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INTRODUCTION

If I am to help others to gain any usable insight, I must show them the school as it really is. I must not attack the school, nor talk over-much about what ought to be, but only about what is. (...)

Realistic sociology must be concrete. In my own case, this preference for concreteness has led to a relative distrust of statistical method, which has seemed, for my purposes, of little utility. Possibly the understanding of human life will be as much advanced by the direct study of social phenomena as by the study of numerical symbols abstracted from those phenomena.

- Willard Waller: The Sociology of Teaching (1961)
  pp V-VI
The re-organization of secondary education has been a controversial issue, with Government initiatives provoking debate on an unprecedented scale. The broad political affiliation of advocates and opponents of re-organization with the Labour and Conservative Parties respectively has acted as a catalyst to the controversy, enticing claims that political motives have usurped educational ideals as the principle behind the system of education. Mr. Edward Heath, for instance, in a speech to an educational conference in Edinburgh (13.12.75) polemicized:

The Labour Party has a lot to answer for here. Up and down the country, it imposed some unforgivable hotch-potch schemes of comprehensive schools. It sacrificed the education and future of thousands of school children on the Socialist altar of political ideology.

The role of political parties in the move toward a comprehensive system of secondary education has been significant for the development of the current profile of the maintained secondary sector - a profile which reflects not only the hesitant process of policy adoption but also its gradual implementation in practice. (Banks 1955, Barker 1972, Fenwick 1976, Griffiths 1971, Rubinstein and Simon 1973). In the decade following Crosland's "invitation" to submit re-organization plans (D.E.S. Circular 10/65), the path to comprehensive education has faced resistance which has effectively postponed its completion and given rise to a period characterized by the co-existence of comprehensive and tripartite schools. The extent to which re-organization has been achieved in the wake of the initial "request" has consequently been a matter of some concern. (Benn 1975, Benn & Simon 1970).

In the social/political arena of debate it has been this process of re-organization, rather than the apposite principles of tripartism and comprehensive education, to which attention has been generally directed. Opponents have alleged that systems of comprehensive secondary education have been created with inadequate facilities and against the wishes of

Evidence to support the claims and counter-claims involved in the debate has been facilitated by the co-existence of the two types of education, and the possibility of comparison afforded by the gradual process of re-organization has indeed aggravated the potential for controversy. Such comparisons have tended to concentrate on the relative success of comprehensive and tripartite schools in terms of their academic achievement. (Miles and Skipworth 1973, Neave 1975), and have relied for the measurement of such achievement largely upon the G.C.E. and C.S.E. examination successes associated with the types of school. (R.R. Pedley 1969, 1970, Todd 1970, Travers 1975, Woodley 1975).

The relative ease with which the standards can be measured has, perhaps, seduced the controversy to an emphasis on this aspect of education at the expense of behavioural standards (although little agreement over the meaning of such data has ensued).

Standards of behaviour, however, have not been totally ignored and have received particular attention in the media where the sensation value of indiscipline, vandalism, violence and truancy has possibly outweighed the alternative criterion of comparison.

Falling standards of behaviour have not been attributed solely to comprehensive re-organization, although those schools identified as suffering the worst incidence of behaviour problems have been regarded generally as large, inner-city comprehensives. Large London comprehensive schools have consequently been the subject of investigation by journalists.

1. With rare exception (cf. Lowenstein 1975) the difficulties of operationalizing research on aspects of conduct and discipline in schools have inhibited quantitative analysis and promoted the case study of relevant schools.
seeking to establish "what really goes on" in such schools (Davies 1975, Stewart 1972, Tweedie 1974). These have contrasted with "official" versions of events in the schools (Boyson 1974, Chetwynd 1960) and presented accounts which have variously seen teachers as suffering a "malaise" and thus being responsible for declining standards, or as stalwarts whose efforts are admirable in the face of such declining standards. Either explanation, however, draws attention to the particular problems of teaching in such schools.

An examination of the debate surrounding secondary re-organization allowed identification of the major controversial aspects of the process of organization and established the relevance of research on teaching as a practical activity. (Chapter I). It also provided the criteria for the choice of schools which were relevant to the debate and within which the alleged problems of teaching could be reasonably expected. (chapter II)

In the schools, research involved a combination of the observation of classroom procedure, tape-recorded interviews and the collection of background material. During the initial stages of field-work both the methods and the focus of research were developed in an attempt to "ground" the analysis in the setting (Glaser and Strauss 1968) rather than test any pre-conceived hypothesis (chapter III).² Both the area of interest and the methods for dealing with it consequently owed something to the exigencies of the research situation as well as the social debate within which the research was instigated.

². The manner in which the research is presented, however, cannot reflect the complex inter-relationship between the field-work and theory. Rather, it reflects the kind of analysis achieved as an outcome of this inter-relationship.
The sociology of education, however, has been defined as the application of sociological theory to the field of education (Banks 1968, Swift 1969), and though the research was instigated in the light of a social problem and sought to "ground" the analysis in field-work it should not be regarded as existing in a theoretical vacuum. The approach, and indeed the focus of attention itself, constituted also an aspect of the sociology of education distinguished by its theoretical tenets.

Various attempts to classify areas within the sociology of education have drawn attention to the relationship between the area of interest and the sociological perspective adopted, and can be categorized under the headings:

(a) the structural functionalist perspective
(b) the neo-Marxian approach
(c) the social construction of educational knowledge
(d) interaction in classrooms
(e) organization analysis of schools

The structural-functionalist perspective has exhibited a concern with the education system and its relationship with other sub-systems or society as a whole, and concentrated on the functional relationship between the institution of education and society in terms of the social requirements of technology, mobility and the discovery of talent, and the relationship between the institution of education and other social institutions (Davis and Moore 1945, Durkheim 1965, Parsons 1959).

---

3. The categories suggested here reflect an amalgum of those suggested by Davies (1970), Eggleston (1974), Shipman (1968) and Swift (1969, 1973) and are not seriously at variance with them.
It is, however, the neo-Marxist approach which has been more characteristic of the sociology of education in Britain. The latter, following a social survey tradition, has drawn attention to the patterned variance in pupil attainment, and clearly demonstrated that measured intelligence alone does not explain achievement. Attention has been focused on a host of background factors affecting the performance of pupils, particularly those related to the socio-economic conditions from which the pupils come.4

Social class was the analytic device used to explain the observed association between aspects of social background and levels of achievement in education. This orientation was the basis of a genre of "more or less Marxist inspired" enquiry (Ergas 1972) or as Hoyle (1970) has termed it, a "nomothetic radical position" characteristic of British sociology of education.

By directing attention to features of the social background of pupils, to explain patterned variations in academic achievement such approaches had the effect of directing attention away from the school itself as the arena in which the background and social class conditions were "translated" into rates of success or failure. (Keddie 1973).

Reaction to the apparent failure of compensating measures to offset the effects of social background conditions5 has consequently involved a re-orientation of the sociology of education toward the school process in an attempt to produce explanations allowing more effective "treatment" of socially generated achievement variances.

---


5. The effectiveness of Project Head Start in the USA has been questioned in particular, with the various arguments rehearsed in the Harvard Educational Review 1969, 1970.
One aspect of this "new direction" has been the concern to explain differential attainment with reference to the social construction of knowledge. This approach retains a concern with the relationship between social structure and educational achievement (Young 1971, 1975) but whilst focusing on how dominance is maintained through the education system (i.e. education as a form of social control) goes further than previous approaches by suggesting that the relationship between social background and pupil achievement may be explained in terms of one group's ability to dictate what constitutes acceptable forms of knowledge.

Thus the direction of research for a sociology of educational knowledge becomes to explore how and why certain dominant categories persist and the nature of their possible links to sets of interests or activities such as occupational groupings.

(Young 1971, p.6)

Thus dominant categories of knowledge are seen as receiving expression in the curriculum, and it is the curriculum which has consequently provided a new area of major significance within the sociology of education.

Dominance over curricular knowledge is paralleled by dominance over the acceptability of cognitive styles and forms of knowledge. Social class remains of significance for this approach to the extent that the forms of knowledge are generated within a family setting which is itself related to the social structure. (Bernstein 1958). In other words, the forms of knowledge typically used by pupils can be related to social class background (through the family), and have a value for educational achievement dependent on which group controls what constitutes acceptable (curricular) knowledge. (Bernstein 1961, Sharp & Green 1975).

6. Bernstein's early work on social class and language was easily interpreted as fitting the compensatory mould, despite his own disavowal of the approach. (Bernstein 1970). The restricted or public code characteristic of working-class pupils was seen to put the pupil at a disadvantage vis a vis school knowledge. Working-class pupils suffered a linguistic and cognitive deprivation related to outside-school culture. His later work made different play on the association of linguistic code and social class by claiming that it was not that the working-class had a restricted code which restricted particular types of cognition, but that they used restricted codes more readily than elaborated codes. That is the problem was changed from the nature of code to the occasion of its use. (Lawton 1968)
The "radical" nature of such enquiry stems not only from its concern for the relationship between modes of knowledge and social control, but also from its willingness to treat educational knowledge as open to doubt. Unlike the reformist "neo-Marxian" approaches which accepted the conventional "criteria of educational success - curricula, methods and evaluation" and "what counts as 'knowledge and knowing' in school" (Young 1971, p. 25) - this approach questions the status of such factors specifically with respect to the distribution of success and failure in education and its relationship to social control. The approach, then, clearly reflects more traditional concerns of the sociology of education (viz. achievement rates with respect to social structure) yet has involved a re-orientation to the extent that what constitutes (educational) knowledge is no longer taken for granted as a basic premise and by directing attention to the school as the arena in which the interplay of the socially constructed knowledge is transformed into success/failure rates.

The re-orientation involved in this approach is reflected in another aspect of "new direction" sociology of education which is primarily concerned with the process of interaction in classrooms. Bernstein's seminal work on linguistic codes has drawn attention to the use of language in the classroom setting. This language-use has been regarded not only in relation to the context (Francis 1974, Labov 1973) but also as an integral component of the classroom situation. Teacher talk, for instance, has been studied in terms of its control over acceptable answers (Barnes 1969) in its capacity of checking on the progress of learning, (Stubbs 1972) and as invoking certain implicit rules of classroom conduct (Hargreaves et al 1975). In such studies the role of language is regarded not primarily as a reflection of social control mechanisms (social class), but rather in terms of its control at an interactional (classroom) level.
The study of classroom interaction\(^7\) has also retained, in many cases, explicit concern for the effects of interaction on the achievement of pupils principally with respect to the attitudes and expectations of teachers (cf. Fuchs 1973, Nash 1973, Rist 1970, Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968).

The effects of the attitudes and expectations of teachers upon educational achievement have been shown to stem not only from expectations based on social class and ethnic factors but also from those based on organization of the school. Ability grouping, for instance, has been regarded as generating institutionalized expectations about pupil performance (Keddie 1971) which may constitute self-fulfilling prophecies (Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968). Streaming and timetable arrangements further, have been shown to be responsible for the creation of distinct pupil identities contributing toward the development of pupil sub-cultures which complement the effects of social backgrounds. (Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970).

The school organization, then, can shape the experiences of the pupils in a manner which influences their expectations and aspirations and consequently their achievement. (Banks and Finlayson 1973, Cicourel and Kitsuse 1963). Indeed, the influence of school organization upon pupil achievement may be greater on occasion than that of the social background:

> the belief which has gained currency mainly as a consequence of the evidence of the Plowden Report that the school is of little importance in comparison with home background in its effect on achievement is by no means true in all cases.

(Banks and Finlayson 1973, p.187)

---

\(^7\) As Chanan and Delamont (1975) argue, the study of classroom interaction characterized by inventories of teacher/pupil behaviour, epitomized in Gage's (1963) collection and annexed to the field of social psychology has been complemented if not supplemented by recent concerns with inter-subjectivity.
Because the organization of the school can be shown to influence the attitudes, expectations and achievement of members, the study of the school as an organization has been a feature of the sociology of education complementing the other approaches. (see for example, King 1973, Lambert et al 1970, Turner 1969). To study the effects of changes in school organization (commensurate with secondary re-organization) upon personnel, then, such an approach would appear particularly well suited. The application of a sociology of organizations perspective to this area, that is, would appear to be a useful method for analysing the effects of comprehensive re-organization upon teaching.

To comment on the relationship between comprehensive re-organization and the activity of teaching, however, it was necessary to consider in some depth the concepts of "action" and "organization", particularly because recent critiques have raised as problematic conventional treatment of action within organizations (Bittner 1965, 1973, McKinley 1975, Silverman 1970, Sudnow 1965, Zimmerman 1971).

As a result of the consideration of action and organization (chapter IV) it was concluded that the formal organization of the schools per se could provide no adequate basis for the study of teacher activity. Rather, it was the interpretation of the formal organization by the members that offered the prospect of understanding such practical activity.

Methods for gathering and representing such interpretations involved the use of extended interviews as "accounts". The staff, through this method, justified their routine activity by establishing for the researcher the manner in which they interpreted the context of their practice of teaching, (chapter V). In this sense, and in terms of the model of action employed, the research acknowledged the epistemological critique entailed
in ethnomethodology.\textsuperscript{8}

The study of teaching as a practical activity in this manner locates the research within the "new direction" of the sociology of education, whilst at the same time focusing on a practical educational issue. As such, it provides a response to Joan Simon's (1974) criticism that there is a lack of empirical study associated with the "new direction" sociology, and that the study of educational phenomena utilizing recent trends in sociological theory has generally failed to produce results of consequence for education.

To understand the manner in which teachers interpreted the practical context of their activity it was necessary, as a preliminary, to outline the formal organizations of the schools. These contained "official" guidelines for approved modes of teacher activity and also exhibited a clear distinction between "academic" and "pastoral" aspects of school organization which was subsequently used in the presentation of findings.

By following on the formal organization of academic affairs (chapter VI), it was possible to establish the relevant official requirements of teaching at Ashton and Beechgrove.\textsuperscript{9} In teachers' accounts, however, such official guidelines were often regarded as inappropriate, particularly in view of the practical situation of teaching and the problems routinely involved in the activity of teaching. These problems were treated as indicative of the actual task structure of teaching (chapter VII).

\textsuperscript{8} Grierson (1974) specifically relates "new directions" in the sociology of education to phenomenological and ethnomethodological sociologies, which Banks (1974) differentiates from previous sociology precisely in terms of distinct views of action and Man.

\textsuperscript{9} These are pseudonyms adopted at the request of the Headmasters of the schools.
The major problem in practice was that of "noise". Teaching activity appeared to be concerned largely with the minimization of noise emanating from the classroom, and this in turn, seemed to be related to the idea of "teacher control". Chapter VII demonstrates the practical importance for teachers in the schools of the maintenance of quiet orderliness in the classroom, and the way in which this was reflected in their attitudes toward pedagogic innovation and features of school organization associated with the term "comprehensive".

On the basis of the teachers' accounts of their practical activity it was possible to explore the manner in which "noise" and "control" were related, with chapter VIII providing some tentative explanation of the relationship with reference to the notion of "teacher competence". It appeared that the key to teacher competence, in practice, did not involve a capacity to act-out the formal organization, but involved an awareness of the significance of noise emanating from the classroom for "control" and competence.

The relationship between "control" and "noise" it is suggested, is understandable in terms of the restricted channels by which members of a teaching community are able to assess the "control" of others. With "private" classrooms and a lack of team-teaching amounts of noise coming from a classroom provide a major (public) source of such information. Teachers rarely observed other teachers actually teaching, and thus "control" was inferred rather than observed. Control, that is, could be more usefully seen as a socially organized phenomenon based on clues such as noise than an actual state of affairs existing in a classroom. It appeared that a major concern of the teachers was to retain acceptable levels of noise within the classroom because this indicated control as much as reflected control.
In practice, the pastoral aspect of school organization was inextricably bound-up with "control" despite the prescriptions of the formal organizations to the contrary. Although the schools exhibited ostensibly different profiles of pastoral care and guidance, there were underlying similarities to the extent that

(a) their official purpose was to deal with long-term emotional problems, not disciplinary matters,
(b) that "control" of the classroom was basically the subject teacher's concern, and
(c) that Heads of House held key positions in terms of authority and communications in the pastoral care and guidance functions of the schools. (chapter IX).

The manner in which the subject teachers and Heads of House interpreted the operation of the House system (chapter X and XI respectively) lent support to the suggested relationship between noise, "control" and teacher competence.

The actual use of the House system, provided an amplification of the problem of "control" and noise. Subject teachers, however, in accounting for their policies-for-use confirmed not only their concern for maintaining acceptable levels of noise, but also exposed a dilemma; they could use the House system to expel disruptive pupils from their classroom and thus facilitate quiet orderliness and indications of "control" but in so doing colleagues might interpret this as a lack of control in itself. Use of the House system, that is, apparently provided a further public indicator of "control". The House teachers' understanding of the use of the House system supported this view of a dilemma, and associated quite clearly these public indicators of "control" with the notion of teacher competence.
Competence in these schools, then, depended on the ability to "control" the classroom, but since only certain public indicators of such "control" were available, the attribution of competence owed a good deal to the teachers' ability to maintain quiet orderliness in the classroom and not to depend on the House system for back-up. The implications of this view of practical competence for probationary teachers and recent arrivals at the school, particularly in large schools, is considered in the course of these chapters. This situation, however, arose in the specific context of Ashton and Beechgrove. The two features of these schools which were of particular relevance for the practical task structure of teachers did not reflect their "comprehensiveness" but were, indeed, features characteristic of secondary education as a whole (Delamont 1976) 
(a) the "closed" classroom setting, and  
(b) the autonomy of subject teacher "control" (chapter XII) 
The applicability of the findings, then, has a scope in accord with the presence in schools of these features. 

In conclusion the practice of teaching was structured in terms of an acquired teacher competence (sense of social structure) which provided the basis for interpreting situations (events and the context). This competence involved a concern to minimize the noise emanating from the classroom because such noise was regarded as a public indicator of failure to "control" their own classroom. 

The thesis is advanced, then, that the actual task activity of teaching stemmed from the sense of social structure rather than the formal organization, and that this appeared to be primarily concerned with the maintenance of quiet orderliness in the classroom. Competent teaching, in practice, referred to "keeping 'em quiet" more than covering a body of curricular knowledge. It is argued that, in the practical context of teaching in the schools, the "peace-keeping" task of teaching was more fundamental to teacher competence than was the inculcation of knowledge, and
that the establishment of quiet orderliness in the classroom was regarded as an end to teaching in its own right as much as just a pre-requisite to the inculcation of knowledge.

Starting from a wide-ranging social and educational problem, then, the research concentrated on one aspect which had received less attention than it would appear to have warranted. The manner in which it was treated reflected the exigencies of research and an attempt to "locate" the research within recent directions of sociological theory. As a result, the findings are possibly of consequence to the field of education, although the orientation is fundamentally sociological. The findings cannot pretend to provide an "answer" to the controversy about re-organization but more modestly may be of relevance to the debate.
CHAPTER I

The Great Debate:

themes in the controversy surrounding

the re-organization of secondary education
The Truth about Comprehensives: For the ninety-four per cent of British children whose parents do not pay for their education there will soon be just one kind of school: the comprehensive. Local authorities which have not yet prepared plans to merge their grammar schools into the comprehensive system have been told to do so, and next year the Government will withdraw the direct grant to independent schools. Meanwhile, the furious debate about the merits and demerits of the comprehensive school rages on. Is it going to be the best school for the future of our society - or a cultural disaster area?

(Sunday Times 26.1.75)

A major characteristic of the re-organization of secondary education has been the gradual and incomplete nature of its implementation (see Appendix I). The reasons for this process of educational reform are dealt with extensively elsewhere (Banks 1955, Barker 1972, Batley et al 1970, Benn 1972, 1975, Brand 1965, Fenwick 1976, Griffiths 1971, Marsden 1971, Middleton 1970, 1972, Parkinson 1970, Rubenstein and Simon 1973) and no full exegesis is warranted in this context. It is suffice to acknowledge that the gradual transition toward comprehensive education has arisen through four factors:

(a) the lack of unified policy of comprehensive education from within the Labour movement in the early post-war years despite the clear adoption of such policy by the Labour Party Annual Conference of 1950 (Banks 1955, Fenwick 1976, Marsden 1971, Rubenstein & Simon 1973).

(b) the reticence of the newly elected Labour Government of 1964 to use legislation to secure what had become by that time unequivocal Labour policy (Griffiths 1971, Marsden 1971). In the attempt to avoid the possibility of lengthy legal wranglings, Anthony Crosland made use of Ministerial Circulars to promote the required legislation.
(c) Despite the observation of Brand (1965) and Rubenstein & Simon (1973) that central government has become increasingly involved in educational policy at a local level, local authorities opposed to re-organization have exhibited a capacity to obstruct and delay the requests of Circulars 10/65, 4/74, etc. and effectively frustrate the wishes of central government.¹

(d) the emergence of Conservative Party policy committed to retaining existing efficient grammar schools whilst allowing the development of comprehensive schools in circumstances which did not threaten these grammar schools. (Banks 1968, Benn 1975, Pedley 1963, Rubenstein & Simon 1973).

The policies of respective Labour and Conservative governments since 1964 have differed essentially, then, in that whilst Labour governments have regarded the co-existence of comprehensive and tripartite schools within the public sector as a temporary feature of the transition to a completely comprehensive maintained sector of education, Conservative policy has tended to regard co-existence as a permanent feature of secondary education to the extent that grammar schools would be retained and would operate alongside comprehensives.

¹ This is a point variously acknowledged by those studies which look at the manner in which local interests have been influential in the process of comprehensive re-organization. (cf. Batley et al 1970, Jenkins 1967, Eggleston 1966), and is illustrated by the House of Lords ruling (July 1976) against Mr. Fred Mulley, Secretary of State for Education, effectively allowing Thameside local authority to retain grammar schools even against the express wishes of the Government.

In August 1976 there were still 36 local authorities who had not re-organized along comprehensive lines, seven of which were doing so in open defiance of the Government rather than "dragging their feet" with re-organization plans.
The co-existence of the two kinds of education has provided the fuel for a great deal of the debate surrounding comprehensive re-organization, and by considering the nature of the "Great Debate" (Sunday Times 26.1.75), it is possible to identify those features of comprehensive education which are currently regarded, in the media as well as educational circles, as the most controversial aspects. These can be dealt with in terms of:

(a) the nature of the intake to comprehensive schools
(b) the structure of the school organization associated with comprehensives, and
(c) the nature of the results, where relative virtues are judged by the examination success and behavioural qualities of pupils.
Early reports on comprehensives (Monks 1967, Ross and Chanan 1972) declined to draw direct comparisons which the co-existence offered because it was felt that this might provide an adverse reflection on the emerging and barely established comprehensive schools. In the years immediately following Circular 10/65 the co-existence of comprehensive schools with selective schools was regarded as a product of the transition - a temporary and intermediate stage on the route to comprehensive education. Yet, as it became apparent that the "transition" was to become a protracted process or even a permanent feature of secondary education, co-existence itself developed as a major controversy, and one which Benn and Simon regard as "the most controversial of the questions involved in re-organization". (Benn and Simon 1970, p.299). By 1970 it was evident that co-existence was not necessarily a passing phase, particularly in light of the change of government. As Benn notes:

When the new Conservative Government was elected in 1970, it did not regard co-existence as a temporary inconvenience, but a positive good.

(Benn 1975, p.14)

Conservative policy by 1970 no longer advocated the retention of tripartism as such, but promoted a co-existence of selective schools and comprehensives. As a result of their determination to retain existing efficient grammar schools the policy of co-existence can be more accurately stated as a co-existence of grammar and comprehensive schools. In such a system there would be schools based on principles of selective intake (grammars) and those based on non-selective intake (comprehensives), and it is the
feasibility of integrating these two apparently opposed principles which has provided a major controversial issue in the re-organization of secondary education.²

Advocates of comprehensive re-organization have regarded the intake of comprehensives as an essential indicator to the comprehensiveness of the school, and as Benn writes:

\[
\text{it is not a specific set of courses, or size, or purpose - building which primarily characterizes a comprehensive school but a specific intake.}
\]

(Benn, 1975 p.2)

The nature of the intake has been taken as an essential criterion for the identification of such a school - a necessary (though not sufficient) condition of comprehensive education. In 1965, when the N.F.E.R. commenced their research on comprehensive education, there was already recognition of the problems that the continued co-existence might entail for comprehensives (Monks 1968, p.2). Ross elaborates on the reasons why comparisons between comprehensives and selective schools were unpracticable: they had differing philosophies; there were relatively few comprehensives at the time; there were problems of studying "similar" groups in different schools; and that:

Many comprehensive schools are so in name only. In many areas the more able pupils attend grammar and other selective schools rather than the comprehensives. A system which is based on the principle of receiving pupils of all types under one roof cannot be satisfactorily compared with other systems, if it has only those boys and girls rejected by other schools.

(Ross, 1972, p.18)

² Not all commentators have acknowledged this distinction in intake principles, and Iris Murdoch, writing in the Black Paper 1975 even asserted:

\[
\text{I am not an opponent of comprehensive schools as such, unless, by definition they are non-selective.}
\]

(Murdoch, in Cox & Boyson 1975, p.7)
The advocates of comprehensive education have held that the presence of selection in the intake to schools negates their potential comprehensive status. Benn and Simon cite a Yorkshire comprehensive headmaster as writing in 1969:

I think it is sheer hypocrisy and double talk to suggest that a "grammar-school" and a "comprehensive" school can co-exist in one locality: if the grammar school takes its traditional "cream"; the comprehensive school is merely a secondary-modern school.


Or as Little put it:

As soon as 10% go to grammar schools, 90% must perforce go to secondary modern schools, and no children at all can go to comprehensives.

(Little 1973)

The co-existence of grammar-schools with comprehensives would appear to have a direct bearing on the nature of the intake to the comprehensives, and thus the extent of co-existence provides a basis upon which to consider the implications of "creaming".

In 1965, 42% of 11-18 comprehensive schools were competing with selective schools. (Monks 1968) Not all these selective schools were grammar. In 1968, it was estimated that in England and Wales, 54% of schools drew from catchment areas in which it was possible for a pupil to go to a grammar school (100% for the I.L.E.A.) (Benn & Simon, 1970, p.302). This later research revealed a situation in which over half the comprehensive schools in England and Wales were receiving only 12% of the top ability range they would expect to have in the intake. More recently estimates of co-existence vary between those committed to retaining grammar schools (cf. Baldwin 1975: 38% pupils selected), the average estimation (50% : Woodley 1976) and those opposed to co-existence (Benn 1975 : 80%).
It has been argued that selective schools "cream" the top ability levels.

Table I  Co-existence of comprehensive and grammar schools: the "creaming" of ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. and % of schools in England &amp; Wales</th>
<th>% of Top 20% of ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiive Schools co-existing with grammar schools</td>
<td>355 54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where comprehensive schools are the only schools</td>
<td>281 43</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL =</td>
<td>661 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Benn & Simon 1970, p.505)

Benn & Simon note:

We found a great deal of bitterness among staff and among parents in comprehensive schools about policies of co-existence. They felt that education committees expected them to operate as fully comprehensive schools while these same education committees were systematically selecting for, and supporting grammar schools in the same areas. They were asking comprehensive schools to show excellent examination results right up through A-level and scholarship level, yet at the same time, they were saying to them that, as usual, 10 to 20% of all top ability pupils will be going to grammar schools (or "long-course" comprehensive schools, as some selectively "re-organized" areas now call them). There are many people who now feel that the word "comprehensive" should not be allowed to be used for schools that are not truly comprehensive - i.e. that are co-existing with grammar schools.

(Benn & Simon 1970, p.307)

If this were to be adopted - if only completely non-selective schools were deemed "comprehensive" - Benn and Simon argue, only about 10% of the secondary school population could be said to receive a comprehensive education (1968).
Caroline Benn, working with the Campaign for Comprehensive Education has elaborated on this theme (Benn 1975). Her argument is that some ten years after the issue of Circular 10/65:

> the percentage of the secondary age population today in undisputedly "genuine" comprehensive schools is only something like 17%. We could even give the benefit of the doubt to a further 3% of the pupils, and we still have a figure of only 20%.

(Benn 1975, p.28)

She excludes as "non-genuine" those comprehensive systems in which selection of any kind occurs, whether that be due to competition with grammar schools, or selection within a two-tiered "comprehensive" system (52% and 18% of comprehensives respectively). This is a situation she says, contributed towards by the Conservative Government's (1970-74) policy of hindering re-organization plans which involved the integration of existing grammar schools, and revealed by a serious consideration of that Government's record of rejections of re-organization submissions (Benn 1975, p.9-12). In 1965, Monks estimated that 35% of comprehensive schemes had involved the integration of grammar schools, (25% being completely new, 40% involving no integration). The numbers of comprehensives at this stage were not, however, large in comparison to the "explosion" between 1965-70; and similar estimations are not readily available in 1975. However, Benn argues that under this Conservative Government, "grammar-schools were twice as likely as secondary modern schools to be among schools rejected for comprehensive re-organization". (Benn 1975, p.11). It would seem then, that the continued co-existence of grammar schools and comprehensive schools will see the latter taking the role of the secondary-modern school not only in the nature of its intake, but in its origins (buildings, etc.) as well.
The emphasis upon the non-selective intake to comprehensive schools disguises, however, a deeper discussion of the term "comprehensive". To use "non-selective" in the manner that Benn (1975) does is to base selection on academic ability. That is, Benn's discussion of the "genuine" comprehensive as being one in which no forms of selection occur implicitly relates to the criteria of "academic ability" alone. This, however, is but one of the ways in which selection (or allocation) might operate. In fact, it is possible to distinguish four criteria of selection which are of relevance to the comprehensive school, all of which stem from the developmental manner in which comprehensive education has come to exist in the British system, these four being:

(a) academic ability
(b) community / district
(c) social class mix
(d) parental choice

The comprehensive school as an "all-ability" school was largely a response to those Reports (e.g. Crowther, Robbins) which questioned the ability to gauge some static potential ability in pupils at 11+. The call for comprehensive schools as "all-ability" schools drew on the claim that selection (specifically selection at 11 years of age) was not a suitable basis of academic organization. This has gained some generality of acceptance across the major political and educational divides with, for instance, support from Rhodes Boyson (1974) who from being a comprehensive headmaster became a Conservative M.P. for Brent North. Even within the most heartfelt expression of traditional educational
philosophy there is the acceptance, in principle, of the all-ability school.

We believe (writes G. Kenneth Green) that to be labelled 'comprehensive', a school should certainly cater for the whole range of academic ability and that its intake should have that range of ability and be in balance (....)

Many schools labelled 'comprehensive' are nothing of the sort, first and foremost because they have no academic top and, as a direct consequence of this, have a level of academic aspiration and attainment which can only be mediocre.

One of the major factors in the indiscipline and truancy from large schools is the fact that they are large agglomerations of children of average and less-than-average abilities.

(G. Kenneth Green in Cox & Boyson 1975, pp 24-25)

The opponents of comprehensive re-organization are not, then unified in their views on selection and the nurture of excellence for there is support in places for the all-ability non-selective school. For such writers as Green (1975) and Boyson (1974) the problem with comprehensive lay not so much in the principle of non-academic selection as the association of "comprehensive" education with "progressive" methods.

Community and Intake

A second vital aspect of selection stems from the view of the comprehensive school as a community school, and one that serves all the pupils in a given district; early definitions of a comprehensive school reflect this "geographical" emphasis. Circular 144 of 1947 saw the comprehensive as a school:

... which is intended to cater for all the secondary education of all the children of a given area.
And again, more recently it has been seen as a school "intended for all the children in a district". (D.E.S. 1973; see also I.L.E.A. 1967, Evetts 1973).

The problems of serving a particular area arise when that area is of a fairly homogenous nature. Where the area constitutes an E.P.A., a predominantly working-class or immigrant area, or where it is part of a ghetto, the school which serves the district or community will tend to suffer relative to schools serving more "advantaged" areas. Rather than promoting equality, such community schools would exacerbate the "deprivation" already existing in the area. Community schools might become "black" schools, "working-class schools", etc. in reflection of the area they serve.  

Educationalists in Britain have, to an extent, recognized the problems inherent in any unqualified call for community or district schools, and the "community" aspect has often been tempered or qualified by the call for a social mix as an integral part of the comprehensive intake. Boyson's definition of a comprehensive school reflects a fundamentally geographical criterion of intake, but qualifies this in specifying that the school should receive a balance in terms of academic and social intake from the catchment area in which it is situated.

I have always maintained that a comprehensive school was one which took in a cross-section of the social and particularly the intellectual balance of the area in which it is placed. Many professional organizations and at least one "Times" leader have quoted my definition. The alternative definition of a comprehensive school as a school which offers all types of courses even if there are no pupils to take them, seems to me to be educational gobbledegook.

(Boyson 1974, p.88 his emphasis)

3. The effects of "bussing" as an attempt to offset such identification have provided a large interest in the Sociology of Education in the U.S.A., and public opinion has been a newsworthy commodity.
Intake and Social Mix

The social mix aspect of comprehensive schools has been seen not only as a reaction to the possibilities of "deprived" areas being reflected in, and served by, "deprived" schools. A more positive statement of the "social mix" aims sees the integration of social classes at school as an attempt to change ideology, old prejudices being removed by the contact of pupils from different social classes at school. (Ford 1969). The success of comprehensive schools at achieving an integration of pupils from differing social class backgrounds is not clear, with Ford's (1969) conclusion indicating a lack of integration, and Blyth and Cooper's (1971) indicating successful integration. To achieve any such "mix", however, it may be necessary to allocate or select pupils to particular schools. A basic dilemma faces attempts to provide community schools with full social and academic ranges, and which would be "non-selective". To gain the "mix" some form of selection (or allocation) even if not an academic criteria will generally be necessary.

Benn's (1975) definition of a genuine comprehensive school attempts to integrate those aspects of a comprehensive (academic and social mix) in such a manner as to compromise the difficulties, although the implementation of her definition is difficult to envisage without some degree of selection or allocation: a genuine comprehensive school, she suggests,

must provide all that would normally be regarded as secondary education in the district for either (a) all the pupils from a given neighbourhood or (b) for pupils from a larger given area, sharing with all other schools, all of which are also comprehensive, intakes between them which individually contain as fair a distribution as possible of such attainment and social groupings as exist in the larger area itself.

(Benn 1975, p.2)
Green, Boyson and Benn agree, then, on the necessity for balancing the intake to schools in terms of ability and social background for which an "allocation" of pupils rather than a "selection" is required. Whilst adhering to the spirit of the "neighbourhood" or "community" school, these commentators recognize the effects which such catchments may have on the nature of the intake to the schools, and seek to redress any inherent "bias" through supplying an academically and socially balanced intake to the schools from a wider area shared with other similar schools.

Intake and Parental Choice

A further factor has influenced the debate on the selection of intake to comprehensive schools. This is the selection which might occur not by staff or L.E.A.'s, but by the parents of children eligible for secondary education. An L.C.C. Survey of 1961 noted the principle of parental choice as basic to comprehensive policy: It was the Council's policy that a comprehensive school should admit and cater for a balanced entry.

... that the first duty of a large secondary school is to the boys and girls who live in its neighbourhood (and) all parents of pupils passing from primary to secondary schools in London have an opportunity of nominating two schools.

(L.C.C. 1961 p.20)

Opponents of comprehensive re-organization have argued that "choice" should include the choice of private education, grammar school or comprehensive whilst "choice" for comprehensive advocates is between comprehensives. This factor is generally articulated to a greater extent by opponents of comprehensive re-organization who argue that when a free choice is allowed comparison will become vital, and free-market forces
will work against the large, egalitarian comprehensive schools, (Cox and Boyson 1975).

Choice of schools is also advocated by those such as Boyson who, whilst promoting the idea of "balance" in intake, is a firm advocate of traditional educational aspirations, - aspirations he claims are in keeping with public wishes as demonstrated by his own experience at Highbury Grove (Boyson 1974), and by public expression if the "voucher system" of education were employed. (Boyson in Cox & Boyson 1975). The "voucher system" would "put the parent (and older pupils) as consumers in charge of schools". 4

In summary, the nature of the intake for comprehensive schools involves three criteria; academic ability, social mix, and parental choice. The basic view that comprehensives are "non-selective" schools stems from reaction to the inherent academic selectivity of the tripartite system. Such non-selection has been the principle underlying the view of the comprehensive school as either an "all-ability" school or a "neighbourhood" school. The non-selection principle, however, has been tempered by advocates of comprehensives in deference to the reasoning that "neighbourhood" schools might reflect and exacerbate the deprivation or advantage of the community in which the school is sited. In other words, a social mix and academic mix may not be achieved through basing the intake to a school on a particular community catchment area.

Balancing the intake to comprehensive schools has provided a solution to the dilemma: comprehensives being schools with balanced

---

4. Evetts (1973) argues that emphasis on parental choice involves treating education as a consumer item at the expense of treating it as a social service for which centralization and expertise choice are necessary.
academic and social intake from a larger catchment area shared with similarly balanced schools (Benn 1975). Such balancing requires the use of allocation procedures as distinct from the selection procedures of tripartism.

Those advocating co-existence, however, have similarly found refuge in the idea of balanced intake because this principle can operate alongside the selection of "high ability" pupils to grammar schools. The balanced intake to comprehensives in this instance is the balance of what is left after creaming the "high ability" pupils. It is here that the controversy has centred. (cf. Boyson 1974).

The controversy between the advocates of comprehensives and of co-existence has not centred on the principle of the intake to comprehensives as such (balanced), but whether such balancing which is creamed by co-existing grammar schools provides the possibility of a truly comprehensive school. Academic and social mix, and parental choice, become controversial, that is, to the extent that they affect the balance of intake to comprehensive schools. Co-existence is similarly controversial in its implications for the balance which is achieved within the comprehensive intake. What is controversial is whether the balance refers to what is left after the high ability pupils have been "creamed" or whether it refers to a balance incorporating the whole academic and social spectrum.
Comprehensive School Organization

As used in the Great Debate, the term "comprehensive" has not referred solely to the nature of intake to the school. It has been used to designate particular organizational arrangements in schools which distinguish comprehensives from grammars, and which constitute a criterion of comprehensiveness distinct from the particular qualities of the pupils who attend the school. The two aspects of comprehensives, intake and organization - provide the source of some confusion as to what actually constitutes a "comprehensive" school. Those who advocate co-existence have been able to focus on the organizational aspect of "comprehensives" and consequently argue that comprehensive schools "co-exist with grammar schools already, and always have, so how can it be impossible?". (Margaret Thatcher as Secretary of State for Education in the House of Commons 8.7.70 quoted in Benn 1975, p.14). Those advocating total re-organization, on the other hand, have asserted that the co-existence of schools based on selective intake with those based on non-selective intake is a logical absurdity.
Age Cohorts and Comprehensives

Circular 10/65 allowed for two-tier systems of secondary education to be designated "comprehensives". The restrictions imposed by existing school buildings and sites rendered a two-tier organization eminently practical under certain conditions and although preference was expressed for the 11-18 straight through school, alternatives were not dismissed. The majority of comprehensive schools have adopted an 11-18 year organization (74% Monks 1968), but even where they have not done so, the age cohorts of themselves have not been a significantly controversial issue. Two-tier systems have been criticized by advocates of comprehensives, however, where they have retained an element of selection. Consequently, it has been possible for sympathy to be accorded by Armstrong and Young (1964), in a Fabian pamphlet, to the arguments for a two-tier system because, for them, the debate centred on the presence or absence of selection in the two-tier system, rather than the transfer per se. The two-tier organization of comprehensive schools has not of itself provided a bone of contention between the advocates and opponents of comprehensive re-organization and has received qualified approval by both sides, the reservations expressed by advocates revolving around the points that (a) the two-tier system should be a temporary measure (Circular 10/65) and (b) that it should not be used as another form of selection (Armstrong and Young, 1964).

---

5. The Education Act 1964 was introduced to facilitate the establishment of middle and high schools by rescinding the 1944 Education Act's specification that secondary education should refer to schooling from the age of eleven years.
Split-site Arrangements

The instigation of comprehensive schools in existing buildings has given rise not only to the two-tier organization, but in other cases to an 11-18 all through organization with a "split-site" arrangement. Benn and Simon (1970) have estimated that 23% of comprehensive schools in England and Wales were on two or more sites, (37% I.L.E.A. schools) and argue that:

Probably the biggest prejudice against the developing comprehensive school is the belief that a school situated in two buildings, or on two sites is a "botched" school and not properly a comprehensive school.

(Benn & Simon 1970 p.89)

Split-site schools were developed in spite of the critics who suggested that the schools should delay amalgamation until there was the possibility of new purpose-built premises because there were particular problems with developing new and large sites in urban settings. The split-site school then has provided a source of contention, particularly in relation to the necessity of commuting.

Size of Comprehensives

The amalgamation of schools into a larger (comprehensive) unit was deemed necessary because of the estimated size of school which could support a sixth-form with breadth of options, and it was this need for increased size which not only caused split-site schools on occasion, but was also a contentious point in itself. In 1947, the Ministry of Education had estimated that a comprehensive school should have about 1,600 pupils to be viable (Circular 144: June 1947 "The Organization of Secondary Education" : Ministry of Education) although other estimates

---

6. Administrative methods were available to limit if not exclude the necessity for commuting, a preference exhibited in D.E.S. "Comprehensive Schools from Existing Buildings". (Building Bulletin 40, H.M.S.O. p.11 cited in Benn & Simon 1970, p.94).
tended toward 2,000. The sheer size of such schools has been attacked with claims that they become dehumanized and alienating environments where pupils feel insecure, lack supervision and consequently perform poorly in comparison to the traditionally smaller tri-partite units.

The size of the school (measured by the number of pupils attending the school) has been identified as a factor influencing the involvement and participation of pupils quite distinct from the social background of the pupils or other features of the organization of the school. Barker and Gump (1964) regard the size of a school as an "ecological environment"

stimulating and compelling students to more active and responsible contributions to the enterprises of small than of large schools.

(Barker & Gump 1964, p.195)

They conclude:

Not only the present research, but all other research known to us, indicates that the negative relationship between institutional size and individual participation is deeply based and difficult, if not impossible to avoid.

(ibid p.201)

These reservations about the influence of schools with large pupil populations have been reflected in the media as part of the public debate surrounding re-organization. Douglas Heath, Professor of Psychology at Haverford College, Pennsylvania for instance, wrote in the Sunday Times that:

Once a school exceeds 400/500 students, a bureaucratic and dehumanizing climate becomes predominant. Numerous negative psychological effects result. Increasing size is directly related to decreasing frequency of participation in school activities, participation in competitive athletics (...) and to increasing cheating, violence and a host of other factors indicative of student alienation from the educational process.

(Sunday Times 23.2.75: original emphasis)
The opponents of comprehensive re-organization have seen the size of such schools as a major factor in their apparent failure in terms of academic standards and discipline, a factor they claim that is leading to reaction against such movements. As G. Kenneth Green wrote in the Black Paper, 1975:

There has been an increasingly active movement against the size of comprehensive schools - one can cite the London area as an example - from parents who want a disciplined framework for their children in which learning can take place.

(G. Kenneth Green in Cox & Boyson 1975, p.26)

Towers (1975), however, makes the point that the actual size of comprehensive schools is less than people commonly surmise, and certainly less than was envisaged in the early proposals.

Advocates of comprehensive re-organization have acknowledged the alienating possibilities of the size of such schools, and have argued that the use of a House system and/or tutor groupings can offset that tendency. Although, the average size of comprehensive schools has not realised figures of 2,000 or 1,600 there has still been the trend toward the creation of smaller "pastorally" orientated units within the large school. In 1968, the average size of 11-18 all-through comprehensives was approximately 1,000 (Benn & Simon 1970, p.72, p.217) and Monks (1968) found that size varied from less than 400 to over 2,000 with 58% having less than 1,000 and only 13% more than 1,600 pupils. Yet even this was a significant growth in relation to the tripartite sector.

Thus, although the curricular design of comprehensives was initially regarded as requiring sizes of 1,600 to 2,000 pupils, the actual size of comprehensives has remained significantly less than these figures (whilst still reflecting an increase over the tripartite units.) The increase in size which has occurred has been cited as responsible for some of the
of the problems associated with comprehensives despite the integration of the organizational device of Houses/Tutor Groups to offset this tendency.

The House System

One aspect of the "social ethos" of comprehensive schools has been the conscious articulation of organizational units devoted to the pastoral care and guidance of pupils. The House system has been generally adopted as the basis, not only for competitive sports and charity collections as characterized in tripartism, but for the social welfare of pupils in the school.

The constitutive features of "pastoral care and guidance" are dealt with in greater depth in chapter 9, and at this stage it is suffice to note three points about the House system. Firstly, the vast majority of comprehensive schools have incorporated a House system as a feature of the organization providing for the social welfare of the pupils (Honks 1968, Benn & Simon 1970), with administrative duties also being variously integrated with this system. (17% of comprehensives have relied solely on Houses as an administrative unit according to Benn and Simon's research).

Secondly, Houses have been used by schools in an attempt to integrate pupils into smaller units within the larger institution, thus offsetting the negative effects of size (cf. Barker & Gump 1964), and further to promote the comprehensive aim of a social mix. Of the 299 schools in Honks (1968) study, 205 had no particular criteria for allocating pupils, but the headmasters reported that they tried to gain academic and social class mixes through the House system.  

---

7. The efficacy of the House system in achieving such a social mix is equivocal with Ford's (1969) and Blyth & Cooper's (1971) research offering different conclusions.
The 'integration' which the system attempted, then, had the dual features of integration to offset the influence of size, and integration to achieve a social mix.

The third notable point is the lack of controversy surrounding the House system as a welfare/administration unit in the debate. However, through the research it became evident that the manner in which the House system was used was highly controversial for teachers in the schools, (see chapters 10, 11.) and it was this latter aspect of the House system which proved seminal in understanding teaching in the two comprehensive schools.

The Common-Core Curriculum

The comprehensive school has also been distinguished (and criticized) in relation to the innovations of curricula and courses offered. The distinct feature of the comprehensive school curriculum is the attempt to delay internal selection by providing a common core of subjects in the period between 11-14 years of age, with the intention that later developing pupils should not be disqualified from more specialist courses at a later stage by their early growth rate.

This common-core curriculum was developed by the teachers involved in London's early comprehensive schools (1946-49) and was designed to cover the main subjects in any curriculum which all pupils would follow even if the standard of the course they followed did differ. A Labour Party pamphlet of 1951 (A policy for Secondary Education) specifies the common-core curriculum as essential to the idea "comprehensive".

The comprehensive school caters for all children through a system based on a central core of subjects common to all, from which branch classes in specialized subjects taken according to the desires, aptitudes and capacities of the children.

(Labour Party 1951, p.9)
At this time, the suggestion was for a "two year diagnostic period" after which pupils could be grouped by "curriculum patterns" or courses according to specific aptitudes, or could be setted in accord with ability at particular subjects. Less emphasis is now placed upon the period being diagnostic of "ability", and the choice by pupils in joining a "post-diagnostic" course is publicly held to be more important (see chapter 6). Neither is the two year period seen as long enough to prevent premature selection of pupils, and for instance, the I.L.E.A. (1967) reports that its common core curriculum was evident for three years. It has been estimated that of comprehensive schools in England and Wales 80.5% adopt a common-core curriculum in the first year with 48% still retaining this pattern in the third year. (Benn & Simon 1970).

The common-core curriculum has also tended to expand from a concern with just the "main" subjects to cover most of the curriculum, a point illustrated by the I.L.E.A. Report (1967) which included in the common course - English, Mathematics, Science, History, Geography, Art, Music Drama, Handicraft (for boys) Housecraft (for girls), Religious Instruction and Physical Education.

Notably absent from the common-core curriculum as listed in the I.L.E.A. Survey (1967, p.59) was mention of a second language, and it is the difficulty of teaching second languages as an integral part of a common-core curriculum which has provoked a large proportion of criticism, levelled at comprehensive development. (See chapter 7)

Bantock, for instance, writes:

The main aims behind the comprehensive philosophy (have) had specific implications for the content of education. There has first been the attempt to impose a common-core curriculum on all for the first one, two or three years. This has led to such monstrosities as the teaching of French (or German) to those who are barely literate in their own language.

(Bantock in Cox & Boyson (ed) 1975, p.17)
Ninety-seven per cent of all-through comprehensives offer a foreign language in the first year, (Benn & Simon (1970), but not all pupils in the schools in fact take the subject. Benn and Simon have argued that many of the schools in their survey which claimed to operate on the principle of a common-core curriculum did not have all the pupils taking the second language; only 43% of schools claiming such curricula had all pupils taking a second language in the first year it was offered, with 28% of such schools having less than three-quarters of their pupils studying a second language in the first year it was offered. It would appear that these latter schools have integrated the idea of a common-core curriculum with the idea of selection in connection with a second language, contra to other comprehensives for whom the teaching of a second language to all pupils is a matter of principle. Clearly, where the proportion of pupils not studying a second language exceeds 25%, the numbers cannot be due to a mode of selection as might operate through remedial grouping.

In other words, 28% of schools in which less than three-quarters of pupils studied a second language in the first year offered must, in large measure, have been actively selecting in relation to subject and not some specialist need of the pupil.

The common-core curriculum has provided a source of controversy in the debate, not only in the implications it has for changing the curriculum, but also for the specific problems it is seen to raise in connection with the possibility of teaching certain subjects in an all-ability situation. The common-core curriculum has been seen as unworkable in the teaching situation, and as exacerbating, if not responsible for, declining academic standards, truancy and discipline problems.
With rising dissatisfaction about many comprehensive schools it could be that the time is ripe to demand (and if necessary legislate for) the introduction of four distinct courses in each large comprehensive school while small comprehensive schools offered one or two courses. It is, with rare exceptions, the non-streamed common or no-curriculum comprehensive which creates most resentment, has the lowest academic standards and the greatest problems with truancy and violence. Comprehensive schools with strict and separate mini-school courses were what many of us first supported when we came out in favour of the comprehensive school and it is perhaps time we returned to this form of organization.

(Cox & Boyson 1975, p.5)

Despite anomalous uses of the term in some cases, 80.5% of all-through comprehensive schools have stated a commitment to the aims of the common-core curriculum which involve the delayed selection of pupils to allow for the individual rate of growth of the pupils. Opponents have argued that in so doing, the "bright" pupil is disadvantaged because certain subjects may not be available. 8

Mixed-Ability Teaching

The argument against the common-core curriculum then has been that to provide a curriculum suited to all pupils, certain subjects appropriate to "brighter" pupils may not be available (e.g. Latin). The common-core curriculum has been regarded as a "mixed-ability curriculum". Within that mixed-ability curriculum it is still possible, however, for the instruction of subjects in selective or non-selective groups such that in extreme example, streaming could exist even when a common-core curriculum is taught: the same subjects would be taught to pupils, but at different levels.

8. The Association of Assistant Masters reported in 1967 on the basis of a survey, that "where the school does not stream or set its pupils, Latin is unlikely to be taught."

(Benn & Simon 1970, p.146)
Controversy has been most furious, however, where the school combines a common-core curriculum with mixed-ability groups. The "common" element in the curriculum is seen to entail a levelling process akin to mixed-ability teaching which is intensified when combined with mixed-ability teaching. Both are regarded by opponents as entailing a "levelling down" of achievement in the school context.

There is no hard and fast rule about ability grouping in comprehensives. Non-ability grouping in terms of intake does not automatically lead to mixed-ability teaching units. In fact, the idea of "multilateral" schools epitomizes the use of ability-grouping within a school of "comprehensive intake". The London Plan of 1944 envisaged a system of comprehensive high schools, whereby secondary schools were to cater for a complete cross-section of the children of secondary school age (Griffiths 1971), but within which it was expected they should "stream like mad", reflecting the sentiments of Sir Graham Savage Chief Education Officer, as expressed in the previous decade. (R. Pedley 1969, p.93). The association between comprehensive schools and mixed-ability teaching groups has not been straightforward, with some advocating comprehensive re-organization, but not a lack of academic selection, (c f. Boyson). Comprehensive schools were not initially associated as such with a lack of ability grouping. Pedley (1954) wrote:

I agree with the great majority of my colleagues in comprehensive schools that children can make more progress if they are working with others of roughly similar ability and attainment.

(R. Pedley 1954, p.2)

Similarly, a report on London comprehensive schools in 1961 claimed that:

None of the schools bases its organization on the impracticable assumption that teaching groups covering the whole range of ability are suitable or desirable.

(L.C.C. 1961, p.32)
A parallel report by the I.L.E.A. just six years later, however, revealed a shift in tenor when indicating that, while setting was still widespread, schools such as Woodberry Down relied on mixed-ability for as much as one third of their teaching units. (I.L.E.A. 1967, p.62). So, prior to the issue of Circular 10/65, the comprehensive organization was not seen as entailing mixed-ability grouping as an essential element of its "comprehensiveness". This situation continues at present despite a growing disenchantment with multilateralism, and increased interest in mixed-ability teaching. Drawing on the research of Benn & Simon (1970 pp.146-153) it can be suggested that by 1968, 17.5% of all-through comprehensives (19.5% of all comprehensives) relied solely and entirely upon streaming even in the first year. 34.5% of all-through (31% of all) comprehensives, however, relied on a broader and perhaps "softer" version of streaming, the broad ability bands. Four per cent used sets (5.5% of all) and only 5% of all-through comprehensives (4% of all) were found to use mixed-ability groups for all subjects and pupils (1968). A special case may be argued for the remedial groups whose selective basis is deemed as positive discrimination to facilitate advance of learning; but even when such "ability grouping" is discounted, still only 14% (12% of all) of comprehensives rely on mixed-ability grouping even in the first year. By 1968, it would appear that, when those who use sets in no more than two subjects are classified as "mixed-ability" along with the others mentioned, still only 24% (22% of all) of comprehensives could be seen as using mixed-ability methods. Monks (1968) indicated that after the first year, only one third of all the schools had any mixed-ability groups at all, and that streaming was practised by 40% of schools in the first year. Fifty per cent in the
second and third and 34% in the fourth years. Thirty per cent of schools used setting in the first year, rising to 55% in the third and fourth.

The opponents of comprehensive re-organization have tended to associate the re-organization with moves away from the streaming of pupils toward the use of mixed-ability groups. The possibility that banding and setting are intermediary stages in such a transition is posed by Benn and Simon; their figures, however, cannot offer positive guidance on such an hypothesis.

The use of streams within comprehensive schools, as envisaged in multilateral schools is far from absent in comprehensive schools, and yet it is its absence which has provoked criticisms in the debate. The debate over ability-grouping has received coverage, notably in the Black Paper I, II and III (1969-1970) and Rubenstein and Stoneman’s "Education for Democracy" (1970) which, whilst not overtly intended as a reply to the Black Papers, provided a timely rejoinder. The Black Papers gave a critique of progressive, non-selective and egalitarian trends in education, the feasibility of non-selective, mixed-ability teaching being an important aspect.

There has been an increasing association, then, of "comprehensive" with not only "all-ability" schools, but mixed-ability" organization, yet from the available data it would appear that such associations are more a factor of the debate than any reflection of the actual situation in comprehensive schools. It is the prospect of non-selection rather than its actuality which underlies this aspect of the debate.
Staffing and Comprehensives

The quality of teaching associated with comprehensives has faced criticism in connection with the experience and turnover of staff at such schools. Monks (1968) found that the turnover of staff in the comprehensives was fairly constant at 12% per annum for male and 20% per annum for female teachers (30% and 25% respectively for part-time staff) and this study also provided information as to the marital status, position in the school hierarchy and graduate/non-graduate status of the teachers. These latter factors have proved to be less consequential for the debate than the length of time staff were staying at any school.

It was not the qualifications or the background of the members of staff so much as the length of time they had spent at their present school, which has been controversial. Monks found that about 20% of all the teachers had had no previous teaching experience - a figure which is acknowledged to be flattering because a number of teachers included their teaching-practice as "previous experience". A further 40% of the teachers were found to have had one year or less than one years experience in their present school. The explanation was proffered that this was due to the rapid expansion policy in comprehensive schools, and the fact that young teachers might wish to "try out" different types of school.

The turnover of staff, and the proportion of young and inexperienced teachers in large city schools, notably London comprehensives, has become a major concern. These schools have suffered from a large turnover of staff and a staff shortage such that part-time schooling had to be introduced to parts of London at the beginning of the session 1973/4. The shortage of teachers willing to work in London at that time led to the employment of probationary teachers on a scale not experienced outside the metropolis. These large proportions of young and inexperienced teachers were not, however, staying at the schools. Two reasons were given.
Advocates of comprehensive re-organization pointed to the cost of housing in London, for instance, which had the effect of forcing teachers with families to look for housing and employment outside the inner cities. This housing situation favoured the young and/or single teacher who was prepared to use rented accommodation and it has been regarded as a factor contributing (a) to the presence of relatively large proportions of young and inexperienced staff in the schools, and (b) toward the associated high turnover of staff. As Miles and Skipworth put the point on the basis of their research:

Since experience in the current school contributed largely to the measure of the teacher's total experience this variable is to a large extent also the obverse of staff turnover. The loading of staff turnover on the opposite side from Staff Experience could also mean that turnover is greatest among young teachers. It would seem that the strongest and most consistent aspect of the factor is bad housing and overcrowding.

(Miles & Skipworth 1973, p.95)

Opponents of comprehensivization, on the other hand, have seen this turnover of staff and inexperience of staff, as indicative of a comprehensive "malaise". Teachers, they claim, are leaving London at an early stage because the situation, associated primarily with London comprehensives, is intolerable. John Fairhall of the Guardian, for instance, reporting on the "crisis" in London schools commented:

Typical again was a group of young teachers who virtually all said they were disillusioned with teaching in London secondary school, and could not do the job they were trained for because of the lack of discipline in the schools. Nine out of ten said they would leave the London service at the end of their probationary year. The worst admission was that none were prepared to put in a personal complaint about their school - because it would blight their promotion prospects. How on earth did the London schools, that were once the goal of young teachers, reach this state?"

(Guardian January 1974)

(quoted in Cox & Boyson 1975, p.62)
Advocates and opponents of comprehensive re-organization concur in regarding high rates of staff turnover and large proportions of young and inexperienced staff as a problem. They differ, however, in that the advocates locate the cause of the problem outside the school organization and the commitment of teachers, whilst those opposing re-organization have generally argued that the problem is symptomatic of the nature of comprehensive organization and the teachers employed in such schools. The debate has consequently focused in some depth on the quality of the teachers in comprehensive schools. It has been argued, for instance, that there is a tendency for comprehensives to attract left-wing and non-authoritarian teachers and that to succeed a teacher in such a school needs to be left-wing. Comprehensives some opponents claim, are being used for social engineering not only in terms of the equal chance they offer but more significantly in terms of "indoctrination" received at such schools.

The association of left-wing egalitarian policies with the comprehensive aims has been recognized by both conservative and socialist alike, and it would seem reasonable that a person with egalitarian and non-authoritarian political attitudes would tend to prefer a school situation sympathetic to these views. A more serious accusation is one illustrated by a letter to the Sunday Times which alims:

Those of us committed to secondary education as a career can by now see that a major objective of the comprehensive movement is to ensure political conformity among teachers, at least at more senior levels. This is being effected by the manipulation of the word "comprehensive" so that it ceases merely to be name of a kind of school, and becomes instead a set of social purposes to which only left-wing motivated teachers can subscribe.

(S.C. Woodley: Sunday Times 16.2.75)
This alleged left-orientation of staff in comprehensive schools has also been seen as leading to particular types of teaching causing subversive, radical pupils; subversive in both moral and political senses. A rather extreme illustration of this is given in a report in the Leicester Mercury. In Leicestershire, perhaps one of the most widely acclaimed areas in terms of the development of comprehensive education, press coverage of the schooling exhibits a continuing anxiety. At 'Hrake Valley in Leicestershire a minority rebel group from the parents association got much publicity over their grievances concerning the school. Led by a Conservative representative on Syston Council, they listed their dissatisfactions in a manner which integrated a fear of political "subversion" with a fear of falling standards of educational achievement and discipline:

Widespread disquiet and anxiety in the school catchment area. Complete lack of discipline and self-discipline in pupils and staff. Unpunctuality and absenteeism rife among staff and pupils. The medical profession are worried by the psychological strain freedoms are placing on children. Philosophies at the school are causing friction in homes where they often completely oppose parental standards. Lack of concentration on the three R’s. Insufficient emphasis on examinations or any form of competition. Too much familiarity between staff and students, including use of Christian names. Acceptance of smoking and bad language by the staff. Left-wing "revolutionary" orientated teaching. Insufficient supervision of out-of-school work, with children using time to commit crime.

Staffing at comprehensive schools is of interest then in two ways, (a) in terms of the experience and turnover of staff and (b) in the political and pedagogic leanings of the teachers. The nature of staff at comprehensives had not been regarded as an essential element in the designation of a school as "comprehensive" although opponents of reorganization have claimed that comprehensives encourage if not require
an orientation to teaching which is non-authoritarian, left-biased, etc. and which may account for the "malaise" in these schools and the subsequently high turnover of staff (c.f. Gloria Stewart: Daily Mail 13.3.72).

The Comparison of Results: Academic Achievement

To recap, the debate over comprehensive re-organization has so far been considered in terms of the organization of the schools and in terms of the co-existence of grammar and comprehensive systems (in terms of the intake to the schools). In so doing, certain aspects of comprehensive organization and intake have been identified as controversial and substantial to the debate, notably:

- "creaming" and the balance of intake,
- 11/18 all-through or two-tier systems,
- split-site schools,
- size: number of pupils,
- the common-core curriculum,
- the position of mixed-ability teaching,
- staff turnover, experience and ideology.

Another area of the debate which can be identified revolves around the comparison of results which co-existence affords - a comparison largely based on examination criteria.

Comprehensive schools have been criticized for failing to produce the academic standards associated with tri-partism. Opponents of re-organization have variously argued that the comprehensive schools:

(a) exhibit falling standards of G.C.E. passes

(b) fail to provide suitable education for the gifted pupil, and
(c) fail to concentrate on providing "basic" education appropriate to the "less-gifted" - the three R's.

These claims are supported with reference to figures which generally tend to compare the examination success rates of pupils in comprehensive schools with those in the grammar sector of tripartism. Figures are produced to support or refute claims by both sides of the debate, and no outright conclusions are available to prove the correctness of either.

It is not the present purpose to consider the validity of claims, however, but to note what the claims involve as controversial issues in comprehensive re-organization. It is necessary, therefore, to look at the criticisms, comparisons and retorts surrounding the academic standards in comprehensive schools.

The Black Papers (1) have offered a wealth of critical material on trends in comprehensive and progressive education, and within "The Crisis in Education", R.R. Pedley develops a theme which is referred back to in the other three Black Paper issues. His argument is that the comprehensive school is less academically successful, and that this is acknowledged by parents who, if they had the choice, would prefer their children to go to schools which "achieve academic excellence".

The latest statistics from the D.E.S. show that of the leavers from all boys' schools in 1966-67, 7.8% went on to universities while only 4% of comprehensive leavers did so. 13.3% of comprehensive school leavers gained five 'O' level passes while the proportion of all school leavers gaining five passes was 21.3%.

The figures continue for a time before the statement:

"We all know that the comprehensive apologists say to this - the comprehensive schools don't have a fair crack of the whip - retention of selective schools means that clever children are creamed away. I reply: (a) it is absurd to destroy the schools which do achieve academic excellence, and (b) that if parents believed that"
comprehensive schools could fully and properly look after their academically bright children, they would not strain every nerve to send these children elsewhere.

(R.R. Pedley in Cox & Boyson (eds) 1968, p.83)

Similar criticisms of the academic standards, particularly oriented to the "high flyers" are voiced by Arthur Pollard in Black Papers II, John Todd in Black Papers III and by both Fred Naylor and C.E. Cox in the Black Papers 1975. Baldwin's (1975, ) attempt to assess the relative success and failure of comprehensive and grammar schools similarly uses examination results to compare achievement in the two types of school. Though he acknowledges the problem of co-existence Baldwin proceeds to compare results. Travers (1976) argues in response, that:

It is impossible to compare the results of the comprehensives with those of the schools they replace. How can one compare the results of schools with schools which no longer exist? The error is vital.

(Travers 1976, p.14)

His point is that schools have distinct identities and problems and that any comparison of results cannot take account of such problems. This, however, does not deter him from re-estimating examination results to conclude that:

On the evidence it is a certainty that comprehensives are not lowering standards or causing any fall in examination rates.

(Travers 1976, p.19)

Neave (1975) similarly argues that comprehensives may not be detrimental to examination success.
The effects of creaming of ability throws doubt on the validity of any direct comparison between the academic results of obtained from the two sectors. Yet it is more than just the creaming of ability which has adverse effects on comparisons. Robin Pedley has argued that a comparison of figures based on comprehensive schools which had not been completed for seven years would not reflect adequately the true effects of all-through comprehensive education. In both editions of the "Comprehensive School" (1963, 1969) he has attempted to get figures on academic achievement from comprehensive schools which (a) had existed for at least seven years, and (b) which had as little creaming of ability as possible. In this manner his figures were intended to accurately reflect the outcome of "full" comprehensive education. It is on the figures from these schools that it has been claimed that academic standards are rising with comprehensive education (Pedley, 1969, Benn & Simon 1970). The Black Papers, however, saw this selection of schools to be studied as an attempt to distort the facts, and Pedley's figures were dismissed as "biased" on premises which misunderstood what Pedley was doing. (See John Todd: "Black Papers" III 1970, also C.B. Cox: "Black Papers" 1975).

One of the major problems with comparisons of academic achievement has been, then, to gather figures from "truly" comprehensive schools - ones which have no creaming, and all of whose pupils have been in a comprehensive system for all of their secondary school career. Robin Pedley's earlier research (1963) and that of the N.F.E.R. (1965) were affected particularly by this problem, given the proportionately small numbers of comprehensive schools prior to the rapid expansion after 1965.

A further problem with such comparisons is that they fail to take account of the change of policy which led to the secondary modern schools also taking 'O' level examinations. That is, comparisons between comprehensive schools and grammar schools perhaps act in favour of
grammar school results because they do not include the results of
the secondary modern school which forms part of the commensurate "unit"
of education. Davis (1967, pp. 130-141) noted that for instance, Robin
Pedley's figures from the 1963 edition were in a period prior to the
policy change, and could not therefore be seen as an authentic reflect-
on of the situation some four years after publication. He argued, in
fact, that results between comprehensive and secondary modern schools
in London were not significantly different in 1965. Davis' point
somewhat reverses the problems hitherto noted with comparison by directing
attention to the "purity" of tripartite results, rather than "comprehensive"
results.

Yet there is a core of agreement underlying the attempts to assess
the comparative academic achievements of the tripartite and comprehensive
sectors: it is that examination results (G.C.E., C.S.E., etc.) provide a
justifiable index of academic "standards" upon which to base comparisons.
Robin Pedley argues that:

One of the ways in which the success or failure of comprehensive schools can be judged objectively is by their record in the General Certificate of Education. Parents are naturally anxious but re-organizations of secondary schools on comprehensive lines will mean lower academic achievement by their children.

(Robin Pedley 1963, p. 105)

This assumption may stem from the practicalities of a research programme
designed to assess relative achievement of different systems of education,
- it may indeed be the only viable form of comparison. It suffers,
however, from its inability to consider the "facts", (the G.C.E.) as a
socially organized phenomenon. In treating the G.C.E. results as an
expression of "fact" about academic standards at the respective schools,
it fails to take account of (a) the policies for entry of pupils to public examination at different types of school, and (b) the philosophies of education adopted in these types of schools.

Julienne Ford takes up the issue over policies of entry to public examinations. She first makes the point that G.C.E. results are no real measure upon which to base a study of "talent" because they measure but one aspect of talent. But even if they were justifiable as a measure of "talent", the differing entry policies might invalidate any direct comparison:

The comprehensive schools, she writes, might be entering as many children as possible for G.C.E. in order to maximise the absolute number of G.C.E. results obtained...

(Ford, 1969, p.24)

Benn & Simon re-iterate the point, noting that

the steady rise in the actual numbers of pupils both sitting for, and gaining, passes at all levels in G.C.E. and C.S.E. ... shows that the opening up of the examination system to a larger section of the pupil population ... may well result in a steep growth in the numbers of pupils in the country achieving examination success.

(Benn & Simon 1970, p.82)

The policy of comprehensives, that is, is to present for examination more than the pupils representative of the top 25% of ability as operated in the tripartite sector (prior to the policy shift which allowed secondary modern schools to present students for G.C.E. examinations). The more that attempt examinations the more that pass; but similarly, the more that attempt examinations, the higher the proportion of failures might be.

9. "D.E.S. Statistics" (1967, p.41) indicate that 32% of comprehensive school and 34% of grammar school pupils are entered for public examinations.
especially where the extra numbers are derived from the lower ability range. The comparison of examination results will be affected, then, by the policies adopted by the schools.

Advocates of comprehensive re-organization have tended to stress the absolute numbers of passes, or permutation of such figures, whilst opponents have stressed the percentage of passes - the pass rate - both for the purposes of their argument.

A comparison of the results of schooling, if it is to be scientifically valid, should also use some idea of comparable groups. The results obtained from an inner city, working-class comprehensive that is, will likely differ from that of a "middle-class" grammar school for reasons other than the organization of the school per se. It would be inaccurate to attribute any observed differences in results to the nature of comprehensive education. In considering the possibilities of comparison and G.C.E. results, Ford specifies just what features would need to be controlled for in any valid research:

.... in order for valid comparisons between comprehensive and tripartite schools to be made, it would be necessary to hold constant I.Q. and social class as well as the examination policies of the schools.

(Ford 1969, p. 24)

However, the present purpose is not to assess the validity of the respective figures but to note the areas of controversy involved in the debate. It is clear that in the debate over the standards of examination results, the differing philosophies of the schools are a crucial factor. This difference between the types of education has been regarded as more fundamental than philosophies of examination entry - and has included claims (illustrated above) of a left-wing political orientation of teachers and teaching in the schools. Those opposed to re-organization
have tended, further, to associate the term "comprehensive" with
progressive teaching methods. Whilst recognizing that comprehensive
organization need not essentially include progressive methods (c f.
Boyson 1974) it has been a feature of the debate that those criticisms
levelled at progressive methods have been seen as particularly relevant
to comprehensive schools because these schools are regarded as more
likely to incorporate progressive methods than are the tripartite schools.

The Black Papers, the most concerted expression of "traditionalism"
in education, exhibit this association of "progressive" and "comprehensive"
schooling. Black Paper I was devoted more single-mindedly to "progressive"
trends, but the Black Papers II, III and '1973' explicitly relate to not
only "progressive" but to "non-selective" and "egalitarian" aims as well.
So, whilst comprehensive re-organization, per se, does not necessitate
moves to "progressive" education it is recognized in the debate as
providing for, and promoting an ethos of "progressivism" through the
shared ethos of non-competitiveness and non-selection.

Non-selection and non-competitiveness are key associations: to the
extent that the comprehensive ideal of non-selection is seen to incorporate
ideals of non-competitiveness, there will be a lessening of emphasis on
contest in the classroom, less examination orientation, more use of group
co-operative teaching methods and associated inter-disciplinary and project
methods associated with the post Plowden era. It is this view of
comprehensives which led Max Wilkinson, a strong opponent of re-organization
to claim that "pupils need competition not more comprehensives". (Daily
Hail 21.4.75)

The schools' examination policies may reflect this wider ethos
of the schools - their educational philosophies. And these philosophies
may themselves deter comparison of what is being attempted within the
schools.
This orientation of the comprehensive school away from selection and competition also reflects the social/political aims attributable to comprehensives. The comprehensive school is regarded by both its advocates and opponents as involving some social engineering; it has social as well as educational pretentions. Banks (1955) cites G.D.H. Cole as giving one of "the most clear sighted discussions of social or political as distinct from the educational aims of the comprehensive school." (Banks 1955, p.136 emphasis added). Cole says

> It has to be designed so as to give every child its chance, but at the same time to avoid the creation of a new class structure based on differences of ability .... This can only be done if there is a foundation of common schooling at the primary stage followed up by some form of comprehensive secondary school in which differences of curriculum and standard in the classroom are combined with equal participation on the playgrounds, in the clubs and societies and in any sort of out-of-school activity.


The aim of the comprehensive school has been seen as promoting social equality by offsetting the tendencies to divisiveness found in tripartism, (Ford 1969) and is consciously a school with egalitarian philosophies. These social philosophies when translated into pedagogic practice may involve the school in an emphasis on factors other than academic achievement. Hunter Davies, reporting on Creighton School in Haringay, North London, noted that in the school:

> The pupil is now forced, more-or-less, to express himself to choose or not to choose, to make the school fit him rather than to be fitted to the school. Equality and the rights of the individual are what matter most.

(Sunday Times: 9.2.75 - emphasis added)
The comprehensive school reflects a child-centred ethos under the auspices of its social egalitarianism. And this "fitting of the control to the pupil" to the extent that it is found in practice, may affect the degree to which a school is solely or primarily concerned with the production of "talent" in the form of examination success. In other words, to the extent that comprehensive schools do not place as much emphasis on examination success as the grammar school part of tripartism, comparisons may not provide valid assessments of the "success or failure" of a school.

The philosophies of tripartism and comprehensive can, rather crudely, be summarised thus: for tripartism, meritocratic ideals stress equality of opportunity permitting the ablest to excel whilst providing basic education for the rest; for comprehensives, egalitarian ideals stressing equality of social and educational provision allowing the most possible students to "succeed". Opponents of comprehensive reorganization have seized on this latter philosophy, interpreting it as "mediocrity" in replacement for meritocracy. Bantock expresses the case for the opponents thus:

In essence we have here the fundamental social argument in favour of comprehensive schooling - its putative power as an instrument of social cohesion and even control. A powerful element in the comprehensive lobby sees it as a vehicle of social justice and as a means of doing away with what is regarded as a damaging "divisiveness" in our society. For such people equality of opportunity is not enough - we should seek (if necessary) by 'positive discrimination' in favour of the under-achiever equality of outcome.

(G.H. Bantock, in Cox & Boyson (eds) 1975, p.15)

10. Daunt (1975) argues that comprehensives should be operating on the principle of equality of value rather than equality of opportunity.
The opponents of re-organization have claimed then, that the social/political aims of comprehensives have involved the attempt to equalize the academic achievement of the pupils by favouring the "under-achiever" and effectively discriminating against the "high-fliers". This positive discrimination in terms of the "under-achiever" they regard as antithetical to the espoused social aims of equality.

It is one of the most grotesque ironies of our times that a Labour Government claiming a particular interest in the needs of the poor and lowly as well as a special concern for high national standards in work, and living, should have determined a policy for secondary education which will beyond a doubt lead to a decline in standards and a reduction in the opportunities open to able children - from whatever social background they come. I am particularly concerned here with the able minority for it is on the talented that national welfare ultimately depends. The best way to help the lame duck is to apply intelligence as well as sensibility to his problems and if those gifted with these qualities - the high fliers - are neglected, the country will be irretrievably impoverished (I'm not thinking just of money) and it will be the lame ducks who will suffer most.

For the notion that talented children are as well catered for in all-ability schools as in schools especially created and operated for them is so much moonshine.

(R.R. Pedley: Black Paper I, p.45)

The comprehensive school is seen to fail in its social policy because it penalizes the "high-fliers", and in fact does not promote social equality. Meritocratic principles underlie such claims, illustrated by Boyson's comments in the Guardian (19.6.75) that:

What most parents want is that their children should climb one step. The grammar schools have been called divisive but they created a form of social mobility far greater than we've seen before or than we have now.

"Egalitarian" aims, it is claimed, are not being fulfilled by non-selective education. To prevent access by pupils of high-ability to special schools is not effecting social change.
The opponents of re-organization have not only questioned the comprehensive school's capacity to deal with high ability pupils but have also claimed that there is a general decline in standards of education which, though primarily attributed to progressive methods, have involved comprehensive re-organization as an integral aspect of new trends in education. Boyson (1975b) for instance, claims that standards of reading, spelling, and arithmetic are lower than they were fifty-five years ago and accords with Froome.

who blamed the decline in literacy on reading readiness, the stress on creativity instead of discipline, and the discovery method.

(Boyson 1975b, p.9)

It is claimed, then, that the "average" pupil is not now attaining standards of literacy associated with tripartism. Cox and Dyson emphasise the point by quoting Dolores Moore of the Mail (28.10.68) as having written:

Read the numbers published now and then of illiterate school leavers each year. (...) Look at the standards of reading books. It is generally low. Sometimes very low.

(Cox & Dyson: Black Papers I, p.6)

Comprehensive re-organization and progressive teaching methods are controversial as a result of the allegation that they are detrimental to academic achievement in comparison with tripartism and traditional methods. Comprehensives and progressive methods are accused of (a) holding back the high-ability pupils and (b) promoting generally lower standards of education, and in particular, literacy.
The Comparison of Results: Behaviour

The debate over the re-organization of secondary education has not been restricted to the "academic" "pros" and "cons" of such changes. In the popular debate, the comprehensive school has repeatedly been associated with falling standards of behaviour and discipline, a subject notably lacking the major studies into the operation of comprehensive schools (cf. Benn & Simon 1970, Ross et al 1972, Monks 1968).

The Press and T.V. have perhaps found the noise, truancy, indiscipline, disrespect, violence and vandalism a more newsworthy topic than the academic standards, and have devoted a great deal of space to exposing the problems. Max Wilkinson, for instance, has not based his criticisms on academic achievement alone; behaviour is also seen to exhibit falling standards:

The evidence is now that comprehensives are failing on this count, even more disastrously than on academic standards. A recent Government report called "Looking Forward to Employment" showed that 16 year olds leaving comprehensives were more bored, discontented, less happy and more likely to play truant than their counterparts in the old secondary moderns.

These are children who were supposed to benefit most from the comprehensive revolution - yet a staggering 25% of them regularly play truant.


These trends are seen to reflect two main factors (a) the comprehensive re-organization and its effects on teachers and pupils, and (b) general trends toward disrespect for authority in society.
The re-organization of education has been criticised as leaving teachers in a position without real guidelines as to their authority, and as providing schools which are too large and impersonal.

In the Guardian, Janet Watts wrote that:

The school teacher has lost confidence because he is no longer sure about what he is supposed to be doing. Such uncertainty is mercilessly exposed and expressed in the discipline and lack of discipline in our schools.

(Janet Watts: Guardian 4.10.74)

Those sympathetic to re-organization have tended to stress that the increase in general violent behaviour, particularly in London comprehensives owes much to the trends in society as a whole. The cultural environment, that is, has been used to explain these apparent and undesirable movements. Watts' articles (3-4.10.74) raise the point that, though exceptional cases of violent schools can be explained in terms of the neighbourhood, if the violence is seen to be becoming a general trend then the explanation may be in the school and the teachers, rather than the environment.

The cases of school violence, truancy, juvenile hooliganism and criminality we keep hearing about may well be the work of a minority in underprivileged areas in the big conurbations; but - we might still ask - what is the normal situation in schools that can erupt into these abnormalities? Could they be rather the tip of an iceberg - the iceberg of a failing situation in the country's classrooms? And could that iceberg be floating nearer to us every day?

(Janet Watts, Guardian 3.10.74)

Could it be that what had previously been seen as a situation specific to "rough neighbourhoods" is now becoming general, for if it is, then the neighbourhood would no longer seem to offer a viable explanation of these "floutings of authority" by school-children? It is this reasoning
which characterises the explanations preferred by opponents of re-organization who are effectively saying that the demise of certain schools is not accounted for in terms of cultural deprivation, as much as the organization and ethos of the school itself. Stuart Froome wrote that:

During the past decade, as complaints of declining truancy, bad behaviour and violence in schools have been given much publicity, it has become customary to attribute these failings to the effect of children living in inner-city areas where the housing is poor, facilities are sparse and the neighbourhood is termed "deprived". (...) However, before attributing all our schooling ills in such localities to social deprivation, it might be prudent to consider if there are other factors in some of the schools themselves which have contributed to increased juvenile delinquency, truancy and declining standards of scholastic achievements. I believe there are.

(Froome, in Cox & Boyson (eds) 1975) p.70

The general conclusion of the Black Paper contributors is that the failing of schooling at present is attributable to the schools themselves, and specifically the comprehensive schools. The editors summarise the feelings:

Inability to read arises from bad teaching or bad classroom discipline not from deprived home backgrounds.

(Cox & Boyson 1975, pp.3-4)

The public debate has significantly shown little sign of denial that standards of behaviour in large, urban comprehensive schools, have given cause for concern. It is the accounts of the phenomenon which differ: the opponents locating the problem within the school; advocates pointing to the social circumstances of the time. There have been attempts to discern "what really goes on within such schools". (Davies Sunday Times, January/February 1975, Tweedie Guardian 9.12.74; Stewart, Daily Mail 13-17.3.72)
Gloria Stewart (Daily Mail 16.3.72) explains that:

Comprehensive schools are a controversial issue. They are being introduced into this country - in some cases against great opposition - at a time when many educational experts admit that they have been a failure in other English-speaking countries (...) I went to Eliot to report in the public interest. I was in a unique position to do so because I am a fully trained teacher and had taught before I began to earn my living as a writer. I know how schools are run. I can tell if they are working well. I know the ins and outs of crumbling discipline and the effects of this on teaching.

The very title of her report - "Chaos in the Comprehensive Schools" - shows the anxiety felt in sectors of the press and television over the state of education in the comprehensive schools.

The comprehensive malaise is attributed by Stewart not to the environment but to (a) the lack of respect for authority by pupils, which she identifies as owing much to (b) the "staff malaise".

The lack of respect for (teacher) authority is illustrated by one of many examples offered by Stewart:

A boy of 14, hair long round his collar, said of his school: 'They shove yer around too much. My dad don't fink it's right!' I said to him: You must realise that at school you must do as you are told. 'You've got it wrong, you have' was his astonishing reply.

(Stewart, Daily Mail 15.3.72)

The pupils' lack of respect for teacher authority was identified by Stewart as being due to the teachers' attitudes:

By the beginning of my third week incognito at Eliot Comprehensive School, I had pinpointed what was going wrong in many of today's big schools: it was a staff malaise.

The way the system is, teachers fundamentally discontented with pay, conditions, and their poor status in society, are not really encouraged to pull their full weight.

Hard working conscientious members of staff get swamped by the sheer numbers in the school. (...)

Truancy, absenteeism, lateness in schools are especially affected by this "withdrawal" by today's teachers.

(Stewart, Daily Mail 15.3.75)
Jill Tweedie writing in the Guardian has offered a more sympathetic appraisal in which the "withdrawal" of teachers is explained by the intolerable conditions in which they are supposed to teach, the noise and disruption, the situation being considered more as a social than educational malaise:

My eyeballs are gritty and swollen. My head rings like a gong. I am jumpy and irritable, my stomach curdles with indigestable emotions. I have spent the day at a large London comprehensive school. (...)

No child, however interested, however intelligent, could hope to learn anything in this bedlam. No teacher, however dedicated, could hope to teach anything. (...)

The devotion of the teachers (if they last the pace and many of the new ones do not) is absolute beyond any call of duty, however well paid. To an outsider, the children may appear large, fat, frightening urchins, foul-mouthed and foul-tempered. To the teachers they are vulnerable little humans, at war with themselves and the world. In and out of the parents' homes, they know intimately the divorce cases, the beatings, the good homes and the bad, the strains and the stresses, the brothers and the sisters, yea unto the third generation.

(Tweedie, Guardian 9.12.74)

A vastly different picture is painted between two London comprehensive schools, one in which the teachers' attitudes are responsible in large extent for the indiscipline, violence and truancy, and the other in which the dedication of staff is exemplary in face of the difficulties they face as a result of the social backgrounds of the pupils. In either case, the role of the teacher has been seen to be of significance to the operation of the education system, a significance of direct concern to the debate. Point three of the "Black Paper Basics" is that:

It is the quality of teachers which matters, rather than their numbers or their equipment. We have sacrificed quality for numbers, and the result has been a lowering of standards. We need high-quality, higher-paid teachers in the classroom, not as counsellors or administrators.

(Cox & Boyson 1975, p.1)
Advocates and opponents of comprehensive re-organization offer, then, differing explanations of the genesis of violence and indiscipline in the schools. Both, however, pinpoint the crucial importance of the quality of teaching to the operation of the schools.

Summary & Conclusion

The re-organization of secondary education along comprehensive lines has been a gradual process. This process of educational reform can be attributed to the influence of political affiliation to comprehensive education and the relationship between central government and local authorities. The effect of the gradual transition to comprehensive education has been to allow for the co-existence of tripartism and comprehensives within the maintained sector of secondary education - a co-existence which in light of Conservative Party policy may not prove to be so much a temporary phase as a permanent feature.

This co-existence following the issue of Circular 10/65 has facilitated comparisons of the relative virtues and failings of comprehensives and tripartism, and it is the comparison of the types of educational organization which has provided most of the fuel for what has been termed "the Great Debate".

The controversial aspects of comprehensive re-organization become apparent through the debate - a debate which has been conducted at both a political/social and educational level. Three areas of controversy have been identifiable. The first concerned the principles of the intake to the schools, and the basis upon which a school could be deemed a genuine comprehensive. Co-existence of grammar schools with "comprehensives"
was problematic to the extent that it threatened the academic and social balance of the intake to the comprehensives. The organization of the comprehensive school provided a second area of controversy. Certain aspects of comprehensives became the focus of critical attention by those opposed to re-organization, such as split-site arrangements, large numbers of pupils, common-core curriculum, mixed-ability teaching.

A third aspect of the debate was the academic and behavioural results associated with comprehensives. Opponents of re-organization have claimed that comprehensive organization is responsible for a failure to provide for high ability pupils, a falling of general standards of education, and poor standards of behaviour in the school.

The quality of teaching in comprehensive schools has been questioned by those who would wish to retain selective schools. In terms of both their organization and results comprehensive schools have been criticized for their high turnovers of staff, unacceptably high proportions of young and inexperienced teachers, left-wing political ideology of staff and the use of progressive methods. These factors have been associated with a "teacher malaise" characteristic of comprehensive schools and used to explain the alleged failings of comprehensive schools by those opposed to re-organization.

Any attempt to assess the validity of such claims requires a study of teaching in comprehensive schools - not necessarily with the ambition of support or negation, but in the attempt to provide an academic contribution to this significant contemporary social issue. The research needs to be oriented to the practice of teaching (what actually occurs) particularly with reference to the influence of the organization of the
comprehensive school on that practice of teaching. 11

Those studies which have focused on the school processes have tended to look specifically at the effects on pupils (Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970, Ford 1969, Banks and Finlayson 1973) and have not attempted to relate, in any sense, comprehensive organization to the practice of teaching. The journalistic reports that have appeared (Tweedie, Stewart, Davies op cit) have recognized some of the associations between the organization of a comprehensive school and teaching within such a school, yet their accounts have not offered any systematic analysis of the association. It is necessary, then, to develop a sociologically viable method of relating teaching to the organization of the comprehensive school. It is also necessary that schools be chosen for research that be of relevance to the debate about re-organization - that should exhibit many of the structural intake and organizational features noted as controversial through the debate.

11. For considerations of teaching and comprehensive school see Biggin, Coast and Stanfield (1966) and Incorporated Association of Assistant MASTERS (1960), the latter pointing out that:

What is printed and available (on comprehensive schools) says very little about that very important person, the man who walks into a classroom of a comprehensive school, takes charge and directs the activity that we call learning. (op cit. p.8)
CHAPTER II

Profile of the Schools: and their relevance to the debate.
The choice of schools for the research was based on an attempt to locate arenas in which it could be reasonably expected that patterns of (teaching) behaviour would exhibit the "malaise" which opponents of re-organization had alleged. To study the relationship between teaching and comprehensive organization in a manner which may be of some relevance to the re-organization debate it is necessary to study teaching in a context which the debate has recognized as pertinent to discussions about the standards associable with those schools.

Two schools were chosen because whilst allowing study in depth, they could possibly provide a contrast of organization within the terms "comprehensive" and could at the same time act as a check against the possibility that the school being studied was too unusual to offer informative suggestions about other comprehensives.

Hargreaves et al (1975) reached a similar conclusion for their study: they comment, -

We preferred to work in two schools rather than one, since this would reduce the demands that we would inevitably make on a school and would prevent the collection of data which might be regarded as idiosyncratic to that institution.

(Hargreaves et al 1975, p.30)

The schools in the research did not conform, however, to ideal-type or even extreme cases of such schools. They were chosen as being appropriate examples which incorporated debatable aspects of re-organization outlined in Chapter I.
London Schools

London comprehensives have been the subject of criticism to an extent far beyond that warranted by the size of the I.L.E.A. Press Reports (Stewart, Tweedie, Davies op cit), headmasters' accounts (Boyson 1974, Chetwynd 1960, Simmons 1969) and research on these schools have tended to concentrate on this particular urban area. It was the amount of attention directed toward these schools, and the extent of adverse coverage received by these schools, which made it appropriate to conduct research within the Greater London area.
Nature of the Intake (academic mix)

The gradual re-organization of secondary education and the subsequent co-existence of comprehensive and grammar schools has led to controversy about the nature of the intake to comprehensive schools and its effect upon the operation of the school. The "creaming" of high-ability pupils by grammar schools has been acknowledged by both opponents and advocates of re-organization - the former regarding it as symptomatic of the comprehensive school's failure to provide for the "high-fliers" the latter seeing it as a cause of some of the problems experienced with comprehensive re-organization. Schools appropriate for study, then, should preferably have intakes of academic ability below that of England and Wales as a whole. They should receive, that is, an ability range which under-represents the high ability pupils. The co-existence of grammar schools provides a prima facie case for expecting such a low-ability intake. The choice of schools in London might not appear appropriate at first sight on this point because, for instance, the G.L.C. did not appear to have any marked contrast with the whole of England and Wales in terms of co-existence in 1972.¹ (See Tables 2. and 3. )


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G.L.C.</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>258 (335) *</td>
<td>1,591 (2,273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>130 (105)</td>
<td>893 (675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Modern</td>
<td>182 (126)</td>
<td>2,218 (1,509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (including &quot;Middle deemed secondary&quot;)</td>
<td>89 (45)</td>
<td>410 (218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>659 (611)</td>
<td>5,212 (4,675)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹. To retain the authenticity of the argument for the choice of schools the figures referred to in the text are those appropriate at the initial stages of research.
Table 3. Percentage of pupils attending the following type of school in 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>G.L.C.</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Modern</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(extracted from D.E.S. (1973 and 1975) op cit.)

* 1974 figures in brackets.

In the initial stages of research there appeared to be little disparity between the G.L.C. and the rest of England and Wales in the proportion of pupils attending comprehensive schools. When the co-existence is considered in terms of the I.L.E.A. and the Outer London Boroughs separately, however, a marked difference becomes observable. (Table 4.)

Table 4. Percentage of pupils attending the following type of school in 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>I.L.E.A.</th>
<th>BRENT</th>
<th>HARROW</th>
<th>NEWHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Modern</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(extracted from D.E.S. (1973 and 1975) op cit.)

* 1974 figures in brackets
** includes middle schools deemed secondary.

The I.L.E.A. has had a history of co-existence which has continued despite its early experimentation with comprehensive schools. The London Boroughs showed no similar pattern of co-existence ranging from Brent with its almost complete comprehensive system, to Harrow and Newham which, at the critical stages of research, had retained a predominantly tripartite
organization.

These distinct profiles of co-existence might be expected to reflect on the ability of the intake to the comprehensives in the various areas of London. The choice of London comprehensives, that is, did not automatically ensure either a co-existence with grammar schools (cf. Brent) or the low ability intake associated with "creaming".

However, the ability of the intake to comprehensive schools in London has been lower than the average despite the relative absence of comprehensive schools in some areas. Benn and Simon (1970, p.268) estimated that only 11% of the top 20% of the ability range entered comprehensive schools in the Greater London area (I.L.E.A. and Outer London Boroughs), compared with figures for all other regions of not less than 15%. It appeared then that schools in London might experience a low academic ability intake irrespective of the presence or absence of competing grammar schools.

The predominance of 11-18 schools in the G.L.C. area (see Table 2.) could also be associated with a lower ability intake. Monks (1967) notes that:

Generally speaking it seems that 11-18 'all-through' schools have a markedly lower percentage of group X pupils where Group X refers to pupils well above average in general educational ability.

(Monks 1967, p.4)

Further, he reports:

The more 'urban' an authority the lower seems to be the intake of X pupils.

(ibid 1967, p.4)

So despite the difference in rates of co-existence to be observed within the G.L.C., it was reasonable to assume that comprehensives in this most "urban" of areas which had an 11-18 "all-through" structure would have an intake which under-represented the high ability student.
And it was this under-representation of the high ability pupil in the comprehensive school which was crucial to the controversy rather than the co-existence of comprehensive and selective schools per se. The key issue in the controversy over "creaming", that is concerned the balance of the ability intake to the schools. In London, comprehensive schools appeared to receive a lower than expected proportion of high ability pupils for reasons quite distinct from the co-existence of grammar schools, and their applicability to the debate rests on the fact that their ability intake did not include the high ability pupils they might expect.

The schools chosen for research were two "all-through" comprehensives, one in the I.L.E.A. (Camden), the other in the London Borough of Brent. To be relevant to the debate these schools had to have an intake which did not represent a genuine academic or social mix. Beechgrove (a pseudonym), in the I.L.E.A. was in direct competition with grammar schools (See Table 4.) and the "balanced-ability" method of allocation operated by the I.L.E.A. did little to compensate for the "creaming" effect. Benn & Simon (1970 p.322) found that 18% of 11 year olds in that year were selected for grammar schools within the I.L.E.A. Less than 10% (5 from 56) of the comprehensives in London in their survey claimed to receive the top 20% of ability commensurate with grammar school ability, and of those 5, 2 were single sex and 2 denominational.

"The intake of higher ability pupils in the Greater London area was, of course, the lowest for any region in Britain", they write and go on to quote some I.L.E.A. head-teachers as saying that "grammar schools are ... filled before one comprehensive" i.e. pupils regarded as "high ability" are directed to grammar schools. "We reject higher-ability pupils only". I find this task of rejecting the most difficult thing I have to do. The
Paul Medlicott (The Hidden 11+. New Society 4.7.74) argues that though the 11+ selection process has been in major decline the new types of test taken by primary school pupils may, in effect, serve a similar function. "So the 'traditional 11+' has almost vanished; but selection remains". These days it is called things like "transfer procedures"; "allocation"; "guided parental choice". Medlicott cites the procedures used by the I.L.E.A. as being a good example of those used in the rest of the country - a procedure in which all children due to transfer to secondary schools take tests and are assessed by staff. The tests are marked in the schools with the N.F.E.R. acting as assessors. The N.F.E.R. establish three groups (25% above average 50% average and 25% below average) which should correspond with the independent assessments carried out by headmasters at the schools which are based on teachers' reports and the children's general performance in the school. However, "The N.F.E.R. exercise is devoted to establishing the proportions of children which should be in each group in Inner London as a whole - not to determine which individual child should be where".

(Medlicott 1974 op. cit. p.12)
I.L.E.A. policy is soul destroying*. (Benn & Simon 1970, p. 322)
- points affirmed by Boyson's (1974) account of intake policy in
Highbury Grove.

The situation at Ashton (pseudonym) in the London Borough of
Brent, given the lack of grammar school co-existence, might have been
different. The closed-test battery scores, however, revealed a
situation of steady decline in the ability of the intake to the school
despite the fact that since 1967 the comprehensive intake had been far
less creamed than in other areas of the G.L.C. (see Table 4*). With
reference to Ashton:

Some general idea of the spread of ability and attainment
of the pupils entering the school each year can be obtained from the total score of each pupil obtained on
the "closed" test battery administered at the end of
the Junior School course. An "average" score is 300
and our intake figures show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>350+</th>
<th>349-370</th>
<th>329-271</th>
<th>270-251</th>
<th>250 &amp; BELOW</th>
<th>TOTAL NO. OF PUPILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures taken from the Headmaster's report to the Governing Body of
the school, 5.11.73, paragraph 5).  

Despite the lack of "creaming", then, Ashton suffered not only a low, but
a falling standard of ability intake as measured by the primary school
tests, and in terms of the debate both Ashton and Beechgrove were appropriate
arenas of research in that, whether through co-existence or otherwise,
they suffered an intake which did not include all of the top 20% of
ability they could reasonable expect as "all-ability" schools.
Nature of the Intake (Social Mix)

The social mix of a comprehensive school has also been important to the debate. It has been argued that comprehensive schools are not solely "all-ability" schools, but that they are identified with a neighbourhood or community, and that they should have a cross-section of society represented in the school.

At Beechgrove, the balanced ability method of allocation meant that pupils were travelling from other Inner London Boroughs, for instance Tower Hamlets, which affected somewhat the neighbourhood image. The numbers involved, though, were proportionately small, and no "bussing" from outside the Borough was undertaken to accomplish a mix. The large majority of pupils were drawn from the locality of the school.

Ashton also drew almost entirely upon its neighbourhood, with in this case no ability-balancing in progress. In both cases the catchment areas of the schools were basically the neighbourhood, satisfying one of the demands for comprehensives. However, in drawing upon the locality the schools were subject to the drawback referred to in the debate (see Chapter I) in that the neighbourhood need not provide a cross-section of social groupings - a social mix. Both schools drew on areas of proportionately high working-class and immigrant populations. The high proportion of working-class pupils at comprehensive schools is characteristic of England and Wales in general (see Table 5. ) and "urban" areas in particular.
### TABLE 5.

**England & Wales**: Percentage of total in each type of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School attended by socio-economic group of father*, 1972</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Employers and managers</th>
<th>Intermediate and junior non manual</th>
<th>Skilled manual</th>
<th>Some skills unsatisfactory and unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day nursery playgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school (incl. independent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school (incl. independent/D.G.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/direct grant (11-14 year olds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Social Trends 1974 p.150)

To the extent that these schools were drawing on catchment areas not providing a genuine social (class) mix nor genuine social (ethnic) mix, the teaching associable with the schools might be expected to face the problems identified in the debate.

Schools in London have had a higher proportion of immigrant pupils than any other part of England and Wales. Tables 6 and 7 indicate that both I.L.E.A. and the Outer London Boroughs have had approximately five times and three times respectively the average for the rest of England and Wales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Pupils</th>
<th>Immigrant Pupils England and Wales</th>
<th>I.L.E.A.</th>
<th>Outer London Boroughs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>7,183,165</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7,328,110</td>
<td>183,776</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>7,541,969</td>
<td>220,212</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>7,753,002</td>
<td>249,664</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>7,960,194</td>
<td>263,710</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8,187,009</td>
<td>270,745</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Pupils</th>
<th>Immigrant Pupils Secondary 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.L.E.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Immigrants</td>
<td>24,609</td>
<td>26,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Pupils</td>
<td>164,924</td>
<td>289,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics of Education 1973, op.cit. p.62)

3. The figures of immigrant pupils relate to:

1. children born outside the British Isles who have come to this country with, or to join, parents or guardians whose countries/origin were abroad; and

2. children born in the United Kingdom on or after the 1 January - ten years before the collection of the information.

The tables exclude children of mixed immigrant and non-immigrant parentage and children from the Republic of Ireland. Children of immigrant parents from two overseas countries have been classified according to the country of origin of the father.

Ashton was in a London suburb with a large and rising immigrant population. This was reflected in the school by a cultural mix including Asians and West Indians and though the exact figures were not available, the headmaster suggested a breakdown in the order of 55% indigenous (in which he included both English and Irish), 25% Carribean and 20% Asian (mostly of Kenyan origin). He regarded this as a reasonable reflection of the population in the catchment area - an area in which there had been a recent and marked increase in the Asian population. Figures for the Outer London Boroughs indicated that the largest groups in secondary education in 1972 were from the West Indies (30.0% of the immigrant pupils), India (20.2%) and Kenya (of Asian extract 13.2%) (Statistics of Education 1973). The immigrantintake to the school, then, was proportionately greater than for the Outer London Boroughs as a whole (cf. Table 7.) with Asians being slightly over-represented in this population in relation to West Indians.

Table 8. Origins of Immigrant Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Greek)</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus (Trukish)</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar, Malta</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (Asian or.)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (African or.)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>19,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries in Asia</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies (+Guyana)</td>
<td>12,108</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>32,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commonw. countr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European countries</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of World</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,845</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics of Education 1973, figures for immigrant pupils not available in 1975.)

Beechgrove, on the other hand, was closer to central London. A large redevelopment programme in its catchment area offered the school the prospect of a decreasing size, and during the period of study the pupil population of the school reflected this possibility. As a local paper noted:

"There are 1,200 pupils at Beechgrove; at one time there were 1,900 but the number has fallen as local rebuilding has reduced the population. In fact there are 150 fewer pupils now than when (the new headmaster) arrived."

(Express and News 22.9.72, p.5)

Although verging on a wealthy area of London its catchment included areas of the Borough with a mixture of old tenament and newer high-rise complexes.

The origins of the immigrant population were diverse in comparison with Ashton. In fact the school was proud of its multi-coloured character, and boasted of 40 different nationalities in the school. The three predominant groups who were non-indigenous were generally estimated by staff to be of West Indian origin (about 74%), Cypriots (about 10%) and Asians (about 10%) with an estimated two-thirds of the school population comprising indigenous, and small numbers of other groups. The overall
numbers of immigrant pupils entering Beechgrove, then, was significantly higher than that for Camden (15.68% : Table 9.) and the I.L.E.A. (14.9% : Table 7.). The origins of those immigrant pupils differed from the general I.L.E.A. figures which indicated that in 1972 West Indian pupils constituted 49.2% of immigrant pupils, Cypriots (Greek and Turkish) 11.4%, and Asians 17.7% (if "Asian" is taken to include those from India, Pakistan, Kenyon Asians and other Commonwealth countries in Asia). In comparison with the rest of the I.L.E.A., Beechgrove appeared to have a higher proportion of Cypriot and Asian pupils relative to West Indians. When compared with the local borough, however, the Asian population was under-represented in the school. In Camden, immigrant pupils were to be found in secondary schools in the proportions of 37.9% Asian, 24.8% West Indian, 21.4% Cypriot and 15.9% from other Commonwealth countries (see Table 9.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9</th>
<th>Immigrant Pupils in Camden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Number of New Commonwealth immigrant pupils 2,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-time roll 22,214</td>
<td>Number of immigrant pupils 3,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of immigrant pupils 3,484</td>
<td>% of New Commonwealth immigrant pupils 10.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Immigrant Pupils 15.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camden full-time New Commonwealth pupils by country of origin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cyprus Greeks</th>
<th>Cyprus Turks</th>
<th>Kenya Asian</th>
<th>Kenya African</th>
<th>Other African</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bangladeshi or Pakistani</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>West Indies &amp; Guyana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I.L.E.A. 1974, p.3)
The relative proportions of immigrant pupils attending Ashton and Beechgrove schools are intended as a guide to the background of the schools and in particular the nature of the intake to the schools. It is clear that both schools were receiving a markedly higher proportion of immigrant pupils than was the average for the Outer London Boroughs or the I.L'E.A. respectively, who in turn had a greater proportion of such pupils than the rest of England and Wales. The schools in the study, then existed in urban areas which have been predominantly working-class and which have had high proportions of immigrant pupils - factors which effectively preclude the possibility of the schools receiving a socially mixed (balanced) intake.

The Organization of the Schools

The controversy surrounding the re-organization of secondary education has focused not only on the nature of the intake to comprehensive schools, but has involved aspects of the organization of such schools as well. Both Ashton and Beechgrove had undergone recent changes in organization, although only Ashton had become a comprehensive in the wake of Circular 10/65.

Ashton's re-organization had involved the amalgamation of two single sex secondary modern schools with one co-educational grammar school. The amalgamation of the three schools led not only to political objection, but many of the existing grammar school staff had left to take posts at grammar schools in adjoining boroughs where comprehensive re-organization was not well advanced (cf. Harrow, Table 4.)
Beechgrove, however, had not been involved directly with the integration of existing grammar schools. It had been formed in 1949 in response to the London school Plan (1947) as an experimental large school, one of eight such schools set up in this early period (L.C.C. 1961). Although it competed with grammar schools, it had not involved the abolition of a grammar and was not, therefore, subject to opposition on these grounds.

Ashton was on two sites. The boys' secondary-modern school and girls' secondary-modern school were built on adjoining sites in 1960 and 1964 respectively. The "grammar school" section was built in 1921, with later extensions in the mid-1960's and early 1970's. This part of the comprehensive school housed the 4th, 5th and 6th years and was about half a mile from the now joined site of the two "secondary-modern" schools, which still retained separate identities to the extent that pupils stay in organizational units based on each building. There was some commuting of staff between the upper and lower sites; pupils however rarely needed to move between the sites, nor commute within the lower site between buildings in connection with lesson timetables.

This split-site arrangement meant that all pupils left the dual-schools at the end of the 3rd year to go to the "upper" school in the 4th year. Being organized as one overall unit, with one headmaster, however, the school was not really to be described as "two-tier" even under System ii of 1965. This split-site arrangement at Ashton put it amongst the 72% of non-purpose built comprehensives in England and Wales (Benn & Simon 1970).
Beechgrove might have been considered amongst the 46% of I.L.E.A. purpose built comprehensive schools, but the separate buildings were not designed as integral units. Two older and original buildings were improved in 1949, and in 1959 a new building was added when an extensive new site became available. The school as a whole, however, constituted a single-site comprehensive.

Both schools, then, were of the 11-18 all-through variety. In a general sense, the value of studying 11-18 schools is that they represent (a) that variety preferred in comprehensive re-organization plans by Labour Governments (re. Circular 10/65), (b) they are the most common form of comprehensive organization and (c) are less acceptable to opponents of comprehensive re-organization than two-tier systems. To this extent both schools constituted appropriate examples for research even where one was a split-site and recently re-organized school, and the other a single-site and well-established comprehensive.

The Size of the Schools

The size of the schools has been indicated in the debate to be a source of contention, opponents of re-organization claiming that the size of school required by comprehensives alienates the pupils and leads to poor standards of behaviour. Ashton and Beechgrove, were of reasonably large size in terms of the numbers of pupils and might, therefore, have been expected to suffer the problems associated in the debate with size.

Ashton had a 10 form entry in the first year and a size of approximately 1,500 pupils (1509 in 1975) - the ten form entry being in the top 18% largest entry (Benn & Simon 1970, p.78). The number of pupils placed Ashton amongst the top 8.5% of schools in relation to size (see Table 10.)
Benn and Simon argue that the size of comprehensive schools in England and Wales overall is falling, although the size of 11-18 all-through schools is, in fact, rising. They draw this conclusion on the comparison of the N.F.E.R. findings of 1965 with their findings at 1968 in which the average size of 11-18 all-through comprehensives in England and Wales was seen to rise from 958 (N.F.E.R. Report p.88) to 983.

Table 10. Size of British Comprehensive Schools, 1965* and 1968

Percentages of schools within each size grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers* of Schools</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-400</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-800</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-1,200</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,201-1,400</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,401-1,600</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,601-1,800</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,801-2,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 &amp; Over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In this respect Beechgrove school, with its 8 form intake (top 44%) and pupil population of just over 1,200 was still above average, putting it in the top 14.5% in terms of the numbers of pupils. Beechgrove had the particular situation of having a falling number of pupils. The school had
been as large as 1,900 but with redevelopment in the catchment area, the size had fallen to 1,200.

However, during the course of the study both schools were well above the average size of 11-18 all-through comprehensive schools in England and Wales, and were therefore appropriate for the study to the extent that they might be expected to exhibit the "malaise" directly associated with the size of schools involved in comprehensive re-organization.

Pastoral Guidance

Re-organization also involved an emphasis on the pastoral care and guidance of pupils in the schools to an extent not typical of tri-partism. The problems of size in the new schools were countered by divisions of the schools into Houses in the attempt to integrate the pupils into smaller, more personalized units.

The type of "pastoral" organization differs within comprehensive schools with most schools using Houses (299 out of 331, Monks 1968), and somewhat fewer using a tutor-group system (113 out of 331). Benn and Simon report that the use of the House system alone applied to but 17% of British comprehensive schools and provided the main source of pastoral organization for only 37% (p.218). Year groups, bands of years and other forms of horizontal organization by years alternatively accounted for 32% of the main organization. (p.224)

4. This fall was severe enough for the possibility of one of the local comprehensive being closed was seriously discussed at I.L.E.A. level.
Combinations of Houses, years, upper/lower school divisions were predominant and few comprehensive schools relied solely on one type of organization.

Table II  
Pastoral Care and Comprehensive Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. with Houses</th>
<th>No. with Tutor Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32 (94%)</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25 (71%)</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>242 (92%)</td>
<td>88 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-600 Pupils</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>103 (95%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-1000 pupils</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114 (89%)</td>
<td>50 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-Pupils &amp; over</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82 (86%)</td>
<td>50 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 11-13/14/15/16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48 (90%)</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>220 (89%)</td>
<td>98 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31 (97%)</td>
<td>7 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALL SCHOOLS**

|          | 331            | 299 (90%)       | 113 (34%)             |

(Monks 1967, p.5)

Benn and Simon argued that comprehensive schools do not reflect the picture portrayed by Table 10. - the situation in 1965. The comprehensive school at this stage was very largely identified with the House system, but a rather unnoticed shift had occurred to the use of year groupings, bands and upper/lower school units - the "schools moving imperceptibly to a form of organization in broad horizontal bands". (Benn and Simon 1970, p.224). Year systems, the most narrow of the horizontal forms of organizations were being used more than any other form of organization - 40% of schools using just this form. These claims contrast with the situation portrayed by Monks: (Table 10. ) indicating that 86% of schools with over 1,000 pupils used House systems, and 53% used tutor groups; of 11-18 all-through schools 89% used a House system, and 98% used tutor groups.
The difference can perhaps be explained with reference to the overall tendency of comprehensive schools of all varieties to become smaller. The average size of all comprehensives in England and Wales in 1965 was 865 (Monks 1968, p.88) which fell to 789 by 1968 (Benn and Simon 1970 p.79). Benn and Simon were to find (a) that organization in year systems increased as schools get smaller in size (while other forms such as Houses increase with size) and (b) year systems were far more popular in shorter age range schools, and less popular in the all-through school. Coupled with this is the fact, already noted, that whilst the general size of comprehensive decreased, the average size of 11-18 schools increased.

So, schools most prone to the use of the House system would be "large" comprehensives (1,201-1200) and using an 11-18 all-through arrangements; - schools like Ashton and Beechgrove. It may, then, be concluded from a consideration of the findings of Monks (1967, 1968) and Benn and Simon (1970) that the incidence of House and tutor group organization more readily corresponds to large, 11-18 all-through comprehensives such as Ashton and Beechgrove and that their use of such systems was in no sense idiosyncratic.

At Ashton, a tutorial system was not used, and emphasis was placed instead on a House system. Four Houses formed the focal point of pastoral and sports organization, each of the lower sites having two Houses, and the four coming together at the upper school site in the 4th year. Each building had a House representative, with heads of House being primarily responsible for dealing with extreme cases of disruptive behaviour, official records in connection with court cases, probation, etc. and special attention to cases of emotional disturbance. In lieu of this
commitment, the teaching load for heads of House was reduced by about five periods a week.

Beechgrove, on the other hand, combined a House system with a tutorial system. The tutorial system was introduced in 1970 with the arrival of the new Headmaster who found that "this system has created a happy family atmosphere" as the local paper was to describe it. (Express and Star 22.9.72). With the exception of the first year which had a fairly autonomous organization, the tutorial groups were the basis for registration and discipline business. Upon his arrival at the school, the new headmaster had proceeded to:

... abolish the upper and lower school system, stress the social aspect and introduce a House/Tutorial system with pupils from the second to the sixth year meeting twice a day in tutorial groups. They attend morning assembly in House groups, have a House and tutor meeting once a week, and the same House tutor throughout their school career.

(Express and Star op. cit.)

The upper and lower schools which were necessary to the split site of Ashton were not necessary at Beechgrove. The tutor groups replaced forms as an administrative mechanism, and were organized under the auspices of a House structure. In this system, it was the tutor who was primarily responsible for the collection of merit marks, disciplinary action, etc. rather than a form teacher as at Ashton. Beechgrove also had a Counsellor who, again, was introduced by the new headmaster. He was not technically involved in teaching or academic affairs at all and was officially concerned with pastoral matters alone.5

5. In fact, he had adopted some teaching to integrate himself with the staff – to win their acceptance, without which he felt his task was impossible.
Ashton and Beechgrove both adopted a conscious "vertical" organization with respect to the social aims of comprehensive education, (Houses) with Beechgrove utilizing a complementary tutor-group arrangement. Such vertical organization, whilst not being the exclusive mode of organization for social matters, has been characteristic (a) of comprehensive schools and (b) particularly of large, 11-18 all-through comprehensive schools.

**Academic Organization**

Both Ashton and Beechgrove adhered to the idea of a common-core curriculum in the 11-14 age group, with setting occurring for certain subjects in the first three years. At the end of the third year pupils at Ashton transferred to the upper school in which they embarked on various "academic" or "non-academic" courses leading to G.C.E. or C.S.E. examination (or in some cases non-examination courses). A sixth form unit could be entered, at the discretion of those concerned, without the completion of a specific amount of G.C.E. or C.S.E. subjects.

Similar options were open to pupils during the third year, at Beechgrove but in their case there was no such apparent physical "transfer" (i.e. to new buildings) and the subjects to be taken in the 4th and 5th years were less specifically outlined as courses. Certain subjects were compulsory (as in Ashton's courses) and other optional subjects were "grouped". Again access to the sixth form was not necessarily dependent upon the attainment of certain numbers of G.C.E. or C.S.E. passes. 6

---

6. As was the case with 58% of 11-18 all-through comprehensive schools in England and Wales.

(Benn and Simon 1970, p.189)
So, both schools were appropriate to the debate in that they exhibited features of non-selectiveness which had been seen as hindering the progress of the "high-fliers", and which were essential elements of comprehensive organizations: these were

- a common-core curriculum in the first 3 years, 11-14 age group
- courses in the 4th and 5th years which still have a common-core but which include "optional" orientation in emphasis (e.g. academic/non-academic, science/arts etc.) and
- non-selective entrance to the sixth form.

The style of teaching at both schools has been identified as an area worthy of further study. At present it can be noted that neither school used significant amounts of interdisciplinary education (I.D.E.) or team-teaching, though both had pilot projects planned in those directions. Project work, as perhaps the nearest to I.D.E. provided an aspect of teaching to the extent that mode 3 C.S.E. subjects were taught at both schools. It did not, however, form a basis of teaching at either schools. And the use of audio-visual aids, group teaching methods and individual work cards was dependent upon the individual teacher and departments. There was no specific orientation to child-centred or experimental-type methods at either school.

Ability-grouping within the comprehensive school has been related to the idea of the common course. If the internal academic organization were to fully reflect the comprehensive ethos of non-selection, mixed-ability grouping would apply throughout a common-course in the first 3 years of an 11-18 all-through school. In fact, only 22% of schools have operated mixed-ability grouping (even when allowance is made for setting in two subjects, and for remedial groups), (Benn and Simon 1970 p.147). Less than one in five comprehensive schools, however, relied on
streams, and the most popular organization - accounting for nearly one-third of the schools - was broad ability bands. Benn and Simon argue that the existence of sets and broad ability bands may indicate a shift of policy within the comprehensive sector, because the terms "comprehensive" and "mixed-ability grouping" were not originally seen to be complementary.

The 11-18 all-through schooling had the highest incidence of mixed-ability grouping. Benn and Simon suggest that 22% of the schools used predominantly mixed-ability grouping - the large majority of which were 11-18 all-through schools; 103 out of 151 (Benn and Simon 1970, p. 151).

At Ashton ability-grouping took the form of a mixture of setting, banding and streaming. In the first 3 years, there were two "jet" forms, chosen for their academic potential, seven mixed-ability forms, and two smaller remedial forms. Departments could "set" independently with the French and Maths Departments doing so. At Beechgrove, the only streaming was in terms of remedial groups - and there was in progress, the attempt to withdraw pupils from normal classes for remedial treatment, rather than risk the stigmating effect of maintaining remedial groups. Again setting was evident in the first 3 years in Maths and French subjects.

Neither school, then, exhibited an abnormal profile of ability-grouping, especially in view of the trend towards mixed-ability, and the emphasis this has received in 11-18 all-through schools.

---

7. "Potential" as indicated by closed test battery scores as administered in the primary schools.
Staffing

The position of teachers has come to be an important issue of the debate, the turnover of staff and commitment of staff being crucial. Monks' study revealed a great variation in the number of years experience which teachers had, but did not deal in depth with the rate of turnover relative to experience. In both Ashton and Beechgrove it was felt that the rates of turnover arose basically from the younger, less experienced members of staff, with the schools retaining a core of teachers having been at the school for five years or more.

At Ashton there were about 88 staff, the majority of whom were under 35 years of age. The turnover of staff in the years of study was high - exceptionally high according to the headmaster. Twenty-four staff left the school in July 1973 - a figure the headmaster contrasted with the average of between 8-15\(^8\). Even this latter figure he held to be too high, but he explained the turnover in terms of the housing shortage in London and promotions rather than any inherent disillusionment with education. He backed this by claiming that, though the majority of leavers were young, they tended to leave after 3 years rather than after one year of teaching, and as a result of marriage and/or the desire to buy a house. House prices in London were seen to be prohibitive, thus forcing prospective buyers to move to the provinces. Staffroom "gossip" did not, however, fully confirm this optimism, some of the staff leaving with disillusionment apparently as part, if not the major reason. The high of twenty-four resignations in 1973 left the staffing situation in turmoil at the start of the '73-'4 session, when temporary and part-time staff were being employed as desperate measures to fill the timetable gaps.

8. Boyson (1975b) cites an Assistant Masters Assoc. Survey of 1973 which found that Brent had the highest turnover of staff in the Greater London area with a figure of 29.8%. This accords with the Headmaster's estimation and compares with the lowest turnover of 17.3% for Hillingdon.
This was not a feature peculiar to Ashton, since the beginning of
the '73-4 session saw many London schools understaffed and sending
pupils home where timetable obligations could not be fulfilled.

Staffing at Beechgrove had a somewhat similar profile. In the 3
years since the new headmaster had arrived there was a discernable rise
in the morale of staff and a noticeably less violent atmosphere in the
school. This did not prevent, however, a relatively high turnover in
staff for reasons similar to those expressed at Ashton and of about the
same proportions, although the period '71-3 did see a slight decline in
the turnover. With a staff of approximately 80 teachers, the turnover
was high in 1969-72 when approximately 25 staff left; however, the
figures fell to about 20 per year between 1972-74. Both schools regarded
their turnover of staff to be unacceptably high, particularly during the
period up to 1973. These levels of staff turnover compare unfavourably with
the figure of 18.6% net turnover of full-time staff in 1973 calculated by
the D.E.S. (D.E.S. 1974 Reports on Education). This net figure, however,
disguises two important facts: (a) that the turnover is higher for the
primary than the secondary sector, indicating that the figure for the
secondary sector alone would be less than 18.6% and (b) that the turnover
of staff in the I.L.E.A. and Outer London is higher than in other areas.

These points suggest that the turnover of staff may be exceptionally high
in terms of England and Wales generally, but may not be exceptional in
terms of the London area.

9. The figures are of necessity approximate because the calculation of
the staff involves part-time teachers and supply teachers, plus the
problem of teachers who leave at the end of an autumn or spring
term. Coupled to this is the variation in pupils attending the
school stemming from immigration, emigration or movement within the
country.
Staff student ratios at the schools did not, however, exhibit any abnormal features. Beechgrove had been brought into line with I.L.E.A. express policy of comprehensive schools with 1,200 pupils (Beechgrove had just over 1,200 pupils) with a staff ratio of 1:16 (80 staff approx.) This was a change from earlier stages when it had 1,900 pupils and in 1966 when it had the abnormally "low" staff ratio of 1:18 (I.L.E.A. 1966).

Ashton had a staff ratio of 1:17 (1,500 pupils 88 teachers) which was slightly outside the average for the Greater London Area (16.3:1, See Table 12.). This figure compares favourably with all other regions. (17.1 in 1973, 17.3 in 1975.)

Table 12. Secondary Education: Regional Analysis 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of pupils</th>
<th>Thousands of pupils (=100%)</th>
<th>Average number of pupils per teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle deemed secondary</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All public sector secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard region:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humberside</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Area</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of South East</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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So, the schools had high turnovers of staff but had staff/pupil ratios which were not exceptional in terms of I.L.E.A. policy or the G.L.C. and national averages.

Summary and Conclusion

The two schools, Ashton and Beechgrove, have been described in terms of their intake (academic and social features) their organization (academic and pastoral) and staffing. The schools differed in some significant respects. Ashton was a recently re-organized, split-site comprehensive using a mixture of House/Year group organization, whilst Beechgrove was a well established, single-site comprehensive using Houses and tutor groups. In most other significant aspects, however, the schools were reasonably similar - particularly with respect to those features of comprehensive re-organization central to the debate. In terms of the nature of their intake, their attempt to use a common curriculum and their staff turnover the schools provided particularly suitable arenas (according to the debate) within which to study the practice of teaching. It has been suggested, then, that the schools were at once (a) relevant to the debate, yet (b) not abnormal or unique enough to render conclusions from their study inappropriate for other comprehensive schools.
Chapter III

Research in the schools
People who write about methodology often forget that it is a matter of strategy, not of morals. There are (...) methods that are more or less effective under particular circumstances in reaching objectives on the way to a distant goal.

The process of research involves adaption and change. Such adaption and change is necessitated by three analytically distinct factors - the practical problems, the general theoretical orientations, and the relationship of these to the emerging data. In the process of research the three factors may be inter-related to an extent which renders the exposition of any one in separation from the others a difficult task. However, it is the purpose of the following chapters to describe the developing focus of interest and the method of research as the cumulation of both practical and theoretical considerations, and the relationship of these to the findings as they emerged in the course of research, by looking at the research in terms of the "practical" problems and the "theoretical orientations" as they developed in the initial stages of the research.

In this chapter, the focus of attention is on the practical aspects of what was done, (rather than the implications it had in terms of theory) and the relevant problems. This presentation of a method of research in separation from its theoretical justification is, it should be remembered, a device aimed at clarity, and does not represent any such separation in the construction of research, per se. In practice, the final area of

1. Glaser and Strauss emphasise this relationship between the theoretical orientations of research and the data itself when writing about "grounded theory".

Generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from the data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research. Generating a theory involves a process of research.

(Glaser & Strauss 1967, p.6 original emphasis)

The substantive theory not only stems from the data (as opposed to pre-generated hypotheses), but also emerges in the process of research. This emergence of "theory" was felt to be a necessity to a method of research aimed at retaining the authenticity, or the "integrity" of the phenomenon being studied.
research, and its method of treatment were emergent over the initial stages of research as an interplay between "practice", "theory" and the "data" in the consideration of that area posed as problematic by the debate over comprehensive re-organization.

Having gained the cooperation of appropriate schools, it was necessary to identify an area within the schools upon which to initially focus attention, since merely "to go to a school" was in the first place unacceptable to the authorities, and secondly too broad in terms of the collection of data. Whilst it was intended that the area of interest should "emerge" as a result of the study, it is not possible to enter the field with no preconceptions relevant to the study whatever, and an election to study certain aspects of the schools had to take place. The "preconceptions" however, need not be rigid, nor prevent wider observations in a manner which the testing of preformed hypotheses might do. The "preconceptions" need be no more than an orientation toward a particular area, as Glaser and Strauss acknowledge when they write that:

To be sure one goes out and studies an area with a particular sociological perspective, and with a focus, a general question or a problem in mind. But (the researcher) can (and we believe should) also study an area without any preconceived theory that dictates, prior to the research, "relevancies" in concepts and hypotheses.

(Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.33)

So, the significance of the debate over comprehensive re-organization for the aspect of education to be studied (cf. chapter I) and the implications to be drawn from recent orientations discernable in the sociology of education (cf. chapter IV) were not regarded as directives for the lines of research so much as an initial perspective within which
the phenomenon could be investigated. From this basis the practice of research could be expected to develop more specific lines of interest for both theoretical and practical reasons, which research might confront as an ongoing, developmental process.

The debate over comprehensive re-organization drew attention to particular aspects of schooling associated with the re-organization which formed the basis for the selection of Ashton and Beechgrove as schools which could be expected to offer seminal data for research. The debate was further shown to focus attention on "teaching" in relation to comprehensive schooling. Sociology and the sociology of education on the other hand, have revealed a shift in emphasis toward the interactive properties of schooling and the social construction of knowledge, and a combination of these two factors provided the orientation of the research at the early stages. Its initial perspective, that is, comprised a concern with "the interactive properties of teaching in a comprehensive school."

The "interactive" element of such research was seen to necessitate a consideration of pupils as an essential part to such interaction, and hence at the initial stages of the study the area of research was specified in the broad terms of "interaction in the classroom". As a consequence of the early concern with interaction in the comprehensive school situation then, the research had to focus on pupils as well as teachers, yet it was a focus of attention which changed in the course of the research at the schools.

Fieldwork in the schools commenced in January, 1972 and continued until December 1974. An initial period of research between January and July 1972 provided in effect a pilot study after which the focus of research narrowed and shifted as a result of (a) practical limits concerning
the amount of data which could be handled (b) the limited access to certain sources of data, and (c) the nature of the data collected to that date. In consequence, by the recommencement of fieldwork in September 1972, the area of study had a more specific concern with the practice of teaching in comprehensive schools, rather than interaction in the classroom.

That initial stage had involved the regular observation of particular classes and teachers, plus a study accumulation of background information pertinent to the schools - their formal structure, intake, catchment area etc. factors which at various times become the topic of more detailed study in the ongoing course of the research. However, given the initial focus of research, primary attention was given at this stage to the observation of classes in progress with detailed field-notes of the positions and movement of pupils and staff being gathered, along with methods of teaching and styles of response by pupils.

Under these circumstances, the choice of lessons to be observed might be considered as a critical element in the research programme - affecting the nature of teaching style, pupil response and the nature of interaction. Further, in the negotiation of observation, senior staff at both schools required areas (i.e. subject matter) of classes to be specified. As a result, humanities and English lessons were selected, and were proposed for five reasons:

(a) the teaching of such classes usually occurs in a classroom, as opposed to laboratory or metalwork shop, etc. Interaction in such lessons would not, therefore, be affected by special or abnormal physical factors of the environment.

(b) within these subject-areas the pedagogic "awareness" of staff might be expected to be more articulate than in other area, possibly
(c) promoting the more progressive teaching styles criticized by opponents of comprehensive re-organization (c.f. Keddie 1971, pp 135-6).

(d) Further, the researcher's association with this field could act to minimize the doubts or suspicions of the staff, who might be more willing to accord the researcher the status of "colleague", and

(e) in the early stages it was felt that the content of the lesson may provide useful information in connection with the interaction. A certain familiarity with the subject matter might, then, prove advantageous.

The actual choice of lessons, however, was the result of fitting the subjects to the timetable in negotiation with senior members of staff and thus involved a degree of consideration for practicality and diplomacy.

Under the circumstances, it would seem to have been possible for members of staff concerned in the arrangement of observation to bias the selection in favour of quiet orderly classes which they may have considered to show the operation of the school at its "smoothest", but nothing came to light over the following three years to suggest that the selection included any attempt to direct research into special or extra-ordinary classes. 2

Between January and July 1972 the observation of classes adhered fairly consistently to those initially negotiated, and it was during this period that the detailed field-notes of mobility and interaction in the classroom were collected. In Ashton the classes came from all the

---

2. It should not, however, be implied that these classes were in any analytic sense "typical". As with the choice of schools, certain features were attended to as directing the research to those areas which, while not being "abnormal", provide what might reasonably be expected to be a fertile area vis a vis the purpose of research.
buildings and were from the 1st, 3rd and 4th years, covering differing abilities as connotated by form and course. All ability bands were covered from both buildings in the 3rd year, with the exception of the "progress" forms. The observation of the fourth year was of courses involved with social studies and whose pupils were generally intending to leave at the end of the fifth year. Staff and pupils interchanged for these groups, thus offering comparisons of classes with different teachers, and vice versa. Observation concentrated on English and History groups in the third year and English in the first year.

At Beechgrove the early research was of 1st, 2nd, 4th and 5th years, the former two being of an unstreamed nature while the latter two involved specialized groups who were not of an overtly recognized ability range. English groups were observed in the 1st year, History in the second, Economics in the third year and Social Studies in the fifth year.3

The classes observed, then, provided a cross-section in terms of age and ability within the specified subject areas. They further provided the opportunity in certain circumstances to observe the interaction of particular members of staff with different classes.

The summer of 1972 allowed pause from involvement in fieldwork and an opportunity to reflect upon the data gathered. It became apparent, that (a) the scope of "interaction in the classroom" was too wide, and (b) that access to pupils at Beechgrove School having been denied, the focus would have to change accordingly. It became necessary, that is,

3. Observation initially covered seven groups with six teachers at Ashton and six groups with five teachers at Beechgrove.
to narrow the research in a manner which accommodated this practical exigency of research.

The use of tape-recorded interviews had been initiated prior to July 1972 as a complement to data gathered by observation. Upon reflection, a concentration upon "teachers" as the focus of attention appeared warranted in relation to (a) the debate over re-organization and (b) the practical developments of research. Not only were teachers accessible, and of immediate relevance to the debate, but research based on them was more readily a possibility in terms of the available resources of the study. But to focus on teachers alone it was necessary to develop a research method which (a) allowed the process of teaching to be treated in terms of "teacher" data rather than "interaction" data, yet (b) treated teaching as an emergent and negotiated enterprise in accord with recent developments in sociological theory. For such purposes, the extended use of tape-recording was seen to be appropriate.

For reasons explicated more deeply in chapters IV and V the use of tape-recorded interviews, supplemented by observation was considered as more useful to the task at hand than reliance on observation field-data. Yet, briefly, the reasoning can be stated: the advantage of tape-recorded data was that it provided an accurate record, available for recall and detailed study by the researcher and/or others (subject, however, to the qualifications that what it records is but one aspect of interaction). Within the classroom its use faced two substantial problems. Firstly, the tape-recording would reproduce only the audible (e.g. verbal) aspects of interaction in a classroom, and of that it could reproduce only fragments 4. And for both theoretical and practical purposes the "observation" of one teacher is facilitated more than the "observation" of a classroom of interaction between teacher and pupils, and between pupil and pupil(s).
or aspects of the phenomenon. It could produce, for instance, an accurate record of the verbal interaction instigated by the teacher with selected pupils, or it could reproduce verbal interaction between selected pupils. It could not, however, reproduce the totality of verbal interaction in the classroom. (The number of microphones and operatives necessary to render this possible would prohibit the "normal" operation of the classroom).

Secondly, and on a more immediate practical basis, permission to tape-record classes in progress was not forthcoming from the relevant authorities, effectively barring any further advance along those lines.

The alternative which was adopted was the use of tape-recorded interviews with teachers which were treated as "accounts" by the staff of the manner in which they taught, and through which "teaching in the comprehensive school" could be analysed. (see chapter V). These interviews took place outside the classroom situation but were supplemented as a research tool by continued observation of classes, (mostly in connection with interviews) and the collection of documented data. In effect, the basis of research shifted from observation to interviewing, - a shift evident in the data salient to research findings (see chapters VII, X and XI.)

From September 1972 to December 1974 the research centred on a developing use of the tape-recorded interviews with teachers in a manner which provided data of a kind amenable to the study of the relationships between teaching and comprehensive re-organization.

---

5. Cf. the type of data collected by Barnes (1969) which was relevant to the particular phenomenon with which he was concerned, i.e. the implications of language-use in the classroom for the process of teaching could be studied with reference to teacher-pupil verbal interaction.
In the course of observation and interviewing it sometimes became necessary to become involved in the proceeding of the class. Teachers occasionally asked the researcher for a second opinion on a classroom topic, or actively involved the researcher in classroom activity to the extent of "persuading" the researcher to teach the class (or some other class) himself. This was not considered to be a desirable practice as it tended to identify the researcher as "teacher", possibly closing channels of information from pupils in the class (cf. Hargreaves 1967). As the research developed, however, it became more pertinent to gain the trust of the teachers, and though not encouraged, expediency determined that such involvement was occasionally necessary.

This latter period of research involved an increasing interest in the nature of the explanations used by staff about their practical, routine teaching in the context of the (comprehensive) school. Such explanations were not only to be found in the interview situation, however, with other situations such as the gossips in staffrooms providing a wealth of information on this area. Yet despite the richness of this source, its limitations in terms of research data derived from the lack of possibility for providing accurate records of such explanations - given that tape-recording and/or the taking of field-notes was not appropriate to the setting. So whilst such sources could sensitise the study to specific areas, the major sources of data were the tape-recorded interviews, and documented evidence (along with the observation of classes).

The sensitizing aspect of staffroom gossip, and the results of taped-interviews and observation were of additional value to the extent that "leads" that they produced could be "followed-up" in the course of the research. Yet in following-up such leads the research had to break from the rigidity imposed by the arrangements in the initial stages, of a
formally ordered pattern of observation. In the latter part of the research the interviewing and observation was dedicated to the pursuance of "leads" derived from earlier research - the desire of teachers to interview and observe being in accord with Glaser and Straus's principle of "theoretical sampling": that is,

... the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyses this data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges. This process of data collection is controlled by the emerging theory....

(Glaser and Strauss, 1967 p.45 their emphasis)

This approach requires the researcher to adapt his research methods to the ongoing development of the study in a way which hypothetico-deductive analyses do not. It is a flexibility which Glaser and Strauss see as disturbing to those who wish for a definite statement at the start of fieldwork as to amount of, and persons involved in, the study. Interpretive approaches are not amenable to such statements because:

... the sociologist trying to discover theory cannot state at the outset of his research how many groups he will sample during the entire study.

(Glaser and Strauss, 1967 op. cit, p.61)

It is in its developmental nature that this research differs greatly from research aimed at the testing of pre-formed hypotheses, (in which, perhaps, the rigour and inflexibility of procedures are desirable features.)

In the course of the developing research certain factors related to teaching in a comprehensive school came to attention through accounts or observation. These factors provided cues for further research along those lines which could only be facilitated where the research involved emergent flexibility. If the results of the research were to be "grounded", that is, an integral part of the method of research would have to provide for
change and adaption in the lines of enquiry. The cumulative effect of the accounts and observation of staff was the clarification of certain issues arising from previous research, and the sensitizing of research to other new areas of interest.

This had the effect of providing no set "sample" of teachers to interview. To have specified, for instance, that half the teachers at the two schools should be interviewed, controlling for age, sex, experience subject and seniority, might have proved inflexible enough to prevent the follow-up of leads gathered along the way. No concerted attempt to interview a particular representative sample was thus employed.

However, in following the various leads, and observing the relevant teachers in the classroom, the staff involved eventually provided a profile not totally alien to a "representative sample". Approximately seventy of the staff of both schools were formally interviewed and observed (out of approximately 170 staff at the schools). These members were not regarded as a representative sample, but rather, they provided data in terms of Glaser and Strauss "theoretical sampling". The numerical justification for "theoretical sampling" cannot be gauged in the sense that it can in statistical sampling, and the criterion which Glaser and Strauss advocate for the quantity of data is the researcher's estimation that he cannot add to the categories of analyses he has derived by further data: when he has reached a "theoretical saturation". To have interviewed all of the staff at the schools would not, it was felt, have generated

6. It is difficult to represent this as a proportion of the staff because of the turnover of staff in the three years of research.
analyses beyond the stage reached in the formal interviews already conducted by December 1975. Not that it should be assumed that the field work consisted solely of interviews, for again, as Glaser and Strauss note:

In field studies, theoretical sampling usually requires reading documents, interviewing and observing at the same time, since all slices of data are relevant.

(Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 75)

The observation and interviewing did, however, provide a basis of the research. Observation of teachers in the classroom context was usually accompanied by informal interviewing and discussion and a "formal" interview of about 30 minutes duration. Only two members of staff declined to be "formally" interviewed (i.e. with tape-recorder) and three declined to have their lessons observed.

The members of staff who were interviewed were derived (after the initial stages) from earlier "leads". By December 1975 these included all of the Heads of Houses at either school, a large proportion of the subject heads and other senior posts. Various subject teachers were interviewed on the basis of factors pertinent to the study such as "experience" (probationary teachers, older staff, length of stay at the school, supply teachers and long-serving teachers), subjects taught (for instance in relation to the special problems of teaching a second language), and special functions such as tutor group or form teachers. (See Appendix III)

In terms of "theoretical sampling" for interpretive sociological enquiry it was felt that this provided an adequate source of data to reach a stage of "theoretical saturation" and thus an adequate basis in practice for the research. Yet, the practice of sociological research must, perforce,
be theoretically imperfect. The development of the research continually posed the problem of putting into practice the implications of theoretical developments in the field. The interplay between the theory and practice is, perhaps inevitably, resolved in compromise, and as Dixon concludes

In sociology it seems best to trim the sails of one's theoretical pretensions to the winds of contingent possibility.

(Dixon 1973, p.120)

Glaser and Strauss have suggested that one aspect of the practical nature of research - the emerging data - be used to influence the development of the (substantive) theory, thus according theory its authentic relationship with data. (Glaser and Strauss 1967, pp 33-39).

Yet this overcomes but one aspect of the "practical" problems of research, and cannot place within the sphere of theoretical examination the effects on interpretive research of, for instance, being excluded from access to a particular group of people - such as the pupils at one school in this study. Such practical problems did not, fortunately, inhibit significantly the development of enquiry along lines in accord with the theoretical strains. And having emphasized "the winds of contingent possibility in this chapter, the "theoretical pretensions" should now be described.
by specifying his theory of the actor .... the observer provides the methodological basis for establishing rules of evidence, of knowledge and of correct proof. He establishes the basis for a correspondence between his theory of the actor and the events he observes and describes.

(Cicourel 1964, p.52)
The purpose of this chapter is to consider the nature of organizational action. It is only through an explication of the model of actor employed in the research that it becomes possible to specify exactly what is to be studied and what forms of social phenomena are to be left aside. An explicit statement of the model of actor also provides grounds for assessing the validity of the findings of research, and the basis for a methodological approach for coming to grips with the phenomenon (the latter being dealt with in Chapter V).

Organizations have been seen as social environments which influence the action of those who participate in them. The re-organization of secondary education along comprehensive lines might be expected, then, to effect a change in the manner of teaching undertaken within the schools. Indeed, this is the form of argument outlined in chapter one, which identifies a "teacher malaise" with comprehensive school organization. Others have argued that such "malaise" stems more from the political or pedagogic ideologies of the teachers, (presumably derived beyond the bounds of the school). Yet the case for either belief has not received the kind of empirical analysis which the strength of public debate on the topic would suggest it ought. Any research which would wish to contribute to this glaring vacuum, however, would need to consider the theoretical status of the concepts of "action" and "organization" and their relationship before being in a position to approach the subject in an academically viable manner.

1. The term "organizational action" is used in the research to refer specifically to those actions which can be attributed to the actor's membership of the organization. It thus excludes the host of routine activities occurring within organizational settings whose "causal nexus" can be attributed to other arenas of social life. In the course of the chapter the distinction between organizational action and organizational behaviour becomes of paramount importance.
The concepts of action and organization have characteristically been related through a concept of social structure which is common to both. To talk of social structure as providing the key link between action and organizations is fundamental to the sociology of organizations because if social life is characterized by "order" (Cohen 1968), then the "order" which characterizes social life in general may be replicated in the "order" which characterizes organizations. Silverman (1970) makes the point that to talk of social "order" is to talk of organization since both are characterized by regularities which are essentially rooted in social existence. Hence, he argues that the study of organizations is inextricably bound up with theories of social existence, whether or not those theories are made explicit. A necessity of research, then, is to make explicit the concept of social structure employed in relating action to organization. To do so it is necessary to consider, in brief, the drawbacks of some alternatives offered within the sociology of organizations although it is not intended in any sense to offer an overview of approaches to the study of organizations for these have been covered extensively elsewhere.² The present consideration is selective in its coverage of issues, and draws where necessary on approaches to industrial organizations for it is in this area, spurred on by industrial sociology and management theories, that the theory of organizations has made perhaps its greatest advances. (Bradley & Wilkie 1974, Silverman 1970).

Social Structure and Organizational Structure

Social order and organizations both have "structure" in the sense that structure involves regularity of relationship between component elements. Indeed, as Silverman points out to talk of social order is to talk of organized activity. The sociology of organizations has not been concerned, however, with the essential features of social existence but with the social relations within formally ordered arenas of action termed "organizations". It is the formal properties of such arenas of action which distinguish them from other social phenomena (Silverman 1970), which have provided a starting point for most analyses of such "formal organizations", and which have been used in attributing to the actors "membership" of the organization. 3

---

3. The term "membership" refers to the actor's "belonging" to the organization. The nature of such belonging generally reflects the particular view of action in the organization entailed in the approach. Membership, then, can reflect tenure of office, role enactment, or a sense of social structure. It is a purpose of this chapter to consider membership as an activity rather than a status, and only with reference to such an activity is it reasonable to talk of "competent" membership of an organization.
A major concern of the sociology of organizations has been the relationship between the structural properties of social order and the (formal) structural properties of the organization, in effect attempting to demonstrate a congruence between the principles of order to be found in society and in the nature of the organization.

Weber's definitive work on the nature of bureaucratic organization reflects such a concern with the manner in which the bases of social order may be replicated in principles of formal organization (Weber 1964), Albrow (1970) makes the point that Weber's concern for the rational principles of organization did not refer to productive efficiency, but to principles of legitimacy: the point being that Weber's approach to organizational structure involved a congruence between the principles of legitimacy operative within a particular power structure in society, and the principles of legitimacy for control in an organization. The patterns of authority relations in society, argued Weber, might best be reflected in bureaucratic types of administration and it was in this sense that such organizational structure became "rational".

The study of organizations has also treated the congruence between social and organizational structure in terms of the nature of interdependence of the parts which comprise the entity - a concern which is far from antithetical to the Weberian concern with patterns of authority. Blau and Schoenherr, for instance, adopt the problematic of Weber and, as Silverman (1975) puts it, are refreshingly self-conscious about the bases of their analysis; they are thus worthy of some consideration as exponents of this approach to organizational structure. They follow Weber (sic) in taking as their concern:
whether the principles that govern differentiation in formal organizations have any similarity with the principles that govern differentiation and stratification in societies at large.

(Blau & Schoenherr 1971, pp.330-1)

It is, they argue, the nature of the inter-relatedness of the component elements which constitutes the structure of the organization, an inter-relatedness which becomes apparent in the regularities observable in organizations:

The gist of social structure is that people differ in status and social affiliation, that they occupy different positions and ranks, and that they belong to different groups and sub-units of various sorts. The fact that the members of a collectivity are differentiated on the basis of several independent dimensions is the foundation of the collectivity's social structure. This differentiation into components along various lines in the formal structure of organizations is the object of this analysis. The theory centers attention on the social forces that govern the inter-relations among differentiated elements in a formal structure and ignores the psychological forces that motivate the behaviour of individual managers and other employees.

(Blau & Schoenherr 1971, p.300 emphasis added)

They take from Weber, then, a concern with the relationship between social and organizational control. Their attention is similarly focused on the formal aspects of the organization at the expense of the "sentiments", "needs" and "goals" which provide what Swift sees as "the equally important non-rational exercise and legitimation of authority." (Swift 1969, p.33).

4. Hoyle indicates that in terms of the analysis of the school as an organization:

"the central concern of (such) studies is to understand the functioning of the schools and particularly the interplay of their various dimensions."

(Hoyle 1973, p.32).
Their approach, however, differs markedly from Weber inasmuch as they attempt to deduce from an empirical analysis of the structure of a particular genus of organizations changing patterns of social structure. That is, through a consideration of the nature of control in organizational structure they aspire to comment, albeit tentatively, on the nature of control in society. They conclude:

The new forms of power that are developing in modern society are closely connected with the great efficiency of indirect mechanisms of organizational control.

(Blau & Schoenherr 1971, p.352)

Blau and Schoenherr's work, nonetheless, exhibits clearly a concern to indicate the congruence between structural features of society and organizations. This orientation contrasts with early management-initiated studies which tended to treat the organization in isolation from its social and economic environment: - as a "closed system". (Silverman 1970)

Silverman argues that systems analysis, and its sociological offshoot, structural functionalism, provided the possibility for a study of organizations as an open system which was able to deal with the social environment in terms of the control mechanisms for boundary maintenance and adaption. The apparent success of systems analysis to cope with the environment of organizations contributed toward a "systems orthodoxy" which Silverman argues has characterized the state of organizational analysis. (Silverman 1970, p.4)

---

5. The school as a topic for organizational analysis, became of interest in the 1950's in America as a relevant instance of social phenomenon appropriate for the application of organization theory (Hoyle 1973). That is, the application of organization theory to the school developed primarily as an outgrowth of the more general interest in organization theory.
Such approaches attempt to relate the organizational structure to the social structure in terms of the nature of the interdependence between the parts which comprise the whole for, as Gouldner (1967) points out, the most important aspect of any system must be the interdependence of the parts which allows for a stable and continued existence.

Following Parsons, this approach holds that an organization should be treated as a sub-system of wider society, existing in an environment of other sub-systems. The sub-systems are characterized by goal orientation - goals which are at once reflective of the relevant values in society and functionally related to the societal "needs". The structure of organizations is based on the normative prescriptions of the wider society for the attainment of the goals of the organization, thus relating the structure of the organization to the wider values and the organizational goal. And the structure thus orientated by the values and goals, should allow for both boundary maintenance and boundary interchanges with other sub-systems along orderly and functionally positive lines. As Elger puts it:

In this analysis organizations (...) are viewed as social systems - specialized sub-systems of a wider society - oriented primarily to particular societal needs and structured in terms of the normative prescriptions for such orientation. This view follows from the assumption that societies are characterized by consensus concerning generalized values, which specify structural solutions to general functional problems. The linages between structure, function and normative order are considered to be particularly clear in the case of organizations as they are crystallized in an explicit organizational goal and operating procedures.
For Parsons this view implies that the relevant values, signified by the organizational goal, inform all aspects of organizational structure. Values and norms pattern the procurement and disposal of inanimate resources (input and output) so that "boundary exchange" between the organization and its environment proceed smoothly in so far as they coincide with societal values."

(Elger 1975, pp 92-93)

The study of organizations along these lines will, then, focus attention on the goals of the organization because, given a consensus view of values and normative behaviour, it is through these goals that the structure of the organization can be identified. This structure must allow for functional relationships with other organizations in terms of orderly boundary exchanges. Organizations, then, are treated -

(a) in terms of the functional relationship between structure and goals and

(b) in terms of the functional relationship of the organization with other organizations, and of its goals to the wider societal needs.

A systems analysis of organizations has found articulation with specific reference to the school in the work of Parsons (1959), and Lambert et al (1970) refer to Parsons "pioneering work on the school class as one of the significant studies of internal constituents of the school". (p.12)

In this approach:

The school or institution is conceived as an organization or social system constructed to attain specific goals and defined by its own boundaries and boundary maintaining devices, from other organizations or social units which impinge upon it.

(Lambert et al 1970, p.14 emphasis added)
Parsons (1959) relates the goals of schools in their function for the wider society; their functions of allocation and integration. The goals, whilst basic to the structure of the organization, exist within a system of other social units with which they are functionally related.

And the school unit can be treated as a sub-unit, similar to others of the society and similar in structure:

To pursue complex and differing ends, the society (school) allocates itself into sub-divisions or sub-systems. Chief among these are the academic, the economic, the athletic, the social, the secretarial or bureaucratic, the domestic and in some schools, sub-systems of living, medical or pastoral care, and extra-curricular activity. Such sub-systems contain the elements of a miniature society in themselves.

(Lambert et al 1970, p.17 their emphasis)

The Parsonian analysis has been influential on studies of the school and classroom. Musgrave (1972), for instance, not only treats the school as a sub-system of society but claims that the school class can be seen as a social system. And following Parsons he argues that:

An obvious way to see what is happening in the classroom is to divide the social system into its main parts, namely the teacher and the children, and to see how each undertake the two main functions.

(Musgrave 1972, p.204)

that is, integration and allocation. In this manner, he attempts to explain for instance, peer group sub-cultures in terms of the functions of the school class. This form of analysis has, then, been applied to the behaviour of members of the classroom with reference to the normative structure that can be analysed in terms of the goals and functions of the school sub-system.
Other applications of this type of approach stress the boundary maintaining devices and the inputs (personal, resources) and outputs (skills, attitudes, knowledge) which the school entails (Sugarman 1969, Hersom 1970, Heald & Moore 1968). And Turner (1969) in his organizational analysis of "Castle School" notes how pressures were put to bear on the school by "social systems which impinged on it". (p.69) and which instigated the "setting-up of sub-structures in the school structure" (p.70).

The school, then, is seen as having systems properties, but at the same time subject to pressures from other systems:

an inter-related whole, a natural system attempting to maintain its equilibrium in the face of internal tensions and pressures from the environment.

(D.W. Swift 1971, p.5)

Two ideas underlie this approach: that organizations are to be seen as a sub-system of the whole society and that they share with the wider society those features necessary for the continued existence of any social system. In the study of an organization then the researcher is directed to look at those features of an organization which act toward its survival.

6. His analysis, in fact, constitutes an application of the paradigm of both Blau (1964) and Parsons in the attempt to relate the macrostructure and substructures of the school.
Those approaches to the study of organizations which have elected to focus attention on the formal properties of the structure, the interrelatedness of its parts, and the way in which these reflect wider social structure have generally borrowed or taken for granted the functionalist conception of organizations as co-operative systems oriented to the pursuit of a system goal which coincides with the production task.

(Elger 1975, p.73)

In accord with Parsons' view that it is a "primacy of goal orientation" which distinguishes organizations from other social structures (Parsons 1956, pp.63-64), they have sought to analyse the organization with reference to the goals of the organization. As Silverman points out:

Much sociological analysis has followed this lead, suggesting that formal organizations have "objectives which are explicit limited and announced". (Udy 1965 p.168) and are structured so as to attain "a particular type of goal" (Parsons 1964) or "a recognized, limited goal". (Firth 1964).

(Silverman 1970, p.9)

These goals-of-an-organization, however, may be difficult if not impossible to specify because the goals may change in time, may be multiple within an organization and perhaps even contradictory (Silverman 1970). Such analysis assumes that it is possible to identify "organizational goals" - goals that are in some sense specific to the organizational structure and not reducible to the goals of participants. The goals of the organization are seen as reflecting relevant social values and are basic to both the social and organizational structure. Lambert et al (1970) employ this approach in their analysis of the school and follow Parsons in identifying three types of goals functioning for the continued existence of the school:
(a) instrumental goals (transmission of skills)
(b) expressive goals (tension-release)
(c) organizational goals (administrative facilitation of self-maintenance of school)

These goals are regarded as characteristic of all schools and it is in the attainment of these goals that the school is articulated into a formal order.

Such goal analysis not only faces the problems of identifying a specific organizational goal, at whatever level of abstraction, but has also to make the assumption that the goals (as identified) are accepted by the members of the organization. This compliance may be "built-in" where the structure of the organization is analytically derived from the structure of society (cf. Weber 1964, Parsons 1959, 1964), but at the level of empirical analysis has to assume that all members recognize, accept and adhere to the organization goal. It is for this reason that such analysis has been regarded as emphasizing consensus in organizations at the expense of conflict, (Cohen 1968) and may, in fact, relate to the goals held by certain group interests in a power position (Silverman 1970 and Albrow 1965). The "goals of the organization" that is, are confused with the goals of a particular group - the administrators or owners, those in control - and analysis based on such goals will therefore reflect the interests of that group. As Levitas argues:

there is an affinity between the unitary, clear-cut, commonly-held-goal understanding of organizations and (Parsons analysis) in that both have a built-in value orientation supporting one set of class interests.

(Levitas 1964, pp 164-5)
Functionalist analysis contains certain problems which revolve around three points. 7

1) its ability to deal with change in the organization
2) its ability to deal with conflict in the organization and
3) the nature of "causality" in such approaches.

The limitations of functionalist analysis in relation to these three points stem from the emphasis on interdependence, already noted, which constrains the analysis to focus on the consensual and stable aspects of the organization at the expense of dealing with change and conflict, because it is the former aspects which provide the functional pre-requisites of a systemic social entity.

Theorists have realized this limitation and have attempted to account for conflict and change within a functionalist framework in terms of strains to autonomy of sub-systems (Gouldner 1967), through the dynamism of equilibrium resulting from a dialectical synthesis of sub-systems (Van Den Burghe 1963) by attempting to avoid the use of "systems" in functional analysis (Herton 1949), or by locating conflict in strains within the normative order, rather than the value system. These, however, constitute attempts to bring "conflict" into the analysis which is inherently disposed toward criteria of consensus and stability. (Silverman 1970).

Another reason for this emphasis, and one which leads to the question of the viability of structural-functional explanations, is that both the functions of the sub-system and the action of members of those sub-systems

7. The criticisms of functional analysis are dealt with elsewhere (see Silverman 1970, P. Cohen 1968) and no full review is intended at this point.
are analysed with reference to a preconceived entity - "society" - whose continued existence is taken to be an a priori requisite of analysis, and an existence already analysed in terms of "functional pre-requisites". Having staked out in advance all the constituent elements of the social system, analysis is limited to studying the manner in which these constituent elements are fulfilled. This prior determination of the analytically pertinent variables has the effect of rendering functional explanations teleological in the sense that the causal significance of factors is seen in their "effect" for maintaining societal equilibrium.

Action in such analysis is seen as an adjunct to the values and normative behaviour characteristic of a society, and the interpretive possibilities of action are neglected in favour of the regularities of roles pertaining to the particular system. In other words, systems analysis, in-as-much-as it sees action as derivative of social "needs," and the interrelatedness of parts, fails to allow for the creative and interpretive aspects of social action.

The structural functionalist analysis of organizations underplays the problem of the action of participants in an organization in favour of the inter-relatedness of the parts of that system and how the interdependence of the parts contributes toward the maintenance of the whole structure. By concentrating on the structural properties of the organization the analysis focuses attention away from action as a problematic of analysis. Taken to its extreme, such analysis would advocate a sociology of organizations in which the problem of social action is consciously excluded from the field of analysis. Blau, for instance, asserts that:
organizational analysis proper focuses upon the system of inter-related attributes that characterize the organization itself and not "the structure of social relations" or "the behaviour of individuals in their specific roles as members of organizations".

(Blau 1968, p.303)

His point is that organizations exhibit regularities upon which to base the comparative study of organizations, and that such comparative study of the concomitance of features of organizations provides the only proper organizational analysis. Such regularities in organizations are seen as existing independently of the motives, decisions or actions of members of those organizations. As Blau and Schoenherr put it:

much of the variation in organizational characteristics can be accounted for by differences in organizational conditions without taking into account how the individual members of these organizations make decisions.

(Blau & Schoenherr 1971, p.viii)

Action within organizations, according to this approach, does not provide a proper basis upon which to instigate analysis because social structure is not considered as the "product" of intentionality, but is considered as the regularities exhibited in the differentiation of people within a social order. As Blau and Schoenherr argue the case:

An organization consists of sub-units that are formally differentiated along various lines. This patterned differentiation along several dimensions defines the structure of an organization, and the extent of differentiation indicates structural complexity. Although the existence of differentiated inter-related sub-divisions and individual positions is not all that is usually meant by social structure, it is its core.

(ibid, p.vii)

The social structure, that is, of an organization has as its base the inter-relatedness of the formally defined parts, and it is to the study of the
formal dimensions of the organization that attention should be focused. (sic)

it is time we "push men finally out", to place proper emphasis on the study of social structure in sociology. 8

(ibid, p.357)

8. Gouldner has made the following observation about this concentration on the formal properties of an organization:

analysis of specific bureaucracy as a complex social system (has been) concerned less with individual differences of the actors than with the situationally shaped roles they perform. Indeed, the social scene described has sometimes been so completely stripped of people that the impression is unintentionally rendered that there are disembodied forces afoot, able to realise their ambitions apart from human action.

(Gouldner 1954, p.16)

It is, however, Blau and Schoenherr's precise intention to promote the view that organizations do indeed entail "disembodied forces" which they regard as a new form of power posing a threat to democracy.
The analysis of organizations in terms of their structural features, does not, however, totally exclude action from the scene. Although Blau and Schoenherr's analysis explicitly distinguishes between social structure and social relations in the organization, and subsequently concentrates on the former in terms of the analysis, action is not in fact taken out of consideration altogether. Their point is that study should be directed to the organizational structure itself (and not to the relationship between the structure and the social relations), because action, decisions and/or the motives of individuals within the organization are "limited" by the structure of the organization and "serve as constraints on human activities and can be analysed in their own right". (Silverman 1975, p. 272)

The assumption is that fundamental structural conditions exert constraints on the members of organizations that make their administrative decisions virtually independent of their psychological dispositions. Formal structures consequently exhibit regularities that can be studied in their own right without investigating the motives of the individuals in organizations.

(Blau & Schoenherr 1971, pp. 300-1)

The structure of organizations is regarded, then, as an independent influence upon the action of the members of an organization, and though not seen as the sole influence upon action, so far as the sociology of organizations is concerned, provides the relevant factor for the analysis of organizational decisions, etc.

Blau and Schoenherr's approach serves their argument that organizations constitute a form of influence an action which is independent of the individuals who belong to that organization. Yet not all approaches to organization have sought to deal with this topic. Indeed, management studies and industrial sociology in their contributions to the field have been specifically concerned with the relationship between the formal structure
and action. (Bradley & Wilkie 1974, Silverman 1970) The advances of Human Relations (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939, Mayo 1949) and Organizational Psychology (Argyris 1964, Maslow 1954) stemmed principally from their awareness that the formal properties of the organization did not operate directly on the action of members (as perhaps the Scientific Management school (Taylor 1913) had assumed,) but was mediated through the - social or psychological "sentiments" of the actors. In managerial attempts to optimize output they became conscious that the formal rationality of the structure did not become automatically translated into productive activity, but operated through the dispositions of the actors.

The recognition of actors' "sentiments" in the analysis of organizations has received expression also in the study of bureaucracy. Blau (1956) for instance, in referring to "bureaucracy's new face" incorporates the insights of Human Relations within bureaucratic administration in order to allow conditions where members will develop new, informal and efficient methods, i.e. "conditions of adjustive development". Similarly Katz (1950) makes the point that participation in planning at lower levels may contribute to greater efficiency, because of the effects it has on the morale of employees.

Organization analysis within the sociology of education has also been concerned with the reaction of participants, but has taken as its main

9. Other contributions to the analysis of bureaucratic organization have identified inherent problems in bureaucratic structure in relation to the effects on personality (Merton 1949), the stability of the task (Burns and Stalker 1961, Crozier 1964) and the delegation of authority (Janowitz 1959). These, however, focus on the relationship between the formal structure and tasks, rather than the formal structure and members' "sentiments".
problems not the productive efficiency of organizational members
but rather, the problems of bureaucratic administration for the profession-
almism of the teacher, and the effects of school organization on normative
sub-culture developments in the school. L. Cohen (1970) considered the
effects of bureaucratization on teacher role, and Robinson (1967) has looked
at the implications of bureaucratization for teacher professionalism. 10
Anderson (1968) emphasized the problems faced by the teacher in a bureau-
cratic school organization in relation to the principles of commitment and
choice associated with professionals, and in terms of the problems of
impersonality, goal displacement and resistance to innovation - studies
which stem from a concern with the implications of a rational formal
structure on the behaviour of participants.

Recent studies of the school in Britain have exhibited this concern
with the effects of structural aspects of the organization upon behaviour.
Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970) in their case studies, both identify
the emergence of normative sub-cultures in the pupils which can be related
to formal organizational factors, notably the effects of ability grouping,
and Ford (1969) was concerned with the possibilities offered by comprehensive
organization for pupil contact and the effect such contact had upon values
and ideology.

Such studies of organizations differ significantly from considerations
of the interdependent properties of the formal structure in that the action
of members of the organization becomes an integral part of the problematic

10. The association of teachers' role orientation and job satisfaction
to school size, bureaucratization, organizational complexity has
been well documented (Carpenter 1971, Fraser 1970, Flizak 1968,
of research. The relationship between the principles of organization and the principles of action are no longer an a priori basis of analysis, but become the subject of research.

The integration of principles of action within the study of organizations becomes all the more necessary where those organizations are primarily dealing with people. That is, where the structure of the organization is established to order the activity of people, (rather than ordering the production of things), that structure will all the more need to take into account the bases of action of people. "People-processing" organizations, that is, have to cope with the recalcitrance of the product, and their structure, will reflect the necessity to minimize the possibility of disruption from this source. (Goffman 1968).

The study of the school as an organization is particularly suited to the inclusion of the principles of action because they are fundamentally concerned with processing people (Brim and Wheeler 1966) and must, therefore, involve a reflexive relationship between product and producer, processed and processor.11

Where the study of organizations has involved the participation of people the problematic has involved the conditions of compliance and conformity of the personnel with the formal structure. The point of Weber's ideal-type bureaucracy was precisely that it established conditions which could expect to gain compliance from members in a legal-rational society. Indeed, Marton's

---

11. Davies takes this point in order to argue that the organizational analysis of schools should focus on process of the school:

Schools specialize in the output of people, processed over time; to understand schools, we must understand the processes that people undergo there.

(Davies 1970, p.35)
(1949) criticisms of the ideal-type centre on the argument that there is too much provision for conformity - an institutional "overkill". This accounts for what he calls "the displacement of goals" in which conformity with the regulations is valued at the expense of the goals they were instituted to achieve. And Etzioni (1961) clearly indicates the significance of the conditions of compliance for the study of organizations.

Gouldner (1954) argues that approaches to the problem of compliance in (bureaucratic) organizations owe a great deal to Weber's formulation of the basis upon which conformity with the rules could be expected. Weber argued that compliance with the rules could be claimed on rational grounds - whether or not the rules were "imposed" (Weber 1964, p.329). The legitimacy of the rules which Weber acknowledged as basic to compliance with organizational rules, existed in the nature of the organization rather than the participants' conceptions of legitimacy. In other words, for Weber, the conditions of compliance existed in the nature of the organization and not in the meaning actors attribute to that structure.

Gouldner further argues that the Weberian ideal-type confuses two distinct conditions of compliance; the first which stems from office in a hierarchical authority structure the second based on technical expertise.

In practice, however, an organization's legitimacy may derive from neither in absolute form. Swift (1969) notes that the relationship between teacher and pupils in the school is an example of how the acceptance of rules, imposed by staff may result partially from the expertise of the teacher, and
partially from the official position of authority held by the teacher. The distinction between expertise and office is reflected in Bidwell's (1965) analysis of schools as organizations in which the positional and expertise elements of bureaucracies are found to be evident in the North American school system, Bidwell characterizing schools in terms of the positions of members (age-grade cohorts) and clientele responsibility (expertise) of the staff.

Compliance and legitimating conditions become of interest for research to the extent that attempts are made to outline the structural features of an organization, and then explain why the members of the organization "go-along" with the formal prescriptions. That is, interest with compliance and legitimating conditions reflect squarely a concern with the relationship between the formal structural features of the organization and the principles of action of the organizational members. The relationship has been characteristically regarded, however, as one in which the action of members is treated as a more or less dependent variable. That is, actual organizational action is treated in terms of its deviancy or conformity to conditions outlined in the formal structure, providing (to parody Silverman) what might be regarded as a "structural orthodoxy" in the sociology of organizations.

The regularities which organizations exhibit constitute a structure, and it is argued that this structure limits or influences the action which occurs within the organizations. The meaning of action within the organization is thus relegated in importance to the theoretical significance of the formal structure. As Zimmerman points out:

Bureaucrats, in conducting their ordinary everyday affairs in organizations, have been seen in study after study to honor a range of formally, extraneous considerations in making decisions and concerting
actions. The asserted contrasts between theory and practice reported by organizational studies are so commonplace that documentation seems hardly necessary. (...) The investigator determines the deviant or conforming status of some activity or event upon encountering it without reference to a set of unambiguous criteria that specify the defining features of situations and the behaviours appropriate to such situations. (...) It is typically the case that the issue of what the rules mean to, and how they are used by, personnel on actual occasions of bureaucratic work is ignored as an empirical issue.

(Zimmerman 1971 pp. 222-3)

The motive of the actor for complying with, or neglecting, the rule is ignored in favour of the effects of such compliance, or non-compliance, or the social and organizational conditions upon which it can be expected. This runs contrary to Weber's formulation of the task of sociology, viz:

Truly empirical sociological investigation begins only with the question, what did and still does, motivate the individual functionaries and members of the community to conduct themselves in such a way as to bring about the creation of this "community" and to ensure its continuation?

for sociologically meaningful interpretations, (...) organizations are merely the result of distinct behaviour of individual persons, since they alone can engage as agents in any kind of meaningful behaviour.

(Weber 1962, pp. 49, 42)

In summary, then, those approaches which focus on the properties, of the formal structure of organizations have inherently underplayed the position of action within organizations. Where they have been concerned, with the nature of the inter-relatedness of the parts, and the congruence between such inter-relatedness and principles of social integration

(a) specific instances of action are of less significance than general features of social behaviour,

and

(b) the association between social structure, organizational structure and action is "written-in" through general and abstract principles of social order. The conditions for compliance with the organizational
structure are integrated with the principles of social order and form a basis for analysis rather than a problematic of research.

Where the relationship between organizational action and structure has been regarded as problematic, on the other hand, there has been a tendency to treat the status of the activity as conforming to, or deviant from, the prescriptions of the formal structure, rather than in terms of the intentionality of the actor.

The relationship between action and structure (organizational and social) to be found within such approaches to the study of organizations reflect what is here termed a "structural orthodoxy" to the extent that the integrity of the phenomenon "action" (intentionality) is relegated in favour of the observable regularities of behaviour in organizations. Any alternative should, however, make explicit the nature of action, social structure and organizational structure which provides for the authenticity of action. In other words, these approaches have concentrated on the regularities of behaviour exhibited in formally organized settings, and have thereby either focused attention away from the intentionality of action, or have produced a model of actor, which is rule-governed - the latter losing the integrity of the phenomenon.
Interpretive Procedures and Social Structure

The mainstream sociology of organizations has implicitly or explicitly produced a model of action as rule-governed (Zimmerman 1971), because of its focus on the structural regularities in behaviour rather than the intentionality of action. Such approaches focus on the observable properties of normative behaviour rather than the interpretive capacities of the actors which provide for that observable behaviour. Wilson (1971) argues that such approaches fall within what can be termed a "normative paradigm" of sociology which is characterized by:

(a) the attempt to produce deductive explanations of sociology akin to those of the natural sciences,

and

(b) a view of action as essentially rule-governed

The concern to emulate the (albeit outmoded) model of the natural sciences may explain the preference for study of the observable regularities of normative behaviour, but the rule-governed model of action arises primarily from the attempt to indicate some form of dependent relationship between action and structure; - a dependency, however, which exists not in the actor's intentions of action, but in the observer's analysis of patterns of behaviour. There is, to quote Wilson, "the idea of a stable linkage between the situation of an actor and his action in that situation." (Wilson 1971, p.60) That "stable linkage", however, is discernable in the properties of analysis employed by the researcher not the actor. It is

an observer's rule of relevance in that it represents a sociologist's decision (his election) as to how items of concrete behavior are to be reformulated as instance of social action.

(Blum & McHugh 1971, p.99)
Such formulations have traditionally been concerned with specifying how aspects of the formal structure, in relation to shared social/psychological sentiments, can explain the action of members (of an organization). Yet in doing so, the interpretive capacities of the actors are neglected in favour of the features of regularity to be found in the social structure and behaviour, - an emphasis which has the inherent effect of presenting action as rule-governed, and the actor as "judgmental dope". In the words of Garfinkel:

Hierarchies of need dispositions, and common culture as enforced rules of action are favoured devices for bringing the problem of necessary inference to terms, although at the cost of making out the person-in-society to be a judgmental dope.

(Garfinkel, 1967, p.68)

Emphasis on the regularities which characterize social behaviour has the advantage of providing the possibility of analysis which can be demonstrated to be in accord with canons of scientific rationality, but in doing so has to forgo the prospect of understanding the methods through which actors are capable of sustaining such orderly action. Again, as Garfinkel argues:

(Traditional social scientists) have used the fact of standardization to conceive the character and consequences of actions that comply with standardized expectancies. Generally they have acknowledged, but otherwise neglected the fact that by these same actions persons discover, create and sustain this standardization.

(Garfinkel pp.66-67)

The resultant model of man is, to use Garfinkel's term as a "cultural dope", that is a:

Man-in-the-sociologist's-society who produces the stable features of the society by acting in compliance with pre-established and legitimate alternatives of action that the common culture provides.

(ibid, p.68)
The Normative paradigm sociology has, then, acknowledged that such regularities as they observe are the product of actors, yet in their emphasis on the "standardized" aspects of behaviour neglected, or chosen to focus attention away from, the processes whereby such orderly behaviour is possible.¹²

¹² Blau and Schoenherr (1971) illustrate the point when arguing that:

To be sure, organizations cannot think or act; only the people in them can. Any characteristic of an organization is the product of decisions individuals have made; for example, how many supervisors to appoint. However, the formal structure exerts pronounced constraints on these decisions.

(Blau & Schoenherr 1971, p.viii)

And for them the formal structure is nothing other than the "patterned differentiation along several dimensions" (p.vii) which is both characteristic of organizations per se, and is the core of social structure. Such patterns of inter-relatedness, then, are acknowledged as the product of action yet are treated as exerting "pronounced constraints" on such organizational activity.
Interpretive paradigm sociology (Wilson 1971) is distinguishable in its primary concern with the actors' methods for accomplishing the orderly behaviour which characterizes both organizational and social life. Such methods employed by actors are fundamental to the very possibility of an ordered social existence, for as Cicourel points out:

How members of a society or culture make sense of, or assign sense to, their environment over time is central to the persistent problem of how social order is possible.

(Cicourel 1973, p.42)

In terms of the study of organizations it stands as an inductive, voluntaristic approach emphasizing action and process, as opposed to a deductive determinist approach which emphasizes system and structure. (Weeks 1973)

The members' interpretations of the formal structure are problematic in the Interpretive paradigm and it is upon the members' methods for creating and sustaining organized activity that attention is focused.

The "structure" underlying organizational activity is no longer regarded as shared social/psychological sentiments but is seen as an every-day, routine accomplishment of members of the organization.

To understand action within an organization (such as the practice of teaching within a school) it is necessary to focus attention on the manner in which teachers are able to establish and sustain the relevant orderly features which characterize organizational behaviour. Such an ability for concerted activity rests fundamentally in the notion of "Interpretive Procedures" (Cicourel 1973) for it is the interpretive procedures employed by actors in an organization (or in society in general) which provide for the possibility of a notion of social structure which is:
(a) the product of the actor,
(b) negotiated and emergent, (allowing for innovation)
and
(c) basic to action

Cicourel (1973) argues that interpretive procedures, employed by actors and sociologists alike, underlie the possibility that instances of action can be seen as normative behaviour. They govern the sequencing and generation of (surface) normative behaviour:

Interpretive procedures are invariant properties of everyday practical reasoning necessary for assigning sense to the substantive rules sociologists usually call norms.

(Cicourel 1973, p.52)

Normative behaviour, such as that to be witnessed in organizational settings, obtains its regularity - and thereby its meaningful potential - through the shared mode of interpreting such instances of action, and not through any abstract or absolute meaning of the act itself. Cicourel is arguing, then, that in order to understand organizational action it is not adequate to concentrate on the surface appearance of regularity (norms) because such regularity is the product of interpretive procedures. To understand the action it is necessary to understand the interpretive procedures, whereby members can attribute meaning to and hence accomplish order within, the organization.

Focusing attention on the normative behaviour of participants tends to obscure the variations in activity which may characterize membership of an organization. Teachers, for instance, do not all agree on the bases for their practical task - classically a division being drawn between "traditionalists" and "progressives". An approach which concentrates on
the normative aspects of behaviour within an organization will be inherently disposed toward obscuring the very conflict which may characterize membership, and will not explain how it is possible for "membership" of an organization to include apparently antithetical interpretations of the context. More specifically for the present research, an approach is required which contains the possibility for treating teachers in terms of their membership of a teaching community and which also provides for disagreement within the community about the meaning of certain features of the routine context of action - disagreement crystallized in traditional and progressive pedagogies. Cicourel, in confronting a similar problem related to the successful interaction of children with adults writes:

The idea that concerted action is possible because norms and common value orientations generate consensus has been a long-standing thesis in the literature.

... (however) members are quite capable of concerted action despite the absence of consensus, during explicit conflict, or as children where it is not clear that even norms are known or understood much less elements of a common value system.

... values, like surface rules or norms or laws, are always general policies or practices whose articulation with particular cases remains an empirically problematic issue dependent on how interpretive procedures structure unfolding action scenes so as to generate bounded conceptions of 'what happened'.

... The interpretive procedures provide for a common scheme of interpretation that enables members to assign contextual relevance.

(Cicourel 1971, p.167)

Interpretive procedures, as outlined by Cicourel, constitute a basic feature of social action. It is because members of a community share similar procedures for interpreting the surface features of interaction that an orderly social situation can occur.
Interpretive procedures are like "deep structures" underlying the production and interpretation of the routine surface feature of orderly action, (norms), and Cicourel's discussion of the nature of interpretive procedures, and their "deep structure" status for action is perhaps worthy of consideration. He argues that:

The actor must be endowed with mechanisms or basic procedures that permit him to identify settings which would lead to "appropriate" invocation of norms, where the norms would be surface rules and not basic to how the actor makes inferences about taking or making roles. The basic or interpretive procedures are like deep structure grammatical rules; they enable the actor to generate appropriate (usually innovative) responses in changing situated settings. The interpretive procedures enable an actor to sustain a sense of social structure over the course of changing social settings, while surface rules or norms provide a more general institutional or historical validity to the meaning of the action as it passes, in a reflective sense.

(Cicourel 1973, p.27)

There is an analogy between the generative or deep structure grammar of Chomsky and the interpretive procedures of Cicourel which receives more than passing treatment in Cicourel's work. Both share the interest in the capacity of members of a (linguistic or social) community to "assign" meaning to essentially new, innovative events.

Interpretive procedures and deep structure grammars do not strictly "assign" meaning to events. They are not structural capacities of the individual to give meaning to events so much as structural descriptions of "competence". As Chomsky points out:

generative grammar is not a model for a speaker or a hearer. It attempts to characterize in the most neutral possible terms the knowledge of the language that provides the basis for actual use of language by a speaker-hearer.

(Chomsky 1965, p.8)
Again, as Cicourel puts the point:

Chomsky's work on generative grammar refers to a system of rules to enable the linguist to assign structural descriptions to sentences under the assumption that a speaker who has mastered the language has internalized the grammar regardless of his awareness or potential awareness of the rules of grammar he has used.

(Cicourel 1973, p.43)

The Interpretive procedures or deep structure grammars do not provide, then, a prescription for how members of the social or linguistic community might go about actual instances of action, so much as description of the structural features of any such actual instance of action. It concerns "competence" rather than "performance" as both Chomsky and Cicourel point out.13

---

13. Cicourel argues that, in fact, sociologists should be concerned with performance as well as competence.
Such interpretive procedures enable orderly action to occur, and do not prescribe the nature of the surface features (norm). They are "enabling rules" for action rather than "restriction rules". (Shwayder 1965, p.265).

The "rules" of action are not rules of regularity, but are rules for the assignment of regularity. Competence exists not in following rules, but in being able to recognize the action as rule-following. The interpretive procedures constitute enabling rules because they provide for the possibility that distinct, unique and essentially new instances of action (events) can be interpreted as orderly. It is through interpretive procedures that actual instances of context - situated activity become understandable to the actor:

The interpretive procedures provide a sense of social order that is fundamental for normative order (consensus or shared agreement) to exist or be negotiated or constructed (...)

The learning and use of general rules or norms and their long term storage always require interpretive procedures for recognizing the relevance of actual, changing scenes orienting the actor to possible courses of action ....

(Cicourel 1973, p.31-2)

Both Garfinkel (1967) and Cicourel (1973) are concerned with outlining the general features of interpretive procedures which allow the sense of social structure in its most basic form. They argue that the "clues" offered by surface features of interaction cannot provide enough information of itself for the construction of continued interaction. Actors need to supply a host of background information to the "clues". It is a basic feature of interpretive procedures that surface features are treated as a "clue" to, or document of, a mass of further information wherein the significance of the surface feature can be gauged. The surface features are presumed to be an aspect of a wider context (of meanings and implications) which allow the actor to make sense of the "clue". The competent social actor (a) assumes that surface features are a document of a wider context of meaning, and (b) is capable of assessing, for all practical purposes which is the appropriate "context" which explains the "clue".
Concern, then becomes orientated to the context within which action occurs. As Douglas indicates this is characteristic of recent theories of meaning:

... the context within which a given statement or action occurs is of fundamental importance in determining the meanings imputed to it by the members of society. This is the basic idea behind the phenomenological theories of meaning and is in complete opposition to the building-block theory of meaning to be found in all absolutist theories of society.

(Douglas 1971, p.37)

Such emphasis on the contextual specificity of action should not, however, be seen as implying that the context has features other than those attributed to it by the members (of the organization) whose interpretive procedures sensitize (reflexively) them to "domains of relevance". (Cicourel 1973, p.40)

As McHugh (1968) points out, the definition of the situation appropriate to action centres on the devices by which meaning is assigned to a context or situation, and that situation has no intrinsic meaning. He follows Wittgenstein (1953) in claiming that meaning is not the content of an "object description" but the rule by which it is given content by the actor.

Interpretive procedures, then, are basic to action and include as a constitutive feature the use of "et cetera assumptions", "background expectancies": - the filling-in of the inadequate clues offered in surface features of interaction. The "clues" are regarded as the document of a context, and it is only through the ascription of a context to the "clues" that they become meaningful.

The use of interpretive procedures is fundamental to the competence of the actor, but as Cicourel (1973) indicates sociology has to be concerned also with the performance of actors. Performance refers to the ability of
the actor to attribute to the "clues" the **appropriate** context of meanings and implications, as opposed to process of attributing a context per se (competence). Sociology of action, then, is concerned not only with these basic structural features of action (competence) but also with ascription of appropriate contexts to the surface features of interaction (performance). It is axiomatic to the present discussion that "membership" of a community (organization) refers to both competence and performance: performance being the shared ability to see "clues" in a similar background or context. Membership is not the product of official status or role enactment but involves competence (as used by Cicourel 1973, Chomsky 1965) and performance in attributing contexts to "clues". And "**competent** membership" of a community or organization involves not merely competence (interpretive procedures), but more significantly it involves performance, i.e. "competent membership" involves competence and performance.

To become a member of a community or organization, in any sense relevant to action, is to share in the activity of that setting: competent members have access to the appropriate methods for interpreting events, for associating "clues" with contexts; non-competent members have not. The "competent" teacher, in this sense, is one who can "read-off" situations as having certain salient features, and certain connotations for action. This sense of "competence" is akin to the ability of teachers to comprehend events as "disorderly" - a "disorderly behaviour set" (Stebbins 1971). Hargreaves et al (1975) illustrate how, with a minimum of surface information teachers can impute "deviance" to a child by reading-in to the suspicions they have through "evidential strategies". These abilities to recognize actions or events as deviant or disruptive do not depend on the intrinsic qualities of the event itself, but on the feature of "interpretive procedures" whereby the sparse and sometimes ambiguous information is interpreted, and through which meaning (deviance or disruption) can be attributed.
Competence involves not just a "knowledge" of the "surface rules" (organizational rules, norms) but how to interpret a situation as appropriate for a particular course of action. In traditional (normative paradigm) sociological accounts of situated activity the way in which the situation is recognized as of-a-type appropriate for a particular (normative) course of action has been taken for granted, (cf. Schütz's "natural attitude"). The normative paradigm sociologists, that is, have employed and drawn-upon a lay-sense of structure in order to render their accounts of normative behaviour sensible to others. As traditionally used, notions such as role and status assume a correspondence between the act and its normative qualities as a basis of analysis, whereas such correspondence is (a) an accomplishment of both lay member and sociologist, yet (b) may not in fact correspond as the sociologist might assume. That is, the correspondence between action and normative structure - to the extent that "action" is of focal interest - should be treated as a topic of research rather than employed as a resource. The association of structure and action is the achievement of actors whose methods for doing so should be studied rather than incorporated (unquestioningly) into sociological analysis. Structure is the product of action rather than a constraining force on action.

In the study of organizations, for instance, the external and constraining influence of the structure (cf. Blau and Schoenherr 1971) has been regarded as an external entity rather than a product of action, yet the fundamental "facticity" of those structures ... is an unexplicated and invisible premise, condition and resource of those investigations.

(Zimmerman and Pollner 1971, p.9)

The surface features of action (norms, organizational structure) need to be clarified through explication of the actors' methods through which such regularities in action become possible.
In the words of Cicourel:

the first task of sociology is to discover the rules employed by the actor for managing his daily affairs.

(Cicourel 1964, p.53)
To summarize, it has been argued that the basic feature of social structure is the interpretive procedures which allow for the prospect of a sense of structure; it provides for an emergent and negotiated sense of social structure. A crucial feature of the interpretive procedures is the et cetera assumptions which entail the surface features of an interaction or event being regarded as a document of a context within which the meaning and implications of that "clue" can be gauged. Membership of a social community involves, however, not only attributing a "clue" to a context, but in attributing it to an appropriate context (performance). Competent membership provides for a sense of social structure which is shared by the members. That is, competent members share the capacity to attribute specific "clues" to general contexts in similar fashions. The "structure" which influences members of an organization, then, is not a formally designated structure or analyst's structure as such, but the sense of social structure which is achieved by members of the organization. Structure is the product of action, an accomplishment of actors, and those approaches to organizational action which implicitly or explicitly treat structure as constraining an action lose the integrity of the phenomenon (action) they seek study, drawing upon a lay sense of structure in establishing sociological explanations. The orderliness of behaviour which such approaches describe is the accomplishment of actors who achieve organizational structure and are not constrained by it.
Action and Organizational Structure

The interpretation which members of an organization give to the formal structure is of paramount importance to an analysis of organizational action. It is to the meaning of the organization for the participants, rather than formal regularities, that analysis should be orientated. As Goldthorpe and Lockwood (1968) put it:

In contrast with approaches which begin with some general and normative psychology (or philosophy) of individual needs in work, or with some conception of the "needs" of the efficiently operating industrial enterprise, an action frame of reference would direct attention systematically to the variety of meanings which work may come to have for industrial employees.

(Goldthorpe & Lockwood 1968, p.184)

The interpretation of formal structural properties of the organization has not been completely ignored, however, by the more "traditional" studies of organizations. Blau (1955) for instance argues that to understand the mechanisms whereby (formal) rules become translated into action it is insufficient merely to rely on members' knowledge of such rules - (rules here providing an instance of formal structure). Members may "know" a rule, he argues, but to become operative in an organizational setting the member has to modify the rule through what he calls an "adjustment, redefinition and amplification of procedures". (Blau 1955, p.27). Such procedures are necessary because the rules of any organization cannot hope to cover the multitude of new situations which may arise.

Strauss et al (1973) focus attention on this aspect of rules and action within a hospital organization. They argue that:

unquestionably in most sizeable establishments, hardly anyone know all the extant rules, much less exactly what situations they apply to, for whom and with what sanctions (...) The plain fact is that staff kept forgetting not only the rules received from above but also some rules that they themselves had agreed upon "for the ward".

(Strauss et al 1973, p.306)
In face of the "dynamics" of the social setting within which the (bureaucratic) organization operates the officials may interpret the rules in terms of the "exigencies of the situation and of the dominant objectives of their task." (Blau 1955, p. 29). Blau's concern with the interpretive methods used by members of the organization, however, is less oriented toward the actual methods of interpretation employed by members than with the effects of interpreting the rules in a certain manner for the organization: viz. his argument that deviations from the formally specified rules can be regarded as functionally necessary for organizational adaption to a permanently changing environment.

Gouldner (1954) similarly provides for the interpretation of rules by members of the organization. He argues that the rules of an organization cannot claim legitimacy (and thereby compliance) on a priori grounds with respect to the nature of those rules (cf. Weber 1964), but that the implementation of rules of an organization stems basically from the meaning which participants attribute to the rules. The legitimacy of the rules, for Gouldner, reside in the expectations of members of the organization, and the increased use of rules (and supervision) stems from the perceived failure to perform role obligations by members of the organization. It was, that is, the perception of failure and not an abstract "state" of failure upon which he bases his analysis of bureaucratization.

However, like Blau, his study is less interested in the methods for interpreting the rules than with the effects of such interpretations. Gouldner is more concerned with the nature of the rules (their source, and for whom they are useful) than their interpretation as such. He argues, for instance, that rules have a disciplining function (legitimating the use of punishment) a protection against arbitrary discipline and provide
a negotiating tool. Such functions of rules are certainly based on the way rules are used (and hence interpreted) by members, but are analysed primarily in terms of their capacities for reducing or enhancing tensions in the organization.

Both Blau and Gouldner are interested in the manner in which the rules of an organization are used by members, and both acknowledge that such usage must depend on an interpretation of the rules. Their focus of attention, however, is on the outcome of such use of rules, rather than the interpretive procedures used by members which may account for such usage. It is precisely to these interpretive procedures that the study of organizational action should move; to the rules of action rather than the rules of the organization, because

in actual life rules are never entirely conformed to, and it remains as the most difficult but indispensable part of the ethnographer's work to ascertain the extent and mechanism of the deviations.

(Malinowski 1932, pp. 428-9)

In other words, rules of organizations do not, and cannot, cover all instances of action and the task for studies of organizational action is to understand how and why such "deviations" occur (rather than focus on the effects which they have on the organization's survival).

14. Blau (1956) refers to "strategic leniency!", and Gouldner (1954) to the "leeway function" wherein the non-implementation of the rules can be used to gain compliance by providing a basis for negotiation. Such "use" of rules provides a particular kind of exercise of authority, and does not denote a lack of it. As Gouldner indicates:

formal rules gave the supervisors something with which they could "bargain" in order to secure informal cooperation from workers. (...) Formal bureaucratic rules served as a control device not merely because they provided a legitimating framework for the allocation of punishments, but also because they established a punishment which could be withheld.

(Gouldner 1954, p.173)
The structure of an organization, inasmuch as it is part of organizational activity, exists as an accomplishment of the members of the organization and as a negotiated and emergent order. The "structure" which is appropriate to organizational activity is not the observable regularities (cf. Blau and Schoenherr 1971) because as Silverman points out:

however deeply one digs, organizational charts (and other socially provided phenomena) have no intrinsic meaning. Their meaning arises in socially organized attempts, both lay and sociological to recognize and count them.

(Silverman 1975, p.275)

Following the ethnomethodological premises outlined in relation to the possibilities of social order generally, the possibility of order in organizational activity stems not from the observable (normative) regularities but as an achievement of the members. In this vein, Elger puts the point thus:

"organizational structure" as a pattern of social relations and social constraints should be seen as the ongoing product of social processes enacted by organization members rather than as some form of "given" which furnishes automatic constraints on the lines of actions of those members.

(Elger 1975, p.91)

Such an approach to organizational activity, then would not seek to describe the "formal" properties of organizational activity (regularities) but would seek to investigate the procedures by which orderliness and stability are achieved and routinely maintained. Rather than consider the organizations as:

stable associations of persons engaged in concerted activities directed to the attainment of specific objectives .... the study of the methodical use of the concept of organization seeks to describe the mechanisms of sustained and sanctioned relevance of the rational constructions to a variety of objects, events and occasions relative to which they are invoked.

(Bittner 1965, pp. 239, 248)
The "structure" relevant to organizational activity is (a) contained in such "mechanisms" and (b) is an ongoing accomplishment of members of the organization.

Studies of organizationally situated activity which focus on the sense of social structure employed by the members (and which have been broadly associated with the genre of ethnomethodology) have exhibited concern with two related aspects of activity; that is (a) the sense of social structure and how it can help to explain the manner in which members of an organization use, neglect, bend, etc. the formally designated properties of organizational structure, and (b) the negotiated and emergent manner in which the sense of social structure is accomplished - how members demonstrate the "rationality" of their action to others.

The use of rules by members of an organization provides an instance of the interpretation of the formal structure by the members. The organizational rules (as specified authority relations, regulations of procedure or official goal) provide a referant point for action, but do not provide a basis for action. As Douglas (1971) points out, organizational rules are not the basis from which actual occurrences of deviation, use etc. can be measured, but are used by members.

Zimmerman's (1971) study of the reception and intake assignment procedures at a Bureau of Public Assistance in the United States provides an illustration of how competence as a member of the organization requires more than just a knowledge of the rules, but requires a sense of social structure where - upon occasion - the by-passing of rules is seen as appropriate. He notes that most of the processing of prospective clients was conducted in accord with the formal rules of procedure, assignment to a caseworker being on the basis of first come, first served, with each caseworker receiving an applicant in rotation. This orderly procedure
was occasionally disrupted where for practical reasons the application of the rule was no longer regarded as appropriate. Where a caseworker was developing a backlog of applicants, where an applicant asked to be interviewed by a specific caseworker, or where the receptionist regarded the applicant as "potentially troublesome", the strict order of intake assignment might be broken. Zimmerman's point is that the breaking of the rule did not constitute a breaking of the orderliness of the intake assignment procedure because the "order" (sense of social structure) lay not in the rule as such, but in receptionist's understanding of the "actual task structure". It was the receptionists' understanding of the actual task structure which was basic to their competent use of the rules and which was concerned with the orderly pacing of processing rather than the strict adherence to a rota system of assignment. Where practical problems arose, that is which threatened the orderly pacing of processing, the by-passing of the rule was regarded by competent receptionists as reasonable and appropriate.

The "competent" receptionist then, is not one who adheres to the rules, but one who has learnt how to recognize situations as appropriate for breaking the rules. Such breaking of rules of procedure does not constitute a breakdown of social order, and in fact is demonstrably an aspect of the social order which characterizes competence of the receptionist, and which is entailed in the receptionists' conception of what really constitutes their task, rather than the official line. As Zimmerman puts the point, the

reasonableness of ... decisions, from the point of view of the personnel, relies upon a taken-for-granted grasp of, and implicit reference to the situated practical features of task activity.

(Zimmerman 1971, p.225)
Bittner (1967, 1973) provides a study based on similar premises. In "Police on Skid-Row" he argues that the law provides a series of "rules" which are available to be invoked by patrolmen. The competent patrolman, especially on "Skid-Row", does not however abide by the letter of the law and each and every instance of a transgression of the law does not lead to the invocation of sanctions. The experienced patrolman proceeds on the basis of a sense of social structure which is characterized by notions of "peace-keeping" rather than "law-enforcing". Bittner's point is that to understand how the competent patrolman decides when and where to enforce the law it is inappropriate to refer to the nature of the law itself. If patrolmen were guided in their official duties solely by the letter of the law they would be indeed "law enforcing agents", but would not be competent patrolmen. Their competence is based on the view that, in the instance of Skid-Row, their actual task is to maintain peace in an environment of incorrigible social maladaptts. To this end, they have at their disposal "the law" which is appropriately enforced on those occasions which the experienced patrolmen consider to threaten the peace. The law, that is, is used as a resource to deal with practical problems such as threats to the peace:

patrolmen do not really enforce the law, even when they do invoke it, but merely use it as a resource to solve certain pressing practical problems of keeping the peace.

(Bittner 1973, pp. 337-8)

The practical problems encountered by members of a "community", then, give rise to a conception of their task which may involve occasional and routine non-adherence to the official rules of procedure. In such organizational situations strict adherence to the rules of procedure would constitute a "non-competence" qua membership. Sudnow's (1965)
study of the methods used by Public Defenders (P.D's) in negotiating the nature of an alleged offence to be agreed with a District Attorney (D.A.) further illustrates this point.

Sudnow notes that the majority of cases never go to trial because a plea of "guilty" is returned. This plea relates to a charge/offence which is negotiated between the officials of Prosecution and Defence, and for which an understanding of "normal crime" is essential. To be a competent Public Defender, it is necessary to prevent an overloading of the courts with "not-guilty" pleas. To avoid this situation it is necessary to bargain with the District Attorney and to establish a charge which is considered appropriate for the defendant to return a "guilty" plea.

The nature of the negotiation relies on the fact that many offences involve a "necessarily-included-lesser-offence", and the bargaining for a "guilty" plea may involve the reduction of the charge to one such included offence. But, as well as these reductions, some negotiation may occur without reference to necessarily-included-offences. Sudnow's point is that the negotiation involves the competent P.D. and D.A. in establishing lesser-included-offences which do not have basis in the law. In doing so, they draw on (and establish) a common-understanding of what a kind of offence must also include: they draw on an understanding of what other and lesser offence accrues to the normal operation of the initially charged offence. The negotiation of charge/plea which is not based on legal possibilities, for reduction, occurs not at random, but on the basis of social structure created by P.D. and D.A. pertaining to "normal crimes", or what the typical execution of a crime classified as 'X' must entail. And such a social structure is not resultant from, or available in, the formally available rules of procedure.
The competent membership and reasonable execution of duties, then, are shown to depend upon a sense of social structure in which the actual task structure is available, and in which it becomes manifest with respect to situations which threaten the attainment of this task structure: for the patrolman it was a threat to his peace-keeping role, to the Bureau receptionist the prospect of disrupting the pacing of the work-load and for P.D's it was the possibility of overloading the courts with time-consuming "not-guilty" pleas. The sense of social structure involves a way of establishing which of the features of a context or event are the salient features and the practical problems for competent members exist, not for their execution of the formal structure, but in terms of the conception of the actual task structure.
The rules of an organization are used, then, on the basis of a sense of social structure which is negotiated and emergent. Members of an organization "account" for their activities as being appropriate and check with others that their assessment of an act as appropriate is indeed confirmed (Garfinkel 1967). In the "accounting" of organizational activity - the second aspect of ethnomethodological interest in organizational activity - the organizational rules can be used as a resource to justify and legitimate actual instances of action. Garfinkel's (1967) study of decision-making in a jury-setting focused on this interest.

Jurors, faced with establishing "what really happened" had to decide between competing accounts (evidence). Garfinkel argues that in doing so they drew upon common-sense knowledge of social structure, a competence at establishing "what is really going on". The jurors, however, were also aware that as jurors their decisions and assessments should be based on good-juror-decision-making-rules which would constitute an objective appraisal of the facts. Such good-juror-rules, it is argued did not form the basis of decision-making by the jurors, but were instead occasionally invoked to justify a decision arrived at through common-sense procedures for establishing social structure. The good-juror-rules did not prescribe the method for reaching decisions but were used by jurors to account for a decision as reasonable and appropriate. "The outcome comes before the decision (as to its grounds)." (Garfinkel 1967, p. 114)

The rules of procedure of an organization, then, can be invoked by members of an organization to demonstrate to other members the "rational" nature of that action. This leads to the assertion that the rational properties of organizational activity lies not in the nature of the formal
structure but in the possibility that action be demonstrated to be (for all practical purposes) in accord with an (organization) rule. That rule, however, need not be only an organizational rule but as Zimmerman and Weider (1971) point out, the rationalizing of action can be in relation to any social (emergent and negotiated) rule, and it is an essential feature of social structure that it is "available" to be checked by others. Members' "accounts" demonstrate the appropriateness of the action to others whilst at the same time being confirmed as appropriate, by reading-off the reaction of the others. This reflexive "accounting" involves, then, a necessity to demonstrate and confirm that an event or action is in accord with a situationally appropriate, formal or informal rule for interpreting the significance and meaning of the situation. (cf. Garfinkel and Sacks, 1970)

This aspect of the sense of social structure has been investigated by Cicourel (1967) and Garfinkel (1967) who both demonstrate that official records in an organization do not necessarily reflect any actual or "real-world" state of affairs, but that the records provide an organizational "history" which is used to demonstrate the rational character of decisions made about the client - making the decisions apparently in accord with an officially sanctioned rule.
Whilst concentrating on different aspects of "accounting", these various approaches to organizational action have in common the premise that the possibility of orderliness in organizational activity exists in the shared sense of social structure of competent members, and that these are emergent and negotiated and subject to continual display and checking by members as part of that routinely organized activity.

In conclusion, the "order" which characterizes organizational activity involves competent members in being (a) able to demonstrate acts as in accord with a rule (formal or otherwise) and (b) able to read-off acts as in accord with a rule (formal or otherwise). Attention is thus directed respectively to:

(a) how rules are used to justify, rationalize and render reasonable actual routine organized practices, and

(b) the social structure involved in the competent members' use of rules.

As Silverman puts it, the study of organizations along these lines is characterized by:

1. An attempt to examine the ways in which activities and their outcomes are displayed as in-accord-with-a-rule such that their sensible character may be recognized, and

2. An examination of the practices and policies through which the features of the real world are provided for in the activities and accounts (both lay and professional) that routinely arise in socially organized setting.

As a consequence, this work specifically avoids:

1. The explanation of talk and action in terms of underlying rationalities and sets of rules (roles, norms and cultures) which arise outside such activities and determine their character, and

2. The treatment of social phenomena (facts, rates and structures) as if they exist independently from anyone's accounting activities and are (in some unknown way) "available" for analysis.

(Silverman 1975, p.280)
The study of teaching as an organizational activity should, then, focus on the sense of social structure which provides teachers with the ability to assign real-world properties to the situation of teaching. This sense of social structure which underlies the practice of teaching may be outlined on the basis of:

(a) the practical problems which teachers face in their routine activities, and

(b) particularly as these problems relate to "comprehensive" features of the formal organization.

It has been demonstrated that the practical problems which competent members confront can be used to explain their non-adherence to organizational rules (cf. Zimmerman 1971, Sudnow 1965, Bittner 1967, 1973). To locate such practical problems specifically with aspects of comprehensive school organization might allow a discussion of the sense of social structure of competent teachers in a comprehensive school.

Further, the negotiated and emergent properties of the sense of social structure seen through "accounts" may be used not as a topic of organizational activity to be researched in itself (cf. Silverman & Jones 1973) but as a methodological resource for achieving an understanding of the teachers' sense of social structure. That is, it is proposed that the reflexive features of the accounting process be used in order to establish the nature of the sense of social structure of competent teachers in a comprehensive school.
Chapter V

Interviews and Accounts
The mechanisms responsible for the observed patterns of social interaction are the inter-relations of meanings as perceived by the interactors. The way people respond is determined by the way in which they have understood the meaning of the situations in which they find themselves, and by the rules and conventions they accept with respect to those meanings.

The structure of the meaning relations can be discovered by studying accounts that people give from their own special point of view, of social interactions in which they have taken part.

(Harre 1972, pp.407-8)

To understand action (within an organization) it is necessary to understand the structure of social relations employed by the actors. The most appropriate method for coming to terms with such procedures is to focus attention on the "accounts" through which the members display and check on the sensible nature of their action.

Action is subject to a rule of interpretation - a rule which must be shared. This sharedness of rules is basic to the possibility of any social order, for random and unconnected "acts" would provide the basis only of chaos, not order. Sharedness is, as a corollary, the basis of meaning - meaning and action both being essentially subject to a "rule". However, the rule to which action is subject is not to be found in the observable (normative) regularities of action nor the psychological or social "sentiments" of the actors, but is essentially a rule for interpretation which is shared, by the actors and which enables social action to exist (cf. Garfinkel 1967, Winch 1958, Cicourel 1973, Dixon 1973).

1. Such "rule" refers to a sharedness which characterizes action, and does not refer to formally designated "organizational rules".
To the extent that rules for action are shared they must also be "available" or public unless, that is, social action is deemed to stem from non-cultural factors. Where the basis of action is learnt (cultural) there must be the possibility for demonstrating and checking on whether or not the rules have been correctly grasped and implemented. It was a basic premise of Wittgenstein's later philosophy (Wittgenstein 1953) that "private" rules were not possible, and as Winch notes, he insisted:

that it must be in principle possible for other people to grasp that rule and judge when it is being correctly followed; (and) .... that it makes no sense to suppose anyone capable of establishing a purely personal standard of behaviour ...

(Winch 1958, p.33)

It is precisely this essential availability of rules which provides for the use of "accounts" by the ethnographer because it is through accounts that the rules for action are made available and public. In other words, to the extent that the rules for action are a cultural phenomenon and are learnt, they must be demonstrable, - and this public availability of the rules exists in the accounts of actors.

These rules for action are the product of actors. They are not based on the analyst's rules (Garfinkel 1967), but are constituted in the practical reasoning of the actors. Cicourel indicates in his definition of ethnomethodology:

the study of everyday practical reasoning as constitutive of all human activities .... (and) A basic consideration of the study of practical reasoning is members' use of everyday talk or accounts to describe the factual status of their experience and activities.

(Cicourel 1973, p.99)
For the members to partake in such a process they must, in some sense, "know" the rule for action, and be able to demonstrate their action to be rational. The rationality of action is the accomplishment of actors and involves necessarily the prospect that the "rule" to which the action accords can be displayed and checked by actors. The sharedness and availability of the rules for action, then, does not exist in terms of some abstract model of rationality, but is the basis upon which members can establish social order. The rationality of action is a practical rationality.

The rules for action are shared and must be available so that actors can learn the rules and check on their correct usage. The rules for action are rules used by actors who, in consequence, must have knowledge of the rules. It does not follow, however, that actors will be in a position to articulate the rule which they use for action. Such rules are usually taken-for-granted and pose no routine problems, and the knowledge which actors have of the rules for action may only become apparent in those instances which appear not to follow the rule. As Winch indicates:

the test of whether a man's actions are the application of a rule is not whether he can formulate it, but whether it makes sense to distinguish between a right and a wrong way of doing things in connection with what he does.

the notion of following a rule is logically inseparable from the notion of making a mistake.

(Winch 1958, pp.58, 32)

An actor, then, may not be able to give a full or consistent account of the basis of his action, but will be able to identify those instances which involve a wrong application of the rule. Indeed, it is this aspect
of the rule-orientation of action which has been used in research
into the nature of the rules (Garfinkel 1967) and as Cicourel argues:

The general point suggested by the work of Schutz and Garfinkel is that when the properties of constitutive rules are violated or broken, then confusion, chaos or an abrupt breakdown of social action will follow.

Experimenting with the properties of rules becomes a necessary task for an experimental sociology.

(Cicourel 1964, pp. 166, 169)

So, although members of a community will have a shared knowledge of the rules for action such knowledge may only become articulated in instances which involve an inappropriate use of the rule. The point is that members may not be in a position to indicate clearly the bases upon which they act, but may be clear about instances which do not accord with such bases. To understand the rules for action, then, research needs to go beyond the surface features of the "accounts" offered in interviews.

No matter how "deep" the analysis goes, however, the research directed at rules for action cannot expect to establish a vocabulary of rules which can be in any sense exact because the rules-for-action do not exist as trans-situational absolutes which govern the action of members. The rules for action are continually enacted and constructed in situations by the members, and their sharedness is more like "family resemblances" (Wittgenstein 1953) than any precise equation (Hartnack 1965, Dixon 1973). It was a major aspect of Wittgenstein's later philosophy that the nature of "rules" were not to be found in what they "contained", but the nature of "rules" was only to be discovered in the way they were used. In the words of Hartnack:
To discover the meaning of a statement is not to discover what it may describe or refer to, but to discover its use.

(Hartnack 1965, p.83)

Consequently, the search for the precise basis of accounts becomes untenable. The rules for action which are shared by competent members of an organization are not identical, but have in common the "family resemblance" of Wittgenstein's language games.

Dixon (1973) makes the point that the nature of social phenomena renders the search for "laws" or "theory" in sociology essentially a "pretension". Drawing on the work of Winch (1958) and thereby Wittgenstein (1953) he argues that theories imply universalism, but that such universalism is impossible (a) where sociology is oriented to social action, and (b) where that social action is regarded as interpretive and not rule-governed. Because rules for action are constantly negotiated and precariously managed the attempt to understand action with reference to theories or laws (trans-situational absolute rules) is basically a "pretence". 2

Two questions arise from this discussion: (a) on what basis can an account be wrong? and (b) what is the nature of the sociologists' representation of the various accounts?

Accounts do not depend for their success on the factual accuracy of that which they depict, and thus the traditional problem of "error" in interviews is, in large part, overcome. (Manning 1967). Whether an account which is offered is "honoured" or not will depend, as Scott and Lyman point out, upon the particular circumstances of the account.

2. Garfinkel's (1967) study of scientific and social rationality provides for similar conclusions.
Voysey (1975) in treating interviews as accounts illustrates the way in which the "misrepresentation" of the surface features can be used, in fact, in research. Her argument is that, in accounting for the influence of a handicapped child on their family life, the parents may draw on their conception of normal family life to give the (false) impression that they have been unaffected.

(Parents) maintain a normal respectable appearance because they make situationally appropriate use of the normal family in formulating particular accounts of their activities. "The family" defines the situation in which the giving of an account is appropriate.

(Voysey 1975, p.56)

The parents' attempt to present an image of normality requires that they draw on their conception of normal family in accounting for their activities to the interviewer. The authenticity of their activities in the account is less significant than the representation on what constitutes normal family life which is embedded in the account.

The point about accounts is that they exhibit a variety of contexts within which the action described would be seen as reasonable, and thus draw on a sense of social structure of interest to the researcher even if the actions or events described in the account are not authentic. Accounts only become of dubious value when the context they establish for the researcher is not one that would normally be recognized by competent members to provide a reasonable explanation of action. As Scott and Lyman put the point,

An account is deemed unreasonable when the stated grounds for action cannot be "normalized" in terms of the background expectancies of what "everybody knows".

(Scott & Lyman 1968, p.54)
The sociologist, in representing the variety of accounts, is himself providing an account to an audience whose sense of (sociological) structure has to be entertained in the presentation of that account. In face of the inherent variety of actual accounts, and the "non-precise" nature of the sense of social structure basic to the sense of those accounts, the form of presentation can only hope to cover the "core" features of the sense of social structure. As Harre comments on the problem:

The only possible sense that can be given to the concept of "the rightness of an account by an ethnogenist" is that his account should be the most stable element in the negotiation of accounts when discrepancies exist.

(Harre 1972, p.418)

The point is that the nature of the phenomenon being studied (the sense of social structure of a competent member of a community) has certain characteristics which do not allow for the exact location of precise variables in understanding that phenomenon. The sociologist's account of the lay accounts involves a structural representation of the basis of social structure depicted in the various lay accounts (cf. Cicourel 1973, Chomsky 1965 on the nature of "deep structures").

Another factor which precludes the precise depiction of the rule for action is that the rule is negotiated and emergent - the account reflexively being a feature of the context as well as a "rationalization" of that context. It is not only that accounts allow members to demonstrate and check on the reasonable nature of their actions, but accounts are
are essentially part of the actions themselves. As Garfinkel observes:

Members' accounts of every sort in all their logical modes, with all their uses and for every method for their assembly, are constituent features of the settings they make observable. Members know, require, count on and make use of the reflexivity to produce, accomplish, recognize, or demonstrate rational-adequacy-for-all-practical-purposes of their procedures and findings.

Members' accounts are reflexively and essentially tied for their rational features to the socially organized occasions of their use for they are features of the socially organized occasions of their use.

(Garfinkel 1967, pp. 8,4)

Two issues arise from the recognition of the reflexive features of accounts. The first concerns the fact that the accounts offered to, for instance, an interviewer doing research may reflect as much on account of the interview situation itself as any particular event or action with which the researcher is interested. The mode of the account, that is, is an enabling factor in the construction of an interview. The possible effects of this reaction to an interview situation are discernable in Labov's (1973) work in which the response of negro boys to an interview situation was mistaken by the interviewers as a response to their questions.

---

3. Linguistic ethnomethodology has drawn on this feature of accounts, and recognizing the significance of J. L. Austin's writings, have sought to demonstrate how people do things in and through talk and words. Talk and words, that is, do not merely represent the context but reflexively establish that context. In consequence, linguistic ethnomethodology is concerned with how social order is created in and through talk (cf. Turner 1971).
Certain tactics of research were consequently adopted to minimize the relevance of the interview and promote the relevance of the particular teacher's actions in day-to-day practice as the basis for accounting.\(^4\)

The second issue concerns the inherent inability of the social scientist to provide some "objective" account of the rules for action used by members of a community. The social scientist, in reporting on the phenomenon he observes uses an aspect of that phenomenon in his reportage. In reporting on any aspect of social order the researcher will draw on a sense of social order assumed in the competent reader. Social order, as a rule-oriented phenomenon, is an emergent and precariously managed accomplishment, and has no basis outside the practices of its members including the practice of research. There is no order (rule) outside the production of order - a feature derived from Wittgenstein's later work.

As Pears notes:

> It is Wittgenstein's later doctrine that outside human thought and speech there are no independent, objective points of support, and meaning and necessity are preserved only in the linguistic practices which embody them. They are safe only because the practices gain a certain stability from rules. But even the rules do not provide a fixed point of reference, because they always allow divergent interpretations. What really gives the practices their stability is that we agree in our interpretations of the rules.

(Pears 1971, p.68)

Winch echoing Wittgenstein's sentiments, argues that:

> Our idea of what belongs to the realm of reality is given for us in the language that we use, (and that) ... there is no way of getting outside the concepts in terms of which we think of the world.

(Winch 1958, p.15)

---

4. This particular problem is dealt with in greater depth at a later stage of the chapter.
The social world, then, is inherently bound-up in the way we think of it, the language and accounts we use to depict it, whether or not they be lay or sociological. It is thus both a logical and practical impossibility to present the rules of action in objective form since it is alien to both the nature of rules and knowledge.

The resource which researchers employ to investigate social order is an aspect of social structure. The importance of language in the accounting process is paramount and whilst, through language, there is a display of the social structure of the accountee, this account draws on a sense of social structure to make that account sensible. There is in other words, an essential reflexivity between accounts and social structure - a reflexivity which is glossed within the Normative paradigm (Wilson 1971) of sociological enquiry. Such research, which employs an everyday sense of social structure, tends to cover-up and ignore this lay sense of social structure, and systematically presents a model of action and the social world based on reified notions of externality (Silverman 1975).

The reflexivity of accounts and social structure need not, however, prohibit attempts to study social phenomena. Rather than taking the reflexivity as a baulk to the study of phenomena, it can in fact be employed in their study.  

5. McHugh et al (1974) have attempted to present a sociological work which explicitly uses rather than masks, the collaborative and generative manner in which a sense of structure (qua social knowledge) is established. They seek to examine the basis of social knowledge by ethnographically using collaboration to be able to write about social enquiry in recognition of the reflexivity of accounts and social structure.
An account involves both description and justification. That is, the account requires not only a picture of actions, but also placement of those events in a particular type of context wherein they can be seen as reasonable, rational and sensible actions by other competent members (of the organization). They give a display of the reasonable (in-accord-with-a-rule) character of the action.

The analytically discernable elements of accounts can be reduced from the "explanations", "justifications" and "excuses" employed by some investigators, (Harre 1972. Scott & Lyman 1968) to just "description" and "justification". Excuses involve a denial of responsibility by appealing to "socially approved vocabularies for mitigating or relieving responsibility when conduct is questioned", (Scott & Lyman 1968, p.47) through, for instance, appeal to "accident", unintended outcome, biological drives, etc. To the extent that these place the causal nexus of action beyond the intention of the actor they are not of interest as an account of action: they involve a denial of responsibility for the action. To the extent that the denial of responsibility relies on the involvement of others, the "excuse" can be treated in terms of a justification which appeals to the context of the action.

"Justifications" approach the question of "why" an action was taken ("description" approaching "when", "how" and "what"). To understand why the action occurred it is necessary to be able to understand the practical reasoning employed by the actor-in-the-context. It is necessary to understand the context-as-the-applicant understands it and thus to be involved in a similar sense of social structure. To justify an action it is necessary for the accountee to establish the action as rational, reasonable and sensible, and to do this the accountee has to draw on a
reciprocity of perspective in order that the meaning of the events be understood in a similar fashion by both parties. Accounts provide the possibility for other participants to an interaction to read-in an appropriate motive for action in the accountee. Such reading-in of reasonable motives to the apparent conduct of the other has been seen as the basis of social action (Blum and McHugh 1968), and as Winch observed, motives are not to be regarded as law-like rules which explain the cause of a particular action, they are justifications offered by an actor and related to what he calls "the accepted standards of reasonable behaviour current in his society". (Winch 1958, p.81)

In giving an account, however, such reciprocity of perspective is not in fact assumed by the accountee. If it were, the action could be regarded as self-evidently reasonable and no justification would be called for (cf. Schutz's "natural attitude"). Rather, the accountee seeks to establish that such reciprocity of perspective exists, doing so by providing the other with the principles for recognizing the salient features of the context (Cicourel 1973 "domain of relevance").

It is upon these "displays" of sense of social structure inherent in accounts that this research draws the descriptions and justifications used by the participants.

Accounts also provide a "check" on the reasonableness of action for the accountee; a check that a reciprocity of perspective does, in fact, exist. Such checks are an essential feature for the possibility of

6. The authenticity of such "read-in" motives is a practical problem of action and does not concern the present issue of the demonstrability of reasonable, even if non-authentic, motives for action.
"meaning" at all (Wittgenstein 1953) and, in the words of Winch:

> it must be possible for the judgement of a single individual to be checked by independent criteria (criteria that are established independently of that individual's will);'

(Winch 1958, p.59)

Certain settings involve a greater necessity for such checks than others, and Stubbs (1972) indicates that teaching is a setting within which the teacher has to continue check that the pupils have "understood" and thus "share" the new "knowledge" (basis of interpretation) which is being communicated. The practice of teaching in this instance is considered in terms of the "checking" functions of teacher talk - checking that a reciprocity of perspective has indeed been achieved through the process of instruction.

A constitutive feature of accounts, then, lies in the check that for all practical purposes, there is a shared sense of social structure in play. In certain situations, such as classroom instruction or formal interviews, the checking feature of accounts becomes more salient because in these situations the reciprocity of perspective or shared sense of social structure, becomes particularly open to doubt. This feature of accounts can be employed in the study of the sense of social structure used by members.

7. Although, as Winch goes on to say, "it is only in special circumstances that such a check actually has to be made". (Winch 1958, p.39). In the "natural attitude" of Schutz, the reciprocity of perspective is not normally problematic (see also Scott & Lyman 1968). A method used to uncover the sense of social structure is to render such reciprocity of perspectives as problematic, (Garfinkel 1967), and the very constitution of "accounts" presumes that such reciprocity has become subject to query, (Manning 1967).
Interviews with Teachers

Accounts, then, have certain properties which have been identified and which can be used to facilitate study of the routine practice of teaching. These properties of accounts involve:

(a) a description of practical and routine activities

(b) a justification of these activities by situating them in an appropriate context

(c) in which process it is necessary to display the sense of social structure which the competent member uses in the application of the rules, and

(d) which reflexively involves a check by the accountee that a reciprocity of perspective does exist, or has been established.8

In the everyday routine events such a shared sense of social structure between actors is normally assumed to exist, only occasionally becoming subject to query. However, interviews by their nature involve a situation where the shared sense of social structure becomes problematic. It can no longer be taken-for-granted that the other "sees" things in the same light, but in fact becomes the prime task of the accountee to establish the principles for recognizing contexts as of a type appropriate for the particular action.

8. Elliot and Adelman (1975) use the essential reflexivity of accounts to effect changes in classroom interaction. They argue that teachers' accounts can provide a "conscious self-monitoring" which the teachers can use to influence their teaching methods.
Treating teacher-talk as accounts can be used to provide a methodological basis for coming to grips with the sense of social structure appropriate to a competent member of the school organization (teacher). One form of gathering teacher-talk as data is through interviews in which teachers are asked to comment on aspects of their practice of teaching. Accounting is an essential feature of the talk which constitutes an interview. Focusing on

the practices and policies employed to display and recognize talk as intelligibly interview talk and to treat it as a report on an 'available' self-constituting social structure,

(Silverman: Forthcoming Manuscript 9 p.10)

Silverman argues that the work of interviewing requires as one of its constitutive features, an account of action by the interviewee. Referring specifically to selection interviews he argues that amongst the constituent features are the fact that

interviews are displayed and recognized as (1) a series of questions and answers, in which (2) answers are taken to stand for underlying patterns relevant to future decisions, where (3) unless specifically arranged to the contrary, interview talk is known to be on-the-record.

(ibid: p.23)

and have in common with all talk the element of accounting:

A final feature of interviews ... arises in a common characteristic of all talk: in their accounting activities members concern themselves with displaying

9. References here are to a manuscript based on research conducted by Silverman on the recruitment activities through interviews in a large organization in the public sector. Other related aspects are to be found in Silverman and Jones (1973).
what will currently be understood as rational grounds for past actions and as rational explanations of past social scenes, i.e. they seek to display their purported 'sensible' and 'reasonable' character.

(ibid p.23)

People do things in and through talk (Turner 1971), and one fundamental piece of work done by talk is to display and check on the reasonableness of action. In so doing, talk entails the work of reflexively establishing social structure, and interviews provide a somewhat formalized condition for such work. Indeed, it is a structural feature of interviews that a documentary method of interpretation is employed which focuses not on the content of talk per se but on the sense of social structure which such utterances document:

In hearing interview-talk .... surface appearances (the words used by the subject) are only important for the glimpses which they give of the patterns which purportedly underlie them.

(ibid pp 4-5)

The use of interviews in the research, then, to the extent that the teachers recognized the interview situation, engaged the teachers in displays of the sense of social structure associated with competent membership of the teaching community. The fact of being interviewed itself provided the basis of co-operation (the giving of accounts) quite distinct from the nature of the (surface) content of the questions and answers uttered during the event of the interview.

Teachers' accounts of their situated activity were gathered in terms of "hard" data through tape-recorded interviews, which were then

10. Accounts were a general feature of teacher-talk, but although the "staff-room gossip" provided a great deal of "sensitizing" data, it was not available for accurate and detailed recall at a later stage.
transcribed to facilitate the analysis of accounts. These interviews usually followed a series of observations of the teacher in action in a classroom setting. This had two advantages (a) that the researcher could "see for himself" the practice, and thus use observation as a "check", and (b) that the teacher was in a position to explain why the lesson had taken a particular course, why they had reacted in a particular way, and so on. They had, that is, the opportunity to justify their actions. Hargreaves et al (1975) use interviews in a similar manner and comment on the inbuilt necessity of the interview situation for presenting the actions as reasonable and appropriate.

Whatever method we used (for initiating a response), the teachers always imputed some motive to us for reporting these events to them or for asking for some commentary upon what had occurred. This motive, presumably, was that we were interested in understanding the events which we were investigating. More interesting, however, is the question of what we were asking for rather than why we were asking. In reporting the teacher's statement back to him for commentary, it is clear that we are asking teachers to "display" to us (...) All the commentaries have one element in common: they all take the form of teachers' attempts to explain or justify their actions.

(Hargreaves et al. 1975, p 219-20)

The interviews were intentionally as unstructured as possible to allow, if not goad, the teacher to provide their own ground for the justification of the acts in question. Not only did this orient the account more directly to areas of teacher relevance (rather than researcher's analytic devices) but it also reduced the possibility, characteristic of survey interviews, that the researcher might "bias" the account through asking leading questions. As Manning (1967) argues, it is only through the use of unstructured interview techniques, coupled with a sophisticated and articulated view of social communication that the
actors' basis for action can be considered. That is, structured survey types of interview lose the integrity of the phenomenon they seek to consider in favour of the appearance of scientific rigour - a rigour which is, however, a gloss on the essential features of social interaction. As Manning puts it:

As long as the survey interview remains predominant and we continue to accept the findings of research without a careful accounting of the social process of communication as well as our models of interpretation, sociology will continue to wander in an epistemological wilderness. (Manning 1967, p.312)

It is with deference to this argument that unstructured interviews were used as accounts of the sense of social structure appropriate to a competent teacher.

To facilitate interviews, the researcher consciously adopted and fostered the identity of "trainee" - a person seeking entry to the profession and needing the advice of the experienced member. Although the teachers were fully aware that the interviews and observation were for research, the status of the researcher was as one seeking to gain the insights which their experience could offer. The researcher had trained as a teacher and was not an "outsider" so much as a prospective member, having partial or superficial knowledge which was open to the benefit of the teachers' experience.

In cultivating the status of "trainee" the researcher was able to negotiate the problems posed by observation, particularly that of being an adult in school who was neither a teacher nor H.M.I. (cf. Hargreaves 1967). Staff tended to normalize the status of researcher...
as trainee teacher. At both schools, colleges of education had placements for trainee teachers and in consequence the staff and pupils were used to the presence in the school and staff-room of adults who were not actually teachers, yet who did not pose a threat or check on their expertise.

Similarly, and perhaps more importantly, observation within the classroom was normalized as a consequence of interpreting the researcher's presence in terms of trainee teacher, because both staff and pupils had become familiar with a situation where an adult would join the class in the capacity of an observer.

It is significant for the purposes of research that to adopt a participant observation role would have been restrictive on research, rather than productive. Hargreaves (1967) notes that his abandonment of a participant observation role was in order to gain contact with the pupils which his status as teacher per se would have jeopardized. In the instance of this research, to have adopted the status of teacher would have prevented the possibility of observation of other classes without gross disruption of the situation. It was not normal practice in the schools for a teacher to observe another teacher in action. Further, the kinds of informal information offered to the researcher may not have been so forthcoming to a colleague where certain forms of rivalry or personal factors became involved. So, for the purposes of this research it appeared that emphasis on unstructured interviews complemented by observation provided, contra to Becker and Geer's (1957) argument, a richer and more detailed analysis of the situation at hand than participant observation as "the most complete form of sociological datum to cope with:
observation of some event, the events which precede and follow it, and explanations of its meaning by participants and spectators, before, during and after its occurrence.

(Becker & Geer 1957, p.28)

For practical reasons this data could best be obtained in the schools and about teachers not through the use of participant observation, but through the use of unstructured interviews complemented by observation, and through adopting the guise of a trainee teacher.

The guise of trainee teacher further aided the conducting of interviews. It allowed the interview to proceed without the necessity of the researcher to comment on or evaluate the accounts of staff. In fact, it was a conscious policy of the researcher, to avoid discussion, however informal, on the relative merits or otherwise of particular styles of teaching or forms of justification. During interviews and observation a neutral position was adopted, with a stress that the researcher was there to learn from the teachers, to gain from their experience, and not to evaluate their teaching. Such a role could hardly accord to a participant observer. This "neutrality" characterizes most prescriptions for unstructured interviews, being noted clearly as far back as the Hawthorne interview programme, (Mayo, 1949) and recently in the study of schools which employ interviews as accounts. (Hargreaves et al 1975, Eliot & Adelman 1975).

Reticence to become involved in interviews (or observation) was in fact very low. This can perhaps be explained by the integrally related factors of social class and articulateness. Mayo argued that the fact of interviewing itself could be therapeutic and expressive.11

11. Elliott & Adelman (1975) go further and attempt to use accounts as the basis for changing the future actions of the members.
for the interviewee, implying that to be interviewed would be
acceptable because of the positive benefits to be derived by the
interviewee as well as the interviewer. This certainly appeared to
be the case with the teachers. As Mayo put the point:

It was speedily discovered that the question-and-
answer type of interview was useless in the situation.
Workers wished to talk, and to talk freely under the
seal of professional confidence (which was never abused)
to someone who seemed representative of the company or
who seemed by his very attitude to carry authority.
The experience itself was unusual: there are few
people in this world who had the experience of
finding someone intelligent, attentive and eager to
listen without interruption to all that he or she
has to say.

(Mayo 1969, pp.64-5)

Indeed, the response of the vast majority of staff reflected this
sentiment. Their responses tended to be articulate, lengthy and
uninhibited but this cannot be assumed to result from the mere fact
of the interview as Mayo would have. The point is that social class
is a significant factor in the typical response to the interview
situation. (Manning 1967). Teachers, being characteristically
"middle-class" tend to respond more "positively" to the interview
situation because they are not daunted or defensive about expressing
an opinion, and also because both as teachers and as members of the
middle-class, language is more readily a resource of expression.

Bernstein (1973) argues that the form of language appropriate for
school use is one which has the potential to be context-free, - that

---
12. This was not, however, the case with the pupils who were
interviewed. Most were highly conscious of the situation of
being interviewed, and responded typically by either searching
for the "correct" answer which the adult/teacher/researcher
required, or restricted their answers to defensive "yes/no"
is, less reliant on historical or non-verbal features for the establish-
ment of sense to the talk.

elaborated codes orient their users towards
universalistic meanings .... Elaborated codes
are less tied to a given or local structure ...
One of the effects of the class system is to
limit access to elaborated codes.

(Bernstein 1973, p.200)

It is precisely the non-context specific language of the elaborated code
which is suitable for interviewee talk, and teachers of all people use
such talk as a professional and routine activity.

Teachers, then, have the capacity to express themselves both as a
practical activity of occupation and as members of the middle-class.
Their willingness to co-operate, however, does not automatically follow
despite the fact that an interview is almost synonymous with the need
to be opinionated. In the words of Manning:

the interviewer is a pervasive symbol of the demand
to be opinionated.

(Manning 1967, p.305)

Whether or not that opinion is elicited depends on the attitude of the
interviewee to the interview itself. Scott & Lyman (1968) note some
strategies for avoiding the situation of having to give an opinion -
mystification, referral and identity switching - through which an
interviewee can negotiate and normalize any strain between the inherent
demand of the interview to have an opinion, and the interviewee's
reticence to provide any such opinion for the record. The accounts offered
in the interviews of this research, however, demonstrated none of these
strategies, and with rare exception, the teachers exhibited an enthusiasm
akin to that noted by Mayo for having their considered and detailed
opinion, derived from their practical experience, noted for analysis by
the researcher.
In summary, then, the aim of the research was to establish some basic features of the sense of social structure appropriate to competent teachers in the two comprehensive schools. This sense of social structure was achieved through shared rules for recognizing contexts. It was this shared sense of social structure which formed the basis of organizational activity, (rather than the formal structure; social/psychological sentiments, etc.). The method of research was to use taped interviews (complemented by observations) as accounts wherein the teachers displayed their sense of social structure in justifying the practical and routine activities in which they engaged.
CHAPTER VI

The Formal Organization of Academic Affairs

at Ashton and Beechgrove
Three sources of information were available in describing the formal organizations of Ashton and Beechgrove: observation, the accounts of staff, and the pamphlets, brochures and hand-outs made available through the headmasters of either school to the governing bodies, teachers or parents. The latter provided what can be called "official guidelines" to the structure of the academic organization and the expected standards of conduct within the schools. In both schools, the researcher had access not only to documents aimed at the general (parental) public, but more significantly to official directives to staff concerning approved courses of action, communication and standards for pupil behaviour. With reference to such "official guidelines" it was possible to outline what can be deemed the formal organization of the school, because these documents provided information about the official structure of the school and the rules of procedure concerning the conduct of both staff and pupils.

These "official guidelines", at both Ashton and Beechgrove made a distinction between two aspects of the organization of the schools; between that aspect oriented toward the academic achievement of pupils, and that oriented toward their pastoral care or guidance.¹

¹ The latter is a facet of school organization having its genesis in the House system of boarding schools, but one which has been re-emphasized in comprehensive schools (a) as an attempt to integrate pupils to smaller units within a large organization (b) as an aspect of school organization aimed at facilitating, thereby, a social (class) mix, and (c) as a unit basic to counselling and a concern with the emotional problems of pupils. (see Chapter 2). There is, in comprehensive schools, a concern for pastoral care and guidance which does not find such formal expression in the tripartite sector, with the vast majority of comprehensives using a House system and/or tutorial system intended specifically for pastoral care. (Monks 1968, Benn & Simon 1970).
The "official guidelines" to teaching staff at Beechgrove, for instance, illustrated clearly this division between academic and pastoral organization when detailing the appropriate channels of communication to be used in the school.

Figure 1.
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PASTORAL

ACADEMIC
In this chapter, the academic (formal) organization of the schools will be outlined, prior to a consideration in chapters VII and VIII of how this formal structure was used, neglected, misused, manipulated or occasionally invoked by those involved in teaching.
Academic organization at Ashton was based on the responsibility of subject teachers to respective Heads of eighteen academic departments, who in turn, were responsible to Senior teachers in each of the three buildings.

There was a ten-form entry of approximately 270 pupils each year who, on the basis of their academic record at primary school were placed in an "academic" form, a "remedial" form, or one of three intermediate "mixed-ability" forms in either of the two parallel lower school units. Each lower school building had five first year forms, so that in all there were:

- ten forms for first year pupils (11+), two Progress forms for pupils needing special help (each of about 17 pupils); two Jet forms for pupils showing special promise (each of 32); and six equal forms each of 28-30 pupils. Transfers between the forms are arranged at any time during the first two years in the light of pupils' development.

(Official guidelines: Ashton)

The parallel organization of pupils in the lower school in two buildings was operative throughout the first three years, that is, until transfer to the upper school in the fourth year.

In the first two years all pupils followed a common curriculum (without, however, having identical timetables). During this period there were two significant occurrences. Within the "mixed-ability" intermediate forms some setting occurred notably in English, Maths and French. There was also a differential emphasis on subjects, specifically French, in which the "Progress" forms received fewer French lessons than the other forms - progressively fewer until it was no longer a timetabled subject for the Progress forms in the third year. (see Appendix II)

2. The primary school records contained reference to test-battery scores, tests in Maths, English and non-verbal reasoning. The implications of this are discussed in Chapter 2.
In the lower school a system of withdrawal from the intermediate groups to a remedial situation was used, and officially explained by the abundance of pupils entering the school in the first year with poor measured reading ability.³

In our 1st-3rd year work at Ealing Road, in addition to two remedial forms in each of the first two years (...) we have instituted a structured system of small withdrawal groups from our mixed-ability forms of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years to have special reading lessons with our remedial teachers. This year we have tested all our 1st year pupils for reading age and we have 58 with a reading age of below 9; this is 21 more than are in our 1st year remedial classes.

(From the Headmaster’s Report to the Governing Body of the School, 1973: Ashton)

In the third year the subjects taken by pupils exhibited a slightly changed profile: for all pupils general science gave way to the individual subjects of Physics, Chemistry and Biology and pupils took either:

(a) a second language along with French  
(b) continued to study just French or  
(c) adopted Social Studies in place of French

This latter change was officially taken as an "option" in consultation with parents:

In the third year, some variation in course is introduced according to the abilities of the pupils and the wishes of parents. Some pupils commence a second foreign language

---

³ This can be seen as reflected in the intake scores on the 'closed' test battery administered at the end of the Junior School course, where "average" is considered to be 300.

Numbers of pupils entering with scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>350+</th>
<th>341-330</th>
<th>329-271</th>
<th>270-251</th>
<th>250-</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From Headmasters Report to the Governing Body of the School)
- either German, Latin or Russian - as well as continuing with French. Some continue just with French, some commence Social Studies in place of French.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)

The "option" was less obviously open when the timetable was considered, for there was no provision for any language in the Progress Forms' allocation, nor possibility of doing other than two languages in the Jet forms: social studies was not an option open to pupils in the Jet stream.

The academic organization of the 4th and 5th years in the upper school was oriented toward two year courses leading in most cases to public examination. Basically there were six courses, organized into two distinct bands:

Course L: Technical; preparation for apprenticeships and industry
Course M: Clerical; typing, office practice
Course N: Commercial; shorthand, typing, English
Course P: Arts and Sciences; for professional or semi-professional career
Course U: Language and Arts; for professional or semi-professional career
Course W: Sciences and Languages; for professional or semi-professional career

These courses were separable into the units P, U and W - the "academic" courses, and L, M and N which provided more "practical" education. The distinction was apparent to the extent that forms did not contain a mix of pupils from the separate bands. Whereas a form could contain pupils taking courses L, M and N, it would not contain pupils taking any of courses P, U and W. Conversely, a form could have pupils from course P, U

---

At this stage the Jet streams were timetabled with two of the six mixed-ability forms, the other four "mixed-ability" forms concentrating on the sciences (extra Biology, Physics, Chemistry) to the exclusion of a second language and possibly even French.
and W but would not have pupils from the other three course.

The courses, then, reflected some specialization along "academic" and "non-academic" lines in the 4th and 5th years commensurate with ability grouping. The official guidelines acknowledged this situation but exhibited a concern that such specialization should not prevent pupils:

(a) from developing academically in relation to their own development, and

(b) from continuing into the sixth year

The official guidelines stated that:

Each course has a certain academic or practical bias and consists of some compulsory subjects and some optional subjects. (...) The aim in the more academic courses is to provide for some bias to allow for the different abilities and interests of pupils, but at the same time to avoid over-specialization in order to permit a wide range of possible choices of 6th form Advanced subjects (...) It must be emphasized that as pupils grow up their interests and aims may develop or change. Each course, therefore, will permit the pupil who does well to continue studying into the 6th form if the parents and pupil so desire.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)

The philosophy behind the courses would appear to contain two theses:
Firstly, the desire to specialize in terms of subjects and academic/practical bias, and secondly, the wish to postpone the selectiveness associated with specialization to allow for the personal development of individual pupils. The banding which occurred in the 4th and 5th years did so in spite of claims to a basically child-centred philosophy to be found in the official guidelines, viz:

We consider each child is an individual and is important, so each must be encouraged to realise his or her potentialities for service and achievement; hence we try to guide and help each pupil according to his or her needs, and give each pupil a positive success path through school.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)
The academic organization of Ashton, then, appeared to include two distinct (and perhaps contrary) themes:

1. ability grouping, with selective forms (Jet and Progress), academic and non-academic courses setting in French, English and Maths, and the withdrawal of pupils to remedial groups.

and

2. individual development of the pupil incorporating choice of options with delayed (academic) selection and specialization.

The formal organization had implications for teaching, however, not only in terms of grouping practices. The organization of lessons, classes and subjects at Ashton could be seen as reflecting traditional pedagogic methods in that the formal organization required the teacher to operate within a context which was appropriate to traditional pedagogies - a context typified by 7 x 40 minute periods per day divided amongst certain distinct subject areas each relating to a fairly specific syllabus to be covered by the class in the course of the year. Lawton (1973) and D. W. Swift (1971) amongst others, associate a subject-centred approach to teaching with traditional or classical styles, or what Evertts (1973) terms "idealistic" educational views. Within Ashton not only did the curriculum reflect this subject-centred approach with "collection" classification characteristics (Bernstein 1971) but the framing of the curriculum exhibited temporal, spatial and authority characteristics of similar vein.

This traditionalism was reflected in the guidelines offered to staff vis-à-vis aspects of pupil behaviour. Staff were enjoined, for instance, not to let the pupils leave the school at lunch-time unless they ate at home. Pupils were required to obtain permission to ride to school by bicycle. Teachers were required to ensure that pupils
regulations in connection with dress, which were felt to reflect
the status of the school:

The Headmaster has the authority to send home from
school any individual pupil who, in his opinion, is
improperly dressed.

The maintenance of a smart and efficient standard of
dress by all pupils is very important both for the
reputation of the school in the neighbourhood, and for
good daily organization within the school.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)

Girls were not to wear jewellery or "heavy" boots in the school, nor
should anyone carry "excessive" amounts of money. Personal articles and
clothing were to be labelled accordingly and each pupil to have a satchel
to carry and protect his or her books, particularly in relation to the
homework which was compulsory.

These directives are cited to illustrate the kind of requirements
the formal organization assumed of teachers. Evidently, teachers'
functions were formally seen to include the control and behavioural
guidance of the pupils as an integral part of their duties. The formal
organization of the school specified, that is, "expressive" as well as
"instrumental" functions for the teacher (cf. Parsons 1959).

Beechgrove was a single site school with a roll of approximately
1,250 pupils aged 11-19 years. Eighty staff were allocated to 18 subject
departments and responsible to their respective Head of Department.
There was an 8-form entry of about 250 pupils each year who were placed
in mixed-ability groups in a somewhat autonomously organized unit within
the school. These first-year pupils were segregated from the rest of
the school in that they remained for their registration and lessons on
one floor of one building—a set-up aimed to ease the transition of
pupils from the small junior school into the large comprehensive school.
During the first three years there was an emphasis on retaining mixed-ability grouping, though individual subject departments did exercise the right to introduce setting. The brochure for parental information emphasized the plausibility of non-streaming when groups were kept to a reasonable size:

In the first three years pupils are taught for the most part in mixed-ability groups, that is to say classes contain a cross-section of the pupils in each year. With classes that are quite manageable in size, non-streaming we contend has many advantages over rigid streaming according to a child's ability at the age of 11. Above all, this flexible approach enables us to ensure that pupils can develop at their own pace.

At the same time, the Mathematics, English and French Departments, may sometimes want to establish separate teaching groups for faster children on the one hand and slower children on the other.

(Official Guidelines: Beechgrove)

Whilst advocating mixed-ability grouping and noting its advantages for the development of the individual at his or her own pace, then, there was also the qualification that for certain subjects such arrangements might not be appropriate and that such subjects could (legitimately) deviate from the generality preferred mixed-ability type of organization.

During the third year pupils were assigned to the course of study in the 4th and 5th years which could lead to public examinations. As with Ashton the choice was seen as being a collaborative effort between parent/teacher/pupil, taking into account the ability of the pupil:

At the end of the third year there is close consultation between pupils, parents, subject-teachers and careers staff so that the course a pupil chooses suits his or her ability, aptitude and possible choice of career.

(Official Guidelines: Beechgrove)
The course which a pupil took in the 4th and 5th years consisted of a core of 8 compulsory subjects, and a structured choice between 5 optional subjects. The core compulsory subjects consisted of English Language, Mathematics, Social Studies, Careers, health education, religious education, physical education and music. The banding which was evident in Ashton's 4th-5th year arrangements was not, then, reflected at Beechgrove where a common-core curriculum was a more salient feature of academic organization than "courses". The "courses" which pupils at Beechgrove followed (to G.C.E. or C.S.E.) were based on particular subjects, that is, rather than a more general band of ability within which the pupil was situated (see Appendix II).

Three special departments existed in Beechgrove to cope with (a) remedial teaching, (b) the teaching of partial-hearing pupils and (c) the teaching of non-English speaking pupils. The "non-English speaking" department reflected a need within this school to cope with the quantities of immigrant pupils for whom a grasp of the English language was seen as a pre-requisite to academic development. Remedial groups operated as distinct groups throughout the first four years providing the only direct streaming effect, and remedial teaching was available also to individual pupils on a withdrawal basis from normal timetables.

The organization of ability-grouping at Beechgrove, then, more readily reflected the view expressed by the official guidelines of both schools that child-centred education oriented to the individual development of the pupil was desirable. There existed within the parameters of the formal organization at Beechgrove, however, the basis of ability grouping. There was a remedial group equivalent in nature (if not size) to the Progress forms, along with the setting of French, English and Maths.
In Beechgrove, as in Ashton, there was an absence of I.D.E. or
team-teaching in any other than a pilot, experimental and very
restricted sense, and timetabling presented a traditional profile.

In terms of the classification and framing of educational knowledge,
that is, the common-curriculum orientation of both Beechgrove and Ashton
did little to alter the traditional ethos of the impact of the curriculum
- the 8 x 35 minute, subject based, teacher controlled, syllabus orientated
arrangements. Assessment arrangements reflected the examination orienta­
tion of tests rather than continual assessment with the exception of
C.S.E. project work, and C.S.E. Mode 3 work which were restricted to the
"non-academic" subjects such as Social Studies.

Beechgrove, like Ashton, offered guidelines to staff about conduct
of the pupils, guidelines which echoed the sentiments expressed at Ashton:

Staff should insist on good manners and courtesy, and
to this end ought not to allow themselves to be addressed
discourteously by children, or to accept slovenliness in
attitude, dress or speech. The importance of the school
image should be stressed and children should be given
guidance concerning their behaviour in public.

(Official Guidelines : Beechgrove)

Teachers were also expected to get orderly lines outside the classrooms
before a lesson, one line for girls, one for boys; not to let pupils out
of a classroom for "frivolous" reasons; not to accept verbal excuses
for lateness; to check the attendance at each lesson; not to allow classes
in the playground unsupervised; not to allow pupils to chew or eat in
class, and to insist on homework. As with Ashton, there was an emphasis
on the staff being in control of pupils, and insisting on certain modes
of behaviour.
In summary, then, although the formal academic organizations of Ashton and Beechgrove differed notably in the extent to which they adhered to mixed-ability grouping and a common-curriculum, there were significant similarities in the principles of organization adopted by either school.

Both schools advocated a common-curriculum design, and adopted it in the first 2 or 3 years, with (delayed) specialization occurring through guided pupil/parental choice in the 4th and 5th years and involving "courses" for G.C.E. and C.S.E. examination. Entry to the sixth forms of the schools was not dependent on previous examination passes. Although the application differed slightly, both schools were concerned to (a) delay specialization and selection, and (b) involve criteria of choice as well as ability in that specialization and selection.

This reflected the generally "child-centred" approach advocated by the official guidelines of both schools - an approach commensurate with the schools promoting the advantages and preferability of mixed-ability grouping as a mode of academic organization.

Both schools, however, qualified their approval of mixed-ability grouping, specifically in terms (a) of remedial grouping and (b) of setting for particular subjects such as French, English and Maths.

The official guidelines also indicated two further factors as relevant to teaching in the schools. Neither school used I.D.E. or team-teaching as a normal or even regular practice, and the duties of teachers were regarded explicitly as including functions of control and behavioural guidance of the pupils.
Bearing in mind this formal "context", the actual practice of teaching within the schools can now be considered in terms of the practical problems which teachers confronted (as members of the organization), the remedies they used and the justifications they offered. In this manner it may be possible to replicate the sense of social structure appropriate to a competent teacher, and thus to understand the manner in which aspects of the formal organization were used, misused, ignored, manipulated or occasionally invoked.
CHAPTER VII

The Practical Context of Academic Matters
Teachers cannot simply interact with the children in their classrooms according to their desires and personal style. Instead, their behavior often takes on characteristics beyond their immediate aims or intents. They must adapt their style, not only to the children, but to the institution, to the principal's requirements, to the other teachers' attitudes, and to the standards according to which they will be evaluated.

(Leacock 1969, p.202)
Practical Problems, Pedagogies and Teaching

In the routine practice of teaching, staff were confronted with practical problems which they sought to resolve by adopting particular courses of action. The accounts which they gave of such courses of action involved not only a description of the situation, but also an attempt to justify their understanding of it by providing the interviewer with the means for recognizing the practical problem as of a particular kind, and of a kind for which the action as described was appropriate (see Chapter V). In accounting for their understanding of the situation the teachers became involved in establishing and/or checking that a shared sense of social structure existed between the interviewer and the member of staff.

To understand teaching as a practical activity within a formally organized setting, then, it was useful to focus attention on the manner in which the teachers identified practical problems because in describing and justifying them as practical problems it was necessary for them to establish for the researcher their interpretation of the context to an extent greater than for situations where it was assumed that little justification was necessary.

Identifying and explaining practical problems provided a tool for coming to grips with the teachers' view of the actual situation within which they operated and the effects of this "practical context" on their actions. In other words, the practical problems were of significance for identifying the "actual task structure" (Zimmerman 1971) appropriate to teaching in the schools as an influence on teaching distinct from formal organizational structures or pedagogies.
This chapter concentrates on those aspects of the teaching situation which were seen to pose problems for the teachers, particularly (a) as those practical problems reflected parts of school organization concerned with academic matters and (b) as they reflected upon issues raised in the debate surrounding comprehensives re-organization (see Chapter I).

Use of the headings "classroom setting", "pupil responsiveness", and "grouping practices" constitutes a heuristic device, (as much as any direct reflection of particular problems), through which to develop the researcher's theme of analysis. This method of exposition is a necessity because the analysis which is presented is essentially a researcher's interpretation of the multiplicity of accounts (Harre 1972) and cannot pretend, to authentically reconstitute what Schutz (1967) has called "first-order constructs". The analysis constitutes an attempt to distinguish some regularity in accounts which may reflect the sense of social structure appropriate to teaching in these schools and is thus unequivocably the product of the researcher even though it seeks to represent the teachers' understanding of teaching.¹

¹ The attempt to reconstitute first-order constructs by pure description of the sense of order pertaining to actors has been, to some extent unwittingly, promoted by recent polemicists arguing for phenomenological sociology (cf. Filmer et al 1972). Whilst paying lip-service to the fact that their enterprise is itself grounded in social knowledge, they seek to minimize the effects of this grounding. It is, however, a matter of degree of grounding rather than absolute distinction (Goldthorpe 1973), and that which represents the actor's first-order constructs must inevitably be an analyst/reader's second-order construct. (Silverman 1975).
The quality of teaching associated with comprehensive schools has been a significant and controversial issue in the debate surrounding the re-organization of secondary education. One aspect of the debate involved the extent to which progressive pedagogies were associated with comprehensive schools, and how such pedagogies entailed an abdication of control by the teacher (chapter I). On the basis of the present research there can be no attempt to assess the veracity of such allegations, but the research itself was oriented by such allegations to consider the possible effects of new pedagogies upon the activity of teaching.

Pedagogic innovations can be taken to involve generally changes to "progressive" education and away from "traditional" education. (Gross et al 1971). Attempts to define or specify what constitutes "progressive" education, however, have been acknowledged as facing difficulties even by those who would proceed to provide such definitions. Miles and Skipworth for instance note that:

This is a concept which is open to a number of differing interpretations, and although there is a generally accepted vocabulary which is used in this context (e.g. informal activity methods, child-centred: flexible timetable: democratic procedures and so on) the same words do not necessarily mean the same thing to different people.

(Miles and Skipworth 1973, p.66)

Yet, despite the differences, the concept is widely used and acknowledged in educational analysis and debate. Swift (1971) draws on this general usage to justify his use of the term, arguing that "progressive" education is a viable concept because it is generally recognized as having replaced traditional education (in the U.S. context) and as being distinct from the
concept of "traditional" education. In other words, the possibility of, and value of, the concept of "progressive" education stems from the popular usage of the term in the field of education.

In specifying what constitutes "progressive" education there is a general agreement that it entails the notion of a "child-centred" approach (Evetts 1973). Swift (1971) argues that both advocates and opponents of "progressive" education recognize it as an essentially child-based approach focusing on the child, and

hoping that, by development of his physical psychological and social needs, the child would develop his personality, initiative and spontaneity.

(D.W. Swift 1971, p.12)

The model of the child underlying the progressive mould of education does not, however, display any universal acceptance of learning potential although there is, as Lawton (1973) claims, a consistent tendency to value a form of approach outlined by Rousseau in "Emile", and to adopt an approach which emphasizes creativity, experience, discovery, awareness, originality and freedom.

In "progressive" education there is a focus on the development of the child rather than the subject, and one feature of progressive pedagogies has been their attempt to break down the traditional subject barriers by instigating project work and interdisciplinary enquiry (I.D.E.). As Gross et al (1971) point out, "traditional" education has emphasized the segmentation of knowledge into distinct subject areas which are presented to pupils and organized in a curriculum. Bernstein (1971) regards such a classification of knowledge ("collection" type) as characteristic of British education, and Ashton and Beechgrove
both relied primarily on such principles for organizing and presenting knowledge.\(^2\)

The juxtaposition of "progressive" and "traditional" education would involve, then, reference to the format of the presentation of knowledge in terms of its time and content parameters.\(^3\) In this respect both Ashton and Beechgrove exhibited a form of organization associated with the "traditional" mould.

---

2. Ashton used seven periods of forty minutes, Beechgrove eight periods of thirty-five minutes, with, however, both schools doing "double" periods for particular subjects (eg. crafts) and special arrangements for games. Neither school used I.D.E. in anything other than experimental cases, and the use of project work was limited in the main to mode 3 C.S.E. work (see Chapters II and VI).

3. These "parameters" generally accord with what Bernstein identifies as the "framing" and "classification" of knowledge, where framing "refers to the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization and pacing of knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship", and classification "refers to the degree of boundary maintenance between contexts". (Bernstein 1971 pp.50, 49). It was not, however, his purpose to relate these to "progressive" and "traditional" pedagogies as such.
The juxtaposition of "progressive" and "Traditional" education is of further significance, however, in terms of its implications for the role of the teacher. In the "traditional" conception of education:

Children are seen as bottles to be filled depending on capacity and, given this basic conception, the primary task of the teacher is to fill these bottles. The teacher is expected to impart or cover a specified body of information and to drill children so that they learn skills such as reading and writing. The teacher is expected to direct the children's energies so that they will learn a standard set of subjects, usually in concert with all or sections of their class and usually in chunks of time during the day.

(Gross et al 1971 p.14)

The influence of Piaget (see, for instance, 1969) and Bruner (1960, 1966) has challenged "traditional" assumptions about the child, and consequently of the role of the teacher. The "readiness" of the pupil to learn has been promoted as a more salient feature than a body of knowledge for orienting the method of teaching, and in consequence "progressive" pedagogies have advocated a child-centred approach to teaching rather than a teacher-directed approach aimed at a set curriculum and subject syllabus.

The extent to which teachers adopted one or other pedagogy was, of course, subject to the parameters of the formal organization of the schools. Within these parameters, however, teachers had a degree of leeway to emphasize or inhibit the preference for activity indicated by the official guidelines. It was their interpretation of the formal structure, rather than the structure itself, which was basic to action. That interpretation, however, relied not solely on the pedagogic preference of the member of staff. Teachers did not consider themselves free to interpret the formal organization in accord with their "ideals" but felt there to be practical consideration involved as well.
The point is that teaching in Ashton and Beechgrove was not regarded as taking place under "ideal circumstances" and teachers explained that, in practice, they had to cut their ait according to the cloth. As a teacher commented when explaining the practical problems she faced with implementing mixed-ability grouping:

"Perhaps if I found myself in ideal conditions - which one never expects .... I mean, you'd be living in cuckoo-land if you were waiting for that to happen .... you'd never get anything done. So I tend to get round to doing what I can do with what I've got, as it were."

(Head of Music: Ma: Ashton)

Such non-ideal conditions for teaching did not constitute a reference solely to the qualities of the pupils, and this teacher, amongst others, referred to the practical problems which arose from the "class-room setting" within which she had to conduct her teaching. It is to this source of practical problems that attention is now focused.
The Classroom Setting

The practical problems associated with teaching in the schools were primarily concerned with the activity occurring in classrooms. As an arena, the classroom has suffered a death of sociological research (Walker 1972, Delamont 1976) and that research which does exist has been more concerned with the pupils, or the interaction of the pupils with teachers, than with teachers themselves. (Hargreaves 1975). Given that the process of teaching is normally undertaken within a classroom and that this forms the basic task of teaching (Delamont 1976), the effects of the classroom setting on the actual practice of teaching provides a prima facie case for starting analysis on the practical problems stemming from the classroom itself.

The physical environment within which teaching took place had an influence upon the nature of teaching in that environment. It provided a "setting" in a dramaturgical sense for the activity of teaching: as Goffman has expressed it:

furniture, decor, physical layout, and other background items (...) supply the scenery and stage props for the spate of human action played out before, within or upon it. A setting tends to stay put, geographically speaking, so that those who would use a particular setting as part of their performance cannot begin their act until they have brought themselves to the appropriate place and must terminate their performance when they leave it.

(Goffman 1971, pp.32-3)

The architecture and decor of the classroom, however, did not provide in any sense a determining influence on the action of teachers. The action of teachers was not dependent on the physical structure of the classroom, but could be seen as the result of the meaning which the teachers attributed to that physical structure (Stebbins-1973). As Dale (1972) argues, the physical context of teaching provides an "arena" within which teaching
(and learning) are negotiated - action being related to the physical environment only to the extent that it is interpreted, given meaning and acted upon.

The physical environment within which teaching took place at Ashton and Beechgrove reflected a "traditional" setting. The majority of teaching occurred in classrooms which were self-contained units, separated from other classrooms by walls or partitions, and square or rectangular in shape. Such teaching contexts were characterized by one teacher and thirty to forty pupils who remained within the confines of the classroom for the duration of the lesson. There were exceptions to this situation where for instance the teaching consisted of subjects which were felt to warrant specific surroundings. Obviously, the teaching of games and P.E. took place outside the normal circumstances, as did the teaching of subjects such as handicraft, art and science subjects where the physical environments reflected the particular requirements of the subject. These, however, did not constitute the bulk of teaching situations at either school.

-the problem of noise

Not all subjects were provided with adequate facilities, and the case of music teaching at Ashton afforded a good example of the practical problems associated with classroom setting whilst also sensitizing research to the specific problems of "noise" in the practical teaching situation. In an interview the Head of music said:

We haven't any really musical facilities here, you know, architecturallywise. Two of us, you know, including myself, are working in a canteen. Well it means that I have never really got a proper base .... it's always a canteen. And at the end of the morning session it becomes a canteen and I can't go on utilizing it .... meeting the kids there. In fact I have nowhere to meet, and I have to "parlee" with the P.E. staff: "Can I use the hall?" ...
(...) And it's the same at (the lower school) where the teacher there in her own building also works in a canteen. And it's even worse there because the canteen's smaller, therefore you've got all the noise of the dining room staff clanking and clicking. We're mice infested .... they eat at, and live at, the bottom of the piano and a store cupboard which is next door to the kitchen. And you have P.E. and drama lessons in the hall which adjoins the canteens. So the noise problem is phenomenal.

If you're trying to do music, which is essentially aural .... even if you're playing an instrument you're listening all the time to what you're playing and seeing if you're in time, is it making some sort of sense ..... and it's very difficult under those sorts of conditions. So much so that that's why I've got a member of staff now leaving after one term's work - she can't stand it, she can't cope with the situation. And we've had six music teachers since I came here in three years in that building, and it's for that reason .... because the conditions are so bad that the teachers have found that ..... that it's an impossible situation.

(Head of Music : Ma : Ashton)

The classroom setting, then, appeared to pose serious practical problems for the music staff, specifically with reference to the transmission of noise between classroom settings. The "essentially aural" qualities of the subject made it particularly susceptible to interference from noise generated in adjacent classrooms. Consequently, in an attempt to overcome these problems, music lessons at the lower site had been relocated:

We had a mobile hut built in the grounds, very close to the main building. And, er .. everybody pointed out that the mobile hut ... it'd be a good idea to put it right away, far away from the building, so if music was going on it wouldn't disturb five classrooms - three lower and two upstairs - with the noise of instruments and singing and pianos and record players. But the Brent Borough refused because that meant the expense of building a concrete path leading to the hut, whereas if they placed it at the side of the main building the path was already there.

(...) And in the summer, because there's so much glass and everybody wants to open the windows, I mean, the situation's impossible. They begged me not to teach music
as such ..... could I just talk to them .... I mean this was the approach. I mean it is very, very difficult. And then the noise was so much there that then, we were taken out of the hut and put back in the canteen. For a while, you see, we had a respite, you see, from the canteen, but we've been put back again because one music class was hitting five classrooms the way it was positioned ..... as I say, three there and two upstairs. So it's really hell.

(Head of Music : Ma : Ashton)

The practical problem of noise, then, was apparently not confined to particular subjects such as music, because the reinstatement of music lessons in the canteen arose directly from the disturbance which music lessons in the mobile hut created for other lessons in the adjacent classrooms. In a general sense, the classroom setting appeared to pose a problem to the extent that "noise" created in one classroom "impinged" on the situation of another, and thus interfered with the process of teaching in that room.

- classroom innovating

Teachers had little control over the basic physical environment of the classroom or the structure of the room. One aspect of the physical environment within the realms of alteration, however, was the seating and desk arrangements. At both schools, pupils were allowed to choose where in the classroom and with whom, they wished to sit, except in those instances where the teacher felt this to exacerbate or instigate a teaching problem. The effects of free seating choice in the classroom have been documented by, amongst others, Becker et al (1973) who indicate that the position chosen in the classroom will tend to reflect the orientation of the pupil to the teacher and thereby school work. (see also Adams and Biddle, 1970. Hendrick et al 1974, Breed and Colaiuta 1974

---

4. This occurred despite the official guidelines' recommendation at Ashton that "pupils should be given to understand that they sit where the teacher wants them to sit."
Sommer 1967, Walberg 1969). Teachers appeared to be aware of the implications of seating, and occasionally demonstrated a willingness to manipulate the situation accordingly. A good example was afforded during the observation of a supply teacher who, upon entering the classroom, proceeded to insist that the pupils who had moved to the back of the classroom move to the front, and accounted for this action later by simply pointing out that the "messers" always congregated at the back where they were furthest from the teacher. And at Beechgrove a teacher recalled, for example, a specific situation in which she had utilized the effect of seating arrangements to overcome the practical difficulty imposed by the constant talking of one group of girls:

And I remember when I was on teaching practice, I had a class and they were hell .... couldn't do anything with them. They were real sods ... girls, all girls ... and they really hated my guts. And there was no way I could try and get them to stop talking, and somebody worked out .... worked out this brilliant idea. And it was a needlework room I took them in, and set all the chairs .... only about 20 of them ... all the chairs in a line. It was a rotten thing to do. And each chair slightly separate from the next, but in a line. And do you know, it worked! (...) 'Cos they were cut off from each other, you know.

(English Teacher : Ho : Beechgrove)

The issue of "inter-pupil contact" was one raised by staff with some frequency, and of interest at this point in its implications for attempts to introduce styles of teaching which relied on such contact. In neither school was the style of teaching specified to any degree in the formal organization other than in a lack of provision for team-teaching and I.D.E. Within the limits of one teacher/one subject, the manner in

5. Indeed, there has been a significant unwillingness to specify exactly which style of teaching should be adopted, particularly at local authority and central government level. The Schools Council acts in the manner of an independent advisory body, and local authority H.M.I.'s indicate an unwillingness to "direct" on such matters, preferring to see their role as "supportive". And whilst the headmaster can influence to an extent the approaches of his staff, the limitations are well illustrated by the controversy surrounding William Tyndale. (ILEA primary) school, and the enquiry that ensued.
which knowledge was communicated to the pupils was not specified.

Teachers were, then, ostensibly free to innovate in terms of group-work individually paced work, flash cards, project work, etc. a freedom which itself owed something to the isolation of the classroom setting.

Seating arrangements were perhaps of more significance, then, where teachers attempted to manipulate the classroom setting by changing desk arrangements in order to offset a change in teaching style. A teacher wishing to adopt a "progressive" approach, for example, might attempt to facilitate and encourage inter-pupil contact by providing an appropriate desk arrangement in the classroom. Contrary to the "traditional" pedagogy's concern to limit pupil movement and to channel communication through the teacher (Gross et al 1971, Lawton 1973), desks could be moved to allow the inter-pupil contact associated with, for instance, group-work.6

At Beechgrove, the English Teacher also explained, how she had re-arranged desks in an attempt to promote group activity amongst the pupils (finding however, that such an arrangement inhibited the amount of teacher-pupil contact she desired).

I find rooms very interesting, and desk arranging. For example, I used to have them where .. um .. in fours so that they could do group work, right .. but then I thought ... then I found that .. um .. I don't like it particularly, because a lot of my teaching is "personality" teaching, right, and class teaching. (...) I found that a lot of the kids I was talking to and their backs were to me, you see, and I just had to be honest with myself and I'm not good enough as a kind of .. er .. group teacher. And my classes are much more

6. Group-work constitutes a pedagogic innovation to the extent that it incorporates the premises of co-operative and child-initiated forms of learning. Its advantages have included, specifically, the fact that it constitutes a pedagogic innovation which can be achieved within the confines of the "closed" classroom. (Davies 1975, Kelly 1974).
weighted to contact with me. So I ... so I had to
have them basically facing, right (...)

And with some classes, the 4th and 5th this year,
with an arrangement like this (...) when we're having
a discussion like the one we've just had now, they can
all be almost within arm's reach of me. And it makes
an amazing difference about what they'll talk about and
what they'll say if they're quite close to you - just
like that, you know.

(English Teacher: Ha : Beechgrove)

This teacher acknowledged the potential of seating arrangements
to facilitate changed teaching situations, yet elected to retain "traditional"
arrangements because these facilitated the desired kind of class contact.

Those teachers who wished to establish group-work, on the other
hand, indicated that it involved problems in certain cases. Music,
in this instance, had particular problems stemming from its aural basis
which rendered group work a problem. As the Head of Music explained
group work was limited to the practical work with peripatetic teachers
(much of which existed outside normal classroom hours) because to have
music lessons oriented to differing groups listening to music or
playing instruments would create an unacceptable cacophony in the
classroom, and thus effectively preclude any learning in the confined
space.

I never do individual/group work and try to have a
whole lot of groups going on partly because ....
well, again, the rooms don't lend themselves, because
you want space to get a group over there. And they
haven't got anything like it ... therefore I just
couldn't do it.

(Head of Music : Mo : Ashton)

This was, however, a problem peculiar to the subject, in extent if
not in essence, and did not of itself prevent the re-organization of
desks to facilitate group work in other subjects. Whether or not teachers chose to take advantage of this possibility depended not only on their pedagogic preference, nor on the nature of the subject; there were practical considerations involved at Ashton and Beechgrove which also affected the actual approach to teaching.

Where teachers did not conduct the lessons in "their own" classroom, for instance, the time involved in re-arranging desks at the start and finish of each lesson proved largely prohibitive. It was not, however, the sole problem affecting desk re-arrangement, the noise involved with such exercises was perhaps an even more powerful deterrent.

Given the proximity of classrooms and the lack of sound-proofing between them, the teacher was constrained by considerations for the noise that such re-arrangement would generate. Inter-pupil contact though it may have been recognized in the schools as permissible, if not a positive pedagogic advantage, was limited in practice by teachers for whom the facilitation of inter-pupil contact was seen as generating unacceptably high levels of noise. Through ostensibly free to innovate, the practical considerations for noise involved in such practices limited their adoption even by teachers for whom the logic was attractive.

At either school, desks were generally arranged in a traditional manner - facing toward the "front" of the room where the blackboard and teacher's desk were situated. Those teachers who would have wished to change their teaching style by increasing the amount of inter-pupil contact could have facilitated this by - the re-arrangement of desks to allow group work, allowing the movement of pupils between desks, and/or allowing verbal communication between pupils. Any such attempts to innovate, however, would have needed to take into account the noise it generated.
The classroom furniture at both schools was heavy and wooden and, with no carpeting on the floors, the prospect of desk re-arrangement unaccompanied by high levels of noise was small.

An alternative to the movement of classroom furniture which would still facilitate inter-pupil contact would be the free movement of pupils between desks. The noise emanating from the classroom, however, affected the degree to which teachers felt it was possible to allow such movement around the classroom by pupils, with recent trends in footwear (clogs) exacerbating the problem on uncarpeted floors. Also, such movement by pupils would be likely to involve the scraping of chairs on the floor. And if communication were allowed between pupils on opposite sides of a classroom, noise levels would tend to gradually rise as groups of pupils contended to hear themselves above others; talking to others at a distance, that is, would entail a crescendo of volume likely to be beyond a level acceptable to other members of staff.

As a member at Beechgrove, indicated:

"It's all very well wanting to shift rooms ... um ... desks around to get group-work and things like that .... I'd like I think it's a good idea ... but there isn't the time. And it involves a lot of fuss and bother ... scraping, noise. It's really just not on, even though you might want it."

(Maths Teacher : T1 : Beechgrove)

The problem of noise, then, provided an aspect of the practical context of teaching which staff used to explain (and justify) their attitudes and actions in relation to pedagogic approach. The non-adoption of innovatory teaching styles could be explained on pedagogic grounds, for instance, the preference for teacher-directed lessons expressed by the English teacher at Beechgrove (above). Yet a distinct factor from pedagogic preference was the practical consideration for noise. It provided an analytically and empirically distinct level of explanation of the practice of teaching in the schools.
Noise was a practical problem, because the architecture of the schools provided a "traditional" classroom setting of "closed" units, adjacent to one another both horizontally and vertically and lacking in sound insulation. The physical environment influenced the nature of teaching which was appropriate in practice, yet as Hanson and Herrington have argued:

One does not have to be an architectural determinist in order to accept that the physical context provides clues about social relationships and values.

(Hanson and Herrington 1976, pp. 37-8)

Noise in one classroom was audible in adjacent classrooms, and thus impinged on the privacy of that lesson. So, in practice, teaching had to take into account the amount of noise being generated in the classroom, and a practical problem of teaching was hence one of maintaining noise at a level acceptable to other members of staff.

Early in the field-work an indication of the problem of noise occurred during an informal discussion with a language teacher at Beechgrove. The discussion took place in the classroom after the observation of a lesson and was interrupted by noise from an adjacent room. The language teacher broke from the thread of conversation to comment to the effect that "things often got worse" with a record-player being used on occasion and proceedings in the language teacher's class having to be temporarily suspended until
it was possible to "hear yourself think". The indication from the teacher was that aids such as record-players were possibly an advantage for the class in which they were used, but constituted something of an educational hazard for those nearby.

Attempts to innovate through the employment of audio-visual aids, it appeared, posed problems for teachers not so much who used them as those teaching in the locale and whose teaching might be affected by the noise emanating from the user's classroom.

The implications of noise for the practice of teaching was also evident in reflection upon the problems broadly associated with "grouping practice", and consideration of this area allows an expansion on the way in which noise levels affected teaching as a practical activity.
Grouping Practices

Grouping pupils according to criteria of ability constituted a second broad area of concern for the practice of teaching. Teachers from varying pedagogic persuasions concurred in identifying the use of mixed-ability groups, sets, bands and streams as problematic despite their possible differing interpretations of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the modes of grouping.

In this section, attention is focused on the implications of mixed-ability grouping, particularly as it influenced the prospect of disruptive behaviour because (a) mixed-ability grouping is an aspect of academic organization associated with comprehensive schools, and (b) the prevention of disruptive behaviour in the classroom appeared to be an underlying major practical concern of the teachers.

- comprehensives and mixed-ability grouping

The re-organization of secondary education along comprehensive lines has involved a general orientation to pupil co-operation rather than competitiveness and delayed selection by ability. (see Chapter I: also Ford 1969). The latter aspect of comprehensive education has been manifested in an orientation away from streaming and towards the use of mixed-ability grouping. In the words of Miles and Skipworth:

Comprehensive schooling principles fully applied, would (...) produce a school in which there would be no distinction whatever between pupils in regard to the subjects they were enabled to study and they would be grouped in mixed-ability classes.

(Miles & Skipworth 1973m p.61)

Teachers at the schools were well aware of the association between comprehensive organization and mixed-ability grouping - those being sympathetic to the idea making assertions of the like:
I don't regard the comprehensive as a school in which there is ... there are streams of academic children. (...) I think it is essential that all the children should be unstreamed.

(Head of History : Me : Beechgrove)

Others, less sympathetic to mixed-ability organization displayed an awareness of the "formal" desirability when acknowledging that where ability-groups did exist, it was not appropriate to call them "streams". For example, a teacher at Ashton, when describing who he taught remarked:

Well .... history .... I teach only the bottom stream - they are not called that, but that is what they are.

and later, with reference to the banding operative at Ashton.

I mean, the L's, R's and the N's are in the same forms and the P's, Q's and U's are in the same forms, ... but there is supposed to be a distinctive intellectual difference there .... or .... rather, there is not supposed to be but it tends to work out. Theoretically you can have very able people who want to do a technically orientated course who would be in a 'L' group but it doesn't work out.

(Social Studies & History Teacher : Pi : Ashton)

Mixed-ability grouping, then, was recognized by those sympathetic and non-sympathetic to it as an officially preferred form of organization, and deference to the idea that ability-grouping was officially, formally or technically unacceptable was demonstrated in frequent qualification of "teacher context" reference to academic grouping by "Educationist Context" acknowledgement that "we don't call them that" or "in theory they don't exist, but they do". (cf. Keddie 1971).

Neither school, however, relied entirely upon mixed-ability grouping, Despite the general preference for such organization expressed in the official guidelines, both Ashton and Beechgrove made provision for a certain amount of ability-grouping. Under certain circumstances it was apparently considered that the use of "setting" was a more appropriate kind of organization.
In accounting for the conditions under which setting was more appropriate than mixed-ability grouping the teachers became involved in establishing for the researcher the practical situation within which they operated and consequently through which their views became justifiable. In other words, in justifying their views on the relative advantage and disadvantages of particular grouping practices, they had to present such views in terms of the context (as they saw it) in which they worked, and for which the grouping practice had specific practical implications.

-examinations and mixed-ability grouping

Comprehensive schools have been subject to comparison with the tripartite sector in terms of examination successes. (see Chapter I). This comparison has provided a source of pressure upon comprehensive schools to achieve an examination criteria to an extent comparable with, if not in advance of, their counterparts. It was in this context that mixed-ability grouping appeared to pose a problem for teachers in the schools. At Ashton, for instance, a teacher explained:

... the results .. examination wise, have been very poor from this school, with a lot of comprehensive. And this is why parents say 'Oh, why aren't the examination results as good as the old grammar school?'. But they seem to forget that in the old grammar school there was very few discipline problems ... that it was just straight-forward examination work and that was it. It was easy for grammar school teachers. But now you have a mixture of the grammar school child, the secondary child, the remedial child, all lumped together in one class. And you've got to sort the sheep from the goats. And it takes a long time to do that.

(Deputy Head of History : Sa : Ashton)

There were those members of staff also who argued vociferously that the emphasis on examination success which was being experienced by comprehensive schools did little to encourage the teaching of the less able pupils
who, as a result of their neglect, became disruptive influences in the school. As a teacher at Ashton observed:

We don't help ... we don't help the less-abled kids, and I'm not just talking about this school ... we don't do it in education at all. We all of us .. whether we like it or not, find that the only rewarding thing in teaching is to get a few certificates. I think from the Head downwards, every school likes to say 'This is .. um .. our school has got so many O's and 'A' levels, but nobody ever stands up and says 'I taught 3 kids to read'. So these poor kids who can't read become discipline problems. And in a way it's .. it's the system's fault not the teachers.

(History Teacher : Do : Ashton)

Reservations were expressed both personally and in the official guidelines, about the effectiveness of mixed-ability grouping in terms of examinations. In the face of pressure to gain academic certification even those broadly opposed to selective grouping of pupils generally conceded the necessity for ability grouping as a feature of school organization.

A commerce teacher at Beechgrove argued against ability grouping in a manner which was clearly illustrative of the idea that mixed-ability grouping was not wholly appropriate in those instances where the subject was part of an externally examinable course:

I don't teach academic exam subjects, so then, it's easy for me to say so .. but I don't like (ability grouping) because of that reason. But what I would prefer to see, say .. there are going to be next year, I think three history groups, and the idea is probably that they'll be one 'O' level, one CSE and one non-exam. Well I'd rather see those mixed-ability for the first year, anyway, if possible and then get onto the actual .. let the kids decide. The ones that know they can't take 'O' level are on the whole not going to opt to do an 'O' level. And let them decide what they want to do.

(Commerce Teacher : My : Beechgrove)
In this illustration, it is apparent that even a member of staff who showed preference for mixed-ability conceded the necessity of ability-sets prior to examination (whether or not the ability was self-judged, or assessed by teachers).

Examinations orientation was regarded as placing practical constraints on not only the mode of grouping operated, but also the style of teaching adopted. Whilst mixed-ability grouping was generally regarded as appropriate for stimulating interest, when the relevant teacher task became that of imparting a body of syllabus knowledge for an external examination the use of ability-groups was considered appropriate. As the Head of History at Beechgrove explained with reference to mixed-ability grouping:

If you don't have as your prime aim the ... putting over of information - the putting over of facts - which I don't have with the second year ... um ... my aim with the second year is to stimulate interest, and to encourage them to perform well against they're own standards ... to improve as the year goes on ... um ... academically as well as socially. So, if you've not faced with this specific aim of getting over ... over the information, then you can try and construct a lesson which will be interesting for all of them and which the bright ones can go into at a greater level.

So it depends what what your aim is in your lesson, whether information or ... or facts are the things you want to get across, or if you're just trying to instill some sort of attitude toward the subject.

(Head of Histoy : Me: Beechgrove)

7. Advocates of mixed-ability grouping have claimed that any lack of examination success associated with such grouping can be attributed to the use of an inappropriate style of teaching for the kind of group rather than the composition of the group per se. (cf. Davies 1975, Kelly 1974)
The pressure of external examinations, then, constituted a practical problem for teachers with regard to mixed-ability grouping. Even those who expressed a preference ideally for the use of such grouping tended to regard it as more appropriate for the lower years of the school where there was less necessity for the pupils to learn a body of knowledge, and consequently more scope for the teacher to base the work on "interesting" material. It was in the face of public examinations that the use of, for instance, sets became justifiable because they were regarded as more appropriate for the kind of learning needed for an examination syllabus.

- subjects and mixed-ability grouping

In recognition of this need to inculcate knowledge for examination success the schools did provide for a certain amount of ability grouping. Such grouping did not, however, occur solely in response to the academic demands of public examinations. Setting, for instance, occurred in both schools even as early as the first year with subjects such as English and Maths. (French developing setting in the second year). In other words, ability grouping in the schools was not justified by the teachers purely on the basis of the need to segregate pupils in the latter years according to subjects and the "level" (G.C.E., C.S.E., non examination) at which they were to take the subject. Selective grouping was also justified with respect to the nature of the subject itself.

Certain subjects were argued to warrant selective grouping because of the nature of the material to be taught. It was no coincidence, then, that these subjects in which ability-grouping was evident at early stages were those considered to pose such special difficulties when taught to mixed-ability groups. Pedley (1964) has noted the apparent problem in relation to Maths. He commented on the basis of his research, that:
Mathematics was seen by Head Teachers as the subject presenting the greatest difficulty in the unstreamed class, and modern languages loomed almost as large.

(Pedley 1964, p.102)

At Ashton this view was reflected by a Maths teacher who said:

Well, you see, from .... I am a very old-fashioned person and I must tell you ... um .. to me, maths is a subject you can't teach to mixed-abilities. You cannot teach maths to a child who is very clever and also a child .. and you ask her "what is one and one?" and I tell her "Two" - which frequently happens I might tell you.

(Deputy Head of Maths : El : Ashton)

Certain subjects were allegedly inappropriate for mixed-ability grouping, and attempts to use such grouping for them posed particular problems for the teacher. Explanations of why ability-grouping was considered necessary for particular subjects reflected in tenor, if not, in extent, the assertion of Boyson that:

Complete non-streaming in comprehensive schools (...) would have consequences in the subjects taught as well as the levels reached. If all-ability classes were to have anything of a unity and the slower pupils were not to be constantly reminded of their slowness, then difficult subjects like Latin, calculus, physics, Shakespearian plays, and even foreign languages, may have to be dropped on the theory that what one could not master no one should attempt. Harry Ree, former Professor of Education at York University, wrote in December 1974 that language teaching in unstreamed comprehensive schools was a waste of time. "In comprehensive schools, with un-streamed classes, the teacher can hardly fail to fail" he concluded.

It is certainly likely that streaming makes the work of most teachers easier and thus more effective.

(Boyson 1975, pp 86, 84)

Problems apparently arose for teachers of such "difficult" subjects when the groups included those for whom mastery of the subject was unlikely. As Warnes has suggested on this point:
the real reason why language teachers do not, in general, look forward to mixed-ability classes is that they will be faced, perhaps for the first time, with children traditionally considered unsuitable for such a demanding subject.

(Warnes, in Davies 1975, p.97)

Certain subjects, then, were identified as posing more problems than others with respect to mixed-ability grouping. To understand the position of mixed-ability grouping in the schools it would seem useful to concentrate on one of these subjects as an "extreme example" of the practical problems associated with the use of non-selective groups, and thus to illustrate the reasoning appropriate to teachers in the schools.

- the case of French

In Ashton and Beechgrove, it was the teaching of modern languages specifically French, to mixed-ability groups which was seen to raise the most problems, A Social Studies teacher at Ashton, for instance, observed that:

.... maybe it wouldn't work in some subjects. I don't think you can teach French to mixed-ability classes, you know, Social Studies you can.

(Social Studies Teacher : Hn : Ashton)

French, along with perhaps Maths and English, was seen to have special problems, and because it was in relation to the teaching of French that the practical problems of teaching were apparently most manifest, through considering the explanations offered by the staff for their views and action, it was possible to identify these aspects of the practical context of teaching, which were regarded as militating against the use of mixed-ability groups. The Head of French at Ashton offered a cogent account of such reasoning:
.. a lot has got to do, where French is concerned, with the principle under which you approach the teaching of French. You see, with the comprehensive set-up came the idea that there should be mixed-ability teaching. That is, doing away with streaming and doing away with any sort of selection, where you just pile them all together regardless of ability. And, quite honestly, as far as I can see over the years, it has just not worked. I mean I think the current Fifth Year exam results have shown that .. which have been appalling .. um .. because the mixed-ability arrangements need .. maybe they would succeed - given a great deal of time and organization on the part of the staff, and secondly, given the most appropriate teaching materials. Now you see it is awfully difficult to find teaching materials suitable for the slow learner in French. When I say slow learner I mean average to slow learner. I mean there's lots of excellent material suitable for the brighter pupils, the grammer-school type children, but relatively little for your remedials or, for your slow learners .. very little.

So, it means that the teacher has an extra burden there to cope with even finding materials before he can even start teaching. And, of course, if you don't have adequate materials or very satisfactory materials then it means that .. er .. discipline problems arise you know, because you need a fairly strong personality to cope with .. to interest ... the majority of the children we have at the best of time. (..)

If you're going to be dynamic (..) it means a great deal of preparation in addition to all the normal routine (administration). (..)

Because of the mixed-ability situation that has been imposed on us, we have obviously had to completely adjust our approach. In fact, because of the lack of success of the mixed-ability, and because of its unpopularity amongst most of the staff, and now we've got it only in the first year where French is concerned. Otherwise we are setting them now, which means that .. um .. whilst they may be mixed-ability say, in some less academic subject, we do our utmost to set them, so that the better ones .. the most able ones .. come together in one set, and then the less able in another set, and then the teacher knows what level to teach at you see, and he knows what level to prepare his material for. We have tried a whole variety of different methods. You know, there are wall charts, there are film-strips so on and so forth, which meant an awful lot of preparation and organization and in the most part they have been abandoned. We have abandoned those ideas and gone back to the more basic idea of working from a textbook. That is not to say that one does purely textbook work, I mean we approach the problem of .. we approach the teaching of French with the principle that one should do as much oral work as possible.

(Head of French : Ml : Ashton)
The clarity of this account possibly owes something to the fact that it followed criticisms of French teaching at the school. In December 1974 a formal interview was being conducted in an empty staffroom at Ashton with a probationer French teacher. During the interview, a young French "assistante" entered the room and joined in with the discussion, in fact dominating the proceedings with an outspoken condemnation on the methods of teaching adopted in the French department. Other teachers came into the staffroom at the end of the lesson period including the Head of French and another French teacher, who joined in with what was to become a heated exchange of views - with the researcher's presence becoming apparently of minimal significance. The Head of French eventually stormed out of the room in disgust at what he felt to be unfair criticism.

The subsequent interview with the Head of French on his own provided a good opportunity for him to describe to the researcher how teaching of the subject was organized, and to explain why this was the case: it offered particularly the prospect of accounting for (justifying) the preference for setting rather than mixed-ability grouping. (see appendix III: transcript of interview with Head of French: Ml.)
The problem of French was stated thus: that the mixed-ability grouping associated with comprehensive schooling did not work for French because of the effort it required of teachers, the fatigue and stress, and the lack of suitable teaching materials, which could give rise to discipline problems. Through setting the staff could recognize the level at which to aim the work and better handle the oral work essential to the subject.

The eloquence of this account, and its subsequent clarification of other accounts, provides for its use as an orientation to the specific problems associated with teaching mixed-ability groups. These can now be considered individually in greater depth.

- the problem of fatigue

A drawback to the use of mixed-ability groups identified by the Head of French at Ashton was the amount of preparation which was necessary for the appropriate kind of teaching. Coupled with a dearth of readily available material for the average and slower pupil, the extra demands on the teacher gave rise to a problem of fatigue. It was not, however, merely the preparation of work which placed extra burdens on the teacher; the actual process of classroom teaching to such groups was also considered to be more exhausting:

The Deputy Headmaster at Ashton was amongst others who emphasised the extra demands which mixed-ability groups placed on the teacher:

... it demands more of the teacher (...) to cope with any mixed-ability class obviously demands more of the teacher. He has got to be a more knowledgeable person, a more flexible person, much more patient. (...) He has got to be prepared for a much slower pace of work.

(Deputy Headmaster : Co : Ashton)

The stress and strain arising from the extra work involved was obviously contrary to the necessity of good teaching. To explain why such groups should involve extra effort and fatigue, however, it is necessary to consider the demands of teaching (specifically, French), under conditions
of mixed-ability grouping, and the practical problems these entailed for the teacher.

- oral classwork

The Head of French at Ashton said that "we approach the problem of ... we approach the teaching of French with the principle that one should do as much oral work as possible". This aspect of the subject appeared to be of special significance in justifying the adoption of "sets" for the teaching of French. Oral work, that is, was a prominent factor in accounts referring to the problems of using mixed-ability groups for teaching French. A language teacher at Beechgrove, for instance, argued that:

... so much of the content of the lessons has to be oral. You've really got to teach people to speak a language and the fact that you've got to hold the kids' attention for the majority of the lesson ... um ... doing oral work is pretty difficult.

(Language Teacher : Pr : Beechgrove)

It appeared that the necessity of "oral" work distinguished French (and languages generally) from other subjects where the extent of, and the centralitity of oral work was less in evidence. The class repetition of French words to obtain correct pronunciation, and all attempts at French conversation were regarded as not only central to the teaching of the subject, but also raised as significant the extra problems posed by noise and disruption. The association between this and the special difficulties of teaching French to mixed-ability groups may have depended on the view of the teachers that:

(a) noise and disruptive behaviour were particularly problematic for the "oral" emphasis associated with language teaching, and

(b) that the prospect of such noise and disruptive behaviour was exacerbated within a mixed-ability group situation.
It is these suggestions which are now explored with reference to the problems of pacing the work and of motivating the pupil - both of which attain special significance in the teaching of French.

- the problem of pacing the work

Oral classwork was not the only feature of the subject which rendered the teaching of French specially difficult. The relevant staff at the schools also noted that it required a strictly incremental approach in which the present material assumed a grasp of previous work. This "developmental" approach was seen as distinguishing the subject from certain others and as effectively precluding the use of mixed-ability grouping. A French teacher at Beechgrove indicated this reasoning with the words:

I think it's possible to teach mixed-ability in history and geography, but it really is impossible with a language because there is so much learning that has got to go on to make it interesting. You know, you have got to learn a certain amount from one year to the next for it to make any sense.

(French Teacher : Ro : Beechgrove)

It was argued that this "development", essential to the subject, prevented the possibility of having individual pupils, or separate groups of pupils, working at a different pace within the classroom.

The prospect of child-paced work was of itself a somewhat controversial issue, and was not recognized universally as a desirable feature of teaching. At Ashton, for instance, a Maths Teacher argued against individually paced work from a "traditional" pedagogic stance:

Now, perhaps I am too old-fashioned, I don't know .. but if you want to (let pupils proceed at their own pace) .. the children don't do it on their own... either they are too thick or they aren't interested. You can't make a child interested if you aren't actually there. I can put things over much better when I am doing it on the blackboard .. then give them examples ... yes, that's fair enough. But to let them work through work sheets, it just doesn't work. I am sorry (...) it's a
correspondence course.

(...) To let them find out for themselves and work at their own pace, that is "poppycock". It just doesn't work. It might work in junior schools, and I'm not sure of that. If it would work so well in junior schools, why are there so many non-readers coming into the secondary-schools? Not only non-readers ... their innumerable. They don't know when they come to this school what is one and one. Or they don't know most of their tables yet ... that's only because they are left to their own devices.

(Deputy Head of Maths : El : Ashton)

In the instance of French, however, it appeared that the inappropriateness of individual or group pacing stemmed from practical factors as much as pedagogic, that is, were seen to stem from the nature of the subject rather than the inherent properties of grouping practices or child-paced work per se.

A French Teacher at Beechgrove, for instance, commented that:

... with lots of subjects you can have kids working at different speeds, at their own pace, and within their own particular field of interest within the subject. In a language course, it's so carefully structured, even if it's non-grammatical ... quotes "non-grammatical" ... it is. You know, the grammar's introduced gradually without calling it grammar, and they have to build on what's gone before and so on ... a continuous process. And they have to work on the same thing all the time. There's just no way you can ... no way that I can see in the present courses where kids can sort of do other things.

(Language Teacher : Pr : Beechgrove)

The grammar requirements, then, were seen to limit the prospect, if not eliminate the prospect of having individually paced work in French, and by the same token, the necessity for a teacher controlled pacing of work was implied. The pacing of work was problematic in such subjects where

8. Kelly (1974) argues that individually paced work and group work, though essential to mixed-ability grouping, need not operate to the exclusion of class (teacher directed) teaching. They are, however, regarded as an integral part of the teaching of mixed-ability groups.
mixed-ability grouping was used, because the progress of the course had to focus centrally on the development of the grammar, rather than the individual intellectual development of the pupils.

Setting had the advantage that it facilitated the appropriate pacing of work. In a context where the pace of the lesson could not depend on the individual pupil or separate groups, the teachers suggested, then, that the adoption of setting was both appropriate and justifiable. Their accounts of setting, that is, involved the establishment for the researcher of a practical context of teaching activity characterized by the necessity of both oral classwork and class-oriented pacing of work — neither of which were conducive to mixed-ability grouping.

The advantages of setting, however, were not solely concerned with either the inculcation of knowledge or the alleviation of fatigue. It was also advantageous in terms of the teacher's control of the classroom and the prevention of noise and disruptive behaviour. It helped to avoid a situation associated with mixed-ability grouping where the pace problem gave rise to unacceptable pupil behaviour.

A Maths teacher at Ashton reflected on the practical problems, thus,

With non-streamed classes it's more difficult I think to set a sort of pace, a pace at which you get through the work...you know, set some sort of pace that's agreeable to everyone. It's too slow for the brighter ones and it's too fast for the ones who are less intelligent and causes, perhaps boredom in the bright kids. And the slower kids get frustrated because they can only half understand something before you move on to a new unit of work - which I think is a disadvantage to both lots of kids.

(Maths Teacher: Mu: Ashton)

The frustration and the boredom of either set of pupils became a problem when it manifested itself in noise, and this teacher - though sympathetic to the pupils resort to talking - still saw the noise as a practical problem of teaching:
While your back's turned and while you're helping two or three people, they naturally start talking even the best behaved kids, and if you are trying to show someone something and you have got this constant distraction and noise gets loader, you've got to keep saying 'All right, that's enough noise' and they may be quieten down for a minute but once again, understandably, they get noisy.

(Maths Teacher: Ma: Ashton)

Teacher/class oriented teaching of mixed-ability groups encountered a problem of noise that is, which arose from the frustration and boredom of those pupils for whom the pace of the material was inappropriate. In the classroom, the bright pupils who found the work did not tax their ability and the less intelligent pupils for whom the work was too demanding, were regarded as potential sources of classroom disruption. The teacher orienting the pace of the work to the middle range of ability, could not provide work of the appropriate level and it was this inappropriate "pitch" of work which teachers noted as a major source of disruptive behaviour.

- the problem of pitching the work

Setting aided the teacher to pitch the work at the appropriate level:

We do our utmost to set them, so that the better ones, the most able ones, come together in one set and then the less able in another set and then the least able in another group. And then the teacher knows what level to teach at, you see, and he knows what level to prepare his material for.

(Head of French: Ml: Ashton)

By grouping the pupils according to their ability the class-orientation of the lesson no longer entailed the problem of pitching the work at a level appropriate to but a few of the pupils, and thus alleviated the accruing problems.

Not all staff, however, embraced this alternative with unqualified enthusiasm. Following the spirit of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) some
teachers recognized that where ability-grouping took place, there was the possibility that the group would provide an institutionalized expectation of behaviour and performance to which the pupil would conform. So, whilst the association of sets with academic standards could be useful for teachers to the extent that it provided a contextual feature allowing the teachers to predict and explain the performance of particular groups, it could also contain a labelling effect. Awareness of this problem was occasionally expressed in the course of giving an account of the practical problems involved with teaching mixed-ability groups. As a Social Studies teacher at Ashton argued:

I think this is one of the problems... that, after you label the class L, K, M, N (lower band) you... or... you straight away come closer... right away you have got staff saying 'These are L, K, M, N children and therefore can't take much' and they don't give them much. And I think you lower your standard all the way through. (...) In the secondary modern school... er... if it was an 'A' stream they used to say 'O.K. I can make something out of this 'A' stream,' whereas now I think even the top group of L, N, N, K's are often labelled non-academics, and therefore can't make much of them.

(Social Studies Teacher: Kn: Ashton)

9. Keddie (1971) argues that in the practical context of teaching what a teacher knows about pupils derives from the organizational device of banding or streaming, and that the "material is categorised in terms of the suitability for a given ability band".

(Keddie 1971, p.39 144)
The role of languages, and French in particular, was interesting in this respect. Ability at French was often taken as an index of a pupil's general ability and pupil's successful at the one subject were considered to have a general capacity to achieve at the "academic" subjects. Those who could cope with the academic rigours of a subject like French were identified as those with overall high ability.

It tends to relate, they tend to be the same. You know they ... if they're good at languages they tend to be good at the other subjects on the whole. One doesn't like to generalise but it seems to be that that's the way it goes generally.

The people who take languages tend to be doing the academic subjects ... on the whole. You know, they accompany the academic subjects.

(Language Teacher : Pr : Beechgrove)

And it should be emphasized that the recognition of French as an "academic" subject and the connotations it involved, was not restricted to assertions by the languages staff. A teacher at Ashton was more positive about the connotations of taking French, and claimed that as far as the 4th year options were concerned:

What it boils down to is, if you are good enough to do French, then you will do an academic course - I mean 'O' levels. If you don't ... weren't very good at French then you do Social Studies. That's what it boils down to.

(Social Studies Teacher : Hn : Ashton)

- grouping practices and behaviour

In the absence of general setting or streaming in the schools, it appeared that ability at French provided a clue to the performance of a pupil which could be used by teachers for the purposes of pacing and pitching work.
It was, however, another aspect of pupil performance which arose as more significant for teaching as a practical activity: the behaviour of pupils. Those pupils involved with "academic" subjects, were generally regarded as posing few problems in terms of pupil behaviour. As a Social Studies teacher expressed it:

Well, there is no doubt that the more able intellectually tend to be easier to control from a discipline point of view, and quieter and so on.

(Social Studies & History Teacher : Pi : Ashton)

French, and languages generally, being regarded as an indicator of pupil ability, it was not surprising that those pupils opting to take more than one language by the fourth year would be considered to pose fewer problems of disruptive behaviour than normal.

The ones who choose to do (Spanish as a second language to French) tend to be .. tend to be academically better, and therefore their work tends to .. or .. I mean, there tends to be no discipline problems whatsoever.

(Language Teacher : Pr : Beechgrove)

Conversely, those pupils regarded as of low ability, and thereby not taking French, were seen as posing problems. As a different Social Studies teacher at Ashton said when describing the groups he taught:

They're the lower form in terms of intelligence .. almost remedial kids who are fairly hard to handle .. They're .. um .. aberrations of what is normally deemed as good behaviour. (..) They're difficult to keep down because their concentration powers are low. (..) By-and-large they're unable to do French, which I suppose means that they're ... they're perhaps not so intelligent as .. er .. er .. the students who do French. (..)

They tend to be of lower ability because well.. because they're not doing French.

(Social Studies Teacher : Ss: Ashton)

French tended to be used as an index of membership of the "academic" (Hargreaves 1967) or "school" (Sugarman 1967) subcultures whose traits included non-disruptive behaviour, with non-French taking pupils being associated with the respective "delinquent" and "youth" subcultures.
The position of "academic" subjects such as French as keys to the ability and disruptive potential of pupils stemmed in part from the methods of allocation adopted in the schools. It was acknowledged by teachers that ability and disruptive potential were associated, and that indeed, selection to ability-groups itself owed something to the behaviour as opposed to academic performance of the pupil. At Beechgrove a French teacher indicated the outcome of the association of ability and behaviour:

There are probably two classes which are quite good but this somehow worked out that .. um .. in one form there wasn't .. there wasn't many people who were very keen on French anyway. (...) It was done on a rough ability thing. It was shown .. but probably behaviour affects ability unfortunately. I mean one class was .. they just couldn't cope most of them .. couldn't cope, you know. This was out of the whole class .. probably out of the whole class probably 13 or 14 of them out of the whole class were really very backward with ordinary reading, not just French .. and they're bad behaviourwise too.

(French Teacher: Ro: Beechgrove)

The use of setting had the effect of concentrating those pupils with generally non-sympathetic attitudes to teacher control and academic achievement within one class.

And I think some of the greatest problems we have are in Maths classes because they become streamed classes. And all the difficult problems are in the bottom group.

(Commerce Teacher: My: Beechgrove)

This teacher went on to recall the kind of effect such grouping could have in the school process:

And going to take the register of classes was just bad, particularly when they were streamed - or cover lessons with classes which were streamed. 'Cos obviously all the discipline problems were in the lower streams. It was the lower stream teachers who were away. 'Cos they just couldn't take it all the time. So, whenever you got a cover you knew it would be a terrible class.

(Commerce Teacher: My: Beechgrove)
A Social Studies teacher at Ashton conversely commented on the experience of filling-in for a member of staff who normally took "academic" classes:

... people who take perhaps the academic forms, they don't meet the discipline problems that the ... er ... others do and, therefore, perhaps they lead a sheltered existence. (...) 

In brighter forms, if I have to take and sit with a group or I am taking the lesson for someone who's away, and I think, 'My God! this is so nice, it's such a pleasant atmosphere'. This ... um ... you know, they sit there and it's quite frightening at first because you think, 'My God, they're quiet!' and ... er not having to say 'Now, come on lads, let's have it down a bit!' or something like that.

(Social Studies Teacher : Kn : Ashton)

Ability grouping, that is, had the effect of creating within the organization of the school, both 'pockets of resistance' to teacher control and groups particularly conducive to the attainment of quiet orderliness.

In practice, then, the effects of ability-grouping were not confined to matters of performance or the inculcation of knowledge, but contained, in addition, implications for the behaviour to be associated with particular groups. The practical advantages of "setting" for the pitching and pacing of work, though apparently not inconsiderable for subjects such as French, also provided an institutionalized expectation of behaviour to the extent that

10. Institutionalized expectations have been regarded not only as a feature of ability-grouping (Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970), but also of the wider social expectations of teachers (Fuchs 1968, Leacock 1969, Rist 1970).
teachers identified poor standards of behaviour and "pockets of resistance" with low academic ability groups.

A teacher's preference in terms of grouping practice consequently did not reflect purely pedagogic considerations for it was argued that the relative advantages/disadvantages also concerned their effects on the prospect of teacher control entailed in the nature of the groups.

It remains, however, to explore the reasons for this association between grouping practice and behaviour. Such explanations of the relationship drew to the fore the question of "pupil motivation" and, indeed, it became evident through accounts that "pupil motivation" constituted a significant practical problem for teachers in the schools, and one basic to the teachers' understanding of the situation within which they operated.
Pupil Responsiveness

The response of pupils to the educational environment provided in the school was frequently explained with reference to the motivation of the pupil. Both in the accounts and in educational literature, however, there have been two discernable aspects of that motivation - "achievement motivation" and "intrinsic motivation" (Morrison and McIntyre 1969).

"Achievement motivation" has provided an explanation of responses to the instructional environment with reference to factors such as selection procedures within the school, but has been concerned primarily with influences stemming from the pupil's home background and neighbourhood upon attitudes towards education. "Intrinsic motivation" on the other hand, has been regarded as a potential enthusiasm for learning which characterizes pupils and which can be utilized in the process of teaching.

Attempts to classify teaching styles have drawn on this distinction, categorizing teachers according to the emphasis they place upon the respective sources of pupil motivation.11

Morrison and McIntyre point out that:

These categorizations often bear a close relation to the distinction between practices which emphasize learning through discovery and self-directed activity, and learning in closely directed and extrinsically motivated conditions.

(Morrison & McIntyre 1969, p.133)

11. Authoritarian and "democratic" styles accord with these respective aspects of pupil motivation, being based on the group leadership styles identified by Lippit & White (1943).
The distinction between these two aspects of pupil motivation corresponds, in large part, with the pedagogic distinction between "progressive" and "traditional" perspectives and the corresponding child-centredness and subject/teacher centredness of these approaches.

In the "traditional" approach:

The teacher is expected to be a director of pupil learning. She takes the initiative in teacher-pupil interaction and their communication is primarily in the form of questions and answers. Teachers are expected to assess, reward and punish children on the basis of how thoroughly they have covered the curriculum content and how correctly they have retained it. In short, this role definition for the teacher is one that stresses her function as the director of the child's achievement on academic standards established by the school or the larger system.

(Gross et al. p.14)

This compares with the "progressive" view of the teachers' task:

to maximise the potential talents and interests of each child, to help children to develop their interests and capacities, to help them learn how to learn, and not to teach them a set of standard concepts or facts. Children are seen as different types of candles to be lit; the task of the teacher is to light each candle. Given this, conception of schooling and children, the teacher's task is to create the type of classroom atmosphere in which children feel free to pursue their own interests, to learn what they, not the teacher, view as important. (…) In short, the new role model for a teacher is one that stresses

12. For present purposes the concept is deliberately restricted to this dichotomy in spite of useful elaborations that are available (cf. Blum and McHugh 1971) because the dichotomy reflects a major pedagogic distinction noted in the text.

13. Gross et al (1971) provide a useful outline of the "progressive"/"Traditional" distinction because it is based on an officially designated "innovation" in school organization with explicit assumptions about the school and the pupil as well as teacher role, and has consequently been used in this definitive sense elsewhere (cf. Esland 1971).
her primary function as a catalyst or guide.

(Gross et al 1971, p.12/13)

A child-centred pedagogy involves, then, not only a move away from the curriculum/syllabus orientation characteristic of the "traditional" approach; as Gross et al emphasize, the teacher's role is no longer regarded as a director of learning but becomes instead a "facilitator" of learning. The process of learning is no longer regarded as a fundamentally unpleasant experience requiring direction and custodial action, but rather, the pupil is seen as having an innate and latent interest which needs to be sparked in the educational context. It is a form of education based on pupil interest, - an interest which when captured provides a motivation to learn that no longer renders the factors of authority and discipline central to the teacher's role. Methods of arousing interest, will consequently attain a high significance in such teaching methodology.

The progressive mould of education, then, has as one of its major constitutive features a concern with capturing the interest of the pupil in order to provide an "internally" situated source of motivation. It is a major function of the teacher to arrange the context of education in such a manner as to elicit the latent interest of the pupils, and thus to establish motivation.

Traditional education, on the other hand, is characterized by an opposite view of motivation. The pupil is regarded as having a low capacity for social responsibility and a "fundamental intractability" which requires of the teacher an authoritarian stance in the aim of curbing anti-social behaviour. 14 Co-operation from pupils in the learning process is not, then,

---

regarded as something which can be expected on any basis arising from the educational context other, that is, from the suppression of inherently unco-operative forces in the pupil. (cf. Waller 1961).

It can subsequently be argued that those pupils who do exhibit some motivation to learn do so as a result of a context other than the educational setting. Their motivation to learn stems from factors outside the school.

The sociology of education has been concerned to argue that pupil achievement is a function of ability and motivation, and that, further, these can be related to environmental factors. Various studies have associated achievement with social-class and sought to demonstrate its affect, which arises in distinction from, and prior to the school process, on the child's capacity to succeed. Principally, the work of Jackson and Marsden (1962), Floud, Halsey and Martin (1956), Douglas (1964) and Bernstein's early work (e.g. 1968) have established factors such as parental values, child-rearing practices, cognitive and linguistic style, and generally "motivation" as factors (a) affecting the performances and behaviour of pupils in the educational setting, and (b) located prior to and outside the scope of the educational context.

The effects of this "cultural deprivation" thesis for orientating interest outside the school to explain failings in the pupil have been rehearsed elsewhere (cf. Keddie 1973); at present the concern is only to argue that the view of motivation operative in such approaches is in accord with traditional pedagogies to the extent that motivation is regarded as an attribute of the pupil which, whilst manifesting itself in the educational setting, is not in fact a product of the setting.
Traditional educational approaches contain the possibility, as a result of this reasoning, of using the "motivation" of the pupil to absolve the teacher of responsibility for the failure of pupils from particular social groups, by implicitly (or explicitly) locating the source of failure outside the school. At Beechgrove, for instance, an English teacher recognized in explicit terms that explanations of pupil behaviour which drew on the personality of the pupil or the social background of the pupil elevated some of the personal responsibility from the teacher for that situation. In her words:

.... it all adds up doesn't it, really. All these things add up to how you deal with the child. For example, if that child, you know .. you suspect the child just doesn't make good female relationships .. why doesn't he? And it takes a lot of emotional pressure off the teacher who's able to say "Well look, he doesn't like .. he doesn't get on with females. I found this from his background". It does take off a lot of the emotional pressure.

(English Teacher : Ho : Beechgrove)

The social correlates of under-achievement noted in research provide institutionalized explanations of qualities associated with failure, such that teachers could say:

I think it makes an awful lot of difference. If you've got parents who are prepared to see that the children do their homework, take an interest in their work, will read .. who have books around the place .. it makes a difference .. The home background makes a difference.

(Deputy Head of History : Sa : Ashton)

As Keddie (1973) has noted: "motivation" can become more of an excuse for pupil behaviour than a result of the institutional set-up. And it has also been argued in the vein of Rønthal and Jacobson (1968) that such explanations of pupil failure become a progressively salient feature of the competent teachers' repertoire of explanations, and, can have the effect
of providing self-fulfilling prophesies about the achievement of pupils from "deprived" groups. (Fuchs 1968).

This view of motivation as a quality of the pupil, and as a product of the pupil's social environment, when used in explanations of pupil behaviour and performance at school, has the effect (a) of directing attention away from the processes of the school (b) of reducing the teacher's personal responsibility for the situation, and (c) of providing the basis for a labelling effect with impact to teachers' expectations of pupil behaviour and performance. In these senses the view of motivation as "environmentally" produced is opposed to the view of motivation as educationally established.

The juxtaposition of progressive and traditional perspectives in education provides the basis for arguing that "pupil motivation" can be seen in these two fundamental ways, and that those teachers at either school who adhered to the "progressive" mould might be expected to justify their actions in the context of attempts to capture the interest of the pupils and thus aid self-motivation, whilst those preferring the traditional mould would justify their actions with reference to a context consisting of variously motivated pupils with which they - the teachers - had to contend in the course of instruction. 15

In practice, no such clear-cut distinction was available. Despite the different meaning of "progressive" and "traditional" views for different people (Miles and Shipworth 1973) which could explain such lack of distinction - a further interpretation of "pupil motivation" began to emerge from a consideration of the accounts.

15. This holds in abeyance, for the moment, the significance of what Keddie (1971) calls the "Teacher Context" and the "Educationalist Context".
Teachers' use of "pupil motivation", in the course of establishing a context in which their actions could be seen as justified, exhibited an amalgum of the two perspectives such that:

(a) teachers could explain some of the practical problems they faced in terms of the "motivation" of pupils derived from their social background and yet (b) also be concerned with "interesting" the pupils - particularly those seen to have low "achievement" motivation - in order to motivate them to work.

Whilst individual teachers tended to stress one aspect or the other, there was a tendency to explain actions with reference to an amalgum of the two approaches. Teachers at both schools felt that the pupils with whom they had to deal were not well motivated (as a result of their social background) with West Indian and working-class pupils being seen as most affected. A social studies teacher at Ashton remarked, for instance:

Well, I most probably would say that one third of the school is not working very well in class, and out of that one third most of the behaviour problems come: - but these are mainly West Indian kids. Now, you know, there may be sociological reasons for this. And the only way to get them is by a more informal approach, and .. more .. um .. flexible approach and above all, knowing as much as you can possibly know about them. (...) I think the main problem is that we have got a group of kids who .. whose sort of natural intelligence is being masked by the inability of communicating with the teachers .. an inability to cope with this kind of structure of class that we have got. So they get bored and become behaviour problems. And this, you know, snowballs into the fifth year when they are behaviour problems to everybody, you know.

(Social Studies Teacher : Ha : Ashton)

There were seen to be certain groups of pupils who, as a consequence of their social background, were not in a position to take full advantage of the educational opportunities offered to them, and clearly in the mind of
a "non-English speaking" teacher at Beechgrove who, when referring to the "plight" of the school, argued:

that the majority of children are working-class children and some from homes where there's not necessarily any stimulus to learning, where there's few books, um, where the parents have not sufficient understanding or time or money to give the children a wider experience and a wide reading and so on, that a middle-class child tends to have—so that working-class children are always at a disadvantage unless the school supplies there opportunities.

("Non-English Speaking" Teacher : S1 : Beechgrove)

The over-representation of working-class and immigrant pupils in the schools relative to local and national proportions was often identified by staff as a source of low motivation. Operating within this situation, "motivation" became a practical problem because it was a factor that could not be assumed in the majority of pupils. And because the "motivation" did not "reside" in such pupils, it was regarded as a task for the school to generate that "motivation". That is, teachers became involved in the practical teaching task of motivating pupils through capturing their interest. The Social Studies Teacher at Ashton went on to say:

You know, I can pass my teaching very much on the kids' own interests. The kids need real things, you know, not the needs we are telling them to, or that the system generally is telling them to want. So I can find out—I sound a bit arrogant about this—but I think my teaching is very successful in this way.

(Social Studies Teacher : Ho : Ashton)

"Pupil-motivation" then, as a feature of the practical context of teaching, had two aspects. Firstly, it explained for the teacher the persistent failure of certain social groups and, secondly, by the same token, it identified those pupils for whom the relevant teaching task of "motivating the pupil" appropriate. In other words, teachers did not tend to see "motivating the pupil" as a basic task of teaching in the spirit of "progressive" education noted above, but saw it as an appropriate teaching
task in relation to those pupils who "suffered" a lack of motivation as a result of their social background. As Morrison and McIntyre put the point:

> Intrinsic motives (...) are the basis of major educational theories concerning "activity" and "discovery" methods of teaching. However, for the practising teacher the second aspect (of pupil motivation), that of motivational techniques, probably holds the greatest interest.

(Morrison & McIntyre 1969, p.121)

In the vein of the "Newsom child", there was seen to be the need to provide interest by rendering the material to be taught "relevant". This was particularly noticeable in relation to the "academic" or "non-academic" stature of pupils. Where the pupils to be taught were considered "non-academic" there was a necessity to present the material in a form relevant to the interests and experience of the pupils. This reasoning was illustrated by another social studies teacher at Ashton who made the following observation about his teaching:

> Taking it as a mode 3 exam, when you're not dealing with particularly academic kids, I think it's much better if you can make a practical relevance as well as some academic side too. (...)

> There is no-one in an academic form who takes social studies, in the way that we teach it to .. to the non-academic forms ..er .. it is a completely different syllabus. I suppose our syllabus was aimed basically at the average and below average children. That's why there is a certain amount of practical things in it which we hope will come to make it more interesting.

(Social Studies Teacher : Kn : Ashton)

And it was felt by some Staff that the schools were not really providing the "relevant" material for these "types of children". As a Language teacher at Ashton put it:
I can think of so many girls at the moment who would be much better off as... um... hairdresser apprentices. This is something they could understand, washing people's hair and making them... er... attractive - they could really understand it. And we can offer them nothing which is meaningful for this type of child, you see (...) school is... simply not what they want, as we offer it to them.

(Language Teacher : Ms : Ashton)

Another teacher at Ashton cogently put the case, reflected in a more general manner in other accounts, that it was the pupils in the lower bands who needed this relevance-of-subject to make it interesting. and also, significantly, that where such motivation from interest did not ensue, discipline problems arose:

The upper streams seem to take a much more instrumental approach to education. They seem... they are much more easily convinced that exams are worth working for. Whereas... throughout Ashton the exam system is operated, and in the lower streams the pupils are not as convinced that the exam system is worth following. Many of them, for example, would have wished to leave at the end of the 4th year... have already decided what kind of employment they are going to... going onto. Often the employment is with someone they know - at a local cafe, local hairdressing shop - where they've been offered a job anyway. They don't need any examinations to get into it and they're merely going through school as a formality - some of them. And... er... they are not finding the lessons interesting - I mean, to me the lower streams curricula seems very much a watered down high-stream curricula -... doesn't have any inherent interest for the particular group of pupils. And I don't find it very surprising there are discipline problems amongst the lower academic streams.

(Head of Chemistry : Ha : Ashton)

16. The presentation of "practical" and "relevant" material to pupils of "average" or "below average" ability, has been established almost as a teaching orthodoxy, and received perhaps most significant articulation in the Newsom Report (1963)
motivation, interest and disruptive behaviour

Underlying this concern for motivating the pupil resided a deeper concern - a concern that where pupils' interests could not be captured, their lack of motivation to learn would be exhibited in disruptive behaviour. A social studies teacher at Ashton was quite explicit about the association which existed between interest and control when saying:

I think interest does play quite a role in enabling to keep control, in the sense that ... in the sense that the kids who are interested in the subject will not play up as much as those who aren't interested. (...) It's the kids who are just blatantly not interested - I mean, you can see that they're not interested - who are creating the problems.

(Social Studies Teacher : Ss : Ashton)

And a History Teacher at the same school summarized the situation:

You have just to, you know .. I mean you've got to find some way to keep them happily occupied.

(Deputy Head of History : Sa : Ashton)

After observing a history lesson at Ashton in which the teacher had explicitly "made examples" of two boys who had been messing around at the back of the classroom the teacher explained:

Well it .. it's for your sake as much as their's. If they're larking about and not learning it's their loss in the end but .. er .. all the same it makes it very difficult for you. You know, we have a job and it's difficult but it's even more difficult if you let the kids mess about.

Interv: How do you prevent it?

Well, come down hard on them, like just now. But really it's easier .. better to get them interested so that they don't want to cause a nuisance. I mean, it's when they're bored that the trouble starts.

(Deputy Head of History : Sa : Ashton)
This episode, and similar instances at other times, sensitized the research to the idea that motivating the pupil was not solely a problem in terms of the inculcation of knowledge in the pupil, but also constituted a method of avoiding the practical problem which disruptive behaviour posed for the teacher.

The implications for teaching were clearly illustrated at Ashton where it was possible to observe the same History teacher with three different third year groups during the course of a school day. The teacher relied quite heavily on the use of tests, rote learning, and text-book work for the "jet" stream and enjoyed what appeared to be a relaxed relationship with the group. Whilst emphasizing that she liked all the pupils in the groups she admitted to a preference for this group.

One of the two "average" groups were rather sedentary. With this group the teacher tended to reply on the pupils drawing pictures from text-books and used a generally quieter, less jovial approach. It was the third group - in her words "the silly lot" - which provided a major contrast in approach. It became apparent that "silly" was less of a reference to their academic capabilities than to the kind of behaviour associated with the group. Discipline was strictly enforced, with this group, she argued, because the pupils could not be trusted to get on with their work. Because they were not interested in the work they were more likely to become "silly" - apparently a reference to loud talking, and walking round the room. Their lack of motivation, that is, would contribute to disruptive behaviour unless the teacher was particularly vigilant.
Accounts and observation suggested, then, that teachers associated disruptive behaviour with a lack of interest in the subject, particularly in instances where pupil-motivation was not seen to stem from external social conditions. Providing material which was "relevant" to the pupils constituted a method of attempting to elicit interest in the subject, thereby to motivate the pupils in the classroom situation and obviate disruptive behaviour.

- relevance and motivation: the case of French

Certain subjects were felt to pose particular problems in this respect, notably the case of French. A French Teacher at Beechgrove said:

I think it's probably one of the most difficult subjects to teach in terms of discipline because .. er .. as I say, you've got to try to somehow give kids a purpose to it.

(Language Teacher : Pr : Beechgrove)

- a sentiment echoed by a French Teacher at Ashton with the comment that:

... certainly, London comprehensive schools being what they are .. certainly we have difficulty in motivating interest in a subject the relevance of which is not immediately obvious.

(Head of French: Ml : Ashton)

The two French teachers latterly quoted came from quite different pedagogic persuasions, yet both recognized the importance of motivating those pupils who saw no intrinsic value in the subject. Relevance was regarded as a pre-requisite for motivation to learn, but such relevance was not easily attainable for this subject. Motivating, for instance, 11 year old pupils to learn French posed problems for the teacher because:
They remain, for the most part, impervious to arguments concerning a European cultural heritage, flippant towards suggestions about continental cousins and the "entente cordiale" and positively blank in the face of the Common Market. The point that I am trying to make is that the impetus to learn the language springs largely from the teacher, and he cannot rely on a latent fund of self-interest to come to his aid.

(Warmes in Davies 1975, p.100)

Motivating the pupil, then, became a practical problem for certain subjects where the applicability of the knowledge was neither immediate nor obvious to the pupil. The nature of the subject, that is, exacerbated the practical teaching problem of motivating the pupil, especially in circumstances where pupils were not generally "achievement" motivated from their social environment. And on the basis of the social characteristics of the intake to Ashton and Beechgrove, neither could expect to be dealing with pupils having a relevant "latent fund of self-interest" in learning the curriculum.

Consider the following extracts from accounts:

What you have got to realise is that in this particular area which is a fairly working-class area, with a large immigrant population (...) obviously we are going to have problems with a subject like French, problems which perhaps don't arise maybe with other subjects (...) and certainly London comprehensive schools being what they are ... certainly we are having difficulty in motivating interest in the subject, the relevance of which is not immediately obvious .. you know, something like French I mean.

(Head of French : Ml : Ashton)

These were sentiments echoed and expanded by a Language teacher at Beechgrove:

I think the fact that (working-class pupils) have very little potential using of French .. you know, with Spanish ... the reason I teach it really is that .. er .. lots of working-class kids now go on package holidays, and they at least you know .. they do go to Spain. They at least get the chance of communicating, even if its with the people in shops and waiters - and they don't get conned so easily if they can speak a bit of Spanish and they get quite a kick out of speaking a
few words of the language. But with French.. um.. the chances of people to Frenchland.. er (laugh) .. to France on holidays is a very bourgeoise pastime really. So I think.. no really, I think it affects working-class far more than in nice grammar schools where they all - they can see the.. er.. the way ahead.

That's another thing I think about teaching languages to the.. working-class, is that they can't be presented with the eventual goal, like.. er.. sort of a mid-class kid can. I think the mid-class or brighter kids tend to be able to see a goal a long way ahead, you know, if they struggle and work at it now. And there are probably certain things in language teaching that they have to.. struggle to learn, you know, by rote. You can't learn a whole language in two years or three years or whatever, but you know, the mid-class kid can see ahead and think "Well, if I do that and if I stick at it, after a certain amount of time I'm going to get a lot of.. er.. spiritual pleasure out of being able to communicate with another race." But the working-class kid really wants his pleasure here and now. And I don't think he's got the patience to, on the whole, stick at learning a language using the very easy fundamental things you'd have to start off with.. continuous repetition orally.. this sort of thing.

(Language Teacher: Pr : Beechgrove)

The circumstances of Ashton and Beechgrove, with below average ability intakes and largely working-class catchment areas, indeed rendered "motivating the pupil" of extra significance for the practice of teaching in the schools. Nowhere was this more apparent, however, than in the teaching of "academic" subjects - epitomized by French - the "abstract" nature of such subjects hindering the prospect of rendering the material "of interest" or "of relevance" to the pupils. It was argued by the staff that subjects which required (a) the grasp of basic principles (e.g. grammar), (b) the grasp of preliminary material before the acquisition of the (language) skill, and (c) the acquisition of a skill they might not be able to utilise, posed problems in terms of the relevance of the material to be taught and the possibility of "motivating the unmotivated".
"Academic" subjects were not only more susceptible to disruption because of their "abstract" nature, but where they involved reliance on "oral" work, such as with French, were particularly threatened by pupils who were not motivated. "Oral" work, that is, was particularly prone to disruption in circumstances where pupils were not motivated.

The preference of the French staff for ability-grouping in the schools appeared to reflect the view that, given both the "abstract" nature of the subject and the lack of internal motivation of many of the pupils, setting was appropriate because it facilitated class-based development (pitching and pacing by groups not individuals) and the use of "oral" work amongst the groups who were motivated. Ability-grouping, that is, had the effect of concentrating within groups those unmotivated and consequently those deemed as potentially disruptive.

On the basis of the teachers' accounts, then, pupil motivation in the practical context of teaching was of concern in a manner which transcended and was analytically distinct from "progressive" or "traditional" perspectives on education. Their concern with "interest" in teaching did not necessarily reflect the ethos of progressive education, nor a traditional educational perspective. Whilst it was acknowledged, for different reasons, by either pedagogic perspective that interest and motivation were vital aspects for the facilitation of learning, the concern with interest and motivation as exhibited through practical problems in the schools owed as much to the aim of preventing disruption as to the aim of promoting the inculcation of knowledge.

Motivating the pupil was a practical aid to teaching as much as an attempt to facilitate learning by the pupil and attempts to interest these pupils perhaps involved as much an attempt to get motivation-to-keep quiet as motivation-to-learn.
Conclusion

The controversy surrounding comprehensive education has drawn attention to the styles of teaching. (see chapter I). Allegations of a "teacher malaise" have been supplemented by claims that informal or "progressive" teaching methods have been detrimental to standards in schools and that nowhere has this been more evident than in comprehensives. Cox and Boyson, epitomizing the complaints, clearly indict the quality of teachers and teaching:

"Why are standards so low? The reason is a breakdown in teaching ......

(Cox and Boyson 1977, p.6)

This chapter has sought to explain certain aspects of teaching in comprehensive schools by considering the teachers' experience of the situation and by drawing attention to some of the practical problems faced by teachers in the routine course of events. As Leacock (1969) has suggested, teachers are far from free to operate purely as they would wish and have to take into consideration the "real" world of teaching in which they operate. To do otherwise would be to live in "cuckoo land" as the Head of Music at Ashton put it.

The "reality" of teaching, however, cannot be considered as an objective state of affairs available for observation on objective criteria. It is, rather, a social phenomenon the meaning of which depends on the mode of interpretation employed by the observer, and it was precisely the intent of the research to use the accounts of teachers to apprehend the mode of interpretation appropriate to practising teachers in the schools, thereby reconstituting the reality of the situation as they saw it.
It appeared that the "real-world" of teaching effectively precluded the possibility of adhering to informal/progressive methods, and though teachers expressed varying degrees of sympathy for progressive (or for traditional) pedagogies, there was unanimity in recognizing that teaching involved practical constraints on the adoption of either style.

In this chapter, teaching style has been considered in terms of (a) the prospect of classroom re-arrangement, for instance of desks, to facilitate group-work, (b) the use of mixed-ability grouping and (c) the problem of motivating pupils and the use of "relevant" material. It became evident that despite the personal pedagogic convictions of teachers as individuals certain common problems were faced by the teachers as part of their existence in the school organization.

The problem of noise, for instance, pervaded the various accounts. It was argued that certain subjects and certain teaching styles were inhibited because of the amounts of noise they engendered, and the interference of this noise on adjacent classroom units. The physical context within which teaching was conducted was of obvious significance to this practical problem.

The application of mixed-ability grouping techniques offered another possibility for innovation in teaching style but was similarly subject to practical limitations. It was generally acknowledged that the use of mixed-ability grouping posed problems for examination orientated groups such as those developed at the end of the third year curriculum and when engaged in the two year courses leading to G.C.E. or C.S.E. examinations. To understand why such grouping was considered
inappropriate in practice attention was focused on those subjects for which mixed-ability grouping posed problems not merely at examination levels, but even during the common-core curriculum stages at the schools. Setting was evident in mathematics, English and French at the schools, but it was the latter which staff identified on the principal example of the practical problems of mixed-ability grouping.

Concentrating on the case of French it became clear that it was considered an "academic" subject whose "abstract" nature posed extra problems where pupils were ill-equipped to cope with the rigours. The developmental and incremental manner in which the subject had to be grasped, coupled with the possibility that the skills acquired might never be of significant use, rendered the subject difficult to teach, but especially so where the pupils were characteristically of below-average ability and not motivated by factors extraneous to the school situation (i.e. the circumstances of Ashton and Beechgrove).

It was not merely the academic considerations, however, which led to a preference for ability grouping in such subjects. Parallel to these arguments there was the view that "academic" and "abstract" subjects were not normally amenable to being "of interest" or "of relevance" to pupils seeking immediate gratification. A consequence of the lack of relevance was the prospect of disruptive behaviour - a prospect particularly poignant for subjects like French relying on "oral" work and being susceptible in the extreme to interference by noise. By adopting ability-grouping it was possible to concentrate those pupils disenchanted with the subject in certain groups and thus facilitate uninterrupted "oral" work in others.
Setting had further advantages in terms of the pitching and pacing of work. Given the developmental approach to the subject, it was argued, a class-orientation rather than an individual orientation was necessary for teaching. With mixed-ability groups this posed additional problems of keeping the pupils of differing abilities occupied and interested in the course of lessons. Yet, again, behind the "academic" argument there remained the implication that the "problem" arose because those who were unoccupied or not interested were potential threats to the quiet orderliness of the classroom. Setting eased this problem by aiding the teachers to pitch and pace the work appropriately and thus retain the involvement of the pupils in the subject.

In their explanations of the practical problems of teaching, specifically in relation to certain features of teaching style associated with the progressive/traditional distinction, the teachers indicated the significance of "noise" in the practical context. It was noise that inhibited attempts to re-arrange desks or allow increased communication between pupils; and it was the disruption by disenchanted pupils as much as the academic problems which accounted for the reticence of certain staff to advocate mixed-ability grouping.

Emerging from the accounts of teaching style, the practice of teaching appeared to be particularly concerned with "noise" and with attempts to obviate disruptive behaviour by pupils. The relationship of these factors to the "reality" of teaching in the schools would therefore warrant further consideration.
Chapter VIII

The Social Organization of Teacher Control:

the significance of noise
In looking at the practical problems of teaching associated with academic organization, "noise" provided a recurrent theme of explanation. It was identified by the teachers as a significant aspect of the practical context of teaching which justified their attitudes and actions. On the basis of these explanations it was possible to establish an initial, albeit tentative "hypothesis" about the social organization of teaching. It is suggested in this chapter that "noise" is associated with the practical assessment of teacher "control", a suggestion elaborated in subsequent chapters.
- the learning context and "control"

The fundamental and characteristic task of all teaching is to establish a "learning context" - a situation which facilitates the inculcation of knowledge. Pedagogies are distinguished by the methods employed to achieve this context - allowing processes as divergent as those used by Thomas Arnold at Rugby, as described by Rousseau in relation to Emile (Brumbough and Lawrence 1963), and as used by Don Juan on Castaneda (Castaneda 1972) all to be regarded as "teaching". Whatever the pedagogy, the role of the teacher is primarily to establish those conditions wherein the appropriate inculcation of knowledge can occur most productively.

It is incumbent upon the teacher to provide the conditions which are seen as essential for learning and to this extent all teaching necessitates, in some sense, a "control" of the setting (Delamont 1976). Even with attempts to minimize the significance of the teacher's presence in the context, the fact of being a "teacher" involves more than just a "catalyst" role (cf. Gross et al 1971), because teachers are responsible for establishing that condition.

In other words, it is taken as axiomatic that the essential feature of "teaching" is the attempt to produce a "learning context", and that any such attempt involves the teacher in "control" of that setting.²

1. The "inculcation of knowledge" can be taken to denote both the instilling of blocks of knowledge and/or the eliciting of particular approaches to knowledge of the world. That is, the "inculcation of knowledge" is intended to refer to the educational aims of both "traditionalists" and "progressives".

2. Even those pedagogies which emphasize the "pupil's" experience as the source of learning (cf. Friere 1970, 1972) and the "pupil's" enthusiasm to learn (Neill 1968, Illich 1973) require the creation of appropriate settings. It is in this sense that, whether he be called a "catalyst", "co-ordinator" or "facilitator", control is still a fundamental aspect of the task.
Teaching which occurs within a formally organized setting, however, involves a control of equivocal nature. Within the organization there are disparate sources of control which, as Bidwell (1965) has argued, provide for the distinctive character of schools and involve two principles of control ostensibly at variance: viz

(a) the bureaucratic demands from administration and external authorities who aspire to accountability, routinization and uniformity of output, and

(b) the professional demands from teachers for whom the idiosyncratic, intractable and even incorrigible nature of input units (pupils) requires flexibility of method and assessment.

Whilst both pursuing the same end of "control", bureaucratic organization and professionalism entail conflicting commitments for teachers to the extent that the former seeks to locate control in the organizational structure and beyond the province of particular members, whilst the latter is based on the notion of self-discipline and autonomy. (Hall 1968, Lortie 1969, Miller 1967, Wilensky 1964).³

The control exercised by teachers, then, would appear to depend on the degree of bureaucratic organization, along with its extensive and explicit rules of procedure designed to regulate behaviour and thus minimize the extent of strategic decision-making by personnel. Under such conditions, as Corwin (1968) has suggested, the scope of decision-making by the teacher might be limited to that of offering advice, the

³ This challenge of bureaucracy to the autonomy of the teacher is encouraged by the increased size and complexity of schools (cf. Anderson 1968) and might be expected to constitute a prevalent feature of schools such as Ashton and Beechgrove, (with pupil populations of over one thousand), and their teachers' view of control.
execution of established policy, or at best the interpretation of that policy. Teachers' control of general policy, that is, diminishes with increased reliance on bureaucratic principles of organization, as indeed does their autonomy in the classroom if Anderson's (1968) point is accepted, that the bureaucratic strictures obviate the need for supervision even of the closed classroom.

By challenging the autonomy of teachers in the classroom it would appear that bureaucratic organization threatens a major source of work satisfaction for teachers (Grace 1970, Jackson 1968) because, although they may exhibit an initial re-orientation toward the bureaucratic aspects of their job in the first year (Kuhlman and Hoy, 1974) teachers do not lose sight entirely of professional aims (Hall 1968, Lortie 1969).

Where professionals operate within bureaucracies, however, the inherent strains of commitment are likely to result in a mutation (Wilensky 1964) and Bidwell (1965) has suggested that in schools this mutation takes the form of a "structural looseness" in the organization. This "structural looseness" facilitates an integration of the professional aspirations of teachers, with the demands of bureaucratic organization by allowing the flexibility needed to cope with the variable qualities of input units (pupils) - i.e. "the professional response" - and is manifested in the autonomy of teachers within the closed-classroom. The mutant structure, that is, provides for the professionalism of the teacher by limiting the interference of the organization in the process of teaching occurring in the classroom - an idea receiving support from Grace's (1970) finding that teachers were largely willing to accept directives from head teachers on general or policy matters provided that their autonomy in the classroom was not
The autonomy facilitated by closed classrooms concerns two aspects of classroom control: (a) control of the academic processes, and (b) control of the behaviour of pupils. It is the latter to which teachers at Ashton and Beechgrove alluded when talking of the problem of control, rather than the broader notion which integrates the two and which is essential to the concept "teacher". Recognition of the duality involved in teaching is well established and can be traced back to Waller's (1932) assertion that the "dominative authority" of the teaching situation involves potentially conflicting strains between, on the one hand, supportiveness geared to motivating pupils to classroom activity, and on the other, control and discipline geared to an orderly environment.

The problem of exercising control over the behaviour of pupils, indeed, can be traced back still further. Swift (1971), for instance, contends that it was precisely the problems of behavioural control in classrooms which led to the adoption of a "progressive" teaching ideology in the U.S.A. Citing cases as far back as 1837, he argues...

---

4. To argue that teachers' aspirations to autonomy become satisfied within the closed or private classroom is not to argue that such arenas become "impregnable sanctuaries". It may be argued that the classroom practice of teachers reflects wider aspects of social control by fulfilling integrative functions (Lambert et al 1970, Davies 1976) or allocative/selection functions (cf. Leacock 1969, Sharp and Green 1975) or, as Warren (1973) suggests, the teacher remains subject to legal, official and ideological pressures arising from the organization of the school and the influence of the community within which the school is located. The expectations of the community, other teachers and even pupils serve to threaten the autonomy of the teacher in the classroom by challenging his/her sole responsibility for the control of classroom affairs - leaving a situation Waller (1932) saw as a despotism poised in a perilous state of equilibrium.
that progressive education arose from the general inability of
teachers to rely on traditional methods for implementing control,
and thereby out of:

the endless attempts of teachers and administra-
tion to cope with recurring problems many of which
had little direct connection with education.

(From 1870), faced with the problems of retention
and control, and unable to use traditional methods
of maintaining order, new procedures were necessary.
Instead of using force and coercion, public schools
now sought the pupils' willing participation.

(Swift 1971, pp. 3, 49)

The control function of teaching, that is, has posed problems for
teachers well before recent claims about lowering standards of behaviour
in schools (see chapter I). The significance of the control functions
of teaching, and its separation from the academic success aspects of
the task, have been highlighted by Gordon's (1957) study of Wabash
High School in which grade-points and behaviour were subject to negotia-
tion and trade between teacher and pupil in the interests of the appear-
ance of control and academic success. Behaviour and academic success
were clearly distinct and negotiable phenomena pertinent to the successful
practice of teaching.

But, where non-school oriented sub-culture of pupils exist within
the school, the grounds for such trade might be uncertain. Pupils
alienated from the formal expectations of the organization, and thereby
less susceptible to bargaining, are likely to exacerbate the role-strain
in teaching, between the academic and behavioural control features by
using as reference criteria factors other than school rewards (cf.
extent the problem of control might take on added proportion. Certainly
an awareness of the distinct and significant character of behaviour
control for teaching is recognized by both teachers (Hannam, Smyth and
Stephenson 1976 Hanson and Herrington 1976) and by pupils (Brophy and
Good 1974) and indeed, under certain conditions the problem of
control has been regarded as superseding other aspects of teaching.
Kohl, for instance, recalling his experience of teaching in a Harlem
school, wrote that:

The (administrative) demands were as frequent as
they were senseless. Yet they were insignificant
when compared with the pressure to fulfill the
function considered most essential to a teacher's
success - controlling the children. The entire
staff of the school was obsessed by "control".

(Kohl 1970, pp.12-13)

- practical limits to autonomy

The significance of "control" for the practice of teaching in
secondary education arises in a context characterized by a concern to
retain authority and a reliance on the closed-classroom to safeguard
this autonomy. A phenomenological understanding of the problem of
control for teachers, then, has to consider the relevance of this
context for the teacher interpretation of events and their practice
within the classroom.
Formal education in Britain is characterized by a classroom orientation. It is normal that learning contexts become established and maintained within the confines of a room in which an age-specific, subject-specific and even ability and sex specific group enjoin in the process of learning.

In neither school were the mainstream of subjects taught in a setting other than "classrooms" - isolated from others and normally constituting one teacher with several pupils (see Chapters II and VI). Team-teaching and open-plan classrooms were not to be found in the two schools, and as a result, the classroom setting and the learning context constituted a "private" arena of education and an ostensibly "impregnable sanctuary" for the teacher. (Warren 1973). As Hargreaves (1967) has noted, the insulation and privacy of classrooms is evidenced by the exclusiveness of the room from adults other than the teacher, with rare exceptions coming from the presence of H.M.I's, student teachers or perhaps a researcher. This isolation of the units effectively precluded the observation of teachers by colleagues.

In the absence of direct observation the assessment of a teacher's control and the criteria of a state of "control" could not rely on obvious sources. Staffroom gossip and feedback from pupils provided indirect information about the conduct of a teacher, and examination successes could be seen as indicative of a situation of "control". The knowledge which teachers had of the performance of colleagues, however, was necessarily the product of second-hand reports. Stebbins has been led to comment on this point that, as a result of his research:

It was learned that teachers have only a vague notion of how their colleagues act and justify their actions in routine situations of misconduct.

(Stebbins 1971, p.223)
From the present research it became apparent that whilst teachers might be indeed "vague" as to the actual actions of others in the classroom setting, they were certainly not "vague" about the justification for possible courses of action. Operating within a community of teachers the justifications for action within the classroom were an integral aspect of the accounts of action regularly displayed by the members, (see Chapter V) and were thereby an essential feature of the membership (in terms of action) of the organization. Stebbins, in other words, overemphasizes the independence and isolation of the practice of teaching at the expense of its socially ordered features.

Teaching though primarily concerned with the classroom setting, (Hargreaves et al 1975) and normally taking place in isolation from other teachers, also occurred within a community of teachers. The activity of teaching, then, did not occur independently of the influence of social pressures to conformity. The "privacy" of the classroom setting had certain implications for the social influence on the practice of teaching, but did not preclude such influence. And it was indeed the publicly available indicators which provided the major link between, on the one hand, the isolation of the classroom setting, and on the other the practice of teaching as a socially organized phenomenon. 5

The control of a classroom which a teacher had, then, although existing beyond the observation of other staff, was not beyond the influence of the community of teachers. Teachers had more than a "vague" notion of both (a) what constituted a state of "control", and (b) the ability of colleagues to achieve this state, because control was a socially organized phenomenon rather than a state of existence. "Control", that is, could be gauged through public indicators.

5. As previously indicated, staffroom gossip and informal feedback from pupils provided other indicators, as well as the criterion of examination success.
One such publicly available indicator was that of noise emanating from the classroom. Noise was a major practical problem for teaching because it was regarded as interfering with the establishment of a learning context. As Boyson has recently argued:

Having taught English in a Victorian school in Lancashire, with the adjacent central hall being used for physical education and choirs, I commiserate with the staff in open-plan schools. In my experience quiet concentration and uninterrupted study are essential for disciplined learning.

(Boyson 1975b, p.61)

From a practical point of view, noise was considered to be antithetical to the establishment of a learning context. As McPherson observed in her study of teaching in a small elementary school in New England:

Justifying order and discipline as good in themselves, the teachers ritualistically assumed that without them learning did not result. The Adams teacher believed that where teachers failed to achieve discipline, that where confusion, noise and rudeness abounded, no learning occurred.

(McPherson 1972, p.33)

Noise and learning, that is, were regarded as mutually exclusive, and as a direct reflection on the state of control in the classroom such that noise became an unacceptable feature of the setting. The communication to colleagues of the unacceptability of certain levels of noise emanating from the classroom is again noted by McPherson when she

---

6. See, for example, the cases of music teaching and French teaching in chapter VII.

7. An exception was that of teaching musical instruments and music appreciation in which "noise" was an essential feature (i.e. product) of that situation.
recalls that:

In the effort to let others observe that which was ordinarily hidden, the Adams teachers developed an "open door" policy, a non-verbal series of cues that were never discussed but were tacitly understood by all. A teacher kept her classroom door open during the teaching day to show her control over her class. A good disciplinarian's door stood open; a poor one's door was frequently shut. Unless a teacher (...) was going to have art (an allowably noisy subject) or do dramatics (...) her closed door meant that her class was too noisy and she was afraid of being overheard.

(McPherson 1972, p. 32)

In accord with the situation at Ashton and Beechgrove, it appeared that the absence of noise emanating from a classroom was regarded as a prerequisite for the possibility of attributing a learning context to exist within the classroom. Quiet orderliness in the classroom consequently provided what Hargreaves et al (1975) have termed a "technical implementive rule" for attributing a learning context and in the absence of direct observation, teachers relied on public indicators such as noise as a method of imputing a learning context to a classroom.

In summary, then, it may be suggested that teaching is essentially bound up with the establishment of a learning context which entails the teacher in control of the setting, and that at Ashton and Beechgrove a learning context was regarded as requiring quiet orderliness in the classroom, subsequently emphasizing the behavioural aspect of control at the expense of academic aspects. Given a lack of direct observation, noise emanating from a classroom served to indicate the absence of a learning context and thereby a failure of the teacher to control the situation: Noise provided an "evidential strategy" (Hargreaves et al 1975) for the recognition of a lack of teacher control in the classroom.
the disruptive pupil

Having proposed that teacher "control" constituted a socially organized phenomenon, and emphasized the assessment of "control" by members outside the classroom setting, the influence of that assessment upon the classroom teacher and intra-classroom definitions of "control" may now be considered.

"Disruptive" pupils posed a major practical problem for the teacher in the routine activity of teaching (see chapter VII). Factors giving rise to "disruption" have rarely been treated in isolation, but emphasis has been placed variously on psychological disturbance (White and Charcy 1966, Blackham 1967,) social background(Linton 1966, Sugarman 1967) organizational career (Cicourel 1963, 1968, Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970), the inadequacy of teachers (Cox and Boyson 1975) and techniques for classroom management (Kounin 1970). Such analyses attempt to locate the "cause" of "disruptive" behaviour without consideration of the processes whereby particular types of pupil behaviour come to be regarded by teachers as instances of "disruption". Those studies which have focused on the teacher's attribution of such labels have either employed the notion of a psychological "set" (cf. "disorderly behaviour set", Stebbins 1971) or the transcendance of classroom rules (Hargreaves et al 1975), both of which have a tendency to treat the teacher's assessment of "disruption" in isolation from their membership of a community of teachers operating in a formally organized setting.

"Disruptive" behaviour has been consistently associated with interference with the establishment of a learning context with, for instance, Bailey (1970) seeing it as "any event which significantly interrupts the education of students", and a recent N.A.S. "Report on Violence in Schools" regarding it as any behaviour short of physical violence which interfered with the teaching process and/or upset the normal running of the school.
Such definitions are of little use for the analysis of practical teaching activity because they do not consider the socially organized basis for the recognition by teachers of pupil behaviour as "disruptive".

If it is accepted, following the previous definitions, that "disruptive" pupils are those who jeopardize the establishment of a learning context, and if it is recognized that teachers operate within a community of teachers, "disruptive" pupils may be regarded as those who threaten the teacher's "control" of the setting. In practice, such threats relate to the public indicators of control such as noise emanating from the classroom. It may be reasonable to suggest, that is, on the basis of the analysis so far, that "disruption" is identified by teachers in terms of noise; (because of its implications for the prospect of a learning context and teacher control in a community of teachers).

In practice, it appeared that "disruptive" behaviour was identified by teachers as that which created noise rather, that is, than that which involved non-learning per se. As a corollary, pupil behaviour which did not include "learning" (of the syllabus) yet did not entail noise, posed little immediate practical problems for the teacher in the classroom.

"Not paying attention" or "being away" for instance,

although subverting his teaching aims, is a more palatable form of disorderly behavior for the teacher than almost any other.

(Stebbins 1971, p.229)

The suggestion that noise is the prime practical concern of teachers is not only generated by observation and interview at Ashton and Beechgrove, but has received support from similar types of study. Hargreaves et al (1975) for instance, quote some field-work notes of an observer involved in their study of two secondary modern schools.
It seems obvious that anything the pupils do that does not make a noise is acceptable. Three or four pupils are obviously not paying attention to the reading but because they are quiet, their conduct is acceptable.

(Hargreaves et al 1975, p.57)

Certain events such as "cheek" by a pupil or persistent sub-reactional disruptions, whilst being unacceptable as modes of pupil conduct, did not necessarily invoke remedial action by the teacher specifically because that remedial action might be seen as creating more "disruption" than it would cure. (Stebbins 1971, Hargreaves et al 1975). In other words, when assessing the appropriate cause of action, the amount of noise emanating from the classroom was more important than the nature of the event as such, and in practice it was those kinds of behaviour which gave rise to noise which were the prime source of problems.

Quiet non-learners, then, did not pose immediate practical problems for the teacher. In fact, the quiescence of pupils could possibly be misconstrued by teachers as a sign of academic involvement. Dumont-Wax (1969) have noted such an instance at a Cherokee reservation school in North-Eastern Oklahoma. Though the pupils appeared as ideal and diligent to the "outsider" teacher there was little progress in terms of the inculcation of curricular knowledge. The researchers indicate the reason for this to be not a lack of ability, but a resistance on the part of the pupils to particular types of teacher control. Their resistance however, constituted a quiet and orderly recalcitrance. Cherokee society

---

8. Kounin (1970) reports, on the basis of his research, similarly that noise and talking constituted the major aspect of "misbehaviour".

9. It should not be inferred that such non-learning posed no problem at all; in terms of its salience for the "control" of the classroom, however, noise was of far greater practical significance.
shuns open conflict, a factor Wax and Dumont use to explain the Cherokee pupils' quiet orderly resistance to a teacher-imposed definition of the teaching situation.

in the eyes of the white educator (...) the Cherokee are model pupils. Within their homes they have learned that restraint and caution is the proper mode of relating to others; therefore, in the classroom the teacher finds it unnecessary to enforce discipline.

(Dumont and Wax 1971, p.79)

The Cherokee pupils apparently liked to indulge in those activities which normally constituted a learning context yet in fact did not "learn" as the teachers wanted them to. This problem was explained by the researchers in their claim that, in fact:

the war within the classroom was so cold that its daily battles were not evident, except at the close of the day, as the teachers assessed their lack of pedagogical accomplishment.

(Dumont and Wax 1971, p.79)

The pupils' reaction and recalcitrance was not of the overt kind to which the "culture-bound" teachers were accustomed, but existed nonetheless in a form which was recognizable primarily between the pupils, and evident only to the skilled eyes of the ethnographic researcher. With sophisticated and subtle forms of reaction the pupils were able to demonstrate to each other, and reinforce the view, that they did not accept the teacher control of the situation.

Because the behaviour did not "openly" challenge either teacher control or the quiet orderliness of the classroom, however, the teacher was unable to recognize the behaviour as intentionally disruptive of a learning context. To be recognized as "disruptive" behaviour had to be manifestly antagonistic to the two features of the sense of social structure appropriate to the competent teacher (in this instance) teacher control and quiet orderliness in the classroom.
The ability of pupils might be associated with behaviour, then, in a manner quite distinct from their academic performance. It became apparent through the accounts that the criterion of selection to ability-groups was not solely one of academic ability, but depended also on the behaviour of the pupils. The association of low-ability groups with disruptive behaviour, that is, could be seen to stem from the fact that disruptive behaviour did not facilitate a teaching situation and thereby effectively prevented teaching for those who were otherwise prepared to learn.

... in the lower streams you find boys and girls who are above average intelligence, but have behaviour problems. And this seems to have operated in the Junior School to put them in a certain stream. In the upper stream you get boys and girls who seem to be below average intelligence in a particular subject, but who are very quiet and very well behaved and conscientious and work very hard and study very hard.

there are more discipline problems in what would be defined as the less-academic streams than there are in the more academic streams.

(Head of House: Ha: Ashton)

At Beechgrove, again, a French teacher exhibited this awareness of the association of disruptive behaviour with placement in a lower ability group:

... the first year they're taught in completely mixed-ability groups for French. The second year ... er ... there are six classes doing French - two groups of three have it at the same time - groups of three classes - The way they divide it up each of the three is that there's one group picked out purely on behaviour and sort of destructiveness and disenchantment and they're put with an experienced teacher who gives them ... tries to give them background work and simple work which they can achieve, you know, without pretending to progress too far in the language, but to ... you know ..., not make life a total misery for them. (...) And the same happens with the other group of three. There's one ... er ... potentially badly behaved group and ... er ..., could make life hell for some people in mixed ... completely mixed group, and they go with the more experienced teacher who takes them on.

10. The assessment of ability stemming from aspects of the behaviour of pupils could subsequently provide for self-fulfilling prophesies associated with the labelling effect, (cf, Nash 1973)
To the extent, then, that behaviour and ability group exhibited a positive correlation, the higher academic groups tended to suffer less incidence of disruption, and thus be easier to control. Yet the adverse side of such a correlation was also recognized:

A large part of the discipline problems in a big comprehensive school is that from the children who feel that they have under-achieved, either because they are um disturbed, or because at some stage in their schooling they um have fallen by the wayside (..) um they have a very big feeling of failure which is enforced by the er streaming and um which leaves them with little alternative except to demonstrate how tough they are, um where they have got a new opportunity there um to show their abilities.

('Non-English Speaking' Teacher: SI: Beechgrove)

Disruptive pupils may be over-represented in low ability groups because their behaviour constituted a publicly manifest threat to the establishment of a learning context.

- conclusion

Noise was a practical problem for teachers because it indicated to their colleagues generally a situation antithetical to a learning context and thereby characterized by a lack of teacher control. Noise emanating from the classroom, that is, provided a public indicator of control, independent of examination criteria or informal feedback of information. Pupils who did not facilitate a quiet, orderliness in the classroom were consequently those whose behaviour constituted "disruption", and those likely to be associated with low-ability groups.

For teachers, it appeared that their "practical task activity" (Zimmerman 1971) was primarily to maintain quiet orderliness in the classroom, and involved motivating the pupils (in order to keep them quiet) with the use of threats or interest techniques to this end. Techniques which aided the maintenance of quiet orderliness, that is, aided "control"
in terms of the public indicators.

One aspect of the formal organization was particularly associated with the problems arising from pupil behaviour; the House system. Study of its practical use might serve to support or refute these tentative suggestions arising out of the practical problems for teachers connected with the academic organization of the school.
Figure 2.
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Abstract

Opponents of secondary re-organization have claimed that certain features of school organization associated with comprehensives have contributed toward declining standards of education. Teaching in such schools has been subjected to considerable criticism yet not received the research it would appear to warrant.

The two schools chosen for study were representative of those involved in the controversy, and a phenomenological approach was adopted which attempted to examine the impact of comprehensive organization on teaching. Use of tape-recorded interviews as "accounts", complemented by classroom observation, provided the method for establishing the sense of social structure appropriate to competent teachers.

Competence was regarded as a shared method for interpreting events, and competence as a teacher appeared to owe more to "control" in the classroom than the inculcation of knowledge per se.

Competent teachers were expected to achieve this "control" without the aid of others and were considered responsible for the "control" of their own classrooms.

Classroom teaching, however, rarely became observable to colleagues, and to assess the "control" of others teachers had to rely on publicly available indicators which transcended the isolation of the setting—principally noise. "Control", that is, was a socially organized phenomenon which was inferred rather than observed.

Teaching competence, then, appeared to be based on "control" which was indicated by the maintenance of quiet orderliness in the classroom without recourse to outside help.

This "control" reflected two fundamental aspects of the teaching: and the autonomy of classroom teaching. Threats to either posed practical problems for teachers because they jeopardized the appearance of "control".

Although teachers felt that certain features of school organization associated with comprehensives posed added difficulties of "control", re-organization itself little affected the basic task structure of teaching which stemmed from the isolation and autonomy of the classroom situation.
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Volume II
Chapter IX

The Formal Organization of Pastoral Care and Guidance at Ashton and Beechgrove
The House systems of both Ashton and Beechgrove were inextricably bound up with the routine maintenance of teacher control and quiet orderliness. This situation arose not through any express desire of the official guidelines or the House staff and, indeed, these contended that the relationship was inappropriate, but was rather the direct result of the referrals which the House staff had to deal with on a day-to-day basis. Pupils whose conduct did not facilitate the quiet orderliness and teacher control of a learning context were likely to be referred to House staff as well as, if not instead of, those with longer-term emotional problems who were regarded by the official guidelines and House staff alike as the proper stuff of referrals. It was this practical "misuse" of the systems which provided the possibility of what will be called the "discipline specialist" function of House staff, and which tended to confirm the suggestion of chapter VIII that it was the maintenance of quiet orderliness in the classroom per se that was basic to the practical activity of teaching in the schools.

In order to grasp the fuller implications of the manner in which the House system was routinely used, however, it is necessary as a preliminary to consider the formal apparatus of the House systems, their official authority and responsibilities, and the channels of communication through which House staff became aware of pupils warranting attention. 1

Authority and responsibility: the formal apparatus of the House systems

The House systems were both officially concerned with the pastoral care and guidance of pupils in the schools, yet exhibited ostensibly differing organizations for the accomplishment of this aim. Ashton's House system was not regarded as the sole basis of pastoral care and

1. Appendix II contains selections from the available official material upon which the account of the respective formal organization is based.
guidance and was officially required to co-ordinate its procedures with the form-group organization, - the basis of administration, - whilst at Beechgrove the administrative units were tutor-groups which operated directly under the auspices of Houses.

Ashton was organized in four House units, with the upper school having all four Houses and each of the lower schools having two.

**Figure 3. The organization of House units at Ashton.**

![Diagram of House units organization]

They were each administered by two Heads of House, one sited at the upper school and one at the lower. Staff and pupils, when joining the school, were allocated to a House on a random basis, and these Houses served as an administrative unit for sports events, charity collections, merit/demerit marks and pastoral care and guidance, reflecting not only the traditional uses, but also the "social" orientation of comprehensive schools.

---

2. With the exception of pupils who had a member of the family already in the school in which instance, the pupil was specifically allocated to the same House.
Pastoral Care and Guidance at Ashton

House teachers represented the most senior posts with sole responsibility for pastoral matters but were themselves subject to the authority of five "Senior teachers" other than the Headmaster. These Senior Teachers had responsibility over both academic and pastoral affairs in terms of the building to which they were allocated. The Deputy Head co-ordinated House activities and moved between sites, but was basically responsible for the lower site and was second-in-command of the overall school. The other Deputy Head was third in the chain of command and was in charge of the upper site. His responsibilities were primarily for staff and discipline. Two of the other Senior Teachers were in charge of the respective lower sites, and the third being the Senior Master in charge.
of the Sixth Form building (at the upper school) with responsibility for examinations. These latter three provided a fourth level of command above the pastoral and academic sub-units of the school organization which were led by the eight Heads of House (at Grade V) and the eighteen Heads of Department (grades IV-V) respectively. The Heads of House, then, held quite senior posts in the school and although they worked through units basically conceived for other purposes (form groups) they still held a position in the authority structure of the school which had overall command and responsibility for the pastoral care and guidance of the pupils.

Beechgrove's House system was similarly organized to the extent that there were four House units to which teachers and pupils were allocated when joining the school, and that such allocation was random except in the case of siblings. The first year at Beechgrove, however, was organized on a somewhat separate basis from the rest of the school having form rooms and lessons on one floor of one building of the school, and being under the overall auspices of a Head of first year. This horizontal organization existed only for the first year and reflected an attempt to gradually integrate the pupils from relatively small primary schools into the large secondary school, but had the effect of reducing the first year pupils' involvement in House activities to that of sporting activities, charitable collections and so on rather than the tutor-group situation which started in the second year.

In the second year, and subsequently until leaving school, pupils were put in House 'tutor groups' vertically arranged, consisting, on average, of 25 pupils from each year of the school. A publicly available
Pupils remain in the same tutor groups and with the same tutor, throughout the remainder of their school careers. Naturally, we always keep brothers and sisters together.

Unfortunately, the high turnover of staff experienced by the school made it difficult to ensure the continuity of tutors, yet the intention was clearly to provide social rather than academic units of administration:

The aim of the tutor group is to provide a small family unit where pupils can develop and mature under the supervision of their tutors. It is here that they can learn to appreciate the differences that exist in a mixture of ages and abilities, and as they grow older show leadership and responsibility for others. Since tutor groups meet together for about half-an-hour a day they have every opportunity of fulfilling these valuable functions.

(Official Guidelines: public brochure: Beechgrove)

The delegation of authority and the channels of communication at Beechgrove were more explicit with respect to the functions of the tutors and the responsibility they had in terms of the pastoral system, yet in practice the tutors stood in relation to the pastoral system much as the form and subject teachers at Ashton, i.e. operating through the Heads of House for pastoral matters whilst using tutor-group periods for general administrative duties.

Each of the four Houses had two Heads whose function was to co-ordinate the pastoral care and guidance offered to the pupils in the House. They stood between the Senior Teachers (and the specialist offices) and the tutors in much the same way as the House staff at Ashton were between the form and subject teachers and the Senior Teachers.
At Beechgrove the pastoral care and guidance of the pupils received further expression in the formal organization through various specialist posts, primary amongst which was the "school counsellor" whose official task was to take over those problems which were either too time consuming or too serious for the sole attention of the House staff. As the Public Brochure of Beechgrove put it:

While tutors are in day-to-day contact with their tutor groups, Heads of Houses - there are two in each House - co-ordinate House affairs. They attend to matters of administration, organize House activities, counsel pupils and meet parents. When tackling more serious problems, Senior House Staff, working closely with the member of staff appointed for guidance and welfare, are able to call upon the services of various outside social and welfare agencies.
In fact, the member of staff appointed for guidance and welfare (the school counsellor) was mainly responsible for dealing with the outside agencies. This post was not to be found explicitly in the organization of Ashton, and inasmuch as it existed at Beechgrove, owed much to the work of the Headmaster whose initiative led to the post being created.

The role of school counsellor reflected a trend in comprehensive education (Halsall 1973) and in use at Beechgrove reflected a position in the school structure which was but marginally a teaching role. In an interview, the counsellor explained how, upon arrival at the school the subject teachers had been hesitant to refer problem pupils to him because, as he saw it, they were not convinced of his competence as a "teacher". Initially he had no teaching load and was available to the pupils at any time:

Part of the work of the member of staff for guidance and welfare (is to) make himself available so that pupils may freely visit him to discuss their personal problems, and so that House staff may refer pupils to him for special guidance.

(Official Guidelines: Public Brochure: Beechgrove)

This "non-teaching" role was seen to evoke some resentment on the part of the subject teachers who felt that the counsellor might in fact be taking the part of the pupil against the member of staff.\(^3\)

To redress the balance, the counsellor at Beechgrove chose to take on a full timetable consisting of the classes which were generally considered to be the difficult ones to control. Only when having earnt the respect of the subject teachers by coping with such classes did he feel

---

\(^3\) As noted by Fred Roberts, school counsellor at Pimlico Comprehensive School, London "The counsellor has had to avoid being viewed by pupils as a tool of the establishment or by staff as a source of pupil sedition". (Guardian 6.4.76)
in a position to withdraw from this teaching commitment in favour of his allotted task of pastoral care and guidance. His role in the school, however, was a specialist role and did not detract from the significantly central position of the Heads of House in the organization of pastoral care and guidance, - the counsellor dealing specifically with the longer term problems which normally involved outside agencies. 4

The Heads of House at Beechgrove acted formally as a clearing house for referrals. Subject teachers were expected to refer "problems" to the Head of House of the pupil who in turn could either refer them back to the pupil's tutor, refer it "up" to the counsellor or deal with it themselves. The tutors could also refer problems to the Heads of House should they desire; there was thus officially a two-way exchange between Heads of House and tutors.

Heads of House also had significant access to the senior teachers which was afforded by a direct meeting with the Headmaster every Friday morning and once a month in addition - comparing favourably with the access of Heads of Department who met the Headmaster on a routine basis only once a fortnight. The Heads of House, then, were given a central role in their authority and responsibility for pastoral matters and also held a strong and crucial position in the school structure.

Further, they were in a focal position in relation to the dispensation of remedial action associated with their pastoral role, being the recipients of information from the "grass-roots" level of tutors and subject teachers, and disseminating relevant information to the counsellor and welfare agencies, or back to the tutors and subject teachers.

4. In fact with the death of the counsellor in 1974, the House staff took over many of these liaison functions, particularly as no suitable replacement was found for the post for some time after his death.
Despite the apparent differences in the organization of pastoral care and guidance between Ashton and Beechgrove, then, the Heads of House emerged, in either case, as those members of staff with key positions. It was they who held the most senior posts with specific responsibility for pastoral care and guidance, and had the function of co-ordinating the activities of others involved in such care - whether they be form teachers, tutors or subject teachers. It became evident, further, that this centrality was not limited, to the authority structure and responsibilities, but was to be found also in their role in the communication of relevant information and subsequent action.

Communications: the role of the Heads of House

At both Ashton and Beechgrove there were formally prescribed methods for the transmission of information about those pupils deemed to warrant attention of a pastoral nature. Such channels of communication were not identical, but did exhibit a marked similarity when considered in terms of three broad categories of referral: (a) "documentary", (b) "personal", and (c) "direct". These categories not only provided the basis for identifying similarity beneath ostensibly dissimilar organizations, but subsequently proved useful in the analysis of the actual application of the system and the practical problems involved for both subject teachers (chapter X) and the Heads of House (chapter XI).

(a) The "documentary" mode of referral

A record card was kept for every pupil at Ashton and was freely available for the inspection of teaching staff. Form teachers made entries on the record card once a year concerning the attendance...
and general attitude of the pupils in their forms, and these records provided a source of information for other staff (including the House teacher) about particular pupils (see Appendix II).

The merit/demerit system provided a more positive method for the communication of problems from the teacher to the House staff. As a Head of House explained, the official school method of the merit and demerit system was one whereby:

the pupils get rewarded with a merit for various reasons, sometimes for good academic standards, other times for being co-operative, helpful ... um ... various reasons for these merits. But the demerits used are a counter to this for behaviour within the classroom or within the school which ... um ... how can we say, all of such a nature that the House teacher must report it.

Interv: So, when a demerit is given out, it automatically comes to your attention?

House T. : It's not given to the pupil at all, it's given to the House teacher himself, either personally or left in the pigeon hole in the letter rack. Whenever I get a demerit I have to record it (...) Each teacher keeps a merit book ... every half-term totals up the merits gained. I also have a demerits book for the pupils in my year in which I record the number of demerits. This is useful on several accounts. Um ... (1) you can see the pupils who are causing the most problems, and (2) you can also try and assimilate where problems arise, you know, from different areas of the school.

(Head of House: Wa : Ashton)

The merits and demerits provided an officially recognized manner in which information about the behaviour of pupils could be communicated to the Heads of House; as the Official Guidelines put it:

Form teachers will keep a special Merit Book, listing the pupils by Houses, and towards the end of each half-term the books with totals by Houses will be sent on request to the Deputy Heads for collation. Form teachers should, of course, comment on the merits received during their form periods. After merits have been entered, the merit forms should be passed on to the Heads of House rooms for information.
Likewise, teachers will make out demerit forms in cases where it is thought the misbehaviour is serious enough to be permanently recorded. Such demerit forms will be handed in by the teacher to the Heads of House rooms. Heads of House will keep a record of demerits received, and will take appropriate action to discuss cases at House assemblies, with form teachers or with the individual pupil and teacher concerned.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)

The merit/demerit system, then, provided a mode of referral to the House system to the extent that the Heads of House became aware of problems particularly through the use of demerits.

The manner by which the House staff at Beechgrove came to be aware of "problems" were much the same as those at Ashton despite the difference in the systems. Record cards were kept on the pupils, charting their academic and pastoral progress and thus providing a source through which a problem could be identified - a problem such as poor attendance or under-achievement. Beechgrove did not, however, have a merit/demerit system. An alternative, and perhaps effectively similar system which was used involved the process of putting a pupil "on report". Pupils deemed to have warranted this were required to get the subject teacher of each lesson to sign a card confirming the pupil's behaviour during that lesson. Being put "on report" constituted a documented index of unacceptable pupil behaviour, as did the award of a "demerit" at Ashton. In either case, the Heads of House were involved in the process and automatically had drawn to their attention the behaviour of specific pupils. Whereas a "demerit" was given by a subject teacher directly, the putting "on report" of a pupil arose from events reported by subject teachers but was given by Heads of House.

5. The record cards were not subject to the same scrutiny for changes in performance which characterized the situation in the United States (cf. Cicourel and Kitsuse 1963), but nonetheless provided a "support" for suspicions which may have been aroused through other circumstances.
(b) The "personal" mode of referral

The contact between the Head of House and the pupil/teacher did not have to stem from such documented sources, and in fact, the official view was that form and subject teachers should keep the Heads of House informed on a regular basis through passing on information by word of mouth. This mode of referral involved a positive communication about events in which teachers contacted the Heads of House personally to keep them informed of any problems they encountered with particular pupils. This was to be a two-way communication which the House teachers could use to keep the other teachers informed about the nature of problems associated with particular pupils, or about the action that had been taken as a result of a referral. With this type of referral the House teacher might be requested to take action, thus constituting a recorded referral, or the House teacher might be merely informed of events for future reference, (or which may, in connection with other contemporary and pertinent data, give rise for concern). The point is, however, that the referral involved a contact between the subject or form teacher and the House teacher.

The "personal" mode of referral was regarded as a necessary part of the successful organization of pastoral care and guidance. The Official Guidelines were clear, further, that it was the Heads of House who constituted the focal point of any such communication and action:

It is the responsibility of each individual teacher to get to know the pupils in the forms or sets which he or she teaches and to endeavour, through suitable organization and work to produce a positive and harmonious atmosphere in the classroom. Any pupil, however, who is persistently difficult or inadequate should be discussed with the Head of House so that the House is fully informed of the problem. Form teachers should acquaint House staff with any new information, cases of truancy, fresh incidents or change of attitude of any pupil in their form. Heads of House will have the records and other information about their pupils and will be able both to give advice and take suitable action.
It is the responsibility of Heads of House to keep the teacher-in-charge of the building and Form teachers adequately informed of any pupils who require special attention, and to discuss any cases they think necessary with the Headmaster or Deputy Heads.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)

Personal communication between the relevant staff was seen as essential to the House staff's duties because only through such contact could they be informed, and keep the other teachers informed, about the problems which some pupils might have. By the same token, such contact provided a mode of referral whereby certain pupils came to the attention of the House staff and possibly became the subject of attention by the House system.

Similarly, at Beechgrove the staff, and in particular the tutors, were regarded as the source of relevant information for the Heads of House who, at their discretion, could choose to refer the matter back to the tutor. The "personal" mode of referral then, was seen as an essential factor in the communication of relevant information between the Heads of House and the other teachers at both schools.

(c) The "direct" mode of referral

The "direct" mode of referral occurred in situations where a member of staff sent a pupil from the classroom directly to the House teacher during the course of a lesson, or directed the pupil to see the House teacher at a later time.

This mode of referral can be termed "direct" in that it involved a direct contact between the pupil and the House staff without the intermediary use of reports, demerits or personal (teacher) consultation.

6. The direct contact between a pupil and House staff could also arise from a pupil's self-referral, where the pupil instigated the communication of some fact or problem relevant to pastoral care and guidance. Such self-referrals did not appear to pose any significant practical problem for teachers and the mode of direct referral will be related specifically to the teacher instigated referrals unless stated to the contrary.
This was perhaps the most controversial of the methods of referral and the mode which accounted for the majority of disagreement between House teachers and subject teachers over the use of the system. It was recognized by the official guidelines, the Heads of House and subject teachers alike that the "direct" mode of referral was normally in response to the misconduct of a pupil in the classroom. Referral to the House system, however, was not officially regarded as the appropriate method for dealing with disruptive behaviour per se, and it was argued that teachers should control their classes and maintain discipline, referring only those pupils whose conduct was persistently obtrusive or whose work fell below the expected standard. Referrals were intended officially to communicate to the House teachers problems arising from an emotional disturbance on the part of particular pupils - problems that is of a persistent nature;

Pupils in our school consist of the enthusiastic and helpful ones, those who conform, those who occasionally are mischievous or lazy, and some who are emotionally disturbed and inadequate or have difficult home backgrounds. Those in the last group present long-term problems and require of teachers a knowledge of the pupil, sympathetic help and special efforts to bring about a re-adjustment in attitude and behaviour. (....)

From time to time, there will be cases of individual pupils or groups of pupils misbehaving or doing work inadequately. If these are classroom occurrences, the subject teacher concerned should deal with the matter as far as possible. (....)

If any pupil is persistently unduly mischievous or lazy and the individual teacher is unable to correct this, the matter should be reported to the Head of House, who should then deal with the pupil.

(Official Guidelines : Ashton)

Clearly, the onus for controlling disruptive behaviour was placed upon the classroom teacher, with referrals only stemming from persistently unacceptable behaviour. Here the emphasis was away from "direct" referral.
It was also recognized in the official guidelines, however, that under certain circumstances the **extremity** of the disruptive behaviour might warrant the expulsion from the classroom of a pupil. It was in this instance that the "direct" mode of referral was officially approved, for, as the official guidelines of both schools indicated, it was not regarded as acceptable merely to remove the offending pupil from the classroom, for they might persist in being a disruptive element even in the corridor. Rather, under these conditions, the pupil was to be referred direct to a relevant member of staff.

Isolated cases of anti-social behaviour may occasionally blow up in the classroom and threaten to disrupt a lesson. If an emotional outburst seems imminent, it may seem advisable to remove the pupil from the classroom. Such a pupil must **not** be stood outside the classroom door. Each Teacher-in-charge of a building will draw up a small rota of duty teachers (including him or herself), to whom such pupils should be sent with a brief explanatory note. If the child is not to be trusted, the note should be given to another pupil who will accompany the "miscreant" to the appropriate place. It is essential always to check that the pupil arrives at his correct destination. Any punishment to be meted out will be the responsibility of the duty teacher and should be reported to the Head of House.

(Official Guidelines: Ashton)

In practice, the rota of duty teachers centred on the Heads of House themselves and the House room provided the destination of the classroom "miscreant". Sending a pupil to the House room for disruptive behaviour was not, however, approved as a regular practice because it was felt that the subject teachers were fundamentally responsible for the maintenance of discipline within their own classroom.

The official guidelines at Beechgrove echoed the sentiments expressed at Ashton that the House system should not be used as a back-up to discipline. The responsibility for the maintenance of discipline in the classroom was seen to lie with the subject teacher, and there was open discouragement of the use of the House system for disciplinary reasons.
Difficult children should not be stood outside the room. This is not a punishment for the child and does not solve anything. It merely places the child in a position without supervision and passes the responsibility to some other members of staff (....)

Discipline within the classroom is the responsibility of the individual teacher but Heads of Departments and Heads of Houses are always ready and willing to support members of staff. However, it should be realised that in the end no useful and lasting purpose is served if too many problems arising within the classroom are referred to higher authority. This practice only serves to weaken the authority of the individual teacher, in the eyes of the children.

(Official Guidelines: Beechgrove)

Summary and Conclusion

It has been argued that, despite the apparent differences of organization which the schools exhibited in relation to pastoral care and guidance, there were certain essential similarities. The Heads of House at either school held "command" positions in terms of authority and communications, and hence constituted a focal point for action with respect to pastoral care and guidance.

The action which Heads of House took affected those pupils who came to their attention, and at the schools there were three modes of referral through which the Heads of House could receive information about pupils - three channels by which problems could be communicated to the House system. These can be called the "documentary", the "personal" and the "direct" mode of referral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Referral</th>
<th>Ashton</th>
<th>Beechgrove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Documentary</td>
<td>(Record Card)</td>
<td>(Record Card)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Demerit)</td>
<td>&quot;on report&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personal</td>
<td>subject/form</td>
<td>subject teacher or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teacher contacts</td>
<td>tutor contacts House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House staff</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Direct</td>
<td>pupil referred to</td>
<td>pupil referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House staff direct.</td>
<td>House staff direct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "documentary" and "personal" modes of referral were those that were officially promoted as the proper methods for use of the House system, with the use of "direct" referrals being explicitly discouraged because, it was argued, the subject teachers should control their own classrooms. Extreme instances of disruptive behaviour in the classroom, however, were regarded as an appropriate occasion on which to invoke a direct referral to the House system, although the House system was not to be used for a discipline back-up for subject teachers who failed to maintain a control in their own classrooms.

In other words, the pastoral care and guidance function of the House systems was officially regarded as dealing with the longer-term emotional problems of pupils and not with the immediate discipline problems and classroom control problems which a subject teacher might encounter.

The formal organization, then, contained a distinction between the "behavioural" responsibilities of the subject teacher and the House teacher. Although all teachers were responsible in the broadest sense for the pastoral care and guidance of the pupils, the Heads of House had specific responsibility for co-ordinating and conducting such care and guidance for those pupils deemed to warrant special attention, i.e. those pupils with emotional disturbances which constituted long-term problems, and ones requiring attention beyond that possible in the classroom situation. Disruptive behaviour, on the other hand, was clearly indicated to be the concern of the subject teacher whose responsibility centred around "control" of the classroom (cf. Chapter VIII).

Empirical study of the House system was directed towards the extent to which such divisions were apparent in the routine use of the system, and to how the teachers explained the manner in which they actually used the House system. By focusing on the practical problems accruing to the use of the
House system it was possible to identify features of the sense of social structure appropriate to the practical activity of teaching in the schools. The distinction between House teachers and subject teachers in the formal organization was used, with Chapter X considering the practical problems encountered by the subject teachers who did the referring, and chapter XI looking at those which the House teachers confronted when receiving referrals.
The operation of the House system as envisaged by the official guidelines of the schools posed certain practical problems for those subject teachers, form teachers and tutors (hereafter simply referred to as "subject" teachers) who would wish to invoke the system. Practical problems arose for these teachers which affected the manner in which they used the system and which can help to explain the actual operation of pastoral care and guidance in the schools.

These practical problems existed in relation to both the communication of information and events to the House staff, and in terms of the effectiveness of the action which House staff took as a result of a referral, and can be dealt with under such headings.
Communications

"Documentary", "personal" and "direct" modes of referral to the House system reflected channels of communication identified in the official guidelines of the schools. The extent to which the actual use of the House system by subject teachers accorded with the preferences expressed in the guidelines depended, however, not only on the pedagogic beliefs of particular teachers but also reflected the practical problems facing teachers wishing to invoke the system.

Perhaps the major practical problems for teachers were those of ascertaining: (a) how the system was officially supposed to operate, (b) who were the vital House personnel, (c) to which Houses individual pupils belonged, and (d) the names of the pupil(s) to be referred. That is, teachers who were unsure of how to operate the system, where to locate vital personnel, or who those people were (be they teachers or pupils), faced practical problems in their implementation of the House system.

One category of teachers faced particular problems of this nature. "New" teachers - probationary teachers, supply teachers, teachers having recently arrived at the school, and even those "covering" a lesson for an absent colleague - faced special, practical difficulties in their attempts to invoke the system. In some instances, teachers were not aware of how the system operated despite the existence at both schools of official guidelines for teachers in documented form. When accounting for his reticence to call upon the House staff, a supply Maths teacher at Ashton said, for instance:

> Often you don't really know how things work, and it's never explained to you.

1. Files containing an outline of the formal structure of the school and preferred modes of procedure were given to "new" members of the permanent staff at both schools and thereby provided the relevant information. (See Appendix II)
It was not, however, the multiplicity of rules or the complexity of the procedures which led to this state of affairs (cf. Strauss et al. 1973), but the "newness" of the staff to the situation. The official methods for invoking the system posed less problem than knowledge of personnel, because the outlines of the procedure could be learnt within a relatively short time after joining the school.

A somewhat more imposing task for the "new" teacher was to identify the vital personnel of the House system and where to contact them. The problem in this instance was not so much how to contact people, but who they were and where they could be contacted. With each school having eight Heads of House, "new" teachers particularly the supply teachers and the recent arrivals, might not be aware of the identity of the appropriate member of the House staff in a situation where they would have wished to refer a pupil. Knowledge of these eight staff was, even then, less daunting than the prospect facing "new" teachers of getting to know relevant tutors (Beechgrove) or form teachers (Ashton), and with more than eight staff at either school this posed a practical problem for even the experienced members of staff. Observation in the staffrooms of Ashton and Beechgrove confirmed the relevance of the problem. An event illustrating the point occurred at Beechgrove where a "new" French teacher wanted to contact the Head of House of a pupil with the intention of getting the pupil put "on report" for bad behaviour. Enquiries in the staffroom as to whom the teacher should contact proved fruitless, with even those teachers with some years at the school being unable to help. Eventually the teacher threw her hands in the air and exclaimed:

I give up. It's useless trying to do it. I'm wasting my time!

2. Field-work observation notes were written-up as soon as possible, but without the use of tape-recordings in such situations, verbatim recollections proved difficult. The words offered here are as close as possible to those actually used by the French teacher at the time.
This problem of identifying to whom a referral should be directed contributed toward the central position of the House staff at each school, because in large schools even those teachers who had spent some time at the schools were not always aware of exactly who was the relevant form teacher/tutor. There was more likelihood, however, of them knowing to which House a pupil belonged.

Subject teachers saw this as a practical problem because they felt that they could not automatically assume a pupil would provide them with the appropriate and correct information about the House to which they belonged, or the name of their form teacher/tutor. Non-co-operative pupils were in a position to avoid referral by withholding the necessary information. Similarly, the pupils who could not be identified by name were in a position to avoid being referred because an essential feature of the official use of the House system involved identifying by name the pupil whom the teacher wished to refer. "New" teachers were in a worse position than others in this respect. "Naming the pupil" however, was regarded as a pre-requisite not only for the adequate use of the House system, but was also seen as a strategy for gaining control of a classroom in a more general sense (cf. Kounin 1970). At Beechgrove, a history teacher, recalling her early experiences at the school, explained that a method which she and other teachers used when taking a new and difficult class was to have the most "difficult" pupil(s) described to her, along with their name(s) by other teachers who regularly took the class. Upon entering the class the "new" teacher could then attempt to gain control by immediately identifying the disruptive pupil(s) by name, impressing the pupils by the "withitness" of the teacher (Kounin 1970).
A corollary to this practical classroom management technique was that those pupils who posed the greatest threat to teacher control and quiet orderliness were those whose names first came to the attention of the subject teachers, (cf. Hargreaves 1975). As a Head of House put it:

It's the naughty ones who are brought to everybody's notice first. I mean, the first years come in .... whose names do you learn? ... the naughty ones. It's the same. It's always been like this in school.

(Head of House: Ashton)

Knowledge of pupils' names, then, was a basic necessity for teaching in the schools, and was specifically useful in the establishment of control in the classroom setting, as well as invoking referrals to the House system.

Knowledge of pupils' name, though it posed problems for the "new" teachers to an extent greater than for others, could also affect established teachers in schools, particularly where there were 1,200 or more pupils such as at Ashton and Beechgrove. In large schools even the established teachers might not know the names of pupils with whom they had no direct teaching contact. In the corridor or playground, incidents which a subject teacher felt to warrant referral to the House staff might not be so treated because the teacher was unable to instigate a referral without knowing the identity of the pupil. Similarly, when called upon to cover a lesson for an absent colleague, the established teachers could face problems of naming the pupil, notably when the pupil was engaged in disruptive activity. During fieldwork at another staffroom at Beechgrove, a situation occurred which, upon reflection, encapsulated the significance for the teacher of "naming the pupil". In the third period of the morning the door of the staffroom was flung open, and a boy momentarily stood in the doorway, shouted some abuse and ran off down the stairs.
The two teachers in the staffroom did not give chase nor did they seem particularly anxious to apprehend the "miscreant". One of the two explained quite explicitly that since he did not know the pupil's name it was a fruitless and frustrating exercise to attempt to find the pupil, let alone gain a confession of guilt or invoke any further action. It was clear in this instance, as in many similar events witnessed, that the teachers' lack of effort in apprehending the perpetrators of "bad" behaviour did not stem from a condonement of the act, nor from a "teacher malaise" or laziness (see Chapter I), but was the result of their inability to "name the pupil" and hence to secure any kind of official follow-up. In situations where teachers did not know the pupil's name, then, they had to rely on the immediate apprehension of the "culprit" and on qualities of teacher personality and pupil deference to teacher authority, in order to secure any type of remedial action.

In summary, then, "new" staff, faced particular problems because of their recent arrival in the situation, but the problems they confronted were probably extensions of problems which faced any teacher. These problems would be exacerbated, however, where the school had three characteristics.3

3. A recent Report of a Working Party of the Essex County Teachers' Association (N.U.T. 1975), in explaining the causes of disruptive behaviour in its schools referred to these factors. They reported that the causes of disruptive behaviour were complex, but included amongst the school factors influencing such behaviour:

- a high turnover of staff, especially in the urban areas of the county.
- too high a proportion of probationery teachers and inexperienced teachers. This has placed an added burden on the senior members of staff.
- some increase in staff absenteeism exacerbating the situation for colleagues who are already hard-pressed.
- difficulties (...) experienced by some members of staff in making adjustments to new forms of organization, new methods, buildings and equipment and a different style of teacher-pupil relationship, often consequent upon secondary reorganization.
(a) a large number of pupils
(b) a large turnover of staff, involving therefore the probability of above average numbers of recent arrivals and probationary teachers in the school, and
(c) a high staff absenteeism, involving above average rates of supply teachers, and of "covering" by established teachers.

These factors, characteristic of Ashton and Beechgrove, would influence the manner in which the House system operated by imposing on the subject teacher in the classroom setting certain practical problems which limited their ability to use the House system entirely as they would have wished, or entirely as the official guidelines would specify - notably the capacity of the teacher to identify pupils by name.

Knowledge of pupils' names though it posed problems for the "new" teachers to an extent greater than for others, could also affect established teachers in schools, particularly where there were 1,200 or more pupils such as at Ashton and Beechgrove. In large schools even the established teachers might not know the names of pupils with whom they had no direct teaching contact. In the corridor or playground, incidents which a subject teacher felt to warrant referral to the House staff might not be so treated because the teacher was unable to instigate a referral without knowing the identity of the pupil. Similarly, when called upon to cover a lesson for an absent colleague, the established teachers could face problems of naming the pupil, notably when the pupil was engaged in disruptive activity.
Effective Action

The problems of communicating with House staff on issues pertaining to pastoral care and guidance were paralleled by the problems associated with "effective action". Even where teachers were not "new" and were aware of the identity of pupils and relevant staff, they had to contend with (a) the time consumed by putting the system into operation, (b) the time delay in action that was taken by the House staff after the event or first referral and (c) the lack of effective action by House staff in relation to the classroom situation of the subject teacher.

Time consumed by the Instigation of Referrals to the House system

In their use of the House system teachers felt there to be a lack of time to implement the proper procedures. Operating the system necessitated the use of non-classroom time, and encroached on time not specifically allocated for the purpose; time such as morning and afternoon break, lunch-time and after school. Some of the work entailed in operating the system could be dealt with in the specifically allotted time, such as tutor-group periods at Beechgrove, take place in these periods, and consequently required of the teacher attention in times other than those officially allotted.

Beechgrove's situation differed from Ashton's in the important sense that registration units consisted of vertically organized tutor groups whose functions specifically included pastoral care and guidance. The formal organization of the school provided for the collection and transference of relevant information to a greater extent than that at Ashton, and would have appeared, therefore, to require less of a commitment on the part of staff to the use of "personal, non-teaching" time.
Yet, even with this formal provision for attendance to House duties, the communication of "problems" from the tutors to other subject teachers of the House staff could not be effectively undertaken during allotted times. Although some of the routine administrative duties could be executed, the implementation of referral proceedings required, depending on the type of referral, the use of non-allocated time, non-teaching time and perhaps "non-school" time to an extent which could prohibit the necessary standard of communications for the proper pastoral care and guidance of the pupils.

The "personal" Mode of Referral

The "personal" mode of referral was the most time consuming for the subject teacher, because in order to communicate the relevant information to the appropriate Head of House, the subject teacher needed to search out the member of staff perhaps during breaks or at the end of the school day. Particularly in a large school with separate buildings or separate sites, the communication of relevant facts could require a prohibitively great amount of time - if not in the actual transmission of the facts, in the location of the person to whom the facts should be transmitted. In effect, it meant that such information was generally passed on in a rather haphazard fashion when the situation arose, with only the exceptional instances receiving positive attempts at communication between the subject teacher and the House teacher.

The information which was communicated to the Heads of House from the subject teachers was, then, selective, not only in the nature of the events or attitudes which the subject teachers deemed worthy of bringing to the House staff's attention, but also in terms of the occasions on which it was communicated. Given the limited time available to the
subject teachers (and form teachers/tutors) only the extreme events caused them to search out the Heads of House, whilst the more minor observations were given if and when an appropriate situation arose - meeting in the staffroom, for instance, at lunchtime. The "personal" mode of referral was, then, time consuming, and the nature of the information which was communicated and the manner in which it was communicated suffered accordingly.

A French teacher at Beechgrove drew attention to this when considering the problems she faced in using the House system:

I think the problem of communication .. um .. knowing that .. senior members of staff knowing what's happening within each lesson or in each class or in a particular place within the school ... it is very difficult to .. for them to communi­cate and for you to get hold of them, - just generally communication .. which I think is very bad, and I think this makes the discipline very difficult to enforce. (...)

If you can't use the tutor system you're ... you have to resort to the Heads of House, and then you have the problem of getting hold of a Head of House or a senior member of staff, which is not always possible to do.

(French Teacher: Beechgrove)

The information which the Heads of House received from the subject teachers did not automatically reflect the actual state of affairs in the classroom because the subject teachers were not in a position to be able to communicate with the House staff to the extent necessary for such information. The situation at Beechgrove, for instance, with three staffrooms in different buildings, meant that to contact a specific member of staff could entail a lengthy tour of the buildings if that contact was considered essential. Although House rooms existed at both Ashton and Beechgrove, a subject teacher had no guarantee that the Head of House would be resident in the room at the time he or
she went to the room. House teachers themselves needed to contact subject teachers at times such as breaks, just when other staff might be looking for them.\(^4\)

In practice, then, the "personal" mode of referral was a time-consuming enterprise, particularly where the school was spread out over more than one building. The amount of time involved in the use of the "personal" mode of referral acted as an effective deterrent to the use of such referral to the extent which was envisaged as necessary in the official guidelines of both schools with the actual information being passed-on on a somewhat pragmatic basis. The information upon which the Heads of House operated consequently reflected not a real state of affairs in the school so much as a conglomeration of rather haphazardly transmitted observations which resulted from the practical problems associated with the communication between staff.\(^5\)

\(^4\) The Heads of House likewise acknowledged the problems of communicating with subject teachers. At Beechgrove, for instance, a Head of House commented:

It is unwieldy in the sense that you have got to then .. you know, something happens that, you know, you need to refer to someone else. And you have got to find out what tutor group they are in. (...) Then you have got to find out whether that person is in and where, and then you have either to write them a note or go and see them, and that takes time of course.

(Head of House: La : Beechgrove)

\(^5\) The nature of the information available to the Heads of House on the basis of subject teachers' referrals constituted a practical problem for the Heads of House in the operation of the House system, and is dealt with in chapter XI.
- the "documentary" mode of referral

The "documentary" mode of referral had the advantage that it did not require a great deal of the subject teacher's time to implement. Inspection of the school records could be arranged to suit the particular teacher and was neither a lengthy nor involved process. Similarly, neither the processes of putting a pupil "on report" (Beechgrove) nor giving them a "demerit" (Ashton) entailed the amount of time consuming activity which was associated with the "personal" mode of referral.

The contact between subject teacher and Head of House was built into the "documentary" mode of referral and did not require of the subject teacher any extensive, complicated or time-consuming activity. Because it was literally "documented" the necessity for searching out a particular member of staff was alleviated, along with the practical (time) problems it entailed.

- the "direct" mode of referral

The "direct" mode of referral had similar advantages over the "personal" mode and was even less time-consuming for the subject teacher requiring little more than the instantaneous command to see the appropriate Head of House (whether immediately or at some later date). It was normally executed during classroom time (and in relation to a classroom event) thus not encroaching upon other times in the teacher's working day. Indeed, the advantages of the "documentary" mode of referral and the "direct" mode of referral were that they generally took place within normally allocated lesson-time, and did not require of the subject teacher any time-consuming follow-up such as contacting personally the Head of House.
It is suggested, then, that one of the major difficulties confronting the subject teachers in their use of the House system was the time involved in the procedure of referral, and that the mode of referral regarded in the official guidelines as essential to the effective operation of pastoral care and guidance - the "personal" mode - posed the greatest problem in this respect. As a result, it would appear that the information made available to the Heads of House from subject teachers would not necessarily prove a reliable index of the state of affairs which actually existed.

**- time delay and effective action**

For the subject teachers the problems of time were not restricted merely to the time consumed in the implementation of the system. In accounting for the manner in which they used the system there was frequent reference to another factor which had significance for the way in which the House system actually operated, - time delay between the occurrence of an event (or observation of an attitude change, etc.) and the time of effective action by House staff. It appeared that the time lapse between the subject teacher noting an event, it being referred and effective action being taken by the House staff, meant that no effect of referral was to be found on the immediate classroom situation. Specifically, it was "personal" referrals which were regarded as having the least effect on the immediate classroom situation, although the problem as such was also related to the ineffectiveness of some "documentary" and "direct" referrals as well.
It's the same with the problem of communication, I don't know whether it is because it's a large school but if you do try and get a senior member of staff to do something about somebody in their House, you wait months and months and there is somebody who's disrupting the whole class who doesn't do the work and this had been going on for a time, well, there's one boy in particular, about 3 months you know, and every time I see the, you know, the particular staff member involved, he's going to do something, he's going to set up a course of action; we have got a letter dated months ago you know and this boy is still exactly the same.

**Interv:** So what can you do?

**French T:** I don't know - whether it is because they're worked too hard or whether this is, perhaps they do too many things, they do too many administrative things. They're all, he always looks so worried, this particular person, and they they all do actually, if you look at them - the Heads of Houses. They all look .. they're all looking very worried and they seem to have so many things to do, so many bits of paper to fill in, you know, they're always cluttered up with files and, it's true, files and reports and ... it's ridiculous the number of forms and things they have to fill in.

**Interv:** So they can't actually deal with .... ?

**French T:** They don't really have time for that sort of thing.

**Interv:** Mm, but what can you do then, if this person's causing trouble?

**French T:** Well, you can't, what can you do? You could go to the tutor, you go to the Head of House, the next up is the Headmaster or I suppose or the Deputy Headmaster.

**Interv:** But what I mean, in the classroom?

**French T:** But within the classroom situation, there is nothing you can do! It's just your own personal relationship with the boy and if you don't happen to have one, or the girl, if you don't happen to have one its .. um .. it's useless.

(French Teacher: Ro : Beechgrove)
The sentiments expressed here, and echoed in other interviews, was that the House system could do little to help the teacher with the immediate problems of teaching in the classroom, because referrals to the Heads of House failed to have any immediate effect on the problems posed by disruptive pupils.

At Ashton, an established history teacher similarly reflected on the viability of using the House system to cope with discipline problems:

**Interv:** When you get discipline problems, how is it dealt with?

**History:** Well, usually you try and deal with it by ... talking ... if that doesn't work ... then you can either give a child - for a very disobedient ... - a demerit, as it's called, and they lose five House points. And then they go to their House teacher who ... - the House teachers in this school are basically in charge of discipline, - discipline problems are referred to them, but I find that it's easier to try and deal with your own discipline problems. You learn as you go along. (...) And I very rarely use demerits.

(Deputy Head of History : Sa : Ashton)

The use of the House system was regarded, then, as ineffectual in terms of the immediate requirements of the teacher in the teaching situation. The time delay between the instigation of a referral and some effective action by the House staff meant that subject teachers had certain reservations about the usefulness of referring pupils. However, in expressing such reservations it was apparent that the subject teachers' notion of "effective" action referred primarily to the "disruption" of pupils rather than an "emotional" problem per se. That is, the problem of time for the efficiency of the House system arose in the context of attempt to secure remedial action on "disruptive" pupils from the House system, and not the pastoral care or guidance of long-term emotional upsets.

It was the "personal" mode of referral which fared worst in this respect because its reliance on personal contact precluded any immediacy
of effect in the classroom situation. According to the official guidelines, however, it was not the function of the House system to deal with classroom "problems", these being the responsibility of the subject teacher. Any such immediacy, then, was not intended in the officially preferred "personal" mode of referral.

Teachers regarded the effective feedback from "documentary" modes of referral with more optimism, particularly the "merit/demerit" and "report" systems. The use of merits at Ashton was the subject of some concern of the senior staff who felt that the merits were often being misused and did not reflect any particular standard of behaviour or achievement of the pupil but were being used as an incentive to good behaviour, or academic achievement. House teachers often remarked that the merits were being used as "carrots".  

Maths T: Now, for instance this morning, you know, Monday morning, I fill in the merits they get during the week. I get a list from one teacher, one merit to each child so I have to make one merit to meet staff. It's meaningless completely, idiotic. Er some people give for .... if you're good, you get three merits. Well, this is wrong for a start, you understand?

Er, .. some people give ... dole out merits as if they were pieces ... well they are pieces of paper, but completely meaningless. I feel a merit has got to be earned by either great effort or exceptionally .. er ... being exceptionally helpful, considerate to your ... to other people. They get from me a merit. But if somebody is good at Maths and gets 10 out of 10 every time they can be quite sure they are not going to get a merit out of me for that, because I expect them to be good. But if somebody is very weak, 5 out of 10 - all of a sudden, that deserves a merit to me.

Interv: For the extra effort...

Maths T: The extra effort, or if somebody says "Oh, I am going to put all the chairs up" the others did not come in or something. But if I would ask the child "Put the chairs up" I would not give them a merit because they are expected

---

6. The use of merits as reinforcement for good behaviour has the pedagogical support of those who would argue that new methods of discipline can rely on simply reinforcing "good" behaviour and only providing non-punitive discouragement of "bad" behaviour. (cf. Hamblin 1969, Goodlet '72)
to be obedient, but if he or she offers something to help that, I think, deserves a merit, so the merit system, different people have different standards of merit-giving and that is why the House system falls down.

You see there is no common standard, and they have tried to ... to standardise and have not succeeded at all, because some take ... er ... merit as ... er ... piece of lolly, as I said, if you're good you get a merit you know. Well I don't need that, of course. Perhaps if I was a young I don't even know ... um ... I don't think I would if I were a young teacher either because I think it defeats its purpose. Um ... I think children should be good without ... without being either threatened or ... or coaxed to it.

Interv: So, merits and demerits are being used as "carrots" to try ...

Maths T: That is right ... very often as "carrots", yes, very often. Or as ... as I don't know ... somebody can give somebody one girl, 13 merits are put into one child's ... well I mean ... um ... to get 13 merits in one go would mean somebody had saved somebody practically from death!

You know, life-saving, you know that is ... er ... you understand? This is one thing why the House system is very difficult to really work well. I personally have not ... um ... found the answer for it; I can only go by my own personal standards and I give merits quite sparingly. I have got one form, they would be useless - the only reason why it's a joy to teach them, although they are sometimes noisy, is because ... um ... I give them more difficult puzzles and I say "Anybody who puzzles this one out will get a merit." Now, that is a kind of a carrot but it warrants it because it will be, I can assure you, a difficult thing, otherwise I would not give it. I would not tell them to ... and ... um ... they really try so that not only the cleverest always gets the merit but also the most stupid ones so the one who tries hardest, the hardest in this lesson will get the merit. Well, they are all trying. That is perhaps in a way a carrot. Um ... but so that the children who would never get merits also have a chance of doing that.

(Deputy Head of Maths: El : Ashton)

Merits, then, did not reflect some objective measure of behavioural standard, but reflected a manner of use - a usage which was not uniform and which was problematic vis a vis the House system. 7

---

7. This teacher's views reflected the official guidelines' opinion that the award of merit marks would depend on:

The pupil's possible achievements and having regard to further efforts for their House. Merit marks should not be awarded for routine good work or behaviour, but only for rather special effort, service or endeavour.

(Official Guidelines : Ashton)
If the merits at Ashton were used as "carrots" enticing pupils to good standards, then the demerits of Ashton and being put "on report" at Beechgrove could be regarded as the "goads" for similar standards. These "documentary" modes of referral to the House system were acknowledged by teachers to have the effect of being a deterrent to bad behaviour, and had the advantage over the "personal" mode of referral in that their effect was of immediate help in the control of the classroom. Staff were not in agreement as to whether the demerits and reports should be used in this fashion, but there was a general acceptance that they could be used in this fashion, and indeed were used in this manner by some members of staff.

The members of staff who tended to use demerits and "reports" were often cited as being the "young" or the "inexperienced" teachers for whom they provided a back-up for discipline in the absence of any more material deterrent to bad behaviour. At Ashton, the Maths teacher with considerable experience went on to argue that:

you will find that the more experienced teacher very seldom gives a demerit because they don't need to, but the younger ones have got no other weapon really ... I mean they aren't allowed to smack. Some children run riot, so they get a demerit but they don't really realise that it isn't worth very much really and I don't think it alters them, because of giving them a demerit children are often no better .. er ..

(Deputy Head of Maths : El : Ashton)

This was a sentiment echoed at Beechgrove by a similarly established teacher who noted that:

discipline is a problem for inexperienced teachers in a comprehensive school because they can't fall back on to set measures of violence and, you know, that sort of .. the strap.

(Remedial Teacher : SI : Beechgrove)

8. The particular problems faced by the young and/or inexperienced teachers are dealt with at a later stage. The point here is to indicate that use of "documentary" mode of referral includes the "control" of the classroom as distinct from the communication of matters of interest to the pastoral care and guidance function of the Heads of House.
The documentary mode of referral, then, was viewed more favourably by subject teachers to the extent that its effects were more immediate in their consequences for the classroom setting. The effects were more apparent in terms of the possibilities for control which they offered and were more instantaneous in their outcome than those of the "personal" mode of referral.
The Significance of "Direct" Referrals

The "direct" mode of referral was officially discouraged at both Ashton and Beechgrove (see Chapter 9) subject teachers were regarded as responsible for the establishment of discipline and control in their own classroom, and the House system was to offer pastoral care and guidance for those pupils with emotional problems. It was acknowledged by the official guidelines and House staff alike that, on occasion, a situation might arise to which it was appropriate to call upon the assistance of the House staff through a "direct" mode of referral, yet such situations were limited to emotional problems which might flare up in the classroom situation, and perhaps to those occasions where the teachers would otherwise lose their temper with the pupil in question.

As a Head of House at Beechgrove put the case:

We don't encourage staff to send kids out of the classroom unless they really feel they can't cope (...) They're advised not to send kids out, in case they don't come here and they're wandering round the school disturbing other colleagues. Obviously, if the kid is just so impossible that they just can't cope, then they do.

(Head of House : My : Beechgrove)

The House system, that is, was not regarded officially as a back-up for the subject teacher in the routine maintenance of discipline and establishment of control in the classroom. According to the official guidelines use of the "direct" mode of referral was to be an exceptional application of the House system, with the normal referrals coming primarily from "personal", and secondly from "documentary" sources.

In practice, however, the "direct" mode of referral had the great advantage for the subject teacher that its effects were both immediate and recognizable in their influence on discipline and control in the classroom setting.
"Direct" referral constituted an immediate attempt to cope with a problem in the classroom setting, and as a Head of House at Ashton acknowledged:

If someone gets to the stage where they send a child out it's really for an immediate relief of the situation in the classroom, isn't it.

This kind of referral, then, had the twin advantages that it was effective instantaneously and was not time-consuming to operate. If a teacher was confronted with a "disruptive" pupil, that pupil could be ejected from the classroom at that instant, thus having an immediate effect on the classroom situation without any lengthy "processing".

The subject teachers' dilemma, however, was that this mode of referral, which was apparently most effective and was the least troublesome to operate, was also discouraged as an officially preferred practice of teaching in the schools.

In their operation of the House system, then, it appeared that subject teachers took into consideration not only the time-consuming in the alternative modes of referral, but also the time-delay in effective action for the subject teacher's control of the classroom. Contrary to the official emphasis on the "personal" mode and its orientation toward longer-term emotional problems of pupils, in practice it was the potential of the House system to aid the subject teacher's immediate control of the classroom which arose as the salient issue. It was the "direct" mode of referral which proved to be the more controversial aspect of use of the House system, a controversy which involved the problem of "control" of the classroom. The "direct" mode of referral, that is, (a) involved a clearly socially-organized basis of use as distinct from the official guidelines, (b) provoked controversy as to its use, which (c) rendered accounts more explicit in their justification and (d) involved centrally
the issue of "control" of the classroom. For these reasons it was pertinent to consider, in particular, the practical problems involved in invoking the House system through "direct" referral, both for subject teachers and House teachers (see Chapter XI), and the implications of accounts of these problems for the notion of "control".
Referral as a Practical Activity

Appropriate referrals to the House system were officially those which stemmed from an emotional disturbance on the part of a pupil and which required the attention of agencies outside the confines of the classroom. Such classroom "problems" were clearly distinguished from those which arose from (a) the over-exuberance of a pupil, high-spiritedness etc. and/or (b) the inability of a teacher to control his or her own classroom. The educational distinction between these "causes" or "problems" in the classroom was generally acknowledged by the teachers in the two schools. However, whilst the teachers were able to recognize the theoretical distinction between the causes of such problems, in the actual teaching situation it appeared to become both (a) difficult to distinguish, and (b) fairly irrelevant in terms of the practical task of teaching. Consequently, the referrals which subject teachers made might have been considered by House staff to be inappropriate on grounds which in the practical context of teaching were irrelevant. It is necessary, then, to consider the (practical) grounds on which subject teachers came to regard pupil behaviour as warranting "direct" referral to the House system.

The House staff saw their responsibilities as relating to the emotional problems of pupils, problems which might be manifested in such things as truancy from school, declining standards of work in the classroom and involvement with the law outside school. There was, however, a significant alternative manner through which an emotional problem might be discovered — that is, through disruptive behaviour and indiscipline within the classroom setting.

---

9. This distinction has provided the basis of much recent educational debate (see Chapter I).
It was not the function of the House system to deal with "indis­
pline" per se, for, as already noted, the official guidelines located
"emotional disturbance" and "pastoral' care"as its responsibility.
Despite this, both schools acknowledged that House staff were still
available, in the odd instance, to cope or help out with difficult
situations;

Heads of Departments and Heads of Houses are always
ready and willing to support members of staff.

(Official Guidelines - Beechgrove)

It is significant, however, that not only were the Heads of
House available to back-up members of staff, but so apparently were
the Heads of Department. The House teachers themselves, according to the
official guidelines, carried no special responsibility for the maintenance
of control, and they were called upon in their capacity as senior members
of staff, moreso than as having discipline responsibilities.

In the case of indiscipline of individual children
the teacher can consult and seek help from the
tutor/form teacher or Housemaster/Housemistress. In
the case of indiscipline of a whole class, the
teacher should seek guidance from the Head of
Department or from the teacher responsible for
that year ....

(Official Guidelines - Beechgrove)

This guideline did more than involve the Heads of Department in
the maintenance of discipline, it re-affirmed the role of House staff as
concerned with the individual problems which could arise from the
emotional disturbance of a pupil, and implicitly recognized that indis­
cipline might be the manifestation of such disturbance. On the other
hand, where it was the indiscipline of a class which was in question,
the teacher was not entreated to "consult and seek help" from a member
of the House staff, but to "seek guidance" from a Head of Department
or year teacher.
There was an assumption underlying these comments that there were two types of behaviour problem; the one which stemmed from the emotional disturbance of a pupil, and which could justifiably be referred to the House staff, and the other which stemmed from a lack of control on the part of the subject teacher, and for which "guidance" should be sought from a senior member of the academic staff. This distinction between two broad categories of behaviour problem has been well established in educational literature. Morrison and McIntyre (1969); in summarizing these indicate, however, that it is the problems of "control" which receive most attention by teachers. They write:

Pupils with behaviour disturbances fall into two broad categories: those which are often called conduct problems (...) and those with so-called personality problems (...). Although these are rather arbitrary categories the two behaviour patterns which appear consistently in studies of children and adolescents, relate to different kinds of difficulties facing teachers; on the one hand, those concerning classroom control and the effective treatment of pupils who are disorderly and who disrupt the work and relationships of teachers and other pupils; and on the other hand, those having to do with helping the under-reactive and inhibited pupil to find more satisfaction in his personal relationships and schoolwork. Both kinds of pupils mean additional and skilful treatment in the classroom, but the very immediacy of conduct problems commonly means that they attract more attention, although not necessarily more effective teacher behaviour.

(Morrison & McIntyre 1969, pp.143-4 emphasis added)

In order for the House system to operate effectively it was necessary for the form/subject teachers (Ashton) or the tutors/subject teachers (Beechgrove) to communicate to the House staff problems of inadequate work or indiscipline which stemmed from an emotionally disturbed state on the part of a pupil and not to burden them with referrals for which they had no responsibility - those stemming from the subject teachers inability to
control a class. This assumed a context of teaching in which it was possible to distinguish between the two causes of behaviour problems in the actual practice of conducting a lesson. Put another way, the efficient and appropriate use of the House system of both Ashton and Beechgrove, according to the respective official guidelines, made the assumption that the subject teacher conducted teaching in a context in which it was practically feasible to distinguish between those cases of disruptive behaviour or indiscipline which stemmed from states of emotional disturbances and those which were due to either a "high-spiritedness" of the child and/or the subject teacher's lack of control.

In the teaching context the possibility of distinguishing the two has been doubted by staff, although they certainly recognized the pedagogic distinction between the two. The influence of practical problems rendered it difficult to implement the distinction, or to operate it even if it was possible to make a theoretical distinction between the two, as these comments from a teacher of Beechgrove illustrate:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Interv:} How would you define a 'bad' kid?

\textbf{English} Well, it's someone whose ... er ... per ... and they're usually personal problems ... er ... so enormous that ... er ... it just is a cog sticking in the running of the class all the time, you know. Er ... for example, I have a very intelligent boy - and I've seen this situation a couple of times since I've been here - very smart orally, verbally, mind-wise ... er ... often a bit deviant, right, and he doesn't make a good class member from my point of view.
\end{quote}

10. Again, the distinction accords with what Keddie (1971) identifies as the "Educationalist" and "Teacher" perspectives.
Interv: How much can you take account of their backgrounds? I mean .. or .. if a child's "bad" do you explain it in terms of their background. I mean, do you think as you're actually teaching .. um .. well, we can explain why he's acting that way?

English T: But that doesn't alter your reaction to him, does it. You see this is why teachers are very often frustrated. They know that they're having reactions to this kid - they know that he's got a stream of mother/father problems, but yet it doesn't seem to alter their reactions to them (...).

And it takes a lot of emotional pressure off the teacher who's able to say "well, look he doesn't like - he doesn't get on with females. I found this from his background". It does take off a lot of the emotional pressure (...)

But you know, half the kids coming in here I don't know what their social backgrounds are. I know my tutor groups and I'm supposed to have a much closer association with them. Sure, I mean I have a couple of kids in my tutor group who, you know, it's absolutely sure I'll really run foul of them unless I do a lot of homework on them, including going to homes, making parental contact. But in the classroom I still think teachers should be trained to make ... matter of making the right decision at the right time. And, you know, how do you train someone to make the right decisions at the right time?

And the other thing is, I think, the profession's very unfair, because I don't see how it could possibly be otherwise, but here are all these kids with all their problems, right - maybe some without - but some have problems, right. So here you stand an authority figure, mum, dad, the law, anybody they like to project onto you, and here they are coming at you, right, with their feelings - the remedial department is full of this. A kid can spit, swear, hate you, right, and yet you're supposed to be so removed that you can say, "Well what do they need? How shall I treat them? Now I'm not going to lose my temper, it wouldn't be good for him". But you're doing this every day, all your teaching life, and I think it's ... it can be dangerous for a teacher that kind of thing. You know, because you're not reacting like a person to another human being; You're saying "Now what does he need? What shall I do?" - Don't you think that's crazy?

(English Teacher: Ho : Beechgrove)

This teacher indicated that to react to the behaviour of pupils on the basis of the emotional "cause" of that behaviour was difficult both because the teacher was unlikely to have an adequate knowledge of the background of that pupil, and because for "personal" reasons the reaction could not always be detached and rationally appraising of the situation.
To instigate "direct" referrals in the officially designated manner, however, it was incumbent on the subject teacher to distinguish between the "causes" of behaviour. Disruptive behaviour, for instance, which occurred as a result of some emotional problem of the pupil was an officially appropriate case for referral, whereas similar behaviour seen to stem from a "high-spiritedness" was to be dealt with by the subject teacher in the classroom.

The subject teacher, in interpreting the behaviour of pupils, had also to take account of the publicly available indices of control such as the noise emanating from the classroom and could not, for practical reasons, make allowance for the emotional cause for such behaviour to any great extent.

Two practical features of the teaching context, then, militated against the officially recommended procedure; firstly, it was not generally feasible to distinguish between the alternative "causes" of disruptive behaviour, and secondly, even where it was possible the teachers' treatment of such behaviour which stemmed from an emotional problem was still limited by consideration of the publicly available indicators of control. The subject teacher could not allow an emotionally disturbed pupil to continually disrupt the class and make a noise because the publicly available criteria of control could not discriminate between the causes of noise, but related merely to its extent.

Hargreaves et al (1975) have indicated that teachers have a higher intervention threshold for pupils who are persistently disruptive, taking into account the "avoidance of provocation" (Stebbins 1970) by competent teachers. To follow this explanation it may be that teachers in the practical classroom setting did not make allowance for the (disruptive) behaviour of pupils because of the emotional "cause" of that behaviour,
but rather any higher intervention threshold with such pupils might have been based on the estimation by the teacher that to intervene would create more disruption than it would solve. (cf. Kounin's (1970) "ripple effect" associated with teacher interventions). In other words it was a practical consideration based on the consequences for disruption in the classroom and not a differential acknowledgment of any emotionally disturbed state of the pupil. It appeared, that is, from accounts and observation that the teacher's concern with noise (chapter VII) and control (chapter VIII) meant that the extent of disruptive behaviour and not its cause provided the criterion in practice for the decision to use a "direct" referral.

As a corollary it would appear that those pupils who did not disturb the quiet orderliness of the classroom would possibly never come to the attention of the subject teacher as worthy of referral to the House system.

This point was recognized by a Head of House at Ashton when talking of the possibility that some pupils with problems never came to the attention of House staff:

..... they might be quiet kids with problems and we never have any contact. They could go through this school in 5 years .. in 5 or 6 years in the school and we .. we may not have very much contact with them at all. I might see them at a House meeting once a week, but because they are quiet kids - but they might still have their problems - we never .. er .. we never contact them.

(Head of House : Do : Ashton)

The "disturbed" child that is, was likely to come to the notice of the House staff only where that "disturbance" - a psychological state - became manifest in some form of educational disturbance such as poor achievement (Cicourel and Kitsuse 1963, White & Chary 1966) or classroom disruption (Blackham 1967). A psychological "disturbance" may, however,
lead to a "maladaptive behaviour" which does not show itself in terms of classroom disturbance. Blackham (1967), for instance, notes that whilst maladaptation may be expressed in academic performance, aggression, stealing and disruption, it can also account for quiescence on the part of the pupil. Pupils may have internalized conflicts which silently take their toll. These are the children who live out their lives in "quiet desperation".

(Blackham 1967, p.73)

He goes on to argue that maladaptation can be manifested in (a) "deviant" behaviour, (b) retreatist behaviour, and (c) over-conformist behaviour. It was evident from the accounts of the subject teachers that it was only the "deviant" behaviour manifestation of psychological "disturbance" which provided a practical problem for teaching in the classroom context and that the "retreatist" and "over-conformist" manifestations were, in the first instance, less likely to pose practical problems for the subject teachers, and in the second, and consequently, less likely to be the basis of a referral to the House system. Those pupils, that is, who had emotional problems yet did not manifest this state in terms of disruptive and noisy behaviour were likely to pose little threat to the "control" of the teacher and hence not be the subject of referral to the House staff.

As with the learning context, (cf chapter VIII), the quiet orderliness of pupil behaviour disguised for practical purposes an underlying problem - be that a problem of quiet, non-learning or quiet emotional disturbance. If indeed threats in terms of the publicly available indicators of control were the criteria for assessing pupil behaviour as "disruptive", then it would appear that "disruptive" behaviour was that kind which was likely to be deemed worthy of "direct" referral to the House system, whilst quiet orderly behaviour was overlooked as a

---

11. This point was confirmed by the Heads of House with reference to their clientele. (see Chapter XI)
manifestation of behaviour worthy of referral.

Because the major problem for the teacher in the teaching context was the maintenance of "quiet orderliness", "discipline problems" were those which threatened the "quiet orderliness" of the classroom irrespective of the "cause" of the problem and referrals to House staff could be seen to stem from problems of "control" and "order" in the classroom rather than the "emotional disturbance" for which the system was originally intended.

Where the subject teacher was conscious of pressures to maintain "control" in terms of quiet orderliness in the classroom, that is, these pressures might outweigh the pedagogic beliefs of that teacher so that, in the practical teaching setting "discipline problems" would no longer be judged on the "cause" of the behaviour so much as the severity of the disruptive behaviour.
Conclusions

The practical problems which the subject teachers confronted in connection with communication and with effective action stemmed in part from the limited time that was available to them. The manner in which they used the system, (made referrals to the House staff), reflected to some extent the time consuming nature in particular, of the "personal" mode of referral.

The amount of time consumed in referring a pupil was not, however, their only practical problem. They were also concerned with the time delays which arose through putting the referrals into operation, and of the effective response of the House staff to a referral once it had been acknowledged.

In practice, such time delays meant that subject teachers got no effective (manifest) relief of immediate problems of control in the classroom setting, that is, in terms of the classroom behaviour or performance of the pupil. Where the system of referral took a long time to implement the subject teacher was left with a continuing "problem" in the classroom.

The "personal" mode of referral was most prone to such criticism. The "documentary" and particularly the "direct" mode of referral, on the other hand, were considered by the subject teachers to be more efficient in terms of time and more effective in terms of immediate control of the classroom. For immediate and effective action to aid classroom control, then, subject teachers were more willing to make "direct" referrals than they were to rely on the "personal" mode.

Use of the "direct" mode of referral was associated with "new" teachers for whom (a) the problems of control were considered to be acute, and (b) the use of the "personal" and "documentary" modes faced rather basic practical problems concerning the identity of those being referred
and those to whom they should be referred.

The use of the "direct" mode of referral was considered to be more appropriate for the immediate control of discipline problems which arose in the classroom, whilst the "personal" mode of referral was more appropriate for emotional problems - a distinction recognized in large part by the official guidelines of the schools and the teachers themselves. But whereas the official guidelines advocated emphasis upon "personal" modes of control, subject teachers exhibited more concern with the practical consequences attributable to "direct" referral and the problem of classroom control. The distinction between the two types of referral, however, relied on an assumption that the subject teacher was in a position to take account of the different sources or "causes" of a problem whilst engaged in the practice of classroom teaching. Now, whilst subject teachers were aware of the distinct causes of "problem" behaviour - emotional disturbance, or pupil over-exuberance/teacher control, - in the practical teaching situation they were not in a good position to react accordingly; firstly in the sense that they could be unaware of the particular emotional problems of pupils whom they taught and secondly, because even when they were aware that a pupil's behaviour stemmed from some emotional problem, their reaction had still to take account of the practical teaching concern for quiet orderliness in the classroom, (and also take account of their reactions as people rather than pedagogic machines). In practice, then, teachers were more concerned with the outcome or "effect" of (disruptive) behaviour in the classroom than in the "cause" of that behaviour.

In conclusion, these practical problems associated by subject-teachers with use of the House system suggest that:
(a) due to the time consumed in its implementation the "personal"
mode of referral was used less than was officially regarded as
necessary and (b) use of the "direct" and "documentary" modes of
referral tended to reflect the severity of disruptive behaviour by a
pupil rather than any underlying emotional cause.

In combination, the House system appeared to be adopting a
"discipline specialist" function to an extent not envisaged by the
official guidelines of either school which could be explained in part
by the practical problems confronting subject teachers. Such a
"discipline specialism" was confirmed by the accounts of the Heads of
House for whom it posed a practical problem per se.
Chapter XI

The Operation of the House System:

practical problems and the Heads of House
Space and Privacy

House teachers did not feel free to operate the House system entirely as they wished, nor entirely in accord with the formal guidelines; like the subject teachers they recognized that they had to work within certain practical constraints that affected the manner in which they conducted House affairs.

The House teachers were aware that they had to work in conditions that were "not ideal" and mentioned as an example the lack of space afforded by the House rooms. House rooms at both Ashton and Beechgrove were shared, and lacked any area in which private consultation between House staff and parents or pupils could take place. Ashton was less severely restricted in its facilities, having rooms shared by just the two House staff at each the lower schools, and was further in the process of providing a sound insulated, partitioned section of the House room that was shared by the four House staff at the upper school. Beechgrove suffered facilities that were not only smaller, but were shared by all eight of the House staff in the school (Heads of House).

The House teachers felt that these inadequate facilities hindered the possibilities of good communications between themselves and either the parents or the pupils with whom they might deal. In a crowded room with persistent interruptions the nature of what was communicated, particularly when of a personal nature, could be affected.

This problem was brought to the fore in the course of research through an incident which was not unusual according to the House staff. During the process of observation and interviewing the researcher spent a considerable amount of time in the House rooms of Ashton and Beechgrove, talking to the House staff and the pupils who came to the rooms as well as
interviewing the House staff. Most of the referrals to the House rooms were of the "direct" mode and neither the teachers nor the pupils appeared to be embarrassed by the presence of the researcher during the "counselling" that ensued. At Beechgrove, the researcher had arranged to meet one of the Heads of House at lunch-time and was waiting in the room while one of the other House teachers dealt with a series of routine matters. A pupil arrived to see this other Head of House, apparently on a self-referral basis, and a fairly light-hearted and open exchange started between the pair. Shortly after the pupil's arrival, the Head of House whom the researcher had arranged to meet came into the room and an informal interview was started. During the course of the interview the tenor of the counselling session in the adjacent desk changed; there was an emotional outburst by the pupil, followed by tears. This itself was neither particularly unusual nor embarrassing for the House staff, but the situation that followed exhibited the problems encountered by the House staff on a routine basis through a lack of space and privacy. The Head of House dealing with the rather fraught girl calmed her down, made a cup of tea, and started to enquire into the deeper roots of the matter whilst the research interview continued. The girl was becoming rather obviously reluctant to talk about the cause of the problem in the presence of others, and the task of the counselling was consequently hindered. It may have been possible for the House teacher being interviewed and the researcher to leave the room, but as both the House staff explained later if they were to do this each time counselling took place their access to their own desks and room would be severely restricted. It was not practical for them to leave the room on occasions such as these, particularly in this instance where the eight Heads of House shared the same room. Neither
did they feel it reasonable to take the girl from the room because they considered there to be still a further lack of privacy in the corridors or in other classrooms which were available. As this House Teacher involved in the counselling put the point:

This is the one room for eight of us. But we had nowhere until a year and a half ago. We used to see kids in various classrooms or corridors or whatever, so this is better. But it's very bad when you want to interview kids confidentially; if they want to tell you something private. You can see what it's like - people walking in and out the whole time. If a kid wants to tell you something confidential - or a parent - it's very off-putting. So we all feel we really do need an interview room.

(Head of House: My: Beechgrove)
Time Allocation

The facilities available to the House staff of the schools for the pastoral care and guidance of the pupils, then, suffered from a lack of space and privacy, and this influenced the process of counselling which took place. As a practical limitation on the way in which they conducted their pastoral duties, however, the influence of space was not as important as the lack of time which was allocated for House duties.

House staff at both schools saw limitations being imposed by the fact that they received only 5-6 extra "free" periods, over and above the normal allocation, in which to execute their duties as Heads of House. As a Head of House at Ashton put it:

"..... the House teacher has a certain amount of free periods a week, ... er ... normally about 5 or 6 extra - which doesn't seem to me to be enough - um ... during which he's supposed to get to know the pupils in his House well enough to write a report at the end of the course - at the end of each year - on the pupil, which is quite a difficult thing to do in fact with 200 pupils."

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

The insufficient amount of extra "free" periods available meant that the House staff operated under very considerable pressures of time. This lack of time specifically allocated to House duties led one of the House teachers at Beechgrove, for instance, to suggest that the House duties were more-or-less performed on top of full teaching duties; she said:

"We only have ten periods considered to be for House work. So we're all almost, you know, teachers ... full-time teachers anyway."

(Head of House : My : Beechgrove)
The House staff recognized that the lack of time allowed for House duties did not stem from any disinterest or "mal-intent" on the part of the respective Headmasters, but was due to general staff shortage. The sort of time seen as desirable was "... just not on with the staffing .. er .. arrangements which can be made within the school".

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton).

There was a further diminution of this time through the fact that much of the time was specifically put aside for meetings. At Beechgrove, a Head of House indicated that of the periods allocated for House duties, at least five every week were taken up with pre-arranged meetings concerned, for instance, with careers guidance, welfare agencies and the Headmaster. This, he said, left him with the same amount of periods for preparation as other "full-time" teachers. It was, then, perhaps a misnomer to call these periods "free", since many of them were taken up with predictable meetings which prevented the House teachers from being available at these times to deal with day-to-day problems.

Similar feelings, held by all the Heads of Houses in both schools, were expressed in terms such as

I only get ... I only get a few periods in the day where ... where .. er .. when, when this job was first advertised we were promised about thirteen periods; well, it's probably only five times in the week when I am able to really see anybody (...)

Yes 5 .. 5 of these sort of little periods, you know, 20 minutes or so, well ... say, it should be 40 minutes but there is only those periods to deal with everything.

(Head of House : Do : Ashton)

The House teachers argued, then, that the 5-6 "free" periods which they received in lieu of House duties (over-and-above the five which normal subject teachers received) did not provide adequate opportunity to conduct House matters, particularly when most, if not all,
of these extra "free" periods were taken up with meetings of a routine
texture with the Headmaster or personnel from welfare agencies outside
the school. Given that these teachers still had a large academic
teaching commitment, the five "free" periods that might remain reflected
no more than they could expect as a normal subject teacher with no
official pastoral duties. Consequently, they felt that their House
duties were conducted over and above the call of a normal teaching week.

The specific practical result of this lack of time was that the
House staff had to draw on other time which was available in the school
day in order to conduct the duties associated with pastoral care; times
such as breaks, after-school hours, and even the time official allocated
for academic lesson work. At the lower school of Ashton, a Head of House
indicated the problem thus:

Officially in terms of um non-teaching periods
um between 10-12 half hours. Your lesson times
that is your allocation for R.E. department work is
going um and so on um It might come down
to what - a couple of hours a week and um say
3-4 hours a week officially, the other times you just
make up in break time. Sometimes lessons have to go
by the board. Um a parent arrives and says "I want
to see Mr. Wa., such-and-such's happened" you know.
Mr. Wa., is actually teaching, then someone has to come
and sit in the lesson whilst I come and interview the
parent, and see what all the problem's about. Um
I have known that happen you know, several times.

(Head of House : Wa : Ashton)

The problems of time allocation faced by the House teachers were exacerbated
where the nature of the calls on their time were immediate and unpredictable.
It was not the long-term counselling of pupils which could be arranged for
specific times that posed problems for the House teachers so much as those
duties which arose without forwarning and without prior notice. "Direct"
referrals (whether involving parents, teachers referring pupils, or
pupils referring themselves) were felt to pose the major practical
problems because of the immediate nature of the attention which they
required. It was these kinds of referral which House staff indicated as most troublesome because they interrupted not only break-time but lesson times also.

Subject teachers, of course, were discouraged from making direct referrals - not because of the time "wasted" by House staff but because of the implications that such referrals entailed for control in the classroom. Despite this official proscription of such referrals, however, House staff were regularly called upon to deal with what they called "crisis" events. These entailed either dealing with a truculent or disruptive pupil who had been sent from the classroom, or even having to go to a classroom to sort out problems arising in that setting. "When "crisis" events occurred, the Heads of House could be called upon to calm the situation and to take appropriate action, which might involve removing a pupil from the classroom situation in order to ease the tension, or looking into reports of pupils wandering around the school. In such cases, it could not automatically be assumed that the (relevant) members of the House staff were not themselves committed to classroom teaching. In the event of a "crisis", House staff might have to leave their own teaching commitment in order to deal with a problem arising elsewhere. The practical problems facing a House teacher in such a situation were indicated by a Head of House at Beechgrove who said that:

You have to choose your priority at that moment. Very often the classroom teaching goes because there's a crisis situation come up, or there's an irate parent or a distressed child, or whatever, and you have to, at that time, make your priority. It's a choice the whole time. I'm lucky in that one of the subjects I teach is typing, which is very easy to leave for a little while, because when the kids are doing something they can get on with it. The other subject I teach, which is community services, I rarely leave, unless it really is an absolute "crisis", because the class needs teaching the whole time and I'm actually involved every minute in the lesson with all of the kids in the class.

(Head of House: My: Beechgrove)
Because a House teacher was also a subject teacher, the operation of House duties had to take into account the practical problems which arose from the House teacher's classroom commitment, as well as the straightforward commitment to duties as Head of House. When "crises" occurred, they could be put in a position of weighing one against the other in deciding upon the course of action to be taken.

Dealing with "crisis" events in the course of the school day, that is, put strains on the House teachers' commitment to academic and pastoral duties. The teachers felt that they were often put in the undesirable position of having to make a choice between their commitment to House duties and their commitment to class teaching - a kind of strain that could only be reduced where there was less use of the "direct" mode of referral. A House teacher at Ashton, for instance, indicated the sentiment with the words:

Um .. I have been trying to cut down on the amount of time on this, I feel quite strongly that it ought to be .. a .. um .. prior arrangement whereby the teacher will say to me 'I have got such-and-such a class, so-and-so's causing a problem, can I send him to you?' and I might say "Well, hang on .. um .. He'll come to the lesson - if you are having problems, send for me". I would prefer to do it that way than rather him say 'Mr. Wa's in Room 8, he'll come at a moment's notice'.

(Head of House ; Wa ; Ashton)

The practical problem with "coming at a moment's notice" was that it involved leaving a classroom unattended, if the House teacher happened to be teaching a class. It put the House teacher in something of a dilemma.

There are some groups I'd be very reluctant to leave to be .. um .. to be honest about it. I'd hate to have to leave them alone and it's not only the (remedials) but there are some groups you can't afford to leave them on their own. You know, you might have to say to the secretary, "Would you ask so-and-so to wait for 10 minutes and I'll be down as soon as I can" and .. um .. there's that problem, you know. Just because you are House staff or you're in charge of this building shall we say, it doesn't mean to say that your pupils are just going to sort of obey your authority - I don't think that works at all.

(Head of House ; Wa ; Ashton)
In an attempt to offset the strains on their commitment the House staff at both schools had adopted an informal arrangement whereby one of the Heads of House would be in the House room at most times to be available for the kind of problems that they were regularly called upon to deal with. This was not an officially recognized arrangement but one that the House staffs had developed to cope specifically with the conflict of commitments which might arise through "direct" referrals and/or when they were asked to deal with an immediate "crisis" event. By informally arranging that at least one of them should be in the House room at most times of the school day (i.e. not teaching and therefore available to deal with "crisis" events and "direct" referrals) there were the practical advantages:

(a) of providing subject teachers with a place and person upon which they could call for aid at any time, and
(b) of allowing House teachers to continue their lessons with less chance of interruption or conflicting claims on their time. ¹

The Heads of House, however, contended that their function was not primarily concerned with disruptive pupils and discipline problems, and consequently they did not regard this facility as a basis for the withdrawal of "problem" pupils from classes in which they were regularly disruptive. The arrangement was specifically designed to cope with the pressures stemming from the "direct" referrals and the immediate crisis

¹. This system did not operate to perfection because of timetabling limitations, staff absenteeism, etc. Further the lower schools at Ashton had the additional difficulty that there were only two Heads of House in each building. They did, however, draw on the support of the Head of Building in this respect.
events which occurred in the school day. It was seen by House staff, that is, as an eminently practical though officially unwarranted arrangement.

It can be concluded that House staff at both Ashton and Beechgrove, despite the differences in organization, felt that they were provided with insufficient time (and space) for the desired or efficient execution of their duties as Heads of House. Staffing arrangements accounted for the lack of time, rather, that is than any mal-intent from Headmasters, but the end result was that too little time was specifically allocated to House duties. Much of that which was allocated, was regularly and predictably used for meetings which, though concerned with pastoral guidance, interfered with their counselling duties.

Despite attempting to establish informal methods to cope with the strains on their time and commitments to academic and pastoral matters the House staff had still to contend with a time shortage which arose, in particular, from "direct" modes of referral. Such modes of referral, though efficient for the subject teachers, would appear to have had contrary effects on the time and aims of the House staff.

2. At Ashton the House staff, through a general staff meeting, had declined to operate a withdrawal system for pupils whereby regularly truculent and/or disruptive pupils could be removed from certain lessons. The biology department subsequently instigated their own systems in which pupils who "played up" with particular teachers were shuffled around amongst the other (and usually more senior) members' classes, thus giving a relief to discipline problems. A list of the biology staff teaching at any time was available to members of the department. The disruptive child could be sent to the member of staff whose name appeared at the top of the list, unless that teacher had two such pupils already in his/her class, in which instance the pupils were sent to the next on the list. It was argued by the Head of Biology that this process was informal and against the express views of the Heads of House, yet was tolerated because of the need that subject teachers, specifically in his department, felt for such a system of withdrawal to cope with those pupils whose presence in the classroom caused regular problems of control and discipline. These pupils, when removed to another classroom outside the sphere of their peers, it was argued, were far less disruptive and their absence allowed the original lesson to continue uninterrupted.
The subject teachers' use of the House system was affected by the limitations of time and the way in which this influenced the type of communication (information and referrals) they were prepared to instigate. The House staff, for their part, were aware that they had to operate with far from perfect knowledge about the "problems" in the school, especially to the extent that they relied on informal sources of information.

At Ashton there were no formal channels of communication through which the Heads of House were to gain information about problems associated with particular pupils, other than by "documentary" (demerits) or "direct" referrals. In terms of the "personal" mode of referral, that is, the Heads of House could not invoke any official channels of communication in order to be sure of receiving information, or disseminating information about pupils.

The form teachers, though being members of a House, had no official brief to liaise with the House staff about particular pupils, and the post was officially nothing more than an administrative task. In practice, many of the form teachers took on an extra responsibility and did, in fact, treat the post as involving some special concern for the pastoral welfare of their pupils (to an extent greater than expected of any normal subject teacher) and hence, in practice, the House staff could rely on form teachers for some feedback of information from the "grass roots" of the school.
A Head of House at the Upper School at Ashton elaborated on the problem pointing to the fact that the kind of information they received meant that many problems which should have been detected and acted upon at an early stage did not come to their attention until the problem had reached large and explosive proportions:

There isn't any automatic way in which the information gets to the House teacher. So one can be very much in the dark about (problems) and then suddenly find out that something's been happening which you don't know about, which can be annoying.

... by the time one's found out the problem has become very large and very difficult to solve. Whereas in . . . . . if there was a . . . . a tutorial system underneath a House structure, if you like . . . . um . . . the House teacher would have operated at a much earlier time.

(Head of House: Ha: Ashton)

It was the feeling of this Head of House that some of the information problems could be overcome if the school were to adopt a tutorial system rather than the form organization in which the communication of pastoral problems was neither direct nor easily obtained. The role of form teacher did not specifically accord with that of tutor. Not only were the forms horizontally organized (in comparison with the vertical organization of tutor groups) but, more significantly, the form teacher was officially conceived of as an administrative position more than a pastoral one.

The form teacher is not a tutor. Some teachers perform a function very similar to a tutor, although they're given no time to do it, although they're given no directive to do it. (...) But, in general, a class teacher feels his job is very administrative at Ashton - it's never been defined as anything else, and . . . . . and er . . . and therefore, a large number of kids we find, are suddenly in enormous problems which must have been building up over a period of time, and one suddenly finds out about them.

(Head of House: Ha: Ashton)
This reliance upon informal channels of communication - upon the willingness of form teachers to go beyond their brief - was not then considered to facilitate the most efficient operation of the House system and did not reveal many of the problems until they had become "enormous".

The relationship between the House system and the form system at Ashton, then, posed problems for the efficient feedback of information to the Heads of House. The form system and the House system were not fully integrated and even those form teachers who were officially part of the House structure felt that in practice they had little real involvement with it. A form teacher at Ashton described the relationship between the House system and the form system when advocating the integration of the two in terms of horizontal year groupings based on form groups, as opposed to the vertical House arrangement based on tutor groups such as that found at Beechgrove. He said:

As far as the House system is concerned, at the moment, a group of us deal with it, and it is very cumbersome. Each house teacher has a kind of allocation of other teachers attached to each Housemaster of whom, in fact, play almost no part in the House system. I mean I am nominally connected with a House with Perkin for a start and now the only thing I do is that instead of assembly one morning some of the kids come to my class ... and that sort of thing, which is fine, but that's the first time I've done anything to do with the House and ours is a big one you know.

So the alternative scheme which is being proposed is to organize it along a year basis ... using the form teachers for each year group as the staff for the unit so it will give you a much greater degree of efficiency. You see, you have about 5 or 6 forms, then in each group, and 5 or 6 form teachers who know their own class very well, alright, and then you can have the equivalent to a Head of House which would be a head of the year group which would work with that team. O.K. So the present system at the moment is that in my House in my form there's about 5 people. Now the other ones who I know very well are not in my house although they are in my form, so it's a dislocation all along the line kind of thing.

Interv: So, if someone wants to contact you to contact someone in your House they won't be able to do it through you as a form teacher at the moment.
P: Well, it wouldn't occur to them. You see if they wanted me
to talk to someone in my form, I'd be talking to them as a
form teacher. My position in the House is non-existent,
except that I happen to be the bloke who's room is used for
Perkins house for assemblies on Tuesday mornings and that is
it, you know. I have no role in the House at all. If I
particularly wanted to I could probably generate one for
myself in the sense that I could help out with one of the
House football teams or something but otherwise I don't fit
into that system at all, so already there's a parallel
system, if you like, there is a House system and a form
system. The ones .. the kids in my form I know well and I
see a lot and I have a lot of dealings with them outside of
academic subjects. So this plan is, you know, the year group,
is to try and integrate these systems. So with year groups
we have got a group whose interests are all in common, ......
............. identity of interests situations and then
you have got a team of teachers all of whom are their form
teachers, so I know them very well. The disadvantage I
think, the only disadvantage, is this question about trying
to create the kind of almost familial structure of different
age groups inside the House system - but that's such a tenuous
thing, it doesn't really exist anyway. It is supposed to, but
I mean the 6th form in one House really hasn't got anything to
do with the 4th form or in the second House. Nothing.

Interv: What are the major problems with the House system as it operates
at present?

P: Well (a) most staff have no part (b) it doesn't synchronize
with the form system. A form is a much better unit and if you
want a larger unit it seems to me the thing to do is to get all
the forms in a year group into the larger unit. This is much
less wastage, much more possibility for individual attention,
using staff much more rationally, your team in your unit are all
form teachers inside that unit and therefore already they know
a fifth of the kids very intimately.

Interv: Does this mean, in fact, the House system has been confronting
the form system almost in opposition?

P: Not exactly in opposition but certainly they are almost parallel
systems. And you see, what happens is that everybody has their
own kind of disciplinary structure, if you like. Some people
who like to deal with everything themselves, almost always, but
there are times when nobody can, and there are some people who
will report a student or send him to their form teachers first,
others who will send him to their House teacher first and then
maybe tell the form teacher and maybe not and so on, and others
who will send them straight to the Deputy Head and then possibly
tell the House teacher or the form teacher or maybe not, or maybe
everybody and so on. There is nothing necessarily wrong with
everybody having their own way of doing it like that, but to me
it isn't nearly tight enough, not in the sense of simply being
effective.

Interv: What's the official line on this?
**I:** I think the way it works is that the House teachers to whom the student has been referred and the form teacher should be informed of the situation and then the House teacher will decide perhaps in conjunction with the form teacher what to do or whether to take it further to the Deputy Head or something. I think that’s the structure.

(History & Social Studies Teacher: **I:** Ashton)

At Ashton, then, the groups with which teachers had the most personal and ongoing contact – the form groups – did not accord with the House structure. As this teacher indicated he could be well informed about the pupils in his form but only about five or six of those pupils need be in the House with which he was associated.

The form teachers at Ashton did not have an officially designated pastoral role in the sense that a tutor would, but as a result of their close contact with the pupils in their forms, through class teaching and form administration, they were in a better position to know those pupils than, perhaps, other members of staff – even including the Heads of House. The pastoral care and guidance which they offered could be effected consequently on the basis of being a form teacher as much as a member of the House organization. The form groups and the House system, that is, constituted distinct systems unlike a House/tutor group system such as that operative in Beechgrove. Forms were regarded officially as administrative units rather than pastoral units at Ashton. Form teachers, though nominally attached to a House did not need to have any significant involvement in the affairs of the House, nor were they likely to have any special awareness of the problems of pupils in their House. In practice, however, they did not adopt a role bereft of pastoral involvement. Their contact with the pupils in the form was akin to that of the tutor with his/her tutor group in the sense that it provided (a) a grass-root contact which, in terms of feature of school organization,
included all pupils, and (b) consequently was a significant channel of communication for the Heads of House. The Heads of House, though a focal point of pastoral care and guidance in the school, had to operate, in practice, through the form system in a manner not alien to that of the House/tutorsystem at Beechgrove.

At Beechgrove the House teachers had beneath them a system of tutor groups (with the exception of the first year) to whom they could refer both in terms of delegating responsibility for particular problems and in receiving information about pupils. In this case, there was a formal line of communication through which the information was to travel. The House system contained not only the Heads of House but also the tutors whose grass-roots contact with pupils was formally integrated within the House system. A Head of House, then, could operate through a tutor knowing that all the pupils in a tutor group were members of one House, and similarly, tutors wishing to pass on information concerning pastoral care and guidance had only to contact either of the two appropriate Heads of House.

Such channels of communication, from tutor or from form teacher, reflected the formal provision for the collection of information through "personal" modes of referral, but in practice many referrals were instigated not as a result of a form teacher's or tutor's observations during form periods or tutor group periods, but arose through events in the teaching situation, i.e. from teachers conducting classroom lessons. In these instances, it was not practical in most circumstances to attempt to contact the pupil's form teacher or tutor (see chapter X). Nor did teachers always follow the official routes when referring pupils. At Beechgrove, for instance, teachers experiencing problems with whole classes (rather than individuals) were enjoined to seek help and guidance from Heads of Department, and not the Heads of House, yet in practice such
channels were often by-passed or ignored with problems being taken direct to the Heads of House who, though they saw the referral as perhaps inappropriate, did not insist that the proper channels be observed. (see Appendix II)

Well, there is a procedure laid down which doesn't necessarily happen in practice. In the procedure, if a member of staff has problems in the classroom, they're supposed to tell their Head of Department, who is then either supposed to deal with it him or herself, or consult tutors or Heads of Houses. But very often a teacher will come straight to the Head of House. And you don't say "Oh, no, you've done it the wrong way; you've got to go to your Head of Department, whose got to go to the tutor whose got to come to us". You know, but that is laid down if they follow it.

(Head of House: My : Beechgrove)

Although, the Heads of House felt that the Heads of Department did not do enough to aid control and discipline, they accepted that referrals might come direct from the subject teachers. Not only were the Heads of Department by-passed as an organizational unit of control, in such instances, but so were the tutors. In practical terms, this had the advantage that the teacher had only to know to which House a pupil belonged in order to make a referral, rather than attempting to trace a particular tutor, who might not even share the same staff-room.

It would appear, then, that the differences between Ashton and Beechgrove in their use of forms and tutor-groups respectively reflected varying officially-designated channels for the communication of pastoral matters, but that such differences (a) referred specifically to the "personal" mode of referral, and (b) were subject to improvisation, particularly under the circumstances at Ashton. Subject teachers at either school wishing to implement alternative modes of referral, notably "direct" and "documentary", tended to operate through the Heads of House because for practical purposes it was considered inappropriate to use any formally approved channels which might exist. The "documentary" mode of
referral provided automatic communication to the Heads of House at either school whilst the "direct" modes of referral could only involve tutors or form teachers where their identity was readily available and where they could be called upon in the immediate situation, - both of which were problematic (see Chapter X).

The centrality of the Heads of House to the operation of the House system even at Beechgrove was evident in their discretionary care and guidance of pupils:

If it's a tutor that I know will deal with it, and in my opinion (this sounds very pompous - but you have to act in your own opinion a lot of the time) - adequately, I will probably pass the whole thing over to the tutor. If it's somebody who I think can't deal with it, or hasn't got the time, or some reason won't be able to at that time, I'll deal with it and tell them what I've done in order to keep them informed. You know, there are a lot of kids that I just do know better than the tutors. And if you have tutors that .. we haven't this year ... but last year we had three tutors who were in their probationary year themselves, and so were having a hell of enough to do without doing that many extra things with tutor groups. So, very often, we took over and told them what we were doing. But I've got one, for example, very good tutor at the moment, but I know she's very overworked in her department. And it's not because I don't think she could do it equally as well as me, but I know that she just hasn't got the time at the moment, so I do lots of little things that I know she could do, and I just tell her I've done them, and she doesn't mind that. I think she's quite grateful ....

(Head of House : My : Beechgrove)
Feedback

The practical problems of communication for the House teachers were not confined, however, to the collection of the information from the teachers. They were also aware of problems associated with the feedback of information to form teachers, subject teachers and tutors. It was clear to the House staff that unless they were to let the referring teachers know of the action which had been taken, the referring teachers might tend to assume that no action had been taken, and thus feel that referring pupils was a fruitless process. This posed a particular problem where the nature of the action taken by the House teacher had no immediate or overt effect on the classroom behaviour of the pupil.

As a Head of House at Ashton put it:

... it's important, I think to go back to the subject teacher and let them know what you have done and sometimes if it is dramatic, it might be .... so-and-so has been caned, excluded whatever, transferred and we do it that way. I think one of the problems, it does fall down with subject teachers, you know, .. um .. they had a problem over and .. um .. feel, you know, nothing of what's going on, and it could be all sorts of things going on afterwards and .. um .. if you don't refer back to the subject teachers, then they feel left out in the dark, you know, suspicious of the system.

You know, they might think "what the hell's he doing!" you know, so there's that kind of thing. While, of course, time is one of these factors where you can't always, you know, someone whose travelling between sites and might even see them once a week and so if I don't leave them a note or send them a note or make a point of seeing them, it might be a week, fortnight before I see them, they'll say "what have you done about that?" In a place like this, such a large building, you know, so many ships parting .. um .. it could well be that you know, you might forget to inform someone that you've taken a particular line of action and then they become suspicious of the system or say that House teacher's not doing their job. "There's not much point referring anyone to them!" you know and the problem multiplies.

(Head of House : Wa : Ashton)
This was a sentiment echoed and elaborated upon by one of the Heads of House at Beechgrove whose comments illustrated the problem faced by Heads of House where the action they took was not of a kind that was immediately recognizable to the teacher in the classroom situation.

We write to parents, we keep them fully informed which, in a sense, could be certainly with some parents it's a sanction; we ask parents to come up to school a lot and we have .. um .. pretty good contact with them in certain circumstances; we see Social Workers and all the other outside agencies. We refer .. you refer kids to .. um .. you know, for help of one sort and another ...... so-on-and-so-forth. So one of the dangers is that people say there's nothing being done but in the old days if you had a kid and you gave him a walloping well it was, you know, the kid said "I had the stick" or "I got walloped for it" and something seemed to be done and you know, that person's sense of guilt had been washed away as it were. But now .. um .. it's not so obvious you know, when you do anything to a kid. And we had a situation not so long ago, when people got very up-tight about a Fifth Year boy in my House who had been doing a lot of leaping about in the building over there and generally being obnoxious and he's .. um .. he's a very big, hefty lad, taller than almost anybody in the school, staff included, I don't know why, and he's got a very loud mouth and he's very silly and although he's got a body of a man he's got a mind of, you know, a 12 year old, and he lumbers about and he bashes on doors and swears at people. He makes everybody's life a misery but you see what happens is that he does this and people see it and they store it up in the back of their minds, and suddenly they're all .... something will come up which will sort of polarize all these feelings you have and it will ... people will be in the Staff-room usually and then they will say, they will talk about it and say "Nothing's been done about him" and I will have about 4 or 5 people approach me and say that "There is all sorts of things going on and there's nothing being done about this kid, well why?". I won't have heard anything about most of these incidents because they will have been on their own, will have been fairly insignificant but they will pile up in people's minds so I have not been in a position to know, although I could have been expecting that they have been going on because I know the kid .. um .. and in fact things are going on and that this particular kid, I have been to see his parents, his father had been to see the Head and he had been excluded from school for a couple of weeks but, you know, it's not possible to inform every member
of staff what's happening about every kid, unless of course, somebody comes and says "Look, I'm a bit bothered about this kid, he's giving me hell" and I will say "Well, I'm doing this, that and the other with him, and you know, it would perhaps help if you could do this and let me know if he doesn't do any work and, you know, we will work closely together". And I think for the kid ... for his own sake more than anyone else, one doesn't publicise .. um .. things generally about him. One would only repeat to people who would need to know it, and in that situation you get people feeling that .. um .. you know, things aren't being done, where in fact they are being done behind the scenes. They are being done you know, virtually all the time.

(Head of House : La : Beechgrove)

The communication of issues pertaining to pastoral care and guidance centred on the Heads of House. The practical problems of communication, however, existed not solely in the collection of pertinent information from diverse and informal sources but also existed in terms of the feedback of information to subject teachers about the action that had been taken as a result of a referral. This feedback was difficult to achieve in a large school, but was regarded as essential in avoiding the suspicions of subject teachers that perhaps no action had been taken. Because the action which they took might not be readily observable to the subject teachers it was a necessary task for the House staff to keep the referring teacher informed about the action which had, in fact, been taken, whilst at the same time, attempting not to "broadcast" the problems and remedial action relating to the particular pupil.
**Clientele**

In practice, then, the Heads of House provided the basis of pastoral care and guidance. Operating through the form teachers/tutors or the subject teachers, the Heads of House had a central location with respect to both the communication of pertinent information and the instigation of relevant action. They had to rely, however, on the information which resulted from informally organized channels of communication. In practice this had the effect, noted with some dissatisfaction by all the House staff, that the pupils with whom they had contact in pastoral terms were but a small minority of the pupils in the school. There existed, that is, no positive organizational provision whereby the Heads of House came into contact with all the pupils in their House:

One of the things really I find, you spend far too much time...um...taken up with dealing with the difficult pupils who might just be a matter of 10/15% of the total number of pupils under your supervision, and it means that the other 85/90% you don't spend so much time on. I'd like to think that I would be able to spend an equal number of hours or minutes with each pupil...um...I ought to, for instance, each First Year within the first month, interview them as soon as I know who they are. Um...when I've got a photograph on the record card the child ought to be there and I ought to be able to talk to them. I never yet have found enough time to do this. I have spoken to the different groups, say 185 like, once a week I might get them together and sort of ask how they are getting on, you know, try to draw the information out of them really, it ought to be just in...either singly or two's or three's. I haven't yet managed to operate that.

(Head of House: Wa: Ashton)

The small minority of pupils who stood out from the rest on the grounds, either of particularly poor behaviour, or because of excellence at sporting or academic activities were not regarded, that is as necessarily suitable material for counselling:
... there is no formal ... um ... procedure ... as there is no definite time when every pupil in a House sees the House teacher. Um ... some pupils will get very well known by the House teacher because they have a particular problem while they are at school - 'cos they participate in school activities a great deal, or because they are in a number of discipline problems and get referred to the House teacher. Other pupils may get to know the House teacher for quite the opposite reason - because they're a very good participant in sporting activities or House activities of some kind, or very good academically and get gossiped about in the staff-room for this reason. And House teachers get to know them that way. And in between, there are a vast number of pupils who are neither very bad nor are they very good in any way you like to specify - and hardly get known at all. In fact, it's certainly true that ... er ... in the House which I run, there must be a large number of pupils which I hardly know. In fact, I'd have to look them up in the records to find out if they're in my House or not.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

This was a view paralleled by another House Teacher who said that:

... in fact there may be a lot of problems in the school which escape us because we only see two types of person - those who are troublesome and have troubles, and those who are very good who come in for praise. But I suppose the 50% say between the two, we don't really know.

There are a lot of kids missed in ... in this great big educational system, and sometimes they ... er ... you know, there is something radically wrong with them. It might be a sort of psychological thing or it could be an educational thing. I am appalled sometimes when kids I meet ... kids in the fourth year (...) and I sometimes wonder how they ... um ... escape the net and get this far with ... with some sort of great psychological problems or some ... er ... you know, educational problems. (...)

We aren't very successful I don't think at diagnosing things as teachers because ... um ... they don't come to our notice until too late. You see there is no system whereby here I could talk to every child in my House for instance. (...) Unless I could get someone to run my House for me once a week, and then get a group in here and talk to them.

(Head of House : Do : Ashton)
In the eyes of the House staff the operation of the House system faced the problem that neither the time nor the official channels of communication provided contact with all pupils in the House and in fact those pupils who came into contact with the House staff were (a) a small minority of pupils, and (b) the athletic or academic superstars (who were not normally the subject matter of counselling), or the "super bad asses" who were persistently in trouble.

There's just two or three teachers in each House who conduct some contact, and what this means is that the only kids who get any special kind of relationship which the House is supposed to provide, counselling, pastoral and all that kind of thing, are the super bad asses who are always in trouble all of the time, and the sports starts and that kind of thing, and there's a great kind of silent majority if you like, who are just faceless members.

(Social Studies & History Teacher : Pi : Ashton)

In consequence, the actual task of the Heads of House included, in their eyes, an unacceptably large amount of effort devoted to disciplinary matters at the expense of counselling:

Um .. too much of my time and too much of the House staff's time I think is taken up with the .. um .. day-to-day ritual type school problems of an institutional nature, rather than a long term emotional one. I really think that that's what we are here for, not to take the part of the counsellor by any means, but I think that that's where we ought to be working, more and more rather than on .. say with the School's running effectively. Um .. I also .. I think shall we say, the School's running side of it and put 10%, and the rest say, you know .. Oh, it's difficult to break it down into percentages all the time .. um .. I certainly spend far too much time on that type of problem as opposed to the serious ones.

(Head of House : Wa : Ashton)

As a result of the type of referral they received the Heads of House argued that their role was less involved with the pastoral care and guidance of (all) the pupils in the school, or even those with
emotional problems: it was, instead, evolving toward that of a "discipline specialist" or "trouble-shooter" - precisely the kind of back-up to control problems deplored in the official guidelines. In practice, that is, their task was dependent on the nature of the clientele with whom they dealt, and these clientele were the product of a socially organized process of referral stemming from the practical situation within which teachers saw themselves as operating.
Counselling and Control: a role strain

The course of action adopted as a result of referrals reflected a dilemma of roles facing the Heads of House. In accordance with the official guidelines, they all advocated a pastoral welfare role as appropriate to their position, yet recognized that, in practice, they were under pressure to involve themselves in the maintenance of discipline in the schools. Some felt that the two aspects were both "part of the job", but all recognized a strain inherent in attempts to be both counsellor and disciplinarian. When deciding upon the appropriate course of action, usually, as a result of a "direct" referral, this role strain was evident.

Explanation of the strain by the Heads of House, however, entailed assessments by them of the source of the referral and hence the qualities of subject teachers engaged in the process of referral. Consideration of the problems affecting the nature of action adopted by them thus provided an account of the problem of control in the classroom by focusing on the manner in which the Heads of House interpreted the reasons for the referrals.

The pressures to operate on matters which they did not regard as appropriate put the House staff in something of a dilemma in terms of their relationships with pupils. As a House teacher put it, they were called upon to adopt a Jeckyll and Hyde personality because, in one instance, they could be required to "discipline" a pupil and thus invoke an authoritarian distinction between the position of "teacher" and "pupil", whilst in the next they might need to break down such barriers in order to provide an effective counselling service:

..... we have all applied for these jobs as House Teachers and the House teacher's job originally was to be a counsellor, plus discipline, which means one has to have a Jeckyll and Hyde personality really, 'cos .. um .. at one moment you are trying to discipline pupils .. er .. actually for other people, not always for yourself - very rarely for yourself because you have usually got quite a good relationship with your own House. And one of the great problems is, you get sent people to the House room with behaviour problems within the classroom.
You have to deal with those behaviour problems and then say a week after, they may be coming to you, or ought to come to you, for some advice - they might have got themselves into some sort of trouble outside and so you have this strange .. er .. thing where you have got some .. one moment you're sort of telling them off and trying to put .. er .. trying to sort of put them on the straight and narrow and the next moment you are trying to get their confidence because they might be depressed over something (...)  

I mean this is what we are employed for see, for discipline and for advice and really the two things are so diametrically opposed really. See, in .. in one case you have got to keep a kid away and say you know "You keep your place; I am punishing you; you are a little swine; you shouldn't have done it" and the other one you are trying to draw him nearer to get his confidence. Well, the thing is if you have bitten him he's not going to come very near you. He's going to be a bit wary and you have lost him. So .. so, therefore, having House staff who are responsible for both .. er is .. is a problem  

(Head of House : Do : Ashton)  

The House staff at both schools were in general agreement that their pastoral role called for a degree of sympathy and understanding with the pupils, and that this required an attempt to break-through any authoritarian relationship which might characterize a normal teacher/pupil relationship. But where the House staff were called upon regularly to deal with "discipline" problems it became progressively more difficult to establish the necessary rapport.  

The strain which this put upon the role of the House teacher was in addition to that which arose from conflicting commitments of time between academic and pastoral duties. In this instance the strain existed in the relationship which the House Teacher had with the pupils - a strain which was increased where the House Teachers were called upon to execute "extra-ordinary" disciplinary duties. The strain between the two aspects of the House teachers everyday duties existed in any case because they ordinarily had to conduct classroom lessons, and thus maintain their own control of the classroom, as well as provide pastoral
care and guidance for pupils who might happen by coincidence to be members of their class. As a Head of House explained:

When you are in the classroom and you expect the kind of relationships which might be different from an informal relationship, whereby you are trying to help someone to solve a problem ... um ... It's difficult I think because it's two different roles, two different images and ... I find it difficult and I think the pupils find it difficult as well; where you stop being an authoritarian in a liberal sense and where do you start being someone who can offer help.

(Head of House: Wa: Ashton)

This inbuilt strain on the relationship, however, was made worse where the House staff were called upon to deal with "other People's" problems to what they considered an unwarranted extent. The abundance of "inappropriate" referrals with which they had to deal put under more pressure their already ambivalent relationship with the pupils. Any form of classroom teaching required them to maintain control, which meant invoking a certain degree of authority, ("authoritarian in a liberal sense" - ) and this approach to relationships with pupils was not considered to aid the kind of personal non-authoritarian approach necessary for counselling. Hence, teachers whose duties included both pastoral guidance and academic subject teaching were automatically put in a position of strain vis a vis their relationships with the pupils.

The House staff recognized this and accepted it as a part of the job, but what they objected to was the additional strain imposed through having to deal with "direct" referrals which they considered as dealing with "other people's" problems and constituting an inappropriate use of the House system. At Ashton, a Head of House elaborated upon this point and referred to a particular instance which illustrated the nature of the dilemma facing the House teacher's role:
Well ... the term "pastoral care of the children" includes counselling. In fact, really, it should include more counselling and less discipline. Then there is, of course, the big argument in fact whether it is possible for us to do what we are doing to any great extent ... to mix the two. Lots of counsellors say that you can't do it, you have really got to be a counsellor ... and you've really got to be a counsellor you've got to be a counsellor and you can't pretend to be an authoritarian figure. Another school of counselling says that you're in locum parentis, and the parent would in fact take one of those roles.

**Interv:** How does this become difficult in practice, in the actual day-to-day .. ?

Err, well, for example ... two weeks ago I had a girl who was a real terror in school ... and she would swear at teachers, stomp out of the room, and all sorts of things like this. No authoritarian methods would put her right - only the ultimate force of capital punishment - and I had to sort out what was the problem. The problem wasn't school at all, the problem was at home. The father ... the mother had left when she was three and ... er ... the boyfriend was doing this, that and the other, and I had to adopt a very equal attitude to her ... to be a friend virtually, yet at the same time I had to be a member of staff. She called me this, that and the other ... what could I do about it? And this is the conflict.

(Head of House: Ir: Ashton)

The House staff at both schools argued that their function was basically one of pastoral guidance, yet acknowledged that in practice - as teachers in a community of teachers - there were pressures involved to adopt an authoritarian stance. The contradiction between the teacher's attempt "to adopt a very equal attitude" to the girl while implicitly objecting to being called "this, that and the other" reflects this dilemma facing the Heads of House.

It was a source of conflict, however, which was exacerbated by the manner in which the subject staff were seen to use the House system, i.e. with emphasis upon the immediate problems of discipline and classroom control, and through the mode of "direct" referral. The Heads of House felt that in practice they were becoming increasingly regarded as "the discipline specialists" to whom the problems of recalcitrant pupils could
be referred. Subject teachers commented upon the discipline specialism of the House staff in such terms as:

(The House Staff) are in charge of the discipline of the children in their House. So, if there are any discipline problems for any members of staff they send the child to the House teacher who deals with it.

(History Teacher : Sa: Ashton)

This was even an opinion acknowledged by a member of the House staff at the school who pointed out that "Usually ..... um House Teachers are um .. appear to be appointed on a discipline basis. If they can keep good discipline then they'll become a House Teacher.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

From the House staff's point of view, however, the acceptance of "discipline" as part of their function was an acknowledgment of what they considered to be a real state of affairs and did not reflect an interpretation of what the House Teachers' role should be under ideal circumstances. The House staff were aware that they were becoming increasingly regarded by subject teachers as the members of staff with special responsibility for discipline. The pressure of work was coming from the "discipline problem" side to such an extent that one of the Heads of House commented:

I suppose I'll go for weeks and it will only be discipline problems really because, in my opinion, this room is being used wrongly as a discipline room.

(Head of House : Do : Ashton)

The situation had evolved at the schools where discipline and the House systems had come to be regarded as integral components of the pastoral care and guidance of pupils. The prospect of altering the situation was not viewed with much optimism, and the House staff had a somewhat resigned
attitude to this integration of discipline within the House system.

This I find is where most of the difficulties arise - staff do tend to use the House system for just one particular purpose, namely discipline. Um ... this is something which I can see the point of it obviously, because the demerit system is tied in with the House system. Um .. a part of it comes from it. But I'd much prefer to see discipline taken out of the system but .. er .. obviously you can't. It's so in-built and such an on-going process that I can't see how you can take the petty discipline as opposed to the serious problem .. um .. out of the House system.

(Head of House : Wa : Ashton)

The increasing "discipline specialism" of the House staff was apparent in the informal organization which both schools had adopted whereby at most times in the school day a member of the House staff was available in the House room to deal with any "crisis" events which may occur. This informal arrangement, that is, not only reflected an attempt to overcome the problems of conflicting (time) commitments to pastoral and academic duties but also the practical pressures on the House staff with the immediate problems of discipline and control arising in the classroom.

In response to the demands placed on them to deal with discipline problems both schools had evolved the co-operative practice whereby a Head of House would deal with any immediate problem, and not just those involving a member of his/her particular House. Though the longer-term emotional disturbance problems were still dealt with in terms of House membership, the Heads of House acted in a positional capacity qua "Head of House", rather than Head of any particular House, when called upon to deal with immediate "crisis" problems.
If it's... or... a crisis thing and the kid's having hysterics or the teacher's having hysterics, then anybody else will deal with it, anybody that's here. Or if... or, what happens quite often... a message comes down and says could somebody come up and help me with so-and-so, whoever's in there - regardless of who the kid is - will go up and deal with it temporarily, but won't make any long-term arrangements. You... you'll deal with it at that moment and then pass it on to the appropriate Head of House.

Interv: Is there always somebody down here?

No, there is virtually always in practice, but it hasn't been structured like that. And it works out that we're nearly always in.

(Head of House: My: Beechgrove)

In practice, then, the House staff had developed a system whereby there was "virtually always" someone available to deal with 'crisis' events. At Ashton, this practice was even more accentuated, especially in the upper school where it had been consciously developed:

... it's interesting that this year at Ashton, instead of an informal situation where a form teacher sends a pupil directly to his own House teacher or says "Go, and see your House teacher at lunch-time or after school", or goes to the effort of finding out where the House teacher himself is teaching, and brings him along, there's now a system at the school by which a House teacher is on duty continuously every lesson of the day... and always in the House room. So that a teacher, during any time of the day, can send a pupil to the House room where a House teacher will be found. It could be any House teacher not necessarily the House teacher of the pupil concerned. In fact, the House teachers at (upper school) particularly operate very much on a group basis, and it doesn't really matter whether the pupil who arrives is in your House or not, unless it's a particular problem which is undoubtedly going to involve a great deal of counselling. When it comes to everybody... um... disciplining of a... a particular problem within a class, who's really talking or throwing things around, or... or fighting or something of this kind, where it appears a quick solution may be found - the House teacher in charge will just deal with it, and that'll be it.

(Head of House: Ha: Ashton)

The House staff on all occasions made it clear that this sharing of the work-load applied only to the "discipline specialist" tasks and to the
immediate "crisis" events, and that those referrals which appeared
to warrant further counselling would be passed over to the appropriate
Head of House. This was true even of the special circumstances of
Ashton's lower school:

I mean because there are only two Houses and we all
sort of get on and work well together .. you could put
it like that .. so we have a sort of interchange. But
we would not go on .. I mean, supposing we used "first-
aid" therapy as you might call it in a particular
situation where a child has been sent out, then we would
not then necessarily follow that through. We would pass
it on to this other person.

(Head of House : wa : Ashton)

This informal arrangement reflected a further aspect of the House
teachers' duties which arose from the practical circumstances within
which they operated, - the Head(s) of House on duty in the House room
could be called upon to deal with problems which did not arise from
pupils in the House, but acknowledged an obligation to deal with all
situations of a particularly disruptive nature irrespective of the
House of the offending pupil(s). At Beechgrove a Head of House illustrated
the kind of routine task he might be called upon to deal with in this
respect:

You see, I mean, there's all sorts of discipline
problems in the classroom. There is the sort where
maybe a kid isn't working but he's not particularly
disrupting the lesson or he says something stupid and
it's thought necessary to let his tutor know about it:
or there is the situation where a child is completely
disrupting what's going on and you know, and the other
kids are then suffering and so something needs to be
done immediately. And it may be a situation where they
have got to call on somebody to .. um .. to come and
say remove the kid for that lesson. Um .. or do some-
thing else to see, if you know, to allow the lesson to go
on for the rest of the class.

Interv: Yeh, at that stage the particular House of the pupil doesn't matter.

It doesn't matter because, inevitably, what happens then is that
you know, like in this situation now you get called out .. you
know, the phone will ring and .. or .. you go.
**Interv:** Can you, without giving details of the actual pupil, can you explain how you deal with the problem. You know, like... to explain for me how to deal with the problem? From answering the phone, going up and dealing with the type of problem... You know, without mentioning the names.

**La:** Well, this afternoon what happened in fact was that um... I was... there was a girl who should have been... it was a series of events really. There was a girl who had been going from French, for a period in a remedial class, you know, for some special coaching and she refused to go out because, as well as having a reading problem she's also got a behaviour problem, and nobody could get her out of the room. So I was asked if I... and in the absence of the Head of First Year, because she happened to be a first-year, they said, would I go and get her out, which I did. And then, as I was coming away from having done that, you know, there were some boys leaping about upstairs outside R.E. and um... the chap who was taking R.E. came out and said: "I think that boy's taken my book" and I said to him, "Have you got his book?" and he said "No", and he fairly obviously had it under his coat, and um... he had got this book under his coat and I said, "Well, look," you know "you have been hiding it under your coat" you know and with that he lost his temper and started to leap about and... er... went fairly berserk. Anyway, he was finally persuaded to come down here with me because obviously in that state he couldn't be left up there because I thought, you know, he would have gone over the top. We came down here and saw the Deputy Head because I thought the best thing then would be for him to go home and in that state, and he lost his temper again, and... er... he then went off out of the room and kicked at bins and doors as he went swearing, and went out of school. And then, about ten minutes later, as we expected, he came back in again, and, as we expected, he was a bit calmer. And I have just been speaking with him and... um... sort of talking him down a bit and I think now he is fairly calm. I left him with another person and... er... he will probably go home now for the rest of the afternoon not for punitive reasons but simply to sort of regain such equilibrium.

**Interv:** Is there any automatic follow-up from that or...?

**La:** Well, the follow-up from that would be that I'll see his Head of House and then, depending on what she thinks, um... or in fact they think because there is two of them, think is appropriate they will do because they... you know... they are expected to know him and to know if this is a particular trait of his character or if it is a sort of one-off thing, but it will be left largely up to them what is done. I won't have any specific action.

**Interv:** So the longer-term problems are transferred over, then, to the...

**La:** Yeh, it's a short-term sort of crisis where somebody is teaching... out of school or something, then there's no choice who deals with it, somebody has got to deal with it.

(Head of House: La: Beechgrove)
By accepting the arrangement of having one member of the House staff available at most times to deal with immediate problems the House staff involved themselves with the task of control (in addition to the "counselling" which they regarded as their proper task) and further, did so at a "generalized" level. That is, the way in which they were involved in control situations did not reflect any expertise which resulted from a significant knowledge of the personal problems of the pupil at hand, because in many instances they were called upon to cope with situations where their particular knowledge of the pupil was no greater than other teachers, and although the pupil might be referred to the relevant member of House staff at a later stage, at the moment of "crisis" action the House staff could not assume such personal knowledge.

The Head of House role, then, involved more than just a counselling role for the pastoral care and guidance of the pupils in their particular House. It involved an element of general discipline control which was manifested in the informal arrangement of duties, and which existed as an exigency in response to the manner in which the subject teachers were using the system.

- classroom control and "direct" referrals

It was evident that at Ashton and Beechgrove a "control" function had been integrated into the duties of Heads of House, and that they were subject to pressure to adopt a "discipline specialist" function at the expense of the counselling deemed appropriate for pastoral care and guidance.

The "direct" referrals, which occupied a large proportion of their time, particularly reflected this use of the House system.

When acting upon "direct" referrals, however, the Heads of House were placed in the position of deciding whether the referral had occurred through an emotional problem of the pupil, or a control problem of the
teacher. The practical reasoning employed by the Heads of House in identifying which was the case provided a source of information about the problem of classroom control.

I would say the House Teacher's function should not be to deal with minor breaches of discipline in class because a class teacher ought to be able to deal with them. But I feel there are certain breaches of discipline which crop up regularly and it begins to be obvious that there are factors influencing a child's behaviour outside school, and .. er .. possibly in school generally, and nothing to do with a particular subject something rather than high spiritedness, something which needs counselling, advice and finding out about, which is too time-consuming to deal with in the lesson. And this is where the House staff ought to operate. Um .. however, it's my experience that House Teachers spend a lot of their time dealing with .. er .. high spiritedness, which the .. er .. the particular class teacher had been unable to cope with, and for which there's no real need for counselling. And .. um .. it's rather a lack of experience on the side of the particular class teacher in charge.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

The "lack of experience" identified by this teacher as a source of "inappropriate" referrals, was indicative of a particular kind of teacher who was generally acknowledged as more prone to the use of the House staff as a discipline back-up and to aid classroom control. It was specifically the new teachers, the young, probationary, inexperienced and new arrivals, who were considered to be the ones who would use the system in this inappropriate manner because it was these teachers who had the problems with control in the classroom.

As far as discipline, etc. is concerned .. um .. usually the House teacher's function is to help the discipline of new members of staff who are .. who have problems with discipline themselves, for one reason or another, and who will send pupils to a House teacher if they have problems with them.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

Schools which had a high proportion of "new" teachers - probationers, supply teachers and recent arrivals - would allegedly have to contend with larger than average problems of control in the classroom, and consequently greater than average pressure upon the House staff to adopt a
discipline specialist function. Ashton and Beechgrove were such cases, (see Chapter II). The high cost of housing was having an effect on the age and experience of the teachers to be found in these schools and in London generally. As a remedial teacher at Beechgrove indicated this had definite effects upon the quality of teaching in the school:

Um .. a school depends on .. on its members, on all the staff .. er .. and where you have a situation where .. er .. the staff is largely young teachers, with little experience, you are going to have enormous problems which you simply can't solve. Um .. and you are going to have many teachers who are completely defeated. Um .. and this is becoming the situation. Yes, we are coming to the situation in London where because .. um .. economic situation that people can't buy houses and so on that .. um .. all the teachers with a middle strata, with a fair amount of experience .. um .. are leaving, they aren't getting jobs in London, they are moving out. And you are getting older teachers coming near to retirement and most of the young ones stop for a short period and .. er .. then move on, so that .. um .. the problems are enormous and you can't solve them.

(Remedial Teacher: Sl: Beechgrove)

One consequence of this over-representation of "new" teachers in the schools was the extra pressure put to bear on the House systems to shift away from a concern with pastoral care and guidance toward a concern with discipline and the maintenance of control in the classroom. Now whilst the Heads of House felt it reasonable to adopt such a role with respect to the referrals of new teachers they did so because they regarded new teachers as a special category; in general, however, control of the classroom was unambiguously regarded as the province of the subject teacher (by both the official guidelines and the Heads of House and experienced teachers). The House staff, that is, saw their back-up function as appropriate purely for those circumstances where the new members of staff might face problems as a result of their newness, and specifically did not regard it as their function to provide a permanent or continual back-up for discipline problems which, in their opinion,
arose from the high-spiritedness of the pupils and which were properly the concern of the subject teacher in charge of the classroom.

To understand how the House staff interpreted referrals to the system in general it becomes necessary to explain what it was about the "newness" of staff which apparently gave rise to the extraordinary amounts of problems they faced in connection with maintaining control and discipline in the classroom setting. Explanations often referred to the expectations of teachers fresh from colleges of education about the nature of the classroom situation into which they were to enter. It was argued by the experienced staff that young members of staff did not realise that the most important aspect of being a successful teacher was to establish control of the class before any attempt at teaching could really be made. The colleges of education were regarded as not equipping teachers with the kind of expectations about teaching which were relevant to the actual and practical teaching situation. As an experienced History teacher at Ashton put it:

"... they come out of college with all these bright ideas - these marvellous ideas - and yet when they find they're in the classroom situation they try and put these ideas over before establishing their own classroom discipline and then they find they just go down and down and down and down. And so many of them find that they are failures. A lot of them give up very easily. You know, they don't seem to teach them in the Teach .... in the Colleges now, it's discipline first, you can put over your subject ... afterwards. You have to establish your rapport with the child ... the children in the classroom. They'll know where they are with you and you'll know where you are with them - and then you can start from square one. But you have to get that first."

(History Teacher: Sa: Ashton)

Colleges of education were seen as underplaying the practical necessities of establishing control in the classroom. The new teachers, as a result of their college of education training exhibited a general tendency to prefer a more liberal and less authoritarian approach to
teaching in the classroom it was argued by the experienced staff[^3^],
yet were in the least advantageous position to implement such innova-
tions successfully.

Certainly, some teachers do try and break down
the (authority) situation, especially teachers who
are recently out of training college and have new
ideas, and try and do group work, and this particular
type of thing. Within this situation there is in
fact a larger problem of control. (Head of House: Ha : Ashton)

This is a view in sympathy with that expressed by an English Teacher
at Beechgrove who described how a student teacher had taken over her
class, and been too keen to establish good personal relationships, etc.
at the expense of discipline:

And with this girl, she was so intent on the relation-
ship angle ..., that her relationship should be good, that
she eased up a bit too much, right at the beginning, and
there was nothing she ..., they were running away with her
because there were 30 kids sometimes to you, and you can't
do it.

(English Teacher : Ho : Beechgrove)

New teachers, then, faced a resocialization into the realities of
the teaching situation when they arrived at the schools from the colleges
of education - when theory stopped and the practice began.[^4^] At Ashton,
the Deputy Headmaster - who had special responsibility for teachers in
the school - felt that the difference between the expectations of new
staff and the actualities of the school were so great that the school
was fortunate to retain any new teachers for very long;

[^3^]: This finds support in research such as that of Finlayson and
Cohen 1967.

[^4^]: The distinction between the theory of colleges of education and
the practice of teacher has become a controversial issue, with
consequent attempts to diminish the difference using special
projects for college of education students. (cf. Hannam et al 1971)
It's a miracle to me that any young teacher stops more than 2 or 3 months in the job at all. Because thinking back to the time when I started, I found, as all young teachers do, terrible difficulties... er... in adjusting. Young teachers now, say, you know, the real problem... I am thinking of one young woman in particular, a very good young teacher, this is her first year in this building. For the first term she was very unhappy and she said afterwards, trying to analyse these problems... um... and be philosophical about it, her real problem was that she expected something totally different because of her college training, it was such a shock when she came here that it was nothing like she had been led to believe and this is... this caused her almost to throw the job up.

(Deputy Headmaster: Co: Ashton)

The colleges of education were accused of providing the schools with teachers who were not willing enough to impose their authority and control on the classroom situation and were, in consequence all too willing to fall back onto the services of the House staff to back-up their discipline in the classroom instead of coping with the problems themselves. New teachers were too concerned with their "personal" relationships with the pupils and too little concerned with maintaining control in the classroom.

Now, it may not be a criticism of teachers, but it might be a criticism of the system that...um... trains them, see, and in a way... er... you know, many of them - this is not all by any means - but many teachers coming into schools now I feel, aren't willing to fight hard enough to get control... (The House system) is providing a feather bedding for people who aren't willing to try to win within the classroom situation. So, I get kids sent down here for various... for very small things...

There are people in this school who will, at the slightest little thing, will send a kid down here. Now you see I'm not marvellous, I have my discipline problems that I have to cope with in all the ways that I know, but sometimes people send a kid down here for chewing or not doing his work or things like that. Now I maintain that if that happens in the class, you ought to be able to solve these problems, or try to, anyway, make an attempt.

(Head of House: Do: Ashton)
The essential aspect of teaching for which the new teachers were purportedly unprepared, then, concerned control in the classroom. Experienced teachers questioned not only the ability but also the willingness of teachers fresh from colleges of education training to implement the authority appropriate to the position of subject teacher; that is, to deal themselves with the discipline problems which arose in the classroom context. It was argued that they were too ready to draw on the support of the House staff rather than establish their own control of the situation. And it was this control of the classroom which the experienced teachers regarded as the basis of teaching. The colleges of education were indicted for their failure to prepare teachers for the realities of the teaching situation in which control of the classroom and the maintenance of discipline were fundamental, and provided necessary conditions for any learning context. There was allegedly a situation, reflected rather succinctly by Swift's observation that:

Many scholarly men and women were totally unprepared for the harsh realities found in the *ghettos*, where "keeping 'em quiet" required more than a master's degree in history.

*(Swift, 1971, p.190)*

5. Indeed, some teachers felt that this essential aspect of teaching need not require such training and could come from a "gift" which some people had. As an experienced Maths teacher at Ashton noted:

... to get good discipline is the question. Unless, you know .. some have got it inborn. They need never go into a teacher training college, they will always have discipline because it's .. they are gifted with a certain kind of .... Some can .. um .. have had longer experience and also go and get discipline.

*(Maths Teacher : El : Ashton)*
The question of a teacher's ability and willingness to establish control in the classroom setting was a major factor in the way in which the House staff interpreted referrals to the system. The point was highlighted in the case of the new teachers whose "failings" could be explained in terms of the pedagogic approach they adopted as a result of their training, but the implications for a teacher's ability and willingness to establish control were also apparent in terms of the way in which the House staff interpreted the referrals which they received in general. The accounts which the House staff offered exhibited a tendency to regard many of the problems as problems of teacher control rather than problems of the particular pupil. There was no automatic assumption that pupils who were referred required some counselling in order to find the cause of their disruptive behaviour because the cause of that behaviour was often attributed to the ability of the subject teacher. As a House teacher at Beechgrove put it:

They'll often come into teacher 'A' or teacher 'B' (Heads of House) very often with problems created by colleagues and not of their own making.

Numerous instances were observed in the House room where "direct" referrals were greeted with a casual and light-hearted air which was ostensibly inappropriate. The Heads of House appeared little concerned to conduct counselling or dispense punishment. An example, characteristic of such occasions, was afforded at Ashton when a "regular" referral arrived at the room. Head of House (Wa), laughing asked:

"And what have we been doing today?"

The boy shrugged his shoulders, and another member of the House staff (Do) in the room joined in the laughter. No detailed account of his referral was sought, and the boy was told to sit and read for the rest of the period. This reaction was explained by the Head of House:
He's a regular. He's O.K. .... just a bit cranky.
But some of the staff can't cope with him and he plays
them up and gets sent down here. It's not all his
fault.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

The response of the teacher appeared to stem from the view that the "disruption" exhibited in the classroom by the pupil need not be purely the product of the pupil. The "problem" associated with a referral was sometimes interpreted as a result of the interaction of the teacher with the pupil, and not necessarily a result of a problem with either the pupil or the teacher.

I get on well with John, and when I teach John in the class everything's fine. But someone else, for a reason which might be John's fault or it might be the teacher's fault, doesn't get on well with John. And therefore if John is causing trouble with another teacher and is sent to me I, therefore, try to get John to fit into that situation and if necessary to get the teacher to fit into situation. Whereas the teacher .... all steamed up ... might be saying "Oh, I'm not going to adapt or John might be saying "Oh, I'm not going to adapt" ... make him do that - which isn't infrequent.

(Head of House : Ir : Ashton)

When treating a "direct" referral, then, the Heads of House bore in mind the fact that the disruptive behaviour which gave rise to the referral might not necessarily reflect a problem of the pupil, but might be an indication of either a particular teacher's inability to control the classroom generally, or a problem of control which arose between the teacher and the pupil as a personal factor. In other words they recognized that the referral could result from personal rather than personality factors, from situational rather than emotional problems. And where they considered that this was the case the House teacher role could not be directed purely at the pupil but had to take account of the subject teacher as well. Under such circumstances they suggested that their role was rather one of "mediating" between the protagonists in a situation:
Sometimes, it's just a reaction of one person against another, sometimes it's something that has built up over a period, sometimes it's the subject, sometimes it's what has happened at home. But I mean it could be a dozen reasons. (...) Well, very often we are mediators in an offence. It sounds very grand, but that is clearly what we are doing. And quite often we talk to children and we talk to staff, and then we will ask the staff if they would like to talk to the child again, and sometimes this works very well.

A few weeks ago I had a girl who was being very awkward with one of the teachers, and the teacher asked me to talk to the girl and I talked to her and I listened to her and had several (.... untranscribable).... We got them both together and left them to make arrangements to get on together, and it has worked.

(House Teacher: Un : Ashton)

The action which House teacher took as a result of a referral depended, then, on the interpretation which the House teachers gave to such referrals, and whether the "cause" of the problem was to be located in the pupil, the teacher, or the situation in which they interacted. The discretion with which House teachers acted not only reflected their understanding of the causes of the problem but also provided a possible source of conflict between the referring teacher and the House teacher. Referring teachers sometimes felt that the pupil being referred should receive some form of punishment from the House staff, whilst, on the basis of their experience and pastoral expertise, the House staff considered that to punish the child would be inappropriate and negative approach to the problem. The House teachers felt that once it had been referred to them, the problem would be dealt with by them, and in the manner which they saw fit. They reserved the right to treat referrals according to their own interpretation of the problem and best course of remedial action.
I don't find a conflict in that at all. I mean, if somebody's messed about, then they've got to do something about it and you just know how to ... well, you should know how to deal with it, where a kid you will shout at, and that will just be enough and they will be so horrified and upset and ashamed that that will deal with it, or if it's kids you send home or if it's kids you send the parents ... send for their parents, or whatever. You just know the situation and know the kid what to do. I don't think there is a conflict. I mean, if somebody ... you see we don't have the cane now ... but I know situations where we did where somebody would come in and say "Would you please cane this child because they've done that" and I think that is ludicrous. If they're passing over the problem for you to deal with, then they've got to expect that you'll deal with it in your own way. As long as you deal with it, I mean, I always tell staff what I've done, but what I do is my decision. If they're making me to do it, I'm not necessarily going to do the heavy handed bit - or maybe I am, because maybe that colleague thought it was a very light thing, but I know that that kid has been terrible all week and this is just the last straw as far as I'm concerned, and so - you know, it can work both ways.

(Head of House : My : Beechgrove)

For their part, the subject teachers were not always enthusiastic about the discretion. Their dissatisfaction was particularly noticeable in relation to referrals for disruptive behaviour, where they tended to express the opinion that the House staff were too lenient with the pupils and were not willing enough to "punish" them. The House staff, however, felt that the "disciplining" of pupils was not their real function and that many pupils should never have been referred to them in the first place.

I think (that being referred to the Head of House) holds no real terror for them, because as House teachers, both myself and my colleagues feel very strongly that some of the problems which arise in class are a combination of pupil/teacher interaction - that the teacher for some reason er ... has very little control, or is inexperienced, and because of this, this particular pupil has stepped out of line, they got sent out. And for this reason it ... it wouldn't be the right thing to do when a pupil came in to shout at him and hassle him ... er ... so that he feels he's done something terrible, which he know he certainly has not done.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)
To the subject teachers the manifestation of such views was regarded as a failure on the part of the House staff to back-up the referrals which the subject teachers had made, and thus led to disagreement about how the House system should operate. At Ashton an experienced Maths teacher, in accounting for why she chose not to use the House system in the normal course of events made the following observations which illustrated the kind of reasoning relevant to the point:

Look, for instance, a child gets a demerit for being cheeky or something, gets a demerit. First of all the demerits are sometimes given for things they shouldn't be given for anyway. Um .. all right, gets a demerit and then it goes to the House Teacher, the House teacher calls the child and gives him or her a talking to but more whether they have done it in school and why they have done it, what their home background is and they try to solve it psychologically why .. um .. And then perhaps after a week or so they call them back again "Have you been now a bit better?" but it doesn't really sink in that it's really a dreadful thing.

(Maths Teacher : El : Ashton)

When making a referral the subject teacher appeared to take into account the disposition of the Head of House which he or she believed to be on duty in the House room because the nature of the action which was taken as a result of the referral was seen to depend on this factor more than the "absolute" nature of the event which led the subject teacher to instigate the referral. This not only affected those staff who would wish the House staff to take disciplinary action against the pupils, but as the following comment of a teacher at Ashton illustrates, also influenced the use of the House system by those subject teachers who would not want such action to result from their referral.
Personally, sometimes I'd like to know who is in (the House room) before I send someone. If I want someone out of my room that . . . I'm going to lose my temper and clock him or something, and he hadn't done anything all that particularly terrible ... it's just that he's irritating me beyond control, then if there's somebody who's approach who I sympathize with in the House, I'd like him to go there. If there's some old dragon who is going to start giving him terribly boring moralistic lectures for hours, then I'd rather he didn't go to them there.

(Social Studies & History Teacher : PI : Ashton)

The more predominant complaint, however, concerned the failure of the House staff to provide the necessary discipline for those pupils referred to them for disruptive behaviour in the classroom, whilst the House staff for their part, argued that many of the referrals were often inappropriate and did not reflect purely a malice of the pupil.
Summary and Conclusion

In their routine operation of the House system the House teachers of Ashton and Beechgrove had to take into consideration certain practical problems which influenced their actions. They indicated that there were the problems arising from lack of space— and consequent lack of privacy— which hindered the success with which they could conduct pastoral care and guidance of the pupils. They were further hindered by lack of time. They were given too few "free" lessons a week in which to conduct the necessary work of pastoral care. Time constraints also affected the extent of communication on which the success of the House system relied and posed problems both in terms of the House teachers' communication of their efforts to the relevant subject teachers, and in terms of the amount of relevant knowledge which the House teachers received from the subject teachers. This restriction on communication possibilities had the dual effect of (a) providing the House teachers with contact with only a small minority of the pupils in their House and (b) shrouding many developing problems until they reached large and/or explosive proportions.

The small minority of pupils with which the House teachers had contact at a House level were not the kind of referrals that the House teachers felt to be appropriate. They argued that they were being obliged, for practical reasons and against their better judgement, to deal with an increasingly large proportion of referrals concerned with disciplinary matters, and that given the shortage of time available, this was to the detriment of their proper function, dealing with the longer-term emotional problems of pupils. This practical necessity exacerbated the already existing strain in the House teacher role between the needs of the counselling/pastoral role for non-authoritarianism and sympathetic understanding, and the subject teacher role and its requirements.
for control of the teaching situation. The extra burden on their already strained commitments to pastoral and academic matters was seen as coming primarily from those members of staff who were young, inexperienced, probationers and fresh from colleges of education, who for reasons of choice or capacity did not invoke their authority in the classroom situation and thereby failed to achieve control. In other words, the shift in emphasis toward a discipline back-up function which the House teachers recognized, they attributed in large part to a lack of control in the classroom situation characteristic of new teachers, (and characteristic particularly of schools such as Ashton and Beechgrove with their kind of staff profiles).

The action which House teachers took as a result of ("direct") referrals was coloured by this interpretation of the cause of referrals, and the discretion with which they handled referrals provided a source of some disagreement between the House teachers who acted upon the referrals and the subject teachers who, when referring a pupil, might have had some specific course of action in mind.

Because the Heads of House were aware that referrals could arise not only from the problems of the child, but also possibly from the failings of the teacher or the personal problems stemming from the particular relationship between the pupil and the teacher, the course of action did not always reflect the intentions or wishes of the teacher who had referred the pupil.

The interpretation which the House teachers put on referrals were based on the knowledge which they had of the particular teacher and pupil, and would vary from House teacher to House teacher. When operating the House system, then, the subject teacher might consider not only whether a referral would generally meet with the kind of action considered appropriate
by the subject teacher, but in face of the informal organization adopted in both Ashton and Beechgrove, they might consider the nature of action which the particular House teacher on duty would be more prone to take, before sending a pupil to the House room as a "direct" referral. As a subject teacher at Ashton remarked when talking about his use of the House system:

(The House system) has two separate intentions. One, it is supposed to be a purely punitive thing where you send someone to do some work, or more likely just to get them out of your room before you lose your temper, sort of thing. And the other is, it's supposed to be a counselling and kind of rehabilitation centre as well. And depending on who's in there - which member of staff is in there - and who sent the child and what for and so on.... you don't know what mixture of those two operations is actually going to get carried out, if you see what I mean.

(History & Social Studies Teacher : Pi : Ashton)

When making referrals the subject teachers had to consider that the action which followed the referral was out of their hands. The action which would actually take place depended in large part, on the member of the House staff who was on duty in the House room at the time of the referral. The only positive point of action which the subject teachers could rely on after having made a direct referral to the House staff was the not inconsiderable relief in the immediate teaching situation of not having the disruptive pupil in the classroom for the rest of the lesson. It was then, perhaps, the immediate relief of the situation which accounted for the subject teacher's use of the House system rather than concern for the nature of the action taken by the House staff after the referral. (see Chapter X).

Given the discretion open to the Heads of House in the way they dealt with "direct" referrals, the action of referral by the subject teacher constituted but one positive and self-evident effect upon the behaviour of
the pupil - to eliminate it as a feature of the classroom setting by removing the pupil. It was apparently in this sense that "direct" referrals aided "control" rather than alleviating emotional sources of disruption.
Chapter XII

Classroom Control and Teacher Competence
In chapter VIII it was suggested that competence involved a concern for control of the classroom, and that this control was a socially constructed phenomenon drawing on the levels of noise emanating from the classroom.

The apparent advantages for control of the classroom offered by "direct" referrals to the House system (chapters X, XI) coupled with the apparent necessity of such control in the teaching situation (chapter VIII) provided a prima facie case for supposing that a "competent" teacher would not hesitate to use the House system in support of the routine maintenance of classroom control.

However, teachers' accounts also suggested that a certain use of the system - specifically the "direct" mode of referral - could itself be regarded as a public indicator of lack of control, and that this manner of usage consequently involved implications for the "competence" of the teacher which acted as a deterrent to "direct" referrals.

This chapter uses the "direct" mode of referral (as an instance of a publicly available indicator of control) to establish the features of teacher competence which are both basic to the practical activity of teaching and which are consequently threatened by the use of the House system in this manner.

1. "Competence" here involves both a basic ability to use "interpretive procedures" (Cicourel 1973) and the capacity to generate acceptable and appropriate interpretations from these in a community of other actors - what Chomsky (1965) and Cicourel (1973) see as the level of "performance".

A third level of "competence" may be introduced at this stage. In addition to a "deep structure" competence and "surface structure" performance, the "competent" teacher must also be able to implement courses of action seen as desirable in the context. The "competent" teacher, then, is one who cannot only interpret the context in an appropriate manner, but can also implement such action as necessary on the basis of that interpretation.
Waller's observation that "young teachers fail because they do not know how to keep order" (Waller 1932 p.V) provides a basis for understanding the implications for teacher competence of "direct" referrals to the House system. It was the young teachers, specifically the new or inexperienced teachers, who were regarded as the prevalent users of such referrals (see chapter XI). The House staff, whilst accepting it as part of their duties to aid the new teachers who, on account of their "newness" were considered likely to confront problems of control to an extraordinary extent, saw the persistent use of "direct" referrals as inappropriate and indicative of an inability to control. Subject teachers consequently faced something of a dilemma in their use of the "direct" mode of referral recognizing that:

(a) it had advantages in terms of the immediacy of its effect upon disruptive behaviour, and thereby control, yet

(b) it ran the risk of indicating an inability or unwillingness to control the classroom.

In order words, whilst it possibly aided the control of the classroom in terms of the public indicator of noise it also exhibited a failure to control the classroom to other members of staff.

The manner in which this dilemma was resolved appeared to depend a great deal on the "experience" of the teacher. Experienced teachers considered it somewhat degrading to call upon other members of staff to help with problems in their classroom and thus tended to refrain from use of "direct" referrals: as a Head of House at Ashton explained:

the older members of staff, particularly because the House teachers at least at (the upper school) are very young .. um .. about my age .. feel that .. er .. it's humiliating in some way .. I feel .. I think, to send their own problems to much younger House staff.

(Head of House: Ha : Ashton)
To refrain for such reasons would indicate that practical repercussions - as much as any educational principle - might explain the differential usage of "direct" referrals between new and experienced teachers. Teachers, in general, and those concerned with career advancement (i.e. especially conscious of status and their expertise) in particular, might have to recognize the disadvantages of adopting modes of procedure which provided public indicators of control and which were associated with a lack of teaching experience.

- the significance of experience for teacher competence

The training afforded by colleges of education was not regarded by the teachers as an induction to the real world of teaching, and, indeed some staff argued that the training received was wholly inappropriate.² The practical skills of teaching rather, were learnt in the context of teaching through experience gained "on site" in the school. It has not been a concern of this research to consider the socialization of new teachers as such; the point is to emphasize that competence is a socially constructed phenomenon as much as a state of being. The problems facing particularly the probationary teacher, have however, received less than adequate research (Taylor and Dale 1973), but that which exists supports the present suggestion of a process of "assimilation" of teachers into the practical situation. Coulter and Taft (1973), for instance, apply an analogy with the assimilation of immigrants in which the entrant achieves "acculturation" through socialization, and Wiliower (1969) similarly suggests that the new teacher becomes an experienced "old pro" by developing a particular stance appropriate to the practical pressures of the teaching situation.

². These views are echoed in the accounts of the first year of teaching provided by Hanson and Herrington (1976) and Hannam, Smyth and Stephenson (1976).
The changing attitudes of teachers toward education (cf. Morrison and McIntyre 1967) would appear to reflect "reality shock" (Whiteside et al 1969) experienced during the new teacher's induction to the practical situation, and the subsequent situational adjustment to the teacher culture appropriate to this reality (Hanson and Herrington 1976).

For new members of staff, then, their election to use the "direct" mode of referral more than other teachers could reflect not only a greater problem of gaining a "state of control", but also the extent to which they had become socialized into the awareness of competent teachers, an awareness in which use of the "direct" mode of referral (a) was acknowledged as undesirable in terms of the official guidelines (b) recognized as being inappropriate in the eyes of the House staff, (c) seen as indicative of a lack of control and (d) could thus become associated with a lack of teacher competence. Competence, that is, might reflect neither technical qualification nor the tenure of official membership of the organization so much as something to be gained through experience, "on site" in the school. Through experience, teachers could become aware of the significant aspects of the context of teaching, learn to value certain features of the task and develop practical competence, as a member of staff.

3. This socialization of teachers is normally accomplished through subtle tactics designed to let the new teacher know what is acceptable without challenging the professional autonomy basic to the teaching ideology (McPherson 1972, Hanson and Herrington 1976, Webb 1962).
- classroom privacy and teacher competence

Teachers have generally valued autonomy (Grace 1972, Jackson 1968, McPherson 1972). The "closed-classroom" facilitates this autonomy by limiting the possibility of supervision, either directly or through bureaucratic rules and regulations (Bidwell 1965, Lortie 1969) with responsibility for events thus belonging to the teacher in charge of the classroom. At both Ashton and Beechgrove this received formal expression to the extent that the subject teacher was seen as the custodian of his/her pupils for the duration of the lesson, and was enjoined by the official guidelines to seek help from other staff only under special circumstances. Responsibility for control, that is, was formally resident in the classroom and with the individual subject teacher.

"Direct" referral to the House system has already been demonstrated to generate problems of responsibility for the action taken with respect to the referred pupil (see Chapter XI). By handing-over the "miscreant" pupil the subject teacher was regarded as abdicating responsibility for the control residual in the classroom teaching situation. Any "direct" referral involved outside agencies in control of the classroom, and thus posed a practical problem in terms of control. The significance of resort to outside help is hard to over-estimate in its implications for teacher control. As McPherson indicated about the situation in "Adams":

The most clearly observable aspect of a teacher was her success or failure as a preserver of discipline. "Successful teachers do not have problems". "To have to send a child to the principal is to admit that you can't control the kids."

(McPherson 1972, p.31)

Similarly, Hanson and Herrington note an extract from a report by a probationer about her experience in the first year of teaching in a
large comprehensive school:

"If the kids see you depend on outside help they'll have you. You've got to do it yourself. That's what I've learnt since I came here."

(Hanson and Herrington, p.53)

In the eyes of pupils and other teachers, the capacity to cope without resort to outside help appears to be a major factor in "making out" as a teacher, and of competence in the school organization.

"Direct" referrals to the House system constituted a potential threat to autonomy, however, not only by inferring that the teacher could not cope with the situation but also by undermining the principle of privacy of the classroom.

Colleagues were not normally expected to intrude on a class where another was teaching, and observation indicated that two "courtesies" were involved when such intrusions became necessary. It was normal for the intruding teacher to knock before entering and subsequently for the subject teacher to suspend such teaching activity as he/she may have been involved in. A member of staff would not normally continue to teacher in the presence of another. The situation again appeared similar to that noted by McPherson in which:

It was wrong to enter another teacher's room while she was teaching. A teacher who went into another classroom apologised profusely for intruding and presented a valid excuse.

(McPherson 1972, p.32)

These courtesies and apologies, normal to such entries of the classroom constituted an acknowledgment of the principle of autonomy and the privacy of the "closed-classroom".

Where help was sought by the teacher, however, the situation altered somewhat.
If the "direct" referral involved the House teacher going to the classroom to intervene in a situation, the actions which followed ran the risk of imputing a lack of competence to the referring member of staff because it involved an invasion of the privacy of the classroom. House staff, aware of this problem, were careful to try to minimise such possibilities by using tact:

I find that, if it's a back-up system rather than being first-line of defence, I think it .. um .. comes on to an area of discipline .. who's actually responsible for discipline of the groups when they are within the classroom. I don't like to think that the, you know, House staff are expected to impose discipline from a distance. Um .. if you could do that .. it's almost like a bit of a monitor and "I'll help him now .. now he's causing problems". I think teachers appreciate from time-to-time if you do go into a classroom where there is noise, and the younger member of staff's definitely having difficulties .. um .. go in for any particular reason and fetch a book or something or ask for a chalk. Um .. the class, you know being particularly difficult .. um .. it does have some effect on the way they ..

The tactics employed to minimize the invasion involved the attempt by Heads of House to treat the situation in a manner which did not undermine the authority of the subject teacher, not only in the eyes of that teacher but in the eyes of the pupils as well. The point was emphasized in the official guidelines:
no useful and lasting purpose is served if too many problems arising within the classroom are referred to higher authority. This practice only serves to weaken the authority of the individual teacher in the eyes of the children.

(Official Guidelines: Beechgrove)

Use of the House system, then, posed a threat to the residual position of classroom control vested in the subject teacher. When referral involved the House staff in entering the classroom arena to deal with a situation, that referral became all the more problematic because it (a) involved trespass on the privacy of the classroom with its additional implications for the residual control of the subject teacher, and (b) took place in front of the pupils who were far from unaware of the connotations of the presence of the Head of House.

House teachers were aware that when dealing with a referral in the classroom they ran the risk of undermining the authority of the teacher and producing an embarrassing scene, which only their tact could really avoid. As a House teacher at Beechgrove said:

most people, providing .. um .. providing you don't go into the movement of trying to take the kid on there in the classroom in front of the rest of the class, producing an embarrassing scene you know .. um .. allow you to get on with it. I mean I think, you know, most of our colleagues here are you know, will trust you to deal with and handle the situation as you see fit.

---

4. The significance of the pupils’ contribution to teacher control has been emphasized by Jerthman (1963) who argued that the legitimacy of teacher authority is problematic, particularly in terms of "delinquent" groups.
Interv: ... to a fair degree ..

La: Yes, with a fair degree of tact you know .. that you won't sort of embarrass them over it or anything like that.

(Head of House: La: Beechgrove)

On this kind of occasion the relationship between the House teacher and the subject teacher became very delicate. Whether or not the House teachers felt they were taking over the classroom authority of the subject teacher, they were at pains to give the impression that this was not in fact the case. Impression management in such occasions was, however, oriented as such toward an audience of pupils. The House staff felt that in these situations it was important not to exacerbate the impression which pupils may already be fostering that the subject teacher had been unable to cope and had therefore to call for assistance from the Head of House, (whether or not the Head of House actually regarded this as an accurate appraisal of the situation). As part of professional etiquette, the Heads of House attempted to disguise the purpose and implications of their presence and thus prevent the possibility of the subject teacher "losing face" in front of the pupils as a result of the implication that they could not "control" their own classroom.

The risk of "losing face" was heightened of course, where the House teacher was less delicate in his/her treatment of the problem. An episode at Ashton served to illustrate the point:

In December 1974, the researcher had been observing a supply teacher at one of the lower school sites, and conducted an interview with her. The methods of teaching she adopted were in her own words "authoritarian", because as a supply teacher she felt this to be the best method of gaining immediate impact and "control" in new situations. As a rule she would not attempt to use the House system because of the practical difficulties (outlined in chapter X). Not long after the interview she rushed into the staffroom, in the middle of the teaching period, bursting into tears and
exclaiming "I've never been so humiliated in all my life!" - a phrase she repeated time and again in the course of accounting for what had happened both to the researcher and other teachers who subsequently entered the staffroom.

The source of this humiliation and embarrassment was explained thus: that this particular class (acknowledged by her colleagues to be 'difficult') had just gone too far, responding to none of her pleas for order, or threats of detention. In desperation and against her normal practice, she had sought the aid of a teacher in a senior position - a Head of Building. This Head of Building had been unable to come immediately and so the teacher had returned to the classroom. She imposed a detention and managed to establish a teaching (controlled) environment. To her satisfaction, that is, she had gained "control" of the class and no longer needed the support she had sought. Five minutes later the Head of House was alleged to have stormed into the classroom and taken a seat with the pupils. In doing so, she was effectively undermining the authority and status of the teacher by implying, in front of the pupils, that the fault lay with the teacher, not with the pupils. In the dumbfoundment that followed, the subject teacher hesitated and faultered, in response to which the Head of House grabbed the lesson notes and chalk and proceeded literally to take over the lesson.

Not only was it the subject teacher who was embarrassed; she emphasised later in accounting for what happened that the pupils too were very embarrassed, recognising the disruption being caused. Pupils were so acutely conscious of the situation that those nearby apparently whispered things to the effect "I wouldn't stand for it, Miss. I'd walk out if I was you". It was at this stage that the subject teacher did in fact leave.

5. The Head of Building co-operated with the Heads of House in the two lower schools of Ashton in this specific discipline specialist function. (chapter XI)
the room, retaining the anguish of such utter humiliation until reaching the sanctity of the staffroom, where she burst into tears.

This event illustrated the possibility, which would not have escaped the notice of the other members of staff, that to call upon other members of staff for help was to run the risk of publicly "losing face" - particularly in this case, in front of pupils. The action of the Head, for this reason, was seen to be wholly unacceptable and petitions to that effect were immediately set in motion. It was an example (and in its extremity a rare example) of the risks involved for staff when seeking aid for situations in "their" classroom from other members of staff; risks in terms of threats to their "competence".

For House staff to maintain the impression (for the pupils) that their intervention in matters did not signify any lack of competence on the part of the subject teacher was perhaps more difficult in light of the fact that they themselves did tend to regard the calls for assistance as indeed indicative of a lack of "control" on the part of the subject teacher.

As a Head of House at Ashton put the point:

> Teachers generally would feel .. I myself as a teacher would feel .. um .. rather than as a House teacher .. that it is important that a class teacher is able to keep control of his own class, because no matter how carefully a House teacher puts himself in a position of walking into someone else's class or being sent someone else's classroom .. um .. however carefully he may attempt to approach the subject of why the particular teacher had to send the pupil to the House teacher, and try to avoid the situation of .. of .. or failure by the class teacher to discipline the child himself, it's very difficult to escape from the fact that this is rather the impression the pupil gets.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

The impressions with which pupils were left were felt to be of a significance because if the pupils began to realize that a teacher had to call on outside help, then this exacerbated the lack of "control" already suffered by that subject teacher. Pupils built images of teachers as those who could cope and those who could not:
They're certainly aware that some teachers send pupils to House teachers and others do not. For example, they are themselves taught by people who are House teachers, and they are aware that House teachers don't send pupils to other House teachers. They are also aware that . . . er . . . many of the senior members of staff would not operate discipline in this way.

I think the pupils are aware that it's um . . . that um . . . that teachers send them to House teachers because they themselves can't cope. It's often been the case that pupils have in fact refused to leave the room, and the teacher's had to send for a House teacher to come and take them out. There's never any trouble. As soon as a House teacher arrives the pupil's perfectly willing to go . . . in my experience. I think that the pupils feel that it's a shortcoming of the teacher in charge.

(Head of House : Ha : Ashton)

In summary, the Head of Building had shown a lack of sensitivity which Teacher Ha. had recognized, and posited as a problem for House Teachers. The Head of Building in this instance had caused humiliation for the subject teacher and near outrage from other members of staff who became aware of the event, by showing disregard for two sensitive areas of teaching. She had openly questioned the competence of the subject teacher, and she had violated the privacy of the teaching context. Both aspects, however, were opened for violation only in terms of the initial request for help in controlling a class which the subject teacher had made. This request complicated the question of the privacy of lessons, which in turn opened the possibility of threatening the competence of the teacher.

---

6. The problem of how such situations should be dealt with without an apparent less of control by the subject teacher has also figured in an N.U.T. working party report on discipline in schools which argued that:

It may be wise always to make it possible to allow a pupil to back down with dignity and without loss of face. This must be balanced against the need for the teachers involved to be seen to be in control . . .

(N.U.T. 1976)
The competence acquired through experience, then, appeared to involve the attempt to obviate the prospect of threats to control of the classroom by consolidating in practice the autonomy vested in the subject-teacher role by the official guidelines. The staff indicated through accounts that this involved an awareness of two possibly complementary sources of challenge to this autonomy; one stemming from the pupils who made a noise, the other from staff entering, and engaging in a teacher's own classroom. Both challenges arose to the extent that the privacy of the classroom unit was transcended.

The social organization of teaching consequently involved a concern to retain autonomy by preventing the public availability of information about what was happening in the classroom and, in fact, provided the teacher with what Zimmerman (1971) has termed the "actual task structure" as distinct from (though not necessarily opposed to) the formally sanctioned tasks of teaching. An understanding of the teachers' experience of teaching necessarily incorporates a vision of this "actual task structure".
- the actual task structure of teaching

It has been a basic premise of this research that:

(a) the formal organization in no sense determines the activity of members, but that it is their interpretation of the formal organization which gives rise to organizational activity and that

(b) these interpretations exhibit a regularity which is derived from the community of teachers.

Awareness of the methods for interpreting the formal organization involved acquisition of the sense of social structure appropriate to a competent teacher and this awareness became expressed in terms of the actual (as opposed to formal) task structure.

Further, it has been argued that teaching normally occurs within an organization and within a community of teachers whose influence transcends the apparent isolation of the classroom setting. Such influence is facilitated through certain channels of information about proceedings in the "closed" classroom which are "publicly available". These sources of information have been identified as:

(a) informal feedback through staff-room gossip, pupils' conversation, and extra-classroom situations, (b) rates of examination success, (c) levels of noise emanating from the classroom, and (d) use of the "direct" mode of referral to the House system.

The election to focus on the practical activity of teaching directed attention to those sources of information which arose in the context of the classroom, and consequently the informal, "outside-classroom"

7. This does not, of course, preclude the influence of pupils' expectations (Delamont 1976, Hanson and Herrington 1976) or the individual preferences of style expressed by teachers, but is a distinct source of influence.
type of information was not of central concern - even whilst acknowledging its possible significance.

Rates of examination success similarly provided a publicly available source of information about proceedings in the classroom which was not irrelevant to the assessment of competence. However, its significance for teacher competence might reasonably be expected to diminish to the extent that schools did not take as their principal aim the generation of G.C.E. or C.S.E. passes, where pupils were engaged in courses not designed for examination purposes or where the intake to the school was not "achievement" motivated (such as Ashton and Beechgrove). Under such circumstances, criteria other than rates of examination success might have added significance for the assessment of teacher competence.

Teachers at Ashton and Beechgrove certainly indicated that control of the classroom constituted an important aspect of the teaching task - indeed its significance appeared to supersede others. Given the circumstances of Ashton and Beechgrove, where pupils did not tend to be "achievement" motivated and where there was a below-average ability intake, control of the classroom no longer appeared to be a "technical implementive rule" (Hargreaves et al 1975) for the establishment of a learning context, but became a goal of teaching in its own right. The practical task activity under such circumstances was primarily concerned with the maintenance of control as an end in itself rather than a passing phase or as a pre-requisite on the path to instruction.

This control, of course, was a socially organized phenomenon using as criteria (a) levels of noise emanating from the classroom, and (b) reliance in the House system to secure quiet orderliness in the
classroom. In summary, therefore, the actual task structure of teaching involved the prevention of noise emanating from the classroom without recourse to help from other members of staff, and it was a teacher's capacity to secure for themselves quiet orderliness in "their" classroom which was the basis of their competence as a teacher.

Such conclusions about the nature of teaching should be recognized as specific to the context in which the teaching was situated. Any case study must acknowledge that its findings derive from the particular circumstances at hand, and attempts to extrapolate must be cautious.

The prospect of extrapolation is dependent upon the extent to which the aspects of the context significant for the practice of teaching at Ashton and Beechgrove are to be found elsewhere. To assess the applicability of the case study findings to other situations, then, it is necessary to identify those features of the schools which the teachers regarded as the salient features for the practice of teaching.

At Ashton and Beechgrove teachers tended to justify their approach with reference to both the nature of the pupils and the social pressures from the community of teachers. Pupils posed practical problems, it was argued, because they were not "achievement"motivated and tended to be of below average ability. Findings about the nature of teaching at these schools reflected, then, a particular profile of pupil intake and might be replicated elsewhere to the extent that the intakes were similar.

It was, however, the autonomy of the teaching situation which appeared to be of greater importance - an autonomy receiving expression in the physical isolation of the "closed" classrooms, the value placed
on the privacy of the classroom, the nature of teacher control, and the primacy of control for the practical task of teaching.

The formal organization of the schools provided settings which were remote from other settings and visually insular. This isolation was re-inforced through an absence of team-teaching and an emphasis on "collection" classification of subjects (Bernstein 1971) which reflected an academic autonomy of the teacher. The official guidelines further contributed to this isolation by stressing that the responsibility for the maintenance of control in the classroom rested squarely with the subject teacher who should have recourse to help from other staff only under certain special circumstances. In other words, the isolation of the teaching situation was not merely a product of the physical setting but was a fundamental feature of the context within which teachers saw themselves as operating.

It can be suggested, on the basis of this research that teachers' use of the formal organization and interpretation of events in the classroom reflected the extent to which the outcome was seen to threaten or enhance their autonomy and their control. Events or courses of action which threatened autonomy constituted threats to the control of a teacher.

The capacity of a teacher to retain the appearances of control by not seeking aid from others was of practical consequence for teachers. A situation occurring toward the end of the field-work provided a rather poignant example. An English teacher at Beechgrove recalled the situation of two probationer teachers she claimed had both suffered problems of control in their first year. The male teacher had "stuck it out" for the year without attempting to involve others. After each break he braced himself and went back to the "battle". The
other probationer, a woman, had attempted to remedy or alleviate the situation by seeking guidance from various members of the senior staff (in accord with the official guidelines, see chapter VI). Her problem of control became public knowledge to an extent far beyond that of the other probationer whose control problems became apparent to only those using adjacent classrooms and sharing the same staffroom. At the end of the year the male teacher had his "probationer" status removed, the female teacher had hers extended.

Under the conditions which enhance the isolation of the teaching situation, teachers might fare better by "muddling through" rather than refer problems of control to higher authorities, thus masking to the outside world the "real" extent of control problems in the classroom. Lowenstein (1975) makes just this point on the basis of reports from N.A.S. members. He argues that teachers were often reluctant to give an accurate picture of disruption, violence and vandalism in schools because they regarded these with a personal sense of failure— as not being able to exercise control. In accord with the present research it suggests that it is the appearance of control, rather than any actual state of control, which is of basic concern to teaching as a practical activity, and as Lowenstein observes, it is because the teacher's competence is at stake, along with their chances of promotion, that teachers will be reticent to admit to problems of control in the classroom. To conclude, in Leacock's words:

A new teacher soon learns that it is her success in maintaining classroom quiet and order, in the narrow sense, which is first noted and which is apt to be the school administrator's first measure of her performance. Classroom management becomes, not a means to an end, but an end in itself.

(Leacock 1969, p.87 emphasis added)
THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF TEACHING
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  Sense of Social Structure appropriate to competent membership of the organization
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CHAPTER XIII

Conclusion: teaching and secondary re-organization
The debate surrounding the re-organization of secondary education has provided both the context within which the research was initiated and the direction for the focus of attention. Notwithstanding the exigencies which have guided and limited the scope of research, it may yet constitute a sociological contribution to the controversy.

Those broadly opposed to re-organization have claimed that educational principles have given way to political ambitions and that the hasty transition has led to the creation of makeshift and "hotch-potch" comprehensive schools. In consequence, they have argued, the process of re-organization has contributed toward falling standards of education in Britain.

Certain features of school organization associated with comprehensives have been identified by opponents as detrimental to educational standards, - features such as the large number of pupils attending such schools (along with any subsequent split-site arrangement) and the adoption of mixed-ability grouping and its curricular counterpart (the common-core curriculum).

Aspects of school organization, however, have not been regarded as the only contributor to falling standards in education. Opponents of re-organization have also associated the quality of teaching with (the alleged) declining educational standards - the turnover of staff, their age, experience, political ideology and pedagogies being seen as complementing the effects of school organization in the general "malaise".

The nature of teachers and teaching claimed to characterize the comprehensive school situation has not been regarded as an essential feature of "comprehensivesness". As Boyson (1974) has indicated, it is
quite possible to have a comprehensive school whose mode of teaching reflects standards far removed from those under attack. However, the association of comprehensive schools with particular types of teacher has been a feature of the criticisms generally levelled at the schools.

The association has been explained in terms of the urban housing situation and the rapid expansion in the comprehensive sector (which have affected the age of teachers and their turnover), and in terms of the ethos of comprehensive education with its tendency toward non-selection, non-competitiveness and social mix, (enticing teachers of a particular type to teach in such schools). The cause of such profiles of teachers and modes of teaching have been of less significance for the controversy, though, than their effects.

The debate, consequently guided the research toward a consideration of the actual nature of teaching in comprehensive schools, particularly those representative of the situation crucial to the debate - large, London comprehensives with lower than average ability intake, non-balanced social intake, large turnover of staff with an over-representation of young and inexperienced teachers.

The phenomenological study of teaching in such schools used observation techniques to complement the use of tape-recorded interviews with staff (as accounts). Their explanations of the practical problems with which they had to deal in the routine activity of teaching made it possible to establish the sense of social structure appropriate to a competent teacher. This sense of social structure involved a member s' method for understanding the relationship between, and significance of, events occurring in the course of teaching and it entailed the grasp of a "real", or actual task structure generated in a community of teachers rather than knowledge of any formal aims or official preferences for teacher activity.
The actual task structure which could be derived from the accounts of the teachers exhibited considerable concern with classroom "control". Indeed, "control" of the classroom appeared to constitute the context in which the events identified by staff as problematic could be understood as such.

This significance of classroom "control" for the activity of teaching receives support from other studies which have attempted to examine the actual problems facing teachers, particularly the new and inexperienced teachers (Hanson and Herrington 1976, Hoy 1974, Taylor and Dale 1971). What constitutes "control" and how it becomes part of the competence of a teacher has, however, remained largely unexplored. As Hoy (1974) has noted:

Control of students -"discipline"¹ - is a major concern of all teachers, but is especially acute for beginning teachers.

The problem of pupil control is not new, nor is there any lack of opinion or prescription on the subject, but unfortunately there is little systematic study of pupil control in schools.

(Hoy 1974, p.247)

1. This relationship between "discipline" and classroom "control" is similarly reflected by the common practical use of the term by teachers to mean "control of the process of their classrooms" (Stenhouse 1967, p.vii). This teacher's sense of discipline "control" is in marked contrast with those sociological studies of "control" in classrooms which have concentrated on how social class dominance is attained in the classroom setting. (cf Davies 1976, Pat 1970, Sharp and Green 1975, Young 1971).
To understand why new teachers confront more problems of "control" than those with experience, it could be argued that those whose problems perpetuate may tend to leave the profession, thus providing an apparent correlation between experience and "control". More commonly, it has been suggested that "control" is learnt and is subsequently open to improvement in the course of time.

"Control" of the classroom to follow such reasoning, might be considered to be a product of college of education experience and/or the individual preference of the teacher. In this sense, the "control" of the classroom could be both learnt and be attributed to the personal approach of the teacher.

The classroom situation, however, is primarily characterized by its social nature (Jackson 1968) and its socializing influence upon teaching has not escaped notice (Delamont 1976, Hanson and Herrington 1976). Pupils themselves provide one source of influence upon the activity of teachers which, given the isolation characteristic of the classroom setting, might be regarded as the primary source of social influence. The isolation of teachers from other teachers with respect to the classroom situation, that is, might severely limit the extent of influence from other members of staff:

    teaching differs from the professions in the relatively small amount of colleague interaction it affords newcomers. Isolated in individual classrooms, experienced colleagues have little time to "socialize" the new teacher into the "teacher subculture" other than in terms of broad "general acceptability".

    (Edgar 1974, p.246)

Hanson and Herrington (1976), however, demonstrate that new teachers may be subjected to a greater degree of influence than would be immediately apparent given the situation, and the accounts offered by teachers at
Ashton and Beechgrove appeared to support this view. The practical problems which the staff identified, for instance, seemed to depend on the influence of the community of teachers as much as pupil expectations or personal/ideological preferences of the classroom teacher.

Despite the extent of isolation normally associated with the classroom setting, teachers were still subject to the influence of colleagues. Although teachers rarely, if ever, came under the gaze of colleagues in the process of classroom teaching, - and were thus not open to observation as a regular feature of teaching - their activity could be monitored by phenomena which transcended the isolation of the setting, primary amongst which were noise and the recourse to outside help in running the classroom.

"Control" of the classroom was consequently inferred rather than observed and relied on clues which could be regarded as a document of the state of "control" existing in the classroom.²

In summary, then, the social organization of teaching at Ashton and Beechgrove entailed:

- regard for "control" of the classroom as fundamental to the practice of teaching.

- recognition that "control" was imputed on the basis of publicly available indicators such as noise emanating from the classroom and use of the House staff for back-up to "control" and

- awareness that teaching competence was largely judged on "control" criteria.

². As an indicator of a state of "control" in the classroom, noise could be significant for both the teacher of the class, and for colleagues outside the classroom.
The sense of social structure appropriate to a competent teacher, then, involved a concern with the public indicators of "control". Threats to the appearance of "control" were those which posed the more important practical problems for teachers because they threatened the competence of the member of staff, and it was events which either (a) raised the noise level in the classroom, or (b) challenged the autonomy of teacher "control" which posed the most significant aspects of disruptive behaviour in the practical teaching situation.

As Jackson has noted:

Classrooms, by and large, are relatively quiet places and it is part of the teacher's job to keep them that way.

The several rules of order which characterize most elementary school classrooms all share a single goal: the prevention of "disturbances".

(Jackson 1968, pp. 105, 104)

For the competent member, then, the actual task structure of teaching involved the attempt to establish and maintain a "quiet orderliness" in the classroom, and to do so without aid from colleagues. It was in this manner that "control" could be achieved.

Certain aspects of school organization associated with comprehensives were significant for teachers to the extent that they posed particular threats to this "control".

The size of comprehensives, for instance, not only threatened the involvement of the pupil (Barker and Gump 1964) but posed practical problems for teachers in their attempts to secure quiet orderliness. The ability to "name-the-pupil" was regarded as a resource in their bid to establish and maintain "control" but the larger the school the more and more problematic was this ability. Although new teachers were at a specific disadvantage in this respect, in large schools the problem could affect any teacher's attempt to impose "control" where they were
unfamiliar with the pupil's names (e.g. "covering" a lesson or in the playground).

The development of pastoral care and guidance in comprehensive schools has not provoked much controversy. The way that the organizational facilitation of such care (the House system), has been used, however, has given rise to significant debate. In the schools, it was recognized by both subject teachers and Heads of House that the House system was becoming increasingly a centre of "discipline specialists" at the expense of its official pastoral role. Use of the House system for back-ups to classroom "control" was regarded generally as a sign of inexperience or inability to "control" the classroom and such usage could consequently expect to be more in evidence where there were relatively large proportions of young, inexperienced or probationary teachers. Their proneness to such use, however, possibly owed as much to their lack of developed sense of social structure as to the actual incidence of disruptive behaviour or "loss of control" - particularly where colleges of education had fostered a non-authoritarian approach to classroom "control".

Mixed-ability grouping posed practical problems, similarly, in terms of its implications for "control". The teachers argued that with the mixed-ability arrangement it was difficult to pitch the work and set a pace which was appropriate for all the pupils in the group, and that this jeopardized the chances of obtaining the pupils' interest in the work. Pupils who were not interested in the work could not be assumed to be motivated to learn and consequently posed a potential threat to the

3. This discipline specialist role has become increasingly common, with a N.U.T. Working Party on discipline (N.U.T. 1976) specifically criticizing trends in this direction.
quiet orderliness in the classroom. Pupils who were not interested in the work and whose motivation did not stem from their social background were regarded as those likely to be disruptive and noisy, thus threatening the "control" of the teacher in terms of the publicly available indicators.

The practical problems posed by the common-core curriculum continued to reflect the concern of teachers that where pupils could not be motivated they were likely to prove disruptive. Subjects such as French posed particular problems because of their "abstract" nature, and the necessity for oral work. The "abstract" nature of subjects such as French referred to (a) the lack of immediate applicability of the knowledge being presented in the classroom, and (b) the developmental manner in which the subject needed to be taught. In a common-core curriculum it was felt that certain pupils were ill-suited to such abstract forms of teaching and needed more practical orientation in order to motivate them (and thus offset the possibility of disruption). The incremental development of the subject was further seen as precluding the possibility of individual pacing of work. These subjects were regarded as requiring a group pacing which could also act to facilitate the pitching of the work at the right level if those groups reflected particular ability ranges.

The ability range of the intake to the schools were also a cause of concern, both in the controversy and to the teachers at Ashton and Beechgrove. Under the circumstances of an over-representation of low-ability pupils and of pupils from lower socio-economic groups, the teachers' task was more directly oriented to motivating the pupils rather than expecting the motivation to reside in the pupil. That is, under these circumstances the teachers were less inclined to regard "motivation" as an attribute of the child which could drawn upon in the presentation of the lesson, but
rather it was seen as a thing to be generated by the teacher in the classroom setting. And where motivation could not be assumed to be an attribute of the child there was an increased threat to the teacher's control in the sense that those pupils who remained "unmotivated" were regarded as a potential source of "disruption".

The view of "control" established through the accounts allows an understanding of which pupils posed problems for the teacher in the classroom situation. Those pupils whose behaviour was noisy, and thus threatened the isolation of the classroom setting, threatened the competence of the teacher because the noise transcended the isolation of the setting and became a publicly available indicator of (a lack of) teacher "control". Quiet recalcitance, on the other hand, posed no such threat and consequently was far less evident as a practical problem of teaching.

It appeared, then, on the basis of the case study of the schools, that competence as a teacher owed more to the ability to maintain quiet orderliness in the classroom than to the ability to inculcate knowledge, to the extent that this manifestation of "control" was not regarded as a pre-requisite to the task of teaching (inculcating knowledge) but was considered to be a fundamental task of teaching in its own right and distinct from the task of inculcating knowledge.

This understanding of the fundamental features of teaching arose in the specific context of large, urban comprehensive schools chosen as representative of those schools giving cause for concern." As a result it might be inferred that the nature of this task structure was peculiar to such schools. However, the salience of "control" in other circumstances is evident (see for instance Hanson and Herrington, 1976, Delamont 1976, Jackson 1968, Taylor and Dale 1971, Stenhouse 1967), and in fact, can be
seen to stem from features of classroom life relatively untouched by comprehensive re-organization.

The significant aspects of the setting in terms of "control" were (a) the isolation of the classroom, (b) the autonomy of teacher "control" and (c) compulsory attendance, none of which have been substantially affected by comprehensive re-organization. They are, however, characteristic of secondary education in general. As Stenhouse has observed:

"We emerge with a picture of a class compelled to attend a school, where the leadership of the teacher is mandatory. Authority carries with it a responsibility to exercise some control over the life of a class. The teacher is normally expected to fulfil his responsibilities without calling in assistance from outside."

(Stenhouse 1967, p.47)

It is under these circumstances that the teachers' understanding of "control" accords with that outlined for Ashton and Beechgrove, not a set of organizational arrangements deemed to be "comprehensive". To the extent that classroom life exhibits these features, then, this view of "control" may characterize teaching in general, and not merely teaching in large, urban comprehensives.

"Control" as a problem for teaching, however, may be exacerbated under organizational arrangements associated with comprehensives, (the problems of pupil numbers, nature of the intake and mixed-ability grouping illustrating the case). Certainly, teachers in the schools identified such arrangements as the source of practical problems, but it can be suggested that it was not so much that they created problems...
of "control" - for these were inherent in the isolation, autonomy and compulsory attendance of the setting, - but that they exacerbated problems of "control".

Changes in teaching which are to be effective are consequently unlikely to result from changes which leave the basic setting of teaching unchanged. Indeed, it may be suggested on the basis of this research that more significant changes in the practice of teaching will ensue from the adoption of open-plan classrooms at a secondary school level, and the use of team-teaching than can be expected or attributed to comprehensive re-organization per se. Such changes, however, would have to contend with the resistance of staff for whom such innovations would literally challenge the basis of their (traditional) competence, and would be likely in consequence to be a long, slow process. (cf. Richmond 1967).

The isolation of the setting and the autonomy of "control" are the bases of a "hidden pedagogy" which parallels the pupils' experience of a "hidden curriculum" under similar circumstances (cf. Jackson 1968). The influence of (formal) organization upon teaching, then, stems more from the "hidden pedagogy" than the avowed aims of the formal organizational arrangements.

To "make out" as a teacher requires the same "situational adjustment" (Becker 1971) to the "hidden pedagogy" as a pupil needs for the "hidden curriculum", - a factor which may explain the changes of orientation of probationary teachers observed by, amongst others, Hanson and Herrington (1976) and Morrison and McIntyre (1967). Socialization into the reality of the school situation, that is, may serve to neutralize alternative sources of change stemming from college of education training.
The evidence of this research suggests that the competent practice of teaching is learnt in school, is developed in a community of teachers and is rooted in the isolation of the setting and autonomy of "control". In accord with Hanson and Herrington it can be argued, therefore, that

the real agency for change is the school and not the college. What teachers are doing is learned in school, and if in college there is some consideration of what teachers should be doing, this is not sustained later.

(Hanson & Herrington 1976, p.62)

Effective changes in teaching, that is, require fundamental changes in school reality rather than pedagogic or (selection) organizational innovations. 4

In conclusion, the essence of teaching has not been affected by comprehensive re-organization because the salient features of the practical context have generally remained unchanged. The isolation of the classroom setting and the autonomy of teacher "control" remain characteristic of secondary education, and it is in this context that "peace-keeping" task of teaching can be regarded as basic to teaching competence. However, certain organizational arrangements associated with comprehensives serve to exacerbate the problems of "control" and threaten the competence of the teacher more than traditional arrangements.

4. If the "closed" classroom and teachers' self-sufficiency of "control" are fundamentally challenged by open-plan classrooms and team-teaching, the prospect of removing compulsory attendance may be still more distant in that it would fundamentally challenge the notion of "schooling". (cf. Goodman 1970, Illich 1971, Reimer 1971).
APPENDICES.
APPENDIX 1  Comprehensivization in England and Wales

This research focuses on the maintained sector of secondary education in England and Wales with specific reference to comprehensive schools. Alongside the maintained sector the direct grant and independent schools have continued to exist, although the effects of legislation withdrawing direct grants has yet to be gauged at the time of writing. Table 13 and 14 provide a profile of the relative size of the sectors and their composition, with the latter offering a comparison over the period 1961-72:

Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>January 1973</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,835) Comprehensives</td>
<td>1,580,406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,915) Secondary Modern</td>
<td>965,753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(819) Grammar</td>
<td>496,766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(963) Technical</td>
<td>25,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(302) Middle (Deemed Secondary)</td>
<td>123,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(245) Other Maintained</td>
<td>171,043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,362,554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

176 Direct Grant Grammar 120,105
Independent (recognized as efficient) secondary 89,191
348 Secondary & Primary 122,991
90 Other Independent Secondary 6,496

916 338,783

Table 14. Secondary Education in England & Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thousands of Pupils</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public: Modern</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(figures extracted from Social Trends No. 4 1973: Central Statistical Office, H.M.S.O. Table 105, p.146)

It is not the co-existence of the maintained and the independent sectors of secondary education, however, which provide the orientation of this research so much as the co-existence within the maintained sector of grammar (selective) and comprehensive (non-selective) schools. The gradual and incomplete re-organization along comprehensive lines can be detailed through D.E.S. publications (Statistics of Education: H.M.S.O.) and those from the Central Statistical Office (Social Trends: H.M.S.O.) as well as from research for institutes such as the N.F.E.R. (Monks 1968) and contributions such as Benn and Simon's (1970) and the host of material produced by the Campaign for Comprehensive Education. A collated picture of the trend is provided by Fenwick (1976):

The pattern of secondary schools 1954–72, with particular reference to grammar schools and comprehensive schools

| Year | Pupils | | | | | Schools | | | | |
|------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|      | All secondary school pupils | Grammar school pupils | Comprehensive school pupils | All secondary schools | Grammar schools | Comprehensive schools |
|      | No. in '000s | No. in '000s | Col. 2 as % of col. 2 | No. in '000s | Col. 2 as % of col. 2 | No. | Col. 7 as % of col. 7 | No. | Col. 7 as % of col. 7 | No. | Col. 7 as % of col. 7 |
| 1954 | 1,822 | 518 | 28 | 12 | — | 5,054 | 1,181 | 23 | 13 | — | — |
| 1955 | 1,915 | 528 | 27 | 16 | — | 5,144 | 1,180 | 22 | 16 | — | — |
| 1956 | 2,057 | 544 | 26 | 27 | 1 | 5,262 | 1,193 | 22 | 31 | — | — |
| 1957 | 2,186 | 559 | 25 | 42 | 1 | 5,380 | 1,206 | 22 | 43 | — | — |
| 1958 | 2,331 | 590 | 25 | 75 | 3 | 5,550 | 1,241 | 22 | 86 | 1 | — |
| 1959 | 2,593 | 641 | 24 | 107 | 4 | 5,715 | 1,252 | 21 | 111 | 1 | — |
| 1960 | 2,723 | 673 | 24 | 129 | 4 | 5,801 | 1,268 | 21 | 130 | 2 | — |
| 1961 | 2,829 | 697 | 24 | 142 | 5 | 5,847 | 1,284 | 21 | 138 | 2 | — |
| 1962 | 2,836 | 708 | 24 | 157 | 5 | 5,890 | 1,287 | 21 | 152 | 2 | — |
| 1963 | 2,781 | 722 | 25 | 179 | 6 | 5,891 | 1,295 | 21 | 175 | 2 | — |
| 1964 | 2,830 | 726 | 25 | 199 | 7 | 5,894 | 1,298 | 22 | 195 | 3 | — |
| 1965 | 2,819 | 719 | 25 | 240 | 8 | 5,863 | 1,285 | 21 | 262 | 4 | — |
| 1966 | 2,817 | 713 | 25 | 312 | 11 | 5,798 | 1,273 | 21 | 387 | 6 | — |
| 1967 | 2,831 | 695 | 24 | 408 | 14 | 5,729 | 1,239 | 21 | 508 | 8 | — |
| 1968 | 2,895 | 656 | 22 | 606 | 20 | 5,576 | 1,155 | 20 | 748 | 13 | — |
| 1969 | 2,964 | 632 | 21 | 773 | 26 | 5,468 | 1,098 | 20 | 962 | 17 | — |
| 1970 | 3,046 | 605 | 19 | 937 | 30 | 5,385 | 1,038 | 19 | 1,145 | 21 | — |
| 1971 | 3,144 | 574 | 18 | 1,128 | 35 | 5,205 | 970 | 18 | 1,373 | 25 | — |
| 1972 | 3,251 | 540 | 16 | 1,337 | 41 | 5,212 | 893 | 17 | 1,591 | 30 | — |

**Sources:** DES statistics and Ministry of Education annual reports for appropriate years.

(Fenwick 1976, p.148)

This trend, though accelerated by Circular 10/65, did not start in that year. The steady growth from 1965 has continued, however, with just 36 local authorities still to re-organize in August 1976. At this time, the latest figures available indicated that in 1974 there were 2,273 schools with 56% of secondary school pupils attending such schools. (D.E.S. (1975) Statistics of Education 1974, Vol. I Schools p.ix: H.M.S.O).

The combined effects of the withdrawal of direct grants and the statutory ending of selection (1976) may be reasonably expected to further promote the re-organization of the maintained sector to a conclusion in the imminent future if a Labour Government committed to its present policies stays in office for its full term.
Appendix II

Official Guidelines at Ashton and Beechgrove
Appendix II

Ashton and Beechgrove provided "official guidelines" for their staff concerning their duties. Such information was considered by the staff as "classified", particularly at Beechgrove where access to the "official guidelines" was not facilitated by senior staff, but was illicitly obtained through informal channels. At Ashton, the "official guidelines" were provided willingly by the Headmaster and for this reason Appendix II constitutes extracts from the "official guidelines" of Ashton relevant to the official expectations of teachers' duties and pupil behaviour with similar extracts from Beechgrove's "official guidelines" appearing in limited form.
1. Pupils in our school consist of the enthusiastic and helpful ones, those who conform, those who occasionally are mischievous or lazy, and some who are emotionally disturbed and inadequate or have difficult home backgrounds. Those in the last group present long-term problems and require of teachers a knowledge of the pupil, sympathetic help and special efforts to bring about a re-adjustment in attitude and behaviour. But every pupil in the school must be made to realise that it is the staff as a whole, and not just the individual class teacher, who combine to encourage and produce a high standard of individual and social behaviour.

2. It is the responsibility of each individual teacher to get to know the pupils in the forms or sets which he or she teaches, and to endeavour, through suitable organization and work to produce a positive and harmonious atmosphere in the classroom. Any pupil, however, who is persistently difficult or inadequate should be discussed with the Head of House so that the House is fully informed of the problem. Form Teachers should acquaint House staff with any new information, cases of truancy, fresh incidents or change of attitude of any pupil in their Form. Heads of House will have the records and other information about their pupils and will be able both to give advice and take suitable action.

3. It is also the responsibility of Heads of House to keep the Teacher-in-Charge of the building and Form Teachers adequately informed of any pupils who require special attention, and to discuss any cases they think necessary with the Headmaster or Deputy Heads.

4. From time to time, there will be cases of individual pupils or groups of pupils misbehaving or doing work inadequately. If these are classroom occurrences, the subject teacher concerned should deal with the matter as far as possible. Suitable extra work may be set pupils to be done in their free time. In exceptional circumstances, individual pupils or groups of pupils may be kept behind after school for up to half-an-hour. But pupils may only be detained after school subject to the following conditions:

   (i) in the case of 1st and 2nd form pupils during the winter months when it gets dark early, detention should only be given in extreme cases after other methods have been tried.

   (ii) the length of detention must not exceed half-an-hour unless the teacher first discusses the matter with the teacher-in-charge of the building.

   (iii) the pupils must have an over-night warning of the detention so that they can tell their parents. This proviso is vital, but it need not lead to inefficient delays. For example, pupils can be warned when work is collected that there will be a detention on the evening the work is given back if it has been done inadequately.
(iv) staff must be aware that a few secondary school children have obligations to collect smaller brothers and sisters from neighbouring primary schools.

5. A short detention (of 10 minutes) may be as efficacious as a longer one. For such a detention, a teacher may arrange for the teacher-in-charge of the building to be present to reinforce the situation. Likewise, when extra work is set, pupils can be told to hand this in to the teacher-in-charge of the building so long as this has been mutually arranged beforehand.

6. If any pupil is persistently unduly mischievous or lazy and the individual teacher is unable to correct this, the matter should be reported to the Head of House, who should then deal with the pupil.

7. Isolated cases of anti-social behaviour may occasionally blow up in a classroom and threaten to disrupt a lesson. If an emotional outburst seems imminent, it may seem advisable to remove the pupil from the classroom. Such a pupil must not be stood outside the classroom door. Each teacher-in-charge of a building will draw up a small rota of duty teachers (including himself or herself) to whom such pupils should be sent with a brief explanatory note. If the pupil is not to be trusted, the note should be given to another pupil who will accompany the "miscreant" to the appropriate place. It is essential always to check that the pupil arrives at his correct destination. Any punishment to be meted out will be the responsibility of the duty teacher and should be reported to the Head of House.

8. Outside the classroom, it is the duty of every member of staff immediately to deal with any cases of unruly or silly behaviour that they may observe. Most of these can be settled with a wise word, but in more serious cases the event and the pupils concerned must be reported to the teacher-in-charge of the building or Head of House.

INCENTIVES

1. To encourage a good social behaviour and endeavour a system of House merits and demerits has been instituted.

2. Each teacher can obtain a supply of merit and demerit forms from the Clerical Assistant.

3. The award of merit marks will prove to be very much an individual teacher matter - probably depending on the pupil's possible achievements and having regard to capability. Their award should encourage pupils to make further efforts for their House. Merit Marks should not be awarded for routine good work or behaviour, but only for rather special effort, service or endeavour. Teachers will give Merit Marks to pupils as and when appropriate and the
pupils will hand these in to their Form teachers during the weekly Form period. Form teachers will keep a Special Merit Book, listing the pupils by Houses, and towards the end of each half-term the books with totals by Houses will be sent on request to the Deputy Heads for collation. Form teachers should, of course, comment on the merits received during their form periods. After merits have been entered, the merit forms should be passed on to the Heads of House rooms for information. Likewise, teachers will make demerit forms in cases where it is thought the misbehaviour is serious enough to be permanently recorded. Such demerit forms will be handed in by the teacher to the Heads of House rooms. Heads of House will keep a record of demerits received, and will take appropriate action to discuss cases at House assemblies, with form teachers or with the individual pupil and teacher concerned. Towards the end of each half-term, the Demerit Book will be submitted to the Deputy Heads for collation.

Total of merits and demerits obtained by each House will be announced at the end of each half-term by the Deputy Heads at building assemblies.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Irregular forms of corporal punishment cannot be countenanced. The cane, for extreme cases of anti-social behaviour, may be administered only by the Headmaster, Deputy Heads, Senior Master, Teachers in Charge of buildings and Heads and Deputy Heads of House. Each punishment must be entered in the Punishment Book kept by the Teachers-in-Charge of buildings. No teacher may administer the cane to a pupil of the opposite sex.
PROMOTION OF GOOD BEHAVIOUR OF PUPILS

DUTIES OF STAFF

1. Form teachers should be in their form rooms by 8.50 a.m. and 1.35 p.m.; and from 3.45 p.m. to 3.50 p.m. or 4.00 p.m. when necessary. The Teacher-in-charge of the building must be notified if on any day this is not possible due to travelling for lessons.

2. At registration time, form teachers should regularly check:
   (i) the appearance of pupils (uniforms and general neatness)
   (ii) that each pupil has a good pen, pencil, ruler and rubber;
   (iii) that pupils have books ready for subsequent lessons;
   (iv) that homework is being set and done;
   (v) that pupils have rough books.

   At registration times and form periods, there should be discussions about the advantages of orderly behaviour, politeness and responsible attitudes; also about litter, tidiness of classrooms and desks, care of curtains and blinds, respect for other's property (including books), naming of clothing, care of money, assembly notices and responsibilities of Form Captains.

3. Class teachers should expect their classes (except for 6th forms) to stand quietly at the beginning of the lesson. Class teachers should strive to leave each class with some work for the next lesson - so that when a class is in the room before the teacher, the class can get on with some task. Pupils should be encouraged to carry a Library or reading book with them.

4. Class teachers should ensure that classes are dismissed in an orderly way and should watch their departure down corridors.

5. Wherever possible, class teachers should be just outside their rooms to receive their form and to keep an eye on general behaviour in the corridor.

6. Running and shouting in the buildings are anti-social and should be checked immediately by any member of the staff observing them. The quickest remedy is to ask the pupil to go back and then walk quietly and to watch that this is done.

7. During a lesson, pupils' requests to visit the toilet should not be granted at first time of asking and only in cases of extreme need. Pupils sent to the Duty Teacher for discipline reasons should be accompanied by the Form Captain.

8. If staff have doubts as to whether all pupils are present a roll call should be made and entered in the mark book. If necessary, the attendance register should be sent for - and returned, and the signing-out book checked. Any cases of unjustified absence from lessons should be reported immediately to the Head of House. Individual pupils arriving late to lessons should be closely questioned and excuses checked.
9. School finishes at 4.00 p.m., but classes when well-behaved can be dismissed at, but not before, 3.50 p.m. Overcoats should be collected by pupils after final dismissal. In the last form period of the day, form teachers can check on merits and demerits received during the day, on society activities, on uniform and dress, on homework and tidiness of classroom. Five spellings can be set each evening to younger forms and checked the next day.

10. Each member of staff should attend regularly the Building and House Assemblies unless he/she has duties in another building. At Building assemblies, Form teachers are responsible for 'silence' and good behaviour by their forms both before the official service begins and afterwards.

11. Notwithstanding the difficulty of being punctual at all times, it should nevertheless be first priority of members of staff to keep as strictly to time as possible at the beginning and ending of class periods and supervisory duties.

"The price of peace is eternal vigilance". G.F.W.
GENERAL CLASSROOM PROCEDURE

Pupils should be given to understand that they sit where the teacher wants them to sit; it is desirable that they should have a regular place. Do not allow any furniture to be moved without your express permission. Do not allow pupils to open other pupils' desks.

Except where a class is to use its own room, pupils should not enter a room before the arrival of the teacher. Pupils who are waiting should always be seated on a bench in the corridor. Do not permit standing round a doorway. It is preferable and more useful if teachers who are waiting for classes wait in the corridor and exercise general supervision meanwhile.

Before beginning dismissal procedure at the end of a lesson check the floor for litter and have each pupil clear its own area before moving. Check that the desks and chairs are tidily arranged so that the room will have an orderly appearance for the next class.

Having all the class on their feet and in lines before instructing them to go, Do not keep back any pupil nor allow yourself to be manoeuvred into delaying a pupil. Try at all times to convey the importance of punctuality.

Pupils are not permitted freely to visit toilets during lesson time and a first request should be refused on principle. Subsequent requests should not produce an easy permit either.

Pupils should not be sent back to another room to retrieve a forgotten item. Do everything you can to discourage the incidence of individuals moving from one room to another during lesson time for trivial or avoidable reasons.

Given a secure, well defined framework and pattern of behaviour the great majority of pupils will produce good work and conduct. Constant praise and encouragement should be dispensed, and recognizable cooperation from the pupil should be rewarded.

(Extracted from Official Guidelines to Staff at Ashton: This document was not available to parents or the public)
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF RECORD CARDS (ASHTON)

1. Every pupil now has a Brent School Record Folder, which consists of a folder containing a loose card headed "Secondary School Record Card" and which must, at all times, be kept with the folder. These folders are green for girls and white for boys and are filed in cabinets in House rooms and are issued on request by House teachers, but like reports, they must always be kept on the school premises. They should always be in the House room except when actually in use for making entries.

GUIDE TO FORM TEACHERS

2. Teacher's Rating of Scholastic Progress:

Where necessary, enter subject titles as on school report and in the first available column put name of Form and underneath December 1972, February 1973, April 1973, July 1973; use each column, crossing out the word "In'ials" when necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS/YEAR</th>
<th>1N4</th>
<th>1N4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>Dec 72</td>
<td>April 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In'ials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter gradings direct from Form profile and initial at foot of column.

3. Attendance:

Enter half-day absent, followed by relevant comment. If pertinent, enter comment such as irreg., tonsil oper., measles, broken arm, frequent colds, etc.

4. Significant Medical Information

Enter more specific details where necessary.

5. Personal and Social Qualities

Summarise social effort as on report.

6. Noteworthy Interests and Activities

Add any that are known.
7. Check details on card folder, bringing them up-to-date if necessary.

8. On returning Secondary School Record Card to folder, check that the names tally.

9. Finally, check that a card has been completed for every pupil on the Form Profile and refer any discrepancies to the House Teacher.
Extracts from the Official Guidelines Brochure of Beechgrove for Parents

The Curriculum

Abundant resources in terms of staff and teaching facilities together with an organization that is pupil-centred enables the school to fulfil a great many educational needs. We can reach the 11 year-old and the 18 year old, the academic pupil and the one who leans towards more practical subjects.

Further in the brochure we shall describe work of the non-English speaking partially-hearing and remedial departments. Firstly, however, there is an explanation of the type of education that is given to the great majority of pupils.

The First Three Years

In the first three years pupils are taught for the most part in mixed-ability groups, that is to say classes contain a cross-section of pupils in each year. With classes that are quite manageable in size, non-streaming, we contend, has many advantages over rigid streaming according to a child's ability at the age of 11. Above all, this flexible approach enables us to ensure that pupils can develop at their own pace.

At the same time, the Mathematics, English and French departments may sometimes want to establish separate teaching groups for faster children on the one hand and slower children on the other.

As well as teaching the traditional range of subjects in the first three years, we are able to meet minority needs. All children are taught French, but those who wish to study further language and have sufficient ability may do so: Latin, German and Spanish are all timetabled. Meanwhile, no fewer than twelve musical instruments are taught by the school music staff and visiting teachers.

All pupils are expected to do homework, and again work that is set is graded to meet individual needs.

The Fourth and Fifth Years

When they reach the fourth year pupils begin a two year course leading to external examinations at the levels of G.C.E. 'O' level and C.S.E. (our commercial courses lead to R.S.A. examinations). At the end of the third year there is close consultation between pupils, parents, subject teachers and careers staff so that the course a pupil chooses suits his or her ability, aptitude and possible choice of career.

In the fourth and fifth years the progress that a pupil makes in a subject determines whether he or she will take a G.C.E. or a C.S.E. examination, and a pupil may finally take some subjects at each level.
Some departments take advantage of the scope allowed by the C.S.E. examination and devise their own syllabuses, that is to say they are involved in Mode III courses. Worthy of special mention here are the courses in English Law and in Computer Science. Recent groups being in the vanguard in the development of these two subjects in schools.

A special course that can be taken instead of a series of options is Basic Catering. Here pupils study both catering itself and allied subjects e.g. science, nutrition, French and geography. The course leads to a C.S.E. examination and can open the way to a number of interesting careers. The Basic Catering department has both a catering kitchen and restaurant.

The following table shows that pupils in the fourth and fifth years take certain compulsory subjects and choose five subjects themselves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language, Mathematics, Social Studies, Careers, Health Education, Religious Education, Physical Education, Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Subjects - Pupils to choose one subject from each of the following groups:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group One: Human Biology, German, Woodwork, Art, Russian, Drama Social Studies, Housecraft, History, Needlecraft, Religious Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Two: Physics, French, Geography, Metalcraft, Office Practice, Computer Science, General Studies, Technical Drawing, English Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Three: Chemistry, French, Engineering Studies/Technical Drawing, Commerce, Geography, Art, Metalcraft, English Literature, Geology, Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Four: Additional Mathematics, Needlecraft, History, Art, Engineering Studies/Technical Drawing, Typing, Biology, General Science, Spanish, English Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Beechgrove Certificate

We feel strongly that education is not simply a matter of passing examination, and that five years spent at Beechgrove without gaining examination certificates is not necessarily time wasted by any means. Therefore we have instituted the Beechgrove Certificate which we award to all those pupils who make good use of the opportunities offered to them at the school. We are confident that this certificate will carry more and more weight with local employers.

The Sixth Form

Like the remainder of the school the sixth form is fully comprehensive. A significant number of pupils study three 'A' level subjects and go on to universities and other institutions of higher education. Approximately thirty subjects are taught in the school at the advanced level. Meanwhile other sixth formers work towards their G.C.E. 'O' levels; yet others take a secretarial and typing course, which leads to R.S.A. and G.C.E. examinations.

All sixth formers continue their general education by participating in minority time studies, such as religious education, current affairs, home management, art, music, and film appreciation. Outdoor activities available to sixth formers include sailing, fencing, roller skating, canoeing, horse-riding, as well as the usual sports and games.

Sixth-form common-room accommodation and library facilities are being extended. Not only will these improvements assist academic work but they will also increase the many social activities which already flourish in the sixth form.
Notes for the Guidance of Staff

School discipline and consequently the tone of the school is the concern of us all. It can only exist through the full co-operation of everyone, and therefore your support is expected in carrying out the requirements listed below which would go far toward keeping Beechgrove standards high.

Staff should insist on good manners and courtesy, and to this end ought not to allow themselves to be addressed discourteously by children, or to accept slovenliness in attitude, dress or speech. The importance of the school image should be stressed and children should be given guidance concerning their behaviour in public.

School Discipline

All teachers should remonstrate with all children who are noisy, breaking school rules, and not confine this to their own form or department. Ignoring or turning a blind eye condones bad behaviour in the eyes of the children. When we walk from class to class or from building to building we are all responsible - running, fighting, shouting, litter is our joint concern and should be dealt with by us all.

'Difficult' children should not be stood outside the room. This is not a punishment for the child and does not solve anything. It merely places the child in a position without supervision and passes the responsibility to some other member of staff.

Discipline within the classroom is the responsibility of the individual teacher but Heads of Departments and Heads of Houses are always ready and willing to support members of staff. However, it should be realised that in the end no useful and lasting purpose is served if too many problems arising within the classroom are referred to higher authority.
This practice only serves to weaken the authority of the individual teacher in the eyes of the children.

The setting of extra work is common practice within the school and providing it is followed up proves an effective check for minor misdemeanours. There is a system of House detentions to cover offences outside the classroom.

Subject teachers may detain pupils for up to half an hour. Pupils should be given 24 hours notice to enable them to inform their parents. In the case of difficulty of maintaining an orderly detention, remember that there are senior members of staff still on the premises after 3.45 p.m. and they may be called upon. Prior warning would be advisable.

In the case of indiscipline of individual children the teacher can consult and seek help from the tutor/form teacher or the Housemaster/Housemistress. In the case of indiscipline of a whole class the teacher should seek guidance from the Head of Department or from the teacher responsible for that year as shown on Page 32.
APPENDIX III.

Use of a portable cassette tape recorder distinguished "formal" interviews from the host of material gathered through informal discussion and staff-room gossip. Assurances of anonymity and other tactful gestures served to minimize the inhibiting effect sometimes associated with tape-recording, and all but two teachers co-operated in the process of being "interviewed". (I)

"Formal", then, is not a reference to the structure of the interviews, and indeed there was a conscious attempt to limit interviewer interference in the flow of teacher comments in order to allow the members of staff to establish areas of relevance to their experience rather than respond to interviewer questions. The general success of such attempts, however, possibly reflects the articulate nature of the teaching profession as well as an interview strategy.

(I) One teacher failed to "co-operate" by claiming that, being new to the school, nothing she could say would be an accurate reflection of the teaching situation at the school. The other, the counsellor at Beechgrove, simply declined to be recorded, but did allow detailed notes to be taken during a lengthy interview.
The interview transcripts are not intended to represent typical interviews or a cross-section of the formal interviews undertaken. Although they illustrate the form of the interviews typical to the research, they have been selected specifically in terms of their content and to reflect the development of themes found in the text.

| Table 16: Breakdown of staff interviewed formally in the duration of the study. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Heads of Buildings:             | Ashton | Beechgrove |
|                                 | 3      | *          |
| Heads of House:                 | 8      | 8          |
| Heads of Subject:               | 13     | 7          |
| Subject Teachers:               | 16     | 12         |

( * No such position )

(Teachers interviewed in their capacity as Heads of House have not been included in their subject teacher capacity unless re-interviewed.)

(The number of teachers formally interviewed represents approximately a third of those in the schools.)
The interview with the Head of Music at Ashton, for instance, has been included because it clearly demonstrates the significance of noise for the teaching situation. The "aural" features of music teaching were regarded as particularly susceptible to interference from externally generated noise, and the nature of the subject was argued to place special constraints on the prospect of practical tuition and group work. Languages teacher Pr. of Beechgrove indicated in his interview that similar practical problems beset the teaching of Foreign languages, notably with respect to the "oral" requirements of such teaching and the necessity for an incremental approach essential to the acquisition of language skills.

In this interview the problem of motivating pupils for whom the subject has no apparent relevance arises as a significant aspect of the practical task of teaching, a problem which receives more detailed treatment by the head of French at Ashton who indicates that such problems are exacerbated in the mixed-ability teaching situation. The practical problems posed by noise, group work and mixed-ability teaching were not, however, restricted purely to music and foreign languages, and the interview with the English teacher at Beechgrove gives a moving account of how these posed problems in the day to day classroom situation and of the practical pressures to assure a teacher-controlled situation.

The/
The advantages of ability grouping appear to centre on their facilitation of teacher control, but for those teachers involved with groups of pupils at the lower ability range such grouping can increase the problems of control. The Social Studies teacher Kn. at Ashton concurs with the previously presented interviews to the extent that teaching can face problems where the relevance of the subject is not immediately apparent to the pupils, but notes that grouping by ability can concentrate such problems in the lower ability sets, and be manifested in disruptive behaviour.

Attempts to control disruptive behaviour can take recourse to the House system, but established teachers such as the deputy Head of Mathematics at Ashton demonstrate that such recourse is seen as unacceptable. Head of House Ha. of Ashton provides, in his interview, a clear overview of the way in which the House system is involved in the problems of classroom control and how the House staff are being obliged, against their wishes, to adopt a discipline specialist function. His colleague, Head of House Do., draws attention to the role conflict involved for the House staff in attempting to execute both pastoral/counselling functions and be discipline specialists.

The general peace-keeping role of the Heads of House is illustrated by Head of House La. at Beechgrove who, along with his colleague Head of House My., indicates how they operate the House system and perform their routine duties.
We haven't any really musical facilities here, you know, architecturally wise. Two of us, you know including myself, are working in a canteen. Well it means that I have never really got a proper base .... it's always a canteen. And at the end of the morning session it becomes a canteen and I can't go on utilizing it ... meeting the kids there. In fact I have nowhere to meet and I have to "parlee" with the P.E. staff "Can I use the hall?" ... so many lunchtimes a week. And it has to fit with their idea of using it because they want to use it for volleyball and table-tennis. So it's a bit competitive .. .. you're trying to get your own little bit in somewhere along the line. And .. um .. so there's no working base really in the senior school. There's no music basis as such.

And it's the same in Easton Road North .... where the teacher there in her own building also works in a canteen, and it's even worse there because the canteen's smaller ... therefore you've got all the noise of the dining room staff clanking and clicking. We're mice infested .. .. they eat at and live in the bottom of the piano and a store cupboard which is next door to the kitchen. And you have P.E. and drama lessons in the hall which adjoins the canteen.
So the noise problem is phenomenal. If you're trying to do music, which is essentially aural .... even if you're playing an instrument you're listening all the time to what you're playing and seeing if you're in tune, ... is it making some sort of sense ... and it's very difficult under those sort of conditions. So much so that that's why I've got a member of staff now leaving after one term's work ... she can't stand it .. she can't cope with the situation. And we've had six music teachers since I came here in three years in that building and it's for that reason ...... because the conditions are so bad that the teacher's have found that .. that it's an impossible situation. Um .. those are sort of building problems .... which are pretty important ... I mean.. everybody can utilize it .. nobody's got a perfect position ... but those are .. er .. fairly bad ones, .. er .. to some extent insurmountable.

Er, the other problem I would say within the teaching situation ... within the curriculum is that it's .. um .. we have a lot of instrumental work here .. in fact I base the whole ... importance of the work on the instrumental teaching. The more children there are actually learning an instrument the more likely they are to be interested in classroom music because they're motivated to learning more theory ... learning what's actually going on because they've got the practical problem of having an instrument and an instrumental teacher. And so the theory and the general music becomes all the more important. I mean
it gives it a certain ... it highlights their own problems.

But the main problem there is that we've got five instrumental/instrumental staff ... string, woodwind and brass .. and percussion, and the strings divided up into two sections, violin/violas and cellos ... and we have to do most of the teaching within the school timetable, that is between nine and four. There is some overlap and we do go outside an hour after school .. er after official school hours, but it means that there's a lot of grumble from the other class teachers when I remove children on a rota system .. I try to make it change so that it doesn't hit the same teacher ... over a term there may be time missed, out of thirteen weeks, three times the same teacher at the most. Um.. that er .. it does cause a lot of hassle. Again you're fighting for your subject because naturally the geography teacher doesn't want to see some violinist trot out half way through some lesson for their twenty minute violin lesson.

But .. er .. we use .. we teach in the lunch hours as well; and after school. But, for instance, the violins ... there's twenty string players so we just can't do them all in a lunch hour or one hour after school.

Interv: What ... taught individually?

Mo: Yes, well, in fact, they shouldn't be. It's supposed to be group teaching, but you can only do group teaching for a couple of weeks. Say, you start off some beginners together at the same level.
But the level of ability and the level of progress is so different that we end up having to do them individually, otherwise your kids just become, you know.. you can't keep .. it's very difficult learning an instrument to keep five children at a pace together because some forge way ahead and others are more slow. So we make it look as if it is group teaching but in fact it's individual, because ... if I want to get something done I have to get it done.

**Interv:** Do you have peripatetic teachers here?

**Mo:** Yes, five

**Interv:** Oh, they're all, well ... they're all peripatetic.

**Mo:** Yes, and I have the job of actually timetabling those teachers myself .. which .. there's quite a bit of paper work involved, because often they're professional musicians and so they hope to come in, say, the woodwind teacher hopes to come in every Wednesday, but he might find himself on tour with his orchestra, and so maybe I would have to change the day very quickly ... and I have to work out .. find individual rotas for each time ... and do my own timetabling within the current timetabling programme, as it were, for all these children.

**Interv:** And the children from down the road come up for these .... ?

**Mo:** No, we try to base the teaching in each building .. er .. well, no on the two buildings we do most of ... as I've only been here three years ... when I came and started to re-establish the instrumental teaching
which had sunk to a 'nil' .. well there were one
or two or three pupils floating around doing a bit
... and we've built it up. And so er, I started
off from scratch with juniors ... because with
instrumental teaching I want to start them as young
and as soon as possible. So, the bulk of my work
is done in the Junior School, with only a few seniors.
And the teachers come up for the senior pupils, but
mostly they're based in the junior annexes.

And that's a problem. With no real music site
... the music practice rooms, again I'm trying to
timetable teaching in libraries and halls. Very often
I have to move those teachers two and three times a
day. So that's quite awkward. The children have to
look and find out where they are because they can be
moved at a minute's notice. If somebody decides to
come in and wants to use the library for group work,
er .. my peripatetic teacher has to pick up his bag
and baggage and go searching for a room. Very often
I'm not even there to help him because it comes
unexpectedly.

Interv: Um, are there other restrictions that are put on you?

Mo: Yes .. for instance, there was .. we had a
mobile hut built in the grounds, very close to the
main building. And er .. everybody pointed out that
the mobile hut it'd be a good idea to put it right
away from the building, so if music was going on it
wouldn't disturb five classrooms - three lower and
two upstairs - with the noise of instruments and
singing and pianos and record players. But the Brent
Borough refused because that meant the expense of
building a concrete path leading to the hut whereas if they placed it at the side of the main building the path was already there.

**Interv:** Where was this?

**Mo:** At Easton Road North. It's behind Easton Road North building in the field that lies between Easton Road North and Easton Road South... in that big green field. But it's plonked up against maths... Mrs El's maths teaching room. And in the summer, because there's so much glass and everybody wants to open the windows, I mean the situation's impossible. They begged me not to teach music as such... could I just talk to them... I mean this was the approach. I mean, it is very, very difficult. And, then the noise was so much there that, then, we were taken out of the hut and put back in the canteen. For a while, you see, we had a respite, you see from the canteen, but we've been put back again because one music class was hitting five classrooms, the way it was positioned, ... as I say three there and two upstairs. So it's really hell.

**Interv:** Yes but with individual teaching, if I understand you correctly, you don't actually teach "classes" you know most people... say, a geography or French class - would be taught...?

**Mo:** In music lessons? Well... yes, I do... I mean I speak for myself, but um... I try to have the class... and, when I'm teaching them it's with the whole class. No, I never do individual/group work, and try to have a whole lot of groups going on, partly because... well, again the rooms don't lend themselves,
because you want space to get a group over there and they haven't anything like it. Therefore I just couldn't do it. So I tend to teach fairly direct. Teacher at the front, and my thirty children sitting there. Well, that's easily done when I do listening work. I play the piano. We do "following scores" bit of analysis. The theory of music. If I do recording. Er, recorder groups, that's everybody. I mean I go down and help slow ones or if they're out of tune, you can hear do something to get them right. And again when I get out the glockenspiel. It's in percussion work, I do it all in one. I mean, whatever the idea is we're working on everybody's working on it, as such, if you know what I mean, I haven't got within the thirty-five little groups all doing their own thing because I think it's too difficult. If you're working on one or two ideas at one time and everybody's plugging away that's sufficient.

Interv: The prospect of having group work with music then is fairly small?

Mo: Yes. Um. I mean outside the classroom situation we have groups working. We have a recorder group who are sufficiently interested to work on their own outside the classroom situation. This is in their lunch hour and after school. Similarly, with the orchestra, there are forty-six people who are prepared to come every Tuesday and stay from four o'clock to five-thirty working. 'Cos that's not timetabled, and. Er a brass band that works every Monday from four o'clock to five, and a wind band every Wednesday from 4 o'clock till five.
We just got that off the ground that wind band .. that's mixed woodwind and brass, and a bit of percussion's thrown in. But all those activities are outside the school .. um .. nine till four thing, you know.

_interv_: So your timetable is a "technical" timetable, I presume, /Yes/. I'm interested in the limitations you see, that .. um .. the subject alone places on the type of teaching you can do. You know .. is it almost impossible to teach .. er .. group work, or individually paced work because of the subject?

Mo: Um, well - to tell you the .. I .. I have always enjoyed teaching a class as a whole unit. I think if you're fiddling around inside a 35-40 minute lesson, ... I mean it's a very short unit of time, and by the time you've got your groups divided and settled ......, I mean I've gone in for such lessons in other schools .. I think it's a bit thorny. It sounds good on paper, but when you put into practice they don't learn as much. Because, if you have five groups organized inside forty minutes, and in music your groups can change because some child mightn't be able to, sort of, physically manage an instrument ... she'll want to try to work on something else .. well, if you've done that the lessons over. I'm prepared to teach my kids, get them organized right at the beginning, and within that framework do some changing around. It's hard to put into words. I don't like, actually, any method of group teaching.
Perhaps if I found myself in ideal conditions - which one never expects ... I mean, you'd be living in cuckoo-land if you were waiting for that to happen ... you'd never get anything done. So I tend to get round to doing what I can do with what I've got ... as it were. You see I ... I don't believe in group teaching as such. I think it is phony. For instance in my old school with the mixed-ability classes in English, - take English as an example - when I taught it, you're presented with a mixed-ability of thirty children - some very bright, ... who're I suppose average ... and then not so average, just a bit below ... and the kids who have real problems. And the idea is that while you get your brighter groups all working away on your own, you go and sit down and help your weaker children. Well, I don't think it works. I think you're kidding yourself because if you have five even, which is a lot, weak children in a group of thirty, and you're kidding yourself that those five lessons a week you're trying to help them to read or write ... which is mainly the problem in English, illiteracy ... you're kidding yourself. And I think it's hard on the brighter children because they're very active, they're quite demanding, they need you just as much as the children who need you for other reasons ... to get started right from the very beginning. They're demanding, they're precocious, they're intelligent, they can work quickly ...
they need your stimulus as much as the backward children. And I think it's **unfair**, as a fact ... as a matter of fact, the pressure that's put on abler groups to get on..... that they will get through because of their innate intelligence and will make it. I think they need the teacher's direction as much as the remedial. And even as the mother of two boys who're quite bright and intelligent and who, you know, have a lot of spare time creative activities outside the school situation ... are very demanding. You have to be really on the ball. I can't kid myself I've got two bright kids so they'll fare alright without me, because they need me.

**Interv:** So there isn't setting in music presumably?

**Mo:** No, well, it follows the setting of the school. Um, this school .. in the junior school they have two periods of music a week, everybody does, up until the end of the third year. Now, within that situation, as you know, in the junior building, ten stream entry .... five classes in each building of first years, for example, five second, five thirds .. well, as you know, we have a form of streaming in that the two top .... 1N5, 1S5 ... are streamed. They are the brightest lot, and so they are streamed. So what are left ... 4, 3, and 2 ... that's the numbers of the classes, are the mixed-ability, what's left, and so in a way it's not really mixed-ability because you're top's already been taken off, but there's some sort of mixture of what's left, and any class that's labelled "number one" is a remedial group. So in fact we are
... it's not setting, but there is some form of vague streaming. It's not ... we don't like to call it that because in the proper aims of education we're all supposed to be against that, but that is in fact what happens. Now, I follow that pattern, my classes are those that are already formed for me, as such, on the timetable, but other subjects do, in fact, get setting. By some information, I found out that well ... that through staff in ... various members of department have asked for setting within their subject ... maths, English.

Interv: in the 4, 3, 2?
Mo: In the 4, 3, and 2 ... yes

Interv: But do the sets follow that always? For instance ... 2S5, 2N5, those people will be in the top set?

/Yes they're always the top set/ There isn't any way in which someone could go from say being in 3 ... 2S5 and going into a lower set.

Mo: Yes, that does sometimes happen. Yes they can be moved down, do you mean or moved up? A kid can be moved up. If you find in the first year intake in the first term that some mistakes have been made through poor analysing coming from the primary school and so on ... um ... other things emerging in the first term through testing and teaching, a child can be moved up or down.

Interv: But, in terms of sets or in terms of ... I'm not ...

Mo: Well, both it would be, wouldn't it. It could be moved up with regard to the setting of English and Maths, but it could be moved up on a form basis, into a higher form which would be a "5" form.
It wouldn't be any point moving him from a 4, 3, 2 basis because it's supposed to be mixed-ability. He's as well off in 2 or 3 or 4. But if he's exceptionally able, or shows the push that's needed.. all that sort of thing, he'll go into the "5" grouping.. which is one of the high forms, which is the top form, top set.. "high fliers"..

Inter: New teachers.. this is a problem I've come across, a few people have mentioned this.. that they face special problems...

Mo: Well, I think their special problems aren't "special". I don't really like that idea of "special" problems, because everybody's a first year teacher sometime in their life. But I think it's the fault of institutes of education, like the London Institute of Education, that there's far too much bloody theory and that, also the sociological approach, I'm against it to an extent. A good teacher should always be aware of that anyway. But they talk so much about it in theory that young teachers who are going in worrying about their grouping.. their isolates.. drawing their diagrams of whose grouping in the class and who's the isolate and the loner, which a good teacher finds out anyway without having to do it. And they don't go in worrying that they are actually a teacher, and they're being paid to do a job which is to teach their subject.
I think it's also a problem that they want to be loved too much by their kids. They're so busy getting to know about the kid's bad mummies and daddies and the wicked brother in prison - they're filled with information like that .. but ask them in return, having got that information ... how much the children know of their subject .. it's nil, because they're not being taught. They're worried too much about the kids' liking of them. I think it's not important whether your kids love you or not. If you thought about it you'd have a nervous breakdown.... if I worried about all the kids whether they liked Mrs. Mo. or not ... It's very nice if you find out they do, but I can't worry about it because I'd never get any teaching done. And I think that it's .. I mean .. I think it's part of the hip .. um .. thing. It's understanding, it's almost touching, but it's not relevant. I mean if I worried about my husband .. does he still love me? ... all the time, and worked, really thought it all out so much, I could argue on any relationships the worries and problems. If you thought on that basis actually nothing positive would ever be done. I could sit cross-legged for hours wondering does he really like me? could he be tired of me? am I tried? do I need a change? .. it's impossible.

*Interv*: These pressures, then on the teacher are not practical? Is it not practical to try and worry about the pastoral care of ....?
No, well, I think that um .. I think if you're a good teacher it comes. I think .. the way I look at it is, for instance, when I went into teaching, when I began as a first year teacher I knew that it was going to a very difficult school, ... a very tough secondary modern school. And, the thing is, when you go in you're naturally nervous, you're trying to feel confident, but you don't, you're a bit shy, bit worried.... even frightened, especially when you know there's been some aggression from the kids and it's very tough. Um .. so you know that you've got to go in acting tough. I think that teachers who go in hoping that the kids will love them just because they're nice, and they try to talk the kids' language are doomed, because I don't think the kids respect them. How many of these sort of teachers succeed? They're always the ones with the most problems. Even if they can keep a friendly sort of a basis going and shammy relationships, I think what they get out of the kids isn't all that much .. except, that's all they've got. Whereas I would like to be able to say that, having gone in and battled, and fought for what I would like to see happening in the classroom and winning .. with the attitude of winning and not giving up .. um .. that you come through. The kids respect you for what you are. Because I think kids want to break you a bit. I remember when I was at .. there's something human about it, like when you're a girl and you've got a young bloke teacher coming in ... you just drop your eyes down a bit .. watch around his waist line and around there and see if
the bloke reacts .. if he gets nervous and you
make him blush or get uncomfortable .... it's a
matter of testing. Young people are testing .. my
kids do it to me all the time, and they're very
quick. Say I give in on something that I've said
previously's my one big thing ..... bed-time, there
comes a point where I want them to be in bed at a
reasonably early time because I think it affects
them the next day if they're tired, they don't maybe
learn so well, their concentration will be poor, like
mine is even as an adult, .. so I .. I'm pretty firm
about bed-time. Now, now and again on special
occasions I give in, through a bit of pressure ...
"something on television we must see" .. "I've done
my homework can I please watch". So under a certain
amount of pressure occasionally I succumb .. I give in
against my better judgment mind you, as I always say.
But nevertheless one does. But having done .. and
made inroads into my original dictum, next time they
don't ask for that, they push a bit further regarding
the time. There's another hour later than the
original time. And .. er .. kids exploit this factor
the same as I do in my work situation. Having made
inroads with a small amount of instrumental teaching
I try to increase it and bully a bit more, and get my
own thing going. I mean it's er .. human conflict.
It's not the best situation, but then nothing is ever
the best. We have to try and make do with what's
given to us, as I said before .. get on with it. And
I think it's ... I don't really see much difference
in my private life in dealing with my children at home, and the situation at school, except that in numbers, of course, it's many more. And I think that's what's even more important than certain guidelines which structure things. And you can say at that point "No!". And if you start having difficulty dealing with one thousand five hundred children instead of two, discipline breaks down and nobody knows where they are. And a kid'll come up and say "but so-and-so said I could". And that's very difficult for the teacher. What do you say if another teacher has said ... and you're trying to keep the demarcation line where there's some sort of sensible choice which has been made for very many reasons, which is not always convenient to the children and not always convenient to the staff. But it's been made with some sort of reasonable ... so that everybody knows where they are. Because, I think it's an institution the school. I think to pretend to make it one big friendly happy home, and we're all working in and out and loving one another is ridiculous because we're not. There's a certain amount ... we have to have a certain amount of structure and organization. The kids feel this and the staff do, we know where we are. When that breaks down, schools break up. And no amount of love or pastoral care and loving and concern, and sociological gestures towards this and that, will make a bit of difference. They're set for chaos.

**Inter:** Would you like to see some move backwards, or at least the maintenance of a structure ....?
Mo: Well, I don't think it's fair to use "backwards". I think that in the .. in the old days, or when I was at school, it was a fairly structural set-up. There were parts that I didn't always like, they were inconvenient, but then for other people they were convenient, for other students in a particular situation they were quite convenient. And in a school you're running for the majority, and the minority cases er .. get their little part in, like music, you know, when it becomes an option, and so I think it's a question of balance. Um .. there'd be no situation where I think, personally, that'd be perfect. So there has to be a certain amount of faith in balance.

Interv: It's how the balance would be achieved, naturally that I'd ....

Mo: Well, presumably this is what comprehensive education should be. I still say it should be a fairly structural set-up, because I don't see how you could cope adequately, and from a parent's point of view, look after one thousand five hundred children well unless it is structured. I think it's less good for the staff and the kids. Um .. and how many situations do we go out into whether in the profession or as a worker, do we find a phase-free situation where one does what one feels like when getting tired. And that's why I think a lot of young people, I think schools have been too comforting, allowing too many little diversions, which is very sweet to indulge yourself at the time, but what happens when you go to university or into a job situation where you can't
indulge these tendencies? Um .. it causes a breakdown and young people not being able to hold down jobs, simply because they can't take any form of structure. And their lives break down too because after all, there has to be a certain amount of structure in order for you to be reasonably successful. It's not a free-for-all is it?

It would be democracy run mad, they'd soon be voting whether or not to bother to go into Mrs. Mo's music lesson, or Mr. Do's English. And if they don't feel like going they'll vote it out. Because this is where it leads to. And I certainly didn't know as a kid, and I consider I was quite a bright kid at school, I couldn't have told the headmaster what I thought the curriculum ought to be. Well you've got kids actually trying to work out curriculum that teachers are working their brains and wits against, the whole problems. And you're asking kids to tell you. It's the world gone mad. I mean it's absolutely crazy. You've got professionals learning ... working for years, studying a subject, running off for Dip. Ed., or theory of educational grouping studies, and you're inviting your 6th formers into take a vote. And not only the 6th form, because it goes right through the school. You've got reps. right through to the junior part of the school. (... untranscribable)

We've had a vote on "games day" here .. sports day .. Now that's a day when the school all meets together for sports. Nobody's forced. The whole school isn't forced to participate, make a runner out of someone
who can't run, but you've kids who are quite capable of contributing, and you know, I think the others ought to go to watch and support it. I'm not particularly "sporty", I'm not really very interested, but I know that I'll go along and support it because there are kids there who are doing things like swimming and all, and it would be very sad .. just like if they didn't bother coming to my concert. I'd be rather sad about all the kids, maybe two hundred in the concert who'd worked hard to achieve this performance, and nobody cared to watch them. I mean, you know, it's support. And .. er .. they're voting that out now .. they don't want a sports day .. and I think that's not good enough. I mean, what .. they want to strip everything down so that there's actually no effort involved in doing anything, except what they feel like doing. What they feel like doing is what we all feel like doing, is sitting on our backsides having a smoke and a chat, and talking with our friends. But it's not going to get you very far, because all of the factors don't add up to a bit of information.
Languages Teacher: Pr.

Interv: Does the teaching of foreign languages differ from any other subject?

Pr: Em... the actual teaching method?

Interv: Teaching method, yes

Pr: Eh, yeh - largely in that it's .. you have to begin with a completely oral approach .. to er .. make it meaningful, I think. You can't just take lists of verbs anymore .. irregular verbs and say "This is an irregular verb, learn it" You have to work with the situation first where .. where some meaningful situation .. where speech would come in and then pick out your grammar from that, rather than the other way round. Whereas in the past you'd get a .. list of verbs and a structured grammar course. Nowadays you have a structured course, but it's not based on the grammar first, and then the examples afterwards. The examples are first in a natural situation, like a conversation, that's the way it normally works out. And then you pick out the grammatical points as such from there, except you don't call them grammatical points, and you work on that. I should think, really, that would be the same as teaching points of English grammar; - you don't really set out with a .. a list of things to teach, you .. you have a passage first with all the things in it that you want to pick out and you work on it from there I guess.
Interv: Does the subject have any inherent properties in it that make it difficult to teach?

Pr: Yeh, many. Especially for working-class kids. I think the fact that they have very little er .. potential of using it, especially French. You know, with Spanish ... The reason I teach it really is that lots or er .. working-class kids now go on package holidays, and they at least, you know, they do go to Spain, they at least get the chance of communicating, even if it's with people in shops or waiters, and they don't get conned so easily if they can speak a few words of the language, but with French ..... the chances of people going to French-land er .. (laughs) to France on holidays is a very bourgeoise pastime really. So I think .. no really I think it effects working-class kids far more than in nice grammar schools where they all ... they can see the .. er the way ahead.

That's another thing I think about teaching languages to .. er .. working-class kids is that they can't be presented with the eventual goal, like .. er .. sort of a middle-class kid can. I think middle-class or brighter kids tend to be able to see a goal a long way ahead, you know, if they struggle and work at it now, and there are probably certain things in language teaching that have ... struggled to learn, you know, by rote. You can't learn a whole language in two or three years or whatever. But .. um .. you know, the middle-class kid can see ahead and think "Well if I do that and if I stick at it, after a certain amount of time I'm going to get
a lot of .. er .. spiritual pleasure out of being able to communicate with another race". But the working-class really wants his pleasures here and now. And I don't think he's got the patience to, on the whole, stick at learning a language using the very easy fundamental things you'd have to start off with .. continuous repetition orally ... this sort of thing, you know, he can't see that that's building up structures, and ... I don't know, I think language teaching's got to move away from the .. er .. classroom anyway. You know, especially French. I think the only way to teach it is for the .. er .. the really bright kids, working-class or whatever class - for the bright ones who are interested in doing it, maybe, who show an aptitude for it, and then arrange exchange courses in the intensive learning situation rather than $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours a week over about thirty-five weeks, you know, - it just doesn't work I don't think.

**Interv:** Do you think this long-term - I mean the idea of .. er .. building up a language over a long time affects the sort of kids who are coming to take French or Spanish?

**Pr:** How do you mean "affects" them? I don't really get it there.

**Interv:** Do the kids choose to come and take .. er .. Spanish and French of their own accord?
Pr: They choose to take Spanish. At this place they ... um .. they start at the beginning of the third year, and .. um .. I usually go around with .. er .. publicity and a bit of spiel saying this is what we all do, and .. um .. background work on Spain and the rest of it. And then, if they're interested, they put their names forward, and then we generally .. if there are about fifty applying we select thirty on .. in terms of past enthusiasm and aptitude for languages rather than purely on ability .. if they're really keen on doing another language and it won't over-burden them, they're chosen. But unfortunately everybody except the .. the remedial kids, the two remedial forms, .. er does French for the first year. And really they can't drop it until the beginning of the fourth year. So it's more or less three years of enforced French, for the majority of kids at school and I think that's pretty common in Primary schools.

Interv: Would you find that those with an aptitude for French would be more likely to .. um .. to choose Spanish?

Pr: Certainly, yeh, that's how it always worked out, you know.

Interv: Is there any sort of relationship between those who have an aptitude for French and those who do Spanish?

Pr: Em .. on the whole, yeh, there tends to be. Er .. people just seem to have .. er .. a linguistic flair, I suppose. They, they're not afraid to open their mouths and speak another language. It .. it's
the confidence they have and they get things right a few times and this gives them the confidence, to go on. Where some other kid whose a bit more timid maybe starts off doing French, doesn't understand it too well, gets a few answers wrong or can't reproduce the accent too well, and gets thoroughly disenchanted with the whole question of language learning, especially when he can't see when he's ever going to use it, probably.

**Interv:** In the 5th and 6th years there's .. er .. Spanish and French sor of 'O' and 'A' levels. Do they fit into a course with others O's and A's? Do you find .. er .. many kids end up doing say Spanish 'O' level and take CSE's in other subjects?

**PR:** Ym, yeh, you can .. mostly the people who start Spanish in the third year. Say thirty started, I suppose you're left with about twenty at the end of the 5th year, who will then either take CSE or 'O' level depending on their .. er .. oral attainment as much as anything else. CSE is a largely oral exam. Then they'll .. er .. very few drop out along the way .. well, I say very few I suppose 10 out of 30 is considerable, but they .. they go into other subjects, other options.

**Interv:** Yeh, I'm trying to correlate Spanish or languages generally with the other subjects that people would take.

**PR:** The people who take the languages tend to be doing the academic subjects .. on the whole. You know, they accompany the academic subjects.
Interv: And the streaming here doesn't involve class streaming does it? Group streaming...

Pr: The, the way it works at the moment is - first year they're taught in completely mixed ability groups for French, the second year .. er .. there are 6 classes doing French, two groups of three have it at the same time. The way they divide it up, each of the three, the groups of three classes, is that there's one group picked out purely on behaviour and sort of destructiveness and disenchantment, and they're put with an experienced teacher who gives them, tries to give them, background work and simple work which they can achieve, you know, without pretending to progress too far in the language but to, you know, not make life a total misery for them. And then the other two groups are mixed up. And the same happens with the other group of three, there's one .. er .. potentially badly behaved group and .. er .. could make life hell for some people in mixed .. completely mixed group, and they go with the more experienced teacher who takes them on. The same in the third year as well. Then with Spanish, eh Russian or German, there's only the one group from the third year upwards so there's definitely no streaming there, they're all .. they are mixed ability groups basically. They stay that way till they take exams.
**Interv:** And would you say as a rule these groups that do take the languages though they're mixed ability within the language are sort of noticeably higher or lower in academic ability than the other groups?

**Pr:** Um, yes, it tends to relate, they tend to be the same. You know, if they're good at languages they tend to be good at the other subjects on the whole. One doesn't like to generalise but it seems to me that that's the way it goes, generally.

**Interv:** Do you find discipline problems at all in the .. in the language groups?

**Pr:** I think it's probably one of the most difficult subjects to teach in terms of discipline, because .. er .. as I say, you've got to try to somehow give the kids a purpose to it. Only most kids can see a purpose in .. er .. doing geography or history to find out what happened before .. certainly in English, certainly in Maths - they've all got an idea where it's helping them. Um, but with French there's been a long tradition, it's never been a popular subject. It's probably um .. just as unpopular now as it ever has been. I can't .. I don't think many parents would look lovingly back on their school days and say "I really enjoyed French", and I don't think it's improving an awful lot these days, apart from schools, perhaps, who use the .. er .. direct method approach, and they use good audio-visual techniques. We use audio-visual techniques as far as we can get them, you know we .. er .. can't afford the whole range of things. Um .. you know, we got film strips
which we project onto sheets of cardboard, and then get kids to outline them and colour them in, and then we have visual aids made like that .. er .. it's a penny-pinching way of doing it really. But I think that's - you know, languages are unpopular, they always have been.

Interv: But do the type of discipline problems in a language group differ from the discipline problems in other groups?

Pr: Um, yes they do. Especially in so far as with lots of subjects where you can have kids working at different speeds, at their own pace, and within their own particular field of interest within the subject, .. in a language course it's so carefully structured even if it's non-grammatical, quotes "non-grammatical" it is. You know, the grammar's introduced gradually without calling it grammar, and they have to build on what's gone before, and so on - a continuous process. And they have to work on the same thing all the time. There's just no way you can - no way that I can see in the present courses where kids can sort of do other things .. Unless, of course, you have background work on the country and the people itself. That's one .. that's one of the discipline problems. The other is that so much of the content of the lesson has to be oral. You've really got to teach people to speak a language. And the fact that you've got to hold the kids' attention for the majority of the lesson .. um .. doing oral work, is pretty difficult for them to do that in a subject, probably that they're good at and that they're fond of. Like
English, you wouldn't probably conduct a whole lesson with .. er .. a group of kids orally. You'd try and vary the activities, but unfortunately, in languages there tends to be .. you have to do most of the .. especially with the first few months of starting a course, it's virtually all oral. That's certainly a distinction I think .. in terms of discipline, 'cos any mug can set a group of kids down to copy out of the book, or copy off the board in some subjects - and .. er .. O.K. your discipline isn't too bad, in the sense .. in the terms of whether they're jumping up and down or not. But discipline in that sense is not ... (untranscribable).

**Interv:** I wonder whether it would be related to the type of kids that are doing the languages and their academic ability generally?

**Pr:** Um, well, it could be, you know, but as I say, when it's compulsory French in the first three years then your discipline problems are quite something, but after fourth year, where it's option French, option Spanish, then I'd say quite the reverse is true. The one's who choose to do it tend to be academically better and therefore their work tends to .. er .. I mean, there tends to be no discipline problems whatsoever.
Ashton 10.12.74

Head of French: ML

Interv: Tell me briefly about the running of the department, how you see its aims, and the problems you face and how you overcome them.

ML: Well the problem seems to have grown gradually over the years...
The school as far as I can see does not seem really to have got to grips with the comprehensive situation since it changed from being two different secondary-modern schools and a grammar school, and as far as I can see although I have only been here two years myself, as far as I can see it doesn't really seem to have got to grips with the problem and organizing successfully the comprehensive set-up. However, that's an organizational matter which as I said, I'm not going to discuss, but where the department itself is concerned what you have got to realise is that in this particular area, which is a fairly working-class area with a large immigrant population, West Indians and Asians, with a completely different cultural background to European standards, obviously we are going to have problems with a subject like French, problems which perhaps don't arise maybe with other subjects and maybe which wouldn't arise in other parts of the country, and certainly London comprehensive schools being what they are, certainly we have difficulty in motivating interest in a subject, the relevance of which is not immediately obvious. You know something like French I mean.

However, besides the aspect of the pupils there is the staffing point of view. We have considerable difficulty in staffing the department, especially on this particular site, especially at Easton Road where you have a large number of either...
inexperienced, I was going to say untrained, but they are not untrained, they are inexperienced, and often poorly qualified teachers, to do what is quite a difficult job, and that is know how to teach French to international children, West Indians especially, to know how to motivate them, to know how to put over a subject and to make it immediately relevant and interesting to them. That is the basis of the problem. In fact because we can’t get anyone else, we seem to end up with a number of French staff, you know French-speaking people from France and they however are usually inexperienced staff, in fact we have got three here now including "assistantes", and they have never seen anything like what they are experiencing here, you see, mainly because they have never taught outside their own little Lycee, you know where they have been, or not taught immigrant children of any description, you know, so that when they come here not only are they coping with children aged 11-14 who are not well motivated for school generally but they are having to cope with West Indians and children from all imaginable backgrounds who are not immediately interested in learning any foreign languages anyway, and of course don’t forget they have learnt English on a different basis to us learning French. I mean English in the world is quite different to French in the world you know, from the point of view of its importance. Er .. someone in France or Germany who studies English does so because English is the most important language in the world, it is the language of pop music, it’s the language of modern technology,
it's the language of all America and so really English has a very important role in the world. On the other hand, what is the comparative relevance of French in the world. Very, very limited. It's only for when you go to France let's say. Now then, many children will say, "Sir, I'm not going to France. I don't want to go to France", you see, whereas you never get a French child say that. He'll say, "Oh yes I'd love to go to America, I'd love to go to England and to see the Beatles and the pop music", and all this sort of stuff, so children themselves are more difficult to motivate in the same way in this country than they would be as French children to learn English. So there is that problem you see, which teachers of French in this country.. don't immediately recognize.

Anyway, that's the staffing point of view. Could I also add on the subject of the staff that because of the relatively poor working conditions we have, and the working conditions are quite poor really, for example, there is one room which I don't think has been given any attention for at least the last two years, it's badly needed a coat of paint even, it's absolutely appalling, and in fact I am going to have to paint it myself during the rest of the Christmas holiday, because I've waited so long for something to be done, nothing has been done, so I'm going to take care of that. But the fact is that the working conditions generally are really quite appalling. That is not to mention the teaching circumstances, just the conditions, the classrooms where we find ourselves, you see. The fact that we have not had any electricity in two of the rooms until say about a month ago from September, so we have had to go all
of October, and most of November with no electricity, there has been lighting but we have not been able to use any equipment of any sort. However, we've got electricity now, so now it means that we can consider other possibilities. Generally, factors which are outside the teacher's control tend to exacerbate the situation.

Also, on the subject of the teaching conditions, it is inevitable that because the cost of living being what it is and so on in London and round here, any teacher with any experience has left to go where life is not so expensive, you know, go out to the provinces, and where life is easier anyway as a teacher. Who wants to teach in a difficult Borough of London when you can get a better paid job with nicer working conditions, nicer children, out in the provinces? So it means that we are left with a large number of relatively inexperienced staff having to cope with what are really difficult problems that really need experienced teachers to deal with.

Interv: You know, I am interested in how the problems come out in the classroom setting. The sort of problems that you face particularly with French.

M1: Because a lot has got to do where French is concerned with the principle under which you approach the teaching of French. You see, with the comprehensive set-up came the idea that there should be mixed-ability teaching. That is, doing away with streaming and doing away with any sort of selection, where you just pile them all together regardless of ability, and quite honestly as far as I can see over the years it has just not worked. I mean I think the current 5th year exam results have shown that, which have been appalling, because the mixed-ability
arrangements need, maybe they would succeed given, a great
deal of time and organization on the part of the staff and,
secondly, given the most appropriate teaching materials. Now
you see it is awfully difficult to find teaching materials
suitable for the slow learner of French. When I say the slow
learner, I mean average to slow learner. I mean there's lots
of excellent material suitable for the brighter pupils, the
grammar school type children, but relatively little for your
remedials or for your slow learners, very little. So it means
that the teacher has an extra burden there to cope with even
finding materials before he can even start teaching, and of
course if you don't have adequate materials or very satisfactory
materials then it means that .. er .. discipline problems arise,
you know because you need a fairly strong personality to cope
with, to interest the majority of the children we have at the
best of times. So if you haven't got good materials as well to
back you up then you're fighting a losing battle and it's easy
to be over-awed; teachers get over-awed, because not only is
there the pressure of preparing interesting attractive lessons
- and you have got 8 to do in the course of a day don't forget -
then you've got your marking to keep up with, you've got all
your administration work, which usually means making records
of work, and .. er .. dealing with the administrative work involved
in organizing your own particular class you know, then you've
got .. um .. the question of homework all to be organized you
see, which means an extra lot of marking and an extra lot of
preparation. Then if you are going to be dynamic in any way at
all, it means a great deal of preparation in addition to it,
to all the normal routine of it, and that's before you have even mentioned coping with potentially difficult pupils, you know, of which there are quite a few. So these are all the tensions and stresses and strains and pressures that we are under.

Interv: The Linguistic ... the verbal side of French in teaching today.

ML: Because of the mixed-ability situation that has been imposed on us, we have obviously had to completely adjust our approach, in fact, because of the lack of success of the mixed-ability and because of its unpopularity amongst most of the staff and because of the lack of time and everything we cut back on, well in fact we re-arrange, the idea of mixed-ability and now we've got it only in the first year, where French is concerned. Otherwise, we are setting them now, which means that ... um ... whilst they may be mixed-ability say in some less academic subject, because French is basically an academic subject, we do our utmost to set them, so that the better ones, the most able ones come together in one set and then the less able in another set and then the least able in another group and then the teacher knows what level to teach at you see, and he knows what level to prepare his material for.

We have tried a whole variety of different methods, you know, there are wall charts, there are filmstrips, there are flash cards, all manner of things, work cards, and so on and so forth which meant an awful lot of preparation and organization and in the most part they have been abandoned. We have abandoned those ideas and gone back to the more basic idea of working
from a text book. That is not to say that one does purely text book work. I mean we approach the problem of... we approach the teaching of French with the principle that one should do as much oral work as possible, but then when you can see that the class has had enough of oral work, you know, because obviously to go through a hundred percent oral work is tiring for the teacher, and is boring for the children after a while, so you do as much oral work as you can, make it as interesting as possible, and then you bring in your written work you see. And... the children seem to like this approach more than any other approach and so we have developed this. But so much depends on what individual teachers themselves prefer. Some teachers prefer to do quite a bit of written work and so if they are happier doing that, then fine, we let them go ahead and do more written work than the rest. You know it's all a question of what particular staff are in a position to offer, that's the point. I think a lot's also got to do with the way that the school is divided. There are the problems of communication you see, there are problems of inexperienced staff, there are problems of immigrant problematic children, and then there is the aspect of the problem of motivating the kids, you know, where something like French is concerned. I think those are our biggest problems.
Yeh, well the pupils gave me a list of um things - I can't remember because I haven't transcribed the tapes - but a list of various things that they did like or didn't like about lessons, and they weren't coherent. A lot of the things didn't match up, so I was hoping that you could just tell me generally what you do with a difficult class. Or how you treat, particularly say, Steve and Perry.... as people. Um, and then perhaps that'll link up with some of what they've told me about what they like about your lessons, - and what they don't like about others.

Yeh, I think this is... I think this is a real problem of today because, you know, they were the first group of um...let's say, mixed ability classing in the school.... really. I mean a lot of them are mixed but they're not supposed to be. But they were supposed to be. So in the same class, which was quite heavy in number, you had say er 25, 26...some kids can't read and write and some kids are very bright - reading ages of 13+. And it really makes it very difficult as when you're being effective and when you're not. But um I suppose what I try to do is two things, one, keep them interested, keep their minds going, because you know even if they can't read and write their minds... it doesn't effect... it doesn't effect their minds. It's true...somebody...you know, like a lot of our kids have language problems because they're...English is a second language/
language. And I've found, you know, split it in half and we talk about ideas and themes, perhaps for half the week/

Interv:

This is in drama, or English?

Host:

No. English. In fact, you know, I've been coming away from drama as a classroom activity because it takes a lot of organization, and you need space and they need security. You need to know that somebody's not going to walk through the hall any minute now. So I haven't done that very much. But, you know, I think the single most important thing is to...er have a sense of humour with them. And er...and get to know them individually. Because, especially the mixed-ability groups, this is so true, they need such totally different things. And, for example, the first year I had them I spent the first term practically making work cards, because I didn't think that, kind of, lessons were going to answer their...their problems. And then I found that er the work cards were O.K. but they really preferred direct teaching and talking much, much more.

Interv:

How much do you think they need the direction? You let the kids have the authority...um the authority of the teacher, as against the pupil. Do you think...You see, Steve and Perry disagreed...because I remember it mentioned um that er...when I mentioned authority they said O.K. they didn't like being told what to do, but when I mentioned a strict teacher they didn't like that either. So how do you reconcile the two. The desire for some sort of leadership, without the... /
without the...

Ho:
I don't think I know the answers to your question really because, um I know what you mean, I mean I see it in them every day - God you're right - but er... you see it never ceases to amaze me, Martyn, how much direction they need. You know, they practically need...some of these kids are so insecure they practically need me to say "Now, pick up your pencil, now draw a margin". Really and this can... I've seen this in 3rd year kids, and they lap it up, really. "Now do question one, now do question two".

Interv:
So, what would otherwise be taken to be, sort of um... lack of intelligence could be the need for direction/security?

Ho:
Yeh, and in creative writing, this is very much like drama, the problem you get in drama crystalized. You see, everybody in the room is going to...you, you give them the basic nucleus of the idea in creativity, you can't be creative about nothing, you've got to be creative about something specific, - so you tell them something, you lead them up into a story...perhaps they're going to finish it, something like this. Now, everybody in the room is going to take off at their own time. No two people are going to feel as though they've got enough from you and that they can start writing at the same time. And I think that you have to make the kids aware that whenever they want to start...you have to..... they're able to go off. And you, you're going to be with some/
/some kids right until five minutes before the end of the class giving them the kind of nourishment they need in order to just write two sentences. I don't...I think I organize the classes...my organization is getting better. I think this is the big secret of teaching. I think teaching is nine tenths organization. Even if it doesn't hit them over the head that you're organized, I think...yourself. And I do feel that I'm getting better at organization. And, at the beginning, you see when a class like that comes in they're all new to each other, they've loads of problems to sort out with each other - their relationships with each other - and when you... when I begin I'm quite formal in fact and I tell them the few rules I have, and I make no bones about it, and I say that um if the door's open they may come in, and you...you know, you'd laugh at how stupid and simple I make it, but I do. I say, you know, the 1st year, let's say, um "when you come in you line...you line up outside. You...girls on that side, boys on that side," and I explain so that you don't make the traffic congestion in there. "You come in and you talk until I say I want to take the register. When I say I want...I'd like to take the register, then there must be no noise". Now I find that if I do these very simple things with most classes right at the beginning, I can get as loose and relaxed with them throughout the lesson as I want to. Because I'm...I always have that one point that I'm going from...I never go from a kind of...well, well I do, you know, you can't say never, but to establish a relationship with a class I always have that very few minutes thing...it's a kind of settling of the tensions and remind them/
/them that I'm me, and not any other teacher.

Interview:

'Well, when anybody goes against those rules, are you fairly strict with the....sort of drawing a line with how far they can go?'

No:

Yeh, I do it with the five years. Particularly this point about silence and the register. And the 5th year I, you know, you really should come into 5:1 'cos it's a fantastic class and it's because they're mixed, very mixed culturally, and very mixed-ability too. But sometimes I can relax to such a point with them, as with...we were doing similes the other day, and I gave them some really um awful similes to do from an old fashioned book and er..there was one something like "The little waves ran to and from on the..on the sea shore like...", and there's one kid, - and I just deserved it - said er wrote down "The little waves ran to and from on the sea er sea shore like uncle Bert with his braces caught in the front door". And it was so fantastic, you see, and I just screamed, you know, just real laughter. But um even with them I...if...there is silence. You know if there's not silence when I'm taking the register then I stop and we take it again. And it's the only point really where I've now relaxed. I used to have then um...at the end of the lesson we'd have a moment of quiet too while they all stood and walked out. But I don't do that any more. And..but the first year I try and keep that, and the second years too, and maybe the third years. But sometimes I do with the third years as I do with the fourth years. I find the third/
/third years always a difficult year. And sometimes to get them over the gap I say...I put them over and give them fourth year behaviours rather than third years to make them feel more adult. But the trouble is that they can never come up to it. But, for example, the fourth years and when they first come in I say well look um..er..I always call the kids ladies and gentlemen...silly things like that, you know, but really you wouldn't believe how the little things work. If you give them the respect, they react back with it, and um I ask...ask them just to come in andI say that now you're in the fourth eh...and, you know, I just let them come in and sit down - actually I don't know them, and they... God, it's all show. You know, I'm sure a training in acting's a big help, you know. And I say "Well, sit down" and I say "Well look, I..I don't have many rules in here, I'm going to tell you the few, and then I'll tell you what you can expect from me in return, If you keep within these rules." And I say "You are allowed to chew". I know it's against school rules, and er I say "Providing I don't find your sweet paper on the floor, then you can chew, but if I do then you understand that you can't chew anymore for a while until you've learnt". And then I say "Well, you know, I expect work from you er and I expect at the end of the session you will have worked, andthat I..."...you know just...just kind of general things. But the first thing I do is relax the rules, and I let them walk in and sit down and talk, but the point is the same, when I take the register there is silence. That's the only thing I have. And the funny thing was I has a student who came in and she was very enthusiastic about/
/about the kind of atmosphere in the room and the way the
kids were talking, and their attitude to me. And this is
the trouble also in training colleges, they're so kind of...
you must get a good relationship with the kids, you must, you
must, - that they seem to leave the organized side out of it.
....out of it.

Interv:

This is what I wanted to ask you really. The relation­ship between authority, you know, in the um the general views
of comprehensives now being taught in the um colleges of
education is one where education is based on relationships
instead of authority. And it's this that seems to be a
problem between, you know, the personal side and the
authority side. You know, pupils like Steve and Perry.....

Host:

But yeh, I think...yeh, you're right you see because um
...here, this girl...all right take Steve and Perry in a
situation like this, um she..I'd already established my
authority and you know there are two ways of looking at
authority; one is as a policeman and the other is someone
who has some information that you don't know, that's why
you go to them, - to learn. And I use the word policeman
in my classes quite a lot if they're forcing me. And I say
"Look, don't make me into a policeman, please, - I don't want
to be one," - right - "You're making me be like a policeman".
But I just bring it up a couple of times. And with this
girl, she was so intent on the relationship angle, - she
came in...she saw how I did, and I said, "Well, look, you
know, make the beginning. Always come to this point at the
beginning/
/beginning and then you'll grasp how far you can ease off, but always remains controllable." And, I think she was just so frightened about...that her relationship should be good that she just eased up a bit too much, right, at the beginning, and there was nothing she,...they were running away with her because there were thirty kids sometimes to you. And you can't do it. And I think"authority" - no. But there is a practical...you are all in a room together, there is only one of you, and there is loads of them, and unless there is some kind of order and give and take then it just all breaks down. And the funny thing is I think, they see it much more than we do...the kids. They see this need for organization, you know. If you used the word organization instead of authority, but then, what...authority I suppose is still what you use to implement your organization isn't it. But you are in authority. You see, why are you in the room with thirty kids unless someone has said, "You know something they don't know" and I sometimes say this to the kids; "You know, I spent six to seven years of my life learning to teach, and it hasn't been easy, and I don't know all the answers, but, you know, I think I have something I can teach you, and you have a lot you can teach me." But...but, why are you here if you don't have authority?

**Interv:**

To what extent do you think kids will um push...push you to a limit...to what extent do they understand authority in the same sense that you do?...as something to be overcome if they can um and they'll push you until they find your limits. I mean...
That's pretty natural.

Do you think kids do push it?

Yeh, sure. My first year here was hell, you know. They used to lock me in. And I remember I had one class... and my knees used to knock before I went in, every time. I used to feel that they were just tearing me apart. And the only thing is I just said well you just can't afford not to like them. You can't afford to dislike them in fact. And I couldn't 'cos it made it much worse whenever you decided to dislike a kid. It's true, you know, I don't think teaching is essentially a very logical reasonable thing. I think, basically, you just have to... you know, you just have to act as though you like them. And if you act as though you like them it changes and they become likeable. I really believe that, you know, because I've looked after kids too. And I looked after one kid who was an absolute neurotic, you know, had him every day and I couldn't stand him. And while I couldn't stand him our relationship just went from bad to worse. But then I thought well if I just start acting as though I care... and I did...and the situation was so much better within two or three weeks. And I liked him, I really did like him better.

You mentioned that thing about "logical", whether teaching can be logical or it can just be an act, an art form/
I think it often is, I think, you know, if you, for example, if you get into a really bad situation with a class and /you can sense it can't you when you go in...the teacher on one side of the room, the kids on another... and I think in a situation like this you have to go in every time saying, "It's going to be a good class". You have to take a fresh attitude in. You can't say "Oh Christ, this class again". You have to go in and you have to say, "God, it's going to be a good class, it's going to be interesting", and it is an act isn't it? It really is. But I suppose the lucky teachers are the ones who are most natural at their teachers... teaching... I... I don't know.

Interview:

Change the subject a minute. Do you find the arrangements with desks is eh... has anything to do with how a class reacts?

Ho:

Yeh. I think it does, but...yes it does but there changes.... I find desk things very interesting. I find rooms very interesting, and desk arranging. For example, I used to have them where um... in fours so that they could do group work, right, but then I thought, then I found that um I don't like it particularly, because a lot of my teaching is "personality" teaching, right, and class teaching. So I teach to them, I talk to them and that half..say half and half...but I found that a lot of the kids I was talking to and their backs were to me, you see, and I just had to be honest/
honest with myself and I'm not good enough as a kind of er
group teacher, and my classes are much more weighted our
contact with me. So I, so I had to have them basically
facing right, and I think Dave um...always seems to have
his desks marvelously arranged, - I really like his
arrangements. I don't think mine are as successful, but I
seem to be getting more out of the middle of the room, now.

Interv:

Yeh, this is getting to the point of how far
situational things such as desks, the classroom, noise from
outside...those things affect teaching. How much you can
teach the kids.....

Ho:

Yeh, well it's true. I mean I always feel somebody
who's over there is always far too far away from me. And
with some classes, the 4th and 5th this year, with an
arrangement like this, we've added chairs on the second row,
when we're having a discussion like the one we've just had
now, they can all be almost within arms reach of me. And it
makes an amazing difference about what they'll talk about and
what they'll say if they're quite close to you, - just like
that, you know.

And I remember once when I was on teaching practice I
has a class and they were hell, - couldn't do anything with
them. They were real sods, - girls, all girls - and they
really hated my guts. And there was no way I could try and
get them to stop talking. And somebody worked out....
worked out this brilliant idea. And it was a needlework
room I took them, and I sat all the chairs, only about 20 of
them/
them, all the chairs in a line. It was a rotten thing to do, and each chair slightly separate from the next, but in a line not in a curve round so they could see each other, but in a line. And do you know it worked. The...why you have to come to it...really. 'Cos they were cut off from each other, you know. But um...really bad, very bad kids, right kids who are real problems are just a whole lot of hard work.

Inter:

How do you explain a sort of bad kid? How would, from a teaching point of view...you come in...What I really want to get at here is the...some of the kids that I've spoken to would appear to be what is known as "bad". Um... yet to talk to them they're angels. They've given the impression to me that they're very good. Now from a teaching point of view how would you sort of...how would you define a "bad" kid?

Ho:

Well it's someone whose er..per..and they're usually personal problems, are so enormous that er...it just is a cog sticking in the running of the class all the time, you know, er...for example, I have a very intelligent boy - and I've seen this situation a couple of times since I've been here - very smart orally, verbally, mind-wise, er often a bit deviant, right, and he doesn't make a good class member from my point of view because...(untranscribable)...careful to give that kid the prestige he needs, you see. You can't give it to him in his work,...perhaps one day but then another day he doesn't do any good. But then perhaps you can give it to him for an important question he's answered. But it's usually the types whose, you know, the feeding of their ego is very important/
Important and you really do have to keep it stocked up.

Interv:

How much is er...as a teacher, and in teaching probably, how much can you take account of their backgrounds? I mean er...if a child's bad do you explain it in terms of their...their background? I mean do you think as you're actually teaching..um..well, we can explain why he's acting that way?

Ho:

But that doesn't alter your reaction to him, does it? You see, this is why teachers are very often frustrated. They know that they're having reactions to this kid, - they know he's got a stream of mother/father problems, but yet it doesn't seem to alter their reactions to them. It's a very confusing world, which is why it goes back to this thing; you can't afford um...not to get on with the kids you teach with. You can't afford it - and I mean that in very strict terms. You can't afford not to, - not they, because you're the one that'll suffer in the end if you don't get on with them. And what you ever you do, you do it...I don't mean you cow-tow...like that...but I mean that you really...a lot of.. if you don't get on with the kids there are a lot of reasons but one of them is that they're seeing you as some kind of stereotype teacher. Right, they're seeing you as a teacher ..."ugh". That's why when I first meet them, as I say, I say to them um..."This is me, other people may not do it like this, but this is me, this is the way I do things, and when you come in here this is how you behave to me." And this one kid here, Chris, um...whose got all these terrible problems/
problems of appearing just as a super adult and really he's a baby when he starts to write anything down, has very similar problems like that. And I've had to talk to him for as long as half an hour, half an hour, quarter of an hour, seeing people, contact people so that he knows (a) I'm going to do what I say I'm going to do, and (b) you know, I'm reasonable in... in so much that I've allowed him not to do any homework until Christmas right. But that I do have... I am different. He knows that I'm me and that I'm not every teacher.

Interv:

Yeh, the point that interests me was how much the teacher, given the situation constraints of being in a classroom, can't take, in the actual practical teaching situation, can't take account of um...the child's background. So the teachers are being trained at education colleges to understand kids in terms of their backgrounds - but when it gets to the actual teaching situation, it becomes an "aside". It's something you can't/

Ho:

Because you yeh... I think you're right in a way, you know, except that it all adds up doesn't it, really, all these things add up to how you deal with the child. For example, if that child, you know, you suspect the child just doesn't make good female relationships, why doesn't he? And it takes a lot of emotional pressure off the teacher whose able to say, "Well lool, he doesn't like - he doesn't get on with females, I found this from his background." it does take off a lot of the emotional pressure. And there is a lot/
/lot of it in it, and so you could have attacked...
approached him, the child, differently with that knowledge
couldn't you?

**Interv:**

Now supposing that knowledge were to change. **In other words um...as once we didn't use psychology or psychiatry as explanations, psychoanalysis um...a new explanation came in er...would that make a great difference to the relationships you(d have to form?....In other words, if somebody came along and a new theory came along that it wasn't the child's background at all that mattered and that it was actually the um...that-child-in-the-classroom that caused the problems, would that create new problems for the teacher?**

**Ho:**

No, because I think that happens now anyway. I mean all these things happen um you know, group dynamics within the..if, you know, it all became a matter of group dynamics rather than heredity and things like that, yeh, 'cos that happens now, we have experience of that every time. Um, we have classes that just do not get on from the moment they're together to the moment they part. And it really is group dynamics. You're really a second class citizen because they're so involved in the dynamics in between themselves, you don't have a chance to get in. **Now, in a situation like that you've got to use quite different means of approaching it. I mean you have to isolate groups, you see, and you have to work within it. And it's all based on observation, - how you really look at the kids, how you really/
really see them isn't it. If it's an individual problem O.K. it's an individual problem, -why is it an individual problem? But you know half the kids coming here I don't know what their social backgrounds are. I know my tutor group's, and I'm supposed to have a much closer association with them, - sure. I mean I have a couple of kids in my tutor group who, you know, it's absolutely sure I'll really run foul with them unless I do a lot of homework on them, including going to homes, making parental contact. But in the classroom I still think teachers should be trained to make ...matter of making the right decision at the right time. And, you know, how do you train someone to make the right decision at the right time?

And the other thing is I think the profession's very unfair, because I don't see how it could possibly be otherwise. But here are all these kids with all their problems, right, maybe some without, but some have problems, right, so here you stand, an authority figure, mum, dad the law, anybody they liketo project onto you, and here they are coming at you, right, with their feelings, - the remedial department is full of this. A kid can spit, swear, hate you, right, and yet you're supposed to be so removed that you can say "Well, what do they need? How shall I treat them? Now what shall I do now that he's screaming at me? Now I'm not going to lose my temper, it wouldn't be good for him". But you're doing this everyday, all your teaching life, and I think it's ...it can be dangerous for a teacher, that kind of thing. You know, because you're not reacting like a person to another human being. You're saying, "Now what does he need? What shall I do? - Don't you think that's crazy?"
Doug K: As far as social studies teaching goes .. um .. the only group that take social studies are courses LMNK. Now, in order to get an elementary course you either have to change to a commercial course for girls or you have to choose not to do a second foreign language.

Interv: Mm

Doug K: There is a complete science bias towards the School also and if you you can manage just to take one foreign language, as long as your willing to take three science subjects. Now what this means is that for anyone on a commercial course, no matter how bright they are they can't take anything more than a CSE examination in anything. Um, one of the things we were asked to set up was a social science course; it was a way of filling up an afternoon as far as I could see, as far as the School was concerned but we made it look more than that. Um, we deal with basic topics but the kids themselves see it just as one subject, as far as I can see, they have it for 3 lessons on the trot. We did this first of all in order that they could go out and visit without interrupting their lessons, but will scrap it next year because we feel that 3 lessons on the trot is a little bit wrong. The teachers themselves move from class to class and within each group I think there is a certain amount of setting also. For instance, we have 3 bands of pupils learning social studies at the same time, and .. um .. they split into 4 groups. This is, to a certain extent anyway, done on .. um .. intelligence from what we remembered from -
Doug K: for instance there was one group which took our remedial, well sort of remedial stream and they were kept together and not mixed with the other groups. Er, the other groups from mainly mixed-ability on the average and below-average pupil but they were one or two that sort of shone and were much better than others. They were mainly put into one small group er.. much easier to work with and that went further into the subject-matter with them.

Interv: Mm

Doug K: Mm, average intelligence kids well, I went to secondary-modern school myself and I was in the 'A' stream. I suppose one or two of them, no, I should think about 13/14 would have been in that form of stream in which case they would probably take 'O' levels in a in a different set up but.. er.. they wanted that set up so everything was based on CSE. Social studies was mode 3 where we set all the information ourselves, we would examine questions ourselves rather; we set the syllabus ourselves; the pupils know vaguely what they are going to be asked which helps them, gives them a bit more , particularly if they can do something in it. We find that the results are better than the other subject, one reason being because we set the syllabus ourselves and.. um.. we tend to teach very close to what we are going to examine them in,.. um.. if the truth be known. Um.. and the second reason is that the kids do feel vaguely that it's got some relevance to or at least some of topics have, for instance, one of us does.. er.. the topic 'going to work' which deals with some of the problems which they are going to face when they start school, er.. when they start work, sorry.
Doug K: And .. um .. it also deals with careers advice, getting to know Youth Employment Office, form filling, this sort of thing. Um .. one of the other sections of course which have its interesting, the kids think its interesting, is the work on the family which they are involved in and .. er .. as long as one doesn't make it just how to buy a house and .. um .. things like that which the kids probably won't be able to do; house prices here £13,000 a piece they're never going to own a house, these kids, unless they marry some guy whose on an income 6, 7,000 a year. Then if you take it back on to family and personal relationships which it can be to do with, or I think it can, .. er .. then they have been involved and they feel this is part of their everyday understanding and they can use what they know and work from that.

Interv: Do you think it's important to be practical in Social Studies?

Doug K: Taking it as a mode 3 exam, when you're not dealing with particularly academic kids, I think it's much better if you can make a practical relevance as well as some academic side to .. um .. for instance, I am dealing with family this year, I wasn't last, I have looked at .. um .. in forms.. of the family something which they won't come into contact with at all. I mean they're never likely to go to to go to and look at the people and say "Oh, look there's a society." Er, on the other hand I think it's good if they can get to know that their society laws aren't the laws of everyone and therefore make it a broader understand of of society.

Interv: Now, the kids who are doing the sciences, for instance would not take social studies as such?

Doug K: No, some of them take if they don't take social studies, they might take sociology at 'O' level and if they don't match up to standards, examination standards, er .. they may go on to what's called social
Doug K: studies mode 1 which is much closer to sociology which is well
which is sociology.

Interv: Mm

Doug K: because they have a certain .....  

Interv: Does this sort of mean that social studies are predominantly 
the educational hierarchy of subjects?

Doug K: Um .. well there is no-one in an academic form who takes social 
studies in the way that we teach it to to the non-academic forms. 
Er, it is a completely different syllabus, I suppose our syllabus 
was aimed basically at the average and below-average children.

Interv: Mm

Doug K: That's why there is a certain amount of practical things in it 
which we hope will come to make it more interesting.

Interv: Does it cause any particular difficulties from the teaching 
point of view?

Doug K: Well, this year with the groups that you saw they are mainly 
well-behaved groups anyway .. um .. we have had about ... the 
first time we started social studies there was a second year 
social studies teacher here. We had 4 teachers walk out and left 
the School completely, just over this one item. Um .. we had, 
well, there was one woman she was a house teacher, she had hard 
10/15 years of teaching experience, she wouldn't go in the class 
she she would take her chair and sit outside, she wouldn't go 
in there, because her social studies 
teaching and would not attempt it.

Interv: What was the basis, the behaviour of the kids or the fact that the 
subject wasn't was they wanted to teach?
Doug K: Well, basically, the behaviour of kids mainly because they were a lot of them were allocated, were not used to teaching this sort of kid.

Interv: Mm

Doug K: They were used to teaching well, for instance, the case of um the case of of the physics teacher who was not used to teaching LMNK or this non-academic stream, his whole approach was wrong. er the kids realised it and they took him for a ride.

Interv: Yeh, School, do you think this is a basic problem?

Doug K: Yes, I think you have got a lot of intellectual snobbery of the staff, they don't want to teach the non-academic group. Also I say, to me my time-tables from Monday to Friday is LMNK so I am not in that problem, I don't sort of think "Ah, these are LMNK." because all my pupils are LMNK, so I don't sort of go from teaching academic form and then say, "Oh, no I've got them!" and I don't sort of feel I'm going down I just feel I am keeping a parallel. I think this is the one of the problems that after you label the class LMNK you er you straight away come closer, right away you have got staff saying these are LMNK children and therefore they can't take much and they don't give them much and I think you lower your standard all the way through, at least with secondary-modern course, I like going into education, it might sound funny, in a secondary-modern school. Er if it was an 'A' stream they used to say "O.K. I can make something out of this 'A' stream, whereas now I think even the top group of the LMNK's are often labelled non-academics and therefore can't make much out of them. I think they should be encouraged along the lines and if there is a chance of getting through
D. K.: well fine, great!

Interv: What do you see

D.K.: What to get rid of that problem.. yes, get rid of the labelling and I think you will get rid of a lot of the problem, just because if you label someone.. um.. if you label someone a thief.. um call them a thief they are treated like a thief and they become more so, and I think it is the same with people, if you label them like non-academic.. um.. they are treated in that sort of vein and they become more that way and they become so that their work gets.. first of all we are not setting enough standards and their work is suffering and I think their personalities suffer mainly because they they believe that they can be free of everything and lark around and play about, whereas in society you can't do that. I mean because when they leave here you are supposed to equip them for life, I gather, I guess, so I feel we should, you know, and yet.. um.. you have got kids in a. when they know they can mess about and do what they like, this is not to equip without them for life. What equipment of life is, being oppressive, it has to be a certain amount of strict in which they can see that if they do such and such a thing wrong then they won't meet with approval.

Interv: Yeh, would you say that teachers take the.. um.. more academic streams in the School treat the whole problem of discipline in a different light?

D.K.: Um.. you tend to get.. you have almost got.. um.. two-start care, you have got the staff who take academics, you see: each Head of Department sets his own time-table and O.K. it's the classes, two different teachers, well some are very fair about it.. um.. some aren't fair at all, some give themselves a share of
D. K.: all the classes from the bright ones to to the not-so-bright ones, whereas others will say "Right, I'm teaching 'A' level I'm teaching 'O' level. . um. . The rest of the staff can share it out between them." In this case you get . . er . . the none-experienced staff with the poorer kid, . . um . . the worsed behaved kid and . . er . . things are self-perpetulated so it goes on and on and on. So they leave and there's another staff comes but . . er . . people who take perhaps the academic form they don't meet the discipline problems that the . . er . . that the others do and, therefore, perhaps they lead a sheltered existence. Of course I might sound bitter . . er . . you know, I think it's nice if you take a bright form because you give your best. On the other hand, if you take one and start jumping from one to the other you tend to sort of say "Well, these are better to the others". But if you don't do that you think of them just as one group and . . er . . nice kids.

Interv: Mm so wouldn't it be easier for a teacher who takes academic forms to lable kids as . . um . . behaviour problems when perhaps you wouldn't?

D. K.: Oh, yes undoubtedly. Um. . for instance, in brighter forms if I have to take and sit with a group or I am taking the lesson for someone whose away, and I think "My God, this is so nice, it's such a pleasant atmosphere", this . . um . . you know they sit there and it's quite frightening at first because you think "My God, they're quiet." And . . er . . not having to say "Now, come on lads less have it down a bit" or something like that. Um . . I think that . . er . . those taking academic forms they can't they see a kid who may be picks his nose as being the most terrible thing that ever happened, you know. . Nice kids. Whereas if you take non-academic kids for some reason or other they mess around more than the others, . . um . . then
and so on. Then if someone said if that's all they were doing
then you would think one of those things.

Has this in any way

. Can you off hand

split them into ... um ...

Degree and non-degree ....

Or ...

Well to be honest I don't really know. From backgrounds I don't
know much, chat to the staff and that sort of thing but ... er ...
you tend to get the older staff having more responsibility, bigger
posts, Heads of Department and, because, as I said before, some of
them tend to want to teach just the best classes themselves, this
is understandable, when you have put in 30 years you want the
last 10 years to be fairly easy-going, I guess, perfectly understand-
able. Um .. but because because of that you get sort of
Mrs. E: different ....... here well you know there there are two houses in north building, two houses in south building and four houses together in Southern Avenue and in each class here there are some of each. See, now, in the other school I taught in, there was a form which was altogether in the same house. I think that for a start worked much better because they ... er ... were (a) as a little unit in their class and they were in their house. They were, that was .... that was a small junior high school only two years and intake of four classes so that we had two forms and one house and two forms of another house. Um ... you could have, the house feeling the feeling belonging .. of belonging was much stronger there than it is here. Here it's just, oh, just that you belong to Elwin, you belong to so that if you have a merit, as I told you before.. There it was far stronger you could have far easier inter-house competitions. Um ... it was much more of a dreadful thing if you had a demerit or did something wrong. Um ... I was at the time the Deputy Head there and had always to add up .. um .. the points. It was far more damaging to the child and .. um .. here I think the demerits for I am not now talking about the first years, this is still a dreadful thing to them but even when they come to the second year, it doesn't mean much to them at all. Er ... whether that is the fault of their House Teachers I haven't mad up my mind yet, I don't think .. um .. I can only talk about those two here - I don't think they are strong enough .. um .. and I am not talking about punishing but they are both very gentle characters .. er .. neither of them are very strong and they do when a child has a demerit they come to the House Teacher, they are called and they have interviews more about "Why do you do
this" - more the reason - go into the background bu .. um ..
to me it flows like a water off a duck's back. It doesn't mean a
thing to them, the kids, and the older they are, they get - the
more meaningless does it become. This is the demerit

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: .. and the merits also there they are not all that keen and
any difficulty is with the House system or its merit demerit,
different teachers have got different, put different veils. Now,
for instance this morning, you know, Monday morning, I do fill in
the merits they get during the week. I get a list from one teacher,
one merit to each child so I have to make one merit to meet staff.
It's meaningless completely, idiotic. Er some people give for
if you're good you get three merit well this is wrong for a start
you understand?

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: Er .. some people give .. dole out merits as if they were pieces
, well they are pieces of paper, but completely meaningless. I
feel a merit has got to be earned by either great effort or
exceptionally .. er .. being exceptionally helpful, considerate
to your .. to other people. They get from me a merit. But if
somebody is good at Maths and gets 10 out of 10 every time they
can be quite sure they are not going to get a merit out of me for
that, because I expect them to be good. But if somebody is very
week 5 out of 10 all of a sudden, that deserves a merit to me.

Interv: For the extra effort ..

Mrs. E: The extra effort, or if somebody says "Oh, I am going to put all
the chairs up" the others did not come in or something but if I
would ask the child "Put the chairs up" I would not give them a
merit because they are expected to be obedient, but if he or she
Mrs. E: offers something to help that, I think, deserves a merit, so the merit system different people have different standards of merit-giving and that is why the House System falls down.

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: You see there is no common standard and they have tried to . . . to standardise and have not succeeded it at all, because some take . . . er . . . merit as . . . er . . . piece of lolly as I said, if you're got to get a merit you know. Well I don't need that, of course. Perhaps if I was a young I don't even know . . . um . . . I don't think I would if I were a young teacher either because I think it defeats its purpose. Um . . . I think children should be good without . . . without being either threatened or . . . or coaxed to it.

Interv: So, merits and demerits are being used as carrots to try . . .

Mrs. E: That is right . . . very often as carrots, yes, very often. Or as as I don't know . . . somebody can give somebody one girl, 13 merits are put into one child's . . . well I mean . . . um . . . to get 13 merits in one go would mean somebody had saved somebody practically from death! You know, life-saving, you know that is . . . er . . ., you understand? That is one thing why they House System is very difficult to really work well. I personally have not . . . um . . . found the answer for it; I can only go by my own personal standards and I give merits quite sparingly. I have go one form, there would be useless - the only reason why it's a joy to teach them, although they are sometimes noisy, is because . . . um . . . I give them more difficult puzzles and I say "Anybody who puzzles this one out will get a merit." Now, that is a kind of a carrot but it warrants it because it will be, I can assure you, a difficult thing, otherwise I would not get it. I would not tell them to and . . . um . . . they
Mrs. E: really try so that not only the cleverest always gets the merit but also the most stupid ones so the one who tries hard, the hardest in this lesson will get the merit. Well they are all trying. That is perhaps in a way a carrot. Um ... but so that the children who would never get merits also have a chance of doing that.

Interv: Yeh. With the demerits ... the problems with using those, that perhaps House staff do not follow them through enough.

Mrs. E: Oh, yes. No, I don't want to be unfair. They will follow them through alright but um the way I have seen it so far is they aren't strong enough. Look, for instance, a child gets a demerit for cheeky of something, gets a demerit first of all the demerits are sometimes given for things they shouldn't be given for anyway. Um ... all right, gets a demerit and then it goes to the House Teacher, the House Teacher calls the child and gives him or her a talking to but more whether they have done it in school and why they have done it, what their home background is and they try to solve it physiologically why um And then perhaps after a week or so they call them back again "Have you been now a bit better?" but it doesn't really sink in that it's really a dreadful thing. Now what I have don in the past in the House Assembly, I was here for one term a House Teacher, when I came Mrs. Un , you know her who is the teacher..

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: She only came in January and ... so they do not have one for a term. I came in September and was asked would I do the House job for a term which I did. Well in my first or second House Assembly I took, I had two people with demerits and I let them stand up and I called out their names and those two got a demerit. Well they practically sank through the floor.
Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: You see the impact alone that was missing, you know, nobody else really knows, and so it doesn't really if you have a private conversation with House staff you might feel quite small .. um .. before the House Teacher. I don't think it has really as good an effect on them, that is my personal view and I have said that quite often.

Interv: Do you think other teachers, as well as yourself, feel that and .. er: .... perhaps won't bother to give demerits for that reason?

Mrs. E: Well you will find that the more experienced teacher very seldom gives a demerit because they don't need to but the younger ones have go no other weapon really. I mean they aren't allowed to smack some children run riot so they get a demerit but they don't really realise that it isn't worth very much really and I don't think it alters them, because of giving them a demerit children are often no better .. er ..

Interv: Attempt to stop indiscipline using the demerit ....

Mrs. E: No, no, stopping, you know, to get good discipline is the question unless you know, some have got it inborne, they need never go into a Teachers' Training College they will always have discipline because it's .. they are gifted with a certain kind of, some can .. um .. have had longer experience and also go and get discipline but probably the older teachers, no, not the .. no it isn't true not the older teacher .. um .. the longer you are in a school the better is one's discipline. Now I am an experienced teacher, I am older and I was in a responsible position, as I told you, I was Deputy Head in that small school and I started here again as a teacher and I must say that I had a tough first year. First of all,
Mrs. E: I think position helps a lot. If I would have come in this
school as a Deputy Head, you have got a different standing in
front of the children for a start. Um .. and you have got to be
consistent, you have to give a good example. Now, I have ... I
am by nature rather strict, I am a perfectionist and where other
people might .. er .. find a class situation is satisfactory
I don't. I cannot work when it's too noisy. I don't mean I
would want them all to sit silently like dummies, I don't want
that either. But .. er .. I cannot work when they .. er ..
climb up the walls or run around or make too much noise or some­
thing you have got to keep on and on, and on and one has got oneself
to set a good example. And one has got to be consistent and gradually
it sinks through. I am never late .. er .. I am never bad-tempered
not in front of the children, although I could crown them sometimes.
Um .. I am always neatly dressed that makes a big, when I tell a
child off for not coming in a tie because it's the school.. you
see the consistency that's what's, that's not only .. that's
through the school. At the beginning of the year, they were told
that they must wear ties and not very long ago at the Staff Meeting,
I brought that up. I said "Look, if you make a rule you have got
to stick to it, you have got to stick to it not just a few weeks
but always; because if I stop a child - boy, for not wearing a tie,
it's flogging a dead horse if they get through this with other
teachers .. um .. one has got to be consistent; also you threaten
then you must do it even if it hurts, you know. "Oh, my God I have
got to go out and there, I told the child I ..." well it doesn't
matter, if I threaten to do something then I do it, and they know
that and so the first year I had a tough year, I had a horrible
Mrs. E: class, a 3rd year. They were dreadful but I stuck it through and by the end they weren't too bad. Last year, it was much better and this year I have got an easy ride, reasonably so. I mean, don't think that they come in and are immediately quiet but something which younger teachers must learn is, I would never start a lesson without having silence. Children line up outside I stand in the doorway. They aren't allowed to come in until I tell them to and then they stand and only when they are quiet are they allowed to sit down. Well they know it now. The first year, of course, it takes a long time, you know until they learn this certain . . . that certain teachers have got certain standards. So, I think the longer I stand here there won't be much difficulty as far as I am concerned because (a) well the younger ones, you know, they are used to me. When I have them in the third year you know, I have got, for instance, now, last year he was in my form this year he is in the 3rd year and I told him the other day "If you aren't quiet I shall put you away and give you a good hiding!" you know and he would take it too. I would probably do it, you know, he is twice as tall as I am ..

Interv: Yeh,

Mrs. E: At the time but, you know, it is this relationship although I am very strict I love the children, naughty as they can be and I think it is also something I feel . . . um . . . I don't do it as a job really in order to earn money. I would say, I mean I don't want to blow my own trumpet, but I think I am a dedicated teacher, plenty of outside interests as well but probably this is now more so. I lost my husband
Mrs. E: 15 month ago and I started teaching in 1965 and there was a time when I got very involved in the school and my husband got almost jealous of my being.. my involvement with the school. I am not involved now as I was in the other school, er.. but um.. it interests me; the children interest me. um.. I would like them to come to me to confide if they want to, I am not.. I will not force any secrets out of them but if they want to and they feel that one's interest in them, not only interest in their academic advance but also their social and in their behaviour - I always tell them, you know. Learning academic subjects three hours is only half as good, the other half is learning how to behave and how to live together with others; social aspect I think is very very important, as far as I am concerned and I have got now first year and they I think er.. er.. I hope that I get this same class next year because I have made such a good beginning with this class you know - they are lovely, all of them, I have got some rascals don't think they are all angels - I have got some quite you know quite rascals but I set a certain standard you know, they they must be polite, they must be considerate to other people, they must be helpful.. um.. so that everybody gets a chance not only the clever ones but I think it is ever so important.

Interv: Can I stop you there?

Mrs. E: ....... not only form teachers, others as well. Other children come to me as well. Now.. um.. I am perhaps have a slight advantage, I don't know whether it used to be a disadvantage, we have got a Maths teacher and we have got a lousy Maths staff, in this building, apart from Mr. Pa whose, he's far better than I can ever be, he's marvellous, he's altogether marvellous, I think - you might have noticed..

Interv: Yeh
Mrs. E: He's tremendous. That's why I am so happy in this building and
would not be quite as happy in the south building I might tell you.
You have Miss Gr ..

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: ... um .. although I am not you know I am not so interested in her
I think he's tremendous and .. um .. anyway apart from him we have
quite a lousy Maths staff so I .. er .. I am concerned I am
responsible for the Maths in this building and the children come
to me because they are worried about their Maths. In fact, I
have taken one to five that is out of the clever first year group.
In the beginning I was time-tabled to have them twice a week and
somebody else had them three times a week and they didn't have a clue
and I couldn't get any satisfaction out of them either because I
had them on Monday and Friday and what they learned from me on
Mondays they had forgotten by Friday. The other one had them and
then I sometimes come in. I couldn't make heads or tails of what he
had on the blackboard never mind the children. I asked them - they
said well they didn't really understand. I say "well for God's sake
why don't you ask!" So they come to me and I was very worried and
said I would like to take them over because I am really entitled to have
8 frees per week for marking and organising things and Parky said
"Don't do that, you will have them next year anyway." Well, I looked
at it for a few more weeks. I couldn't bear it any longer. I could
have cried for those children because for first years who had a chance
to do Maths well and they didn't have a clue. They didn't know whether
they were coming or going so I went to Parky and I said to him, "I make
Mrs. E: a deal with you, from now until the end of the year I will sacrifice 3 frees - 3 of my frees each week. I will take them over completely don't ever call for me for cover for anybody else. We discussed it and we discussed it with Mr. In. and that's how it went and they have got on fine. But I don't want to tell you that children come to me with their not only their Maths troubles, not all, I don't think the whole school comes to me, that's not so. But some children I take for instance, one child .. er .. home. I coach her - that is not public, I don't think that even Parky knows about it .. er .. she has got no preferential treatment I make that quite clear in the beginning but she is exceptionally good at science and rather weak in Maths and just by chance I mentioned it once to her you know, "It's a pity that you are rather weak in Maths because if you want to concentrate on science you will need Maths and so she came and wanted coaching, did I know of a teacher, I said "Look, I will do it myself and she was delighted and we talk about all sorts of things, not only Maths about, and I talk with other children about .. er .. their interests, about their homes .. um .. for me that is teaching itself, teaching matters only half, half the job the other half is the children themselves that's why I was so keen to go on the cruise. When people, I love to be together with children out of the classroom situation ..

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: That is the best, well just you know .. and I enjoyed that cruise tremendously. It was very hard-work. Don't think "Ah, you know," people think "Oh, lucky you, going on a fortnight's cruise." Of course, I wanted it it was lovely, but I was shattered when I came back. There again, I was conscientious I took it seriously, I got on very well. We went .. two of us .. took 25 kids and there we were on completely different .. er .. level there was of course
Mrs. E: .. we always taught you know while we were at sea, a few lessons, although it was very half-heartedly really. But .. um .. you know got to know the children they were more or less your friends. They talk about their boyfriends and their homes and their worries and their interests and that is something I really like and I think there should be far more of it in schools with teachers who not only teach English, Geography or Maths .. er .. it is more very old-fashioned way. I remember when I was a child the teacher was for me somebody up there. You were afraid of your teacher and what teacher said was right and if teacher said 1 and 1 are 3, 1 and 1 were 3, you see, because the teacher said it. That part I like very much more now .. um .. not the truth .. that was a tremendous enjoyment and gave me a big satisfaction.

Interv: Would you rather adopt a tutorial role ..

Mrs. E: Pardon

Interv: If there was a tutorial system in being of house system ..

Mrs. E: Mm ..

Interv: Um, would you see your position there as a tutor being able to involve yourself more officially in ..

Mrs. E: Um, there I would be afraid that I would not know enough about other subjects. I feel a tutor .. er .. well can help the child in her or his own subject but if they would, I could help in English I suppose I could help in German, if they would come to me with geography, I don't think I could help them much as a tutor.

Interv: I meant more in the pastoral care, the pastoral side.

Mrs. E: Yes

Interv: Um .. some schools have the house system with the tutors beneath so that the heads of house, instead of relying on say form teachers to give information to them, have this rather official position as
Interv: tutor with tutor groups that are a and they refer back
to the house staff. I mean ..

Mrs. E: I have never seen that work that I have never seen the house system
before but not tutorial system I have not
I was in three schools, I am not talking about the war, that was old-
fashioned stuff, you know, that was in a Boarding School anyway. Er
.... quite frankly I don't know.

Interv: Do you in fact .. um .. get much feed back from the house staff between
yourself about say particular pupils you might feel have problems.
Would you go out of your way?

Mrs. E: Well, yes I suppose so. If difficulties with a child I would discuss
him or her with the house staff. Whether they are particularly
helpful I am not so sure. They probably are because they have got
well they talk about other things but academic .. er .. subjects
but you would probably get the same on the record cards except that
the record cards are not filled in properly, I don't think, when you
want to know something about the first-year child and you look on
the junior what the junior school has written, there is very little
there to .. to to give information. Really, I suppose house staff
is very important if they are good but I mean this .. this room
between you and me, I personally don't think that the house staff
are very good in this building.

Interv: Yeh.

Mrs. E: I mean, if you are if you .. you were ever present in house assembly
then it is just pathetic. In fact, we had a few weeks ago a new
that supposed to be with the staff that the staff are
supposed to be in the house assembly. Well the others said "You
aren't going to be there." so that you cannot be there you know,
that's .. you must take it over with Miss Un because house
assembly is pathetic, completely meaningless. And .. er .. when we
Mrs. E: talk now lots of times about altering the house assembly, I still maintain I have not got the answer for that yet mind you. What do we want a house assembly for? Do we want to occupy the children for 20 minutes, once a week? Do we want to make them feel they belong to a house? Er .. what's the aim of a House assembly? I have not got the answer.

Interv: Mm

Mrs. E: But to me the walking out and just not bothered and leave Mrs. Un with 200 kids was not the right thing to do and I was pleased I stayed. And they listened to me really because you see I am in a position where I am sitting in the staff-room but less so experienced wise and .. um .. up there so I am kind of in between and I sometimes well .. I talk to Parky the other day and I said that .. er .. I think there should be more part of the staff room, I mean they are there up on that floor.

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: They are no different from anybody else and the staff feel that you see. Um .. then you go to the house assembly you stand and the house staff sits. Well to me this is wrong. Now, then I was the Deputy Head in the other school and I was in the staff room, I was sitting in the staff room. I could have also sat in the Head Master office but I didn't because I feel I am very susceptible to atmosphere and I can sense straight away if there is a strange atmosphere. Um .. I don't think the house staff are aware at all. But this is, as I said, don't play this back to them, they may not like it!

Interv: No, no
Mrs. E: No, no that's that is why I think they are very nice personally. They are good with the children, I don't think they are strong enough, personally, they are not strong enough, their personalities I have a house teacher to me, has a very strong personality otherwise they are .. they fall down on their real jobs.

Interv: Mm

Mrs. E: Well you met them both, didn't you? They are .. er .. oh first year with Mr. Ir ... I can't remember now, it was something about - I had told a child off and sent him to Mr. Ir and he .. um .. asked the child and the child denied it and then he come to me and said have I got proof or something. I could have cried I wouldn't have sent the child in the first place if I you know, there is this .. er .. no, I don't .. it is nothing personal against either of them because they are both very very nice, I don't think Mr. Pa ... you should see the difference. How Parky talks to the children and how these other two talk to children, he's got everything at his fingertips, the way he talks to the children also there is love, sometimes very very cross, they are too mellow - too gentle. To .. to me pastoral .. you have got to have patience, you have got to be understanding, you have got to be sympathetic, but .. um.. you youself must be um .. very strong personality. And I find that for instance, on the cruise it was .. it proved my point on the cruise, both Mrs. Sa .. I don't know whether you have met Mrs. Sa ?

Interv: Yes, er

Mrs. E: You have met Mrs. Sa , well she was the other one, we two went on the cruise and ... er .. we got on very well together and .. er ..
Mrs. E: ... er ... we both are quite strong personalities and I think this is half the secret of pastoral care.

Interv: Yes

Mrs. E: These two aren't ... er ... strong enough as house although I cannot judge awfully well, but Mrs. P... has not got love enough for children from what I see. Um ... Mr. W... I really I don't know, I think he is got enough love for children but I only know he loses his temper too often but that's something I just ... There I don't want to judge but I can only see. These two I can judge and as far as I am concerned they aren't ... um I somehow thought you wanted to talk about something completely different something about comprehensive ... er ... system I mean..

Interv: I was saying, I mean that is a very interesting part of the research I am doing. That is putting with your mixed-ability teaching another kind of mental aspect.

Mrs. E: Well you see from ... I am a very old-fashioned person and I must tell you ... um ... to me Maths is a subject you can't teach to mixed abilities you cannot teach maths to a child who is very clever and also a child and you ask her "what is one and one?" and I tell you 2, which happens frequently I might tell you.

Interv: Mm

Mrs. E: that is impossible and ... er ... when I looked there was no set now, I went straight away to Tom her and I think through my ... um ... I must have a few weeks I said in one staff meeting and said to him "Well, it used to be done and I think it was dis... either
Mrs. E: discontinued or never done, it was suggested and I said "Well can you please cover the .. can you tell me for what reason it was discontinued". I never got that reason to this last .. yes, for one year we didn't set and the second class we were setting and that works, although it's not perfect yet but it definitely works better. Not in the first year because .. er .. you must give them a chance you still sort them out fairly soon but especially in the and in this .. in this .. um .. yes, in this building the seconds aren't set either because 2 and 5 I have always had I had them last year and they were a set on their own. They are clever all of them and .. er .. we wanted to set so 2 and 4 was on its own .. on its own anyway. We wanted to set 2 and 3 and 2 and 2 half Mr. Pa and half myself and .. um .. it worked for 4 lessons we could but one lesson I would have to take one class because they didn't fit into the time table and he the other class was under Mr. Pa. . He said "Why don't we split them up you take one class and me the other?" and that works very well really.

Interv: In fact the setting & the forms are the same.

Mrs. E: that's right, the third they are set and that's .. well it doesn't it does work better than no set at all. Makes group, yes, they also have the same chance but certainly doesn't work, I would never .. and if you told a child to get on work on their own, for instance, the Head of Maths wants to or wanted them to, and is doing it starting a work-hard scheme - I am also against that. Why? I will tell you why. Because I started I have done a work hard and I find myself teaching far less. It makes it easier for for the teacher that's so. Now perhaps I am too old-
Mrs. E: fashioned I don't know, but if you want to, the children don't do it on their own, either they are too thick or they aren't interested. You can't make a child interested if you aren't actually there. I can put things much better over when I am doing it on the blackboard, then give them examples, then giving them work sheets for examples, yes, that's fair enough but to let them work through work sheets, it just doesn't work. I am sorry. What did Parky say the other day? - yes, you .. we talk one language there, it's a correspondence course.

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: that's exactly what it is. It was spoken right out of my mouth, no, I am probably old-fashioned. It doesn't work you have got to teach the children something. Yes, I try within my teaching let them find out, I am not saying this and now that you do it this way, I will let them try. Sometimes it doesn't work but at least I make the effort - they have got to find out themselves they have got to they .. they think for themselves, to find the solution of this because I find that if they then understand it much better if they find it out. But to let them find out for themselves and work at their own pace that is "poppy cock". It just doesn't work. it might work in junior schools and I am not sure of that. If it would work so well in junior schools, why are there so many non-readers coming into the secondary schools; not only non-readers what they forget is and I am trying, I have not talked to the Head of Department yet, their innumerousy they don't know when they come to this school what is 1 and 1. Or they don't know most of their tables yet - that's
Mrs. E: only because they are left to their own deviced. It is not always
the teacher's fault, I mean the class is far too large, I mean 40
little ones together in one form is criminal..

Interv: Yeh, yeh

Mrs. E: I mean what do you do first? One child gets the chance of reading
once a week I mean that is .. I don't know whether you have also
also researched in junior schools but they will tell you that, yes,
but they will tell you that. This is criminal, so finding them,
find out for yourself. It doesn't work in practice. And in the
States, they are going back to the old the old routine. They
have found during years that it doesn't work and in a few years
time this country will also go back to it.

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: I mean, this .. er .. high falluting words. Now I tell you something.
In the other school I was the Deputy Head I was not involved with
the team teaching but there was team teaching going on, one afternoon
a week. So I walked through the hall and I saw two children doing
nothing, and I said "What are you doing?" and they said "This is
our time off." For team teaching (a) you need a building, a
purpose-built building; you need marvellous staff, really, staff
who have prepared their lessons, have planned it to the last detail
months ahead; not many teachers do that you know. No, I am against
team teaching and to send a child let's say find out a bit about
goingrphy and then find out a bit about history, it doesn't work
in practice, not with these kids. You find them half the time in
the 'lou' probably, if they would be sent from one room to another
to find things out. They would not be involved.

Interv: Why's this? Why I mean did this occur in the earlier schools you
talked about, the same sort of attitude, or is it something that's
developed more recently?
Mrs. E: What?

Interv: The whole attitude to kids

Mrs. E: No, this is.. I have never seen it.. well, perhaps in some schools I think it probably works but in the schools I work in, it doesn't work, that I can assure you.

Interv: There has been no change in attitude over time?

Mrs. E: No, no

Interv: you know, sometimes, it has been claimed recently that kids are becoming more violent, less interested, sensitive to them, as opposed to the teacher?

Mrs. E: It might be! Children need security. I think if you let a child .. not so much this range but the younger age, where: there is a lot of team teaching going on, I think they are not secure enough; they are much more secure in a classroom sitting in a desk than being sent from room to room in a big area. I think it might be lack of security and you might then perhaps find that growing violence originates from that.

Interv: Mm

Mrs. E: You follow me?

Interv: Yeh, and larger schools presumably..

Mrs. E: Of course, I mean this is ludicrous this is.. it's a factory a .. they are sausage factories. Why do you think I am quite happy in this school because as far as I am concerned I am a part of a 400 children school. I only teach in North building I only .. only teach North building children.

Interv: Yeh

Mrs. E: 400, 500 that's a fine size, anything larger than that is just too big. Well, I'm sorry I have got to go but I hope ...
Head of House: Ha

Interv: O.K. er can you tell me how the tutorial system works at Ashton?

Ha: Well, within each building, which is about 4-5 forms, there are four teachers who take a vertical cross section, by which I mean they take .. um .. about 200 pupils each, from all forms, from all streams, and mixed sexes obviously .. and um .. the pupils are allocated to the house on a fairly random basis, apart from the fact that .. er .. the siblings are kept in the same house with .. er .. an older sister, in such-and-such a House, the younger sister tends to be in the same house. And otherwise its done on a perfectly random basis.

However, the House teacher has a certain amount of free periods a week, er .. normally about 5 or 6 extra - which doesn't seem to me to be enough - .. um .. during which he's supposed to get to know the pupils in his House well enough to write a report at the end of the course, at the end of each year, on the pupil, which is quite a difficult thing to do in fact with 200 pupils. And also he may be asked .. um .. to help the pupil with any problems which may arise, either academically or to do with the career of the pupil later following, or to do with disciplinary matters. This means in fact as there is no formal .. um .. procedure, as there is no definite time when every pupil in a House sees a House teacher, .. um .. some pupils will get very well known by the House teacher, because they have a particular problem while they're
at school, 'cos they participate in House activities a great deal, or because they are in a number of discipline problems and get referred to the House teacher. Other pupils may get to know the House teacher for quite the opposite reason, because they're very good participants in sporting activities or House activities of some kind. Or very good academically and get gossiped about in the staffroom for this reason, and House teachers get to know them that way. And in between there are a vast number of pupils who are neither very bad or nor are they particularly good in any way .. you like to specify, and hardly get known at all. In fact, it's certainly true that .. er .. in the House which I run there must be a large number of pupils which I hardly know. In fact I'd have to look them up in the records to find out if they're in my House or not.

Um .. as far as how it operates, which is what you mentioned, er .. it operates very informally in that there is no set procedure .. um .. A Pupil may, if he wishes, consult his form teacher or a particular subject teacher or any other House teacher if he has a particular problem, and certainly no one would interfere with this. Um .. usually he'll consult his House teacher, however, because he feels that his House teacher should be the one he goes to see. The feels that his House teacher .. um .. has some kind of knowledge of him and .. er .. perhaps has .. er .. um .. the information required to help with some problem and that it's his House teacher who ought to do something about a change in course .. something of this kind associated with the school.
As far as discipline etcetera is concerned, um, usually the House teacher's function is to help the discipline of new members of staff who are, who have problems with discipline themselves, for one reason or another, and who will send pupils to a House teacher - if they have problems with them.

Interv: Do you think the older staff, or the staff who have been there longer, would tend not to send pupils to the House teachers?

Ha: I think this happens to a large extent - yes. Um, the older members of staff, particularly because the House teachers at least at Stanley Avenue are very young, um, about my age, feel, er, it is humiliating in some way. I feel, I think, to send their own problems to such younger House staff and therefore there must be some problems which arise, um, which are either dealt with outside the House system, certainly this happens or are dealt with by the subject teachers themselves - rather than refer it to the House teacher. There isn't any automatic way in which this information gets to the House teacher. So one can be very much in the dark about this, and then suddenly find out that something's been happening which you don't know about, um, which can be annoying. Um, subject heads of department, um, also, er, often express the opinion that they feel that discipline problems could be dealt with better on a subject basis. Um, although they never attempt this themselves, and the younger members do rather have to fall back on the House because the subject teachers aren't willing to, er, the subject heads of department aren't
Hat: willing to take the responsibility of the discipline themselves.

Usually House teacher are .. um .. appear to be appointed on a discipline basis. If they can keep good discipline then they will become a House teacher. This is the criterion, the main criterion for becoming a House teacher.

Interv: Do you think the subject heads of department would consider discipline should be a class teacher's responsibility rather than the House teacher's?

Hat: Teachers generally would feel, I myself as a teacher would feel, um .. rather than as a House teacher, that it is important that a class teacher is able to keep control of his own class, because no matter how carefully a House teacher puts himself in a position of walking into someone else's class or being sent someone who's been misbehaving in someone else's classroom .. um .. however carefully he may attempt to approach the subject of why the particular teacher had to send the pupil to the House teacher, and try to avoid the situation of .. of .. or .. failure by the class teacher to discipline the child himself, it's very difficult to escape the fact that this is rather the impression the pupil gets. I would say the House teacher's function should not be to deal with minor breaches of discipline in class because .. because a class teacher ought to be able to deal with them.
But I feel there are certain breaches of discipline which crop up regularly and it begins to be obvious that there are factors influencing a child's behaviour outside school, and possibly in school generally, and nothing to do with a particular subject, something rather than high-spiritiness. Something which needs counselling, advice and finding out about, which is too time consuming to deal with in the lesson, and this is where the House staff ought to operate. Um however, it's my experience that House teachers spend a lot of their time dealing with high-spiritiness, which the particular class teacher has been unable to cope with, and for which there's no real need for counselling. And um it's rather a lack of experience on the side of the particular class teacher in charge.

How many kids would you say are actually, say, under your control at the moment. Or how many kids are in your club in your House?

Approximately 200. I would say 200 plus or minus 20.

How do you feel as a teacher this compares with the tutorial system of other comprehensives?

I think that the ideal situation in a comprehensive school for a House system would be this. Because of staffing limitations, which the headmaster has to cope with, it is not possible for the headmaster to employ one person who has almost no teaching timetable at all in order to do the kind of job which I am doing. In some comprehensive schools they operate it as follows, and I think it's a very good mode of operation: that within the school there are tutorial groups.
The tutorial groups are very small and a tutor deals with them and keeps in touch with a regular basis.. um.. with the pupils within his tutorial group. Now in fact this tutorial group should also be a register group and the tutor should be making a constant effort to keep up with the everyday activities of the pupil, - which subjects he's finding difficult, which subjects he's finding easy, how he's getting on at home, what parties he's been to.. all sorts of everyday information which can in my experience be quite easily picked up, if a member of staff puts himself out to enter some kind of relationship on a personal level with the pupil, even if it's just chatting at the lunch table or something of this kind. This kind of information is quite forthcoming, you don't have to fight for it. If you're prepared to spend a little bit of time talking to children it comes out. And I think this is the sort of thing that a tutor of a small group can get to know which a House teacher in a House my size has no chance of getting to know. I would like to see the tutorial groups then arranged into house groups which are much larger. And a House teacher with substantially more free time than myself operating over a number of tutorial groups so that a tutor, when he gets.. um.. wind of a particular problem which he knows is going to need a lot of time to operate on, which is probably going to need consultation with parents, and possibly with other outside agencies.. For example, a report comes in that.. er.. a particular child has been in trouble with the police, or something of this kind, or a tutor finds a child is very upset about something that has happened at home,
and this is the sort of field in which the House teacher ought to be operating. But the House teacher ought to have .. um .. under him, tutors of very small numbers of pupils. Um .. I would hope as small as 20 or 30, who the House teacher can consult and find out individual detail of information about the pupil in their charge. At Ashton there are class register groups. The form teacher is not a tutor. Some form teachers in fact perform a function very similar to a tutor. Although they're given no time to do it, although they're given no directive to do it, do in fact find out a lot about the pupils, - they take an interest in the pupils in their form, and .. er .. this works very well. It's always worth talking to them because lots of useful information can be learnt. But in general a class teacher feels his job is very administrative at Ashton, it's never been defined as anything else, and .. er .. and er .. and therefore a large number of kids, we find, are suddenly are in enormous problems which must have been building up over a period of time and one suddenly finds out about them, and by the time one's found out the problem has become very large and very difficult to solve; whereas in .. er .. if there was a .. a .. a tutorial system underneath a House structure if you like, um .. the House teacher could have operated at a much earlier time.

But you see you can't have very small tutorial groups and also give tutors the large amount of free time which is necessary to .. to operate on the particular basis where many hours may have to be spent a week on one particular pupil, or a number of different pupils. It's just not on with
the staffing .. er .. arrangements which can be made within the school. There has to be someone who a tutor can refer to.

**Interv:** Can you tell me how the kids who come to you as "discipline problems" feel about the House system, and being referred to you, rather than being dealt with by the class teacher?

**Ha:** They're certainly aware that some teachers send pupils to House teachers and others do not. For example, they are themselves taught by people who are House teachers, and they are aware that House teachers don't send pupils to other House teachers. They are also aware that .. er .. many of the senior members of staff would not operate discipline in this way. How do they feel about it? How do I think they feel about it, that's a very good question? Er .. it's interesting that this year at Ashton, instead of an informal situation where a form teacher sends a pupil directly to his own House teacher, or says "Go and see your House teacher at lunch-time or after school" or goes to the effort of finding out where the House teacher himself is teaching, and brings him along there's now a system at the school by which a House teacher is on duty contin .. during every lesson of the day .. and always in the House room. So that a teacher at any time during the day can send a pupil to the House room where a House teacher will be found. It could be any House teacher, not necessarily the House teacher of the pupil concerned. In fact the House teachers at Southern Avenue particularly operate very much on a group basis, and it doesn't really matter whether the pupil who arrives is in your House or not,
Ha: unless it's a particular problem which is undoubtedly
going to involve a great deal of counselling. When it
comes to everyday .. um .. disciplining of a .. a particular
problem within a class whose really talking or throwing
things around .. er .. or fighting or something of this kind
.. where it appears a quick solution may be found, the House
teacher in charge will just deal with it, and and that'll
be it.

I think the pupils are aware that it's .. um .. that
um .. teachers send them to a House teacher because they
themselves can't cope. It's often been the case that
pupils have in fact refused to leave the room, and therefore
teachers had to send for a House teacher to come and take
them out. There's never any trouble - as soon as a House
teacher arrives the pupil's perfectly willing to go, in my
experience. I think that the teachers feel that it is a
shortcoming of the teacher in charge.

I think .. I think it holds no real terror for them
because, as House teachers, both myself and my colleagues
feel very strongly that some of the problems which arise in
class are a combination of pupil/teacher interaction, - that
the teacher for some reason .. er .. has very little control
or is inexperienced, and because of this, this particular
pupil has stepped out of line, they got sent out. And for
this reason it .. it wouldn't be the right thing to do when
a pupil came in to shout at him and hassle him .. eh .. so
that he feels he's done something terrible, which he knows
he certainly has not done .. anything terrible .. it's just that the teacher has let him get away with something which he wouldn't do in another class. And for this reason .. er .. as a House teacher I feel that .. er .. sometimes a very quiet talking to, and almost a friendly chat, and it may even have a .. a joking content, may be appropriate for a particular interview and a particular child .. with an appeal to respect .. um .. such as:

"Now there are 30 people in the class you're just one. Now your misbehaviour .. the other 29 can't do any work". And this kind of approach may be more successful. And shouting at the child is something which the child knows, and you know, is a product in fact of the classroom situation, and not of his bad behaviour.

Interv: How much do you think .. er .. the behaviour problems are a product of the staff not wanting to apply discipline as, say, it has been applied before in the classroom?

Ha: As it has been applied in the past

Interv: Yes, not a lack of application of discipline, but the application of a different form of discipline.

Ha: I think the pupils have certain expectancies of teachers. They expect a teacher to be able to keep quiet absol ... class absolutely quiet. They define a study situation as one which is completely quiet and which is teacher dominated. I believe this is true of pupils at Ashton, this is what they expect the lessons to be. Certainly some teachers do try and break down the situation, especially teachers who are recently out of training college and have new ideas, and try and do group work, and this particular type of thing. Within this situation
Ha: there is in fact a larger problem of control. As soon as you break down, it seems to me, very strong barriers between teacher and pupil, and you let it become more fleid, then a new position has to be negotiated. The pupils are allowed a lot more freedom .. um .. and a new position between teacher and taught has to be negotiated in which the child has to find out again .. um .. what the "do's" and what the "don'ts" of a particular situation are. And within this kind of situation with an inexperienced teacher, although he is the one who has .. er .. introduced the .. um .. the new kind of teaching, he may find that things go beyond where he was prepared to let them go, and he has to reimpose control. Now in this kind of situation it can be that he has problems with particular pupils, and .. er .. these may have to be dealt with.

Interv: Er .. well, rather a question changing the subject .. um .. could you explain how streaming of any sort or .. um .. classes are divided in the upper school at Ashton?

Ha: When pupils arrive at the upper school, by which I mean the 4th year, they're already streamed. In the 3rd year they're offered a series of choices of subjects which involve doing one language or doing two languages, etc. And these choices are not complete choices in fact to everyone. Certain people who have done .. who have got certain grades
in particular subjects have more choices open to them than others. Um.. pupils are definitely influenced by guidance from their form teachers.. House teachers at Easton Road as to which course to take. When they arrive at Ashton they are very strongly streamed.. um.. academically and socially. It's very noticeable that although they are streamed in general terms according to ability, there is also streaming going on in that in the lower streams you find that boys and girls who are above average intelligence, but have behaviour problems.. and this seems to have operated in the junior school to put them in a certain stream. And the upper stream - you get boys and girls who seem to be below average intelligence in a particular subject but who are very quiet and very well behaved and extremely conscientious and work very hard and study very hard. And so the groups have been streamed but on.. er.. certainly not on purely academic bases. In the upper school there is very little change whatsoever in between the 4th year and the end of the 5th year.. hardly any. Individual pupils may be moved. When an individual pupil moves it's usually done on the basis of not being able to cope with a particular course.. er.. which the child is finding difficult. It's usually done with consultation with the parents. It may be a very small.. er.. change in respect to an option course - doing needlecraft instead of housecraft, or drama instead of art or something of this kind. Um.. movements are usually from more difficult to easier courses. Occasionally there are movements up in
courses, where a pupil in a lower course is found to be doing extremely well. The courses they are in doesn't offer, for example, English at 'O' level: the pupil is thought to be capable of English at 'O' Level, and is moved into a higher course. Probably those changes and the changes where the child isn't managing in a high academic stream, are about equal - but changes between 4th and 5th year are really very very small.

**Interv:** How are the groupings related to form classes?

**Ha:** Er .. pupils are kept very largely, in the 4th year, with the same people they were with in the 3rd year, - and that is that there is very little re-arrangement. In the 3rd year they do most of their classes with their own form. Vast majority of the classes with their own form. When they arrive in the 4th year they're then taught in course groups so they .. they .. er .. may be doing, they may be doing course P, and they may be in the same class as someone doing course Q, course U and Course W. So you may have people with four different timetables in the same class.

However, there are not forms in which there are pupils from course K, which is a non-academic general course, and pupils from course W. Why this doesn't happen emerges from the 2nd and 3rd year groupings, which have been an academic .. which are academically named, and they're not changed from these groupings. So there's no definite operation to put them in course groups or academic groups in the 4th year but it's a bit inherited from the 3rd year. I think most of the streaming
and course decisions and this kind of thing are chosen . . . er . . . are performed in the 3rd year, and just carried on into the senior school.

**Interview:** And how does streaming affect . . . er . . . discipline and academic attainment?

**Hat:** How does stream affect at? Er . . . there are more discipline problems in what would be defined as the less academic streams than there are in the more academic streams. The problems which arise are of a different kind. There are more problems associated with the general horseing around in the lower streams. In the senior streams the problems House teachers find themselves operating on are prolonged truancies . . . um . . . due to being frightened of school . . . um . . . antagonism . . . um . . . with particular persons or particular groups of people, which again has been instigated outside school. Sometimes there are . . . no, that's not important. Um . . . there are more discipline problems in the lower forms. And the lower form teachers find more difficult to handle, possibly because they're more different from themselves. The upper streams seem to take a much more instrumental approach to education. They seem . . . they are much more easily convinced that exams are worth working for. Whereas throughout Ashton the exam system is operated, and in the lower streams the pupils are not as convinced that the exam system is worth following. Many of them, for example, would have wished to leave at the end of the 4th year; have already decided what kind of employment
employment they are going to ... going into. Often the employment is with someone they know - at a local cafe, local hairdressers - where they've been offered a job anyway. They don't need any examinations to get into it and they're merely going through school as a formality - some of them. And .. er .. they are not finding the lessons interesting, - I mean, to me the lower stream curriculum seems very much a watered down high stream curriculum. Doesn't have any inherent interest for the particular group of pupils. And I don't find it very surprising there are discipline problems amongst the lower academic streams.

**Interv:** Do you find that streaming makes the actual teaching situation easier for a teacher .. or would you imagine .. (untranscribable)?

**He:** I think .. that given one is teaching exam curriculum, which is the case at Ashton, then it's much easier for most teachers to teach one of the particular ability ranges of pupils. Because, if he is teaching an exam subject for which the headmaster had laid down, the pupil at the end of 2 years, 3 years, whatever it might be, have to take exams, and he finds that he has a mixed-ability range, - some pupils taking 'O' level, some taking CSE's, some perhaps taking neither, then he may have to arrange .. he may have to do a great deal more lesson preparation. Er .. given that he's willing to do the lesson preparation, even then he may have to group teach, and controlling a large number of groups, different groups, involved in a different activities, is more difficult than controlling one group of pupils doing the same thing. This is certainly true, and .. er .. although it could be much more interesting, and one
I could operate on the basis of some of the teach . . . some of the more able pupils helping some of the slower ones, I see no reason why this shouldn't be done. Um . . . I think . . . eh . . . most teachers would find it difficult - much prefer to teach streamed classes, and would have difficulty in control using any other system.
In this school none of us are actually trained counsellors to start off with...er...there is nobody here who has really had any training as counsellors, not in the accepted sense...um...because we have all been...we have all applied for these jobs as House Teachers and the House Teacher's job originally was to be a counsellor plus discipline which means one has to have a Jeckyll and Hyde personality really, 'cos...um...at one moment you are trying to discipline people...er...actually for other people not always for yourself - very rarely for yourself because you have usually got a quite a good relationship with your own House and one of the great problems is, you get sent people to the House room with behaviour problems within the classroom. You have to deal with those behaviour problems and then say a week after, they may be coming to you, or ought to come to you for some advice - they might have got themselves into some sort of trouble outside and so you have this strange...er...thing where you have got some...one moment you're sort of telling them off and trying to put...er...trying to sort of put them on the straight and narrow and the next moment you are trying to get their confidence because they might be depressed over something so...but in a way none of us are really I suppose trained counsellors but we just use our experience as teachers to try to discuss problems with kids and if we find it's something we can't spend too much time upon or it's rather more dramatic than just a little upset with a boy-friend we then phone up guidance people or the/
the clinic and we usually as a ... we usually use this room as a 'screening' see. If we find that we can cope with the problem within our own experience we will do but if we feel that it's ... um ... it's something rather serious ... I mean if a girl wrote a letter and was threatening suicide for instance, I would then get on to the child guidance clinic and say "look, I have got a child who seems to be depressed, she's having problems at home, it seems rather serious I would like you co come down and see her". So in a way we are like the General Practitioner who sort of tries to sort of see if we can manage within our own limitations but if it's anything serious we leave it to outside bodies and Brent are rather good I find, because if they ... um ... people are available ... um ... there is ... er ... social services and all these people we have contacts with. So, in a way if you come to me and ask me what counselling is, I would not be able to go into great depth except to say my main problem here involves girls who have problems in growing up sort of thing - I have had a girl in here ... had a sort of a crush on a teacher even sort of thing and ... er ... she used to follow him around but it wasn't a sort of a normal ... it hadn't got a sort of sexual thing about it, it was more a father figure see and she used to follow him around and in the end it became impossible for me to deal with it because I found she wasn't even listening so I got her interviewed by ... by Kingsbury Guidance Clinic and they seem to havesorted out the problem but ... um ... we usually have ... er ... parents up in the first instance because we can't refer the child without parent's co-operation. In this case, there was no co-operation until/
/until I had a suicide letter which the parents took as a joke but I said if that er... because there was a case in Brighton a girl was sort of killed and... er... there is another girl... well it was the parents wasn't it?... it was the stepfather who killed her and there was another case where the girl committed suicide in the south when she was being teased by kids, I have always held this over the heads of people and said "Well, these things mightn't be a joke but if there is anything seriously wrong it's better to get advice than to let it get this far", and we get parents who agree but this is usually the stages we go through. I should say at least 80% of the cases that come in here... er... are just asking for advice, it might be even on a boyfriend it might be on a career, although we aren't really career teachers.

They sometimes come and talk to us... er... they believe in talking... a girl was asking me on Friday whether... er... I thought she ought to go out with a bloke of 25 who was a solicitor in Mayfair and things like this and... er... you know, you have... um... quite a lively discussion with them and it's... um... quite interesting you know and... er... they come into you for little things and... er... because although they seem to be very mature, sometimes they put on this front and they come to you and ask you questions... er... some are of a sexual nature but I suppose because of my age they... often girls have said to me they prefer to talk to me because they know I won't be shocked rather than go to a woman teacher. They will say to me you know... er... "When can I go on the pill?" and things like that and they know I won't tell them what naughty/
/naughty girls they are because I'll never sort of ridicule them - I'll sort of tell them straight where they can get it and I'll also tell them that..um..as..er..as young girls there is certain dangers in it and I'll say medically that they ought to..I give them the advice that I read about blood clotting and make sure they get the right one - I mean then I say to them that it's far better to go to a Doctor and check first because I'm only a layman but..um.. I don't 'poo-poo' the ideas and say "Get out of here you dirty little devil" so, therefore, they do have confidence in you but really..um..I don't know what the others have said we..we don't really go into any great depth of guidance or anything because we are not qualified and in fact we..we really look to the local authorities if it's something we feel ought to be referred we usually do that ourselves as I think we do spend a lot of time doing this, it seems to me we give very little guidance in a way..on anything of real importance see. We get kids come who are in trouble with police but, of course once they get in trouble with the police there is very little one can do about it. I mean it's no good turning round and saying to them "you shouldn't have done it" that doesn't help at all see, so our main concern if they are in trouble with the police is filling in a form and being as kind as possible, perhaps phoning a Solicitor who might want to get in touch with us and give them a general run-down on the kid's character and we'd be helpful in that way but see when they have reached the stage where they have already been into..into a house and committed a burglary then it's a bit late and they will never/
/never come to you for guidance on whether I should break into No. 3 or not, see so it's...it's a great problem but this is what ours revolve around and problems here are...are really problems that Mums and Dads would normally be asked to solve if they were...if...they their Mums and Dads were available all the time. They would probably come to us with a bit more confidence and I find that really you have got to be a wise parent more than a counsellor because they usually ask you for things that one would normally, if they has a good relationship with Mum and Dad, one would...um...usually ask one's Mother and Father you see but if it goes beyond that the Mum and Dad would then say "Take Johnny down to see the Doctor, or something because there is something wrong with him so we only really advise...um...you know which are...er...on everyday things really.

Interview

What extent...what amount of your time do you think you spend on that kind of counselling as opposed to the small...discipline...er...counselling you talk about.

Dpi:

Oh, a very small amount of time, very small, I suppose in a week. I suppose I'll go for weeks and it will only be discipline problems really because in my opinion this room is being used wrongly as a discipline room and we haven't got enough...um...as much time that we should have for counselling...in fact there may be a lot of problems in the school which escape us because we only see two types of person - those who are troublesome and have troubles and those who are very good who come in for praise but I suppose/
/suppose the 60% say between the two, we don't really know and they might be quiet kids with problems and we never have any contact...they could go through this school in 5 years..in 5 or 6 years in the school and we...we may not have very much contact with them at all. I might see them at a house meeting once a week but because they are quiet kids - but they might still have their problems, we never...er.. we never contact them. It is only when something develops and the more confident kids will come in and discuss things with you so...there may be...we...we sometimes ourselves look at classes..I mean through experience you can tell those kids who are depressed or sometimes have some phobiers or sometimes we will talk to them and get help. You see I have known a child go through this school up to the fourth year...er..without hardly talking and..er..is missed. You get kids come to this school and you wonder how they got through the Primary School stage. There are a lot of kids missed in..this great big educational system and sometimes they..er..you know there is something radically wrong with them. It might be a sort of psychological thing or it could be an educational thing. I am appalled sometimes when kids I meet..kids in the fourth year.(see I don't really teach anybody to the fourth year) and I sometimes wonder how they..um.. escape the net and get this far with some sort of great psychological problem or some..er.. you know some educational problem..er you know even the spelling like this dyslexia thing, you know I found a girl that I was certain had it and I referred her to the _ because she started spelling words round the wrong way but they/
they can get to fourth or fifth year so really our...um...
we aren't very successful I don't think in diagnosing things
as teachers because...um...they don't come to our notice until
too late. You see there is no system whereby here I could
talk to every child in my house for instance, perhaps even in
the whole school career, unless I could get someone to run my
house for me once a week and then get a group in here and
talk to them because...um...I only speak to them as a mass so
I don't suppose I really do very much good to...um...as a
counsellor I don't think I do very much good and it is...as
I say it's only when they are really desperate or they are
confident kids and they want to come in for a chat that I
ever have a talk to them. See, I can't really go out and
grab people and talk to them and interview them. It's only
when the problem is got so acute that they are desperate that
they come to me and I don't think this is really what a
council is...there should be somebody in a room where they can
go to always at any time, they can't come to see me any time
when I'm teaching, see. I only get...I only get a few periods
in the day where...where...er...when when this job was first
advertised we were promised about 13 periods welll...it's
probably only five times in the week when I am able to really
see anybody.

Intery:

This is what 5 er....

Do:

Yes, 5...5 of these sort of little periods you know,
20 minutes or so, well say...it should be 40 minutes but
there is only those periods to deal with everything. So it
doesn't/
/doesn't really give you much chance so as counsellors I don't think we are er..of great use. We... if a problem is of great magniture we can't deal with it 'cos we aren't trained...in any case even if we were trained if it was a medical problem or something we could haveto pass it on to the authority and..um..in a way we can't really spend enough time on each case because there's just not the time given for it.

Interv:

Yeh, so...and all that time in any case is spent with those small discipline...I am interested in how people come to be..you know, come to meet this small percentage..who're the problems, er say the problem type?

Do:

Well, you see, in this school there was a..um..you see I suppose I feel that I am a progressive in many ways but.. um..but as I listen to people and..er..see how the system is going, I sometimes begin to relate to people that a few years ago would have appalled me see..in fact at staff meetings now I wonder whether I am a fascist or something because..er.. some of the idead that are being pushed around now...I am beginning to worry a little bit because of the sort of problems that young teachers are having and I try to relate back to my own days when I was a young teacher and wonder how I dealt with them. Now, it may not be a criticism of teachers, but it might be a criticism of the system that... that um trains them see and in a way...er..you know many of them, this is not all by any means, but many teachers coming into schools now I feel aren't willing to fight hard enough to get control or or some kind of response from the class, you/
you see and... and therefore there is people... in this school who will, at the slightest little thing, will send a kid down here. No, you see, I'm not marvelous, I have my discipline problems that I have to cope with in the all the ways that I know but sometimes people send a kid down here for chewing or not doing his work or things like that, now I maintain that if that happens in the class you ought to be able to solve these problems or try to, anyway, make an attempt, but this room in a way is... is in my opinion, and I must stress in my opinion in other people's opinion it would be very good, but in my opinion it isn't very good because I feel that it... it's providing a feather bedding for people who aren't willing to try to win within the classroom situation so I get kids sent down here for various... for very small things... sometimes they happen to be the one kid in the class who... all the class may be noisy... and this kid happens to be near the front and he comes in here and he's just the unlucky one who has been picked out see and... um... I... I... I'm very reasonable and I feel that... I would often take the kid back and say "Well, look... um... he isn't the only one"... we'll back the teacher up obviously but sometimes we say to the boy "Well, just apologise to Mr. or Miss so-and-so" and come back. But... um... then it isn't always the teacher's fault because... um... it's really the curriculum see, we... we don't help we don't help the less-abled kids and I am not just talking about this school we don't do it in education at all. We all of us... whether we like it or not that the only rewarding thing is teaching is to get a few certificates. I think from the Head downwards, every school likes to say "This is... um..."
...um...our school has got so many O's and A levels but nobody ever stands up and says "I taught 3 kids to read" so these poor kids who can't read become discipline problems, see and although I have said that these teachers give in easily, it isn't always their fault because...er...they are trying to teach kids who are unable to cope with the things that they are teaching, see. And in a way it's...it's the system's fault not the teacher's. But in this room we have to cope with this situation, it's real enough, there are problems...there are lots of problems, I suppose if we walked round the school now we may be lucky and find every classroom quiet but I dare say we could go to one or two classes and find teachers having problems. They...they're probably finding it...if it gets too much that door will open and...er...if a kid has been really nasty to a teacher and told them to 'sod' off or something which they might do, they might say "you get down to the house room" see. You know, I...I don't know of...um...a lot of people feel that...that's the right thing to do. I feel it's a bit defeated because I think once you lose the kid and you send him out of the room he's really defeated you, so I would like really to think that some of them would fight a lot harder. But in the main, we do kids down here from teachers for what I would think very petty things which they could deal with themselves and they may not have been trained to deal with them but nevertheless they have got to have a go and try and win in the end...perhaps in a fortnight or month they will gradually get the kids on their side. The other type we get down here is usually...er...caught "truanting" or "bunking off" out of the gate/
gate when they shouldn't have been and these sort of things. But in this school I must say there is very little violent behaviour as we read about in the press. I don't suppose there is any boy in this school who would really attack a teacher. I have heard of teachers punching kids and teachers being punched but, in the main, it's not... this school... I must call it a non-violent school. We... we have never had to deal with situations where kids have started on teachers and in a way... in a funny sort of way... I think they have some sort of respect for us and we sort of have a respect for them. There seems to be to me... I have a rather fresh approach to kids but I don't suppose I am a good example to young teachers because I have developed this over the years see. I can say to a girl that... you know, "Have you got your knickers on today" or something like that whereas if a young teacher went up, she would probably say he's being very obscene and report him. But I can get away with things with the kids that not many teachers can. See I can pinch a boy's bum and say "Oh, that was nice" and he would say "Oh, you're a queer" or something; I'll say "Well so are you give us a kiss darling" or something as I go down the corridor. Then I am able to get away with this relationship 'cos it's only over the time I have developed this relationship where I have a joke and I'm not annoyed when they get back at me. But see, some teachers when they take the micky out of a kid and they get a reply... er... and they don't like it, you get a confrontation. See, I know... I... er... I shouldn't... er... say this as an example and get I get away with it and I can develop/
/develop this...see, I can bring a girl in here and say to her "So-and-so, give us a kiss it's your birthday" and she'll give me a kiss. Now, I know it isn't a good example but I have still got a good relationship with her see and she'll sit down and talk to me as you...as you are talking - I mean ..er.. we would be talking as equals. But..um..I don't really think we are doing a good job here as counsellors because we have to divide our...as I said..I think the best way to describe it is a Jeckyll and Hyde existence, see. This is why it doesn't work.

Interv:

I was interested in..er.. you said early on about this ..um..this distinction between discipline control one side and counsel on the other.

Do:

Yeh, um..you see it isn't really..see, you know..I mean this is what we are employed for see, for discipline and for advice and really the two things are so diametrically opposed really. See, in..in one case you have got to keep a kid away and say you know "You keep your place; I am punishing you; you are a little swine; you shouldn't have done it" and the other one you are trying to draw him nearer to get his confidence. Well, the thing is, if you have bitten him he's not going to come very near you. He's going to be a bit wary and you have lost him. So..so, therefore, having House staff who are responsible for both ..er is..is a problem. But this..this is the main thing... I don't know what other schools do see and I know that in some schools there are trained counsellors to do it as a full-time job. You see, nobody in this school is a trained counsellor/
/counsellor. There is some people who think they are, I mean they come around and we have one or two staff who aren't house staff and who think they are doing well. But by and large I don't think they are really 'cos they aren't trained and they try..um..we have a lady who is in charge of girls and things and she is..er..she is well-meaning woman and.. er..perhaps a victorian attitude but..but I can see the girls laughing at her because of your ideas..her prim and proper ideas on sex and things like that. She's sincere but see if the girls well say to her you know, "I had a bunk up last night"-as sort of a ..um..a bit of a joke and she would say "What's a bunk up?" you know that sort of thing and er.. you know..and I think you have got to have somebody whose very wordly-wise as a counsellor who knows the kids intimately, who knows their terms and can speak to them on their own terms, see. You don't want somebody whose a very nice person but..but can't relate to them very much, lives in a different world really see..um..we, we aren't trained but I suppose the people who do the house work here are wordly-wise people and we try from our won experience, we try to give them advice. I don't suppose we would do very much better if we were trained because, as I said to you before, we would be..um..reluctant to give..er..to psycho-analyse the kids or to ..um..or if we really had a problem we would just have to call in the experts. So, I don't suppose we can do a much better job.

Interv:

Does, does this conflict come out when you are actually teaching?

Do:/
/Do:

No, no it's only in my own mental conflict. ...um... it doesn't arise as much as...er...as you would think it would...um...but it, it doesn't come out when I am teaching because I do think kids don't really look upon me as being too much of a friendly uncle because they know that I have to keep them in here and things like that.
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Interviewer: Actually, what is your role as House Teacher in relation to maintaining discipline?

M.L.: Um, in relation to maintaining discipline? Um .. well along with the tutor, I suppose, I am, you know, one person in the school who .. who sees the kid as a ... sees a complete picture .. um .. you know, as far as discipline goes and an individual child then you know it would be largely based on my relationship with him, if he is in my house.

Interviewer: Yeh

M.L: Um because .. once you know, as we have done .. done away with .. um .. corporal punishment .. um .. in terms of sanctions you are left with what - detentions, which is left to speaking with kids. Um .. but the problem with that of course is that whereas with corporal punishment you had you have kids were walloped and it was done you know it takes .. the commodity we are short of now is time.

Interviewer: Yeh, do you think this reflects do the kids resent having to .. wait for the punishment .. for this .. um .. time lag between the event and any form of ... 

M.L: yeh, I suppose they do in a way but that's one of the problems when you organise the system in this way. I mean you know I think one of the beauties of this system is not in terms of discipline, a teacher can no longer think in terms of "Oh, what a trouble 3B is" um .. you know and come up to you and say you know, "Your class is a shocking class" and anything like that, because no-body as such is responsible for 3B. I mean there is somebody
M.L: who has got overall ... oversight over the 3rd year so I mean teachers are forced to look at individuals and when they teach a class and find things are going on they, of course, look at the individuals in it because they know that they all come from different tutor groups and there is no one person who is responsible for the whole class. Um .. but it is unwieldy in the sense you have got to then .. you know .. something happens that you know you need to refer to someone else and you have got to find out what tutor group they are in ..

Interv: Yeh, then you have got to ...

M.L: Then you have got to find out whether that person is in and where and then you have either to write them a note or go and see them and that takes time of course. The message has got to get to them and they have to do something about it. Um .. if it's something more serious that requires instant action then probably you would get in touch with the Head of House.

Interv: That's when they are going to send people here as opposed to writing a message?

M.L: Yeh, you see I mean there's all sorts of discipline problems in the classroom. There is the sort where maybe a kid isn't working but he's not particularly disrupting the lesson or he says something stupid and it's thought necessary to let his tutor know about it: or there is the situation where a child is completely disrupting what's going on and you know and the other kids are then suffering and so something needs to be done immediately. And it may be a situation where they have got to call on somebody to .. um .. to come and say remove the kid for that lesson. Um .. or
M.L: do something else to see if you know to allow the lesson to go on for the rest of the class.

Interv: Yeh, at that stage the particular house of the pupil doesn't matter?

M.L: It doesn't matter because inevitably what happens then is that you know like in this situation now you get called out .. you know .. the phone will ring and .. er .. you go.

Interv: Can you, without giving details of the actual pupil can you explain how you deal with the problem .. you know like .. to explain for me to deal with the problem .. from answering the phone going up and dealing with the type of problem .. you know without mentioning the names.

M.L: Well, this afternoon what happened in fact was that .. um .. I was .. there was a girl who should have been, it was a series of events really, there was a girl who had been for French. For a period in a medial class, you know, for some special coaching and she refused to go out because as well as having a problem she's also got a behaviour problem and nobody could get her out of the room. So I was asked if I .. and in the absence of John Harley because she happened to be a first-year, they said would I go and get her out which I did and then as I was coming away from having done that, you know, there were some boys leaping about upstairs outside R.E. and ..um .. the chap who was taking R.E. came out and said "I think that boy's taken my book" and I said to him "Have you got his book?" and he said "no" and he fairly obviously had it under his coat and .. um .. he had got this book under his coat and I said, Well, look you know you have been hiding it under your coat you know and with that he lost his temper and started to leap about and .. er ..
M.L: went fairly berserck – anyway he was finally persuaded to come down here with me because obviously in that state he couldn't be left up there because I thought you know he would have gone over the top. We came down here and saw the Deputy Head because I thought the best thing then would be for him to go home and in that state, and he lost his temper again and .. um he then went off out of the room and kicked at bins and doors as he went swearing and went out of school and then about 10 minutes later as we expected, he came back in again and, as we expected he was a bit calmer and I have just been speaking with him and .. um .. sort of talking him down a bit and I think now he was fairly clam. I left him with another person and .. er .. he will probably go home now for the rest of the afternoon not for putiny reasons but simply to sort of regain such equilibrium.
Interv: Is there any automatic follow-up from that or ....

M.L.: Well the follow-up from that would be that I'll see his Head of House and then depending on what she thinks .. um .. or in fact they think because there is two of them, think is appropriate they will do because they .. you know .. they are expected to know him and to know if this is a particular trait of his character or if it is a sort of one off thing but it will be left largely up to them what is done. I won't take any specific action.

Interv: So the longer term is transferred over then to the ...

M.L.: Yeh, it's a short-term sort of crisis where somebody is teaching out of school or something, then there's no choice who deals with it, somebody has got to deal with it.

Interv: Yeh, do you ever see your role as 'trouble-shooter': in this instance?

M.L.: It is a bit, yes .. um .. and .. er .. as long as one doesn't .. as long as one isn't expected to punish all these individuals because then you get yourself a bit of a reputation as being everybody's hatchet man which is not good for me and isn't good for the kids. But by and large, most kids .. um .. in that sort of situation are fairly reasonable - they'll come out of a room and you can do something with them to overcome a you know a sort of confrontation .. that's usually what happens a confrontation .. a confrontation between a kid and the teacher over a particular thing and somehow you have got to take the sting out of in the short-term.

Interv: ..... or without coming down on the kid and without embarassing the member of staff you know .. you have some-how to negotiate a sort of .....
M.L. : It is a bit but you know most people providing . . . um . . . providing you don't go into the movement of trying to take the kid on there in the classroom from the rest of the class, producing an embarrassing scene you know . . . um . . . allow you to get on with it. I mean I think you know most of our colleagues here are you know . . . will trust you to deal with and handle the situation as you see fit.

Interv: .. to a fair degree ..

M.L. : Yes, with a fair degree of tact you know . . . that you won't sort of embarrass them over it or anything like that. Um . . . one of the difficult things is the question of being in a . . . you know when you are in a counselling situation with a kid who . . . um . . . which is essentially going to be non-judgmental whereas in another sort of . . . if you put your hat on you get in other situations in a class where you have got to be .......

Interv: Yeh ..

M.L. : You know, and there's conflict in this sort of . . .

Interv: ah that's interesting yeh, sorry! .... Do you find out when you are actually teaching that sometimes when you have to teach a pupil that you might also have been in contact in a counselling role that they don't know which way to respond to . . .

M.L. : Well, I don't know that they don't know how to respond to you but I think what it does do is that it makes any relationship which you might have in a counselling more and more difficult because . . . um . . . you know there have been other situations where you have had to be sort of judgmental and you have had to take up a stance ....
Interv: Um, yes apart from the kids having difficulty or maybe perhaps ...

... what about the staff. Do you feel that other subject staff will want you to adopt more than a counselling role?

M.L.: With kids?

yes, .. um .. I think there is a split in the .. in the profession as a whole. There tends to be from what one reads in .. I mean I base this on what I read in the educational press and that sort of thing about ... I mean if you read that article there you know, that tends to outline it. There's a split between the pastoral and academic in as much as people feel that there are too many people - relatively highly paid people in pastoral jobs .. um .. who are the .. you know .. no experience teachers and instead of doing that they should be teaching in the classroom to a greater degree and I often feel that people in the academic side .. that people
they don't get enough results from pastoral care you know they... they think... harp back to what they refer to as "Good Old Days" when you know it was all different and in fact you know, I mean I have been here over a period of time - on and off and it wasn't substantially different, I mean the school was much more different because the atmosphere was totally different in terms of some "discipline", things were not that much more different. I mean there were teachers who were getting you know coming out and so-on-and-so-forth and... um.. you know, in many respects the school was a much more violent place 10 years ago than ever it was now. I mean, you know, you have an incident like the incident this morning, I'll recall it without mentioning any names, where a child was to take a message into a teacher and the teacher said to him "Thank-you lad" but called him by his surname so the boy replied to the teacher, "Thank-you" and referred to him by his surname. Now he's really sort of gone up in the air over this "What's the School coming to" you know... um "I want something done about this" and the reason he doesn't call the boy by his christian name is because he believes that you have to earn the privilege of being called by your christian name, you know, and really he's sort of - I mean you know 10 years ago then probably kids were called by their surname and the whole place operated on a completely different basis, you know, but now it doesn't; the kid resents being called by his surname...

Interv: But do they really resent it?

M.B.: Oh, they do resent it. I mean if you call a kid by his surname he will more often than not say, you know, "Tony's the name." but if
M.L. : I call the Register I very often use surnames only because this is quicker to read through a long list of names, just to read one name and sometimes there is confusion if there is more than one kid by that name and I say that "I'll use your surname because it's quicker"and they find that's acceptable. I mean it's just a means to an end but generally speaking, all kids will expect to be called by their christian name and resent being called by the surname.

Interv: I have another point - if .. um .. if a member of staff sends a pupil out for say a discipline reason, a child was messing around, not necessarily for very bad behaviour, to a Head of House and the Head of House then counsels ...

M.L. : that that isn't sufficient

Interv: is there a feeling at all that that .. er ..

M.L. : isn't enough?

Interv: Yeh, that your not being perhaps the might feel that they aren't being backed up.

M.L. : that there's not enough you know .. they .. um .. they demand some sort of sanction? There is a bit but I mean we use a number of ways we write to parents, we keep them fully informed which, in a sense, could be, certainly with some parents it's a sanction; we ask parents to come up to school alot and we have .. um .. pretty good contact with them in certain circumstances; we see Social Workers and all the other outside agencies. We refer .. you refer kids to .. um .. you know for help of one sort and another so-on-and-so-forth, so one of the dangers is that people say there nothing being done but in the old days if you had a kid and you gave him a walloping well it was, you know, the kid said "I had the stick"
or "I got walloped for it" and something seemed to be done and you know, that person's sense of guilt had been washed away as it were but now .. um .. it's not so obvious you know when you do anything to a kid and we had a situation not so long ago, when people got very up-tight about a Fifth Year boy in my House who had been doing a lot of leaping about in the building over there and generally being obnoxious and he's .. um .. he's a very big, hefty lad, taller than almost anybody in the school, staff included, I don't know why, and he's got a very loud mouth and he's very silly and although he's got a body of a man he's got a mind of you know a 12 year old, and he lumbers about and he bashes on doors and swears at people. He makes everybody's life a misery but you see what happens is that he does this and people see it and they store it up in the back of their minds, and suddenly they're all ... something will come up which will sort of polarize all these feelings you have and it will .. people will be in the Staff-room usually and then they will say, they will talk about it and say "Nothing's been done about him" and I will have about 4/5 people approach me and say that "There is all sorts of things going on and there's nothing being done about this kid, well why?" I won't have heard about most of these incidents because they will have been on their own, will have been fairly insignificant but they will pile up in people's minds so I have not been in a position to know, although I could have been expecting that they have been going on because I know the kid .. um .. and in fact things are going on and that this particular kid, I have been to see his parents, his father had been to see the Head and he
had been excluded from school for a couple of weeks but you know, it's not possible to inform every member of staff what's happening about every kid, unless, of course, somebody comes and says "Look, I'm a bit bothered about this kid, he's giving me hell" and I will say "Well, I'm doing this, that and the other with him and you know it would perhaps help if you could do this and let me know if he doesn't do any work and you know we will work closely together" and I think for the kid .. for his own sake more than anyone else, one doesn't publicize .. um .. things generally about him. One would only repeat to people who would need to know it, and in that situation you get people feeling that .. um .. you know things are being done where in fact they are being done behind the scenes, they are being done you know virtually all the time.

**Interv:** Yeh, so in a way that would build up .. um .. the very feeling of nothing being done ..

**M.L.** : Oh, yes it does build up.

**Interv:** and cause confliction between say your role as Counsellor or as Head of House you know in the counsel role and .. um .. subject teachers how they see the house system.

**M.L.** : Yeh, I think it does and because you see a system like this relies very much on communication and anyway this school is a bit of an administrative night-mare because of the three separate buildings you know and then three staff quarters so communications are difficult at best. And, you know, the telephone system is not that extensive so that communications are a bit difficult and .. um .. this adds to the frustrations because people don't you know .. they feel exhausted at the end of the day and .. um .. you know at times when
they ought to be communicating with people, they probably go home and one can't blame them in that certain way. I mean I think . . . I think this is the one thing that we have got to do, to really spend time, you know, spend time getting together as a staff, spend time talking about the kids and . . . um . . . you know that would be mainly by to timetable, and this is a question of you know, not something we could do in the school by timetables, time for people to communicate with each other try to take the pressure off a bit but you know this could be something one would have to rely fairly heavily on the Authority for because we would need more teachers and you know to improve the ratio so that so that the rate of recognition could be given to the job that people do as teachers or form teachers but give them more time you know, when they are not actually . . . um . . . with their tutor group, either to see individuals and to communicate you know amongst ourselves about the problems and ways we can solve them and on individual kids . . . um . . . but you know as I'm sure you realise that would be a fairly situation in London at the moment, where we are short of teachers anyway, apart from the place as a whole.

Interv: Do you think you are still fighting an image of the teacher or teachers purely in the classroom

M.L. : Oh, indeed yes.

Interv: in that 40/80 minutes and

M.L. : I mean there are alot of people still see it, they still see it very much like that . . . um . . . and they feel that you know their time's spent in pastoral roles are thoroughly wasted. You know it. Maybe its the minority now but at times, particularly when things get hardgoing one's made very conscious of it's well worth reading that though yes, I don't think you get them, do you?

Interv: um . . . when I'm here I usually look at them.
M.L. : but that by .. um .. of William Collins who was Head
of the House there and he talks about .. um .. you know, how
pastoral care has been given no real recognition you know, there
is no Inspector for pastoral care or anything like that. It is
a very interesting article to read actually.

Interv: Yeh, I'll take a look at that.
Could you tell me, to start with, how the House system is organized, formally at Haverstock. The actual

Yeh, well the first year are separated and treated as a horizontal year, although the pupils are already in Houses, they don't have very much to do with their House apart from going to a weekly assembly and playing games and forming some sort of allegiance to the House - but they're looked after directly by a Head of First Year. But once they go into the second year, they go into tutor groups: 4 Houses, each of them has 9 vertical tutor groups, pupils from second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth year in the tutor group. There are male and female Head of each House above the tutors, so there should be three people who know at least three people who know every kid well, and know their family. Families are kept together in the same House and usually in the same tutor group.

And how does the Head of House ..... what function has the Head of House?

A very wide question - everything. You can run messages, it's a clerical job; it's a social worker job; it's a police job; it's a parental job - in locum parentis - you name it, it all comes into the category.

Yes, it's the "locum parentis" idea do you see yourself as that, or is your relation with kids something else? Are you, then, setting yourself as a father figure or mother figure, or ?

Hardly, because I'm not that much older than them. But I'm an authority figure with a lot of them, whether I like it or not. I represent the school and the authority and all that goes with that.

Are you in fact, you know, is your brief as Head of a House to say, when kids are sent out of the classroom, sent here, are you put in a position of what ?

Yeh, they'll come into Teacher 'A' and Teacher 'B' (other Heads of House) very often with problems created by colleagues and not of our own making. But, hopefully, we have a good enough relationship with the kids anyway, not to take on the conflict which is the ordinary situation without making it a conflict between us and the kids. That's the idea, and usually that works.

So you've sort of separated them quite from the actual subject teacher. You stand outside the situation - there's you and then there's the subject teacher, and the pupil ....

In that instance that you're quoting, yeh. But not always, not for everything. And we did all teach, quite a lot. We only have 10
Interv: Do you ever find a conflict if you're teaching, er, yet also the House teacher of the person? What happens when you get some kid who's .... ?

Kate: All the time. You have to choose your priority at that moment. Very often the classroom teaching goes, because there's a crisis situation come up, or an irate parent, or a distressed child, or whatever, and you have to, at that time, make your priority. It's a choice the whole time. I'm lucky in that one of the subjects I teach is typing, which is very easy to leave for a little while, because when the kids are doing something they can get on with it. The other subject I teach, which is community service, I rarely leave unless it really is absolute crisis, because the class needs teaching the whole time and I'm actually involved every minute in the lesson with all of the kids in the class.

Interv: You're on call, though, you know even when you are teaching you're still on call. Do you think the kids are ever aware of the .... he think's that you're a House teacher at one point and teacher at the same time?

Kate: I think they take that all in what they consider your status. Or maybe they wouldn't cheek her or him because he's also Head of House. I think the older ones realise the conflict in the role - well, not conflict, but the choice that you have to make all the time. I don't think it matters to the younger ones, really. Some of them get very upset if you're not there immediately when they want you. If you say oh you're teaching and you can't see them now. . . .

Interv: So, if you get sent in, say, a kid from Camden and there isn't the Head of House from Camden, would they .... what happens to them then?

Kate: It depends. If it's er a crisis thing and the kid's having hysterics or the teacher's having hysterics, then anybody else will deal with it, anybody that's here. Or if .... or what happens quite often .... a message comes down and says could somebody come up and help me with so-and-so, whoever's in there, - regardless of who the kid is - will go up and deal with it temporarily, but won't make any long term arrangements. You .... you'll deal with it at that moment and then pass it on to the appropriate Head of House.

Interv: Is there always somebody down here?

Kate: No. There is virtually, always in practice but it hasn't been structured like that. And it works out that we're nearly always in.

Interv: This is just for this room, is it?

Kate: This is the one room for eight of us. But we had no-place until a year and a half ago. We used to see kids in various classrooms or corridors or whatever. So this is better. But it's very bad when you want to
interview kids confidentially. If they want to tell you something private. You can see what it's like - people walking in and out the whole time. If a kid wants to tell you something confidential - or a parent - it's very off-putting. So we all feel we really need an interview room.

Interv: What do you do, say, with a kid who's been sent out of a classroom, um, presuming that when they're sent out of a classroom they're not allowed to just stand around ...... so they're sent down here, yet um, from your point of view you're getting one side of the picture - you're getting the kid's side. How can you, you know, what can you do?

Kate: You know, that doesn't often happen. I mean unless a kid is ...... we don't encourage staff to send kids out of the classroom unless they really feel they can't cope. But it doesn't often happen - a kid will just arrive without anything at all. And usually, the staff will complain after the lesson. They'll see you and then you'll deal with it knowing what the staff's point of view is, or the ....

Interv: Yeh, I wondered if, once they'd sent the kid out, then you can't get their point of view because they're still involved with the teaching, if that limits what you can actually ...... how far you can take anything?

Kate: Yeh, you can't generalise. It depends who the kid is. Usually, you can say 'Look, you wouldn't have been sent out for nothing' and usually whatever it is will come out. But if it doesn't, then you hang on till you see the teacher, or you go up. You can't really generalise.

Interv: So, um ... but if they're your particular ...... in your particular House, I presume you can begin to operate it, .... operate on the job straight away, you have some record.

Kate: When you know whether they are likely to mess about in maths, say, you know if they've had particular problems with that teacher before or, whether they are likely to do whatever they are said to have done, you know.

Interv: Yeh, I suppose you get recurrent - I say recurrent, kids who keep coming back. Do you ever find there's a sort of problem of them cooling off? Say there's a kid in the classroom causing problems, um, or there is a problem arising, however, but once they're out of the classroom on their way down here they cool down?

Kate: Um, sometimes a kid comes in so het-up that you just tell the kid to sit down for 10 minutes, and leave it, or give them a cup of tea or something, and just calm them down before you even talk to them.

Interv: Do you find that when, ...... well, sort-of the .... this is asking for a generalisation but ...... when kids come down are they usually annoyed or, .... are they annoyed at being sent out or ....

Kate: Well, you keep saying "When kids are sent down" .... it very, very rarely happens that a kid is sent here. It's usually, .... the procedure is that you get a note saying "please, will you see so-and-so because they did this in my lesson", and you deal with it afterwards.
It so rarely happens that a child is just sent out of a lesson. Or the other way round - that you're asked to go up there and get somebody out of the lesson.

**Interv:** Teachers would prefer to do that than just send the kid out.

**Kate:** Yeh, because they're advised *not* to send kids out; unless they don't come here and they're wandering round the school disturbing other colleagues. Obviously, if the kid is just so impossible that they just can't cope, then they do. But that does happen rarely.

**Interv:** Yeh, they're supposed to have a note, aren't they, if they're going round?

**Kate:** Sure. It's usually that they deal with it after a lesson.

**Interv:** And how do the tutors fit into this, because it .... if a teacher refers them to a Head of House, how then does it feed back to the tutor?

**Kate:** Depending on the tutor. If it's a tutor that I know will deal with it, and in *my* opinion (this sounds very pompous - but you have to act in your own opinion a lot of the time) - adequately, I will probably pass the whole thing over to the tutor. If it's somebody who I think can't deal with it, or hasn't got the time, or some reason won't be able to at that time, I'll deal with it and tell them what I've done, in order to keep them informed.

**Interv:** I suppose the turnover of staff is giving a lot of problems?

**Kate:** Well sure, you know, there are a lot of kids that I just do know better than the tutors. And if you have tutors that .... we haven't this year .... but last year we had three tutors who were in their probationary year themselves, and so were having a hell of enough to do without doing that many extra things with tutor groups. So, very often, we took over and told them what we were doing. But I've got one, for example, very good tutor at the moment, but I know she's very overworked in her department, and, it's not because I don't think she could do it equally as well as me, but I know that she just hasn't got the time at the moment, so I do a lot of *little* things that I know she could do, and I just tell her I've done them, and she doesn't mind that. I think she's quite grateful. So ...... you laugh .... but some people mind very much, if you do anything with their tutor group. We also have tutors like that. So I mean it's as much knowing your tutors as it is knowing your kids.

**Interv:** There's a split, then, between the academic departmental functions and the sort of pastoral House functions. And the tutors themselves are subject to as well as yourself. At times, the two might conflict? Yeh. Do you find that .... that .... this conflict between the academic side and the House/pastoral side, gets over into discipline? Like your role as House Teacher, sometimes .... you want *not* to impose discipline but go onto a pastoral solution ....
Kate: I er don't find er a conflict in that .... at all. I mean, if some­body's messed about, then they've got to do something about it and you just know how to .... well, you should know ... how to deal with it, where a kid you will shout at, and that will just be enough and they will be so horrified and upset and ashamed that that will deal with it, or if its kids you send home or if its kids you send the parents .... send for their parents, or whatever. You just know the situation and know the kid what to do. I don't think there is a conflict. I mean, if somebody .... you see we don't have the cane now .... but I knew situations where we did where somebody would come in and say "Would you please can this child because they've done that" and that, I think, is ludicrous. If they're passing over the problem for you to deal with, then they've got to expect that you'll deal with it in your own way. As long as you deal with it, I mean, I always tell staff what I've done, but what I do is my decision. If they're asking me to do it, I'm not necessarily going to do the heavy handed bit - or maybe I am, because maybe that colleague thought it was a very light thing, but I know that that kid has been terrible all week and this is just the last straw as far as I'm concerned, and so, - you know, it can work both ways.

Interv: When there was corporal punishment, the Heads of Houses were the only and the Deputy Heads, were the people .... the only people .... allowed to give it?

Kate: No, they were people who had a book - people who had permission .... I don't know, I mean, it was .... I never did it, so I don't really know the ins and outs, but there were various members of staff who had permission to use it .... dotted around the place.

Interv: There wasn't any sort of institutional position, certain people who were ....

Kate: No, but they .... I think they were nearly all people like Heads of Departments, but not all Heads of Department used it. But I think it was virtually people who had been long-standing and wanted to. Really it's that type that used it.

Interv: Yeh, cos I find it .... what I'm finding difficult in my line is to work out where discipline fits in between the academic departments and subject teachers actually ..... when I say 'discipline' I mean just the general running of the class - keeping order, and the House system. - where it's located.

Kate: Well, there is procedure laid down, which doesn't necessarily happen in practice. In the procedure, if a member of staff has problems in the classroom, they're supposed to tell their Head of Department who is then either supposed to deal with it him or herself, or consult tutors or Heads of Houses. But very often a teacher will come straight to the Head of House, and you don't say "Oh, no, you've done it the wrong way; you've got to go to your Head of Department, whose got to go to the tutor, whose got to come to us. You know, but that is laid down if they want to follow it.
Interv: So they sort of short circuit because ..... for efficiency

Kate: Yeh, except that I think it'd be true to say that in a lot of the Heads of Houses, feel that we would like to see the Heads of Departments take a greater part in the running of the school in all ways.

Interv: Yeh, how do the Heads of Departments .... you know it's asking you to project into them ... how do they see their job?

Kate: Well, there seems to be a lot of resentment between the Heads of Departments and the Heads of House. Heads of Houses although they're not paid more than Heads of Department, they haven't got higher financial salaries or anything like that, they have higher status ... on the whole. For example, the Heads ... they have much more to do with policy making, I think. At the moment, the Head sees them once a week on a Friday morning, and then every month, for a meeting. And the Heads of Department are now seen every fortnight. It used to be, last term, every month. You see, the Heads of Houses are a smaller group - only eight of us. We meet in this room. We meet the Head together. We are, because of the fact of our appointment, more likely to have things in common and feel the same way about things in general than the Heads of Department who .... are all very different in personalities - a lot of them are traditional teachers, and some of them are very young teachers - you know, they don't sort of have a harmonious front. Not that we do, completely, but we're more likely to feel in common about things, and work as a unit, and help each other and work as a team. We work much better as a team. We work with each other. And, as you said, I'll see a kid in Kenwood, or Primrose or whatever if necessary.

Interv: Because you have some sort of common ..... common aim, really?

Kate: Exactly, because we our this sort of job is likely to attract people with that sort of aim, whereas a Head of Department's job isn't necessarily. Someone who's interested in commerce isn't necessarily going to be the same sort of person who's interested in maths, or even have anything in common. I mean, whereas two Heads of Houses, although the House is different, is very likely to have a lot in common. You see what I mean?

Interv: Do the Heads of Department ..... mightn't they be in competition, say for resources at a certain time?

Kate: I don't think they're for physical resources, if that's what you mean, because we don't have any money or ... anything like that allowed to the Houses. Nothing at all. All we've got is this room.

Interv: No, no. I meant the Heads of Departments might be in competition for resources.

Kate: Oh, to each other you mean, yeh, yeh, oh yeh. I don't think that's ever very serious. but yes ....

Interv: And they don't have a common room at all? No. You were saying that you wouldn't expect a traditional teacher to be appointed to a Head of House ....

Kate: No, I wouldn't in this school, because of the aims and the ideas of the Head. You ought to clarify what I mean by .... I mean, I don't mean a good traditional teacher anyway. I mean, I really mean a bad traditional teacher, who thinks that's just what's going on in his classroom is the important thing. And he could be very good in his own
classroom, but doesn't care at all what goes on outside school, or care about the kids at all. He only cares about his subject. That's a bad traditional teacher, but there are good traditional teachers. But I don't think that somebody who is a traditional teacher is probably going to be interested in the pastoral side, which is the main side of this job.

Inter: And this is more ... what, you consider the House job, to be concerned with outside school as much as inside.

Kate: Well, it's a link I suppose.

Inter: Um, what influence has Mr. George had, then, on the .... I mean, has he sort of been emphasising the House aspect?

Kate: Well, when he came here there were just four Houses - which is five and a bit years ago - some Houses; all they were used for really was Games. They used to have inter-House games. The school was streamed on ... in horizontal classes. There was no pastoral system as such. There was a Head of lower school and a Head of upper school.

Inter: So, what ... there was, say a fourth year, you have four streams/eight forms, yeh/ that would all be in academic.

Kate: down to 4.8, yeh.

Inter: judged on exams, after you've .... so that when you've ...

Kate: So the discipline was absolutely appalling. You can imagine, as I had to as a new teacher, go in and take 4.8's register.

Inter: You were here before Mr. George?

Kate: Well, I came with him and the first term it was the same.

Inter: That's interesting, because I haven't met anybody yet who's talked about or who's been around through the transfer.

Kate: Well, Dave was here. Dave was here the year before me. Martin was as well. Most of the House staff were actually.

Inter: Oh, I find this interesting about the transition.

Kate: Yeh, well, I mean ... it's a subjective picture, 'cos I was a probationary teacher myself then. But I was literally frightened to walk across the playground. It was that .... for me, a new teacher ... it was that bad. I hated it. Well, I didn't hate it 'cos I stayed. I found it absolute hell for the first term. And going to take the register of classes was just bad, particularly when they were streamed - or cover lessons with classes which were streamed. 'Cos, obviously, all the discipline problems were in the lower streams. It was the lower stream teachers who were away, 'cos they just couldn't take it all the time. So, whenever you got a cover you knew it would be a terrible class.
Interv: There wasn't, eh, a remedial group as such?

Kate: Yeh, but that was 4.8 or whatever it was, ..... 5.8 No, there wasn't a 5.8 because they all left.

Interv: And there was an upper school and a lower school, yeh? How was that operated?

Kate: Well, first three years were in the lower school - fourth, fifth and sixth in the upper school.

Interv: The new block wasn't built at that stage presumably?

Kate: Yes, I mean, in fact the names of these buildings go back even further than that. They weren't housed in just lower school and upper school, though I think their forms probably were. I think the first three years had their forms in this building, and the upper school had their forms in the other building. But the new building was built when I came. That's been built for 15 years odd.

Interv: But it was quite traditionally arranged with a "form" room. A form being a form with a form teacher for registration and things like that. And, well, I don't know if you remember, were there assemblies?

Kate: Eh, yeh, Upper school and lower school assemblies.

Interv: And, eh, have the subjects changed at all since Mr. George has come?

Kate: Yeh, quite a lot. Um, from my point of view - I teach community service now - which is a new subject that we've introduced in the last couple of years. But I think there are quite a lot of new subjects on the curriculum .... I don't think the curriculum has gone as fast as the pastoral system .... but I think it's started to move now and a lot of staff are looking at the curriculum and thinking about doing things like integrated studies - that sort of thing, which I think we've been quite slow on so far.

Interv: There isn't any integrated study is there, or team teaching?

Kate: Not at the moment. There is to a very small extent within departments. Like .... I can quote the community service, there are four of us, and we prepare for 2 years, and we prepare a topic each and share the topics, and so on. So, to some extent .... but that depends on the departments at the moment, although we've had various experiments. But I think we're definitely going to do it next year in the first year.

Interv: The first years are all on one floor, aren't they, so there's some opportunity?

Kate: Yes, they're treated quite separately from the rest of the school.

Interv: I suppose there would be big problems if you were having integrated studies, with people ... or .... moving between rooms - and small rooms?
Kate: Well, er I think the biggest problem is getting staff to co-operate and have a common curriculum. I think once you get over that block then you can get over all the difficult problems. It's having the willingness in the first place to do it. Which I think is now coming; there are a lot of the staff interested in doing it.

Interv: Would the exams pose a problem - CSE's and GCE's?

Kate: Well, we're not talking about doing it in the fifth year. We're talking about doing it in the first year. So there's a hell of a long way off.

Interv: Does exams sort of pose restrictions on what you can do?

Kate: Yeh, very much. You see, the options ... er ... are chosen by the fourth year, and very often they're stated ... the kids choose them, actually, when they're in the middle of the third year ... and it's stated whether they're going to be exam subjects or not. So kids will often choose because they want to do the exam. And then, if you're going to do an exam subject you must follow the curriculum for that two years.

Interv: So, there are certain courses set up which are exam-type courses, and, of course, they're not related because of the tutor groups so they can't be related to forms as such.

Kate: No, that's why all fourth and fifth years are virtually on individual time-tables.

Interv: They meet in one tutor group and then go off to their individual subjects. Well each tutor group will only have, what, four or five from these years. / Exactly / And then not, of course, streamed. You wouldn't have / no / four fourth years in one tutor group / no / in one ...

Kate: They're completely mixed.

Interv: Is there some idea, of an implicit streaming system being set up. That's a very touchy problem but ... er ... if you have exam courses and non-exam courses ...

Kate: Yes, you're ... er ... streaming. Without any doubt, once you do that that's why I'm against it ... to start with anyway. I mean I can see the problem ... I don't teach academic exam subjects, so, then, it's easy for me to say so ... but I don't like it because of that very reason. But what I would prefer to see say, they're going to be next year, I think, three history groups, and the idea is probably that there'll be one 'O' level, one C.S.E. and one non-exam. Well, I'd rather see those three mixed ability for the first year anyway, if possible, and then go on to the actual ... let the kids decide. The ones that know they can't take 'O' level are on the whole not going to opt to do an 'O' level. And let them decide what they want to do. Otherwise, you're creating problems within the subject.

Interv: When does it start then? When does the system ... after the first year?

Kate: No, some subjects will 'set 'Maths' sets' all the way through, which I think is absolutely appalling.
Interv: Even in the first year?
Kate: Yeh

Interv: How do they ... how are they sorted out?
Kate: Do it on their primary school record. And I think some of the greatest problems we have are in maths classes because they become streamed classes. And all the difficult problems are in the bottom group.

Interv: Does that work for French as well? Is French .... ?
Kate: Um, I think French are mixed ... I'm not sure ... but I think French are mixed ability in the first year, and sets in French after the second year and then kids can give it up anyhow after the third year. But maths goes all the way through.

Interv: And they start the courses, going into the actual courses, for exams ...
Kate: At the beginning of the fourth year.

Interv: So, they choose at the end of the third?
Kate: Well, they choose in the middle of the third. You see, we're already talking to the third years now about it. And next term they will actually choose, because the timetable's got to be set up ... fairly soon.

Interv: And... I'm trying to clarify this for myself ... once ... when they're choosing, they have to go into a certain course which will include a core of subjects that they have to do and ... er ... there is a distinction there between the GCE and the CSE.

Kate: In some subjects. Some won't say at that stage whether it's going to be a GCE subject but one or two will say "This is a GCE subject".

Interv: Will it, ... say, if you're onto an exam course ... would it be possible to be in one of the lower sets for maths yet still be in an '0' level subject?
Kate: Oh, yes. That is the one argument that we're not really streaming as such, we're setting. A kid that ... and it is possible that a kid could be very good at English and very bad at maths, and they could conceivably be ... the top stream set for maths and the bottom stream ... oh, the other way round ... for English. So, oh yes, I mean, each subject does it individually.

Interv: But, doing the course, he must be doing say English and Maths.
Kate: The whole year does English and maths and S.H.E. (Social Studies, Careers and Health) and P.E. and R.E. and then, up to now, they've chosen 5 options. Next year they'll probably just choose 6 options we're adding an extra option choice.
Interv: And the options aren't - they won't be streamed will they? Or will they?

Kate: Some of them will be. You see, if say for history - I can quote history - they get enough kids to form these groups, the department may well decide to stream, within its department. It really depends on how many kids opt for it, but usually you have a good idea. And the sciences definitely will stream their groups. They usually get a lot of kids, and they will say, "This is going to be an 'O' level group, this is going to be C.S.E. and this is going to be non-exam".

Interv: But, here I'm still confused. If ... if a kid is in say the 'O' level stream, hypothetically, for science, um ... yes... some of the other courses he's doing he's on an 'O' level course, say maths - which he has to do in any case- he's not so good - he doesn't have to be....

Kate: He could well be doing C.S.E. No, it's completely separate. The departments don't meet together on that at all. The kids are judged quite individually in that department.

Interv: So there is, well, the courses are unstreamed?

Kate: Yes, it is conceivable, as I say, that somebody's in the top stream for one thing and in the bottom stream for something else. But, unfortunately, it just happens - and you're found to have, if you're a comprehensive school - a core of very low ability kids and inevitably if you're going to find that, unfortunately, every subject does 'set'. - you're going to find they're going to be in the bottom set for every subject. I mean, fortunately, every subject doesn't so it doesn't happen, but the more that do the more of a problem those kids are going to be.

Interv: And, are there certain courses which are more prone, you know, to ..... for each subject. Because, I think David said this about French and Spanish earlier, that ... er ... there's a tendency - well he said this quite some time ago - that there's a tendency to have the pupils who were ... er ... more willing to sit down, participate in the lessons - by the very nature of the subject. Er, and therefore if you are taking French or Spanish, they are likely to be the type of pupil who will be doing well in the other subjects. And there's a self-selection amongst the courses. "Streamed" courses - implicitly.

In terms of these courses, again, is there - in any sense - that a pupil could be barred from doing a course on account of not being very good, for instance, at maths. Would that ....?

Kate: Well, maths is a good example because everybody does it. Um, I don't think it's (unintelligible) we've had that before. But the departments have been told that they must have work for all - they must be able to cater for the whole of the ability range. And I don't think now that there's any department who can because of ability say 'no'. So they just have to find out how to cope with it with it within their department. You see the commerce department is going to, next year,
have a "C.S.E. Typing Office, Practice and Commerce Course" and then a non-exam typing course. So, in effect, if and very low ability kids wouldn't be able to cope with the C.S.E. ... because their English would have to be fairly good to do that, but they would be able to cope with a non-exam which is an interest-type - improving their English with it. That's what they ... so within that department, there is something for the whole ability range and I think that that's what all the departments have been asked to do - make sure they do cater for the whole of the ability range. The problem comes up far more with ... um .. difficult kids - with disturbed kids, behaviourwise. Because the low ability kid - if he doesn't make a nuisance of himself - is quite easy to cater for. Most teachers don't mind putting themselves out for somebody who's willing and interested to learn, whatever their ability. It's the ones who create the disturbances in the classrooms that are far more of a problem to cope with in the subject.
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