apparent in later analysis that from a very early stage social interaction became problematic. The key problem was that of integrating a group of people whose attitude to the conventional education division of labour was at the very least ambiguous. The question arose as to how to deal with an educational organisation where there was no clear acceptance of a separation of knowledge from organisation or curriculum from administration. If 'knowing' really was going to be 'doing', then conventional modes of social control immediately became problematic. The X school almost from its inception operated with an unusual conception of the relationship between knowledge, social transmission and social organisation. Davis' approach to power and deviance provides a framework for analysing the X school in its organisational environment and for understanding the nature of the conflicts which occurred.

Davis' fundamental assumption is that 'Power exists, and causes all observed deviance'. Such a general statement is elaborated
in terms of a series of propositions, definitions, corollaries and conditions which here will only be summarised. Essentially the argument revolves around responses to the perceived legitimacy or illegitimacy of power within a social system. Power is operationalised as those resources which can be marshalled by groups or individuals to affect system outcomes. The Weberian distinction between power and authority is implicitly followed when legitimate power is defined as the control of resources according to legally established rules principles or standards (Weberian 'authority'). Illegitimate power is the control of resources in a way which violates legally established rules. Deviance within this framework is characterised as a form of conflict since it includes both opposition by the ruled to the rules and standards of the rulers, as well as the ruling class's perception and definition of violations of rules by the ruled class.

Despite any limitations that emerge from an insufficiently elaborated account of power in this framework, nevertheless the equation of deviance with conflict allows for the development of further useful propositions. The latter propositions and corollaries relate to the emergence of deviance under conditions of conflict over resources which effect system outcomes. Either a decrease in the ability to effect system outcomes, or the perception that resources are ineffective are predicted as leading to conflict (and the creation of deviance). Finally, severity of sanctions are postulated as being related on the one hand to the status and resources of the ruled groups and on the other hand to the elites' perception of the degree of threat to the authority system itself.

The case of the X school is interesting because its creation posed problems for both 'rulers' and 'ruled' as to what in fact were resources, whether there had been shifts, at various times, in the availability of resources, and what it was proper to consider a sanction. In recognition of the potential for conflict in such a situation, the X school was formally attached as an annexe to a school

---

1 See ibid., p.216 ff.
which related to the education administration in conventional terms. The responsibility for mediating a linkage between the X school and its host was vested jointly in the head of the host school and the coordinator of the annexe (X school). However, despite a superficial appearance of organisational form, the content of the role relationship was unknown and unspecified and was formally stated to rest in part on the 'good' personal relationships of the two particular people. Later incumbents to the role of coordinator were able to define the role and its resources with considerable variation. Furthermore, there existed both changing and conflicting patterns of expectations amongst parents, students, teachers and administrators with respect to the nature of the coordinator's role (and perhaps more importantly, such conflict extended to the very notion of what constituted a role; that is conflicting evaluations of the relationship between personal identity and social function).

In fact the setting up of the X school as an annexe can be argued for as the result of conflict over such things as the proper administration of 'resources' (as defined by Davis) in schools as revealed in the relativities of power inherent in conventional teacher-pupil roles. Given Davis' thesis that deviance represents conflicts over the legitimacy of power, we can see the formation of the X school as an annexe - as illustrating Newman's theory of deviance removal. Newman has argued that in terms of the classic definitions of what constitutes a deviant - children, and more especially, school children, admirably fit the definition. School children are 'liminal' beings, people whose moral status is ambiguous, people in the process of crossing a threshold of family dependency and affiliation to integration in the adult community. For this reason they are seen to be available and in need of special control. (Conversely, they are socially 'dangerous' without such special control.) Newman argues that schools as institutions function in part to 'make safe' people who - like all classic deviants - suffer from being economically non-productive, fulfil no family responsibilities and whose legal, moral and social responsibilities are seen as problematic. Schools serve to separate this population and to imbue a particular sense of order, to favour particular ('convergent') modes of thought, to develop a conception of authority based on the reproduction of
particular approaches to knowledge as well as an emphasis on
performance, socially acceptable information and particular types of
sociability and intimacy springing from the institutionalised power
relations of teacher and taught.\textsuperscript{1} In effect, Newman and Wilkins
are discussing the problems of legitimation especially as they
derive from the problem of cultural transmission, in much the same
way as these problems were elaborated by Berger and Luckmann. What
the former authors do is to relate the discussion more specifically
to both education and power.

In relating the work of Newman and Wilkins to Davis' notion
of the power and resources, we would argue that within the institution
of education, 'resources' refers to the rules legitimating the
configuration of socialising influences outlined above. Where there
is a challenge to this configuration or part of it, there will emerge
conflict and deviance. (Newman later developed this early work
completed with Wilkins into his own theory of deviance removal.)

Newman and Wilkins conclude their paper suggesting that

\ldots different kinds of deviance may be 'produced' or at least
emerge, as a result of the forms of social organisation of the
school and the paradigm of knowledge upon which this social
organisation is based. Various rules or guiding principles
operate to reassert the forms of social organisation and to
insulate the basic paradigm of knowledge from attack...That
is, the social order is not built for variation but rather
for conformity. The logical outcome is therefore to exclude
deviants from the schooling process, so that psychologists,
doctors and other specialists play an important part in
formally diagnosing such deviants, and recommending their
removal to special classes, or schools, where they are
subsequently more easily identifiable. Thus, the extent of
a child's deviance is amplified both by the distance (most
often physical) to which he is placed apart from the others,
and by his heightened visibility at being set apart.\textsuperscript{2}

It is important to note immediately that the process of
separation of 'deviant' schools or schoolchildren need not be a
simple one-way act of coercion. It is important because at the same
time as arguing for the X school as having gone through a process of

\textsuperscript{1} G. Newman and L. Wilkins, 1974, 'Sources of deviance in the schooling
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p.316.
'deviance-removal' - the process was actively participated in by the school community. Newman, in fact, suggests that the removal functions as a measure of the deviance.

The process of removal, rather than being a resocializing process is instead a deviance-defining process. In fact, we may suggest that the extent of removal is an operational definition of the extent of deviance.\(^1\)

In the case of the X school, the original coordinator had a powerful supporter in the educational administrative system, who was in favour of the coordinator's suggestion that the proposed school should be established as a separate entity. If degree of removal is taken to be an operational measure of deviance, then the ultimate outcome whereby the status of annexe was rejected and a full-scale separate school identity was created, is certainly a significant event.

Newman proposes four models, or possibilities of deviance-removal which take as their central assumption the necessity to account for the relative power of the parties to the interaction. Newman is suggesting that since all social interaction is symbolic and in principle problematic, there is always the shared knowledge that interaction may break down. Deviance-removal is a coping mechanism for such exigencies. The point is that all initial interactions involve a mutual influence between participants and that in the early stages of any interaction there may inevitably be some degree of 'conflict'. However 'the game is to keep the interaction flowing, or if this is not possible, to terminate it. It is the way in which the interaction will be terminated which is affected by the comparative power or influence one has upon the other'.\(^2\)

**Model 1 : Simple Offence** (the 'standard' labelling theory)

A affects the removal of B, the assumption being that B has little choice about the matter.

---


\(^2\) Ibid., p.208.
Model 2 : Simple Defence

A, the more powerful, chooses to remove himself from the arena, leaving B isolated.

Model 3 : Submission

A influences B who readily removes himself from the interactional setting.

Model 4 : Coexistence

Both A and B are similarly powerful so that the conflicting interaction can be determined only when they agree to retreat.

Newman's models of conflict and deviance removal are of course for analytic purposes and they have the advantage of allowing the development of models which postulate processes of removal and processes of removal maintenance. However, an indication of some difficulties within the theory is given in the concluding sentence of the paper when Newman rather weakly is forced to hypothesise that rather than relating to something called 'deviance' perhaps 'the removal and isolation of deviants is merely a special case of the general differentiating processes operating in a society which separate "normals" from "normals", indeed, man from man.' The effect of such comments is that they either beg central questions about what sets 'deviance' apart from non-deviance or that they thwart systematic theoretical enquiry into this issue.

Newman's approach has the advantage of acknowledging that deviance is a phenomenon emanating from the moral ambience of everyday social interaction ('breakdown in interaction...is a moral breakdown') i) noting that relative power is vital to a consideration of deviance production; ii) recognising that the morality of everyday face-to-face interaction actually penetrates then permeates social structures at the level of organisation. ('when we are mindful of the intensity of the deviant images which the interactors may bring with them to the inter-actional setting, the differential perception of the

1 Ibid., p.215.
relevant rules, and the extent to which one or the other of the interactors has the support of a stronger group, the breakdown of interaction should have far-reaching consequences'. In developing 'some types of removal', Newman provides a descriptive typology which lacks any internal dynamic. In fact, having established that all interaction has its moral components, this point is sidestepped in order to distinguish between 'normal' and 'deviant' removal processes.

Generally speaking, these 'normal' segregational processes [such as segregated dining rooms or staggered factory lunch hours] do not rely upon the stigmatized label being applied to the members of the weaker group, mainly because the 'morality' dimension is probably lacking. On the contrary, it is not that the 'morality' dimension is lacking, it is rather that the evaluation is built-in, it is taken-for-granted, it is part of a Weberian framework of 'domination' or an example of Gouldner's 'normalised repression' - it is a moral evaluation of social interaction which 'everybody knows'. The effect of Newman's failure to theorise the power-morality connection in ordinary interaction is that there remains no means of ascertaining why one process (a stigmatising, deviant-making process) of removal or separation occurs and not another (a legitimated, 'normal' routinised removal).

In the case of the X school it will become apparent that the same forces operated at times to effect 'normal' segregation and at other times to effect deviance-removal. When events and circumstances became problematic there were a variety of interpretations; some of these imbued events and people with connotations of 'moral danger' which led to actions designed to repress or eliminate. Other interpretations carried connotations of 'liberation and freedom' implying actions ranging from either support, through further separation to isolation accompanied by surveillance. These events and their accompanying reactions, though varied and apparently

---

1 Ibid., p.211.
2 Ibid., p.212.
ambiguous, must nevertheless be comprehended sociologically as occurring within a social structure. Responses may have been varied but they were not random, neither was there an infinite range of possibilities. 'In this context' says Clarke, 'ideology is the crucial middle term, the mediation between ruling interests and problem groups.'

Differentiation or removal: the moral structuring of group interaction.

Why use deviance theory in support of a case-study examining the phenomenon of social order? The answer to the question depends firstly on granting the usefulness of seeing all schools as institutions dealing with people who have all the hallmarks of the classic 'deviant'. The issue then becomes one of investigating the meaning of 'alternative' schools and the essence of their viability. In the theoretical terminology that has been used to date, we need to know by what processes some schools come to be morally evaluated as 'special' and what processes lead to 'normalised' separation ('ordinary' schools) as distinct from deviant or stigmatised separation ('alternative' schools). It will be argued that 'alternative' schools and more particularly the X school, did not challenge their removal or separation per se (that, after all, is the basis of the institutional identity) however, there was a challenge made to the 'normalisation' of this separation. It was as if by maintaining an 'anti-normalisation' stance in a variety of changing organisational circumstances (without explicitly theorising this), the X school projected a morally ambiguous collective identity, which like the morally ambiguous identity of individual deviants, became available for special reactions and unusual forms of social control.

Deviance theory, of course, has usually focussed on individuals and individual deviance. Granted, groups of deviants such as Gay Liberation etcetera have also been studied in their own

right and as groups. However, this present study begins with a collectivity as the unit of analysis and works on the assumption that the significance of any one individual's behaviour (for the purposes of this study) can only be seen by reference to the collectivity - the X school. The fact that a child went to a cricket match or grew vegetables was not significant so much as the fact that the child was ostensibly a school-child and a member of a particular school - the X school. Alternative schools (and the X school) at first glance appear to be analysed as social movements. The point being however, that in many cases it is only the label (alternative school) that is a common characteristic of these schools whilst the social organisation and modes of social control vary between schools so greatly that the idea of analysing 'alternative schools as a social movement' is not theoretically feasible. The point needs to be emphasised that deviance theory is being used to analyse social control as it operates within and around a particular collectivity.

It is in respect of the relationship of the group, the X school, to its institutional environment, that Michael Clarke's work is relevant. Clarke, like Davis, recognises firstly that labelling of deviants and deviant groups inasmuch as it involves power - is a political struggle. Secondly, since such struggles are socially constrained, there is a need to investigate the social structures within which the labellers may range, in order to identify the limits of their power and the effects of these limits.

An account of this range and of some of the problems posed by its use is hence a precondition of understanding fully a) why particular labels get stuck on particular kinds of deviants and b) why certain labels are more popular than others at particular points in time.¹

The argument is now revolving about the need to recognise the effects of social structures (and both people's membership and apprehension of these) on the everyday theorising of deviance categories. Turning again to Berger and Luckmann's discussion of legitimation, they note that with the production of specialised

¹ Ibid., p.408.
legitimizing theories and full-time administrators of legitimating theory, then legitimation goes beyond pragmatic application to the realm of 'pure theory'.

... legitimation begins to attain a measure of autonomy vis a vis the legitimated institutions and eventually may generate its own institutional processes.¹

That is, we are referring to the differentiation of legitimation knowledge that separately attaches to schools (as organisations), to the educational process (curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation), to educational theory (the philosophy of education), to the educational administrative process and educational administration theory. The legitimation of education has developed a range of knowledges, each with special interest groups. Clarke, addressing these knowledges as ideologies, claims that social problems (in this case within the institution of education) will be conceived according to constraints operating on the ideologies of particular interest groups. Briefly, social problems of education (educational deviance) will be conceived differently from within a framework of educational administration than from within a framework of educational process.

Clarke argues that the limits to the range of ideological conceptions of social problems (or deviance) can be conceptualised within two dimensions, 'whether the action at issue is collective or individual, and whether the actors are deliberate and conscious or unconscious and determined'.² Eventually Clarke refines this typology to take account on the one hand of the fact of formal organisations intruding themselves between the individual and the broader collectivity and on the other hand of the thorny issue of some deviants earning a moral stigmatisation whilst consciousness and responsibility for their actions are nevertheless denied them. (Cripples and other people in what Goffman calls disvalued roles, fall into this latter category.) This problem of implying moral responsibility on the part of people whose position is nevertheless

² ibid., p.409.

Clarke, op.cit.,
seen to be a determined rather than a deliberate one, is much better expressed via McHugh's concepts of conventionality and theoreticity. 1 These concepts refer, in the case of conventionality, to members' common-sense recognition that a deviant act 'might not have been' or 'might have been otherwise'. Theoreticity refers to an act the agent of which is deemed to 'know what he's doing'. McHugh is arguing that deviance has to do with members' rules for moral characterisation of people and acts, not the concrete acts themselves.

A moral observer cannot grade his subjects by looking at the doing of a behaviour the way arithmetic teachers grade theirs by looking at the doing of a multiplication. And again, it is not because observers are weak or uninformed, nor because the moral rules are merely more complex, but because moral rules are incomparably and qualitatively distinctive. We never talk about the 'erosion' of arithmetic, for example, but this is easy with morality, because deviance is always a conventional-theoretic charge. Moral rules not only permit but create and require the possibility of argument, denial and confirmation.

With all this in mind then, we will construct Clarke's typology with a view to extracting a more detailed section when it comes to looking at the variety of ideologies as they relate to education and schools in the context of three generalised political positions - conservative, liberal and radical.

1 P. McHugh, 1970, op.cit.
2 Ibid., p.85.
### A 'Common-Sense' Classification of Deviance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Common-sense' moral rules</th>
<th>Collectivity</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Maximum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evil</td>
<td>Theoretic/ conventional</td>
<td>Revolution</td>
<td>Mafia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Theoretic/ non-conventional</td>
<td>Lynch mob</td>
<td>Suttee, Kamikaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Conventional/ non-theoretic</td>
<td>Riot mob</td>
<td>War criminals (Calley's platoon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathetic</td>
<td>Non-conventional/ non-theoretic</td>
<td>Crowd panic</td>
<td>Group neurosis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Minimum) - degree of social threat corresponds to degree of moral imputation

---

* Extract section used for examining ideological approaches to schools and education as social problems.
A 'Common-sense Classification of Deviance.

In the above table the examples filling the typological spaces created are partly derived from Clarke's work. Before moving to Clarke's discussion of particular ideologies and problems in their operation, we will extract that section of the table of particular value and relevance for looking at X school. Since it was always acknowledged by all interest groups as a school and since it was a formal organisation (as distinct from a random collectivity such as a crowd) - then the left column and bottom row are irrelevant. So too is the top row since no argument was ever explicitly advanced which saw the X school as a place of training for revolutionaries or criminals. In pointing to how the style of reaction to social problems and the choice of alternative actions varies according to the political position of the reacting agent - Clarke has constructed a generalised diagram which relates conservative, liberal and radical politics to the way threats to social order are seen, and the response in terms of slogans, strategies of control, and tactics of implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response level</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Radical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Anarchy</td>
<td>Social malfunction</td>
<td>Redefinition of 'problem' and translocation to elites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan</td>
<td>Law'n'order</td>
<td>Sick society</td>
<td>Expropriation of elites; revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Repression/discipline</td>
<td>Long hard look</td>
<td>Democratization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic</td>
<td>More police</td>
<td>Royal Commission</td>
<td>Propaganda; Guerilla war</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. M. Clarke, op.cit., p.414.

Clarke's work is reproduced as an aid to understanding the range of ideological response to social problems. We are interested in it on the assumption that at some time or other, for many interest groups, the X school came to be defined via members' rules of conventionality.
and theoreticity as a social problem, a deviant organisation. For Clarke, conservative responses to social problems are in terms of the imminent collapse of the social order and the need for decisive action to buttress it. In contrast, there is a tendency by liberals to identify what they see as social malfunctions which need to be identified, investigated and manipulated rather than repressed. The radical response is to challenge the definition of the problem, to see it perhaps as a symptom of pressure originating outside the problem group and to argue for radical change in the future whilst presently agitating for democratisation and organising for consciousness of oppression by stigmatised groups.

Once the X school, or groups or individuals came to be seen by other groups or individuals as a social problem, there was such a variety of reactions that when everyday or commonplace categories of education or social interaction or politics were used to construct accounts - these accounts were often so conflicting in their interpretation of events as to make each other appear superficial. In other words, when different criteria were being used by members to answer questions, 'could it have been otherwise?' 'did they know what they were doing?' - conflicting responses to apparently objective questions produced confusion and anomie. (For a start there were continual divisions over the degree to which people attending schools - school children - could be held to be morally responsible individuals.)

The following and modified section of Clarke's original typology is meant to point to some of the possible conflicts in ideological accounts and to point to sources of confusion. At the outset it should be noted that the categories organisation and individual are included in the table because interpretations of events surrounding the X school from almost all interest groups, fluctuated between identifying problems as having their source with particular individuals or in some organisational or collective dimension of the X school. (This confusion in part harks back to the preoccupation of many participants in the X school - with the nature of the relationship between social roles, social positions and personal identity. An important issue which will be raised again elsewhere.)
### 'Common-sense- Deviance and Associated Ideologies'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'BAD'</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretic Non-conventional</td>
<td>Control by closure</td>
<td>Change reorganisation/leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'SAD'</td>
<td>Control by reintegration with mainstream or redefinition</td>
<td>Investigation and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional non-theoretic</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Radical</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Radical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The comments within the table are specifically oriented around the idea of how various individuals associated with different interest groups, went about the process of identifying the X school as a social problem or deviant group. Here we will be explicating the table rather than looking at actual events or circumstances. Numbers 1 and 2 refer to conservative responses to an organisation which is perceived as abnormal and requiring social control. In space number one the 'theoretic' element implies that the organisation quite clearly 'knows what it is about'. Although there is no question either that the organisation can be seen as responsible for its program and that (from the conservative standpoint) this program is a threat to social order, nevertheless the 'non-conventional' element involves a recognition that the organisation is a school and that schools per se are acceptable organisations. The problem is that in the conservative judgement we have a school whose avowed aims are 'bad'. In space number two the 'non-theoretic' element implies that the aims of this social group are so confused that the group itself can scarcely be held responsible for what it is doing. Allied to this, the 'conventional' element suggests that there were/are alternative lines of (organisational) action open to the group which include other options apart from that of a school - a therapeutic community, for example. The conservative ideology of control in space number one will emphasise the clear dangers to social order and tend to argue for control via closure and elimination of the organisation as it is constituted. In space number two the ideology will argue for control either by the re-integration, or the 'proper' integration of the organisation into the mainstream institution of education - or the redefinition of the organisation into a separate non-educational area. If the social problem as conceived within the conservative reaction is not one of a social group, but of particular individuals, then the control ideologies will also vary. In space number three the individual deviant will be seen as 'theoretic' (wilful, responsible, 'knowing what they're up to') but 'non-conventional' (having little choice of action arena, for example, being under school-leaving age). In space number four the individual deviant is 'non-theoretic' (cannot be held entirely responsible for their behaviour) yet 'conventional' (has a choice of action arenas).
In this case the person may in principle be able to choose between work and school. For the first person in space number three, the conservative control ideology will stress discipline and repression, possibly with separation but only as it aids the strong control measures. For the second person in space number four the conservative control ideology will reverse the previous priority stressing control via exclusion or separation over discipline or repression.

The liberal ideologies of control at the level of the organisation will vary between that of space number five where the emphasis on 'theoreticity' will lead to arguments in favour of changing the leadership or changing the organisational structure - to space number six where close investigation and expert guidance will be summoned. At the level of individual deviancy or abnormality the liberal control ideologies will vary between deviance-removal of an authoritarian bent (space number seven - 'remove the rotten apples') and that of a more ameliorative tone (space number eight, therapeutic isolation). These latter responses both revolve around the issue of 'theoreticity'.

The radical approach to ideologies of control is qualitatively different to that of both conservatives and liberals. The radical approach in fact rejects the proposition that the social problem can properly be conceptualised at the level of the organisation itself. The argument is that what others define as a problem - a question of deviance, is better conceived as a symptom; that what others see as a cause of social disruption is better viewed as an effect of poor integration at a broader social institutional level. Thus in response at the organisational level to the determination of 'theoreticity-non-conventionality' (space number nine - 'this is a bad school'), the radical position is to argue that problems at the institutional level have created difficulties for the school which comes mistakenly to be seen as the problem. The program advanced in relation to space number nine is one of militant organisation in order to 'hold the line'. In space number ten, once again problems at the institutional level have allowed the construction of a pseudo-problem. The idea being that it is not the school which is confused in its aims - these aims are simply difficult to articulate given other widespread but erroneous presuppositions about the meaning of education. The program
advanced is one of democratisation and 'consciousness-raising' as a means of defense against the 'non-theoreticity' label. From the radical standpoint individual 'deviants' will tend to be 'taken on their merits'. The control ideology may well be in terms of a policy on selection with the emphasis being on either integration through 'commitment' or simple exclusion. Social control from the radical orientation is much more likely to stress operation at the symbolic level with violation represented, for example, by a loss or lack of commitment rather than physical separation. Non-attendance or truancy then is an issue with the potential to be interpreted in quite different ways by radicals on the one hand, and liberal/conservatives on the other. For one group it is crucial to be present 'in spirit', for the other group to be physically present is the test of effectiveness of control. It was no accident then that the issues of attendance and 'head-counting' versus 'commitment' or closure and therapy versus separation and 'consciousness-raising' were critical points over which opinions varied widely and strongly.

Social Problem Ideologies: From Private Knowledge to Public Accounts.

The essence of this section is to show that the operation of social problem ideologies (successfully or otherwise) is dependent on the generation of public accounts. The categories which are used in these public exercises of justification, are themselves important elements in a discourse of moral imputation. Accounts are the sociological equivalents of individual motives, but the media of public knowledge generation and exchange also exert their own influence in the process of deviance definition and resolution.

In discussing some typical difficulties in the operation of social problem ideologies, Clarke¹ makes it clear that what is important is the presentation and interpretation of public knowledge. Although Scott and Lyman originally developed the concept of 'accounts' to deal with the face-to-face negotiation of social order, nevertheless the concept can serve well in the area of public

¹ M. Clarke, 1976, op.cit.
categories and discourse. The notion of 'accounts' was designed to avoid simultaneously the reductionist psychological connotations of the term 'motive' and the spurious unconsciousness of 'rationalisation' - whilst preserving the idea of social force and facticity. (The concept has its roots in Mills' 'vocabulary of motives' and its difficulties resemble those involved in translating Durkheim's 'conscience collective'.) Accounts are divided into excuses - 'an admission that the act in question was bad, wrong or inept, coupled with a denial of full responsibility', and justifications - 'an admission of full responsibility for the act in question, coupled with a denial that it was wrongful'. The connection with McHugh's 'common-sense' rules of theoreticity ('did he know what he was doing?') and 'conventionality' ('could it have been any other way?') is close enough for their practical amalgamation. In the conjunction of accounts and theoreticity/conventionality we have the basis for the everyday theorising of order and deviance within a social framework that invokes interest groups, ideologies and social structure - a sociological analogue of motivation as it pertains to deviance and social order.

The study of accounts - by which individuals and groups bridge the gap between the promised and the performed, the expected and the actual, and the surprising and the routine - focusses attention on a basic mechanism of social order. Accounts which are deemed appropriate and acceptable allow a presumption of normality.

...the label of deviant can be attached successfully to an actor only if he is unable to relieve himself of the negative interpretation of his intentions. If he is able to offer an acceptable account (an excuse or justification) for his presumed untoward action, his behaviour is no longer deviant. When his account is honored, we may say that his deviance has been neutralized.

2 Ibid., p.113.
3 Ibid., p.91.
However, in pluralistic societies or situations where audiences to whom accounts are given do not share similar values or the same universe of discourse, then 'the value pattern and moral beliefs of the power structure tends to take precedence over all other value structures and moralities'.

Public Accounts, Deviance Imputation and Amplification.

In our society there is a considerable variety of sources of public knowledge. Public documents and productions of the various news media are two important ones, with the media especially fulfilling functions with respect to accounts of putative deviance. With respect to public documents, deviance and the deliberation of public instrumentalities, McHugh has remarked

...conventionality and theoreticity can be used to study social change....At one time, for example, decisions about deviance were mostly the province of lay persons as members of the same collectivity. Now, however, many of these deliberations rest with experts in bureaucratically rationalized organisations, often with rather different results than before.

In writing this way no doubt McHugh had in mind those bureaucracies dealing with criminals, the sick and insane and various minority groups such as aborigines. However, what he has to say has increasing salience in societies where there is a declining consensus on the role, function and meaning of the institution of education. When viewed from the perspective of power and social deviance, education and its presentation in the mass media make questions of order and social control peculiarly salient.

Quite a deal of research has been conducted relating to deviance as it has been portrayed and presented in the mass media, and the effects of this portrayal, firstly on the media itself, secondly on the form of deviance, and thirdly on the public as

1 Ibid., p.107. Hermann Melville treats the themes of accounts, deviance and power, with great insight and sensitivity in two of his short stories, 'Bartleby the Scrivener' and 'Billy Budd, Sailor'.
2 P. McHugh, 1970, op.cit., p.84.
audience. However, the material has generally referred to the 'conventional' deviances ranging from criminality and sexual deviance to political deviance. It has been extensively argued that the mass media tend to work within a framework that takes for granted the social and political status quo and which assumes that the social institutions within our society function on the basis of a value consensus.

Its basic model of society is that of a democratic consensus where a considerable measure of agreement occurs over the legitimate nature of the existing political and economic arrangements. This paradigm might in fact 'work' for many events but the problems and contradictions arise when the media are asked to explain those groups and phenomena which explicitly deny this consensual world view, for example, Black Power, the New Left, unofficial strikes, the Gay Liberation Movement, the formation of prisoners' unions. To face this challenge, the media adopt an analysis - and hence, implicitly, a mode of selection - which defuses the reality of alternative conceptions of social order. It does not allow such phenomena an integrity of their own, but instead characterises them as 'meaningless', 'immature' or 'senseless', as involving a misunderstanding of reality rather than an alternative interpretation of its nature.

The institution of education thus tends to be taken for granted, its problems are typically conceived in terms of the assumed value consensus. Problems may arise for example, over questions of administration, or from equitable resource distribution, or as a result of 'scandals' which in turn derive their meaning from within the conventional moral framework of deviance; property, sexuality, 'authority', health and productivity being the key themes.

Alternative schools present problems because they are 'in' but not 'of' the institution of education as conventionally conceived. The very coining of the term 'alternative school' and its production and use by the media exemplifies problems of

3 The reference is not to any actual state of affairs here so much as to education as it is displayed and discussed in the mass media.
distortion and stereotyping which typify the presentation of social problems and deviance in the media. Judgements are encouraged on the basis of constructed categories, and what Cohen calls 'manufactured news inventories' whose ideological form when taken as reality begins to function as a powerful myth.¹

The problem is compounded when the terminology used by the media, initially for ease of categorisation, becomes absorbed into the literature of professional debate on education. The notion of a 'deviant school' presents the mass media with a contradiction that has its parallels in other areas of deviance. For homosexuals as well as alcoholics and drug addicts the mass media may simultaneously sustain definitions that are contradictory or mutually exclusive.² In the case of prostitution, where heterosexuality and normal business ethics are juxtaposed, a genuine mythology is created which has its foundation and legitimation in a quasi-functionalist interpretation. The assumption is made that there is a consensus about optimum levels of 'vice'. Moral absolutism is tempered with pragmatism in a way which sustains status quo definitions of respectability.³

¹ Ref. S. Cohen and J. Young, 1973, op.cit. An explicit connection between the media's implicit use of paradigms of social order and deviance in the production of news inventories is made by Cohen. 'Labelling theorists have drawn attention to the complex nature of the screening and coding process whereby certain forms of rule-breaking are picked out for attention [the application of 'common-sense- rules of conventionality-theoreticity]. Such processes relate to social control as a whole and not just the media. The media reflected the real conflict of interests that existed at various levels....In such situations the media adjudicate between competing definitions of the situation, and as these definitions are made in a hierarchical context - agents of social control are more likely to be believed than deviants - it is clear which definition, will win out in an ambiguous and shifting situation.' (p.240)

² Ref. F. Pearce, 1973, 'How to be immoral and ill, pathetic and dangerous, all at the same time: mass media and the homosexual', in S. Cohen and J. Young, 1973, op.cit., p.284.

³ On the connection between moral absolutism, social order and deviance see J. Young, 1971, The Drugtakers, Paladin, London, ch.2, 'The absolutist monolith'.

The media by processes of selection, exaggeration, distortion and symbolisation,1 construct their own 'information' which is used by them (and subsequently by other powerful figures such as administrators and 'experts') as the public informational basis for 'accounts' (Scott and Lyman) of deviance. Media-constructed categories are used in these justifications and excuses that are then publicly elaborated. It is this public information, often stereotypical in form, which is the basis for social reaction. I will argue that social reaction in part, consists of the media-dominated decision to apply McHugh's 'common-sense' rules of theorecticity and conventionality. The argument tout court, is that the role of the media is to arbitrate the application of the 'common-sense' rules of deviance in a way which simultaneously gives the impression of neutral information gathering and dissemination ('publishing the news') but which nevertheless projects issues as having a special moral significance or salience. For schools that are identified by the mass media as 'normal' (and this is usually by default - it just so happens that 'news' has not been 'made'), there is no special awareness of deviance as an attribute of the school. It is 'normal' to produce accounts justifying the status quo ('boys will be boys'; 'it's natural to have periods of high spiritedness - it lets off steam'). However, if there is perceived to be a challenge to the moral boundaries within which such accounts are produced - then there is either a problem or a scandal.2

---

1 Symbolisation refers to the imbuing of neutral words with complex ideas and emotions giving them symbolic power. A word (punk) may come to symbolise a certain status (deviant), objects (hair style, clothing) symbolise the word and the objects themselves may symbolise the status. Hence a British magistrate's reference to 'these long-haired, mentally unstable, petty little hoodlums, these sawdust Caesars who can only find courage like rats, in hunting in packs'. Ref. S. Cohen and J. Young in S. Cohen, 1973, op.cit., ch.2.

2 For an elaboration of the distinction between 'problems' and 'scandals' as they refer to the involvement of non-elites and elites, see M. Clarke, 1976, op.cit., p.415.
At the same time that the media concerns itself with defining public information that reduces ambiguity of meaning and allows unequivocal moral decisions to be made, the mass media also communicate messages at a more abstract level. The very forms in which public information is presented in the mass media (as distinct from the substance), possess a variability which communicate mythological messages. The theory for this science of signs or semiology is not relevant here; what is relevant is that such media myths are important with respect to messages about symbolic universes and threats to these.\(^1\) The complaint that was made earlier about the concept of 'symbolic universes' was that the elements of these were not linked to any theorising of power and its distribution in society, especially as this connected with questions of the adjudication of morality. For this, Gouldner's concept of 'normalised repression' was employed. The link between 'normalised repression' and the myth-producing capabilities of the mass media is that media myths similarly function to eliminate the joining of power and social norms.

Myth is depoliticised speech. One must naturally understand political in its deeper meaning, as describing the whole of human relations in their real, social structure, in their power of making the world....Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact. If I state the fact of French imperialism without explaining it, I am very near to finding that it is natural and goes without saying, I am reassured.

The mass media in producing the category of social deviance, or alternatively, in reducing ambiguity to abnormality, effect a form of collective normalised repression. If an alternative school is simply characterised as an 'abnormal' school, the history and the structures

---


of power involved in the production of this category (not of the school itself) are denied. The category remains for the consumers of the myth, a natural one with a truth that is taken for granted. The media thus may facilitate the acceptance of the contradiction of a deviant school.

The closure/reopening of X school and the problem of social order and control.

Early events, conflicts and confusions surrounding the X school were intimately connected with the form and development of later events. Definitions of what occurred were constantly being amended or revised in the light either of further events or of others' interpretations. For this reason it is proposed to make an adaptation of what Young has called a deviance amplification spiral. In his book The Drugtakers, Young was centrally concerned with the effect of unfolding definitions of the situation as they affected the course of later social interaction, and the understanding of preceding interaction. Young attenuated a series of deviance amplification spirals, however the one which is of prime concern in this work is the fifth spiral 'The Self-fulfilling Prophecy Fantasy'.

In each of his deviance amplification spirals, Young presents drug-taking as something perceived as a solution to an initial (unspecified) problem for the potential drugtakers. In the self-fulfilling prophecy fantasy, a series of agents and agencies selectively misperceive the nature of the phenomenon of drugtaking. For the agents and the drugtaker there exists differences in perception based in part, on different modes of theorising deviance as indicated by the absolutist and relativist conceptions of deviance.

In this study the initial problem will be seen as the problem of social order and social control. In place of Young's

---

1 J. Young, 1971, op.cit., ch.5, esp. p.113 ff.
2 Ibid., ch.3.
The SFP Amplification Spiral and the X School

1. ORDER AND CONTROL IN SCHOOL
   - CONTROL IN SCHOOL
   - WEAK CLASSIFICATION AND FRAMING AS SOLUTION (BERNSTEIN'S INTEGRATED CODE)

2. (selective misperception) - (drug-taking solution)
   - (social agencies) ~-------(selective misperception)----(drug-taking ~
   - PARENTS, TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS
   - WEAK CLASSIFICATION AND FRAMING AS SOLUTION
   - ADMINISTRATORS

3. (introjection of stereotypes) - IDEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTATION
   - LOW MORALE
   - LOW SOCIAL COHESION
   - (pervasion of image through therapy and media)
     - MEDIA PRESENT 'CONCRETE ISSUES'

4. (change in structural position of drugtaker)
   - X SCHOOL A 'PROBLEM'
   - ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL
   - COPE WITH INVESTIGATION
   - INTERNAL POLARISATION ON 'NEW' PROBLEMS

5. (positive feedback)

6. (confirmation of original stereotype: theory 'proved')
   - CONFIRMATION ONLY OF CONFUSION
   - IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT HOLDS
   - POTENTIAL FOR INCREASINGLY OVERT POLITICISATION OF ISSUES.
   - QUESTIONS OF ORDER AND CONTROL BECOME ACUTE.

7. (increased commitment in terms of drugtaking stereotype)
   - POLARISATION HARDENS ROUNDED COMMITMENT TO VARYING SOCIAL PROBLEM IDEOLOGIES

CONFLICT BETWEEN SOCIAL PROBLEM IDEOLOGIES
- 'CONSERVATIVE' - elimination via closure and/or 'reintegration'
- 'LIBERAL' - control via definition of proper leadership
- 'RADICAL' - control via restructuring institutional environment

DEVIANCE SPIRAL HAS MOVED PROBLEM FROM THE LEVEL OF ADMINISTRATION AND RHETORIC OF EFFICIENCY TO LEVEL OF POLITICS AND RHETORIC OF POWER AND PROPRIETY.
drugtaking as a solution, there will be substituted the idea of 'alternative schooling' as a solution to the problem of integrating new paradigms of knowledge and social control, learning and social organisation, socialisation, and the transmission of culture. Young's diagram of the self-fulfilling prophecy deviance amplification spiral will be presented, modified then used as a framework for simultaneously covering the case-study material and the theoretical issues of social order and control in an institution of cultural transmission.

Summary Remarks.

The closure and re-opening of an 'alternative' school is being taken as the opportunity to investigate the production of and conflict between different social control ideologies. A set of concrete events has allowed for a sociological account of conflict over the legitimation of forms of social control and cultural transmission. The aim is to use the concept of 'deviance' to illustrate peoples' attempts to direct the course of conflict between different (and in an organisational context) competing definitions of social order.

One procedure is to understand how people use 'common-sense' rules of deviance in their accounts of social interaction and how such accounts are constrained by their own group interests in the form of social problem ideologies.

A form of Bernstein's collection code of educational transmission is identified as currently institutionalized in a position of orthodoxy, legitimated within a symbolic universe based on positivist science and scientific rationality. It is argued that the X school can be seen as having become available for control as a deviant institution by separation and removal out to the margins of the moral boundaries of educational orthodoxy.

In elaborating the production of common-sense theories of deviance of people in everyday interaction, the mass media are invoked as a source of public accounts of deviance. In mass media
accounts, however, an ideology of consensus may constrain such accounts in a way that leads to an amplification of deviance.

The method involves the gathering and analysis of members' accounts of what were 'issues' at the X school. In addition to members' accounts, documentary material is presented and analysed. Documentary material comes in the form of school 'position' papers, newspaper reports, Education Department files, letters, memoranda and records of interview. These accounts are analysed in terms of peoples' attempts to 'make sense' of situations which appeared almost constantly to be changing. Accounts themselves, then, were partly constitutive of the order they purported to analyse. Accounts were 'triangulated', that is, compared across individuals, groups and documents, but the purpose was not primarily to verify the 'true' state of affairs - to write the 'real' history of events at X school. (However, a considerable amount of research is related to producing some rudimentary history of events.) Rather, these accounts are analysed in terms of whether people saw the issues as involving individuals or a collectivity and whether those people involved were perceived a) to 'know what they were doing' (theoreticity); b) to have had available a choice of action which would have avoided an 'issue' (conventionality). The total or partial application of these 'rules' is connected with the amount of 'deviance' generated and is set against actual outcomes and actions.

The extent to which 'deviance' is produced via accounts and related social interaction may be taken as a measure of the degree of difficulty of institutionalising and legitimating a mode of social organisation with its accompanying forms of order and control that are different or run counter to prevailing orthodoxies.
A recurrent theme of criticism in the field of deviance, especially those studies loosely described as using the labelling and phenomenological perspectives, is the failure to connect face-to-face interactions and such microsociological events and analyses, with a recognition and systematic theoretical accounting for wider social structures and members' understandings of these. Manning remarks that the 'Tendency to see the important and significant aspects of the labelling process as those surrounding interaction seems to retard the capacity of analysts to construct an analytically sound picture of institutional and political processes.'

Whilst the notion of deviance, or at least the phenomenon of deviance, will be used frequently in this study from the point of its representing properties of social order, the above criticisms are well taken. Some systematic attempt must be made to go beyond what Rock has called 'a description of legislation and rule-making which embodies [no] more than anthropomorphic conspiracy theory'.

What happens in terms of understanding about the nature of rules, rule-breaking and their associated sorts of authority, will vary between situations and their social contexts, even where the same individuals are directly involved. The idea is that there exists layers of meaning (including norms which may be directly in conflict one with another), 'it is possible to discover tiers and clusters of meaning, each with its own contours, and each related to some larger principle of stratification. At the deeper levels it [the analysis] might unearth understandings which are so universally taken for granted that they are not even noticed by those who maintain them. These background

beliefs permit transactions to develop between structurally distant groups', or, stated differently, 'quite detailed communication is possible between seemingly disparate groups. What may be treated at one level as pluralism can, on another, be seen as participation in a common universe of linguistic symbolic and gestural styles'.

The language of face-to-face interaction only partly reflects the realities of the surrounding world of social institutions and their processes. How these structures actually work is necessarily concealed in part from people because at the same time that structures are constraining, they are open to change since social structures only exist via their continual affirmation by people in interaction. It is only thus conceived that change is theoretically made possible, reification is avoided, yet the constraints of social structure remain available for analysis. At the X school, conflicting modes of theorising order and power led members to seek mediation via what they saw to be more powerful structures. 'Meaning' and 'understanding' are here seen and used not merely as sociological methods or concepts; rather they are viewed as central ontological characteristics of human social life and are, therefore, integral in a constitutive way.

In the following history of the X school, the material is derived from interview and documentary material but is essentially the production of this writer. The history is linked with interpretations deriving from theoretical material already outlined. The chapter itself is necessary to cope first of all with the fact that as the early interview data was being gathered, respondents were simultaneously providing a history of events as well as their interpretation of the significance of those events. Very often these interpretations were reflexive inasmuch as the interviewees distinguished between what they knew 'then' (when the recalled events were occurring) and what they knew 'now' (as they were interviewed). The interviewer's notes consisted of parallel but related concerns. Questions of historical matters were set out by the researcher at the same time as questions which might illuminate how the respondents

\[1 \text{Ibid., pp.147, 148.}\]
produced a sensible account from the information they had to hand.
In effect a number of unfolding and extending summary histories were
written by the interviewer. Some idea of the extent to which one set
of historical material was effected by others can be conveyed by the
fact that it was not until after most of the interviews were conducted
that access was gained to Education Department files. This material
considerably clarified and altered the writer's understanding of the
history, as well as providing a great deal more insight into various
interpretive accounts. When these circumstances are coupled with the
necessity to refer to people involved by coded initials, then it
will be clear why a summary of events is produced at the outset. The
associated sociological commentary will serve to orient later more
detailed discussions of particular issues and circumstances.

When the XI school opened in February of Year I, it did so
in a fashion which set it apart from most other schools, including
'alternative' schools which were already operating within the
administrative orbit of the Education Department. The XI school was
not opened for conventional reasons such as demographic growth, it
was, from the outset, an avowed 'experiment', a special project that
had been the 'brainchild' of its first coordinator, SJ. However,
the authority for SJ to set up such an experimental school derived
from the Director of Secondary Education, who at that time was CT
and who had been personally approached by SJ and who subsequently took
a personal interest in the XI school until his retirement shortly
after its establishment.¹ The arguments produced in favour of the
establishment of XI at the time are not known, however a number of
XI school supporters subsequently remarked firstly that to their
knowledge such an association resulting in such a school was unusual
(if not unique), and secondly, that some people felt that each of

¹ In none of the historical summaries subsequently written by X school
supporters, was there any reference to changes in the directorship
of the Secondary Education Division as a factor which may have been
a salient feature in the course of events.
the men may have been satisfied that the school would in part serve their own special purposes.¹

The Xl school was administratively set up as an annexe to a metropolitan High School (the 'D' school), after the Director of Secondary Education (CT) approached the principal of the D school (KF). KF acceded to CT's request that the Xl school be annexed to the D school.² The organisational status of 'annexe' was one which existed elsewhere in the Education Department and it seems to have been taken-for-granted for some months that the categories of administration/organisation were kept as conceptually separate from the categories of curriculum/pedagogy/evaluation, by the coordinators, staff and supporters of the Xl annexe, as they were by Education Department officials, including KF, the principal of D school. However in May of Year I, an Education Department officer drafted a formal letter relating to the establishment of Xl and addressed to KF. The letter will be called the 'letter patent' and analysis of its possible implications in various contexts will be reserved for a later section.

Although the establishment of the Xl school had eventuated in part out of the relationship of SJ as coordinator and CT as Director of

¹ It was never possible to interview SJ who left the Xl school in mid Year II. Nor was CT, the then Director of Secondary Education, interviewed. However, a number of points need to be made about the coverage of this period. The impressions of the Xl school and the arguments used by participants and interviewees, produced via their own recall, after, and including their interpretation of subsequent events, is an adequate basis for this part of the thesis. It is assumed that interview material would have presented a different picture of events earlier in time, if in fact the interviews had been conducted earlier. This thesis focusses on interviewees' interpretations of early events in the light of their knowledge of the official investigation, closure and re-opening of the school. All interviewees understood the investigator's purpose to be focussed on the closure and re-opening of X school.

² Appendix S gives details of relevant organisational structure and personnel within the Education Department.
Secondary Education, the 'letter patent' of May Year I marks, in documentary form, the end of that association. It is a document which marks the beginning of the time in which SG succeeded CT to the position of Director of Secondary Education and there was no information of a documentary nature to indicate why there had been no charter statement within the Education Department prior to May of Year I, or what prompted the 'letter patent' of that month. Despite the fact that from its inception the Xl school had been described as an experiment, there appears to have been little or no attempt by way of formal definition to indicate what would constitute an evaluation of the experiment or by what criteria it could be judged if it were to continue. The general point concerning evaluation is important in the light of a number of other features of the Xl school. Firstly, the original coordinator of Xl school (SJ) was appointed in a way which made no formal provision for his successor's appointment should that become necessary for any reason, furthermore all seven original staff members were chosen by SJ. In addition to playing a large part in the establishment of the school and the selection of its staff, SJ was able to make it clear to prospective students and their parents that the educational inspiration for Xl was A.S. Neill's school Summerhill in England. Parents of all the original student intake were encouraged to read Neill's book of the same name. Under the close direction of SJ, the school published a document setting out the educational philosophy of the X school.1

The Xl School and the Integrated Code.

It can be argued that a form of ideological consensus in a form of integrated code at the Xl school was initially maintained via the personal efforts of SJ. The weak classification and weak framing of the Xl school was apparent in the lack of formally separated subject areas and the flexible use of time. Evaluation was also a function of weak frames and classification. There certainly was no formal dependence on tests or regular performance of acquired skills. Emphasis was placed on the personal attributes of individual students.

1 Appendix B.
SP: And SJ... carried on and gave them long speeches at all the general meetings. Telling them and us and everybody, with great emotion at all times, not to worry when your child was sitting under a tree just doing nothing - but eventually it would all come good.¹

The attempt to produce what Bernstein called a teachers-based, across-subjects, integrated code at the X1 school is nicely illustrated in the document titled '[X1]school: A general statement of school philosophy'. In terms of the range of information included, the low degree of insulation between contents and the high degree of mutual control of teachers and taught over the selection, organisation and pacing of knowledge transmitted, and finally the open-ended, multiple-criteria approach to evaluation, all these factors point to a clear form of integrated code.²

The following are extracts from the general statement of the philosophy of X1 school, the full document is available as Appendix B. Under the sub-heading of 'The Individual and the School Community' we read:

The principle upon which the school operates is that education is a total experience.

Our aim is that knowledge and learning will arise from, and be integral to, the individual's own experience of the world.

... We believe in working through co-operation in all spheres of school life. Co-operation is the effective antithesis of competition.

The next sub-heading deals with School/Community and includes inter alia

Our aim is to develop in children, and in ourselves, a social conscience which enables us to see how the ideas and practices in the school relate to society as a whole.

The school must confront and understand its social context in the most perceptive and challenging ways possible.

The school should help the student to be aware of the wider society and be able to examine it critically.

---

¹ SP/LP interview.
² B. Bernstein, 1971, op.cit.
It is in the next section that emphasis is placed on changing the traditional separation and insulation between subject matters; pedagogy and teacher-pupil relationships.

Curriculum/Teaching/Learning

If we define the curriculum of the school as 'the total of the experiences offered or planned within a school leading to changes in knowledge or behaviour of those attending', then we have gone beyond the narrow idea of curriculum as being confined to knowledge gained in certain subject areas.

... The curriculum offered should be open to wide choice within it and should embrace at least the Arts, Physical and Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, Mathematics and Physical Education. (The Arts are taken to cover literature, visual and manual arts, music, film and drama.)

- All, or any of these, need not be offered as separate 'disciplines' nor should they necessarily be regularly sampled by each student, nor should there be any fixed pattern of learning in the school.

- That this range of studies be readily available to the student throughout his school life, along with informed guidance and encouragement for the selection of individual learning programmes.

To this more 'total' sense of curriculum:

That the curriculum of the school is the totality of the social experiences which change its members' views of the world and themselves.

...

The staff of the school see teaching as the assistance, guidance and inspiration of learning.

They believe that there should be constant evaluation of the individual development of a child between the child and the teacher, which can be discussed with parents.

There is no place for competitive assessment.

The appropriate form of assessment for any activity or experience should depend upon the nature of that experience and, if necessary, involve a co-operative agreement between teacher and student.

It is under the heading of 'School Organisation' that a system of weak framing is made clear.

Organisation should be flexible enough to encourage varied groupings of students, teachers and subjects.

Organisation should permit the development of understanding and concern between all members of the school and its surrounding community.
The nature of the relationships which are made between parents, students, teachers and all of those involved in the school is at the heart of the school life. The school is built upon close, personally determined working arrangements. We therefore see the organisation of the school as a network of personal relationships. We value the individual, and respect their experience and needs. A child who is respected can learn at his or her own pace, without fear of failure, without fear of ridicule.

....

In working to fulfil these aims, in the context of the prevailing Education System, we hope to become a truly alternative school.

This final sentence, referring to a 'truly alternative school' which would operate within the State-funded education system seems to reinforce the implication that any contradictions between this philosophy and instructions couched in traditional categories in the 'letter patent' addressed to KF, principal of D school, would be resolved via the personal efforts of SJ and KF. In a summary of the operation of the Xl school, which was printed in Year IV (for the purpose of a documentary presentation preparatory to a meeting with the Minister for Education), the following account was produced.

[Year I] was a year of continuing change in an attempt to evolve structures to accommodate the diverse needs of students. The initial arrangement was one of compulsory morning classes in four core subjects. The afternoons were left free for creative activities. After some months it became clear that this structure did not work for the majority of students. Some were unable to use the unstructured free time, and left the school most afternoons, while for others the compulsion of morning classes was not compatible with a supposedly 'free' school.

After much concern and discussion over a period of time, a new structure was evolved. Class attendance became optional and classes were spread across the full day. At the same time, a system of 'vertical groups' of about 12 students of diverse ages and levels was established. Each of these 'vertical' or 'home' groups was attached to one teacher who was responsible for the welfare of the group and for the general oversight of the individual timetables and activity patterns of the members. Where possible, the groups were formed on the basis of a pupil's choice of teacher.

At the beginning of Year II, five of the original staff members left and were replaced by a further five who were selected by the coordinator in consultation with other staff members and students.
This procedure was consonant with the requirements of a 'teachers-based' as distinct from a 'teacher-based' form of integrated code. In the latter case the teacher operated with a block of time which is freely available for segmenting, but subject boundaries may remain as strongly bounded as in a collection code. At the X1 school SJ (the first coordinator) was attempting to operate a 'teachers-based' form of integration which theoretically required a greater degree of ideological consensus to be forged between teachers, hence the need for consultation over new appointments with remaining staff members is understandable in theoretical terms. The 'teachers-based' form of integrated code also has the effect of shifting the balance of power in the pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught. In suggesting that 'we have gone beyond the narrow idea of curriculum as being confined to knowledge gained in certain subject areas' and that information 'need not be offered as separate "disciplines" nor should they be regularly sampled by each student, nor should there be any fixed pattern of learning in the school', the X1 philosophy was creating the conditions for strong student identities founded not on the ritual of hierarchy or on subject identities (as was likely the case for their teachers who were moving away from the conditions of their own collection-code-educational socialisation), so much as on their common work tasks. This, no doubt, was the reason that it was felt necessary to involve students as well as staff and coordinator in the selection of replacement members of staff at the beginning of Year II. It would have been possible for some observers to construe the involvement of the coordinator as the one 'common-denominator' in the selection and replacement procedures, and in fact some school supporters later identified SJ, either as a 'charismatic' leader or as someone who interfered with what otherwise could have been a 'more democratic' selection process.

Towards the end of Year II a number of developments occurred which are significant when construed within the development of an integrated code. For the latter four months of Year II, SJ the original coordinator of the X1 school, was on extended sick leave.

1 'Philosophy of the [X1] School', Appendix B.
In fact he never returned to the school in an official capacity. During these four months the position of coordinator was filled in an entirely temporary fashion by XB - one of the original staff members. XB made it clear from the time that he took up the position that he could not stay into Year II. During the second half of Year II it became clear that the physical accommodation of Xl would have to change, however, the Education Department made the appointment of a new coordinator conditional on the successful location of new premises. The primary onus for locating new premises fell on the Xl school supporters themselves. It was only after direct representations to the Minister that a decision satisfactory to the school community was reached. Prior to this decision, Education Department officials offered a location but it was rejected by school supporters due, amongst other things, to its small size and the fact that its only buildings would have to be portable classrooms which were still to be positioned on the block of land.

In November of Year II, at the same time as seeking a new location for the Xl school, supporters staff and students were coming to terms again with another facet of the issue of evaluation at the school, and simultaneously were welcoming KX, who had been appointed by the Education Department as coordinator of the school in Year III. None of the X school supporters attached any particular significance at the time to the fact that it was the Director of Secondary Education who arranged for the appointment of the coordinator. Apart from working under great pressure to find a new location for the Xl school (this after all was the condition for the new coordinator's appointment) the procedure was taken-for-granted since formally the original coordinator (SJ) was appointed by the then Director of Secondary Education. The assumption apparently was that since the Education Department authorised the appointment of the first coordinator to the experimental school, then this must be the appropriate procedure to be followed for the second appointment.

The issue concerning evaluation revolved about an undertaking that SJ had given at the commencement of the X school, that the Higher School Certificate (HSC) would be taught as an option for senior students. A series of meetings of staff, students and parents
eventually resolved that the HSC would not be taught in Year III. Although the decision was taken by a majority of school supporters (including staff and students), a proportion of parents remained unconvinced about the wisdom of the decision. The decision with respect to the HSC was important because it was the symbol which marked the boundary between the school and institutions of further education and employment. The decision of the original coordinator (SJ) to retain the HSC had effectively kept the development of the integrated code as something occurring almost entirely inside the boundaries of the school system. Once the question of dropping the HSC was broached then an issue could be made of the general relationship between types of schooling and modes of recruitment into institutions of further education and the workforce generally. The collection code was already institutionalised in respect of the connection between schools and places of further education and employment. On the one hand there were regulations concerning the means of formulating achievement in separate subject areas for purposes of competitive grading and sorting of individual students. On the other hand formulas existed for the granting of the certificate based on achievement measured in areas of cognate disciplines - the arts, science, music etc. By eliminating teaching for achievement in the HSC, the X1 school contributed to other forces which were demanding a reconsideration of the institutionalised means of connecting schools with the workforce. It was during meetings to discuss these issues that KX, the second coordinator (but the first to have been appointed on the sole initiative of the Education Department) made his first appearances and was introduced to the school.

KX, the second official coordinator (and the third person to fill the position) took up his full-time appointment at the beginning of Year III after the school had moved to its new premises at X2. X2 was a school with an admittedly short history, but nevertheless a history which was tied to attempts at founding what was effectively an integrated code of educational transmission, although it was never theorised explicitly as such. KX's own educational socialisation had been within a form of collection code, his own identity was linked very strongly with a particular subject-discipline
to the extent that there had been a time when he had acted as an Education Department inspector in that subject. The effect of the collection-code of transmission is to create a strong sense of hierarchy with respect not only to forms of knowledge but also to organisation. Evaluation within this code connotes the attainment of states of knowledge rather than ways of knowing.¹ On the question of teaching the HSC the new coordinator for Year III (KX) changed his mind at least once. At first he supported the retention of teaching the HSC, an action theoretically in line with his own consciousness of what was educationally proper. Later on, however, KX supported the decision to abandon the HSC. Some people felt this was out of deference to the process of majority decision-making within the school.

Year III was marked in its early stages by conflicts which superficially bore little resemblance to one another but which a number of participants characterised as KX's desire to 'fashion greater order and discipline'² throughout the operation of the X2 school. The course of these various conflicts will be analysed in detail elsewhere because it is in peoples' accounts of these conflicts that some sense can be gained of various sets of presuppositions about social order and control which people brought to particular issues. It was, however, through the issue of the nature and legitimation of the authority of the coordinator's position that more general questions relating to the institutionalisation and legitimation of forms of control came to divide the school community into factions. These factions, each with its own ideology of the social problem, reached very different conclusions about the nature of solutions. The social problem ideologies were in part worked through in particular events, with some interests identifying individuals (who were deemed to possess McHugh's 'theoreticity' - they 'knew what they were doing') as key factors and recommending the elimination of the problem via the exclusion of the individual. In other cases the problem was

¹ B. Bernstein, 1971, 'On classification and Framing...', op.cit., p.60.
² Appendix C, 'The [X2] Community School'.
identified as related to the collective interest of a particular group or faction and suggested solutions ranged from an appeal for discussions and a general internal 'stock-taking', to the appeal for an investigation from a 'neutral' body; that is, an investigation from an 'authoritative' source outside of the boundaries of schools symbolic order.

For some school supporters the appeal to an authoritative source outside the school was a fundamental negation of the form of order for which they saw the X school to be standing. It was from amongst this group of supporters that there came the proposal for greater 'democratisation' in decision-making. Those supporters who took it for granted that the order of the school was contingent on hierarchically-distributed authority were able to take as evidence in itself of some sort of breakdown in the system of control the very arguments of other supporters who favoured a more emergent notion of order. It was the way the central issue of legitimation and control was itself conceived which divided supporters. Furthermore it was the manner in which some groups conceived of what could be a solution which led to appeals being made beyond the boundaries of the symbolic order of the school as they had remained up until that time. It was during the course of specific conflicts that people became aware that these were not just 'normal' issues which were being debated. Once people perceived that something was 'going wrong', because in fact the conflict was over the very notion of how order was to be legitimated, then previous impressions of a consensus were revised. This process of revising opinions frequently centred on what was perceived to be the essential identity of alter. In effect, alter was subjected to an attempt to conduct what Garfinkel has described as a 'degradation ceremony'. When the fundamental nature of the conflict became clear, there was a tendency to transform the old identity and not simply to substitute a new one. ('We thought s/he was a hierarchical-order person, now we know that really s/he was an emergent-order person.) 'The former identity at best, receives the accent of mere appearance...the former identity stands as accidental; the new identity is the "basic reality". What he is now is what "after all",
he was all along. The point being that the moral evaluation in such a process is evidence firstly of the emotional involvement of the participants, but more importantly of the application of common-sense rules of deviance, that is of 'theoreticity' and 'conventionality'.

At the same time that ideological definitions of what constituted the social problem led to various definitions of 'solutions' within the school community, once an appeal had been made to the Minister and Director of Secondary Education - there emerged within the administration similar difficulties in defining both the problem and its possible solution. The announcement in April of Year II to hold an Education Department Enquiry into X2 was only made after a variety of proposed solutions were canvassed, including a suggestion to close the school as soon as this was practicable (taking into consideration the need to place staff and students elsewhere etc.).

Although parents and staff were invited to present written submissions to two Education Department investigators (and some were subsequently interviewed), it was emphasised that the investigation of the school was intended to be a 'low key' affair. The investigation was 'into the present administration' and 'the welfare of the pupils', however, the very fact of an enquiry was a social marking event. Once the enquiry was announced this validated the idea that there must have been proper cause for an official examination and that consequently the enquiry would have some sort of outcome. One way or another the enquiry would serve to validate a particular state of affairs which could be either more or less satisfactory or unsatisfactory; there could be no decision which said there was no cause for an official enquiry. In addition to some evaluative outcome, the fact of the enquiry also implied that 'something would have to be done'. The meaning of what constituted a 'low key' enquiry remained problematic and available for interpretation. For some supporters the notion of 'low key' was able to be interpreted as implying that any problems

were seen in advance as 'merely administrative' and that therefore any outcome would not represent a fundamental change to the central tenets of the school (whatever they were). However, the question of a 'low key' enquiry became increasingly a matter for conjecture and concern as a lengthy time passed without any official outcome. Nevertheless, Education Department officials presented the future outcome of the enquiry as legitimation for their decision that no replacement staff could be provided. The enquiry became a resource which was viewed differently depending on attitudes towards its legitimacy as a resource. In other words, school supporters tended to see such actions as unfair (illegitimate use of a resource), but their objections were able, in turn, to be presented as an 'abnormal' reaction. This further conflict reinforced the process of deviance attribution.

Within the Education Department, the report of the enquiry into X2 school was not uniformly perceived as having identified critical issues, defined problems in terms of possible alternative actions or made recommendations that were unequivocal and internally consistent. The report itself serves to document the difficulties inherent in analysing conflicts over the process of institutionalising unusual ('abnormal') forms of educational order and associated modes of social control. Some measure of the intra-departmental difficulties can also be gained from the length of time it took before any decision - an 'outcome' - was announced. In addition, the nature of these difficulties were partly communicated to the supporters of the X2 school during a visit to the school by one of the two investigators. KG (who in Year III at the time of investigation was the Deputy Director of Secondary Education, but who became the Director of Secondary Education in Year IV) invited supporters at a school meeting to consider his 'moral position' given that in his opinion, any final decision about the recommendations of the Report of Enquiry were essentially political and therefore were required to be taken by the Minister. One effect of such an account was to induce X2 supporters to believe that they needed to see the Minister in order to present a case on this issue. However, the very fact of the protracted delay had the effect of focussing attention on the report in such a way that any outcome was believed to represent a considerable symbolic meaning. The decision to close the X2 school, which was
conveyed to the school just a few days before the end of the school year (and which had the imprimatur of the Minister), made the enquiry into X2 a public (moral) issue. Prior to this time the X2 school and its difficulties had an audience restricted to those specially interested in education.

A category of analysis in the report of the investigation into the X2 school was that of 'normality-abnormality'. Although this category was never analysed, assertions about the abnormal aspects of the X2 school and its operation constitute a theme which reappears throughout the report. One reason for the lengthy deliberation over the report within the Education Department was a conflict over whether in fact any decision about the future operation of the X2 school was 'political' in the sense that it required the Minister's initiative. Despite the report itself not being publicly available, events during the period of Education Department deliberation created the impression amongst X2 supporters that they were involved in a conflict in which the report itself and its findings would represent a 'resource' in legitimating whatever action eventually was taken.¹ The announcement of the closure of X2 resulted in public confrontations between X2 school supporters and the Minister. The presentation of events as news by the mass media produced an atmosphere in which there appeared to be a need to evaluate firstly the action of closure and secondly the X2 school itself. In the period between the closure and Christmas, X2 supporters felt that media stories were an important resource, and they acted strenuously to present their case and reacted bitterly to what they saw as the unfair effects created by the way the mass media, but particularly the popular press, gathered and presented information.

In effect the mass media were presenting their accounts which were then available (with the implicit objectiveness of 'news') for interpretation via commonsense rules of deviance.² The action of the Minister of Education, the responses of X2 school supporters, reporters' accounts of what the X2 school was 'really' like; each

¹ Resource is used in the manner explained by N. Davis, 1975, op.cit.
tended to be presented discretely (daily press stories are structurally constrained in an episodic form\textsuperscript{1}), with the public implicitly invited to apply tests of 'theoreticity' and 'conventionality'. For the school, the 'experiment' with an integrated code had been a solution to perceived problems within the orthodox educational order which involved forms of the collection code. The perceptions of groups internal to the school, the Education Department report of enquiry and mass media accounts of the X2 school selectively misperceived the underlying symbolic order according to an 'absolutist' (collection code) conception in such a way as to produce a distorted image of the school and its symbolic order. In turn, the X2 school supporters (or at least some of them) found themselves reacting to images which they felt were not 'relevant' to the essence of their project and which were therefore biased and unfair. According to Young's model of deviance amplification the result should have been a greater commitment to the particular form of 'deviance' (in this case 'alternative education', more particularly a form of integrated code). However, while the underlying symbolic order remained unexplained there remained the potential for supporters to conflict in their interpretations of the ideology 'alternative education'. With a Federal election recently ended and a State election due within months, all participants felt that the evaluation of the X2 school and its closure in the popular press, held a quite specific political significance. When the Minister convened a meeting in his office towards the end of January, the Press were excluded before the meeting began.

Certain Education Department officials, including SD, had been detailed in late December of Year III, to act on the question of the X2 school, reporting directly to the Minister. Prior to the meeting of January Year III, the X2 school supporters had submitted a list of people who were prepared to become coordinators of the X school and who were acceptable to the school community. The Minister's assistants approached one of these people, ET, immediately before the meeting, and ET accepted their suggestion that he take on the job as

\textsuperscript{1} S. Cohen and J. Young, 1973, op.cit.
coordinator of the X school. This decision, which was announced in the form of one condition of reopening by the Minister, apparently came as a great surprise to both the X school supporters and other Education Department officers who were present. Officers of the Secondary Division spoke against the proposal for continuing the X school and it was the Assistant Minister of Education (CE) who refuted these objections as being of minor administrative importance and not relevant to more serious educational issues. After this meeting with the Minister in January of Year IV, the issue of the X school had been removed from the arena of public debate. In official terms the decision relating to X2 remained unaltered. A 'new' school, X3, had been authorised by the Minister with a coordinator who was satisfactory to the Minister and the X school supporters. The X school supporters felt that they had achieved their immediate aim of staying in existence in order to continue the experiment with 'alternative' education. Although new accommodation needed to be found this was regarded as a minor administrative matter which did not affect the principled decision relating to the continued existence of the X school. In addition, the X school now appeared to be free of its annexe status.

From the point of view of the Education Department, the decision to close the X2 school had not been officially revoked and the X3 school had been set up via the Minister's intervention which was a Ministerial prerogative. The original symbolic separation of the X school appeared to have been renegotiated on a more stable basis since by eliminating the annexe status the X3 school was even more clearly a separate educational entity yet despite its proximity to the symbolic margins of educational orthodoxy, nevertheless it was still inside these moral boundaries.

Such structural arrangements are, however, necessarily carried 'in the heads' of particular people. The structure of the Education Department reflected the movement of discrete individuals. KG, who had been Assistant Director of Secondary Education to SG, and who had been appointed, along with CD, to conduct the enquiry into X2, became Director of Secondary Education in Year IV, after the January meeting. The X school was an educational entity with a history that was intimately related to the professional identity of KG. Events after January of Year IV reflect the evaluation by KG of the X school. The intervention
of the Minister did not alter KG's evaluation of the X school as basically abnormal, as an organisation that was fundamentally not educational. Where, for the Minister, the legitimation of the X school was founded in his political authority as Minister, KG was in the position of mediator of a symbolic order as well as its administrative and organisational arrangements and the Minister's decision was in a separate realm of legitimation. Working from within a symbolic order of strong classification and framing, KG found the X school to be abnormal both educationally (in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation) and administratively, X3 was not an annexe yet was not formally designated a school, nor was it formally attached to any division of the Education Department. Even after DL was appointed as a liaison officer to the X3 school, it took further intervention by the Minister's assistant (SD) in order to achieve a separate formal school identity for X3.

In terms of the symbolic order of X3 there was a new coordinator (ET) who did not, for example, explicitly reaffirm the earlier 'philosophy' produced by the X1 school. The new coordinator insisted on a strong policy of media exclusion from X3 in order to avoid a further extension of a 'goldfish-bowl mentality' which he felt had been induced by events at the end of Year III. After his appointment as a liaison inspector to X3, DL asserted that his job was one which allowed of a clear-cut demarcation between matters of 'education' and 'administration'. DL deplored much of the X3 school practices and policies associated with curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. In viewing the X3 school in these terms he reaffirmed the views of KG (now the new Director of Secondary Education), that X3 was 'abnormal' and many of its activities were 'not educational'. However, DL saw his prime function as liaising over administrative matters.

The 'experimental' status of the X school was maintained at X3 via an ideology of 'alternative' education. But in the absence of either any definitional outlines of 'alternative' education or of the dimensions of evaluative procedures for X3, the 'experimental' nature of the X school could only be measured by the evidence of its having 'tested' or delimited the moral boundaries of orthodox education. Stated differently, the X school's experimental nature could only be assessed by reference to the extent to which a form of integrated code
could operate as a deviant form of educational order with its associated deviant modes of social control, within a wider orthodoxy represented by forms of the collection code. However, the strong classification (separation) of the categories curriculum/pedagogy/evaluation and administration/organisation were still perpetuated.

It was DL who reacted strongly to the presence of a speaker invited to X3 from a university to talk on the topic of anarchism. DL resented the presence of this speaker and the topic very strongly because this represented DL as being 'used as an umbrella' for discussion of theoretical material to which he was strongly personally opposed.¹

By Year IV then, the X school had achieved a formally separate status within the Education Department, with some drafts of documents indicating the Secondary Division's understanding of 'alternative' schools - what they meant, and how this meaning could be handled within the wider administrative framework. Draft documents show that the difficulties experienced previously with respect to evaluation at the level of the HSC, for example, were being incorporated in terms of 'compromise' between the X school and the Education Department. However, the more fundamental issues relating to accreditation and the legitimisation of educational codes with differing conceptions of knowledge and social control, were not explicitly recognised. The solutions were still pragmatic and related to the particular case of the X school, rather than theoretical and therefore incorporating wider implications for the institutionalisation of new forms of educational transmission and social control.

¹ DL interview
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Bernstein and Davies have each in their own way summarised the difficulties of working in a field which is currently in a state of lively development both theoretically and methodologically.

...All would agree that an exciting sociological account should be comparative and historical and should reveal the relationships between structural features and interactional practices in a context of change. But how do we obtain such an account? What is the relationship between the means sociologists use to gain knowledge of others and the nature of the knowledge obtained? How does the sociologist make his knowledge public and plausible? In what sense is sociology an empirical discipline? What is the relationship between observer categories and the categories used by members to create order and change meanings? None of these are new questions. What is of significance is that they are being put today with a new vigour and intensity. The methods of the natural sciences (which include both the form of the theory and the manner of its empirical exploration) are considered by some to be either inappropriate or dehumanizing, or both, when applied to the study of man. It is argued that man reflecting upon man is qualitatively a different relationship from man reflecting upon objects. How can man, then, reflect upon man in such a way that he is not transformed into an object through the means of his reflection?

These debates are fierce because they are fundamentally political. They are about what view of social phenomena the sociologist ought to have and the relationship between the sociologist and his society. They reveal the dilemma of being a sociologist. Whom do we serve? Which side are we on?

Sociologists of education are today caught up in the larger debate. The basic inter-actional unit of their study is an inter-generational relationship. The basic content of their study is the social origins and consequences of variations in the formal structuring of consciousness. The basic institutions which they attempt to understand are cultural repeaters. The formal or planned educational relationship is a crucial repeater of whatever it is to be repeated, even if it is the unlikely. The inter-actional context, its contents and its institutional expression realize in condensed and explicit forms, in visible and invisible ways, the constraints and possibilities of a given society. Alive in the context, contents and institutional embodiment of education is the distribution of power and principles of social control. As a consequence, educational arrangements are only comprehensible when they are viewed from the perspective of the total society.

(Basil Bernstein, 1972.)
...writing a short book entitled Social Control and Education involves the realization that one has undertaken a task rather akin to whistling the Messiah, solo, in the Albert Hall in no more than eleven minutes, flat. (Brian Davies, 1976.)

The case study of the closure and reopening of the X school provides only an historical matrix of events. This historical matrix, although never meant to be a central feature of the project, nevertheless required careful treatment and considerable research if only because of the constant reference made by participants to events and their occurrence at a particular time. Participants were told that the sociological significance of the study meant that the details of history and biography were important but of only secondary significance to the central question - what was their understanding of events at the X school which were so able to break with routines and conventions that a situation arose in which the school was first closed and then reopened - both times in the name of the Minister of Education? Within this question lies two possible approaches to an analysis of social order.

The more conventional or 'normal' social scientific approach is one that has been characterised by phenomenology as operating on the assumption that social order is preconstituted in the mere fact of social organisation so that the sociological question becomes one of investigating social forms and types of ruptures which occur in the fabric of society.

...social order is the emergent product of human activity and the manner of its emergence, therefore, must become the central concern of sociological investigation. It could, of course, be argued that positivist sociology also takes social order to be the central focus of its concerns, but the phenomenological criticism would be that it deals with it in an entirely unsatisfactory manner. Typically, positivism explains social order as being 'out there' in an external social world produced by relationships between factors external to the members of that world, primarily through the agency of shared norms and values. But this not only leads to an illegitimate reification of society but more specifically avoids crucial issues about how a shared social world is possible at all. The result is that social order becomes a taken-for-granted background to the explanation of the social activity that occurs within its boundaries.1

In recognising the value of the phenomenological position thus stated, it was also recognised that for this investigation the question of social order was being investigated within the context of an institution which Bernstein has called a 'cultural repeater',\(^1\) that is, institutions - the family and education in particular - wherein culturally sanctioned ways of conceiving 'social order' are transmitted to new generations. At the same time as recognising that phenomenological sociology allows important questions to be raised and investigated, this dependence also brought certain critical issues to the fore which are peculiar to phenomenological sociology. These include phenomenological sociology's

a) rejection of its approach being characterised as microsociology,\(^2\)

b) arguments that it deals with social structure in a way which allows the concept to be properly emergent and located in a socially-shared way between members (rather than described in a reified way by sociologists),\(^3\)

c) commitment to a form and concept of validity which allows members' categories to be in some fundamental way, congruently linked with researchers' categories.\(^4\) (In this case the categories are those relating to recent approaches to the sociological category of deviance.)

The case-study format also forced the theoretical issue in that participants' own accounts were very much 'accomplished' accounts in the sense that whilst participants both provided data for the researcher they also absorbed information from him that became itself an organic part of their account; nevertheless events were still occurring in the early period of the research which were later to

---

\(^1\) B. Bernstein, 1975, op.cit., p.148.
\(^3\) Ibid., pp.167-8.
\(^4\) Ibid., pp.149-53.
become sedimented into the account which constituted the piece of research itself.¹ This raises the point described by phenomenological sociologists as that relating to the possibility of an 'infinite regress' of validating accounts.² It can be argued that to 'withdraw from the abyss' in the way outlined by Cicourel, is a solution which is both partial and unnecessarily restricting to the phenomenological perspective. In this study members' accounts can fruitfully be related to a sociologist's account, one which links Bernstein's theory of educational codes to Davis' theory of power and deviance.

Cicourel argues that

...'the elaboration of circumstances and particulars of an occasion can be subjected to an indefinite re-elaboration of the "same" or "new" circumstances and particulars'. Having given us a glimpse of the abyss Cicourel implies the path away from it - what appears as a threat to the sociological enterprise becomes its central area of research interest. How accounts are constructed and read by providing for a factual world becomes a phenomenon worthy of study in its own right. As he [Cicourel] says in a discussion of linguistics (his remarks might equally well apply to conventional sociology):

'Linguists prefer to live with different kinds of conveniently constructed glosses, while the ethnomethodologist prefers to treat the glossing itself as an activity that becomes the phenomenon of interest while recognizing that no-one can escape some level of glossing in order to claim knowledge about something.'³

In general terms the methodical bases of the research can best be indicated by reference to the set of polarities outlined by Bruyn and labelled the 'inner' and 'outer' perspectives. Bruyn emphasises their typological character and notes cross-cutting characteristics relating to issues of quantification, determinism, sensitisation (instead of operationalisation), and synthesis/analysis. He summarises the inner perspective as encompassing a philosophical

¹ On the term 'sedimentation' see P. Berger and T. Luckmann, 1971, op.cit., 'experiences that are so retained become sedimented, that is, they congeal in recollection as recognizable and memorable entities', p.85.
² P. Filmer et al., 1973, op.cit., p.162.
³ Ibid., pp.11-12.
background of idealism, modes of conceptualisation which are synthesising and sensitising, and explanatory principles which tend towards voluntarism and being telic (oriented towards explaining the purposes of men) rather than causal and deterministic. In suggesting that it is proper to distinguish between the methodological styles of participant observation and 'traditional empiricism' Bruyn comments on the former,

The observer should exercise this control [over the language of his research], by releasing it, by allowing himself, his viewpoint, and even his language to be influenced by his subjects. He must be able to 'surrender', as Kurt Wolff has so aptly put it. He should have some control over his perspective, but he cannot control the perspective of his subjects or remain uninfluenced by them, and still understand them....The style which can reveal the subjects as they see themselves, and yet still comment - tragically, humouroously, or realistically - upon their culture without demeaning or destroying it, has the greater power. For a cultural perspective to contribute further to scientific purposes, however, the order that lies within it must be studied for its place in general theory.2

The study of the X school was not one of participant observation in the terms outlined by Bruyn for example. The researcher never visited any of the locations of the X school, nor did he ever observe the school in operation or become involved in any of its on-going educational activities. The point is that the methodological assumptions were those of Bruyn's participant observation style. The data for this study were members' accounts and the school and its history provided a social and historical context.

One of the key conceptual elements of the data analysed is members' accounts, and the distinction needs to be made that ultimately it is the accounts rather than the process of accounting which is of prime importance. The concept of accounts has already been elaborated largely within the terms proposed by Scott and Lyman.3 The focus is intended to be on the use made by members of their different symbolic

---

2 Ibid., p.253.
constructions rather than on the process by which various interpretive procedures are employed to produce them. It is in the work of Alfred Schutz that there occurs the best elaboration of Weber's definition of, and scientific approach to social action. Schutz' elaboration extends the possibility and necessity of common-sense constructs as data to be analysed and to be kept congruent with the abstractions of sociology. At the same time as distinguishing between the work of natural and social scientists, Schutz affirms that the differences which do exist are in methodology not in logic.¹ It is in other work, notably 'The Problem of Rationality in the Social World' that Schutz produces those concepts which he sees as necessary to enable the fundamental connection to be made between how members 'make sense' of their world and how sociologists theorise those members' productions.

The world of nature, as explored by the natural scientist, does not 'mean' anything to molecules, atoms and electrons. But the observational field of the social scientist - social reality - has a specific meaning and relevance structure for the human beings living, acting, and thinking within it. By a series of common-sense constructs they have preselected and pre-interpreted this world which they experience as the reality of their daily lives. It is these thought objects of theirs which determine their behaviour by motivating it. The thought objects constructed by the social scientist, in order to grasp this social reality, have to be founded upon the thought objects constructed by the common-sense thinking of men, living their daily life within their social world. Thus, the constructs of the social sciences are, so to speak, constructs of the second degree, that is, constructs of the constructs made by the actors on the social scene, whose behaviour the social scientist has to observe and to explain in accordance with the procedural rules of his science.²

In the body of the thesis there will be no attempt to identify and translate into Schutz' terms examples of 'reciprocity of perspectives', the production of forms of 'intersubjectivity', the effects of 'multiple realities' or 'practical interests',³ but the

² Ibid., p.59.
³ A. Schutz, 1970, On Phenomenology and Social Relations, selected writings edited by Helmut Wagner, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, passim. For a brief discussion of 'The everyday world and
collection of members' accounts was premised on the idea that such an
approach was necessary to keep participants' discussions (which were
in their terms) about 'rational action' 'bureaucracy' and 'being
practical' at the level of topics not resources. In effect it was
the history of the closure and reopening of X school which became a
'resource' (in Zimmerman and Pollner's terms), whilst the 'topic' was
the analysis of members' accounts of social order and control.
However, the social action which is reported links information from
micro-situated contexts to on-going structured historical events and
the analysis is kept manageable by operating consistently at the level
of participants' accounts of 'what happened at X school'.

Many of the events and difficulties experienced at the X
school were precisely because of differences between groups and
individuals in establishing understandings about the process of
legitimating authority. Weber's own analysis at the same time as
recognising the need to judge ideal-types in terms of their 'adequacy'
at the level of meaning' also

...implies that social life proceeds on the basis of interpretive
procedures which specify what may be taken to be the case rather
than upon what, in some ontological sense, is 'really so':

"Obedience" will be taken to mean that the action of the
person obeying follows in essentials such a course that the
content of the command may be taken to have become the basis
of action for its own sake. Furthermore, the fact that it is
so taken is referable only to the formal obligation, without
regard to the actor's own attitude to the value or lack of
the content of the command as such.'

The issue here, clearly, is that social objects become recognized
by imputing motives to parties and inferring regularities in
their activities. In this sense alone do social phenomena have
'intrinsic' features or possess ontological status.2

accounting process' occurring as part of a larger article relevant
to the general approach of this thesis, see David Silverman, 'Accounts
of Organizations - organizational "structures" and the accounting
process', in J. McKinlay, 1975, Processing People..., pp.269-302.
1 On the distinction between 'topic' and 'resource' see D. Zimmerman
and M. Pollner, 'The everyday world as a phenomenon', ch.4 in
By analysing members' accounts of events of the X school, the accounts represent data. The social construction of this data, how members use interpretive procedures is a topic tackled by ethnomethodologists, but for the purpose of this work, the only element in this process which is important is the construction and imputation of moral meanings. These moral meanings, and the commonsense rules for their use, are keys to understanding only insofar as they became instrumental in maintaining participants in conflictful positions.

The contention here is that having examined members' accounts about the closure and reopening of the X school, then it is legitimate and worthwhile to locate members' accounts within a context of power as it is differentially distributed within organisations and between groups of people. Bernstein links the overarching question to the ways it could be framed within a new tradition of sociological theory and method when he writes

From different sources, Marxist Phenomenological, Symbolic Interactionist and Ethnomethodological viewpoints began to assert themselves. Although there are major differences between these approaches, they share certain common features:

1) a view of man as a creator of meanings
2) an opposition to macro-functional sociology
3) a focus upon the assumptions underlying social order, together with the treatment of social categories as themselves problematic
4) a distrust of forms of quantification and the use of objective categories.
5) a focus upon the transmission and acquisition of interpretive procedures.

...fundamental questions were raised about the existing classification and framing of educational knowledge as to its significance for the structuring experience and as a repeater of society's hierarchical arrangements.¹

It was clear from the outset early in Year IV that the X3 school, because its existence was probationary, was not a closed issue in the eyes of those involved as both supporters and administrators. This being the case a number of problems arose which bore on

¹ B. Bernstein, 1975, op.cit., p.152.
the methodology for the research. The actual history of events would need to be gleaned at the same time as data was collected relating to the meaning attributed to events and the social actions of those involved. In keeping with the focus on members' accounts as fundamental data, and given that in Year IV the Education Department's report of enquiry was not a public document and did not appear likely to become one, it was decided to commence by interviewing participants and to begin by approaching whichever X3 school supporters were prepared to assist. For Year IV there were some school supporters and Education Department officials who regarded one another with mutual suspicion and for this reason it was decided to approach school supporters first. The idea was that if supporters came to know that the researcher had successfully gained access to Education Department officials there may have been a reluctance to cooperate which was based on assumptions of a lack of neutrality by the researcher with respect to what many participants still saw as 'live' issues. Not only were historical events associated with the X school still unfolding, but so too in the field of sociological theory and theorising - were developments occurring which had significance for the project in hand.¹

¹ Three books published in the 1960s provided important statements on (theory) methodology, from the point of view of this thesis. However, these were statements that were either pragmatic or critical of what then existed. Ref. A. Cicourel, 1964, Method and Measurement...; S.T. Bruyn, 1966, op.cit.; H. Garfinkel, 1967, Studies in... In the early 1970s there were statements which summarised the implications of weaknesses in sociological knowledge. See for example D.L. Phillips, 1971, 'Sociologists and their knowledge....' However, it was not until the 1970s that material appeared which included examples of work produced within the phenomenological, ethnomethodology traditions, as well as more exegetical accounts. See especially Jack D. Douglas, 1970, op.cit., Jack D. Douglas, 1970, Understanding...; P. Filmer et al., 1972, op.cit.; D. Sudnow, 1973, Studies in.... By the mid-1970s work was being produced that related directly to the field of education, however, despite phenomenologists' rejection of their stance as a microsociological one, there was little empirical work that would refute the charge. See for example articles collected in M. Hammersley et al., 1976, The Process....
A rationale was developed first for the collection of data via unstructured interviews, and secondly via a process of interviewee selection which stemmed largely from the interviewees themselves. Interviewees were told that the investigator knew something of the facts surrounding the closure and reopening of the X school, but that there were many 'peculiarities' and much detail relating to events and motivations that appeared incomprehensible. The researcher pointed out that whilst the project was not primarily about matters of historical fact nevertheless 'factual' information was a necessary and unavoidable part of collecting data about how various groups and individuals emerged as salient figures and proceeded to 'make sense' of what was happening in order to develop a basis for their own social actions. The researcher's purpose was to provide a rationale that at the same time as being 'reasonable' nevertheless provided respondents with the opportunity to set out their own 'systems of relevance'.

It was recognised that different respondents interpreted the offer of confidentiality in different ways. The most marked difference was amongst those respondents whose involvement with the X school incorporated occupational or professional responsibilities. For example, in the case of some supporters of the X school, the offer of confidentiality appeared to be interpreted in terms of being able to express doubts about previous actions, ideas or motivations, relating both to themselves and which they had felt it necessary (at one time or another) to attribute to others. Examples of this occur in the early part of the chapter of analysis - see especially quotations from the interview with SP and LP. In the case of respondents who held

1 Schutz argues that in a methodology which uses the typifications of members as a basis for constructing the analytical typifications of the social scientist, then the postulate of rationality guarantees the effectiveness of the principle of relevance, and the postulates of subjective interpretation and adequacy, in making it possible for a social science to refer at all to events in the life-world. It is these methodological precepts which assure that the interpretation of any human act by the social scientist might be the same as that by the actor or his partner. A. Schutz, 'The problem of rationality in the social world', in Collected Papers Vol.II (ed. Arvid Brodersen), 1971, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, esp. pp.81-88.
formal positions within the Education Department, the offer of confidentiality appeared to be interpreted within a context of the link between past events, the present and future. Such respondents appeared primarily to be concerned about the effect of making public an account which as a result of its public-ness rather than its 'truth' or 'accuracy', would have the potential to become a 'resource' in the everyday theorising of members.

Interviews were structured only to the degree implied by the investigator's general outline of the project. However, a tape-recorder was carried but its use was dictated by the context of the interview. The aim was to allow the respondents to react in a way which the interviewer judged to be as unrestrained as possible. The result was that some interviews were fully recorded, some were partly recorded and partly reported by notes made during and after the interview. Some interview material was put onto tape in the form of the researcher's recollections made immediately after the interview. The strongest possible efforts were made (consonant with allowing respondents to produce their accounts) to preserve the distinction between the language of the respondent and the language-in-recollection of the researcher. Not only was the issue of respondents logic-in-use at stake, but also it became obvious that notes recorded after interviews arranged material more in accord with the researcher's system of relevancies than did direct transcripts of fully recorded interviews. There was clear evidence in the case of the interview with DL that much of the content of his responses varied between the period of tape-recording and that when 'informal' discussion and note-taking ensued. The nature of intersubjectivity between researcher and respondent was noted to vary in at least one case, in accord with the medium of recording the interview. The procedure was adhered to despite (or because of) these impediments.1

1 Ref. A. Cicourel, 1964, Method and Measurement in Sociology, Free Press, New York, p.99 for a discussion of the natural or unavoidable problems of formal interviewing (as distinct from the informal interviewing of the present study which produced its own characteristic problems).
The researcher was physically located in a different State to that in which the events of the case-study occurred - this was one practical reason which influenced the style of selection of interviewees. Another reason, more theoretical, was that since the study focussed on members' constructed meanings, then one source of information about what events and people were salient, was who the interviewees saw as key holders of important knowledge and information. Thus it was decided that at least in initial interviews - the researcher would allow himself to be recommended from one interviewee to another. At the same time, this allowed a list of people to be constructed who were described as 'possibly significant - but you'll have to introduce yourself to them'. In other words, the process of interviewee selection was used to build up a picture of 'interviewees-omitted', that is important putative interviewees. Not only is it possible, of course, to have an 'infinite regress' in terms of members' accounts, but this is almost the case, given the research orientation when it comes to the universe of possible informants. Since the assumption was that the process of accounting, that is, the techniques of meaning-manufacture, were of interest as sociologically generalisable phenomena, then it would have to be the comprehensiveness of historical data and the range and variety of accounts that would have to suffer through the limitation of the interviewee-sample. With regard to historical facts, there was the possibility of a degree of 'triangulation' between informants. The important point of discrimination here being to maintain a distinction between the importance of facts for historical accuracy and facts for members' accounts.

In summary, the strategy of interviewing people associated with the X school was adopted as an opening gambit. These interviewees provided a range of further possible interviewees and a list of interviewees-omitted was constructed. The interviews were unstructured in terms of conventional sociological methodology, but the deliberately non-specific introduction and subsequent probing questions by the interviewer were designed to perform the dual (and sometimes non-complementary) tasks of eliciting historical information as well as data pertaining to members' accounts, members' categories and members'
relevance systems for the accounts they were in the process of constructing and reconstructing.

During the course of interviewing it became apparent, due to constant references to the Education Department's 'secret' enquiry (and more especially the recommendations justified by this report of enquiry that were not generally known), that some attempt should be made to support the historical data-gathering with documentary evidence from Education Department files. This possibility was raised in the first interview with an Education Department official, SD. The request had a context which made it a 'natural' request, since SD also had to make reference to the report of the enquiry, and he conceded the difficulty of talking in interview to an interviewer who had not seen the report. On the same day as the interview with SD, in February of Year V, CE (who had been Assistant Minister of Education in January of Year IV when X3 was (re)-opened), also recommended a direct approach to the Minister of Education. The Minister of Education replied twice to a letter of enquiry, forwarded in mid-March of Year V. At the beginning of May the Minister first replied, regretting his unavailability for interview, but noting that the request for access to Departmental files would be referred to the Deputy Director-General of Education, UN. At the end of May the Minister wrote a second time indicating that access to Education Department files could be negotiated via SD, provided that certain conditions were met relating to confidentiality and publication of material.¹

The offer of access to Education Department files marks only one (but the most superficially obvious) of a number of points of reorientation which occurred during the study and which had an impact on both the theory and methodology. By turning to the earliest data-gathering stages, these points of reorientation will be made available to the reader and serve to free the reader from what the researcher did.

¹ Ref. Appendix D.
The very first interview data collected were from a family interview with the IG family. In this case the introduction and proposal were much more specific than was the case with all later interviews. In fact, the researcher had responded to two press cuttings by writing draft papers linking education, social control and deviance. One of the cuttings dealt with the closure of the X school (its subsequent reopening was not known to the researcher at the time of writing the papers) and in approaching IG - who was himself a social scientist with considerable administrative responsibility - these papers were forwarded and were indicated as a basis for the thesis to follow. In a letter of introduction to IG, the researcher asked if he might tape-record an interview and subsequently a date was set. In the event, the interview consisted of a discussion with all members of the family present for most of the time, which extended over almost five hours. The tape-recorder was not used at all and the records created consist of notes handwritten from recall. IG made available a very extensive personal file which included a very full set of press clippings and copies of letters forwarded to the press and the Education Department on behalf of individuals and various groups of petitioners.

Methodologically, the researcher's own 'system of relevance' dominated this interview. In other words, the concerns of sociological theory (as set out in the draft-papers) were what prompted questions and recalled data, and there seems little doubt that a recording of the exact language interaction between family participants would have yielded much data at the level of constructed meanings, and consensual validation of viewpoints. Even via the recalled notes there are passages pertaining to such processes of consensus and mutual validation of meanings. An especially important example was the 'talking through' process that seemed imperative to members, which related to the meaning, the place of the first coordinator of the X school, namely SJ. Both the recording and analysis of later interviews, reflecting a growing awareness by the investigator, of processes of

1 Ref. Appendix E for copies of both the cuttings and the draft-format papers.
'everyday theorising' occurring in the interview situation. The conduct and recording, therefore, of the first IG family interview, marks a beginning-point unique in terms of both theory and methodology. It was the IG family which recommended contact with the next interviewee, BN who, together with her daughter, was subsequently interviewed twice.

The interviews with BN and BNd were fully recorded and by the time they were conducted, the researcher felt that he had a much better grasp of the main historical events, at least those surrounding the closure of the X2 school. It was partly because of this that more attention could be paid to the form of members' accounts themselves, and this growing interest was reflected in the encouragement given for explanations to be 'produced' at some length. An example of such a production is found in the analysis of BNd's explanation of what was perceived as a particularly conflictful interaction between the staff and students of the X2 school and the coordinator, KX. The analysis shows a development of a member's concept of a 'lack of feasibility' for KX to come to terms with staff and students because he fell into the descriptive category - 'a rules and regulations man', it being 'unfeasible' for such a category of person to 'bend' rules effectively. BN had had quite a close affiliation with the X1 and X2 schools in a number of different capacities, and consequently recommended a wide range of people for interview. Inevitably some of these filled up the list of important putative interviewees.

The interview which followed BN and BNd's was with ET, who at the time of interview (21 August, Year IV), was coordinator of the X3 school during what subsequently came to appear as one of the school's most difficult periods of administration. ET had given the impression of some reluctance to be interviewed in connection with events of January Year IV, mainly because of pressure of work at this time. In fact the interview - arranged for no more than one hour - extended for much longer, and there was no opportunity to introduce a tape-recording request. The researcher recorded a summary of interview on tape almost immediately afterwards, but two very important explanations produced by ET were not able to be analysed in terms of ET's own language.
The first of these explanations dealt with ET's apprehension of the production of the Education Department's report of enquiry into the X2 school. ET made the claim that he had had access to sufficient of the material of that report (though not to its final recommendations) to draw the conclusion that it was necessarily an ineffective document. ET made the point that he felt that both those who contributed to the enquiry - as well as the two officials who conducted it - made a bona fide attempt to get at the 'truth' of the situation. ET was the only interviewee to imply that the orientations of contributors and officials was such that they were not able to define the issue they were addressing. Paraphrasing ET's account, he said that there was no 'interface' between the understandings of both groups. Despite a lot of 'talk' there was no 'real' communication. On being probed to develop this explanation ET indicated that it was perfectly adequate for his purposes - 'That was it in a nutshell - no communication'. This example perhaps most clearly distinguishes between members' first-order constructs and sociologists' second-order constructs. As a member - the researcher could understand ET's explanation - it was perfectly adequate for any practical purpose - as a member. However, as a sociologist, such an explanation was not framed in terms which would allow generalisations to be comprehended in a way which linked social institutions with forms of communication and modes of social control.

The second important explanation provided by ET was one in response to a question as to whether ET could see that some supporters of the X school (and administrators as well), may have been inclined to develop a conspiracy theory after the manner in which the Minister insisted on the appointment of ET to coordinator of the X3 school - during the meeting with the Minister in January Year IV. ET conceded that he understood why such theories could develop and circulate. In detailing what he meant by saying that he felt the Minister placed some trust in him - ET provided insight into the process by which members build meanings during face-to-face interaction. ET provided a summary history of his contacts with the Minister. ET explained how on at least one occasion it became clear that the Minister had chosen to engage ET in conversation and in fact to prolong discussion of what was an unimportant matter, because this functioned to shield
the Minister from a group of potentially hostile questioners, who were, however, deferring to the Minister's conversation with ET. ET claimed that although no verbal acknowledgement was made, there was a tacit understanding that ET was functioning to protect the Minister's position. It was such experience that ET felt was the basis of the Minister's judgement to appoint ET as coordinator of X3. ET made the point strongly that - far from being a 'conspiracy' - there was merely a history of interaction which was predicated on truly 'social action' in a Weberian sense.

It was BN also who recommended that an interview with SF might provide information about how it was that ET was selected as coordinator for the X3 school, since SF had also been on a list of 'possibles' that had been provided - SF having the presumed advantage of being currently employed by the Education Department. In fact the lengthy tape-recorded interview with SF yielded little information (or interpretation) because he knew very little about the X school at the time he volunteered to be a possible future coordinator, nor did he know many of the people associated with the school. Another interview which yielded little information (the only one in which the interviewee explicitly rejected the idea of a tape-recording), was that with CE who had been Assistant Minister of Education at the time of the January Year IV meeting. CE recommended that in the interests of historical accuracy it was best to approach the Minister and request access to Education Department files.

BN's further recommendation to contact LP and SP coincided with similar advice from IG. The lengthy interview with LP and SP was fully recorded; it provides a number of instances of the necessity for both interviewer and interviewee to rely on an assumed correspondence of meaning in everyday constructs and commonsense theorising. For example, in recommending that the researcher approach LZ for an interview, LP commented that he was not sure exactly how useful such an interview would be, however the researcher felt that LP did not want to qualify any opinion in a way that through its explicitness would appear unfair; eventually the recommendation was glossed along
the following lines: 'Anyway, LZ is an interesting bloke, wait 'til you meet him, you'll know what I mean....'

It was SP who verbalised the distinction between styles of interaction and everyday methods of negotiating roles and personal identity; SP distinguished between KX's perception of D as the cleaner, and other people at the X2 school who identified the person D - who was 'also the cleaner'. It has already been mentioned that the task of gathering historical information was not always complementary to the task of generating members' accounts that were analysable for their contribution to the on-going production of a sense of social order. An example of such non-complementarity occurred when LP described a recent assessment of DL of the progress that had been made towards establishing X3 as both a separate and normal school within the Secondary Division of the Education Department. LP exclaimed

You see we're back to where we were three years ago. We're back to the [CT] position now. That's what they want to play, actually....'

The fact that LP continued without elaboration in part indicates that he was satisfied that he had made his meaning clear. However, such an assumption by LP presumed that he in turn had understood explanations made earlier in the interview by the researcher. What the researcher concluded was that LP saw the X school as having begun its existence in an anomalous and vulnerable fashion and that this vulnerability was being perpetuated at X3; evidence for this being the difficulties that DL was experiencing in mediating between X3 school and the Education Department. The notion of vulnerability being one coined by the researcher to act as a link between members' perceptions of

---

1 It must be emphasised that this is a paraphrase and not a quotation. The point being made is that as an ordinary member the researcher was presumed to be able to identify and construct statements which members recognise in everyday interaction as functioning in a way that credits a mediating member with the ability to distinguish between two other members in matters of personal style of thought and communication.

2 LP/SP interview.
the institutional power to define the X school as 'abnormal', and the sociologist's second order construct of the X school being available for processing as a deviant institution. Such analysis was noted by the researcher as being both necessary and difficult. The necessity was reinforced by the recurrence of members' categories which suggested that they were in the process of deviance-production.

In order to follow the theme of uncovering and analysing members' definitions of deviance and members' production or attenuation of abnormality or deviance, it is necessary to turn to documents that become available only after data had begun to be collected in the form of interviews. Of course, the initial data were documents in the form of press accounts which were a special case of the public accounting of putative deviance. However, it was in the documents relating to the interview of X school supporters during the enquiry into the X2 school, the recording made by X2 school supporters during a visit by KG to the school, and the report by DL on the X3 school - it was in such documents as these that the X school was presented as problematic, at best abnormal and at worst educationally deviant to the point of requiring control by exclusion beyond the margins of educational orthodoxy.

What made the problem of exclusion and deviance-attribution especially difficult was a situation that can only be grasped once it is acknowledged that in everyday accounting of deviance (whether that be in reference to drunken-driving or rape) - members use an absolutist model of deviance in order to have a criterion against which particular situations and events can be measured. Using such an absolutist theory it is logically possible for members readily to concede the possibility of 'secret' deviance. That is, 'real' deviance that goes undetected. Pollner has suggested that such a mode of everyday theorising of deviance is best seen as itself constitutive of deviance-production. ¹ For this reason it needs to be kept quite logically separate from second-order sociological theories of deviance which are necessary to

¹ M. Pollner, 1974, op.cit.
generate explanations of how first-order, everyday theorising produces the phenomena it theorises. The point for this thesis was the difficulty for members (especially KG the original investigator of the X2 school whose position as arbitrator of the symbolic order made him 'the community's reflexive conception of itself') to locate or generate a criterion with the necessary referential concreteness to persuade or impress other members that X2 'really' was 'not school'; that X2 'really' was 'abnormal'. It was in a commonsense notion of authority that KG first attempted to situate the criterion for the X2 school's abnormality. Eventually the situation arose where evidence for the flouting of this authority was referred (via the documentation of the enquiry into the X2 school) to matters of attendance in particular, but also to such issues as expectations about sexual behaviour of the schoolchildren. KG argued that the X2 school was qualitatively different to other schools. However, whilst KG felt that there was evidence that the X2 school incorporated a studied committment of opposition to 'authority' - X2 supporters in denying this proposition were not able to be identified with the putative deviance. (In an analogous case at the individual level, the person may - for a variety of reasons - confirm the attribution.) It was at the second-order level of theorising deviance that an understanding could be gained by equating Bernstein's integrated code with the form of social control envisaged by many X2 supporters, and Bernstein's collection code of educational transmission with KG's conception of social control and 'authority'.

Methodologically, it was only from the language of documents and interview transcripts that it became possible to situate members' accounts in such a way that the analysis could move with some degree of continuity between members' accounts and sociological abstraction, between first and second-order constructs. In discussing 'abnormality'

1 The overriding point, however, is that Model 1 is a constituent feature of the process for which deviance is the gloss. Part of the 'response' through which deviance is constituted includes the community's reflexive conception of itself as responding to essentially objective structures. Ibid., p.37.
in education, members created potentials for conflicts resolvable by deviance-attribution. Thereafter the historical events of conflict became absorbed into members' views of social structures and were thus further resources in the struggle to produce the legitimate account of whether and why the X school warranted special treatment.

In January of Year IV, immediately before the meeting of XI supporters with the Minister of Education, the supporters produced a document part of which involved a brief history of the X school. In dealing with the origins of the school reference is made to the first coordinator, JG, who was in contact with the current Director of Secondary Education Mr (CN), who was also one of the group establishing such a school, and to later (Year 5) the project was given the "go ahead". This brief history included a list of 'Assumptions about the school'. These assumptions, drafted in Year 3, have a different emphasis to the earlier document at the beginning of the XI. However, the section referred to distinguishes education department initiatives into those relating to 'community education, annexes and rehabilitation schools'. Given that neither the first coordinator (SJ) nor the Director of Secondary Education or that the (CN) have been interviewed, and there seems to be little guidance available for the establishment and maintenance of members within the Education Department at that time, then the impact on the intentions of the XI school is difficult to trace and analyze. With the later development answers are needed to questions about the nature of the authority for the formation and maintenance of the school, in addition there is the question of what one means by an 'school in an alternative form of education'. However, there is a question relating to what it meant to those involved in formal education via the status of 'annexes'. It is from various participants' retrospective accounts as well as the document referred to in the

See Appendix C. The "XI" Program.

[Ilfd., pp. 12, 14.]
CHAPTER IV

INSTITUTIONALISING AN INTEGRATED CODE

Events and Accounts: The Xl School

In January of Year IV, immediately before the meeting of X2 supporters with the Minister of Education, the supporters produced a document part of which involved a brief history of the X school. In dealing with the origins of the school reference is made to the first coordinator, SJ, who 'was in contact with the current Director of Secondary Education Mr[ct], who became convinced of the case for establishing such a school; and in late [Year 0] the project was given the "go ahead"'. This brief history included a set of 'Assumptions about the school'. These assumptions, drafted in Year IV, have a different emphasis to the earlier document on the philosophy of the Xl. However, the section referred to distinguishes Education Department initiatives into those relating to 'community schools, annexes and rehabilitation schools'. Given that neither the original coordinator (SJ) nor the Director of Secondary Education at that time (CT) have been interviewed, and there appear to have been no formal guidelines for the establishment and maintenance of annexes within the Education Department at that time, then the impetus for the development of the Xl school is difficult to trace and analyse. In the light of later developments answers are needed to questions about the nature of the authority for the formation and maintenance of Xl. In addition there is the question of what was meant by an 'experiment in an alternative form of education'. Finally, there is a question relating to what it meant to those involved to formalise administration via the status of 'annexe'. It is from various participants' retrospective accounts as well as the document (referred to as the

---

1 See Appendix C, 'The [X2] Community School'.
2 Ibid., pp.12, 14.
'letter patent') that such meanings must be gleaned. LP, for example, felt very strongly that the principal of D school (KF), to which Xl was originally annexed, agreed to the arrangement because of a formal request by the then Director of Secondary Education (CT), and not because of any empathy or understanding of the enterprise that SJ felt he was setting about. SJ invited parents and pupils to read A.S. Neill's Summerhill before they made a personal commitment, but KF agreed to the annexe (in LP's opinion) because of a request from a senior officer of the Education Department. In their much later descriptions of SJ's efforts at that time, interviewees who had been associated with the school as parents or students, uniformly attributed the founding and early development of Xl school to the drive and energy of SJ. Thus SJ was regularly identified as almost synonymous with the Xl school.

SJ apparently had very clear ideas as to how the Xl school was to operate. Furthermore, the IG family, for example, saw SJ as a powerful personality.

R: Yes, you would never come out on top from a discussion with [SJ].

BG was conceded by the rest of the IG family as the one who most often 'stood up to' SJ. BG commented that SJ would always 'win' a discussion even though BG believed strongly in SJ's commitment to individuals' rights to differ. I and C, the parents in the IG family, claimed that SJ would use psychoanalytic terms and exampled his suggesting that people's views sprang from an ego-involvement or ego-problem. The IG family agreed that whilst conceding that SJ operated with the best of intentions such an approach frequently involved a 'double bind' that was difficult to counter. In addition to his

---

1 In the Education Department documents surrounding the formation of the X school, none were found which formally set out the views of the Director of Secondary Education (CT) or any of his officers. One letter from SJ's wife to CT, complaining of unfair local press coverage might lend support to the view that CT was viewed as a personal mentor to the school, whose direct intervention could be relied on for protection when it was needed.

2 R - friend of IG family and one of the original students at the Xl school.
personal power, SJ made it clear to students and parents that the XI school was to be very special. CG recalled that SJ 'had a vision of a unique school, he had remarked that "We are different, even from the other progressives"'. CG recalled in support of these comments how SJ had refused to attend a state-wide seminar devoted to progressive education that had been held at a nearby university in Year II.

CG: [SJ] was always able to sustain tremendous loyalty from a core of kids and that really helped....

Some interviewees not only remarked the unusual protege/mentor relationship of SJ (the founder coordinator) and CT (his administrative supporter), but that each of these people may have mutually seen themselves as moving towards the solution of different problems. SJ confronting a problem of 'new' knowledge needing new educational forms, and CT confronting the problem of administering an educational system which included groups of highly politicised students prepared to take highly visible political action on a wide variety of issues. And both SJ and CT recognising an alliance of convenience, since each recognised the different emphasis in the other's aims. One interviewee developed this theme of selective misinterpretation at some length. In the process of elaborating the view he suggested that at least some of the teachers had inferred the operation of such a program on the basis of student recommendations that came to the school from the middle of Year II. The argument is worth reporting in full.

JB: [CT] had a funny thing going there with [SJ]. [SJ]'s association had almost become legendary around the school, and people would talk about it in terms of [SJ]'s ability to get on with [CT]. It was as much the other way, but [CT] was a very, very sharp political operator, and [CT] saw all the advantages in the world of setting up this school, both from the point of view of he had a year and a half to go [to retirement], from the point of view of getting all these bloody ratbags out of his schools and getting them down in one little place. They could rip the walls down and paint fuck all over the bloody walls, and do what they bloody liked, as far as [CT] was concerned. As long as they didn't

---

1 IG and CG were parents of BG and EG. Both BG and EG were students at the XI school from its inception. The entire family therefore had a close involvement with the school from Year I to IV. The interview with this family was conducted with all family members present, it was not tape recorded and quotations are paraphrased from notes made after the interview.
march up and down [main city street] and bang on his fucking door every day, which is what they'd been doing. Every time the [(a) teachers union] or the [(b) teachers union] went on strike these bloody kids went on strike and marched under a banner. You know it really wasn't very pleasant. So then there was good reason, you can imagine, good reason for [CT] - and the other... 

Int: So you think [CT] avowedly had a plan to co-opt them effectively without them knowing...

JB: I don't know whether they knew it or not - I talked to those kids in [Year I], and they knew what - they understood this was on, but they were having such a happy time, and such a good time that they said - fuck that, we're not going to take that down there, we're having a nice time in [Xl] you know, bugger [CT]. Let's not worry about his games. The kids are not that politically sophisticated see? Like they recognise what's going on, but they're not sophisticated - haven't got that long-term perception. Life's immediate for a seventeen-year old you know. So they knew it, but they didn't let him [CT] bother them. They just went on living the life that they wanted to lead because they were getting what they wanted. But [CT] also, I think, saw the possibility - he did - and certainly people around him did [in specialised branches of the Education Department].

Well I think he did it because the action of his directors, the actions of his inspectors show it, because not long after the school began, certainly in [Year II], [UT] told me he had a helluva job with parents being directed to the school. Kids who had had trouble in school. And then the school suddenly started to be a place where every kid who had got chucked out of secondary school got directed down there.... I think [CT] was quite a clever enough man to have had those two ideas in the back of his mind.¹

From such retrospective accounts by participants it is clear the reasons for the establishment of the Xl school tend to be added to in the light of later developments. The social position of various participants is seen to influence their perception of what social problem originally prompted the establishment of the school. JB (a parent and school council official in Year IV at X3) implied that out of a lack of mutuality of the aims of the original coordinator SJ and his mentor CT, it was possible for some Education Department officers to construe the Xl school as a 'dumping ground' for troublesome students. JB locates the source of part of his substantiating evidence as being

¹ Interview JB, pp.15-16.
UT - a teacher at the X1 school. In fact the theme of the X1 school becoming something of a 'dumping ground' for unwanted students was one that was repeated by other interviewees (for example LZ, a parent who had held a chairman's position for the school community from around Year II). The point being made is not only the difficulty of arriving at any 'truth' of these ideas, but nevertheless the irrelevance of such 'truth' given the evidence that the view was widespread and to that extent, an effective influence amongst certain important figures in the numerically small school community. 'Explanations' of the CT/SJ alliance then, ranged from that of an old man in his dotage supporting a young man of promise, to that of a shrewd administrator exploiting for the benefit of later administrators an idea which would serve different purposes but with mutual benefits to the 'progressive educators' as well as the administrators. The point to be clearly emphasised here is not the 'truth' or otherwise of all or any of these explanations, but rather that a number of informants felt it necessary to voluntarily make salient a relationship which did not have a self-evident basis but which was problematic enough to require a consciously devised explanation.

In attempting to establish that different views of the nature of the initial problem and the meaning of the proposed solution to this problem, had fairly wide currency amongst parents, teachers and administrators, the argument is being advanced that conventional views of 'deviant acts' and 'deviant audiences' with homogenous interpretations of these, cannot easily be sustained. It is important to note that within the ranks of education department officers, there was a variety of attitudes towards and understandings of the X1 school. Furthermore, the changes that took place in these attitudes had significant impacts on the course of development of the X school. As has been mentioned earlier, the nearest thing to a letter patent for the X school was a letter which it has been argued, effectively bound the X school to the personal interaction of SJ, the first coordinator and KF, the principal of D high school. By the middle of Year II, this nexus was broken with the departure of SJ.
The 'letter patent' epitomises the extent to which an atmosphere of weak classification or framing surrounded the establishment of the Xl school. Stated differently, the Xl school appears to have been instituted in a very non-formal way with the effect of making particular people and their personal interactions very significant and salient. This, of course, is the characteristic of the integrated code of social control. The 'letter patent' is a document which, paradoxically, appeared after the retirement of CT - the Director of Secondary Education who apparently had a personal interest with SJ in the founding of the Xl school. The paradox arises from the fact that although the letter effectively locates the responsibility for the successful operation of the Xl school in the personal interactions of KF (the principal of D school) and SJ the founding coordinator of Xl, nevertheless this idea was not formalised along these lines until after CT had retired.

It was in May of Year I that an Education Department officer wrote to KF, the principal of D school

...I think I should commit to paper some points concerning the relationship between you and [X school]. They are

a) the [X school] is officially a detached part of [D secondary school].

b) [KF] principal of [D secondary school] is responsible in the normal way for the correctness of administrative procedures and for the welfare of all persons in [X school].

c) [SG - chief administrator of this section of the education department] expects the [X school] to operate - 'according to the book', it therefore follows that there should be frequent contact between the principal and the teacher in charge with a view to keeping the principal fully informed and to resolving any difficulties which may arise particularly in areas that involve departure from conventional procedures. It is desirable that the issues of security, supervision and accounting be clearly stated. Because of the nature of the school it is intended that Mr[SJ] has almost complete freedom in the matters of curriculum and organisation. It is appreciated that these cannot always be dissociated from administration but we are confident that goodwill and open discussion, such as is already apparent in your relationship with Mr[SJ], will continue to achieve workable situations.1

1 See Appendix F.
It is important to note immediately that this is an official document which is simultaneously an enabling and legitimating document. This is the document which sets out the operational criteria for the X school. At the time the letter was written (mid-Year I) there was no other statement or document within the bureaucracy, of a formal nature which defined or delimited the conception of 'alternative' education, although the term itself had become a popular one and was built into the rhetoric of party political platforms on education at that time. (In fact, the X school and its closure/reopening if anything marked the recognition of the need for and development of bureaucratically-framed guidelines about 'alternative' education which was funded by public money.) By themselves the instructions are at the least ambiguous, possibly even contradictory. For example, the school will be expected 'to operate "according to the book"' (the phrase in inverted commas is presented this way as part of the layman and bureaucrat's 'everyday' recognition that working exactly to the rules set out in any book represents a publicly defined form of deviance which the inverted commas excludes 'for all practical purposes'). However, at the same time as 'working to the book' as distinct from 'working to rule', the instructions refer to a need for special communicative strategies to resolve 'any difficulties which may arise particularly in areas that involve departures from conventional procedures', furthermore 'it is appreciated that these (curriculum and organisation) cannot always be dissociated from administration'. The difficulty of the letter revolves around the need to solve a paradox of everyday rules in theory and practice. Part of the very definition of members of the regular secondary school is that those associated with it use the same glossing practices in making the formal rules operate. There is a recognition, albeit a vague one, that the 'alternative' school may in fact be defining itself in part as 'alternative to taken-for-granted glosses of formal procedural rules'. There follows a paradox of inviting a regular principal to work 'according to the book' in solving problems which are implicitly defined as not being in 'the book'. At this point the notion of 'restricted code' applies most concretely since the final 'gloss' in the letter patent is one which personalises and particularises instructions which are normally and in principle not personalised. The letter states: 'we are confident that goodwill and
open discussion, such as is already apparent in your relationship with Mr[SJ] will continue to achieve workable situations'. This gloss effectively locates a set of instructions of a principled and general nature within the relationship of two people in terms of their personal identities, not in terms of their formal roles. In other words, this gloss is not an afterthought but is an intrinsic and organic part of the meaning of the document.

At the time at which the letter was written, it was accepted as the basis on which the X school could be established and proceed, and to this extent it can be taken obliquely as some evidence of the effectiveness of SJ's rhetoric and strategies of communications. The letter itself also needs to be seen as significant for the broader themes of social ordering and techniques of legitimation. These themes are central to the case study with its focus on rules, social control and contexts of interaction.

In fact the enabling letter uses language that assumes that all schools function by definition within Bernstein's 'collection code'. In other words, that the boundaries between organisation, curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation are clear, strong and essential.
CHAPTER V

ON POSITIONS AND ROLES: CONCEPTIONS OF ORDERING RITUAL

A considerable effort was expended in part of the opening theoretical section, establishing the importance of contemporary ritual as it contributes to a sense of order in our society. Mary Douglas' work was invoked to establish the idea of ritual being social actions which are 'alive' and function without any necessarily conscious purpose on the part of the social actor. In Bernstein's work on 'Ritual in Education' he refers to the ordering functions of school rituals which separate sexes, rank students by age or intelligence, and mark off teachers from taught. One of the key arguments in Bernstein's paper on 'Classification and Framing' is that the integrated knowledge code affects more than just what passes for 'knowledge'. Varying strengths of classification and framing effect also the nature of deference and demeanour as they occur in the ritual exchanges of everyday activities. It is this, it will be argued, which provides a way of understanding the plethora of 'complications' in social interaction which occurred at the X school. Whether it be the case of 'D the cleaner' or the apparent non-acceptance of KX the third coordinator, or the difficulties which various departmental officers reported having with the staff and students of the X school (both before its closure and after its re-opening) - all of these phenomena are best understood in terms of the implications for social ordering rituals, of changes in the strength of classification and framing.

In exemplifying the significance of rituals of deference and demeanour, evidence can be gleaned from the actions of three separate Education Department officials on different occasions, during the eras of three separate coordinators. During the early period of the XI school when SJ was coordinator, his Education Department 'mentor' CT made a point of changing into casual clothing before proceeding with a visit which he had arranged to make to the school. Even if CT was not fully aware of the implications of his actions, nevertheless they involve the attempt to present a demeanour which acknowledged
the 'special' ritual ordering of X1 school, and which would presumably engender the appropriate deferential responses. Sometime after KX had been appointed coordinator of the X2 school, SG, as head of the Secondary Education Division, submitted a memo to his superior officer outlining various complaints from KX the coordinator, KF the principal of D school and a representative of a group of parents. SG recommended that a panel of six persons be selected to review the school, but was asked instead to visit the school himself. The point to be emphasised is that SG's reluctance to visit the school is evidence of a degree of interaction breakdown and social distancing. When SG subsequently visited the school, the ritual exchanges were such as to inhibit rather than facilitate communication. SG did not ensure that his arrival would be communicated to the school body. (Part of the substance of complaints revolved around the alienation of KX and his rejection by staff and students.) The visit was brief enough to be perceived as one in which effective interaction could not take place. LP reported that SG had been offended by a teacher who sat with his bare feet up on a table. SG reported inter alia

On Friday last I visited the [X2 school]. Many of the students were wandering aimlessly about in corridors, sitting on the floor in the common room, or smoking cigarettes on the front verandah. During my visit I could see little of educational value being undertaken or achieved.

What is being argued here is that the rituals of social exchange involved a demeanour by SG that was suitable for a school operating under a collection code. This demeanour did not attract an expected response of deference. The effect was to create greater social distancing and to confirm SG's opinion that the school was 'abnormal' and in need of special forms of social control.

In Year IV, DL a school inspector, volunteered to take a position as a liaison officer for the X3 school. During his early visits to the school he described how he took offence at students addressing him by his Christian name. In conventional ordering rituals both his age and formal position would demand the deferential ritual

1 Personal notes.
2 SG's initial suggestion of a six-member panel to visit the school was overruled by an instruction that he first should visit it himself (personal notes).
of addressing him as 'Mister'. In fact, the practice persisted. Within an integrated code such conventional rituals of deference are likely to be ignored. DL in the course of the interview 'explained away' the problem. He realised that at the time of re-opening the students were 'bound to have been anxious and upset', DL felt it was his responsibility to be conciliatory. Later on, said DL, he realised that the familiar form of address implied no offence to his person or position - so the practice was allowed to continue. (Later when DL was asked if he felt any replacement officer, taking over his position as liaison officer to the X3 school, might experience difficulties, he seemed surprised and suggested that there should be little difficulty since such a replacement process was a normal bureaucratic procedure.)

It is in the events surrounding the interaction of KX with D the cleaner that there is revealed the sense of confusion and anger over different approaches to the connection between personal identity and key social roles. It is in the interviews that we see participants developing their own accounts for such breakdowns in interaction. The instance of 'D the school cleaner' was cited repeatedly with the same event being employed at the level of 'common-sense' information supporting particular (but nevertheless very different) views of social order. It is thus the 'common-sense' rules of interpretation which it is necessary to make problematic. All parties apparently believed that events had a meaning which was self-evident, that is that any interpretation was so minimal - once 'the facts' were cited - that the rules of interpretation could be taken for granted since they must inevitably lead to different people drawing the same conclusions. Nevertheless, the contexts of discussion in which the incident of 'D the cleaner' was mentioned, influence the meaning for the producer of the explanation and when contrasted with other contexts and rhetorics give some idea of the variation in the taken-for-granted rules of interpretation as they relate to understandings of how order and social cohesion are developed and maintained.

1 DL coined the term 'closure shock' as a means of accounting for student reactions to himself. DL interview.
In the following exchange it is implied that differences between two people (the cleaner and KX the new organiser) at the personal level were transformed by the organiser to the 'formal' level and it was this transfiguration, in part, which violated a school-based sense of order and interaction based on the acknowledgement of the primacy of personal identity over social role.

LP: A cleaner being employed who was one of the originators of the founding of the school. He was an ex-student of [SJ]'s at [V] High School, was a friend of [SJ]'s and was employed at the school as a cleaner - if you like - to use the European term, was a factotem. Doing everything - doing teaching, doing learning, doing cooking, doing cleaning. He was officially employed as a cleaner. [D] was his name. In fact, he's now teaching English somewhere. Some private school. Very nice fellow actually. And there the episode is a very quick one; the school went to a camp. The staff invited the cleaner to the camp. [KX] objected. Because he couldn't stand the fellow. He forbade him to participate in the camp. And he went on the camp.

SP: And the children were enraged [at the prohibiting of the cleaner from the camp], because the cleaner meant a lot to them.

LP: The kids were upset, the parents were upset, everybody was upset.

SP: He wasn't the cleaner, he was also the cleaner.

LP: And out of this little conflict and all the other accumulated muck, there evolved an idea that all of us should participate in making decisions.

In articulating the difference between being only the cleaner and being also the cleaner, SP points to the difference between a sense of order and the power in interaction deriving primarily from the particularities of a personal identity and the generalities of a social role.

The point has been mentioned already that many participants cited the event of 'D the cleaner' on their implied understanding that the 'facts' of the event would 'speak for themselves'. What is becoming clearer is that the event in and of itself means very little but it is capable of 'illustrating' a variety of 'facts' which range from KX's understandings and use of formal rules, through varying conceptions of the relative importance of individuals' personal identities vis a vis their formal roles, to the 'fact' of the intentional 'defiance of
authority' by a subordinate of a superordinate's 'authority'. It seems clear that to some members there was little conscious distinction between an individual and his occupational role. For those people who see identity as largely being determined by one's main activity, then the answer is a simple one, if one is an organiser then one is judged primarily in terms of one's organising. That officials of the Education Department held to a conception of coordinator as an authoritative role within an hierarchical structure with predicated forms of deference is nicely illustrated in SG's official memorandum.

...Last year the cleaner was accepted as a member of the group and in addition to his cleaning activities, assisted with the cooking of natural foods and even had voting rights on educational topics....

What appears incomprehensible to the writer of the memo, given the nature of authority as it relates to his conception of the role of coordinator, is that the cleaner should vote on educational topics. Put in Bernstein's terms, the memo-writer conceives of a role-system that is strongly-classified, where the boundaries separating the roles of cleaner and educator are clearly and unequivocally defined and where blurring of the boundaries implies a lack of social competence and consequently an incipient state of disorder.

The question of order and social control as they derived from different conceptions of social positions and social roles is so central to the conflict, yet was so difficult for participants to articulate despite their own awareness of the issue, that members' accounts are worthy of extended treatment. BN and BNd for example used the issue of D the cleaner to symbolise a more general phenomenon relating to the generation and application of 'rules' of interaction at X2. This account illustrates Gouldner's concept of 'normalised repression' since the actors indicate that their attempt to apply common-sense rules of 'theoreticity' and 'conventionality' are constrained by the realisation that the most powerful definitions of the situation are not theirs.

BNd: [XX] wouldn't let [D] who was the school cleaner go on a camp....Well look, that's through [XX]'s eyes. He sees things - I think one of [XX]'s big faults was he couldn't
see - he had his set of rules from the Education Department, and he was so conservative that he couldn't - it just wasn't feasible for him to see, to be able to stretch them which was what we'd been doing for the last two years. But to stretch the rules and regulations in the Education Department? It wasn't just that he wasn't prepared for it - to stretch them - the fact was that he couldn't see that it was feasible to stretch them. You know? His mind was geared to the fact that there were rules and regulations.

BN: ...about that, I think one of the biggest faults with the school right from the start, and a tension that I'm sure others have mentioned, is that [KX] was responsible to [KF], the principal of [D] High School. Now that was... [another daughter's] school. So we know the school, and at that stage it was a very conservative, traditional school, very similar to the sort of school I went to [N school], twenty-something years ago. You know, that was an academic high, and that - as far as it being a different day and age - that's how she was trying to run it. And she was a very efficient, you know, strong educational person, but she was very much a rules and regulations woman. Now she put pressure on [SJ - first coordinator] and [XB - second coordinator] before this... [SJ] eventually learnt how to handle her. And that again is another bit about that. But [KX] was in that sort of pressure from [KF] and the staff putting pressure on, and the parents. But parents didn't come into the incident with [D] the cleaner. He used as his reason for taking him, or letting him go, that the school was filthy and he hadn't done his job properly. So that staff and students did a clean-up (because the staff did tell the kids everything that was going on, and they cleaned the school up spotlessly, and then, I think the staff made the mistake, they took him on the camp with them. And it was fait accompli. So [D] defied [KX].

BNd: As soon as the conflict started I see the problem was - and probably a lot of the students would differ from me, because they were very anti-[KX]. But so far as I can see it, if the staff had been willing to compromise, like they'd - we had this person who was a rules and regulations man, but we were stuck with him. As far as we know, we couldn't do anything about getting another coordinator. Now when you're stuck with somebody like that, and you're faced with a situation of either compromising or closing down, you've got to compromise. But instead they went out and straight-out defied him. And the teachers, one in particular I know, would go around indoctrinating the kids about what a bastard [KX] was and he said - this particular teacher was saying (I was trying to argue with him one day - you've got to compromise in the situation) and he said 'There's no way you can compromise, you've got to stand on your ideals'.

What seems apparent from the extract of interview thus far is that there is a clear awareness of a conflict, of who the parties to this conflict were, and more particularly, of an option having been
exercised (by 'defying' and the 'fait accompli') to use a tactic of confrontation. What also is evident is difficulty in resolving any satisfying underlying meaning for the confrontation. That is, there was understanding of the meaning of confrontation but a failure to theorise why this approach and not some other, was adopted. Early in the extract the argument is developed that KX was not suited to the situation he was in, 'his mind was geared to the fact that there were rules and regulations'. Furthermore, it became necessary to explain why this was a significant factor, and this explanation was produced in terms of 'pressure' from a social environment which included the principal of D High School who was also 'very much a rules and regulations' person. The fact that the original coordinator had 'eventually learnt how to handle her' was related to the problem faced by KX in terms of the enabling concept 'feasible'.

'It wasn't just that he wasn't prepared for it, to stretch them [the rules and regulations], the fact was that he couldn't see that it was feasible to stretch them'. The word 'feasible' is adopted since there is a clear awareness that there could be some debate about the degree of self-consciousness with which KX was actually using the rules and regulations as an enabling mechanism. In the incident with D the cleaner, it is said that 'He used as his reason...', in other words, this interviewee explicitly noted that the roles are being 'used' in a 'power-full' fashion; furthermore, the response of the staff is seen as one which allows for clear apprehension. The response of the staff is one of reciprocating 'power-full' action which is seen to allow of no misinterpretation either by KX or other participants. The problem for the interviewees is one of resolving the meaning of confrontation, that is, its choice as a tactic:

END: All the staff have got their own philosophies about the school and how they could run it, and they were very enthusiastic, they're all very young. A lot of them had never been to a straight school. They'd always been in a community school situation. They are very young, most of them. And they had all these fine ideals and everything, but it just wasn't feasible. You know, they just wouldn't compromise. And I was really mad, because they just - I'm sure, possibly (KX was a nice guy) unfortunately he wasn't the right sort of person, but I think, with compromise on the staff's part, it could have been a workable situation.
What appears to be happening in this argument is that the abstract referent 'rules and regulations' is identified as a 'stretchable', that is a variable entity but that 'pressures' and personal identity make it 'unfeasible' for KX to 'compromise'. On the other hand, the fact that staff are young, have ideals, are unfamiliar with 'straight' schools does not make it unfeasible for them to have avoided confrontation via a rigid response to the rules which were invoked (they cleaned up the school) in order to by-pass the coordinator's wish that D the cleaner should not go away on the camp. A 'compromise' would have avoided a 'fait accompli' or 'defiance' on this particular issue. It would have produced a 'workable situation'. The choice of the word 'defiance' with reference to KX is significant as is the language that identifies particular individuals with their social roles. It is implicit in the above extract of interview that KX is capable of being separated from his role as coordinator ('KX was a nice guy'). Furthermore, it is the role of coordinator that is implied as being crucial (implicitly it is theorised that the power to produce 'workable situations' is located in the role, and to this extent the 'confrontation' was decried).

We had this person who was a rules and regulations man, but we were stuck with him. As far as we knew, we couldn't do anything about getting another coordinator. Now when you're stuck with somebody like that, and you're faced with a situation of either compromising or closing down, you've got to compromise....

Throughout this account BNd is struggling to develop criteria for evaluating the actions of KX. In Mc Hugh's terms - the problem stems from the fact that having first decided that KX is not suitable for the position of coordinator on the basis of his actions (such as those surrounding D the cleaner), then the moral decision has to be made as to whether KX had any choice (his degree of conventionality) and whether he 'knew what he was doing' in a morally responsible way (his degree of 'theoreticity'). BNd finds that KX 'knew what he was doing' in applying Education Department rules, but that KX had no choice - it was not 'feasible' for him to do otherwise. (KX's decisions were 'sad' rather than 'bad'; tragic rather than malicious). At the same time however, BNd's awareness of two positions from which one could apply the common-sense rules of deviance (from within the bounds of the X school community, or from within the wider community, more especially
as it was represented by the Education Department), highlights the question of power and pluralism. BNd argues in favour of compromise with the surrounding, dominant community and she does this by using this wider community's form of evaluation of the X school staff. The staff were 'young' and 'inexperienced'. BNd is effectively saying 'we know that the wider community would apply the tests of theoreticity and conventionality in a different way to KX than would the members of the school community, but the dominance of this mode of commonsense rule application forces a compromise. This is the sort of situation to which Gouldner alludes when he writes of normalised repression:

If morality seems coextensive with power, it is not only because power influences the levels at which conformity to moral values becomes conventionalized, but also because power can actually shape the definition of what is moral (and, indeed, of what is 'real'). For, in any given case, what is moral is often uncertain, frequently disputed, and invariably resolved in a situation where some have more power than others. Those with more power therefore exert more influence in determining which moral rule applies and what a rule means in any given case.1

The question of 'D the cleaner' was raised during an interview which was part of the data-gathering process of the Education Department's official enquiry. In the material which follows, a parent who holds an academic post involving some considerable administrative responsibility, presents the example in order to develop an account of contextually-influenced power and authority especially as he saw its application at the X school. There were two departmental investigating officers, KX and CG. If the line of questioning is followed it is noticeable that KG ceases his questions once it is elicited that it is 'a fact' that the coordinator has been 'defied'. It is the other interviewer, CG, who follows through the implications of context for power and authority.

KG: You also commented extensively on the management... administration...[in the invited written submission to the formal enquiry] and you raised the issue of the kind of school it is and I suspect a little conflict in your own mind as to just where authority stands. Would you like to tell us a little more about this?

---

IG: [relates a series of anecdotes about people being dissatisfied with the present state of affairs at X school; suggests 'lack of experience' on KX's part. Suggests that there are people about who could exercise the sort of authority which is needed in this type of school but KX has not got the sort of skills which are necessary.]

It is worth interjecting at this point to indicate the frequent use by people of varying interests of the gloss 'so-and-so does not have the experience'. The gloss itself is a figure of everyday speech which functions to avoid lengthy explication of a tautology, for example, if Bill Smith is agreed to be successful, then he patently must possess the requisite 'experience'. If Bill Smith is seen to be unsuccessful, then an explanation in terms of 'lack of experience' is acceptable. So far in the course of presenting various accounts of the affair of 'D the cleaner' we have seen the gloss about 'lack of experience' explicitly produced to explain first the failure of the staff to 'compromise' and second the failure of the coordinator (KX) to exercise the 'right sort of authority'. It was explicitly mentioned by at least one later participant in the closure and re-opening of the X school, that during these investigatory interviews, the use of glosses such as 'so-and-so lacked experience' were quite dysfunctional for communication.

KG: You are insisting that some authority is essential?

IG: Of course - I'm Chairman of a Department. This story seems to be quite symptomatic. Well [D] going to a camp was a nice one, perhaps even better, the business of how many kids are allowed to fit into cars. When you go on excursions you are supposed to have seven, and then somebody else rolls up at the last minute. Okay, you just put an eighth person in there. [KX] says 'don't do that' and he is defied, he is defied regularly every day and of course it riles him; it's rather a hard thing for him to take. He's used to a situation where one exercising authority, exercises authority.

KG: He may be worried about it.

IG: Of course he's very worried about it. He has every reason to be worried. I worry about the safety reasons, but the methods he's using for coping with that situation doesn't work. They don't work because [XB - teacher cum previous 'interim' coordinator] didn't do that, they don't work because [SJ - original founder coordinator] didn't do that.

KG: How would they have averted those situations?
IG: They would have talked, they would have argued. [KK] can't talk, he's no talker. These are such an articulate mob, teachers and students, and if you can't appeal to them in moral terms, and if argument and discussion about what this school and community is all about - you haven't got a hope. Of course, I'm used to this situation because I'm dealing with my own tutors. If I exercise authority administratively over them, as distinct from cajoling talk to them, intimately appealing to some common ideal, I would never get anywhere. Of course there are times I raise my voice and say 'You bloody-well won't do that!' but unless I economise very greatly at times when I use that kind of authority, it's very difficult.

At this stage in the interview there are a number of points worth noting, which flow largely from the categories of language in use. As a first example the interviewer shapes the questions in terms of the need to 'avert these situations'. The form of the question is unwittingly tendentious if (as seems to be the case from the thrust of the interviewee's responses) it is not necessarily accepted that these 'events' really are 'situations'. Stated differently, the question tends to beg the possibility that 'situations' are never so much 'averted' as managed in such a way that they are defined out of existence; the set of circumstances becomes routinised in its handling such that it is no longer a 'situation' (something unexpected as well as extraordinary) so much as an 'event' (something which may be unpredictable in its specifics but in general is not extraordinary), since a set of routinised practices exists within which it can be handled without the implication that 'something unusual is happening here'. All schools handle unpredictable events to do, for example, with unexpected revelations of sexual relations amongst school children, or the introduction, distribution and use of illicit drugs. Most schools, however, routinise the handling of these events using 'normative elements' which effectively define a set of circumstances as an event rather than a situation; as a circumstance for which handling-routines and practices exist rather than a situation which will require the intrusion of external powers with the authority to 'define the situation'.

1 J. Gibbs, 1972, op.cit.
2 P. McHugh, 1968, Defining the Situation, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, passim.
A second point refers to the interviewee's reply when he says 'KX can't talk, he is no talker'. The interviewee knew that he was employing the terms 'talk' and 'talker' in a special way and he elaborated by reference, first of all to the teachers and students being 'such an articulate mob'. This was not ordinary talk, it was talk that was explicitly rhetorical as it was necessary for the coordinator to 'appeal to them in moral terms'. This leads to the third point which is that the appeal in moral terms is not seen as a discrete rhetorical device - a form that can be defined as merely involving the art of persuasion. Even the apparently minor issues need 'talk' which involves a 'moral appeal' which, in turn, is described as 'argument and discussion about what this school and community is all about'. It is not made perfectly clear whether 'this school' and '(this) community' are identified as one and the same thing. (The probability is that this is the case given the name 'community school' which occurs frequently amongst those involved.) However, there is a line of thinking developed which links together the notion of this particular school/community and a process of social exchange involving the on-going definition and maintenance of an authority which links events with such abstractions as 'the community' in a way which is meaningful to members. This line of thinking is contrasted with the need to 'economise' on the 'exercise of authority administratively'. The idea of 'economic' usage of administrative authority implies the acknowledgement of the legitimacy of such authority but only under certain contextually or situationally appropriate circumstances. (Whether there are procedures for ascertaining these circumstances, and what these procedures are or how they are constituted, is not hinted at. Though this, of course, cannot be a criticism since specification was not part of the practical purpose at hand.)

KG: Perhaps [KX] may see the necessity of legal responsibility more than [HG - coordinator of another 'alternative school' within the same education department, the TS school].

IG: Oh yes, [KX] is doing all the sensible things but the way he is doing them....The parents have argued with me about this a great deal and I agree with them. What [KX] is doing has to be done, but it is not being - that is to say it is not being done effectively. The message is being sent but it's not being received or it's being rejected.

KG: That's a fact?
IG: Sure! Of course it is, and the more [KX] uses administrative authority, the more resistant the teachers become, and then it becomes an issue around the School Council, and this is another aspect of where [KX], not being able to talk, comes in. He gets up at parents' meetings or [X2] school meetings and can't articulate. In that situation he can't relate to that group of people, and so it seems as if he's bowing out and not willing to participate in a community or joint democratic thing. It's not really true, in a way he would be perfectly willing to compromise, he's not a hard man, he's not a man who does not want to compromise, but because he does not know the styles of operation of that kind of group, that sort of rough and tumble style - he doesn't get across. And then people say 'he's just a bureaucrat, a man playing the Department's game, he's just the Department's man foisted onto us'.

CG: You are really saying then, that as you see it here, it's a problem of communication?

IG: Yes - probably that's what I'm saying. But it's not a problem he could solve by taking a course in communications or 'getting-across', because it's the man, it's his background.

It is in this preceding passage that it is possible to see what was referred to by another participant as a 'lack of interface' between the interviewers and the interviewee. The interviewee is presenting an argument about forms of authority which could, in Bernstein's terms, be described as involving weak classification and framing.¹ The interviewee distinguishes between 'administrative authority' and the process of decision-making which is shared between people, who in 'formal' terms could be said to be occupying roles whose relationships (role relationships) suggest particular patterns of deference and demeanour. However, in many circumstances the interviewee argues, there is need for greater dependence on contextual and situational cues. 'He does not know the styles of operation of that kind of group, that sort of rough and tumble style'. Furthermore, the problem is compounded by virtue, firstly of the coordinator's personal identity being cast in a different mould and secondly because such an identity is seen as one not easily modified by forms of conventional learning 'it's not a problem he could solve by taking a course in communications or "getting-across" because it's the man, it's his background'.

¹ B. Bernstein, 1971, op.cit.
What has been presented here is a sampling of explanations and interactions between people all of whom, despite their best intentions, were only partially successful in transmitting their explanations of events to one another. The purpose has been to show that the issue is not simply of groups of people who fully understand one another's position and then 'agree to disagree'. The notion of consensus is singularly inappropriate here. The problem centres around groups holding understandings of the meaning of social order which are to them implicit and consequently renders these people incapable of articulately representing the basis of their mutual lack of comprehension. At the same time, however, at the level of interaction - a sense of effective communication is frequently sustained. Such 'surface' communication which is undergirded by a fundamental failure to communicate becomes deeply frustrating.

In other words, for people operating with a set of assumptions derived essentially from within a collection code of educational transmission, it seemed axiomatic that there existed specialised, clearly-bounded positions, whose easy identification provided a systematic source of authority for decisions made by whoever occupied the position. On the other hand, those people striving to develop a school operating on an integrated code of educational transmission, found themselves looking at how well individuals showed themselves able and willing to cooperatively evolve relationships. It was the strength of this integration, the whole fabric of this cooperation, which was seen to validate the authority and decisions of particular people within the unit.

At this point we will summarily relate the detailed material presented so far to the modified version of Young's 'self-fulfilling prophecy' (SFP) deviance amplification spiral and Bernstein's theory of educational codes. SJ drew together supporters, who favoured his attempt to organise a school which was different to conventional schools on the one hand, and different to various alternative schools on the other. The nature of authority in the X1 school was highly personal revolving around the intense loyalty of a core of students towards SJ and his approach to teaching and communication which was described by members of the IG family as a 'therapy' relationship. In the X1
school, the ritual ordering associated with uniforms, highly formalised
time-tabling and clearly segmented fields of knowledge were all
abandoned. In terms of Bernstein's typology of educational codes the
X1 school must be located towards the polar type of the integrated
code, with special note to be made of SJ's personal role in first
establishing and then gradually losing an ideological consensus. It
was SJ who had the fundamental influence in choosing the initial staff
members and in developing an ideological framework which would be
conducive to their working together.

Young's 'SFP' deviance amplification spiral starts with an
initial problem and moves to the solution adopted for that problem.
In this case the initial problem is that experienced by some teachers
(SJ in particular) and pupils, with the conventional forms of social
order and control in schools, and the relationship of these to learning,
socialisation and the transmission of knowledge; in other words with
the monolithic and prevailing collection code. The solution to this
problem which was adopted was that of establishing an 'experimental
progressive school'. We want to argue, in fact, that the X school was
to be a solution to the absolutist educational problem of the
collection code. The collection code (in various degrees of strong
classification and framing) was reacted against with an integrated
code which is of its nature a much more relativistic form especially
with regard to its forms of social control. We are here attempting
to blend the work of Young and Bernstein by suggesting the usefulness
of arguing that in the realm of education at the time, Young's
'absolutist monolith' (which he of course coined in order to discuss
approaches to deviance) can be equated educationally with Bernstein's
collection code.

The conceptual touch-stones of education were those associated
with the strong classification of knowledge, epitomised in the clearly
insulated subjects of the final school evaluation - the HSC, and the
strong framing associated with conventional pedagogical specialisation
and various teaching techniques and identities. To be educated was
simply to have been successfully socialised into the educational
consciousness of the collection code. The importance of this equation
of Young and Bernstein's work follows when we argue that it allows for
a better understanding of a) why the X school had difficulties in producing its own form of social order, and b) how these difficulties came to be interpreted from within the prevailing 'absolutist monolith' of the collection code. The X school, in rejecting the HSC, appeared from the absolutist perspective to have rejected evaluation and assessment per se. When the staff spoke in terms of control of students via students' and parents' sense of commitment (meanwhile taking a lax attitude or apparently cavalier approach to student records of attendance), this action, from the absolutist perspective, appeared as folly or irresponsibility but certainly not as a legitimate approach to social control. Depending on which perspective was adopted - the 'relativist' position of the integrated code, or the 'absolutist' position of the prevailing collection code, the X school came to be seen either as a radical innovation or as a social problem with potentially disastrous consequences. In Young's approach to deviance which focusses on drugs, drug-taking only becomes a social problem when the drug or the mode of ingestion is defined as illicit. In the case of the Xl school, although it was not established illicitly, the establishment was unusual. The Xl school was not established, for instance, as a result of recommendations based on the bureaucratic assessment of population growth or other demographic trends. In fact, from the outset, there were administrators who were reluctant to concede the validity of the establishment procedures used. To this extent the establishment of the Xl school could be argued for as a putative social problem. The fact that there were different perceptions and interpretations of the meaning of the establishment of the Xl school accords with Young's arguments about the selective misperceptions of the solution to the initial problem.

The polarisation of views on issues of evaluation (HSC), organisation (participation and decision-making), led to a variety of participants' accounts of these things, all of which included different interpretations of the position and attitudes of the three coordinators. The variety of accounts thus represented a conflict between groups, none of which had sufficient power to conclusively define issues. Young, in his SFP theory of deviance amplification, argues that the 'solution' of the drug-takers to their problem, is selectively misperceived by agencies of social control and the mass media. We
are suggesting that by viewing the attempt to evolve modes of social control consonant with the integrated code - from within the assumptions of a collection code - the Education Department administrators, investigators and later also the mass media, effected an analogous form of selective misperception. There was thus no definitive and unequivocally legitimate account of the state of affairs at the X2 school. The variety of interest groups and their interpretations, however, meant that the X2 school was able to be presented as a 'social problem'. It was no longer a 'normal' school, not even a 'normal' alternative school. By Term II of Year III a decision had been made to organise an investigation of the X2 school by two officers of the Education Department. Presumably this would result in a definitive and officially legitimated account of events that would allow undisputed decisions to be made about what actions were needed to produce a state of normality and order.

The X school, in other words, was being presented as abnormal, as deviant inasmuch as it appeared unmanageable within the accepted legally instituted administrative framework. In McHugh's term of 'conventionality', the X school was presented as pressing for alternative modes of administration which were not acceptable as alternatives, the degree of wilfulness or 'theoreticity' had yet to be formally established.

Administrators would come to claim that - unbeknown to them, the X school had always stood for operating procedures which were in fact illegal, but that the real identity of purpose was not able to be discovered until after the appointment of KX 'brought matters to a head'. That this interpretation was possible, where the people involved felt strongly that their interpretations were valid and formed by wide experience, is a result of their working within the assumptions of a collection code of education which was so widely shared - especially by administrative officials - as to be analogous to Young's 'absolutist monolith'.

This evidence for the absolutist monolith of the collection code is admittedly fragmentary and spread through a number of sources, including the report of the official investigation itself. In SG's own memoranda it is taken for granted that there can be only one
interpretation of such ideas as 'very little instruction is proceeding', that 'the timetable is not being observed', that 'the staff see themselves as fully autonomous', that 'at any one time less than half the pupils are in attendance', that 'the staff bend to the will of the students', or that the cleaner 'even had voting rights on educational topics'. In a letter addressed to the Minister in April of Year III, by the same parent (FI) who had telephoned an earlier complaint to SG, it is argued

The staff see as their primary mission the establishment of an order in which they are answerable to no-one - in their words they want 'autonomy' which appears to be interpreted as implying absolute rejection of any responsibility to the [Education] Department in particular.¹

What is carried implicitly within such rhetoric are assumptions - about the relationship of social organisation of the school, pedagogy and curriculum to social control - which relate to the strong insulation of these areas, one from another. It is taken-for-granted furthermore that there are no conceivable variations in the strength of such boundaries, let alone a consideration of any implications for different forms of social control. Similar assumptions appear in the early memorandum relating to the Xl school when it is suggested that the school is 'unusual but not necessarily educational', that it is unmeasured (and by implication unmeasurable) and that this makes it a 'highly suspect unit'.²

Both the selections quoted above, as well as a great deal of the commentary contained in the two Education Department investigators' report, are representative of a generalised rhetoric which assumes the collection code of education as normative. Whether it be in reference to class size, the style of recording attendance, the tight framing via a timetable which regulates all time segments, the pedagogy of teacher and learner in formal social relations - it is this strong classification and framing which is assumed and taken-for-granted as the educational norm. Any variations from these norms are in this thesis being described as selectively misperceived

¹ Personal notes.
² Ibid., and see below, ch.IV.
if these variations are taken as self-evident facts of dis-order. If there is no indication that what has been observed could have a legitimate but different normative matrix, then the effect is one of selective misperception since it will be taken as axiomatic that the observations are evidence of a lack of order. However, the particular observations, because they are capable of receiving different emphases, are in turn prone to produce a variety of social problem ideologies.

Conflict within the school came to be seen and used by some people as a manifestation of the weakness of the school itself, as evidence of its abnormality and, in turn, its availability for special methods of supervision and control - in this case an Education Department Investigation. However, there is a need to avoid attributing, even implicitly, a monolithic unity of purpose to the Education Department itself. Indeed, to make this error would destroy the opportunity to understand the reasons why such an apparently minor and small school (an annexe, to be precise) was on a number of occasions referred to (or referred itself to) the Minister of Education. The Education Department as a formal organisation possessed strong classification and framing of its social boundaries, with clear specification of areas of jurisdiction (classification), and modes of operation (framing). It will be argued that the X2 school in particular, operated under conditions of increasingly distanced social interaction with key parts of the Education Department, and that for these parts at least there developed a process of deviance attribution. However, these views, social distancing and deviance attribution did not occur uniformly in the Education Department, in addition because they were formally expressed in an implicit way by reference to and communications about substantive affairs (the HSC decision, parental complaints, conflict over 'authority' etc.), they were not able to be effectively shared throughout the organisation. Finally, supporters of the X school had little time or even understanding of the formal insulations of the Education Department - these insulations were seen at the very least as an impediment - so they saw no difficulties in approaching any part of the administration - and finally the Minister himself, with their complaints. Thus even the special investigation was prone to equivocal interpretation, it documented circumstances and attitudes of those involved in such a way that a variety of action recommendations
(even contrary one to another) could be premised upon it. The document itself was transmitted through different levels of the Education Department, including the Minister's office, but such was the equivocation that on-going and subsequent events and participants' accounts of these became significant when the Minister finally proposed to close the school and made this announcement public, only within a few days of the close of the school year in Year III.

The closure of the X2 school at the end of Year III marks an important point in both theoretical and substantive terms. Substantively the Education Department had acted via the Minister in a way which affected parents, students and teachers in the first instance, but administrators as well once the issue became a public and political one. Theoretically, the emergence of the school closure as a public, and therefore, political issue meant that the involvement of the popular mass media, for example, created an audience and the possibility of deviance amplification. Administratively, the Minister appointed special assistants to solve the problem which meant that even in terms of the formal organisation of the Education Department, completely new forces operated to influence the course of events.
CHAPTER VI
FROM INTEGRATION TO INVESTIGATION

Modifying Integration, From X1 to X2

In the middle of Year II, SJ left the X1 school and the position of coordinator was carried on in an 'acting' capacity by XB, who had been with the school from its inception. At this time the school community was negotiating with Education Department officials for accommodation to supersede that of the X1 school. Members of the school community recalled in later interviews that a great deal of frustration was experienced in these negotiations. At the same time changes were made (and perceived in various ways) in the organisational structure of the school. The X1 school originally had a structure involving a general meeting of staff and students, plus a general committee of parents and what has been described as 'an informal Education Committee, advisory to [SJ]'\(^1\). In addition, the transfer of the coordinator's position to XB roughly coincided with the development of a debate in the wider community context of education throughout the State, with respect to the effectiveness of and possible alternatives to the HSC. A decision was eventually reached that the X1 school would not continue to teach the HSC. It was during the latter period of this debate that the third person to hold the position of coordinator (KX) was appointed by the Education Department. All of these events were the subject of a variety of accounts and typologies. Some of these were revised even as they were in the process of production. The producers of these accounts on occasion explicitly mentioned an awareness of a need to produce such explanations of events in order to be able to 'understand what was happening'. Since the range of such accounts is very wide, only a selection will be presented. The selection was constrained partly by the limitations of material but partly also by the attempt to provide a contrast in styles of accounting as these relate to differing normative conceptions of how people should 'do' social order.

BN's daughter (and also a son) attended the X1 school from early in the period of SJ's coordinatorship. BN herself was involved

\(^1\) Appendix C, 'The [X2] Community School'.

professionally with the school from time to time as well as spending periods of quite close involvement on parent committees. BN was employed by the Education Department as a school counsellor, her training was in psychology and on occasion she reported on children attending various alternative schools, including the X school. In the following edited transcript BN and her daughter discuss the atmosphere for BNd at Xl school under SJ.

Whenever you talk about [Xl] [amongst those students who had attended it] - you know, the subject often gets on to [Xl] - sort of like, it was like a dream world really.

You were certainly cut off from the community. I mean, probably most of the kids that first year needed to be cut off. They needed it. It was sort of like being in a bubble where you didn't have any other hassles, you just had time to clear things up. But it shouldn't have stayed like that. It should have evolved from that, which it didn't really do. We were completely cut off from the community, we were mixing with the same type of people - it became an escape for a lot of people including myself.¹

It was never made really clear who or what constituted 'the community', nor was there a resolution of the suggestion on the one hand that the 'kids needed to be cut off' from the community but that this situation needed changing. It does seem clear that the term community and the idea of community and school involvement sprang readily to mind.

Towards the end of Year II, XB who had been an original teacher at the Xl school, took over as a temporary coordinator while SJ was away on extended sick leave. It was during this time that participants felt a process of 'democratisation' occurred with staff achieving greater cohesion and ideological consensus. In the following retrospective account some idea can be gained of the difficulty of attributing significance to particular events and issues (for example the change from SJ to XB and the fact of the Xl school, an annexe, debating whether it would continue teaching for the HSC).

BN: The staff stayed the same, and the method of operation only gradually changed.

BNd: But also, what happened was that the staff instead of - the staff more-or-less took over the running of the school and

¹ BN interview.
became a very tight close group. It still wasn't the kids having any say in what went on - it was the staff. So it changed from SJ to the staff and XB. But then KX came in...

BN: Well right at the end of that year while XB was still there there was the Interim School Council, which was the 5-5-5, which was the beginning of the official student involvement.

Int: This was at the end of [Year II]?

BN: Yes. And I can remember being on that Interim School Council and having only two meetings, I think, before the school was closed [for the normal school year ending]. And the kids weren't strong on Council at that stage.

BNd: There was no need...

BN: No. But they were expressing their ideas, but they weren't taking a great deal of responsibility. But it was a very new thing anyway.

BNd: It wasn't our school. It wasn't the kids' school. We were just there.

Int: And it was good to be there, but therefore there was no problem about doing more than that?

BNd: Yes. But it wasn't the original idea of the school, where there was a democratic community which was run by the teachers for students - protection for students and the parents. It wasn't like that at all. It was SJ's school, and he ran it.

(BNd appeared to be arguing that the procedure whereby SJ 'ran the school' did not fit with her understanding of the 'original' idea of a 'democratic community' run by the teachers for the students and parents. BNd was arguing for SJ's as a position of unacceptable autocracy.)

Int: Okay...and 5-5-5 got under way when [XB] was there?

BN: Yes. Right at the end of November, and there were a series of meetings because school councils were just being mooted and so on, and it could well have been the first one in the State, but we're sure - it's not an official one because it [the Xl school] was an annexe anyway.

BN is here alluding to the point that because of its establishment as an annexe to D high school, there was a degree of ambiguity surrounding the status of parent and other committees formed from within the Xl school. Officially, the Xl school was not in a position to initiate administrative reorganisation except under the direction of KF - the principal of the D school. Thus BN acknowledges that when the Xl school, as an annexe, responded to public statements
by the Education Department's top official encouraging the formation of school committees with greater parent and student involvement, this response had no official standing unless positively sanctioned by KF and the school committees of the D school. The above interview extract also represents some evidence that the form of teachers-based integrated code was beginning to function. Both teacher cohesion and the student's (BNd) perception that in the early days under SJ there had been little student involvement, carry these implications.

It was the issue of the continuation of the HSC which created acute divisions particularly amongst parents. On the one hand the effect of an integrated code of educational transmission was to encourage teacher solidarity at the same time as forging a student identity favouring the evaluation of ways of knowing rather than forms of knowledge. On the other hand, the HSC represented an institutionalised link between education (via collection codes) and society. The associated polarisation of views was not, of course, articulated in terms of educational knowledge codes. The particular issue was linked with a wider politics of education, since teachers' unions were pressing strongly at the time for the abolition of the HSC as an institutionalised mode of school assessment. The issue, in other words, was capable of being phrased explicitly in terms of the politics of education. It was at this time that KX, the third coordinator of the X school, was unilaterally appointed by the Education Department.

Int: How long did it take you to be uncertain about [KX]?
BN: Oh well, you know - I think there was a suspicion - what will he be like - but not from my own point of view, not in a sort of hostile, or expecting-the-worst point of view.

Int: It was just a strange quality, and it'll be interesting to see this...?

BN: Yes, and we also did hear that he'd come from a straight school. And at one of the meetings [in the beginning of Year III] another thing that seemed more important than a coordinator was the HSC, which I presume people have told you about?...[SJ] had left, there was the [teachers' union] policy which had come up fairly strongly in favour of the abolishment of the HSC. The staff were very strong [teachers' union] people. Now that is what one would expect....And they were very strong, and they perhaps - in retrospect - they went about it in the wrong way - but they decided they would not teach HSC in [Year III]. They didn't call a meeting first, but they put out a sheet, giving the policy statement and their views, and inviting the parents to come and discuss it. Now there was a general meeting called, and I don't know
who called it. But the main point of it was the HSC debate, and there was terrifically intense parent anger at that decision to abolish the HSC at school.

Int: And where did [KX] stand on that issue?

BN: Well he came in just after we had a general meeting at which it was endorsed that HSC would be abolished. Now at that meeting, and there was still discontent from the parent group because they said that the teachers had pressured the children into agreeing with them, and that it was the teachers and students who had agreed and the parents in the main were against it....Now when [KX] came in, we got pressure from the [education department] - there was an inspector at this first or second Interim School Council meeting, that is the 5-5-5, plus observers, and the inspector was invited and [KX] was invited. And the inspector was really putting a threat on us that if we didn't have it, there would be no building. Now I can't think - there might be minutes available that you can look through, but that was the sort of pressure that was coming from the Department, that we must offer HSC...and when [KX] first came and met the teachers (and he was allowed a bit of time to work with them), he initially stood out against them on the HSC, he thought it should be offered. And the teachers argued and some of the parents argued - that in fact, you know, those kids who were motivated - there were lots of schools around where kids could do it. But [KX] stood out against the staff, and then went home, he couldn't sleep etc. etc., and he decided to back the staff against the Department.1

Other participants viewed the changes in the X1 school as evidence of conflict over political ideologies conceived in terms of democratisation of decision-making and the radical implications of redistribution of power.

The DP/SP account is one which traces the growth and a sense of dissatisfaction by some school supporters (including parents, staff and students) with what was felt to be an autocratic approach by the initial coordinator, SJ and the initial parents' Advisory Committee.

LP: ...we were dissatisfied with [SJ]. Yes, some parents were, we were. Because, this group, this in-group adored him - they weren't dissatisfied with him. But we were dissatisfied for political reasons. It wasn't only us. The students were pushing just as much and so were the staff. It was a - was always an organic thing. It wasn't one parent, saying to the staff 'Well, look what's going on?' It was all of us together coming out at one point of time, almost, and

1 BN interview.
saying 'This is rubbish. Look what's happening to us. This is an autocratic dictatorship.' That's what it was.1

The initial parents' Advisory Committee was described by LP/SP as an elite in-group whose president failed to communicate the import of many of the decisions in which he was involved.

LP: And there was a committee, and all of the committee was establishment Advisory Council. The committee covered sixteen people. It was an in thing. Whoever was on the committee had been with [X] school from the beginning - it was an in-group - the large majority of parents never got near - never got to grips with these people, never got to grips with the school....And when this came to a head after the HSC controversy, the fronts had already formed. There was a small front for conservatism, for HSC, for cleanliness (for cleanliness of everything). And there was this large majority of us interested in the school, interested in its novelty and its political implications - interested in all sorts of ways. And we suddenly found we were being manipulated by these people; we were being pushed into all sorts of things that weren't true...

SP: ...it's very simple you know in some ways. This elitist in-group, that we just described, were the people who were there from the very beginning when the school opened, and I think they looked at the school as an alternative environment, in which students could have freedom and nevertheless end up doing all the right things; HSC at the very end....And in the beginning there was HSC. And the students did very well. They were given a lot of individual help which was later on one reason why the teachers felt that it wasn't fair to the rest of the school to continue the HSC. But the first lot of parents were always really still rather orthodox. You know - they wanted alternative education, but they didn't really want alternative education. From the Labor point of view it - the school wasn't political enough, but from the conservative point of view it wasn't academic enough. In fact it was, because the HSC students did very well. I don't quite know, but that's essentially what they complained about. Later on it wasn't just enough learning, and the morals were bad and all this kind of thing which they couldn't take.2

LP: [SJ] never wanted the kind of communal influence within the school - within the body which we exerted from [Year III] on. He would never have survived - he would just - well he would have killed himself. That was one of the main troubles that [SJ] experienced, and I'm sure he knew it - he saw it challenged by what we eventually came to call 'common decision-making'. Also there was a sort of - the seeds or

---

1 LP/SP interview.
2 Ibid.
the beginnings of a certain political consciousness-raising among staff began. Because during [SJ]'s time, the school was completely a-political. You can see the results. We are still battling with the results today, and you can see something like that among the present generation today [at the X2 school]. They are a-political. You don't necessarily have a Left or a Right bias or something - you accept everyone. And we would have gone along with the X's, Y's and Z's and all these people. If they had agreed to common decision-making. But they wouldn't.¹

The LP/SP account was, like all accounts, not without its revisions and apparent contradictions. For example, despite the early explanation which cites differences in social ideologies amongst parents as an 'inevitable' cause of polarisation, and contrary to the argument that trouble about participation and common-decision-making was apparent even during SJ's time, nevertheless at the very close of this interview SP remarked

SP: You know - because of [KX], we all began to think so hard. I think we mightn't have got involved about the school that much either if it had run smoothly with [XB], we would have said 'Oh, that's very nice, yes', and there would have been no problem, but because we had the conflict we had to question ourselves to the bottom of our souls. Now the students got very upset with [KX]. It was just terrible. I mean there had never been such a thing in the school....²

Of course there is no reason why LP and SP should coincide in their accounts of events, but the point is that even within the understanding of one actor there were ambiguities and changes of opinion. Furthermore, even when there are apparent contradictions within an account these may be matters of varying emphasis. Nevertheless, it is the accounting of events which is crucial in producing the same phenomena for different people as 'normal' or 'non-normal', that is available for special scrutiny and control as a 'social problem'. In both the account of BN and LP/SP, emphasis is placed on KX - the third

¹ Ibid. All of this material occurs in the same flow but has been presented in almost the reverse order of its original utterance.
² Ibid.
coordinator, in terms of his impact on the school, on the subsequent investigation by officers of the Education Department and on the decision by the Minister to close the school.

It was in Year II, after the departure of SJ, that there developed indications that aspects of the school became problematical to various people. Towards the end of October of that year one parent wrote to SG (who headed the Secondary Division at that time). The letter referred to the departure of SJ from X1 school as a factor contributing to difficulties as well as the variety of student types that were being sent and accommodated at the X1 school, along with the lack of a 'systematic curriculum'. The letter-writer specifically requested the allocation of staff 'who could handle the situation' and made a point of mentioning KF (the principal of D school) as the only contact whom the letter-writer 'was prepared to trust'. This letter was prior to SG's appointment of KX as coordinator of the X2 school.

Within days of the receipt of this letter an assistant (JNI) to the head of the Secondary Division raised a series of points about the X1 school in an Education Department memorandum. The memo was prompted by the search for new accommodation by the X1 school and it specifically mentioned the wide range of people involved, that telephone discussions occurred between 'certain parents and the Assistant Minister', that there was no documentation of such communications in the Secondary Division, and that KF, the Principal of D school who acted as a supervisor to X1, was put into 'a difficult situation' with parents and the administration as a result. The memo concluded

...all these factors...have produced a confusion of facts, opinions and pressures in a setting which is so apparently informal (even spontaneous) as to be administratively unmanageable.

I have no particular dedication to formal structures or procedures per se, but I believe that if this [Secondary] division is to make the final decision then the sooner all concerned relate properly with this division the better...who will ultimately be held responsible?

---

1 Personal notes.
2 Ibid.
One day later there was a memorandum in response which not only confirmed the administrator's concern over being by-passed in communication between the parents and the Assistant Minister, but it went on to indicate that the X1 school was at this stage regarded as educationally suspect, supported only by educational 'extremists' and having at best a temporary existence. Since all of these points relate to the idea of the X school as abnormal and a 'problem' the memorandum will be quoted at length.

[D] School - [X1] Annexe

[JNI] is clearly and appropriately concerned, the Division does not wish to act contrary to Assistant Minister's wishes but it is time for some paper to appear, either there is or there is not a viable proposition at [X2], that can be decided now. I doubt very much if any separated, non-fitting annexe should cost the sums suggested for at best a transient existence. But a decision can be made now. [X2], a goer or not? These problems then remain,

1. Some parents seem to think [sic] that their children will not get schooling except at [X1]. This is not so, but the relocation of all pupils of [X1] cannot effectively be done in a couple of days. For the sake of pupils, parents and placement this should be a settled issue in November.

2. [X1] is unusual, that does not make it educational it is in fact an unmeasured but highly suspect unit.

3. [X1] cannot be an annexe of [D] school next year. Which other school will take it on? I suggest none voluntarily.

4. [X1] almost certainly loses its senior staff and without regret as I understand it. We'd have to find an appropriate person, these seem to exist in the extremist lobbies of the teaching service and not elsewhere. I propose taking final action and acquainting the school with this action on November 22 [Year II].

The writer of this memorandum takes it as axiomatic firstly that senior staff should be selected unilaterally by the administration for a school which is 'unusual' and 'not educational'. Secondly, although 'appropriate' staff are implicitly acknowledged to exist, their membership of 'extremist lobbies' renders them disqualified from consideration. Later annotations on this memo include, 'Seen and dismissed'; 'This matter has been by-passed by other action, suggest no further action but put on file'.

It could be taken as a measure of understanding of the implications of the integrated code, spelt out in the document of the
philosophy of the X1 school, that supporters were ambivalent about the role and functions - the very meaning of the coordinator's position. Whereas Bernstein, in presenting a typological contrast indicates in a theoretical way that conceptions of roles (as they relate to authority and social control) will vary considerably between collection and integrated codes, supporters of X1 school were operating either without theory or with partial, unshared or conflicting theories. In the final months of Year II, KX was appointed by the Director of Secondary Education (SG) to the position of coordinator at X2 in Year III.

The initial formalising via the letter patent of the personal characteristics of the relationship between the original coordinator (SJ) and the principal of D school (KF) had confusing implications for school supporters as well as departmental officials, and had emerged as a crucial factor. However, there had never been clearly established a set of procedures or even expectations, as to how the position of coordinator was to be maintained. From BN's perception of parent understanding at the time, the staff was seen to become a more vital force during XB's temporary incumbency as coordinator. Furthermore, the appointment of KX was perceived with 'uncertainty' yet it was thought to be improper to intervene. Finally, the issues of accommodation, pedagogy and evaluation and the coordinator's role in leadership were seen to become joined in a salient way. Bernstein mentions that integrated codes will only work (in the sense of creating order) when there is a high level of ideological consensus among the staff and furthermore 'a committee system of staff may have to be set up to create a sensitive feedback system and which will provide a further agency of socialization into the code'.

The transition of KX as coordinator to X2 was one which manifestly failed in this requirement to socialise new members in an on-going fashion into a clearly enunciated educational ideology.

X school supporters were apparently unsure of the appointment of KX but also not sure of their own position with respect to the appointment. BN remarked 'I think one saw it - at that stage - as the

---

prerogative of the Department. We certainly were uncertain about [KX]. ENd characterised this uncertainty by reference to KX only ever having had experience with 'straight' schools. LP argued, with the admitted benefit of hindsight, an even stronger account of KX's appointment

...and there arrived this insignificant little man who was very shy and - a country schoolmaster - that's what he looked like. And we know today that he was put there for a purpose by the Department, by [SG] and [KX], well that was just one heart and soul....'We put [KX] there to save you' that's what [SG] said to us....He didn't say it in those very words - he wouldn't go that far. We gathered from that that he [KX] was a selected man to come here to bring some order into the place and find out whether the experiment is worthwhile....Irrespective of parental conflict, or the staff conflict if you like, [KX] probably would have said 'Oh, it's not worthwhile having these places - close them down'. I'm quite sure of that....

Regardless of questions of accuracy in LP's suspicions, the account reflects the degree of polarisation which existed both prior to and following the appointment of KX.

As has been mentioned earlier, the X1 school eventually moved to new premises and became the X2 school. By early March of Year III the head of the Secondary Division himself (SG) had cause to write a lengthy memorandum in which he concluded that a six-person panel should investigate the X2 school. The memo is lengthy but will be fully cited since by its dependence on the reports of more junior staff it indicates the sense of propriety associated with a strongly-framed hierarchy. Knowledge and information in such a system are validated by virtue of having passed through the correct channels.

Until this year the [D school] annexe was located at [X1] but as the premises were not available for [Year III] the annexe was moved to [X2]. The teacher who was in charge of the annexe until term II last year [Year II] suffered a nervous breakdown and after some difficulties I located a suitable senior teacher who volunteered to take over the responsibility for the running of this annexe.

On 6th March [Year III] I received a deputation from the teacher-in-charge, [KX] and from [KF] principal of [D school]. They are considerably disturbed, as [KX] was not selected by the

1 LP/SP interview.
staff he feels he has not been accepted by them and even a first-year college placement, Mr [N], has had similar difficulties because he was placed there instead of being selected by the group. The teacher-in-charge [KX] has reserved the right to decision-making after discussing all aspects with staff, but this still fails to please the members of staff. On many occasions the staff has done things without reference to the teacher-in-charge e.g. groups have gone skin-diving, the cleaner was told not to go to the camp by the teacher-in-charge but the staff decided that the cleaner should go to the camp. Last year the cleaner was accepted as a member of the group and in addition to his cleaning activities assisted with the cooking of natural foods and even had voting rights on educational topics. In the opinion of [KF] the staff bend to the will of the students...the school needs more mature staff as they are substantially a group of beginners. The staff believe they have the right to come and leave the school as they please and not conform to regular hours. There is a strong suggestion that some children may be invited to pot sessions at night and that even LSD may be used. They suspect one student who may have some sort of a police record (name given) to be a pusher. At the present time the students are at a camp at [beach], the teacher-in-charge has been there for the past three days; he considers the camp to be too large and there has been some evidence that drugs are being used at the camp. [KF] informed me that some of the students are receiving the dole, the staff reject the idea that they are under the control of the Department and consider themselves to be totally autonomous. The school has 120 pupils and in addition to the teacher-in-charge a staff of 11 teachers. At the suggestion of [KF] and [KX] I interviewed on the 7th March [CN] a Psychology and Guidance officer who has been closely associated with the school since its early days. [CN] maintains that at any one time less than half the pupils are in attendance, the staff do not want restrictions and several of them are not making a useful contribution. The pupils who do arrive are treated with 'What will we do today?'

The new pupils start off with a degree of enthusiasm but soon drift into the attitudes of the older pupils. In the opinion of [CN] there are too many first-year teachers there who do not understand the art of teaching, unless mature teachers are involved she feels the experiment will break down. I consider that a team of six should be recruited to review the situation as a matter of urgency. [SG nominates four institutional sources for selecting panel members.]¹

The response of SG's senior officer to this report was that SG himself should visit the X2 school. The perception by some parents

¹ Personal notes. The memorandum was dated 6 March, Year V, the day the deputation was received by SG.
(LP/SP) that because this visit was unheralded and brief it could not contribute a great deal of understanding, has been recorded elsewhere. In his follow-up memorandum SG's personal observations comprise a small section whilst the remainder outlines further complaints by the supervising principal of D school KF, and a parent who telephoned SG. Since SG was the Divisional head and formally responsible for the administration of the X2 school, this memorandum will also be fully cited.

On Friday last I visited the [D school] annexe at [X2]. Many of the students were wandering aimlessly about in corridors, sitting on the floor in the common room, or smoking cigarettes on the front verandah. During my visit I could see little of educational value being undertaken or achieved. Today I received another phone call from [KF] in connection with the annexe. [KF] is very disturbed and feels that the annexe should be closed down, [KF] confirms that the children are very rarely in a class situation. The clerk who spends a portion of her time from [D school] at the annexe, spoke to [KF] yesterday she maintains that very little instruction is proceeding that the children are wandering aimlessly about and the timetable is not being observed by most teachers and pupils. I understand that there is a 'get [KX]' movement a member of staff Mr[-] has already informed his vertical group that he will discuss his objections to [KX] with [DH - chairman of X2 parents' committee], the staff and [KX] today. Apparently a member of staff is to move a vote of confidence in [KX] with the idea of the motion being defeated. Anything the principal [KX] says is ignored, the staff see themselves as fully autonomous if the annexe is closed down it is fairly certain the staff would mount an immediate campaign and bring in the teachers' union]. Yesterday I received a telephone call from [FI], the parent of a girl attending the school, [FI] was extremely worried about the school and worried about [KX]'s position, [FI] was also worried about the safety of [FI]'s daughter....[FI] found the 'knock [KX]' campaign quite unacceptable, a statement such as 'if you don't like it, lump it' to the teacher in charge by a member of staff in front of children is quite unacceptable. Teachers are criticising [KX]'s decisions with pupils. One member of [a] parent group reported that a group of children were taken skin-diving, the teacher in charge had instructed the teacher not to go ahead. But nevertheless the teacher disobeyed the instruction of the teacher in charge. I was told there was nearly a serious accident at this project. Groups of children from the school on an ice-skating expedition have been engaged in brawls with students from other schools. [FI] does not wish [FI]'s daughter to be engaged in brawls of this nature. I again urge that a team of six as outlined [above] should be engaged to investigate the annexe.

18 March Year III.
The head of the Education Department (below the Minister) attached a note to the Minister indicating that SG

...has now been informed that [XX] has decided to request transfer out of the situation. This creates a very bad situation, I suggest
  a) you should accept the invitation to visit the school and/or
  b) you institute a Ministerial inquiry into the annexe.

[Minister]
Follow course B.

On 24 March Year III, KX, the coordinator of X2, submitted an official report on the school to SJ, the Director of Secondary Education. The report stressed the matter of freedom as a problem. 'We are so concerned with allowing pupils to 'sort it out' for themselves that their basic need for security is threatened....This should be a school. It should not just be an experiment in group therapy for parents, pupils and teachers'. Two days later a school meeting was held and two pieces of correspondence emerged dated 26 March. One was a letter from the parents of a pupil at the Xl school addressed jointly to the coordinator KX, the principal of D school KF, and the Director of Secondary Education SG. The letter expressed concern at the 'confrontation' between the coordinator and the staff and suggested that further bitter debate would be avoided if some responsible person defined 'what powers are and are not available to parents, children, and staff within an Education Department school such as ours'. The second piece of correspondence on that date consisted of five handwritten pages summarising proceedings at the Xl school general meeting. The summary was produced by a professional officer from SG's staff, acting as a contact officer with the Xl school. The contact officer identified contributors by name and form of affiliation with the Xl school and included points debated under various headings. Under the sub-heading 'decision making' three separate speakers were noted. Speaker one argued 'that there had been

---

1 Personal notes.
2 Ibid.
a "reversal of aims" which meant a return to [SJ]'s system, this problem was attributed to [KX] who "should have known more about the school first....need for discussions with staff". Speaker two attacked the first position arguing that '[XI] must be realized to be an Education Department school and therefore [KX] had been given the responsibility and accordingly the power of decision-making'. Speaker three argued that KX had 'authority on paper - but trust and cooperation is essential'. Under the third heading 'Relationship between the Department and [XI]' the writer recorded that one speaker 'pleaded not to go outside of the school' this speaker was described as a 'staff member [name] who also made typical cliches/comments about external authoritarianism'. A second speaker was reported to have attacked the first's arguments as 'a defiance of rights, if she wished to inform the Department [and this speaker named and identified as a parent] 'would be prepared to send information to the Education Department'. The final section of the summary titled 'Staff attitude on decision making' named various staff members and added comments, for example, Person A 'was most volatile in his anti-systemic comments'; Person B '(a socialist) emphasised that decision-making was a staff affair'; Person C was quoted saying the "staff not in disagreement with [KX]"? but "who is running the school"..."faith in the capacity within ourselves in making decisions"..."group decision as contrast to one man plus outsiders' direction".1

From within the XI school by March Year III there was evidence of disagreement about the form and means of achieving an educational code different from the collection code, parents were in disagreement one with another and a Departmental officer was able to 'make sense' of some staff comments by articulating them within a political vocabulary.

By March of Year III the Minister had authorised an official Education Department investigation of the X2 school. This was the imprimatur that was necessary to define the school as a 'social problem', as a deviant educational entity. Although SG was in some senses a key figure, nevertheless a social process was involved. SG as a professional administrator, heading the Secondary Division faced the task of presenting the X2 school as sufficient of an

1 Ibid.
administrative problem to involve decisions which he was not formally competent to make. At the same time the situation should not be one which could appear to have resulted from any incompetence on the part of Education Department officers. On the one hand SG could recommend the closure of the X2 school but such action could not easily or safely be taken in any unilateral way. (Already the Division had had experience of being successfully by-passed in discussions with the Assistant Minister vis a vis accommodation.)¹

On the other hand there had to be serious grounds which indicated the dangerous unmanageability of the school. These latter grounds were presented in the form of a direct challenge to the authority of KX, the coordinator appointed by SG (and therefore representing a challenge to the authority of administrators generally; in a situation of strong classification and framing a threat to one rule must characteristically be interpreted as a threat to all rules). There were also suggestions of a physically dangerous lack of control and supervision of students accompanied by explicit parent awareness expressed in these same terms of danger and lack of control. On these grounds SG argued implicitly that X2 school could not be administered and for this reason an attempt should no longer be maintained. The request for transfer of the formally appointed figure of authority was apparently a potent one since the Director-General himself argued its seriousness to the Minister. At the very least SG argued there should be an investigation to ascertain the 'facts' of the situation.

¹At the same time, at the ministerial level, there was a need to preserve the formal bureaucratic order, to avoid if possible any strong suggestion from career administrators that their expertise was being spurned. Thus it was that in February of Year III, the chairman of the X2 parents organisation wrote to thank the Minister for his assistance in finding accommodation for X2, and to extend an invitation to visit the school. Hence the Director-General's formal choice (in the March 18 memo) to the Minister to either visit the X2 school personally (when any subsequent decision could be portrayed as a ministerial one) or to authorise an investigation by officers of the Education Department. In fact a draft reply from the Minister asking for an invitation to visit X2 school later in Year III was dated March 13 and annotated 'Not sent'. Ibid.
CHAPTER VII

INVESTIGATING ABNORMALITY

The special investigation of the X2 school was carried out in May and June of Year III. The report was a confidential one to the Minister and has as its stated tasks the examination of

a) the present administration of X2 school
b) the welfare of the pupils at present enrolled.

There was no detailed specification of such terms, for example, as 'welfare'; whether this referred to physical, social, educational or all of these, was not further clarified. Invitations to submit signed written reports were sent to the Secondary Division school inspector under whose responsibility the D school (and its annexe X2) fell, as well as the principal of D school, the chairman of the Advisory Council of the D school (not to the parent group of X2 school since it had largely been absorbed into the 5-5-5 committee). 'From these and otherwise, a selection of people was made to have discussions with the investigators of particular points raised in the written submissions and otherwise'. ¹ Transcripts of these interviews were attached to the report. The report began by setting out what were felt to be some generally held misconceptions about the X school, it went on to discuss the welfare of the pupils by referring to background information, points for and against including the topic of drugs. Five general conclusions were drawn before some seven recommendations were made. It is proposed here to selectively deal with the report with a view to illustrating how its organisation, rhetoric and conceptual structure depended on assumptions consonant with Bernstein's collection code of education.

One issue which could not come through in the official report, but which relates to a central characteristic of the X school, is the very fact of the investigation on a group which sees its basis of cohesion, order and solidarity as being at least partially in

¹ Personal notes.
opposition to the form of ordering engendered in a large formal organisation with strong hierarchical ordering. Any unilateral proposal for evaluation of the school which stemmed from outside the school community placed participants in a 'double-bind'. If an assessor went to the effort of making friendly overtures and won acceptance on the basis of this - then any negative report would tend to be seen as some sort of betrayal. The report notes

The advisers from the Education Department have attempted to go about their tasks with integrity and with an appreciation of the supposed aims of the annexe. These officers find that there is no acceptance of any critical advice and, at the present time, are quite disillusioned.¹

The gloss which refers to 'an appreciation of the supposed aims' of the school can be taken to mean either that there were no 'aims', in which case making 'an appreciation' contradicts the idea of operating with integrity; that is if there were no aims then this fundamental fact needs to be indicated directly if integrity is to be preserved. Or on the other hand the 'supposed aims' could imply a discrepancy between what was being said and what was done. In this case it seems incumbent on the observer (if his integrity is to be preserved) to explain just how it is that the aims differ from the achievement. This of course was not a specific aspect of the investigation brief, but could have been indicated as being essential to the task. The gloss effectively avoids this problem by assuming that all readers would know quite unequivocally what constituted the aims of this particular 'alternative' or 'community' school, and by inference what actions would indicate a failure to pursue the aims. Finally, the rejection by school members of 'critical advice' and the subsequent 'disillusion' of the Education Department officers was precisely a matter for a detailed account and investigation. In other words, particular examples of advice and its rejection, might have allowed report readers to form an opinion of their own. In the context of the report the gloss was used as a resource (the gloss substituted for evidence), with a taken-for-granted meaning being used as critical

¹ Ibid.
evidence against X2. Any assessment by X2 school supporters that was felt to be unnecessary, and an imposition, would be responded to as an oppressive action. At the time of the Education Department investigation, there was resentment to one degree or another between the coordinator KX, and the staff and students. The latter felt that KX had been responsible for the investigation. The cooperative principle of order and control inherent in the integrated code held the seeds of conflict if the inside/outside boundary of the group was not properly negotiated. This was the essence of the difficulty of KX's initial appointment. In the institution of the family the mode of authority is taken for granted and is not significant so long as members are not apprehended for transgressing rules of the surrounding culture. However, new power figures within the family (new parents, for example) need their entrance to be carefully approved. The X2 school had tended to order itself on the basis of a 'happy family'. The report specifically mentions the problems caused by school supporters (referred to below as 'the resistances'), distinguishing very clearly between personal identity and formal role position.

While the resistances which have precluded the establishment of a proper official administration express appreciation of the officers concerned as people, as official administrators they significantly ignore these same officers. The resistances include sections of the parents, much of the staff, the attitudes and habits of many pupils and some indirect outside influences.... The Coordinator has made most deliberate efforts to relate to the Principal [of D school] and to the DSE [Director of Secondary Education - SG] but has found this causes conflict with the role he has thrust towards him from some sources in and around the annexe. If [KX] had been weak there would have been less trouble because he would have been absorbed and robbed of leadership. [KX] seems right for the job. He is practical and competent, not authoritarian. As soon as he made any attempt to impose any degree of structure at all, the school turned against him.¹

The reaction of this 'family' to the uninvited intrusion of the investigators was not dissimilar to that of families in some countries when governments first introduce formal regulations about family size or compulsory schooling.

¹ Ibid.
The topic of curriculum, as defined by subject matter or content taught was not mentioned in the report. From the inception of the X school it had been conceded that the first coordinator (SJ) should have complete control of curriculum matters. Similarly in the case of evaluation - this was referred to in only oblique ways: for example, there were frequent comments about the general lack of training, the inexperience and incompetence of the teachers of the X2 school, it seemed implicit that this took-for-granted the idea that since there were no conventional tests or examinations - then evaluation was altogether absent.

...classes seem to have been held as amateur encounter groups, but children soon tire of finding out about themselves and stay away from classes. I would feel that at least 50% of the trouble at [X2] was caused by the incompetence of teachers. These teachers were not able to interest children or entertain them, let alone stimulate them to self-directed learning. Teachers therefore became embarrassed being at school with nothing to do. More structure is feasible and necessary in such a school. Remedial teaching for a large number of these children is a necessity, but the general quality of the staff would not permit any of these.

The fact that many of the staff had little or no teaching experience and certainly no previous experience of the type of child attending [X2], indicates that they were unable to either run a class or act as resource persons for children's self-motivated learning, consequently there was no continuity of class subject-matter or any planned study courses.¹

This statement epitomises a conception of educational transmission as the progressive acquisition of 'states of knowledge' with both the progression and the states remaining in the control of experts via strong classification and framing. Such a conceptualisation excludes, almost by definition, the acceptance as a version of 'normality' any forms of education based on 'ways of knowing' since they require a form of control founded in a much greater degree of mutuality between those involved. Amongst other things, there is an assumption in the above paragraphs, which is consistent within a collection code that 'no teaching experience' is a positive handicap.

¹ Ibid.
Bernstein has made the contrary point in dealing with integrated codes where previous experience may entail resocialisation for some teachers.

The reference to a need for 'more structure' and 'remedial teaching' when linked to the conclusion that the 'quality of staff' would not permit these, once again highlights the difficulty of communicating across different conceptions, as represented by the two different educational codes – collection and integrated. A strong element of frustration flavoured the conflict because various parties were committed to accounts which were incomprehensible to other parties.

Confusion and a state of anomie may arise when one interactant cannot fathom any meaning from the other's behaviour and thus is left in a state of diffuse anxiety and fear. Such is likely to occur when the interactants employ entirely different and mutually impenetrable universes of discourse.

In this case, of course, each party called on all its resources in order to legitimate its account over and against all others. What was not anticipated by many people were the difficulties experienced by the Education Department in producing and presenting an account which received full acceptance within its own organisational boundaries.

Throughout the report of the investigation there is a view of socialisation which involves strong classification, children are seen as quite separate from adults and teachers, education is quite separate from therapy, adult forms of control are separate and legitimate as distinct from that effected amongst children.

Children cannot be expected to argue these matters objectively on their own. It is possible that [X2] pupils are having too much unguided say in determining which school they will attend.

In opining that it is possible that students 'are having too much unguided say' in the form that their own education will take, the tentativeness of the writer's conviction draws attention away from the failure to come to grips with what is meant by 'too much unguided say'. It is this latter phrase which again points to assumptions.

2 Personal notes.
about the 'abnormality' of students having some degree of 'effective say' in the direction their learning will take.

Some worried parents seem unwilling to make an issue of their concern because their children do not want them to do so.\(^1\)

The school could be a valuable therapeutic community if it was run better with a staff who understood what it was all about. But is this the purpose of the school's existence?

[Recommendation 3: That the [X2] unit be not necessarily regarded as a school.]\(^2\)

There are too many opportunities for misbehaviour without the check of alert adults.\(^3\)

In such a school where the children seem to stick together out of school (our community versus their community) drug-taking cannot be policed. In such a community (especially away from school) children can be introduced to drugs, and use them subject to such group pressures that they have difficulty in refusing.\(^4\)

The assumptions underpinning the quotation relating to drugs and peer-group pressure are firstly that peer-group sub-cultures will generate norms or values which are essentially inimical to the well-being of individual students and secondly, that individual students will have essentially no impact on their peer-group. What is being presented is a 'one-way' conception of socialisation with the implication that adjustment (since it must occur due to social pressure), should be in accord not with peer-group pressures but with that of 'proper' or 'normal' school cultures.

The topic of socialisation is one which is dealt with as an individual, psychological phenomenon of 'adjustment', rather than as an outcome of varying social structures and processes. Rhetorical devices are employed to withdraw the possibility of legitimacy from alternative views that were encountered.

Many pupils and some parents for whatever reason or pseudo reason, do believe that they cannot relate to the normal school situation and will resist so relating. Some pupils have relocated to normal school with little strain reported, there are others who are not ready and may never be ready to so rejoin the usual school environment. But there is not much evidence that [X2] can be considered a complete school education in itself.\(^4\)

[Underlining in the original.]

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
In the preceding passage a difficulty is presented in conceding that some parents may actually favour a 'non-normal' school environment for their children. Since children are essentially liminal people, it is not necessary to take serious account of their assertions, but for a parent to assert that their child 'cannot relate to the normal school situation' produces a conceptual difficulty which is only accounted for by describing such an assertion as a 'pseudo-reason'. Socialisation is conceptually insulated from the notion of education via the idea of education relating to cognition and socialisation to conative matters and questions of social adjustment.

One of the most common features of the annexe is that its pupils tend to be unsatisfied pupils of other schools before coming to [X2]....It seemed not common for the previous problem to be related to slow learning or even low achievement, rather has it been related to emotional problems of adjustment to the normal form of school (socially and psychologically).1

By locating students within a framework of individual social and psychological adjustment, some credence is created for the view that where such people are collected together in a group, it should not be surprising that the group fails to produce a 'normal' form of social cohesion. Furthermore, the report comes to grips with the idea that the X2 school is attempting unconventional approaches to socialisation, and with parental claims for positive changes in their children's attitudes.

Some parents of children at the school are particularly concerned at what they see as the nature of contemporary society and see schools as being significant in continuing the current mode or - as changed schools - in altering the current mode. Several parents report on the changed attitudes of their children since they became associated with [X2] school or its predecessor, and expressed their opinion that the social and psychological changes in their children have been for the better.2

However, parental claims are countered by the argument that firstly the size of X2 school may in itself have produced any beneficial effects observed by parents,

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
In fact it may well be the size of the annexe which allows some of the pupils to relate to it in ways which give them a sense of belonging and ownership, but a very large number of other children succeed in gaining such feelings in other schools.\(^1\) This line of argument comes close to conceding the significance of social factors in a collective institutional sense rather than in an individualised sense. This is one point at which some discussion may have been introduced about the function of certain sociological factors as they have an impact on the behaviour of individuals in variously structured groups. The argument continues that the X2 school-children would be 'normal' but for special pressures on their peer-group that are generated in the X2 school.

From discussions with people who have spent considerable time with them, from limited observation and questioning and from common sense, the children of [X2 school] would appear to be normally articulate, normally naive, normally charming under such facades as peer group demand; the ubiquitous smoking, the ugly language, the off-hand address, the quasi-maturity - all seem rather thin veneers laid over a reasonably normal school pupil, by the challenge of reputation and by elements of the peer group.\(^2\) This tautological style of argument was used to gloss the problem of how the students at the X school could be seen as normal but the school defined as abnormal. The separation, however, between pupil and school is not effectively made. 'This is a group of normal school children' runs the argument 'but for the following factors which are veneers laid over a reasonable normal school pupil'. The question of why and how some behaviours and not others may be construed as less than 'real', that is, as veneers, is not answered in detail but rather it is merely implied that these 'veneers' are school-generated and school-based.

The report writers argue that although there is a form of social integration at X2 school, since pupils themselves said they were happy, nevertheless the causes of this may not be a spirit of tolerance and egalitarianism but rather exclusivity and elitism.

1 Ib\(\text{id}\).
2 Ib\(\text{id}\).
The number of pupils at [X2 school] who feel a sense of involvement with the unit is probably significant. Some of the reasons are in terms of their being happy - according to their interpretation of happiness, others in terms of a sense of ownership and other for seemingly elitist feelings.¹

By referring to 'their interpretation of happiness', the writers imply that a distinction must be made between 'real' happiness and the assertions of people (children) who for some reason may suffer from a faulty apprehension of 'happiness'. In other words, even the experience of states usually conceded to be personally subjective, is seen as correctable by the writers in this passage. But at the same time, the writers take what they see to be approved school values (tolerance and egalitarianism) and argue that an 'objective' assessment (that is, by the investigators) indicates that 'elitist' values are cherished. The assumption apparently being that there is little ambiguity either in the concepts egalitarianism and elitism or in their conceptual opposition and objective identification. There is no attempt to explore the possibility that the values which sustain a strongly bounded group may not be antithetical to values of an egalitarian type with respect to either particular individuals or other groups.

The writers continue their account by discerning a difference between the '[X2] ethic' and its realisation, but they do this using the conventional school grouping of 'forms', for example form I II III, through to VI, where the X2 school had made various attempts, via such arrangements as 'vertical groups' to eliminate the strong boundary classification of the school organised into forms. The notion that there is an automatic community acceptance does not always follow, senior pupils seemed to have as little time for the new first formers as their contemporaries do in normal schools, and pupils who were wavering from the [X2] ethic were not accorded any more tolerance as to their point of view than might well be found in senior pupils in normal schools.²

The lack of ideological consensus, especially between staff and parents is obliquely reflected in the following statements which also highlight

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.
the problem of organising parental affiliations in a conventional school with an unconventional one formally annexed to it.

It would appear that the [D] school [parent] advisory council has only limited understanding of the annexe, and probably has limited access to increase its understanding....There seems to be no way in which the 5-5-5 Committee can have a representative view of parents....It seems that there will always be dissidents and lobbying with resulting tensions. It is extremely doubtful if the 5-5-5 Committee could become a part of a more responsible administration of the [X2] annexe.1

Lyman and Scott describe their concept of 'account' as 'statements made by social actors to relieve themselves of culpability for untoward or unanticipated acts'.2 Accounts are given via excuses and justifications and thus tend to be produced by putative deviants. However, at the X2 school, the investigators were themselves providing an account, since they were implicitly defending what was construed to be an attack on the accepted ways of administering schools. At the same time as providing an account, the investigators - especially via their justificatory style in some passages - were acting to maintain the dominance of a particular symbolic universe as it pertained to mass education. Whilst noting at the outset the ultimate importance of the relative power of those espousing different and conflicting symbolic universes, Berger and Luckmann suggest that control is maintained by increasingly separating specialists in the mythological tradition from laymen. (In Bernstein's terms, the strengthening of classification and framing increases social control.) An important aspect of Berger and Luckmann's argument is that it is not the knowledge or lore itself which is complex, what is crucial for social control is the clear institutional separation of this lore.

...although there are specialists in the mythological tradition, their knowledge is not far removed from what is generally known. Initiation into the tradition administered by these specialists may be difficult in extrinsic ways. It may be limited to select candidates, to special occasions or times, and it may involve arduous ritual preparation. It is, however, rarely difficult in terms of the intrinsic qualities of the body or knowledge itself, which is not difficult to acquire. To safeguard the

1 Ibid.
specialists' monopolistic claim the non-accessibility of their lore must be institutionally established. That is, a 'secret' is posited, and an intrinsically esoteric body of knowledge is institutionally defined in esoteric terms.¹

(The institution of education itself as it occurs in societies with a high division of labour epitomises the points made in this statement.) In the educational setting of the X2 school, the investigators were functioning in part as official and specialised legitimators of an institutionalised educational mythology. Since the transgressors were a collectivity it was not easy to use the technique which Berger and Luckmann call 'therapy' whereby the offender 'develops "insight" and the diagnosis becomes subjectively real to him'.² However, by 'nihilation' there was an attempt to deny 'the reality of what phenomena do not fit into that [dominant] universe'. Firstly, 'deviant phenomena may be given a negative ontological status', and secondly 'nihilation involves the more ambitious attempt to account for all definitions of reality in terms of concepts belonging to one's own universe'.³

In the introductory comments of the investigator's report into the X2 school, there is an account which depends for much of its effectiveness on the nihilation of explanations produced by people supporting the X2 school.

It is a common misconception that a school can be set up on some ideal, then a curriculum, teaching practices and systems of order associated with another ideal added, without alteration of the original ideal of the school. It is a misconception in the thoughts of many associated with [X2] that other schools are places where none of the relaxations which they see as characteristic of [X2] can exist.

[X2] is a community within itself, it does not fit to the generally accepted mores of society as well as does the large number of normal district secondary schools. As an insular community it does not accept the need for records, planning, order and demands. Several parents say that they want these characteristics, but cannot see, or will not see that these are not compatible with the current style of [X2].⁴

² Ibid., p.132.
³ Ibid., pp.132; 133.
⁴ Personal notes.
The conclusions of the investigation further exemplify this process of nilhilation.

1. Pupils are at risk in the annexe to a considerably greater extent than at a normal school, and to a greater extent than can be accepted.

2. These risks arise from a lack of guidance and supervision, from a vulnerability to temptation, to peer-group pressure and example, from assumed over-sophistication combined with fundamental insecurity.

3. Proper schooling of the pupils is in the discard. Such education as they may be gaining is suspect as to its worth and as to its lack of harm.

4. Failure to bring authority to bear on matters of language, appearance, habits, smoking, alleged drug-use, environment maintenance has done harm to standards accepted and will do more harm.

5. Withdrawal from the normal community seems to be more common than close association with the community. Elitism seems more common than egalitarianism.¹

Bernstein's collection code is thus a way of specifying in educational terms and settings a symbolic universe which had the characteristics of Young's 'absolutist monolith' (as far as educational deviance was concerned), and which was under attack via supporters of a different symbolic universe, a universe akin to Bernstein's integrated code. The document produced as a result of the investigation of the X2 school was couched in terms of the dominant symbolic universe and to a great extent it became simply a part of the 'conceptual machinery of universe maintenance' used to legitimate the explanatory style of one symbolic universe over another. And as Berger and Luckmann also point out - 'Specifically, the success of particular conceptual machineries is related to the power possessed by those who operate them. The confrontation of alternative symbolic universes implies a problem of power - which of the conflicting definitions of reality will be "made to stick" in the society.'²

¹ Ibid., p.8.
Whereas in the 'conclusions' to the report of the Departmental investigation, the writers operated using the conceptual machinery of universe-maintenance called 'nihilation', when they came to make a set of recommendations, the constraints operating on them were of a different nature. On the one hand, as full-time specialist investigators, the writers were in effect the arbiters and interpreters of current educational science or mythology, they were responsible to interpret the symbolic universe as it related to education and this they had done in terms of 'emotional adjustment', 'proper teaching' and 'normal schooling'. However, the fact that the X school did exist and had been maintained for some two years, that an official investigation had been instigated at the Minister's behest; this meant that the arbiters themselves were being assessed to a certain extent. If in fact it was 'power' that would influence the outcome of the conflict between two symbolic orders, then the fact that the investigators were to produce only recommendations indicated clearly enough that theirs was not a final or ultimate power. The recommendations of the investigation were thus framed by the producers in an awareness that the power to approve or disapprove of them lay elsewhere - in the Minister and his advisers' hands. Furthermore, the brief had been to investigate the 'present administration' of the annexe and the 'welfare' of the pupils.

There were seven recommendations listed in the report of the Departmental Investigation, set out as follows:

1. That the [X2] school continue to exist to meet the needs, or assumed needs, of a group of parents and children.
2. That the [X2] school not be permitted to evolve into a Mini-Academy with an over-generous staff-pupil ratio.
3. That the [X2] unit be deemed not acceptable as the annexe of a school.
4. That the [X2] unit be not necessarily regarded as a school.
5. That any request from the Director-General, the director of a division, the principal of [D] school, the coordinator, or members of staff to opt out of the responsibility for [X2] unit or its pupils be automatically accepted.
6. That the laws and regulations be altered to give protection to any departmental office or officer against claims of litigation.
7. That for such time as departmental officers are concerned with the [X2] unit they be advised that any suspicion of fault, such as the taking or peddling of drugs be reported to the police.
Mr [CG - one of the two investigators] wishes to record the following statement in the form of a recommendation, but agrees that [X2] should not become such as to negate recommendation 2 above.

That if [X2] is to continue (as I [CG] think it should) it should be with a different staff carefully chosen because of their substantial knowledge of how a community school should be run.¹

It is only the first recommendation which is a positive one, the next six are more in the nature of restrictions relating to technicalities of administration. The recommendations seem to argue that although X2 should remain in existence, it should not be attached as an annexe, or even regarded as a school. Nevertheless, its staff-student ratio should be calculated in a way that required it to be comparable with 'normal' schools, in order to prevent its receiving favoured treatment or an unequal share of available resources. However, any Education Department administrative officer should be permitted to refuse to deal with the X2 school, and special alterations were to be made to the law and regulations in order to protect those officers who did choose to administer X2.

The recommendations were difficult and contradictory to the point where the question came down to their practical implementation. How could the recommendations be put into operation, either as a whole or as separate parts?² Although there was no formal recommendation to close X2, the indication was that those normally vested with administrative power and authority found the X2 school impossible to supervise unless very special arrangements were made. The special nature of these arrangements, interestingly enough, would have had the effect of weakening the strength of classification and framing within the organisation of the Education Department itself. To allow officers to choose the area of their duties would have involved a devolution of authority that would have radically affected the mode of social control in the bureaucracy. This was, in effect, an implicit recognition of the nature of the conflict as being one between competing symbolic universes, each with its own mode of

¹ Personal notes.
² Ref. Appendix R.
social control. As has been remarked, the recognition of this competition was implicit in the document. However, it is worth noting that although no formal records of discussion exist which focus directly on the issue of modes of social control - the degree of emotional involvement by all participants tends to bear out a moral commitment to a set of regulations which were in principle instrumental, and as such not usually considered a source of moral commitment.

The 'letter patent' relating to Xl and the fact of the decision to hold an enquiry indicate that the X school had been 'special', not 'normal' and therefore an administrative problem. Consequently those interpersonal relations which superficially appear unrelated to such structural matters, were deeply affected. Newman reinforces the point that interaction is a moral encounter inasmuch as people approach one another with expectations about how to behave in particular situations and contexts. SJ, CT, and KF, the three key figures at the opening of the Xl school had worked on the assumption that the pioneering nature of the school would require a special awareness of the fragility of their social interaction. The difficulty apparently was in transmitting this awareness. By setting up the Xl school as an annexe to the D school there was a tacit acceptance of deviance/abnormality on the one hand, and control via 'removal' on the other. Newman, in recognising the operation of power in his theory of deviance-removal, cites four models of removal. Model three - 'submission' - describes the original Xl situation, where A - the most powerful party (the Education Department, represented by CT) persuades B - the less powerful party (represented by SJ and his supporters) to remove himself and his supporters from the (normal) interaction setting. In other words, SJ agreed that for his experimental school to operate, it was best kept separate from any normal school. CT facilitated this 'deviance-removal' by arranging for Xl to become an annexe to the D school. Although the identity of the Xl school was located de facto (and even to some extent formally) in the relationship of KF and SJ there was no formal provision for the winding up of the school should the association between KF and SJ for some reason no longer exist or function. Nor was there provision for any further formalisation which would enable the experiment to continue (although there was one Education Department memorandum which spoke of the X school as only ever having a 'transient' existence).
The tenor of the document setting out the philosophy of the XI school has already been described as approximating to Bernstein's integrated code; in other words the XI school had an approach to educational socialisation which was quite different to that of conventional schools. This was to be facilitated by removal and separation. Newman, however, puts the case that

The process of removal, rather than being a resocializing process [i.e. resocialisation to 'normality'] is instead a deviance-defining process....In fact we may suggest that the extent of removal is an operational definition of the extent of deviance.¹

The quotation has two related implications. Firstly, even in his 'submissive' model three, Newman was theorising about individual putative deviants. In the case of the XI school - the 'submissive' removal was avowedly for the purpose of developing a new approach to educational socialisation. There was never any question - for SJ at least - of the XI school performing 'resocialising' functions. However, this may not have been CT's view, and the frequency of the term 'therapeutic' in the report of the Education Department investigation indicates that for later administrators, their best view of the X2 school was in terms of resocialisation to normality. When viewed from this position, Newman's proposition carries the implication that the mere fact of removal serves as a deviance-defining process. The mere fact of the separation of the X school, according to Newman's theory, was sufficient to create and maintain a deviant collection identity. Further removal would enhance a more extreme sense of deviance. For Newman these were propositions - the X school (within the limitations of its being a 'natural' and 'uncontrolled' occurrence) provides a test of these propositions.

The argument here is that whereas the extent of removal in the case of the XI school marked it down as sufficiently deviant to be removed to the margins of educational orthodoxy - by the time the Education Department investigation produced its recommendations, there was a strong suggestion that the X2 school was deviant to the point

of needing removal beyond the margins of educational orthodoxy. Either X2 should be designated 'not a school' or else a radical transformation needed to be effected in the laws and regulations which defined the structural form of educational administration. Supporters of the X school had expressed little resentment at being regarded by outsiders and officers of the Education Department as unconventional educationally, however, it was becoming clearer that there was an attempt to withdraw or withhold the educational aspect of the X2 school's identity. The Education Department investigation marked an interaction breakdown which, Newman suggests, can have profound effects.

The type of social organization which will arise to deal with deviance will depend upon the interplay among facets of inter-subjectivity, power and morality....Thus we are mindful of the intensity of the deviant images which the interactors may bring with them to the interactional setting, the differential perception of the relevant rules, and the extent to which one or the other of the interactors has the support of a stronger group, the breakdown of interaction should have far-reaching consequences ...what is being suggested here is that the distancing which occurs during interaction breakdown does not stop there, but continues to be implemented after the interaction has ceased.1

The completion of the Education Department's report, at the same time as indicating the continuation of the distancing procedures outlined by Newman, also represented part of an accumulation of what Davis calls 'resources' which are used to influence social system 'outcomes'. Davis' social control theory of deviance suggests that deviance is an outcome of conflict within a political structure over control of resources. Newman had set out to develop a theoretical link between interaction breakdown and organisational process. However, this was only achieved in a schematic way at the conclusion of his article when some types of deviance-removal were sketched (these included tertiary-level 'student-teacher' separation as a 'coexistence' model of deviance-removal). 2 Davis, by contrast, has a more detailed set of propositions relating more to the level of organisational process/social system, however the theoretical propositions retain the focus on power-social interaction-deviance-organisation and social order.

1 Ibid., p.211.
2 Ibid., pp.213-215.
Deviance is identified in this theory as 'any behaviour of the ruled class that is defined by rulers as a violation of rules and standards' or 'any form of opposition to the rules and standards of rulers that is displayed by the ruled class'. Furthermore, a higher rate of conflict results from a) a further decrease in resources of the ruled, b) a decreased ability of any party to effect political system outcomes, c) the perception of any party that its existing resources will not effect system outcomes. Davis' concepts of 'resources', 'rulers', 'ruled' etc. despite the definitions provided, can still appear vague and difficult to specify, especially when used in the context of struggle which may alter who is ruled and who are the rulers. Nevertheless, the approach does have much to offer if the political structure referred to by Davis is taken to refer to the system of laws which enabled the formulation of regulations and in turn their informal interpretations and expectations by which this particular State system of education was able to function. The case of the X school derives much of its interest and importance from the course of a conflict which makes more clear what things can become 'resources' in the struggle to define normality, the extent to which these are overlooked in day-to-day operation, and the varying effects of their deployment. At the X2 school the unilateral decision to hold a special enquiry and then a subsequent long delay before any decision was made, while at the same time the recommendations of the investigation were not revealed - these developments were able to be construed as a loss of resources; as an exercise in illegitimate power, and finally as a decrease in the ability to influence the outcome of a political system. There is evidence that a sense of conflict and polarisation was at least maintained up until the moment of the Minister's decision to close the school; after this the conflict increased.

CHAPTER VIII

DEVIANCE, POWER AND RESOURCES : INITIATING ACTION ON A SOCIAL PROBLEM

Davis' social control theory of deviance, which argues that conflict is a form of deviance, has been used to show how the report of the Education Department's investigation into the X2 school, at the same time as constituting a 'resource' was seen by many involved as effecting an illegitimate use of power. In the first place this was because the report was a confidential one addressed to the Minister, however, as time went by people began to attach significance to the delay in the making of some sort of official announcement based on the recommendations of the report. People associated with the X2 school began to request some official clarification. Within the Education Department there were delays whilst the report was assessed by a variety of people. Linking events internal and external to the Education Department were meetings at the X2 school, one of which was attended by one of the producers of the report, KG. The X2 school was perceived by the formal agents of control as abnormal, as a social problem and in need of special forms of control. However, the extent of deviance was not yet formally established and this was being effected as a part of the process of negotiating what was to be done and how action was to be carried out. Appendix S is an abbreviated organisational diagram, reference to it will be necessary as developments between the completion of the investigation, and the closure of the school are reviewed.

Between July and November of Year III a series of communications came from people associated directly with the X2 school, addressed to the Director of Secondary Education and the Minister. On 31 July UT (a teacher) wrote to the Minister on behalf of the X2 School Council. UT mentioned that two months had passed without clarification, that a 'low-key' investigation did not seem to fit with official advice that further staffing needs could not be met until after an official outcome of the investigation. On 14 August the Minister's office replied that enquiries were being made. The following day UT
telegrammed the Minister's office and on 18 August the Minister replied that the report had been received, and that it was under active consideration and that the Minister would write 'as soon as possible'. On 22 September, KF (principal of D school) wrote to SG, the Director of Secondary Education. KF complained that with a twenty-week lapse since the official investigation, some sort of findings were overdue as plans could not be made for Year IV either 'for the students there, and/or the coordinator, [KX]'. No written reply was filed. On 6 October LZ, the chairman of the School Council of X2 school, wrote to the Minister requesting that a deputation of three school representatives be allowed to see the Minister. On 29 October, the Deputy Director of Secondary Education (KG) attended a General Meeting of the X2 school, and on Monday 24 November the Deputy Director General of Education (UN) and the Director of Secondary Education (SG) met a group composed of the principal of D school (KF), the coordinator of X2 school (KX), the president of the D school Advisory Council and two parents of children attending X2. The chairman of the X2 School Council (LZ) wrote to the Minister on 26 November. In this letter LZ thanked the Minister for the opportunity to meet with the Deputy Director General (UN), and went on to say that all views had been heard and presented at a School Council Meeting where 'it was unanimously decided that Council supports autonomy for the School as the most desirable course of action'. On 15 December, KF the principal of D school and LZ the chairman of the X2 School Council, received copies of a similar letter from the Minister announcing the closure of the X2 school.

What is represented above are the summary details of correspondence dealing with the course of events between July and December of Year III. There was a great deal more documentation which proceeded via memoranda internal to the Education Department. Although examination of these documents will show that conflict existed in aims (and proposals for achieving these aims) between officers of the administration, what does not show so clearly in such material is the type and intensity of involvement deriving from the perception that the

1 Personal notes.
X2 school and its supporters were committed in principle to a form of education that endorsed destructive forms of disorder. This sense of fundamental opposition emerged most clearly in face-to-face interaction which is difficult to retain on record. Supporters of the X2 school perceived such a strong distinction between the impression created by formal correspondence and face-to-face interaction that they remarked the point in interviews and tape-recorded interaction at a school meeting on one occasion. This material will be referred to shortly.

On 24 September\(^1\) Year III the Director of Secondary Education advised the Director General that the principal of D school had written asking for information about the outcome of the enquiry at X2 school, since it was necessary to plan for Year IV 'if the annexe is to continue'. The Director General asked for the report to be located and a ministerial decision to be sought. An Assistant Director General responded on 20 October\(^2\) by noting firstly that he found 'difficulty in reconciling the adverse nature of the report with the recommendation that it should continue', but secondly that staffing and other logistics required reassessment so that thirdly, the Minister should receive the deputation requested. The Director General added the following note and forwarded the memorandum to the Director of Secondary Education for advice.

Agree - do you? (Perhaps 'time and talk' has resolved some problems. Mr [KG] discussed this with me on the way back from Sydney). Advice please.\(^3\)

On the face of it the latter annotation is ambiguous, the agreement could either be with the recommendation for closure or for receiving the deputation. The reference to 'time and talk' could mean that relations with supporters of X2 had improved sufficiently to continue the experiment, or that discussions internal to the Education Department had produced a consensus of views. In any case the next memorandum was dated 23 October and was a response, not from the Director of Secondary Education (SG) but his deputy (KG) who had

---

\(^1\) Personal notes.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid.
helped conduct the enquiry at X2. (And who was therefore being attacked in a previous memorandum, for making inconsistent recommendations.) The memorandum was titled '[X2], Annexe of D School. Response to Report of Investigation'. The first sentence noted that the 'Minister has not responded to the recommendations'. The remainder of the memorandum revolves about the issue of who can say authoritatively (and what evidence is valid), just what constitutes a 'normal' pupil at a 'normal' school.

a) the recommendation to keep the [X2] unit open is based on one idea only, namely that pupils who have reacted very badly at home or in schools previously attended have become acceptable family members after becoming part of [X2], or a significant number of parents see such a connection. It is not disputed that there may be a 'normal school' in which these pupils can become equally happy, but it is presented as a fact that in transition from the 'normal' school which they did attend [before X2], a significant number did change from unacceptable to acceptable in their families, otherwise there is no objective reason to retain [X2].

It is worth noting that the evaluative concept of 'adjustment to school' is not used as a positive measure with reference to X2. Positive adjustment - acceptability - in the family is a valid measure but not to X2. A theme which can only be inferred but which appears to differentiate the normative systems of the supporters of the X2 school and many Education Department administrators, is the degree to which the child, the family and the school can be expected to adapt to one another. In the case of the X school, its early 'philosophy' and to some extent its operation, reflect an expectation that the school will 'adapt' considerably to both pupils and families. By contrast much of the writing by officials carries the implication that the pupil and the family must be expected to 'adjust' to the school.

b) ...there is little that is 'school' about [X2]. Consequently it may be less efficient to staff it with school teachers.

c) [KF] is being asked to take responsibility for a unit which she regards as non-educational.1 Mr [KX] has learnt to

---

1 DL, the Education Department officer who volunteered to act as a liaison/contact person for the X3 school after its subsequent revival in Year IV, asserted strongly (and quite cheerfully) that although he saw nothing 'educational' about X3, since it was classified as a school, he would administer it as effectively as possible because the essence of his job was administration (DL interview.)
live with his problems but is quite dissatisfied in his position and will get out. I would not ask any secondary teacher or secondary principal to run a unit which breaks the law so flagrantly and which is encouraged to break the law so flagrantly.

d) We have children who do not fit the patterns carved by normal schools, we have parents who think they have children who are not fit for our sort of schools. Some of them think (at least for a time) that in [X2] they have found a place for their 'unusual' children, even if we do not see these children as 'unusual'. [The normative conflict is perhaps most evident in this passage.]

e) The real issue for [Year IV] is that if [X2] remains a school or part of a school then its leadership should attempt to uphold the law relating to schools, if they succeed it is no longer [X2] in type, if they don't succeed then they are under tension, are vulnerable and are remiss. The only other alterations are (i) to have [X2] legalised but not as a school or, (ii) to alter laws specifically to suit [X2]. Both of these alterations are beyond the administration's field of operations, they seem to be theoretical if anyone can so move.

This passage is the clearest single statement of the view that the X2 school represented a threat to the status quo, a threat to the principles of order on which the entire education system was seen to be based. The view is stated in the form of a threat to the system, since any compromise is represented as the elimination of the essence of the symbolic order of the X2 school. The problem is couched in terms such that 'the administration's field of operations' is essentially pragmatic whereas the pressures from X2 school are for 'theoretical' solutions which are by analogy 'impractical' or non-pragmatic.

f) The only 'easy' solution to [X2] is to shut it and I think that would prove to be far from easy.

The annotations which follow this memorandum are dated 31 October. They include a number of requests by the Director General for other administrators to clarify the Director of Secondary Education's attitude towards the closure of the X2 school. The Assistant Director General (BI) affirms that the 'DSE believes annexe should be abolished'.

On 3 November the Deputy Director General (UN) requested that the Director General authorise the meeting of a deputation to

---

1 All this material occurs on one particular typewritten memo. Personal notes.
'decide future' of the X2 school. The Director General apparently discussed this with the Minister who requested that the Deputy Director General (UN) and the Director of Secondary Education (SG) 'see deputation perhaps to [persuade] them that the school should be closed, suggest you might talk with [name given of the head of another alternative school annexe] beforehand as to possibility of another person being able to [coordinate] school at [X2]. It seems reasonable to conclude on the evidence so far that the idea of closing the X2 school was not shared with equal strength amongst administrative officers. Furthermore, even those who wanted it closed realised such a decision would not be a popular one. Memoranda had consistently been addressed in such a way as to encourage the Minister to make a firm decision. On more than one occasion advice was tendered which encouraged administrators to meet representatives of the X2 school and to persuade them to initiate the school's closure. From the principal of D school upwards, there was a great reluctance to fill a position which involved straddling the boundary between the X2 community and the formal organisation of the Education Department. The problem was not unlike that confronting any representative of the State required to deal with a family which for reasons of principle, will not comply with the law, for example on compulsory schooling or compulsory military service etc. The X2 community appeared as composed of educational 'utopians' (or 'terrorists'), but in any case, routinised administration using criteria of efficiency and conventional views of 'schooling' were seen as inoperable.

On 25 November the Deputy Director General (UN) reported on a meeting the day before a deputation composed of the principal of D school, the president of the Advisory Council of D school, the

---

1 It is important to note certain difficulties in dealing with official files which are sometimes typewritten but which often have lengthy handwritten annotations that are not always perfectly legible. As a result there is sometimes doubt as to the exact wording as well as the identity of the writer and addressee. However, the detailed examination of this material is important because it reveals the difficulty of arriving at a single organisational decision on a course of action vis a vis X2, where implicit evaluations conflict and where there are advantages in not being individually responsible for decisions which may be difficult to administer.
coordinator of X2 and two parents of children at X2. In his report, UN asserted that for reasons of distance and a breakdown in personal relationships it was not possible for X2 to remain an annexe of D school. Three options were canvassed at that meeting: to close X2; to annexe X2 to another school; to establish X2 as a separate school. UN noted that there were problems at the school, that the coordinator felt that action had been taken to remedy many of these problems and that closure would be opposed by parents. The effect of UN's recommendations was to put the onus back on to the Secondary Schools Division. Attempts were to be made to find a school prepared to adopt X2 as an annexe. Guidelines for administration were to be formed with provision for on-going evaluation being reported to the Minister. The Director of Secondary Education was to devise aims and objectives for the X2 school as well as to define the role of the coordinator. On the same day that the Minister agreed to these recommendations, which shifted administrative power very firmly back to the Director of Secondary Education, the coordinator of X2 wrote to the Director of Secondary Education requesting an administrative transfer back to his original permanent position. The transfer was granted on this day, 26 November, two days after the coordinator had suggested that many of the X2 school's problems were being resolved.\(^1\)

On 1 December, the Director of Secondary Education drafted a memorandum in which firstly, he noted the administrative transfer of the coordinator of X2 'for both professional and personal reasons', then mentioned that he could not 'convince any principal that [X2] should be regarded as an annexe to his school', and finally, averred that since he was not 'prepared to consider [X2] as a separate section of any secondary school in [Year IV]' then X2 should be closed at the end of Year III. The Deputy Director General endorsed this memorandum on 3 December. 'In view of DSE's minute above' he noted 'I believe that we have no alternative but to close the annexe at the end of this school year'; he added a further note after the Director General's confirmation to the effect that 'Minister agreed to closure verbally

\(^1\) Memoranda of 25 and 26 November. Personal notes.
today'. This was on 5 December. By 15 December, the principal of D school and the chairman of the X2 School Council had received letters which read in part

...the recommendations made following the enquiry into the operations of the annexe and the various alternatives proposed for its future administrative control have been given close and careful consideration. However, it has not proved possible to establish an acceptable pattern for the future administration of the annexe and the decision has therefore been taken with considerable reluctance to close the annexe as from the conclusion of the present school year.

It seems clear from the foregoing material that there was a great reluctance on the part of those with administrative authority to take responsibility for what would be seen as a unilateral decision to close the X2 school. We will suggest that this was because there was a continuing difficulty in specifying exactly the nature of the putative deviance of the X2 school, and that this difficulty was recognised as having the potential to be magnified in an uncontrollable way, should the 'audience' to the deviance become a more public one.\(^1\) At the same time the final accounts or justifications for the closure decision were very much of the order of accounts or justifications. The Minister had agreed with UN's recommendations after the deputation of 24 November. These recommendations effectively strengthened the power of the Director of Secondary Education to control X2 by 'defining the role' of the coordinator and effecting continuous evaluation. The later resignation of the coordinator was (at least in principle) a decreasingly important factor since the Director of Secondary Education now had authority to appoint an incumbent in much the same way he appointed incumbents to positions throughout the rest of his Division. Despite the authorisation of extensive powers of supervision the Director of Secondary Education simply refused 'to accept [X2] as a separate section'. The situated nature of decisions of refusal to cooperate with hierarchically authorised directions is well illustrated

\(^1\) D. Ball, 1975, 'Privacy, Publicity, Deviance and Control', Pacific Sociological Review, vol.18, no.3, July, pp.259-278, where it is argued that 'people who live in glass houses won't throw stones'. That is, a public debate about X2 school was to be avoided if possible.
when this case is compared with various 'refusals to cooperate' by staff and some supporters of the X2 school.

In addition to the issues of imputing educational 'deviance' from within the framework of the X2 school and its activities, it is important to mention that X2 school supporters were acutely attuned to the wider political climate and contemporary political events. IG mentioned in the earliest of interviews that prior to the formal announcement of closure, a friend who was professionally involved in educational matters reported that the Director General had remarked in conversation that the X2 school had 'had it'. IG went on to develop the notion that the Minister had probably felt constrained to hold back any public decision until after the Federal Government election of 10 December. The State Government itself was facing an election in the following year and on Saturday 20 November the Minister issued a press release indicating that principals of schools would be asked by letter 'to control political expression among teachers and pupils'.

One of the difficulties faced by those administrators who were put into the position where they personally evaluated the X2 school in some formal capacity was in specifying what we have referred to as breaches of everyday ritual or violation of the respectability norm. The problem for the evaluators was that reference to particular

1 IG interview.
2 Appendix E.
3 Goffman's material on deference and demeanour has been discussed in the chapter on theory. It is not a usual thing in the sociological literature to find examples of behaviour such as 'the refusal to cooperate' by one part of a formal organisation with another - being cited in support of theories of deviant behaviour. The connection is being made, however, following the line of thinking that any behaviour describable as a violation of expectations is available for social definition as a form of deviance (the issues of culpability and inevitability have been canvassed earlier via McHugh's concepts of 'intentionality' and 'conventionality'). However, the matter of social expectations and their violation in 'everyday' interaction is complicated by virtue of the 'invisibility' of expectations especially as they relate to mundane interaction rituals, to deference and demeanour. Many of the descriptions of negatively evaluated behaviour at the X school referred to an accumulation of minor violations of interaction rituals. Such a phenomenon was difficult to 'make an issue of' by investigators and administrators but recurs so frequently in their reports that there is little doubt that they sensed 'violation' in many everyday interactions. Ball has linked these issues theoretically in his discussion of 'the respectability norm', which refers to
examples of violation of 'residual rules'\(^1\) of everyday etiquette, would seem petty and unconvincing. To go further and list an accumulation of such violations may even have reflected badly on the credibility of the person making the list. The question may have arisen as to their 'sense of balance'. Nevertheless, people ranging from KX, the departmentally-appointed coordinator, through KF to SG and the Education Department investigators (KG and CG), indicated in some way or other their sensing of a violation of the educational respectability norm. On the one hand these people held the view (with varying degrees of disturbance, shock or outrage) that the X school promoted a form of disorder. The emotionality of the response derived from the linking of disorder with

the injunction to appear normal and worthy to others although it is pervasive it is unstated

It is a characteristic of this type of expectancy or rule that it frequently becomes visible only when punitive sanctioning orientations and activities by offended audiences come into play; then we first notice or infer back to the norm; it is through this explicit reaction that the implicit to which is reacted becomes evident.

Now, if we look at the consequences of lacking the appearance of respectability, we find that the penalties run the full range from mild to severe: from 1) symbolic degradation of self, identity and character (verbal abuse, sneers, the 'cut direct', and other mechanisms of informal interpersonal control) through 2) limits on social participation such as prohibitions on entrance and exclusion from various membership categories (occupations, voluntary organizations, residential areas, and so on), to the ultimate of 3) removal from the community....

Thus, we would argue that the sociological study of deviance should embrace all actors and actions which are considered other-than-respectable - either by the powerful in society or any bounded group in it. This broadens the field of deviance well beyond its traditional concerns with the 'criminal' and the 'pathological'; but if we build our constructs on actors' meanings and categories we are likely to find there is no qualitative disjunction, only quantitative differences. Put another way, as part of social reality respectability and its cognates subsume the distinction between deviance and mundane normality which is typically maintained in sociological reality.

a moral evaluation. On the other hand it was difficult to articulate this sense of disorder to any effective degree. In fact, the conflict between supporters and opponents of the X2 school was at times extremely confused because particular points of administrative procedure or particular regulations were made to serve as 'reasons' for certain views or recommendations, which made the purveyors of such views seem 'unreasonable' or to appear as martinet. It is very difficult to 'document' such a conflict but an opportunity can be made via a detailed analysis of an X2 school record of a visit to a school meeting by KG - as Deputy Director of Secondary Education on 29 October of Year III.

1 On the connection between deviance and normality, especially as these relate to the ways in which the term 'moral' is used in the context of this thesis, Ball writes

In a series of studies Garfinkel has demonstrated ethnomethodologically that for members, moral as social reality equals normal : to be perceived-to-be-normal means appearing to be conventionally situated or placed in the natural-order-of-persons-taken-for-granted, to be socially located in the 'of course' environment of non-reflective everyday/any-day life. Thus, to be accorded such placement is to be deemed normal, and this location is a moral one: normal = moral, and therefore to be respectable one must appear to be normal, must be received as such, confirmed as such (for example, through deferential or respectful responses from others), and thereby socially demonstrate one's moral worth. It is in a sense close to this that some sociologists conceive of society itself as a moral order - that is, as a set of normally, and thus morally, ordered locations of positions and roles realized in symbolic communication - although traditional sociological reality has usually stressed the more explicit and obligatory rather than the implicit and taken for granted exchanges of mutual understanding in social realities.

Thus, being respectable independently involves conceptions of and perceptions of the appearance of normality, leading to the accordance of moral worth, along with deferential displays of ratification, by other socially located actors. Therefore, we should note that if we know who is respectable or otherwise, we thereby know what is considered normal or otherwise.


2 See Appendix G for the document cited in full.
Documenting Violations of the Respectability Norm

For almost five months between June and October of Year III, the supporters of the X2 school sought information concerning the recommendations of the Education Department enquiry and the effects these would have on future plans for the school. After a number of requests had been extended to meet with either KG or the Minister, KG agreed to attend a school meeting on 29 October. The invitation to attend noted that the purpose of the visit was not to discuss the Departmental investigation but was concerned with the school and its development. Given the nature of the discussion and recommendations in the official report and the fact that no decisions had been approved which were based on the report, it is understandable how on the one hand KG could feel free to comment on what he defined as the 'development' of the school, but on the other, people at the school meeting may have felt that KG must in fact have come prepared to talk not on development, but on matters arising from the investigation which they felt had been ruled out, and for which they were therefore unprepared. The transcript of this meeting notes that an urgent need to organise for the survival of the X2 school dates from this meeting. Scheduled business 'was quickly resolved immediately after [KG] left, the attention of the school being redirected towards the necessary steps for survival. This became the major preoccupation of the school over the ensuing twelve months.'

In the minutes of this meeting it is recorded that KG 'said he believed [X2] should continue but not necessarily as a school on the present terms. He said the Minister could decide to change the law or possibly create a new division especially for schools like ours, and emphasised that everything depended on him [the Minister].' Although the supporters of the school may have been suspicious of KG because of his apparent lack of sympathy yet a stated belief that the school should continue, there was nevertheless a considerable consistency between the

---

1 Appendix G.
2 Ibid.
recommendations of the official enquiry, KG's Departmental memorandum of 23 October and his comments at the meeting of 29 October. KG was involved in the imputation of deviance. The X2 school, according to KG was systematically violating respectability norms as they especially applied in the realm of education. KG was convinced that these violations were not accidental or unwitting, that given a choice of behaviour the supporters of X2 school deliberately chose what were normally unacceptable approaches in schools. By the commonsense rules of deviance, the X2 school supporters were 'theoretical' - they deliberately eschewed the opinions that normal schools would have chosen under the same pressures or circumstances.

However, given the nature of the norm violations, KG (and others) had difficulty in spelling out a 'logical' argument that was tied to empirical reference points whose moral significance was agreed upon by all parties. The tendency was thus to refer vaguely to the 'prime characteristics' of the X2 school and the response was frequently one of confusion or misapprehension. At one point JB (a parent) asked KG:

There's no way in which the currently structured Education Department can foster schools of this sort; I understand that is what you are saying:

KG: No! I don't think there's as much limit within reasonable observance of the law - and that is all any of us do when it is all said and done. I don't think there's as much limit as one sometimes hears from protagonists of this kind of place. That's not just [X2] but some of the others. There is room for variation, but if the characteristics that some active parents of children at this school seek as the prime characteristic of the place, are themselves illegal, then there are only two things that can happen. Either someone causes the law to be reasonably followed, in which case these parents become dissatisfied and presumably look for somewhere else, and since that's clearly (from the lobby action of last year) not on, then the only alternative left is for the Minister to alter the law with respect to any such place as this. I believe that to be logical.

SQ: Mr [KG] you lost me there. I don't know what these legal requirements are. Could you clarify that for me?

---

1 Appendix H.
KG: They're all very clearly spelt out in the report and I dare say there are others that I didn't spell out, but I can't do better than say that.

KG's difficulty was that these points surrounding the prime characteristics of the X2 school were the very ones that a number of other people had had great difficulty in 'spelling out clearly'. KG was forced to allude to the still-private report in a way that gave the X2 school supporters the idea that there were some clear, unequivocal, easily statable and very serious faults with the school that were alarming enough for them to be kept secret and placed before the Minister and his colleagues. The response from school supporters was in terms of a perceived imputation against the values to which they held most strongly.

KT followed KG's remarks by saying

I would like to say Mr[KG] that I am a member of the School Council and as far as I know we take a tremendous amount of trouble to work within the framework of the Education Department. I've never known of anything dishonest. Certainly I think we take a tremendous amount of trouble....

When discussion moved to specific matters, once again the imputations of deviance against the X2 school were made implicitly, it was as if they were coded into a set of assumptions which took for granted certain relations of power and authority. When these relations were challenged, the ensuing discussion rarely dealt explicitly with the critical issue of the locus of power and authority. For example, KT raised the question of the selection of teaching staff at X2. KG's response depended heavily on the notion of normality

KT: ...the most frustrating thing I've found of being on Council is the fact that we cannot choose our own teachers and I just wondered if this is something that is just a lack of communication between the school and the Education Department or if they really want to choose our teachers. We know there are a lot of teachers who have left the Education Department and are in the community who would really like to work at this school and we would like to be able to advertise some of the positions so they could come forward when we have got a vacancy and we could use them. But, apparently we are not allowed to do that. I'd just like to ask what you think about that.

KG: A lot of schools find some of their own teachers; a lot of teachers find some of their own schools - in the temporary rank. In the structural ranks of the permanent service then the law requires advertisement. Therefore normal procedures
operating in most big institutions can apply. Normally these
days the people who apply for such positions have some
knowledge, at least of the position to which they are going.
But, the place itself has no choice in saying whether they be
there or not or no direct choice. I don't find myself in
disagreement with the philosophy that places outside the normal
stream need specialised attention in their resources and in
particular their human resources. I don't find that a difficult
philosophy to accept. I would certainly fight against the
establishment in any place of an academy which was doing exactly
what a normal school was doing except that by dint of its lobby
it had got itself a pupil staff ratio of somewhere in the order
of 4:1. I would consider that grossly unjust to normal schools.
But while people are prepared to say that there's something
different from the normal about the youngsters who are
concerned then a case may be made for a different staffing
ratio. But that isn't what the parents of [X2] say. Your
argument about staff has got to be in terms of the different
institution that this is and not just enough staff - as some
of your parents wanted to convince me - enough staff so that
you could do a straight-line attack down to HSC only having one
teacher to every four or five children instead of the normal
youngster out there having one one to every thirteen or fourteen.
That is not on as far as I am concerned, but as far as choosing
people to fit a job - who ever chooses them - I would agree
with that, particularly where the unit is different from the
norm.

It is in this speech that KG implicitly defined 'normality'
as the retention of control vis a vis staff appointments, within the
administrative sections of the Education Department. This retention
of control over staff allocation was justified by the need to maintain
a numerically equitable distribution of staff resources. 'Normal'
schools were identified in this argument by reference to a staff-student
ratio and if the students at X2 school were 'normal' and therefore the
same as other students, then the staff-student ratio must also be
'normal'. A different staff-student ratio could be justified in the
case of the X2 school only if students were demonstrably abnormal. By
reference to a 'straight-line attack down to HSC', KG is defining
student normality by reference to the major selection mechanism of
secondary schools. This selection mechanism (the HSC), operated on
the assumption that students competed on equal terms and so staff-
student ratios became an important indicator. However, if the X2
school was prepared to acknowledge that it had 'abnormal' students,
that is, students who could not compete in the HSC, then although the
staff-student ratio was no longer important, nevertheless X2 became
an institution that was no longer legitimate in an educational way, X2 was not a 'proper' school (although its continuation might be justified on 'non-educational', therapeutic grounds). This was the framework of concepts within which KG spelt out the limits of educational normality and if these were to be breached or altered then the matter became one of where the power lay to make these changes.

In the following pages of the document, the issues of 'autonomy' for the X2 school was explored in a way that illustrates the connection between power and the successful imputation of deviance. When the discussion moved to the issue of 'autonomy' for X2 school (on pages 3 and 4), KG was at pains to draw out a distinction between educational 'experimentation' and educational deviance. The term 'deviant' of course was not used and the questioners focussed on drawing from KG - whether there was a distinction between X2 and other experimental annexes, and what comprised this distinction. KG made a series of important points. Firstly, that in a 'normal situation...it's impossible for me to say whether the others [annexes] are similar, different, alike in some things and not in others'. However, given that circumstances (over which KG claimed he had no control) had led to KG conducting an investigation, then this had created the opportunity for him to be 'disturbed'. KG had been disturbed, in part at least, because the X2 annexe 'is extraordinarily, markedly separated from the philosophy of its principal'. KG, of course, in referring to the principal of X2 meant KX, its third coordinator and his philosophy, not the philosophy of SJ the original coordinator, or KF, who was the principal of D school and its annexe, X2. The next questions invited KG to clarify whether the deviance of X2 school related to substantive problems, to particularities that could have been discussed piecemeal, or whether the deviance was founded in the relational aspects of X2 to its 'parental school'. KG's response was couched in terms that connected power with deviance and which invited an understanding of KG's implicit distinction between administrative power and political power. On the one hand 'questions can be very difficult for someone who has to match education with politics', but on the other hand, 'the law is broken in this place'. When KG conceded that the law relating to the compulsory school attendances of children under fifteen was only one of the legal problems, he was invited to be exhaustively specific. In refusing KG suggested 'that's
a moral reality that I invite you to understand'. Such a response was baffling and enigmatic to supporters of the X2 school but by referring to the moral dimensions, KG was alluding to the Minister's right and duty to make a political decision which incorporated a powerful arbitration on the putative educational deviance of the X2 school.

A point which was also implicit in KG's discussion of the investigation and comparison with other annexes, was the effect of the official nature of the complaints and the official response. KG was making the point that it was not so important what actually occurred on a day-to-day basis in other annexes, what was important was that there had been no complaints leading to a formal and official designation of events. Events, of which there were no official accounts, were peccadilloes, the same events if officially accounted would be evaluated in accordance with common-sense rules of deviance, and inevitably a pronouncement would have to be made one way or another.

An inherent difficulty with the X school was that the very impetus for its development arose out of a felt need to establish a new authenticity of interaction that was seen to be absent in the larger formal educational organisation. The phenomenon is commonly experienced in such environments. However, the fact of 'hiving off' small groups within a wider collectivity has impacts in terms of a pluralism of interaction moralities. Douglas has argued that

> Individuals in our society distinguish between public and private situations and take it for granted that rules will not be invoked or enforced across the boundaries of private situations unless what happens in these situations is believed to affect the public realm adversely.¹

Furthermore, there is a problematic connection between the 'situated' moralities of various groups and an assumed wider 'public' morality. For example, professional groups such as medical doctors, hold a 'situated' morality with respect to the body, life and death, which is mediated via the degree to which it is isolated from public view.²

In the case of the X school, an investigation had been made and this

made public a dissension over the drawing of moral boundaries. It was easier for KG to argue about violations of public laws than it was to define violations of norms of (educational) respectability. However, even the regulation relating to compulsory school attendance for children under the age of fifteen, raised difficulties. With the 'private' situated morality of the X2 school, the issue of attendance was conceived differently to the way it was in the 'public' morality of the laws relating to school attendance. It was because of this difference of conception that an additional element of conflict occurred between the X2 school and Education Department officers such as KG and SG. What the X2 school supporters saw as a matter largely relating to a 'private' morality of the annexe, the administrators saw as an essential element of the wider public morality.

The issue of school attendance links together a number of the issues mentioned earlier. When the question of the X2 school's approach to attendance regulations was raised, it was never fully resolved except insofar as it was linked to the general notion of the deviance of X2.

KG: ...the law is broken in this place...
IG: Are you referring to the compulsoriness of education to the age of fifteen?
KG: That's one of the things.
TTN: Wouldn't it be a lot simpler if you could just tell us?
KG: Well that's a moral reality that I invite you to understand ...I don't believe you can adjust [X2] to meet the regulations and still retain it like [X2].
IG: Could I ask how central is this question of the law as regards compulsory attendance of students under fifteen? Is this central or is this only a minor aspect?

1 The issues of privacy/publicity, deviance and social control was taken further by Ball who showed that strong collective rules were associated with opportunities for private rather than public deviance, but that the greater the opportunities for private deviance the stronger was social control (D. Ball, 1975, op.cit., pp.259-78). If strong classification and framing were equated with strong collective rules, then it could be argued firstly that the weak classification and framing of the X school corresponded to the opportunity for private deviance but that conflict occurred when private-public moral boundaries came to be defined.
KG: I think it is the most dangerous one with respect to the future of the people I have named. Judges are hard-headed people and barristers can make a jolly good case.¹

It would appear from the foregoing that KG wants the issue of compulsory education to be regarded as a sample, as one type of regulation which he sees as central to the question of orderly administration but whose 'violation' he sees as an essentialising feature of X2. It epitomises an attack on a central tenet of social ordering in such an educational setting. However, this key dimension of social ordering was subsequently challenged by BN, one of the parents professionally involved with providing solutions to 'problem' children in secondary schools.

BN: Mr[KG]...I do work in schools and find that the regulations are chiefly ignored by some schools - certainly by [KF]'s school. [This was D school, the 'parent' school of the X annexe.]

KG: They are?

BN: Yes - in terms of pupil response. I am very concerned with pupils and sometimes it is very convenient for a school to ignore pupils who aren't attending because when they attend they can't cope and I know this goes on in schools. I also know where there are such people employed by the Social Welfare Department now - not our Department - to check up on kids who are not attending and I've seen them putting pressure on 13 year-old children and their parents to get a school exemption and this legalises their situation of roaming the streets because they don't seem to put the onus on the stated aim so that the child will then go out into the work situation and be fulfilled and then there's no hassle. Now for some kids and in good schools where an agreement is reached between the parents and its students of the school this does not happen, and it's a very realistic solution to their problem and in other cases I've seen this pressure put on kids so they are legally staying home or roaming the streets or running risks to themselves and I wonder, you know, how real you are being worrying about this problem. I certainly know my son, at this school, has been legitimately in the eyes of the school, attending a test-cricket match which I consider educational whereas perhaps you wouldn't. But I certainly never saw him as at risk like many of the kids I see roaming the streets in my area.

KG: Yes, another group's fault does not excuse your own. And I dare say there are a lot of activities that squeeze themselves

¹ Appendix G.
under the heading educational these days where someone as square as I may find less educational. But you are not the only people that want places. And I don't know that all of you want places like this one from what I hear from you - not tonight but elsewhere - because I believe that some of your colleagues, who may or may not be in the hall, have some fond hope that this [X2] is really very like [B] High School or [M] High School or where have you, except that it's different - it's not really very like it - and that's the sort of thing that I've heard today. One child in 24 in the USA - and we are not unlike that country - has been suspended from school and one child in 8 of the black population of USA has been suspended from school. And when you get numbers in the millions like that you begin to see how stupid suspension becomes as a means of trying to get people to follow a set of laws which to at least some of those people in a million don't make any sense. Now the Department's not blind to these things. After all, we are dealing with them. So there's quite a lot of feeling in the Department that we need other kinds of places too, but I wouldn't like to be the administrator, I wouldn't have the guts, to send those youngsters to you here at [X2] just because you are that kind of place. You'd soon put me off that one. So there are other people who find the law restricting when trying to deal with the total population.

SU: If you see the main problem is in dissassociating from [KF] for her sake, are we allowed to have a school that is not annexed to anybody? Is that within the law, or does it have to be annexed to another school?

KG: I don't know.

SU: How would you find out?

KG: Ask the Minister. Which is what I did.

JB: And you still don't know?

KG: No!

It might be asked why compulsory school attendance became such a pivotal issue and whether this was mere chance. In arguing against the latter point, it should be noted that school attendance incorporates some important elements of social control. Compulsory attendance laws blend together in a set of formal regulations several analytically separate elements of social control. The formal nature of the regulations give them a concrete legal identity which allows for both decisions relating to precedents and a range of graded sanctions. This may not, of course, have been one of the original educational aims, which were more likely to have worked from the assumption that physical presence was a minimum condition for teaching and learning. Compulsory attendance regulations allow for the production of rolls and registers
and these in turn entail various 'theories of office'\(^1\) relating to matters of educational effectiveness, teacher efficiency, and deviance within a school setting. Compulsory attendance combines functions of both control and organisational efficiency. Records are created which provide a legal basis for regulating relations of interaction between parents/guardians and teachers as well as teachers and pupils. Such regulations also have the effect of institutionalising parent-child relationships with a spurious static quality. A relationship which in other contexts is seen as essentially dynamic (that is, in theories of growth and maturation and child psychology generally), is in this context made unchanging 'for all practical purposes' in law.\(^2\) At the same time, the same regulations institutionalise a teacher-pupil relationship. On the one hand, despite any difficulties or changes in the relationship between parents and child, the parents have no discretionary power to mediate the force of the compulsory attendance rule; on the other hand, the teacher-pupil relationship has had institutionalised as its 'lowest common denominator' of social control, the fact of the physical presence of the student and the teacher. A student may be enthusiastic, merely obedient or may practise what armed forces define as 'dumb insolence', but the fact of school attendance is what differentiates between modes of control adopted within the organisational boundaries of the school, and action needing to be taken within the wider organisational boundaries of the Education Department.

When a rule such as compulsory education is enshrined in the form of a law, then any exceptions to the law much be 'negotiated'. In many cases informal understandings operate at a level at which 'everybody knows', for example, that 'normal' attendance means something quite different before and after final school year examinations. It will even be understood that what constitutes such 'normality' will vary from school to school and time to time. Such exceptions generally

---

relate to a particular institution, the fact of their introduction and usage validates them unless there is a public protest. Certain other exceptional cases receive legal definition. EN quotes the case where a Social Welfare Department is able - with the parents - to negotiate a 'school exemption' for a child under fifteen. Putative deviance by the child is avoided by a form of 'institutionalised non-control'. The phenomenon is theoretically a difficult one, it is able to function largely because it is negotiated on an ad hoc basis. In other words, legal exemption from school must be formally an ad hoc procedure, it cannot be a publicly available alternative to school since as such it would contradict the law of compulsory education.

In effect, the X2 school was perceived by KG to be seeking public validation for a collective legal exemption from the law of compulsory school attendance. Such a claim for public (as distinct from private and individual) endorsement could be seen to pose a fundamental threat to the authority of administrators as they approached 'normal' schools. In such schools it was taken for granted that there could be no collective dispensation of the legal requirements on school attendance. From one perspective, that of administration, as it related to social control, KG perceived that alterations were being sought which fundamentally affected the organisational structure of education and this required powerful political solutions,

...if enough people say they must have this kind of place with these kinds of characteristics, and that means that they are a bad misfit on the wall, then it's up to those people to have the situation changed. And it may mean...making this a one-off school in a division all of its own, or the first of several such places....

On the other hand, where social control was separated as a function from compulsory attendance (as it was by many supporters of the X2 school) leaving it as minor administrative accounting mechanism, the perception of its significance was quite different

SU: Is that all? I don't mean 'is that all' is nothing, but is that the only thing?

1 Personal notes.
2 Ibid.
It should be reiterated that the issues discussed here were included in an implicit way in the original discussion at the X2 school general meeting. People who questioned KG about the possible 'autonomy' of the X2 school were at best only vaguely aware that being an annexe had contributed to the emergence of X2 as a 'publicly deviant' school (that is, to the formal investigation), but the mere fact of autonomy did not of itself eliminate the possibility of later 'public' deviance via demands (for example) for collective waiving of compulsory under-fifteen attendance laws. Such was the ambiguity of the situation that where some supporters linked the problem of deviance-imputation with the need for 'autonomy', and others de-emphasised 'autonomy' in linking deviance-imputation with power, no-one was able to relate all the apparently unrelated issues via a notion of the struggle for the power to successfully impute collective deviant status to the X2 school.
CHAPTER IX

CONFRONTATION : PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF AN ENDING

The Minister's letter advising of the formal closure of the X2 annexe marks the end of a stage in the process of imputing educational deviance to the school and in its associated process of deviance removal.¹ Up to that point the conflict had largely been confined to those people with a more-or-less direct knowledge of the X2 school. By legitimating the act of closure within a language of administrative impracticality and by gaining the imprimatur of the Minister it may have been presumed that there would be insufficient oppositional resources on behalf of the X2 school. However, school supporters experienced a sense of injustice due to what they saw as a misrepresentation about what they called the issue of 'autonomy' and the possibility for their independent functioning within the system of educational administration. In Davis' terms, conflict was increased (not decreased), because X2 supporters felt that illegitimate power had been used to close the school. The illegitimacy did not derive from the fact of the decision to close the school, but rather from the mode of the decision - given that supporters felt that they had been offered the opportunity to operate 'autonomously'.²

...in October, I decided that probably the school would get closed, and I got sick of all these bloody mixed up people. ...And [UN] would have probably recommended to [the Minister] that - 'look the political guts have gone out of this place'. [KX was] totally incapable of running the job that they'd hoped he'd be able to do. He just proved to be quite ineffectual. Even from their point of view, he must have looked pretty piss-weak, you know....Anyway, they probably thought it politically advantageous to close it....In fact if they were a month earlier, I probably wouldn't have taken the slightest bit of notice. They'd have gone through the proper channels, they'd have notified people - even [if in] October they'd have said 'look, it's really not on, this place

is a mess, we're going to close it', I probably would have agreed with them. But to do it two days before the end of the school year, in such a callous fashion, without any concern for people, and people involved - I just said, 'look that's not on'. And we immediately convened a meeting.¹

The arguments developed by the supporters of the X2 school fundamentally revolved around the idea that they had been led to believe that 'autonomy' was a genuine option which had been offered, on the basis of which they had been making plans for the future, but which subsequently (in the official notification of closure) had been dismissed out of hand. Much of the action in the ensuing weeks was oriented around the idea of protesting such an 'injustice'. From this point the involvement of the popular press marked the introduction of an element capable of 'producing' a much wider audience than heretofore with respect to the issue of deviance as imputed to the X2 school. The involvement of the press created the means for disseminating various rhetorics that amounted to the public 'accounting' of putative educational deviance.²

Deviance, Power and Resources: The Amplification of Deviance.

Once the supporters of the X2 school were acquainted with the Minister's decision on its closure, a sense of outrage manifested itself in a series of meetings at the school aimed at achieving a meeting with the Minister with a view to persuading him to alter the decision. In

¹ JB interview. Note, the group which convened to oppose the closure at this time was an ad hoc group with some, but not all of its participants, holding 'official' positions within the X2 school's internal community organisation.

² There are many 'publics' when it comes to the collective evaluation of the organisational or interactional propriety of the actions of a group or individual. Before the involvement of the mass media, the 'publics' which evaluated events at the X2 school (apart from the pupils and parents) were predominantly segments of the education profession. Their various conflicts of interest have already been manifested, however, the reference now is to those largely undifferentiated 'publics' of the mass media audience. The notion of intra-professional 'publics', their evolution and conflicts is derived from the work of R. Bucher and A. Strauss, 1961, 'Professions in Process, American Journal of Sociology, vol.66 (Jan.), pp.325-34.
fact it proved impossible at that time for any X2 school supporters to
meet with the Minister and the entire issue became very publicly visible.
Interviews and stories were run in the press and on radio and television,
all of which added to the dimensions of the issue by virtue of the
expanded communication network with the associated expansion of interests.
The news media were (at least for a few days) interested in the 'news'
value of various people's stories. The process of communicating with
the Education Department and the Minister of Education achieved its own
'story' value which became incorporated into the public image of events
surrounding the closure of the school.

On Tuesday 16 December (Year III), KF, the principal of D
school, received the official notification of the closure of X2, and
began drafting letters to parents of X2 students. Essentially this
letter was to inform parents that endeavours would be made to place X2
students in other 'alternative' or 'community' schools but that failing
this, students would be obliged to attend their local high school.
Over the next four nights school supporters met on the premises of the
X2 school, initially to formulate plans to oppose the closure and
secondly to prevent the physical removal of the paraphernalia that
represented the school. A letter of protest was drafted at the first
meeting of 16 December, and was delivered by hand to the Minister's
office on the following day - 17 December. The importance of this
letter lay in the stress upon the understanding that representatives
at the previous deputation had gained, vis a vis the genuineness of
the possibility of an 'autonomous' existence for X2. The letter
referred to the deputation of 24 November listing the participants and
noting that the report from these participants 'led us to believe that
the continued functioning of the school would be recommended to you'.
The letter continued by explaining how this impression had led students
to 'abandon their options of accepting places at other schools in view
of the positive encouragement conveyed by your officers at this meeting'
and that staff had courses in an 'advanced state of preparation'. There
followed a concluding plea to allow X2 school representatives to meet
with the Minister 'to discuss two possibilities with you a) that the
school be permitted to function on the basis of autonomy of the type
discussed in negotiations between your officers and the coordinator [of
another city 'alternative' school] and b) that the school be permitted
to function as an annexe to a local high school or local technical school'. At the X2 school itself, the coordinator had publicly announced his resignation at the first meeting of Tuesday 16 December. KX thus formally withdrew from the actions of the school which followed. Even at this time, but certainly later on after people had spoken to one another, there was a feeling that there was some contradiction between KX's words and his actions. Writing at the time, a student of the X2 school wrote

[KX] made a fairly moving resignation speech [on the evening of 16 December], about how he believed in what we were doing etc. Why he couldn't have told us before, so we could have arranged for another coordinator, I don't know. But he must have known he wouldn't be staying long before he told us. Maybe he knew nothing of the decision though. I don't know.

However, the student's mother (who typed the notes) later added in parentheses 'Apparently he had formally resigned the week or two weeks before, but had not told anyone at the school.'

During an interview in November of Year IV, BN was mystified both by the fact of KX's resignation and its timing, although both were seen to be crucial factors.

I'm quite sure the decision [to close X2] had to do with [KX]'s letter of resignation which went in at such a late date, and God knows what [KX] had in his letter of resignation....

...it was a very late decision and I don't think it was prompted by any incident or anything in particular that happened...but the assumption presumably was from [KG - Deputy Director of Secondary Education] that he was transferring because of continuing strife. You know, I suggest that there probably wasn't continuing strife in November/December...in a November meeting - late November meeting - he was saying he wasn't asking for transfers.

Other X2 school supporters later expressed their mystification at the time over KX's resignation - in stronger terms.

Actually I felt sorry for him [KX]....We made these efforts to help him. And if I had only known what I know now, we wouldn't have. Because at the same time we found out that he

---

1 Appendix Q.
2 BN interview, cf. ibid.
was actually - he had done things that were detrimental to the whole set-up and he would never tell anyone about it. He had already put in his resignation - two weeks before the school was closed he had resigned! Now if we had known that, we would have kicked him out of the place! That's how stupid we were.¹

In a letter to her son, dated Friday 19 December, CG wrote

I am now beginning to feel, unlike earlier in the week, that the Department is much more than indifferent to us - i.e. just putting off decisions till December but in fact actively hostile ... The Education Department really planned the timing to catch us; Saturday tomorrow, school holidays already started, Dad and the others have exhausted themselves for nothing....[JB] is saying 'the Press men who have come out to interview have been convinced straight away by the justice of our cause and have asked us - why have they set you up like this? - Why you? Daddy agrees with him [JB], they were sore at losing over the [X2] building last year - a year ago - and were determined to win this time .... [name] has just reported that on [KBM]'s last visit to the Department one of the High Ups said 'I'm going to get you' and so he did.²

From the time of the closure then, at least some X2 school supporters produced accounts which involved notions of a conspiracy or at least of a coordinated plan of opposition. Attempts were renewed to make direct contact with the Minister.

On Wednesday 17 December, IG visited the Leader of the Opposition in the State parliament. This man's daughter was a some-time student of the X school and he undertook to arrange a meeting between X2 school representatives and the Minister of Education. One of the

¹ LP interview. In such interview situations a sense of personal culpability was sometimes implied. In this case the attribution was towards KX. Such limited information about details of personal interactions is available, that it is not possible to do more than show that a great variety of imputations were possible, and this variety changed constantly as participants strove to integrate new information. It is not inconsistent with the information available that KX was much more subject to pressures over which he felt he had no control than vice-versa. However, such speculation is useful only for indicating the range of possibilities. What is important is the significance firstly of people's continuing efforts to gather information and 'make sense' of it, and secondly the function of 'maintaining continuity' in the moral evaluation built into such explanations or 'everyday theories'.

² Appendix I.
students gave an interview on the local ABC radio second channel and at the school a number of reporters interviewed assorted students and staff. Meanwhile JB and LP had waited two hours at the Education Department and were able to interview UN, the Deputy Director General. By the afternoon of Wednesday 17 December discussion revolved around UN's conditions vis a vis autonomy. The three conditions debated were the appointment of a principal-cum-coordinator by the Education Department, who would take full responsibility for every student from the time they left home until the time they returned; a curriculum as approved by the Education Department and the recognition that school inspectors should be allowed to visit at any time, and without notice. In fact, these 'conditions', which were seen as 'farcical' by X2 supporters were probably no more than a formal statement of Education Department regulations. The issue presents in a most clear-cut form, the fact that regulations and rules are 'achieved' phenomena that occur despite other formality and not because of it. Stated differently, formal rules and regulations represent publicly promulgated delimitations, but in the same way that public utilities become inefficient (or cease to function) if they 'work to rule', formal regulations represent legitimising resources which can be called on to mediate public issues. Whilst issues remain non-problematic and non-public ones, regulations (in the words of BNd) can be 'stretched'. However, when the informal procedures for achieving adequate rule-use do not operate then the subsequent resort to a formal restatement of the rules and regulations is a measure more of their inadequacy than their fundamental effectiveness. It has also been argued elsewhere in the thesis, that the sort of reasons for the failure to successfully achieve the maintenance of the formal rules typically occurs when there is a conflict at those implicit levels of interaction dealing with norms of respectability. Individuals or groups lacking 'respectability' operate according to unsatisfactory moral criteria and are simply not to be trusted. All of which has little to do with more overt values as was indicated in the visit of KG to the X2 school General Meeting when his suggestions about the deficiencies of the school were perceived by SU
to be impugning a fundamental commitment to 'honesty' and 'integrity'.

At any rate in summarising the internal debate at the school, BG wrote that some people including herself 'thought that we could get around them' while others thought the conditions were 'impossible and ridiculous' and that 'we must get to see [the Minister]'..

On the evening of Wednesday 17 December it was decided to hold a public demonstration on the next day, moving from the city centre to Parliament House, as a means of indicating numerical support and gaining press coverage in order to maximise the impact of the closure of the school as a public issue. LZ also undertook to arrange to breakfast with the Assistant Minister of Education whom it was felt was sympathetic, at the very least, to the general issue of 'alternative education'. The demonstration took place and provided its own dimensions of drama when the Minister appeared (quite fortuitously) and fell down on the steps of Parliament House whilst surrounded by the demonstrators. On this day also, the coordinator returned briefly to announce that the school would be officially closed up at 12 noon; subsequently a group of parents decided to occupy the building. In the event, the security guards allowed one parent and a student to stay all night, while the police sat outside in their car.

---

1 KT remarked 'I would like to say Mr[KG] that I am a member of the School Council, and as far as I know we take a tremendous amount of trouble to work within the framework of the Education Department. I've never known of anything dishonest' (see Appendix G). Although there was open discussion in the meeting after KG left, about what were facetiously described as 'regulation microphones', it is not clear whether KT knew that KG was unaware that his speech was being recorded.

2 a) However, neither the acceptance or rejection of these conditions was very likely to be a move towards an effective solution since much of the mutual antipathy between the parties was founded in an unarticulated conflict over the power to define propriety and 'respectability' in interaction across the school-administration boundary.
b) The detail of actions at the X2 school after receipt of notice of closure are almost entirely from the document 'The way [X2] was closed' (personal notes).

3 Details are drawn from ibid. The issue of political resources or contacts is a recurring theme in events surrounding the X2 school. For example, the student who stayed overnight on 18 December at the school premises was the daughter of a Liberal MLC. Whether the security guards and police knew this particular detail, there is little doubt that they would have known that the school was 'well-
watched the television reports of the demonstration during which the
Minister indicated that he was prepared to organise a meeting for the
next day (Friday 19 December). Up until this time no amount of
efforts, either by the Leader of the State Opposition or the Assistant
Minister of Education had apparently been successful in arranging a
direct meeting between school representatives and the Minister. Thus
it was a stimulus to appoint representatives and to prepare a document
outline for possible future and alternative administrative arrangements.

On the morning of Friday 19 December, the X2 school
representatives met UN, the Deputy Director General, who undertook to
convey the school's proposals to the Minister. School supporters in
their contemporary records noted a feeling of depression when their
phone-calls to the Education Department throughout that afternoon only
elicited the response that the Minister had not yet reacted to the
proposals.

During the evening of the same day, the parents organised
themselves to 'sit-in' at the school premises as a gesture against the
physical closure of the school. One press interview, which was
conducted at 3 a.m., was run in the first edition (but only in the
first edition) of one of the next morning's daily newspapers. Some
time shortly afterwards the parents were informed that they could
remain in occupation until Christmas if they wished. By the time of

connected' politically. At various times the daughter of the Leader
of the State Opposition had attended, the grandchildren of a sometime
Federal Treasurer and another Federal Minister had attended the school
for a period, the chairman of the X2 school General meeting was a
personal friend of the Assistant Minister of Education (and previous
communication between them had been criticised in Education Department
memoranda). At the time of the Year II difficulties in finding
accommodation, one parent had made personal approaches to the then
Federal Shadow Minister for Education. Finally, after the events and
publicity of the days following the closure of the X2 school in
December Year IV, the Minister appointed a special assistant to the
Deputy Director General to deal exclusively with the problem of the
X2 school. It was the Assistant Minister of Education who asked two
members of parliament to coordinate the January Year IV deputation
to the Minister, after they had expressed support for the school and
the proposed deputation.

Ibid.
the meeting at the school on the following Tuesday there were reports of 'foreign' graffiti on the walls, the school minibus (paid for by the school supporters) had disappeared and some students were now irate because they felt the security guards had not kept the building as secure as they might. These latter points are of interest since it emerged in a subsequent Education Department memorandum that a considerable amount of equipment was unaccounted for and that no reliable inventory was in existence. Of course, given the period of confusion between the closure and Christmas time, when various groups asserted occupancy or control of the premises for a variety of reasons - then there are a variety of possibilities as to how and why material and equipment may have disappeared, not to mention speculation by different interest-groups of the reasons and culpability for the disappearances. In the days prior to Christmas, meetings were held at which the idea was confirmed that direct representation to the Minister was needed. The parents inserted a paid advertisement in the daily press on Christmas Eve, which reiterated their belief in the school and determination to see it maintained.

Within the Education Department, the letter of protest drafted on 16 December and delivered by hand on 17 December to the Minister's office, was initially handled by the Director General of Education who queried those sections relating to the offer of autonomy. The Director General addressed his queries to the Deputy Director General (UN), who (along with the Director of Secondary Education) had attended the deputation. The Director General suggested that since 'this is opposite to information received from you - I think' the Deputy Director General and Director of Secondary Education (SG) should

1 In his minute to the Minister of 28 January Year IV, the Assistant Director General in charge of buildings wrote inter alia, 'd) Furniture and equipment which is recoverable, very little has been taken into storage by Public Works Department e) Equipment loss is extensive and includes microscopes, telescope, vacuum pump and balances, some items e.g. incubator, refrigerator and typewriters have been salvaged and returned to stores branch but there is no inventory of equipment that might be checked.' Appendix J.

2 Appendix E.
discuss the matter with the Minister. On 17 December there was also a large number of telegrams received by the Minister's office, variously expressing opposition to the actual closure of the X2 school and support generally for this particular school and the general approach to education which it was seen to represent.

On 18 December, a lengthy Education Department memorandum was presented in conjunction with what probably was the first set of alternative administrative proposals drafted by the X2 school supporters themselves. The memorandum was drafted by Assistant Director General (DN) who had so far produced little by way of formal comment on the administration or closure of X2 school. DN's memorandum was added to the following day by UN after he had seen the deputation of parents from the X2 school. His addendum made it clear that the closure decision 'must stand and any alterations...be examined subsequently without prejudice to the current decision'. Finally, there occurred an unsigned handwritten comment on the submission (which is presumed to have come from the X2 school). The writer tersely noted 'Much improvement recently, not hopeless.'

From within twenty-four hours or so of the publication of the letter of closure, there were indications that within the various administrative sections of the Education Department there were the sort of difficulties which prevented the usual channels of communication and authority from presenting the problem in a solvable form. From around this time a temporary assistant was appointed to work with UN, but acting for the Minister. Furthermore, it was clear from this time that serious consideration was being given to the possibility of maintaining the X2 school.

1 The Education Department memorandum was titled ]X2] Alternative School: Some Thoughts on [X2]. Why it failed, why it was closed, how it could be revived.' The accompanying document was not on Education Department paper and was unsigned. See Appendix K.

2 Appendix K.

3 SD interview.
Once the closure of the school became an issue in the popular news media, both the supporters of the X2 school and Education Department administrators used the media as another resource in the attempt to define the moral calculus of the issues. On the one hand, the report of the official investigation was defined by officials as having the status of 'proper' information, whilst on the other hand X2 school supporters felt that reference to information from within a report which had never been made public (either in its substance, conclusions or recommendations), was an appeal to 'illegitimate' information.

In the first instance the X2 supporters were satisfied to quote one of the earliest press reports in full at the beginning of a review document, regarding this report as presenting 'the basic facts surrounding the decision' (to close the school).\(^1\) However, when in Education Department press releases and interviews, reference was made to the fact of the investigation or to details of the report's findings, or even, in one case, to the fact that the report was eight inches thick, then X2 supporters saw the press as either biased or being 'manipulated'. CG wrote to her son 'after the meeting [of Friday 19 December] with Dad and the others this morning they leaked all the JUICY bits to the Press without evidence,...having (apparently) got them from complaints earlier this year and last year'.\(^2\) (One difficulty of course was that, apart from selecting material from the report of the Departmental investigation - many of the complaints in that report did refer to a lengthy time span during which some problems had been solved and others had occurred. However, a cursory reading of the report may not have shown this.)

From the point of view of Education Department officers, a great deal of difficulty had been caused in their administrative efforts as a result of what were seen as 'illegitimate' political connections. Since the school was 'well connected' this alone gave it an 'unfair'

---

1 Ref. preface to document 'The [X2] Community School - An Assessment of Past Difficulties with New Proposals and Selected Documents', Appendix C.

2 See Appendix I.
advantage over other schools and to this extent it was abnormal though the rhetorical terms used referred to 'elitist' tendencies. The Minister of Education was placed between two domains of operation; as a politician he had to respond to public political pressure, but as political head of a public administration it was vitally necessary that he be seen to work with this administration and to show understanding of the constraints upon its operation.

The Minister, as well as administrators and X2 school supporters showed some awareness in dealing with the news media of that 'unwitting bias...coincident with official ideologies of the status quo'.

X2 supporters consistently referred to the fact that the report of the investigation was not made public and that in interests of 'fairness' they ought to have the opportunity to discuss the affair with the Minister himself. However, various people were upset and suspicious of sinister behind-the-scenes manoeuvres when reporters either expressed what seemed like support or sympathy and then published stories containing only 'official' information, or collected information and did not publish at all.

The Minister and his Deputy Director General announced through the press on Friday 19 December that they would meet a deputation from the X2 school despite the public demonstration of the day before. In announcing on Saturday 20 December that the decision to close the school remained, the Deputy Director

---

2 'The funny thing was that in later editions (printed two hours later) the photo and favourable blurb had been carefully replaced with a photo of...and two girls. Obviously the editor, arriving late in the morning hadn't liked what the reporters had done, and had it removed.' Page 6 of 'The way [X2] was closed', personal notes. '[name] from the [daily newspaper] came and talked to us about how the reports are made and was sorry about the [same daily newspaper] report by [reporter's name] which was reporting only what [UN] had said and not us. He helped us tremendously with writing our press statement mainly denying accusations about us in the Press, by the Department. He typed it up and took us to the [daily newspaper] office where a guy from the [Sunday newspaper] was trying to write a story on X2. We gave him a copy of our statement which he didn't use in fact. But the [daily newspaper] guy took one and said he hopefully would be able to write something in the [weekly 'radical' newspaper].
was quoted as saying 'I don't think the events of the past few days have given us any reason to change our minds'. The newspaper then referred to the public demonstration, the fact of the police visiting the school during the 'sit-in' and that the Minister was 'knocked over on the steps of Parliament House'.

The Minister's fall on the steps of Parliament House came to assume a special symbolic value as a result of its public circumstance and media reporting. In the very earliest interviews with people who had supported the X school at that time, the 'Minister's Fall' and its subsequent reporting was raised: the IG family mentioned the issue as did BN. CG wrote at the time 'unfortunately he [the Minister] slipped on Parliament House steps and had the decency later to admit it was a slip and not our fault, but the Press made a big thing out of it'.

In the notes she made within a day or so of the events, BG wrote

We followed him up the steps and had to pull a few kids away from him, they were shouting so loudly, almost in his face. He was surrounded by people at the top of the steps, and he suddenly fell forward. A gasp went up through the crowd and the Press men [sic] helped him up and rushed him inside. I wasn't in the front, and was afraid he'd been pushed which would have been terrible for us. Everyone near him said he just fell, and most believe he did it on purpose. Others say the pressure was too much for him. As it was, the Press reported he'd been "tripped" or "pushed" by the kids.'

Actually a variety of wordings were used in the newspapers to describe the event. The point being, however, that the event was seen by most people to have some special significance which had the potential to be used in different ways. In the interview with BN and BNd, the event of the 'Minister's Fall' was linked with accounts of the role of the press as it related to portraying the X2 school.

BN and BNd had had explained to them that one article had not been printed because it was composed of newspaper-derived

1 See Appendix E.
2 Appendix I, personal letter from GC to EG.
3 'The way [X2] was closed', personal notes.
background and was unable to be supplemented by official Education Department views since the Minister 'was away' at the time. Later when there were two reporters from the same paper, with one covering the X2 school and its supporters and the other contacting the Education Department, it was only the 'official' news which was published.

It may not have been a conspiracy [but] an article came out that wasn't informed by a reporter who'd done the majority of the on-the-ground work...if that had come out [that, the actual report with its 'official' information], plus the on-the-spot reporter's, that would have been balanced reporting.¹

It was this line of thinking about the role of the media and the difficulty and necessity of anticipating its function that led BNd to select the 'Minister's Fall' as an example of the production of news.

BNd: Oh yes, he was very clever...he said 'Well if I'd been an umpire I would have given a free kick' - you know

BN: [The Minister] himself was a League footballer

BNd: Our immediate reaction was that - I'm sure that they're going to make a big thing of this - you know, they're going to say that we've hassled him and pushed him over and you know, we were worried about that....²

Every Saturday afternoon in winter-time, thousands of Australian football supporters gather to watch what is a ritual affirmation of the morality that is encapsulated in colloquialisms such as 'giving a man a fair go', 'being a good sport' or 'being able to dish it out and take it like a man'. Like most team sports such as soccer or basketball, the 'advantage' rules in football allow great discretion to the umpire. Thus 'playing dirty' has more to do with violating chivalric norms of honour, loyalty and manhood, than it does with breaking the formal rules of the game. In this respect the sport is more like wrestling, where the crowd is essential because of its (frequently exercised) potential to oppose the umpire or referee, whose decision, although technically correct, may be seen as morally

¹ Ibid.
² Appendix L.
insupportable. Thus the Minister opined that regardless of the technicalities of his fall, regardless of whether he fell or whether he was pushed - he felt a 'good' umpire would have exercised a decision in the Minister's (moral) favour. Intuitively, but probably with the benefit of political experience, the rhetoric was one which readily appealed to the wider public's sense of the moral, of what was respectable. To the extent that the event of the 'Minister's Fall' was irrelevant to serious consideration of the fundamental issues surrounding the X2 school (the investigation and closure), it is indicative of the role of the media in providing material piece-meal for the public application of common-sense rules of deviance.

It has been argued here that the conflict between the X school and the Education Department administrators grew out of contrasting implicit understandings of how social order was achieved and transmitted in educational settings. No matter how much individuals in the news media may have perceived this, there are always great pressures to avoid analysis in anything other than the contemporary popular stylised language used for discussing current social problems. So the conflicts over conceptions of social order were never canvassed except in the rhetoric of "'pop' school' 'experimental school' or '"trial" schools'. However, there were other dilemmas associated with presenting news about a group with the equivocal status associated with 'alternative education'. This latter term compounded connotations


2 Ref. P. Rock, 'News as eternal recurrence', in S. Cohen and J. Young, 1973, op.cit., p.73. Rock argues 'how news consists of the unusual event occurring within the rubric of the "usual" characterizations of journalists and press officers. The paradigm of the usual "taken-for-granted" world view of the journalist becomes stylized into a number of almost reflexive cliches evoked effortlessly in the face of the deluge of events which face him in his work', p.19.

3 Appendix E.
in a way which joined together the generally publicly-favourable notions of 'innovation' and gradualist reformism, with publicly not-so-favourable ideas of 'counter-culture' and the politics of confrontation and radical change. The difficulty with such composite stereotypes is to present a 'balanced' picture within the prevailing press ideology of consensus and compromise.\(^1\) In the case of the X school the press faced the same difficulty as the Education Department administrators, that is, they needed to judge to what extent the tenets of the school implied a denial of the 'consensual world-view'. Any judgement, however, became built-in to the selection of particular events as 'newsworthy'. If the Education Department officials or the Minister of Education refused to speak or meet with school representatives this was potential news. After all, people are suspicious of 'red-tape' and 'bureaucracy', reform can only occur when there is a 'spirit of compromise'. However, public demonstrations are located further across the spectrum of 'respectability' and there is a lack of propriety in the 'jostling' of a Minister of the Crown. Both the X2 school supporters and the Education Department (including its Minister) presented themselves to the mass media in terms that they thought the media would respond to in a way which favoured their particular interest. In the long-term the media contributed only to the struggle for legitimising resources in the effort to achieve sufficient power to influence the outcome of deviance imputation and deviance-removal. With the publication of the parents' paid advertisement on Christmas Eve of Year III, the part played by the media in the process of public deviance delineation was finished; when the Minister met a deputation of X2 school supporters on 28 January Year IV, he ushered the media out of his office before the introductions were made.\(^2\)

\(^1\) S. Hall, 1973, op.cit. Where Hall examines the implicit and unstated rules of journalism arguing that these frame a 'basic model of society [with] a democratic consensus where a considerable measure of agreement occurs over the legitimate nature of the existing political and economic arrangements. This paradigm might in fact "work" for many events but the problems and contradictions arise when the media are asked to explain those groups and phenomena, which explicitly deny this consensual world view', p.20.

\(^2\) ET interview; LP/SP interview.
CHAPTER X
THE TRANSITION FROM X2 TO X3

Politics and Administration

During the Christmas and New Year period of Year III, the supporters of the X2 school drafted a lengthy document reviewing past difficulties and making concrete proposals for future administration. They also spoke to politicians and educationists in order to maintain support for their case. Much of the communication focussed around the Assistant Minister of Education who was a friend of LZ, the chairman of the X2 school General Meeting. On 5 January, JS in his capacity as an MLC (and school parent) phoned the Minister's office indicating that a formal request would shortly be forthcoming for the Minister to meet a deputation. The deputation would discuss proposals that were being drafted and which would shortly be forwarded. On 13 January EB, the Director of a College of Advanced Education located near to the X2 premises, wrote a personal letter to the Assistant Minister of Education. In this letter EB argued against the closure of X2 and favoured its administration by a group of experienced educationists. EB indicated three people, including himself and his institution, who had indicated their preparedness to cooperate. Another politician, CK, wrote to the Minister of Education on 15 January. In seeking to accompany a deputation of X2 supporters to meet the Minister, CK enclosed the earlier-mentioned paper which outlined a brief history of the X school, its difficulties in the past, and some 'key proposals' for the administration of the school in future. CK also indicated that a number of people had shown a willingness to act as coordinator for the school and of these, CK supported the idea of appointing ET.

1 Note by Minister's private secretary dated 5 January Year IV, Appendix J.
2 Personal notes.
The paper outlining past difficulties and new proposals was read and annotated first by the Director General and then the Deputy Director General. Both men added notes indicating that X2 'was not a school', that is, it had never been formally established as a school and that this formal attribute was central to future discussions. 'The annexe can only be the ultimate responsibility of the Director of Secondary Education and unless it is proclaimed a "school" by the Minister - must function as attached to such a "school" OR become a private school.' It was further stressed that the proposed Advisory Board posed problems of membership, but on the question of 'the appropriateness of its [X school] continuing to function beyond a 6-9 month period' (a suggestion put forward in the X2 school document) the addenda stressed that such a decision 'must be a function of the Education Department (which can receive advice of course). Elsewhere one reader of the review underlined the view that the X2 school supporters wished to remain 'within the State education system' adding the comment, 'Is this really what they want? or do they want their school and our money?'

Under the section discussing school government the Deputy Director General raised questions relating to accountability for expenditure of public funds, the school council and the role of the coordinator. It had been proposed, for example, that

(1) **The Co-ordinator**

(a) The final accountability for the school's functioning within the departmental structure rests with the co-ordinator who is legally responsible for the administration of the school.

(b) The co-ordinator is responsible to the Education Department and the school community for the effective management of the school.

(c) The co-ordinator also serves as the main link with the umbrella institution and with other learning institutions with which the school has co-operative and accreditation arrangements.

The Deputy Director General felt that 'the position of the coordinator under these prescriptions is intolerable. An alternative set must be written...I could not, nor could the system, accept responsibility for such an arrangement. This is only appropriate to a private school which is really what they want.' Questions relating to control of
material resources as well as control over decisions of educational 'normality' and legitimacy (symbolic resources), were still of primary concern to those responsible ultimately for the public distribution and maintenance of education within the State system. (In Australia there are very few of the 'private' or non-government schools which organisationally, or even in terms of their ordering symbolic, are totally independent or separate from larger social structures.)

Whilst both the Director General and Deputy Director General's notations indicated that they agreed the document unreasonably 'blamed' KX ('the' coordinator) to the relative exclusion of parents, staff, students, the Director General once again queried the apparent difference between the school supporters' account of the Deputy Director General's approach to the question of 'autonomy' and the Deputy Director General's own intra-departmental report. The Deputy Director General replied in a formal memorandum that it had been 'clearly stated' that 'if the school (annexe) wanted to be a school in its own right it would have to be a private school and seek registration....'

By 20 January Year IV a decision had been made to allow a deputation to approach the Minister. The Assistant Minister wrote in reply to CK's letter of 15 January to the Minister. The Assistant Minister asked CK and JS, the two members of parliament, to coordinate the deputation, and suggested in particular that EB, HB and UE ¹ all be invited to attend. The Assistant Minister also wrote in reply to EB inviting him to attend the deputation as an interested observer.

In an Education Department memorandum dated 20 January Year IV, the Director General noted that the Minister had set 11 a.m. on 28 January as the time to meet a deputation and that the Minister required a set of guidelines for the possible future operation of the X2 school. The Director General suggested a number of matters should be considered, viz

---

¹ EB, Director of a CAE near to X2; HB, principal of a State teacher's college who had expressed a willingness to cooperate in the direction of X2; UE, principal of an 'experimental' community school in the Technical branch of the Education Department.
a) overcoming objections of neighbours
b) assistance in restoring the damage to property estimated at $30,000
c) attendance of pupils and staff mandatory
d) writing of obscenities on walls not to be permitted. (No smoking to be permitted within the school buildings.)

The more positive aspects of the guidelines to be
a) curriculum to be devised by the school
b) community service to be a feature
c) use of outside facilities encouraged
d) a large amount of freedom within the school.

The Director General went on to mention that ET should be interviewed in order to see if he would act as coordinator, and since the Minister presumed that staff from X2 had been transferred (they had not), four to five names of possible new staff should be forwarded. Finally it was emphasised firstly that the guidelines' existence did not signify a reopening of the X2 school and that, in any case, 'it is also essential that we find a school whose principal can be associated with the annexe'. This memorandum of 20 January Year IV was marked 'for urgent action' and resulted in two lengthy memoranda from each of two Assistant Director Generals who had not had a long or close involvement with the affairs of the X school. Both memoranda in response to that of the Director General produced what were effectively new organisational initiatives.

In the first of the two memoranda (dated 21 January and signed by DN) the new initiatives arose via the proposal to extend the

---

1 In the X2 school document assessing past difficulties it was stated that 'when students circulated a pro-school petition among the nearest neighbours of the school on Thursday 18 December, 146 of the 154 residents asked agreed to sign it' (see Appendix C). The Education Department filed one letter of complaint from a resident concerned professionally with real estate and property values, there were no records of telephoned complaints. An official spokesman for the Education Department was recorded in the newspapers as saying 'the Department had investigated complaints received from some parents and a number of neighbours' (see Appendix E).

2 Appendix J.

3 Ibid.
activities of the appropriate Regional Director of Education. In a special comment the writer noted that it was

Not necessary for school to be attached to existing school if Regional Director is prepared to increase general oversight of the procedures for reopening and to maintain supervision through membership on the management body. Is Minister prepared to declare this institution to be a school?

In addition to pressing for an explicit directive from the Minister as an adjunct to extending the Regional Director's supervisory powers, DN strongly recommended 'a twelve month development period during which the Regional Director prepares for the establishment of an alternative school at a different site'. It was further argued that the Regional Director should be consulted in the selection of a coordinator/principal and that these two people should together prepare a document which set out the school philosophy, aims, objectives and rules. This proposal was a completely new administrative initiative. The effect was to interpose another functionary between the X school and the directorate level of administration, but a functionary who within the educational division of labour was still that of full-time administrator whose responsibilities were to education in its organisational practicalities. The effect of the proposal was to shift the onus for negotiating the institutionalising of a relationship between an experimental school and the Education Department, from the Director of Secondary Education to a Regional Director of Education.

The second memorandum (dated 28 January Year IV) was divided into a section dealing specifically with details associated with costs, losses, ownership and leasehold as they pertained to the particulars of the X2 school and property. A second section set out some proposed guidelines for the establishment of community schools and the third section contained the writer's own recommendations. There had never previously been codified procedures for the establishment of community or alternative schools, and the various approaches had aroused comment, at least amongst some supporters of the X school. BN had been in a position to discuss the vicissitudes of X2 with HU, the coordinator of

---

1 Appendix J.
T school (a community school) and it was these discussions which made BN aware of differences in procedures for setting up community schools. Although the content of the guidelines was much the same with respect to the role and authority of the Regional Director as the earlier memorandum, the fact of these being incorporated and codified at this time was significant. At no time in the previous two years had the Director of Secondary Education, his assistants or superiors recommended that alternative schools be recognised 'in administrative principle' via a set of formal procedures for their initiation and maintenance. The idea of a twelve-month 'development' period was strongly endorsed.

Establishing X3

There are no documentary accounts of the meeting between the Minister of Education, the Assistant Minister, Education Department officers and the delegation of X2 school supporters, which was held in the Minister's office on 28 January, Year IV. What documents exist within the Education Department record the conditions of appointment of ET to a 'new' alternative school (eventually given a title but which here is called X3). As an 'outcome', it is straightforward enough to record that although the closure of the X2 school was never formally revoked (and this was not a demand made by anybody), the X3 school - with the addition of ET as coordinator, took over new premises (eventually) with the majority of staff continuing their positions from the X2 school. However, the meeting on 28 January was a very complex one in terms of social interaction, especially if the variation in the explanations that were produced is taken into account. The

1 BN: 'It was very interesting when - in the retrospect of the discussions that [HU] and I had - in the way [T school] was set up compared with the way [X2] was. And the School Council at [T school] - it was all beautifully manoeuvred first [i.e. beforehand]. And [HU] said the reason his school gets on so well is because he's an ex-League footballer as was [CE - the Assistant Minister of Education]. He said, you know,"It's like the bloody RSL!"', BN interview.

2 Appendix J.
point is that to a great extent documents are themselves 'final outcomes' of interaction and deliberation, and the very fact that this meeting produced no immediate documentation is significant because whatever the conclusion there were bound to be some people who were dissatisfied. That this meeting marked the beginning of a further period of conflict and confusion for some people was evidenced in BN's remark made in an interview towards the end of Year IV.

Our strategy in going to [Minister's name] in January was the right one, but we didn't realise that because we didn't at that stage know the real reason why we had been closed down. We assumed at that meeting in January that all was home and hosed. We came out absolutely elated. We had [name of Director General] who's, you know, the very senior in the hierarchy, non-politician, coming out afterwards and sort of talking about ways we can expedite it and maybe be started in three weeks....For me it was only the April meeting [April Year IV] when everything gripped into place, really.¹

Some few minutes prior to the meeting of 28 January, the Deputy Director General and his assistant, SD, approached ET outside the Minister's office. In a private conversation he was asked whether he would be willing to act as coordinator if some means were found to keep the X2 school in operation. ET was very surprised at this approach but accepted immediately. When the meeting with the Minister began, the press were excluded from the very beginning. At this point none of the supporters of the X2 school knew of the proposition that had been put to ET, they had merely presented his name as one of a number of people who would be willing to take the job. In the opinion of ET, the reaction of the Director of Secondary Education (SG) and Assistant Director of Secondary Education (KG) was of such astonishment that ET believed they also had no prior warning of the idea. In the event, it was left for the Assistant Minister to argue against certain difficulties raised by the Director of Secondary Education and the Assistant Director. Because he was no longer employed by the Education Department, ET made it a condition of acceptance that he should not be obliged to rejoin the Education Department and that he be able to maintain the benefits deriving from his present position. A further condition imposed by

¹ BN interview.
the Minister and agreed to by the delegation was that there be an absolute minimum of publicity given to the details of the decision, its implementation and that the school should acquire a new name.  

It is important to convey some idea of the extent of surprise and confusion at the 28 January meeting in order to see why people later were prepared to draw conclusions about what they saw, for example, as conflict internal to the Education Department. LP, for example, expressed surprise at the selection of ET as coordinator,

To us the greatest surprise was not the reopening of the school, but that they accepted [ET], at a salary they had to pay him at the pro-rata superannuation [not audible]. I think that's what surprised him more than anything else, really. Because of the uneasy situation that existed in [State] in [reference to teachers' colleges and the Education Department].

LP and SP went on to explain that they had had great confidence that given persistence they would sooner or later have been successful in achieving the continuation of the X school in an acceptable form. Both LP, SP and BN remarked that SG, the Director of Secondary Education, objected quite strongly to the idea of any continuation of the X2 school. According to ET, the Minister, after introducing people to one another, made some pointed remarks about the difficulties that had been caused in the Education Department by the supporters of the X school over a period of time. He continued by suggesting that the school could only be continued under certain conditions, of which one very important one was the appointment of a suitable coordinator. ET in interview dramatically exclaimed then how in describing a 'suitable coordinator' he (ET) was described 'just about down to the last freckle'. There followed a

---

1 This material is inevitably an 'account' in its own right, derived as it is from interviews with ET, BN, the IG family, LZ and SD. All of the interviewees produced their accounts with hindsight, which was quite equivocal as far as any 'benefits' of conferred insight or confirmed 'facts' were concerned. The interviewer also had different understandings at different times which meant that each interview was unique inasmuch as the knowledge or explanation of events of both interviewer and interviewee were modified in the course of the interview.

2 They, of course, were making these statements in retrospect, from November of Year IV. LP/SP interview.
series of points made by SG, the Director of Secondary Education. In turn it was the Assistant Minister who strongly made the points that these objections were largely ones which could be solved administratively. BN made an explanation as to why it was that the Assistant Minister attacked the administrators on these points in the presence of the other delegation members.

I think [the Minister] acted on their advice [that of SG and KG re the original closure] thinking 'Well they might be a fairly vocal little group of parents but it is Christmas....' There was an election coming up - you know - (I try and think how politicians work). He didn't want trouble. And the timing when [KG] suggested that we close two days before the end of the year - it seemed the sort of thing that would create [only] a storm in a teacup - and after all, he has to work with people like [SG] and [KG]. And he doesn't want to be in opposition to their recommendations on things that are trivial and, at that stage, there were big fights with the unions and so on - X2 to [the Minister] was trivial. And I don't think that he could have possibly imagined that we would still be nuisance-value into January/February. I think that when he did come back from holidays, late January, he found that we were still nuisance-value. That is we were lobbying politicians from Senator [name] in Canberra through to his own (at least two ministers of his own cabinet), gave us a sympathetic hearing....Well in January [the Assistant Minister] was, I thought, fairly courageous (knowing politics) in that he made no secret of indicating he thought [SG] was a bloody old fool. You know, he said something like 'Oh for God's sake, what are you on about [SG]?'. You know, or '[ET] can cope with that' or something to that extent....[The Minister] didn't give much away...I don't think it would have been good for [the Minister] to have shown his hand as strongly as [the Assistant Minister], you see, [the Assistant Minister] had shown his hand because he didn't have to work as strongly with [KG] or what's-his-name - [SG].... On the other hand, [MT - the Director General] who was there didn't say a lot at the meeting, but [MT] came immediately out to us afterwards and talked very positively with [ET] and parents, immediately after, that is, he also showed his hand. A strong, and sympathetic - 'We will get it reopened' - ....[The Minister] was very non-committal, sat there pontificating, and he put us in our place as, sort of, the delegates wanting something. And I think he played the power game, and we all accepted it.\(^1\)

This interview, which was made in November Year IV, continued with BN asserting that there was less difficulty in coming to an understanding of the process which led up to the closure of December Year III than

---

\(^1\) BN interview.
there was in putting together an explanation of how, after the meeting of 28 January Year IV, there was a 'non-happening', in BN's terms. She explained that in general terms the delayed and difficult start to the X3 school had its source in the connection between politics and bureaucracy.

...half-way through January...we in fact had a diary of events of what happened on a day-to-day basis and we finally did wake up to the interplay of politics and bureaucracy and we would use - we would put a bureaucratic pressure - a political pressure.¹

More specifically, BN located in the meeting of 28 January, a cleavage between political and administrative decision-makers which allowed participants (in this case BN) to draw inferences about the personal approaches of particular administrators to their formal organisational positions and their style of executing their formal responsibilities. In speaking of the difficulties experienced between January and May of Year IV, BN said

I sort of feel that probably it represents very much how much a bureaucracy, or the people who get to the top through the bureaucratic process, how much resentment about a political power to make a decision over and above what they see is a well-thought out decision, made on their full view of the situation. (After all they're trained educators.) And [the Minister, Assistant Minister, MP - named, as well as KP] and all those other people who put in their little bibs, and [KG] would have known why he [the Minister] changed his mind given the delegation - that there was pressure from all these people. But it must be pretty galling to someone who's got their promotion through the bureaucracy, through their supposed educational expertise, to have a politician slap them in the face with that sort of decision and they say 'Now help expedite this sort of decision we have made', and I think there was a huge difference between the [KG/SG - Assistant Director/Director of Secondary Education] reaction to that, and [UN/SD - Deputy Director General/Assistant]. Now [UN] - I don't think he bloody cared one way or the other....I'm quite sure [UN] will say what's politic to say. Whereas I think [KG] is probably the sort of man one would like more because he's a bit more genuine himself, he might make wrong decisions, but he's probably a more honest person. Whereas [UN] is more devious and we definitely got the deviousness of [UN], between a November meeting and a December meeting [of Year III].²

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.
Despite their perception of the difficulties that had been created between politicians and administrators, many (if not most) X2 supporters felt that after the meeting of 28 January Year IV, the critical question of the school's continued existence had been effectively resolved. LZ recalled late in Year IV

...we came out of the January meeting convinced that provided we agreed with the Departmental guidelines (which we had already agreed with), and that [ET] was going to be seconded by the [teachers' college at which ET was employed], we were going to reopen provided we got a building. And in practice that's where the bureaucracy boys tried to frustrate us, by saying 'No buildings'. I said 'Alright, we'll send out our own people and find buildings'. And we did.1

Even this was not without its difficulties such that LZ eventually made direct contact with the Minister and the Assistant Minister. LZ explained that of the five buildings the X3 supporters had submitted for consideration to the Education Department, the Minister had apparently received a report on only one, and it had been unsatisfactory. LZ mentioned that after this meeting the Minister invited further direct contact should there be any difficulties and that, 'From then on, these guys [named] with whom I couldn't talk before suddenly started ringing me up...What I make of it is this...they finally realised that [the Minister] was really fair dinkum, that he wanted the place to open'.2

There were other accounts of X3 supporters becoming so frustrated that they contacted the Minister directly. ET's account is very similar in some respects to that of LZ. ET found difficulty in contacting SD within the Education Department, so ET rang SD at home. When the result of that contact was unsatisfactory, he rang the Minister at home. ET said that he wanted to do no more than acquaint the Minister with the opinion that the Minister's directives which issued from the meeting of 28 January were being thwarted or frustrated by officers of the Education Department. ET's comment was that to his

1 LZ interview.
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surprise - the Minister agreed and that subsequently many of the previously-experienced difficulties disappeared.¹

There are other accounts which make it difficult to ascertain from exactly where came the initiative to control the publicity which the X3 school might achieve. On the one hand it was remarked by LZ...

...the big problem was [the Minister) had stated, and it had been quoted in the press, that [X2] would close and would not reopen....As a politician he wasn't going to say 'I made a mistake' and this is why I had to cool the publicity. This is my - I thought about this for a long time then I made the decision - I've got to cool the publicity, I've got to refuse to talk to the press. I've got to refuse to let my people talk to the press. And I've got to agree with [the Minister] that the term [X2] will be a dirty word in future. No-one mentions it. If we get reopened it will be under another name in a different location, and about that place there will be no publicity whatsoever.²

Other people, however, had their own views of the question of publicity, especially in terms of what it meant for the identity of the X school. ET, in interview, remarked that one of the conditions for the continuation of the X school, which was agreed to at the delegation meeting of 28 January, was that the name be changed, even though the same students may attend. ET said that he had insisted that whatever teachers from X2 there were, who wanted to continue at X3, that they should be allowed to do this. He felt that collectively they may have caused problems in the past for the Education Department, but that individually no-one could take exception to them and that consequently they had a claim to stay with X school if that was what they wanted. ET explained to his staff and students that access to the school by public media and other observers would be severely limited. The X3 school was going to be a 'gold-fish bowl' in any case, and publicity would not solve any problems. For LP and SP the approach to publicity by ET was interpreted as an overbearing attitude to those who had had a longer association with the X school.

He [ET] didn't know enough about our history, because he didn't want to know. Because it is one of the things he said the moment

¹ ET interview.
² LZ interview.
he walked into the place. This is not [X2]. This is a new school. You listen to me.

SP: ...but it wasn't you know.

LP: He knew bloody well. In fact he admitted it six - three months later he admitted 'Yes of course we are really ex-[X2] people....'.

Two points emerge from this material, firstly the degree to which the type of involvement of individuals influences their perception and account of others' (and their own) actions. Secondly (and more importantly), the strictures on publicity vis a vis the X3 school functioned in a way that strongly limited the further amplification of a public image of a 'deviant' institution that had previously been associated with the X2 school. There had been cut off the possibility of generating information that invited the general public to make a moral evaluation to 'take a stand' on whether the X school (or the actions of those associated with it) were a 'good thing'.

Sometime shortly after January of Year IV, SG the Director of Secondary Education, retired from the teaching service and KG who had previously held the position of Assistant Director took over the post. Despite the efforts of X3 supporters, including LZ, it was May 24, Year IV before the X3 school was functioning at its new location. Throughout February and March, an assistant to ET (BU, who subsequently took the coordinator's position after ET fell ill) worked closely on a day-to-day basis with the students of X3 school even though there was no formal accommodation and BU was not receiving pay cheques throughout this period.¹

¹ LP/SP interview.

² 'For something like a period of two months or more he acted in an unpaid position - hoping by sheer faith and knowing that we would survive....And when it came to [HB] applying pressure to [the Minister] - personally - to finalise the matter so that [ET] can officially be released and officially be the coordinator instead of looking after the [teachers' college] students as well as this new place, which is what he did (although it didn't exist)....within hours a messenger appeared at his house, delivering a pay cheque for two months' work ...to [BU], that's how he got paid....And ET immediately, when he got paid, rang me and told me.' Ibid.
In April a meeting was arranged between the new Director of Secondary Education (KG), the coordinator and certain parents from X3, as well as SD (originally appointed as an assistant to the Deputy Director General, reporting to the Minister at the time of December, Year III closure of X2). The purpose of the meeting was to establish further guidelines for the operation of X3. This was the meeting at which it became perfectly clear to BN that there were difficulties due to the connection between what she described as politics and bureaucracy.

BN noted how KG (in his recently-appointed position as Director of Secondary Education) 'said very bitterly that he didn't want to meet the parents' but that he had drawn up a set of tight regulations. KG spoke to the parents' meeting

...more or less saying 'If this school is reopened...it will open under these conditions or not at all as far as I'm concerned'... but he and [SD] were having a fight and [SD] announced to him after the meeting was part-way through, after we'd looked at these regulations, that in fact the school wouldn't be part of [KG]'s secondary empire, it was an independent school, it is not under [KG] at all...which is a very humiliating experience for [KG] so the in-fighting there is very high...and [KG] spoke to us so bitterly and hostilely, but honestly, I'm sure [saying] 'You caused the breakdown of one principal and you almost caused the breakdown of another' (and he was meaning [KX]), and you know, 'If I had my way there would not be....'1

Basically, these accounts with their perceptions of hostility from some sections of the administration and obstruction from other parts - were presented by supporters of the X school who necessarily drew inferences on the basis of information limited by both their position vis-a-vis the school and their perspective on 'alternative' education. It was SD who was in a very different position and who, as a special assistant appointed to report to the Minister via the Deputy Director General, would produce an account with a different perspective and interest, based on different information and knowledge of events.

In SD's own words

'When you're assigned work by the Minister, you think in a different way to the role you perform as a conventional divisional administrator. So on the one hand, there's these trouble-shooting guys reporting directly to the Minister, on the other hand there are divisional

1 BN interview.
guys who have to live with the responsibility of running a division and hundreds of schools according to statutory requirements.¹

SD had not been directly involved with events prior to December of Year III. However, the Minister had made it clear at that time that he wanted a solution to the problem and that he was attracted to the idea of appointing ET.² SD felt that much of the early difficulties of X school could be explained by virtue of the lack of a stated policy on 'alternative education'. He made it clear that he had had nothing to do with events prior to December of Year III, however, he did make passing reference both to the appointment of coordinators and to the Departmental Enquiry into the X3 school. In reference to the appointment of KX, who was unilaterally allocated by the Secondary Division officials, SD defined the problem almost in terms of 'too much routine efficiency'.³

¹ SD interview.
² The apparently very quick and smooth nomination of ET to the coordinator's position at X3 puzzled supporters of the school - some of whom advanced ideas of a 'cosy arrangement' or 'conspiracy' between the Minister and ET. No doubt members of the regular administration of the Education Department felt angered or upset by the move. (SD said that these administrators felt that the rules for selecting personnel from within the career structure had been violated and that 'fortunately, or unfortunately, those questions [about the irregularity of ET's appointment] weren't asked out in the open' however 'that's the privilege the Minister has...and he saw that ET was the person....'). ET's own explanation involved examples of interaction with the Minister over the period of a number of years, which ET felt the Minister would have used as a basis for deciding that ET 'could be trusted'.
³ The expression 'too much routine efficiency' glosses many of the issues which are seen to be central to the thesis. Although the evidence in this particular instance is not extensive, what evidence that does exist (the Director of Secondary Education and his Assistant's actions and rhetoric in the matter of expectations vis a vis the coordinator's role) suggests that there was a wide range of understanding between participants as to how 'routine efficiency' was achieved. At the same time as making the point elsewhere in his interview that 'unfortunately, we all have to live by some of these rules....' SD left it implicit that 'everyone knows' or should know, how to go about achieving the operation of those rules which happen to be appropriate. In other words there is a normative element in the process of putting rules to work but its very implicit nature removes it from the sort of scrutiny which in the case of the X school led to groups and individuals mutually concluding that each was either stupid or possessed of some ill will. In the case of SD, we have seen
'I suspect that it was just like any other appointment: it was somebody that was put in without much thought as to what the particular problem was....' Of course, in the account of SP, it was suggested that KX was deliberately selected because he was subservient to his superiors; by contrast, the Director of Secondary Education at the time (SG) wrote that KX was the best person he could find - who was willing to move into the position. On the issue of the Departmental Enquiry, SD had read the document and remarked that 'there was nothing that was helpful to me coming out of that to solve the continuing dilemma of [X2]'.

The question of the appointment of ET did contribute, for SD, to what was already a difficult situation.

The Secondary Division had no say whatsoever in putting up a name. That's difficult for them, so I guess their attitude was 'Alright, if we can't have any say, who's going to be put in for this particular school - it's created so much controversy, and wasted so much public money, some of which is still not accounted for - we're not going to have anything to do with it'. Now that was a difficult situation we had to resolve.2

For SD this difficulty was conceived specifically in terms of the demarcation of the power to construct definitions of educational legitimacy. SD perceived his task as being one which avoided the situation being seen in these terms.3 The difficulty of this process

something of the gloss which prevented the emergence of a problematic issue. ET remarked in his interview that, having had partial access to the report of the Departmental Enquiry he could see that the investigation was carried out quite 'honestly' but that between the investigators and the X2 school supporters 'there was no interface'.

1 SD interview.
2 Ibid.
3 Int: One of the fairly obvious questions to me at this stage is why the Secondary Division wasn't able to put together something that you eventually had to do?
   SD: Because they didn't want any part of it. They had had enough of this crowd. And they'd had this crowd foisted on them before. And once bitten twice shy.
   Int: So in a way you can almost argue that...the fact that they'd been in the Secondary Division and it hadn't been spelt out was partly a reason why it had to be all gone through again? By someone outside the Division?
   SD: Yes.
   Int: Just to keep it at arm's length?
   SD: Yes, and if you want to work the formal line, Secondary Division
can be measured in terms of the time it took between the Minister's decision on 28 January and the formal opening of the school on May 24.

In discussing the months of delay SD argued that X3 supporters had little idea of the complexities of administering school building accommodation and that as a function of their relatively small size, outspokenness and previous record of losses of public funds, there was a tendency for administrators to become antagonistic. However, SD knew that since ET had had considerable experience with the Education Department, a further explanation seemed warranted for ET's personal complaints to SD at the latter's home address, about the delay in implementing the Minister's approval of ET's transfer to the X3 school.

...normally he would have been reporting to the Director of Secondary Education, but he had to - well he didn't know, because there was this group that was dealing directly with the Minister.
I think it was something to do with that. I think we were stalling for time at that stage. 

SD was never explicit about who was 'stalling for time' over what, but it was at the April meeting between parents, the Director of Secondary Education (now KG) and SD, that X3 supporters felt that they witnessed something of a confrontation between KG and SD. It was at this meeting that BN felt that finally a clear understanding was gained by X3

say no, we will have no part of this, that could have led to a confrontation, and that's the sort of thing I had to avoid.
I don't want - I wouldn't want the Minister to be in a situation where he says to the Director of Secondary Education, 'You will have this school my boy, and that's all there is to it'. We never got to that stage, it was all subdued.

Ibid.

1 SD: 'I could understand, on the one hand, the attitude of the Departmental administrators [who] didn't want to have anything to do with it. We live by a set of rules. On the other hand, this group of parents, who rightly, believe the structure appears to be very rigid, and it can't accommodate alternative approaches, but also a group of people who did not appear to recognise that they were using public funds' (p.10 transcript) 'That's another example of the inability of a group of people to understand the magnitude of the buildings operation in this Department. Those people expected the whole building operation in the Education Department to grind to a halt while their concerns for a group of 60, 80 kids were met.... But people like me, in here, don't have to think of only one school.' 

Ibid.
supporters about a connection between politics and bureaucracy.

The document dealing with guidelines for the X3 school is dated March Year IV, and it includes a section which was later deleted at the parents' request as being irrelevant. This deletion harks back to prior conflicts over whether the X school was properly-speaking a 'private' school. This deletion is the only indication that this document may have resulted from the meeting during which parents said they perceived conflict between SD and KG over guideline details and the attachment of the X3 school to a division of the Education Department. Whilst BN described how KG's guidelines or conditions were very stringent and were ultimately overruled by SD, SD himself outlined how eventually the X3 school was simply created administratively and located within the Secondary Division. SD conceded that this might be described as an 'almost revolutionary' method of establishing a school.

---

1 Appendix N, 'Guidelines and Proposals for the Operation of the [X3] Alternative School'.

2 SD was discussing how DL came to volunteer to liaise with the X3 school.

...he was appointed at a stage when I said 'Look, I've taken this thing so far, it's inappropriate for me to go on any longer. It is a Secondary School, therefore a Secondary Inspector ought to have responsibility for it' Because I had done what I was asked to do, and what some people, I think, wanted me to do was to go on as some sort of intermediary, attached to nobody - I didn't mind that, but I had other responsibilities, and I didn't think it was an appropriate responsibility for me in this Division. So I was trying to argue on what I thought were fairly formal principles, that it was a Secondary School, people are saying 'Oh it's not a Secondary School'. I say 'Yes, it is a secondary School'. Secondary Division - 'No, we're not having anything to do with it.' I knew it was, therefore, a person from within Secondary Division ought to be receiving these sorts of things, solving their day-to-day operational problems, one of which was how do they get money for the school. Quite simple. You declare it as a school, so it was given a school number [number] I think it is. Now that immediately gives it authenticity...within the bureaucracy. It comes out in the computer printouts. Salary cheques go out with the number on it. Now that fairly and squarely places it within the Secondary Division. The Minister can say, he can establish schools, so he established this school as a Secondary School.

Int: That...is almost revolutionary. How many schools has the Minister established like that?

SD: Oh I don't know. That's a different question.
The Secondary Division itself was now in the position that having defined the X school as beyond the margins of acceptable educational orthodoxy, a political process was being used to relocate the X3 school. The leaders of the Secondary Division were obliged to work within a framework of administrative process to put into action their decisions which were informed by their specialists' expertise. They perceived a threat from the X school which by implying a challenge to the definition of educational normality and therefore to educational expertise, mounted a challenge to the institutionalised monopoly of educational mythology and administration. ¹

After the April meeting the Secondary Division was under pressure to appoint a liaison officer who would connect the X3 school to the various sections of administration. This officer was not conventionally appointed, rather, at a meeting of the panel of inspectors, the Director of Secondary Education called for a volunteer. In the words of SD - 'You can imagine the response.' ² What SD implied was that in a situation where people are 'normally' appointed, then the very act of calling for a volunteer carried special significance. On the face of it, given the 'unpopularity' of the school, this was a 'fair' method of operation. From a different point of view, since the 'unpopularity' derived in part from the actions of the Director of Secondary Education, there was always the possibility that a volunteer could be seen implicitly to be challenging the judgement of the Director as to the educational abnormality of the X school. DL explained

---

¹ 'To safeguard the specialists' monopolistic claim the non-accessibility of their lore must be institutionally established. That is, a 'secret' is posited, and an intrinsically exoteric body of knowledge is institutionally defined in esoteric terms.' P. Berger and T. Luckmann, 1971, op.cit., p.128.

² SD interview.
in his interview that it was not that he was the only volunteer, just that he was the first volunteer. Viewing developments in retrospect, SD felt that DL 'was probably a terrific bloke for the job'. When asked why DL should bother to have volunteered SD suggested, 'Well, he's that sort of person', and added that 'he's been able to tread the delicate path between the school and the administration....Not many people can do that, if any! But he trod right up the middle....'

DL explained things differently. He mentioned first that he had known and worked with ET when ET had been a member of the State teaching force. Despite what DL had felt had been a few 'indiscretions' he felt that he 'had no worries about not being able to gell, if I may use that expression, with [ET] in this new venture'. Secondly DL made an issue of his extensive experience and in fact his own illness as factors which could make it easier, not more difficult for him to cope. DL was here pressing an argument that it was his amalgam of professional and personal experience which uniquely qualified him as someone who at the

1 'I don't think you should have the opinion that I was the only person who would have volunteered. There would have been others, I'm sure, but I was the first one. The Director of Secondary Education caught my eye (or my finger) first....' DL interview.
2 SD interview.
3 Ibid.
4 DL interview.
5 DL: [KX] is a most worthwhile person but we asked him to do the impossible....His background experience...would not have prepared him for it [X2], it's only my grey hair and age that's let me cope with it....

Int: With respect, you've said that it was your grey hair and age which qualifies you, but in a way...one might argue - some people might argue that that's what should dis-qualify you. Can you see what I'm getting at?

DL: Yes I can see what you're getting at...in a way, without being boastful, I'm a fairly unique kind of person in this system, and I am, by age and length of service, the most senior secondary school inspector in [State] and I had been able to cope with this thing. I must admit every time I go to the school, and I visit it very frequently, it's a series of recurrent shocks I suffer. They get no less no matter how frequently I've visited. It still doesn't coincide with my concept of what education is about, and yet I can visit.

Ibid.
same time as disagreeing quite profoundly with what he took to be the educational assumptions on which the school was based, nevertheless allowed him to operate in an efficient and empathetic way as an administrative connection with the formal system of administration.¹

There were a number of other points which were touched upon in the interview with DL which indicated that not only did he have a considerable amount of experience in educational administration but that he approached this job with a special sort of enthusiasm and a will to help manufacture a situation that could be defined as sufficiently effective for the X3 school to be allowed to continue. ET and LZ remarked in interview that 'the X3 job' had given 'Old [DL]' a second lease of life. But in the process of doing this there were adaptations on both sides which were unusual enough to require explanation. DL, for example, admitted that it was neither customary (nor in 'normal' circumstances, acceptable) for school students to greet his arrival at the school by referring to him by his given name. His explanation for this was in terms of the special situation of the school and the establishment of a relationship which could be glossed as 'special' and thus justify the putative abnormality.² DL

¹ DL: Now I'm letting my own personal bias come in here. To me they are a very spoilt group of kids, who are being spoilt and pampered more, at a very steep cost to the taxpayer. Although I might have been a bit hasty in saying that...the degree to which they may be emotionally upset, or ill, is something I can't determine....My views on it - the rehabilitation aspect of the school, would be at variance from many of the members of staff, and a lot of the parents...and I would think my colleagues even at this stage find it a little - they find it incredible that the school has functioned in the latter part of [Year V] without there being some kind of boil-over.

Int: ...but don't you find that incredible?
DL: No, because I supervise it. And they accept my supervision.
Ibid.

² DL: ...I can go down to [X3] now and go into any room in that school no matter which teacher's in it, and they won't walk out and be on strike. If I went to a municipal school and did the same, I could have every school in the State on strike within half an hour.

Int: Now why? What have you done?
DL: I don't know. They've just grown to accustomed to my face I think. [DL was asked if he could explain why his approaches had been responded to]
DL: I don't think they feel that they've compromised but I think they
went on to concede that not only was he uniquely connected with the X3 school but that he felt no other functionary could automatically step into his position. When this issue was pressed, DL made the point that although his position carried an authority which was recognised in X3, for his part there had been a necessary process of personal identification and that one effect of this was that if there was any desire to bring about the collapse of the school then this could most effectively be done by simply failing to ensure adequate continuity between liaison officers when it came time for DL to retire. SD had also alluded to

now feel much more secure. They were a very insecure group... the children...used to greet me with surly suspiciousness - so that has gone.

Int: How do they greet you now?
DL: With 'a smile and 'How are you [D]?

Int: The kids do?....But many people see the use of a christian name like that as an automatic sign of a lack of deference. As a lack of respect. How did you negotiate that change?

DL: Well they did it in spite of me. It was fairly well known amongst the staff and the parents that the kids were not going to be given the privilege of calling me [D]. But it has somehow or other happened. And when it happened to me, I didn't stand the kid up and bawl him out, because it didn't at the time seem inappropriate or in any way disrespectful.

Ibid.

1 DL: They [X3] were under threat. And after all I - I represented - I was an authority figure. Now I think the contact inspector who looked after it when they were in [X2] for reasons best known to himself, he did not choose to identify with them [my italics] and with the community as I have chosen to identify with it. Some of my motive would have been curiosity....Suddenly to have an opportunity to get in and work with something like this was a unique chance for me, even though I only have but two years of service left....No I honestly think - I'm not being too egotistical here - that if anyone else took the job over that I'm doing now at [X3], they wouldn't do it as well, and the school would not function as smoothly as it has....The school's smooth functioning is directly related to [DL]''s outlook and personality....Oh I think the present Director would, in turn, when my time for obligatory retirement approaches nearer, than it is now, I'm sure he'll take steps to have another inspector understudy me, to become identified, so that the break won't be too abrupt. The school will have had a chance to adjust to someone else....That's if they want the school to continue to function. If they want to close it down, then don't do that.

Ibid.
the special nature of the X3 school being such that continuity, not only via Education Department liaison inspectors, but also in the position of school coordinator, may need to be institutionalised in a way that differed from anything which had been practised previously.

When [BU]'s term of office expires, whenever that might be, then we might be able to advertise in a different way (to it being the conventional high school). Say - here's a school that has this philosophy, this is the attitude or the expectation of the Secondary Division - people interested in this sort of leadership role are invited to apply at this salary.¹

BU was a friend of ET's and the liaison inspector, DL, explained that he approved the appointment of BU, firstly on the recommendation of ET, but secondly because

...I chose [BU] mainly because he had had a very close liaison with [ET] throughout the re-establishment of the school - he was one of the stipulations that [ET] made before he accepted the job - was that he could have [BU] on his staff. And [BU] had well, he had impressed me during [Year IV] by his fairly quick identification with the school, and he displayed a deal of industry which I felt would be required to assume the job that [ET] had vacated....²

Thus the question of continuity of those people who 'patrolled the moral boundaries' of the school community and the wider administration was mentioned as a critical problem but had never been fully explored.

DL's contact with X3 school was an ambiguous one and an important one. Some indication of this ambiguity is derived from the fact that although there had been liaison officers with the X1 and X2 schools, they had not acquired the same significance in the eyes of participants as had DL. DL's own description of his relationship to the school indicates his own strong reservations. On the one hand he had described it as not measuring up to the definition of a school (a definition which he cited from the 'Karmel Report'); he suggested

¹ SD interview. In fact there was still no expectation or understanding about coordinators' terms of office. BU had taken over from ET in Year IV after ET had been hospitalised. ET had, in a report to the Education Department, made it clear that his illness was partly due to the creation of what he had felt to be unnecessary difficulties in the reopening of the X3 school.

² DL interview.
that it was a 'massive child-minding centre' which 'ought not to be in
existence at all', and furthermore 'what is happening at [X3] has little
to do with public information or knowledge and the interactions have
nothing to do with what I call learning'. On the other hand, DL had
volunteered because of an interest in such an 'experiment', because he
was prepared to work with ET and because his de facto seniority meant
that he recognised how far he could 'push things' with KG. In the
estimation of ET, DL had appeared to be rejuvenated by his assignment
at the X3 school, but for SD

...he's been a terrific person for that job, in that he's been
able to tread the delicate path between the school and the
administration. Plus the fact of the industrial issues of
inspectors coming into a school. Not many people can do that,
if any! But he trod right up the middle... SD's comments acknowledge the issues of power and resources but these
are either glossed in terms of 'treading up the middle' or explaining
later in terms of it all being a matter of 'personal relationships'.

These participants did see it as worthwhile to provide
explanations for DL's behaviour. No-one pointed out that his was not
a new role. That this may have been taken-for-granted could be implied
by the focus on DL as a person - his personal style and organisational
history. As DL himself indicated, his personal contribution was
paramount in the viability of X3 and to ignore this by not ensuring
adequate 'understudy' training for his replacement would risk some
future collapse of the X3 school. All of which exemplifies a consistent
theme throughout the study, which was that few if any of the participants' explanations ever involved a systematic attempt to see whether and why
the X school represented something uniquely threatening to conventional
definitions of education and administration. Perhaps the only attempt
was that of KG when his characterisation of the school was in terms of
its educational abnormality, which for KG represented grounds for action.
When DL much later made a similar assessment of abnormality, he accepted

1 DL interview.
2 Ibid.
3 SD interview.
the Minister's actions as grounds for maintaining the X3 school within the margins of educational orthodoxy.
CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSIONS: INSTITUTIONALISING ABNORMALITY

X3: Endings and Beginnings

The Year IV issues were about the way power was used to define legitimacy, both in terms of education and administration, but mostly the latter. What was never fully grasped (except in political or social cliches such as 'radical', 'left-wing', 'anarchist' or 'anti-bureaucratic') were the systematic implications at a theoretical level of a transformed conception of social control associated with a paradigm of knowledge which varied greatly from the one currently underpinning a collected code of educational transmissions. KG, as the new Director of Secondary Education, was being pressed to accept X3 as an administratively legitimate educational unit. Previously, of course, had been involved in the production of an account of the X2 school as educationally abnormal, that is, deviant, and therefore in need of special forms of control. The closure and reopening of the X school had seen the issues of educational abnormality transformed into issues of administrative propriety. It was in Year IV, however, that the Minister's directives became the focus of conflict over definitions of legitimacy. For SD, DL and ET (plus the X3 school) the Minister's directives established unequivocal legitimacy. This was not so for KG and subsequent delays experienced by ET were identified as an illegitimate use of power, hence his direct approach to the Minister. SD, as one of the key people negotiating the legitimacy of X3's status, did not approve of personal contacts by ET but acknowledged the problematics ('we were stalling for time, I think'), and subsequently explained many of the issues of the X3 school in terms of 'personal relationships'. This was accurate in one sense, although it did not explain why personal relationships should become problematic to the point of closure with one school and group of people, and not with another. After the formal opening of X3 in May Year IV, ET began 'normal' requisitioning of materials, and 'normal' petitioning for such things as science and library grants. At this point administrators were again obliged to question the legitimacy of the requests. It is
in the associated memoranda that KG, as a representative of his division, most strongly queried the legitimacy of the Minister's actions. KG made the point that the political power of the Minister had been used in a way which forced the violation of accepted administrative (and legal) procedures. X3 was 'not a school' or at least it was a Private School within the State education system which was quite anomalous and inimical to routine administration.¹

DL's situation was one in which he explicitly acknowledged that there was a period in which he worked within the Secondary Division as a liaison officer to X3 which at that point was not officially accepted by the Secondary Division. In stating that he felt no difficulty or ambiguity about this, he indicated that for him the notion of legitimacy derived unequivocally from the Minister.

DL referred also, in this matter, to his age, experience and de facto seniority within the Secondary Division.² Nevertheless, in his report of July Year IV, DL felt concerned to conclude by asking, 'With respect to funding, is the school to continue to operate in limbo or is it to be directly responsible to a division and derive funds therefrom? In respect to staffing is Section [number] of the Teaching Service Act to apply to this school?'³

One of the most interesting aspects of DL's involvement, especially when compared to that of KG, was the way it illustrates the significance of varying reactions to violations of norms of respectability.⁴ Both KG and DL were like-minded about the 'non-educational' aspects of the X school's program, although only KG moved to a position of administratively characterising it as a deviant institution.

¹ For the clearest statement of KG's arguments on this point refer to Appendix O, final section.
² ET, in interview mentioned that on at least one occasion DL had felt obliged to remind officers within the Secondary Division that his authority was vouchsafed by the Minister himself, that although he had never needed to appeal to the Minister, he was prepared to do this if it was necessary to continue X3 in operation. ET interview.
³ Appendix P. Report on X3 by DL in July Year IV.
⁴ D. Ball, 1975, op.cit.
DL was prepared to see X3 as on the margin of educational orthodoxy, but KG had moved to define the X school as beyond the margin. DL said that he came to identify with X3 as an assignment. It is being suggested that one factor which might influence one administrator identifying with the X school and others doing the opposite, is best located in individual conceptions of norms of respectability and reactions to perceived violations of these. The predictability norms is a much less charted sociological field. In addition to these influences there is the individual's own sense of the legitimacy of various powers and his relationship to their sources.

**Negotiating Forms of Social Order and their Transmission in Schools**

The X3 school continued to operate through Years IV and V under the coordination of BU with DL continuing as liaison officer to the Education Department. In many fundamental respects the issue of a school supported by public funds in a State-controlled system, attempting to effect a move from the normative collection code to the symbolic mode of the integrated code was not a settled one. The course of events alone illustrates some of the dimensions of the problem. The extent of problems in the future are unassessable and from the point of view of some of the participants, the questions that likely will be relevant to them have to do with whether the X3 school effectively 'stands' today for the goals which were set out by SJ in the philosophical prospectus for X1. For some participants answers can reasonably be formed in terms of having been forced to 'capitulate to the system', or having adapted to the routinised procedures of educational administration instead of having demonstrated that there are alternatives to the perceived rigidities. If we continue thinking in terms of the immediate participants it is perhaps worth noting that quite significant changes have been effected in the administration of education in the State. Firstly, Regional Directors were 'found' by administrators to have the formal requirements necessary to supervise alternative schools such as the X school, in a way that meant annexe-status was no longer mandatory as an administrative form for viability. Secondly, the Minister had set up a school
virtually by fiat and against the expert judgement of the controllers of the symbolic order as it currently applied to cultural transmission. It is this latter point which is of greater significance here. What has been argued is that the events surrounding the X school showed a rare breach in the social reality that specialist administrators had created from their own position of control.

From the interview with DL it could be inferred that one of the reasons that enabled him to function for the X3 school was his explicit separation (strong classification) of questions of administration from questions of education. At the same time, however, as prefacing some remarks about educational aspects of the school with comments to the effect that these were 'personal' observations (that is, he was not speaking as a mediator of the official symbolic order), and maintaining that he strove to work with the school in a way which separated his administrative authority from pressures to modify matters of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, nevertheless there were discernible tensions. For example, towards the end of the interview, DL mentioned that on one occasion he had been very upset to find that a parent who held a university post and who had been invited to present material at the school, was discussing the topic of anarchy. DL resented this strongly, alluded to his loyal connection with the military and asserted that if he was going to be 'used as an umbrella for that sort of thing, then they have another think coming'.

DL made no distinction between discussing types of political theory and some notion of propaganda or illicit persuasion. The topic itself was educationally taboo so long as he filled the position of liaison officer. The issue of the relationship between forms of knowledge and types of social control was thus at least latent. At another point, DL criticised the lack of formal records of planning by X3 teachers; he expressed concern that failing to produce such records indicated that students were being deprived of exercising rational

---

1 During that section of the interview which was tape-recorded, DL attended almost exclusively to the tape-recorder, framing and articulating his responses with a deliberation which disappeared when the recorder was switched off and the interviewer took notes.
choices in topics and material which they might want to 'follow up'. DL instanced the small 'bits of paper' which ought to be substituted for by more detailed future proposals as to material to be covered, its sequence and timing. The essence of such arguments are issues relating to the strength of classification and boundaries, which in turn relate to issues of who controls what material, how it will be presented, evaluated and at what pace. For some participants as least, this was an important educational issue, to which the title 'alternative education' pointed.

The failure to identify the full ramifications of the problems of symbolic orders and potential changes in these at the X school is argued here as being a critical factor in deviance-attribution and subsequent removal processes. There seems little doubt that DL operated within a paradigm of knowledge which was associated with development of (cognitive) skills and the efficient dissemination of objective knowledge, whose 'frontiers' were extending so rapidly as to require more efficiency (but similar methods) than had been used in the past. DL certainly felt that since these things appeared to be so strongly discounted at the X3 school, that at the very best it was a 'non-educational' institution. At the same time, DL referred to the 'problem' of knowledge in an increasingly complex social world. The issue of competing paradigms of knowledge as they related to knowledge, education and cultural transmission, were thus broached but not in any theoretically informed fashion.

Curriculum

There is no doubt that it [X3] is a genuine alternative to traditional patterns of schooling...the staff have concentrated on the emotional and social needs of their students to such an extent that they have de-emphasised the generally accepted basic educational purpose of a school, viz the cognitive domain which includes the teaching of many skills and facts thought necessary for successful operation and participation within the social context we, that is society, has developed....I cannot but seriously challenge whether the fragmentary nature of the school's curriculum as displayed on the school's program board is of sufficient and satisfactory standard to enable the students to choose wisely their school-based educational experiences. Rather to me it interprets freedom as an absence of controls ...[there follows a strong recommendation for staff to prepare detailed syllabii well in advance of teaching and that] The
syllabuses would not be adequate unless they contained a statement of expected outcomes, the number of hours of study, that is attendance at classes per week and also some indication of proposed methods e.g. surveys, excursions, debates, assignments, essay writing to be employed in developing the study program. My recommendation is not aimed at a reversion to reliance on authority and coercion....

Factors influencing curriculum procedures which should be borne in mind include:

(i) Knowledge, in particular the exponential growth of knowledge,

(ii) The rapidity with which this new knowledge is being applied in technology.¹

DL's conception of knowledge is fundamentally derived from positivistic natural science, while the approach to education is from within a strong collection code. In contemporary conventional secondary schools in the State, the practice of official inspectors regularly visiting schools in order to supervise the specifications and requirements of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, had disappeared. A process of professionalisation had led to teachers accepting this responsibility and inspectors acting in a consultative capacity. In conventional schools, the strength of the conceptual boundaries between curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation were paid service to, at least to the point where the collection code of which this boundary-strength was a part, was accepted as 'normal education'. No doubt there existed individual teachers, groups of teachers and possibly entire schools, which at the same time as paying lip-service to the collection code, deviated 'secretly' from the 'normal' code with respect to the number of potential variations. (For example, staff-student boundaries blurred via dress rules, smoking rules, restricted areas etc. Curriculum-pedagogy-evaluation boundaries blurred via project productions by groups of staff and students.) X3 in Year IV was in the position of having attempted to base itself overtly rather than covertly on the move to a strongly integrated code, now being faced with operating that code covertly, if at all.

Appendix P. Report by DL on the X3 school, July Year IV.
The document emanating from the March meeting and which set out the guidelines for the future operation of the X3 school spoke in terms firstly of the need for educational alternatives and some accumulation of experience as a result of experimentation, but it also discussed as the 'Prime Purpose'

- the school should be an educational institution offering a genuine alternative to traditional patterns of schooling;
- while all schools should be aware of the emotional and social needs of their children, this should not displace the prime educational purpose.1

It possibly was this document which DL echoed when, in his report on the progress of the X3 school conducted in July Year IV, he wrote on the one hand that the X3 school 'is a genuine alternative to traditional patterns of schooling'; however DL went on to detail in what ways the school had 'de-emphasised the generally accepted basic educational purpose of a school viz., the cognitive domain....'

The fundamental dilemma posed by the difficulty of specifying the nature of the relationship of knowledge, teaching and social organisation - a difficulty which had also beset the X1 school, was nicely duplicated in the guidelines for the X3 school, viz.

Curriculum

5.1 The school should provide for years 7-12. However, students seeking the formal HSC qualification should enrol at neighbouring secondary schools. This does not preclude the school from developing an alternative course to the HSC requirements.2

Once it is granted that the crucial social function of HSC is one of accreditation and certification, then it becomes very important to define what is meant by 'developing an alternative course to the HSC requirements'. Certainly the issue of the extent to which evaluation is part of a collection code or an integrated code, is not clarified by such a statement. The guidelines continue under the Curriculum heading:

2 Ibid., point 5.1.
5.2 There has already been considerable autonomy granted to schools/annexes in the development of relevant curricula and the school could appropriately continue in this way. The role of the council in this area should follow [section of appropriate legislation).

'The Council shall... tender advice to the principal and staff of the school as regards the general educational policy which might be followed in the conduct of the school.'

5.3 Advice in the curriculum will be as noted in Section 4.6.

4.6 Advice concerning the school will be provided by the Secondary Schools Division upon request.¹

Perhaps the key characteristic of such a codification is that its very ambiguity will require it to wait upon events and subsequent interpretations which are situated socially, before any predictable knowledge could be derived from it. Such a statement or formulation is produced in the belief that it will function administratively, 'for all practical purposes'.² However, in this case the assumptions underlying the meaning of administration and administrative norms as they relate to the social organisation of the X3 school, its pedagogy, curriculum and evaluation, could not be taken for granted.

The question of hidden assumptions has been raised and discussed under various rubrics, including the 'hidden curriculum' by writers such as Reimer, Kozol and Kohl, but more particularly by Ivan Illich. Illich's discussion of such points has been contentious (and non-sociological) enough to have induced its own corpus of literature.³ Illich's work needs to be mentioned here for two related reasons. Firstly, Illich's hidden assumptions deal with issues that had been important points of friction with the X school at various times. For example, the issue of certification, accreditation and control via evaluation mentioned above; but also the questions of 'maturation via education', of teachers as hollow representatives of

¹ Appendix N, 'Guidelines...', points 5.2, 5.3, 4.6.
² See D. Zimmerman, 'The practicalities...', op.cit.
agencies of social control having a 'depersonalising' effect on students, of the coercion via compulsory attendance rules and of teachers as licensed disseminators of authorised knowledge - all these were issues of which various participants had, at various times, been aware. Secondly, Illich himself had visited the State prior to the establishment of the X1 school, which in turn had been put together in an atmosphere of the 'deschooling society' debate, although not explicitly with this intention. Illich argues, for example, that

Only certified consumers of knowledge are admitted to citizenship. Men are not born equal but are made equal through gestation by Almer Mater.¹

This thesis, by contrast, attempts to put the argument that writings such as that of Illich, are symptomatic of heterogeneity in modes of social control within the broad institution of education and that one approach to an analysis of this variety is through a sociology of applied educational knowledge. Instead of Illich's approach which ultimately provides a partial and hortatory description, the idea has been to apply Bernstein's educational codes in a way that illustrates processes in the production of a conception of normal education.

In duplicating the language and concepts of the proposals and guidelines document, DL was adopting a problematic framework of assumptions which did not theorise the differences between collection and integrated codes in terms of control or administration. SD also, in discussing the process by which the X3 school was legitimat ed within the structure of the Secondary Division, accounted for problems of power rules and deviance, within a rhetoric of gradualist change by compromise. The latter account did not extend to an examination of the significance for X3 school, and many of its supporters, of variation in administrative styles. In particular, the effects of altering the degree to which the educational issues (curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation) were kept bounded and separate from administrative and organisational issues. For SD most of the problems could be traced to 'personal relationships'.

¹ I. Illich, 1972, Alternatives to Schooling, AUS, Melbourne, p.16.
The parents, when we were talking about this business, they couldn't see why they couldn't make the appointment of the Principal and the staff, they wanted to do the lot. Now that's asking a bureaucracy to move too far, too quickly. What they got, I think, was a satisfactory compromise. The Director of Secondary Education said 'Right, you put up the names of people that are satisfactory to you and', he said, 'I won't step in your way to make sure that you get them'. So they put up a list of people that they'd work with, and [ET], I think, had a couple of others that he wanted to work with.... And Secondary Division did not stand in the way....

To me the whole issue illustrates the importance of personal relationships. You see, I was trying to encourage some sort of diplomatic negotiation without confrontation - at the same time working within the confines of what I understand the statutory requirements to be. But when you get two people (two groups of people), who get at loggerheads and who can't understand the other point of view, you don't get very far. So I think no-one's breaking the law of the land on this issue. All it is doing is saying, maybe requirements at that level of administration are rather inflexible, couldn't we just, for a start, see if there's a way round it. Okay, so we set up this school and give it a number, and that then, just - if it's handled carefully and the proper people put in it - it illustrates to organisations that the rigidities aren't as rigid as some people would like them to be. And people will always work behind the protection provided by bureaucratic rules. But once you move outside of those, and try to see how flexible they are, personally it becomes very threatening. And if you're not secure, and you don't like confrontation, and can't handle confrontation, you stay within the confines of the rules and say no, there it is - that's the rule - no further! So on this one, for me - personally - it was a bit of a hassle because I know that there were people on that [X2] committee that didn't like the stance I took. Even [ET] has made disparaging comments about the administration. Well, there was no malicious intent in what I was doing. I had to try to steer up the middle, but he does make comments about the obstructionism of some departmental administrators....

I didn't have anything against [ET], I was interested in working with him and trying to resolve this political problem.

I think that was one of [ET]'s major contributions, that when he took over he said to them, 'Right - this is how I operate' and might have even returned them to the authoritarianism of a traditional High School. But it's what they wanted and what they should have been told before; that you can be alternative, you can adopt an alternative approach to education, and still work within the legal constraints of a system....¹

---

¹ SD interview.
Personal relationships reflect (as well as influence) patterns of interaction. It is when assumptions about order and control which underpin social interaction lose their mutuality (without this loss being detected by participants) that conflict and anomie occur. Over a period of years people associated with X school and officials of the Education Department, had communicated despite conflict which was at an implicit level but which affected every other dimension of communication, not least that of everyday ordering rituals. Despite noting changes in personnel very closely and analysing individual accounts of particular events (and simply not collecting any sort of range of accounts of the same event) the purpose of the study has been to avoid locating change in the phenomenon of changes between one individual and another, but rather to substitute an analysis of the effect of shared and competing ideologies of educational control and deviance.

Changes and Continuities

The closure and reopening of the X school in Years III and IV is only superficially a point of disjunction in the more general process of institutionalising an educational code. The various documents of school aims, as well as issues such as the selection of staff and the negotiating of decision procedures reflect changes as well as continuities. In the 'General Statement of School Philosophy'\(^1\) for [X1] there had been stress, for example, on knowledge not being presented in the form of 'disciplines', or in measured 'samples' or in any fixed pattern of learning. In January of Year IV, the school document on 'The [X2] Community School', included amongst its assumptions a stress on providing 'basic skills necessary to equip students for active participation within the existing social framework' and with the aim of providing 'an alternative learning opportunity within the State education system for people of secondary school age....' Finally in the acting coordinator's report from X3 in September of Year IV, there was developed the idea that although there should be no compulsion to attend classes, there should be an emphasis on student-acceptance of

---

\(^1\) Appendix B.
responsibility for both the planning and execution of their own learning programs. It is important to note that these are minor changes of emphasis, the theme of the integrated code remains, control of learning is continually negotiated by staff and students. Learning itself in this way is conceded to be a problematic phenomenon not easily available for the routinisation implied in the strong classification and framing of collection codes. Nevertheless, varying emphases are detectable within integration as it was mediated through various stages of the X school's development.

Much of this account (and that of participants) has been concerned with the development and form of conflict over the selection and replacement of staff at the X school, including the replacement of successive coordinators. In the document of guidelines, produced in consultation between officials of the Education Department (including the Director General and the Director of Secondary Education) and dated March of Year IV, it was noted that

...the appointment of a Coordinator and teaching staff is to be agreed to by the Education Department and representatives of the parent sub-committee....The Coordinator is to be immediately responsible to a central administrator, nominated by the Minister and ultimately the Director General and the Minister, for the effective administration of the school.

There was in addition a particular provision for a review of staff by the Director of Secondary Education, the central administrator and the coordinator at the end of term II, Year IV.¹

Towards the end of term II, ET, the coordinator appointed by the Minister, became ill, was hospitalised and it was not until October that he submitted a report on the progress of the X3 school. In that report ET noted the 'considerable reserve and hesitancy' by school supporters in the early part of the year; nevertheless 'all staff consciously and conscientiously attempted the utmost cooperation' with ET with the result that he was prepared to recommend that X3 'be deemed to have passed its probationary period'. However, ET felt so strongly about the difficulties experienced in opening X3 that he viewed the

¹ Appendix N.
'sustained mistreatment/delayed treatment/non-treatment at the hands of certain sections of the Education Department' as 'a breach of faith not only with the school but also with [ET] personally. He attributes the consequent worry and tension as significant contributing factors towards his ill-health'. ¹ It was in this report also that ET recommended that his assistant coordinator should take over the position in a permanent and formal capacity when the period of ET's sick-leave terminated. (This recommendation was endorsed by the central liaison officer, DL, and was eventually acted upon.)

These difficulties over staffing at X3 closely paralleled events at X1 and X2. This needs to be emphasised since the parallel occurs despite the fact firstly that different individuals filled almost every formal position (both at the X3 school and in the Education Department), and secondly, that the coordinator of X3 had been expressly appointed by the Minister who had known ET and his work over a number of years. In recommending the appointment of his deputy as the next coordinator, ET (and the X3 school) were probably fortunate that this deputy was able and willing to accept the position. The point being that had this not been the case, the situation at X3 would not have differed very significantly to that of X2 after KX had resigned at the end of Year III. The formal agreement that the choice of a coordinator should 'be agreed to by the Education Department and representatives of the parent sub-committee'² had not been tested inasmuch as there existed no machinery for taking the initiative in the search for replacements or in criteria for deciding between competing candidacies.

The X school supporters, almost from its inception, had had great difficulty in maintaining that their desire for an 'alternative' approach to education was not inconsistent with the idea of working within the publicly-funded and centrally-administered education system. In effect the claim was that since it was analytically

¹ Appendix P, 'Report on [X3]' by ET, October Year IV.
² Ibid.
possible to separate the idea of centralised administration of material resources from the central control of educational symbolics, then it ought to be practically possible to institutionalise such an analytic separation. The course of events throughout the history of the X1 and X2 schools had demonstrated the difficulties that accrue when particular individuals identify their formal roles in such a way that analytically possible distinctions become blurred. It was very difficult for successive Directors of Secondary Education (in particular) to accept the possibilities. One official's rhetorical assertion in an internal Education Department memorandum epitomised the dilemma, when it was asserted - 'What they want is their school and our money'. This essential problem appeared to be little closer to being formally recognised at the time of the establishment of the X3 school. In the document setting out its guidelines there occurs the following passage

1.3 With careful planning and supervision, alternative schools can operate within the legislative requirements of State Parliament and the Regulations established for the operation of the Education Department. (Where parents and/or students have been unable to accept the requirements of operating within this framework, there has always been recognition that provisions can be made for private education through the Council of Public Education.)

This passage nicely encapsulates the problem since the concepts 'variability' and 'need' are equally capable of being interpreted within a framework either of equal distribution of material resources within a system based on a common symbolic order, or equal distribution of resources based on an assessment recognising different symbolic orders. The conceptual difference allows for quite divergent assessments of what constitutes fair and equal treatment.

---

1 Note: parent representatives requested the removal of this sentence because they felt it was irrelevant to their endeavours. They have consistently sought to remain within the State system partly because it provides some protection and flexibility from narrow sectarian community pressures on teachers and students, but more importantly because they support a variable state system which is concerned with the fair distribution of resources to areas of need. See Appendix N.
In writing a sociology of applied knowledge as it related to illness and the medical profession, Eliot Freidson was concerned, amongst other things, to show how knowledge (especially that which is generated and controlled by powerful professions such as medicine), can assume a social reality of its own. One of the possible effects of such a development is that professionals or experts become more removed from their clients and vice-versa. This becomes ironical in those professions which specialise in service to people, in treating people not merely as products or outcomes of manufacturing or other technical processes, but as ends in themselves, as reflexive beings capable of contemplating and evaluating the quality of professional service from a non-professional but not therefore non-valid or inconsequential viewpoint. Freidson chose to study medicine because it is a powerful professional institution with a correspondingly powerful penetration of its social reality into that of Everyman in our society. At the same time illness was able to be conceived of in non-medical, non-biological terms, in fact in sociological terms. Illness became a construct available for analysis in the same way that 'crime' or 'sin' can be sociologically analysed.

The social reality of education is one which in industrial societies has been invested with a solidity not too dissimilar from that of medicine and illness. To 'have an education' to 'plan education' to 'distribute and administer educational resources' and to produce theories about the control of such publicly-defined and accredited knowledge (via licentiates, for example); such themes are quite familiar to members of our society. Freidson, in part, is concerned to analyse the relationship of knowledge, legitimacy, power and forms of social control. In the case of education, by contrast with that of illness and medicine, not to be properly educated is analogous to a state of illness. To be not educated, to be illiterate, functionally illiterate or in some way defectively educated (to be an autodidact), these are states which are potentially evaluated as non-normal (unusual) if not abnormal.

---

1 E. Freidson, 1970, Profession of Medicine, Dodd-Mead, New York.
The case of the X school has served to illustrate and to provide understanding of some of the variety of 'educational knowledges' which appear as the educational division of labour becomes more extensive. At the same time an opportunity was provided to examine the effect of the assumptions which axiomatically underpin one body of educational knowledge (for example, 'educational administration') when circumstances bring it into conflict with another body of educational knowledge (such as 'pedagogy' 'curriculum' or 'evaluation'). Whereas in Freidson's work with medicine and illness, the basic phenomenon to which the profession has addressed itself is a 'natural' state, and it is from this state (which is phenomenologically available to all people as a sense of abnormality) that practitioners have developed their specialisms; by contrast to be 'ignorant' or non-educated (in other words, to be abnormal or potentially deviant) is the 'natural' state once formal education becomes established as a normative phenomenon.

This difficulty of education as a 'normal' but 'non-natural' state posed problems for a sociology of applied educational knowledge which it was felt was partly solved by depending on Bernstein's concepts of educational codes as ideal types of cultural transmission. It was the concepts of classification and framing which seemed to provide the possibility of linking the effect of different types of specialist knowledge in conflict with questions of social order, social control and conceptions of normality and deviance. The X school provided a rich source of rhetoric and ideologies, of differently structured bodies of knowledge with implicit but varying forms of legitimation - as well as the opportunity to analyse outcomes of their conflict. In the connection between commonsense rules of deviance and sociological accounts of deviance there lies the possibility for seeing how notions of abnormality are developed and then shared in a reified way which thus allows of them being used to define limits to social action. It was in the manner and strength of the imputation of abnormality that there was represented a measure of potentials for change in the institutionalisation of moral boundaries and forms of social order in an institution which itself specialises in cultural transmission.
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