PROBLEMS, CONFLICTS AND SCHOOL POLICY:

A CASE STUDY OF AN INNOVATIVE

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

ANDREW HANNAN

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF PH.D. 1978

UMI Number: U434890

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI U434890

Published by ProQuest LLC 2015. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

THE SIS

572 509

20 3 71

X753002255

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe thanks to students and staff of Redmond College, to Mrs. Gardner, my typist, to Tom Whiteside, Gerry Bernbaum, and Sara Delamont, my supervisors, to the S.S.R.C. and the City of Birmingham Polytechnic, my sponsors, and last, but by no means least, to Kate, my wife.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
CONTENTS	ii
INDEX TO TABLES AND DIAGRAMS	iii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO REVIEW	8
CHAPTER THREE METHOD	52
CHAPTER FOUR THE SCHOOL	76
CHAPTER FIVE PROBLEMS	92
CHAPTER SIX STUDENTS	100
CHAPTER SEVEN CONFLICTS	117
CHAPTER EIGHT CONCLUSION	156
APPENDICES	185
APPENDIX A THE BUILDINGS	185
APPENDIX B COLLEGE UNIFICATION	190
APPENDIX C THE QUESTIONNAIRE	199
APPENDIX D INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	207
APPENDIX E THE SCHOOL YEAR: A SUMMARY ACCOUNT	209
APPENDIX F THE STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE: ANALYSIS	223
APPENDIX G MEETING OF SENIOR STAFF	263
BIBLIOGRAPHY	269

INDEX TO TABLES AND DIAGRAMS

		<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1	Faculties	223
TABLE 2	Divisions	224
TABLE 3	Closed-ended Questions	226
TABLE 4	Question 18: Staff-Student Relationships	240
TABLE 5	Egalitarian-Hierarchical	244
TABLE 6	Unstructured-Structured	245
TABLE 7	Individualised-Standardised	246
TABLE 8	Question 24: Curriculum	249
TABLE 9	Curriculum Changes	249
TABLE 10	A Classification of Items	252
TABLE 11	Question 30: Decision-Making	254
TABLE 12	Decision-Making	255
TABLE 13	Staff Opinions	259
TABLE 14	Open and Closed Groups	260
TABLE 15	Division Membership	262
DIAGRAM 1	Baldrige: A simple Political Model	28
DIAGRAM 2	Bernstein's Open and Closed Types	38
DIAGRAM 3	Punishments and Standards: The Ideological Positions of Staff	147
DIAGRAM 4	A Model of Organizational Change	163
DIAGRAM 5	The Redmond College	188.

CHAPTER ONE.

INTRODUCTION.

The Redmond College is a case of particular interest to theorists of innovation. The school was originally a small country grammar with 400 pupils to which a new headmaster was appointed who was strongly committed to launching the staff and students on the path of comprehensivization. Within five years the school was established on a new site with a new intake of students who had chosen to go on from their high schools for at least a two year course at the upper school. The full age range of 11-18 was gradually transformed into a 14-18 comprehensive upper school with the passage through of the original Redmond Grammar School students. The shape of the building was a matter of some consultation between architect and staff and in its finished form reflected a commitment to some integration of subjects within Faculties, with Humanities, Science and Design blocks, although only the Humanities and Design blocks were on any sort of open plan.⁽¹⁾ The new school started in 1969 with ideals of staff participation in decision-making and with a particular emphasis on pastoral care for the individual student. The innovations in curriculum, apart from an individualized timetable introduced from the start, developed more slowly over the years with the phasing out of the old grammar school students and the phasing in of the non-selective intake. The driving force behind the transfer and transformation came from the Principal with considerable help from certain senior members

1. See Appendix A for fuller description and map.

of staff. He held the vision together and he initiated staff committees for planning. The staff were brought through a period of reorientation through reading, visits and discussions with a view to establishing a comprehensive school purpose built and purpose organized. This period of planning had as its monument the book School for the Community (1971). After the establishment of the new school the energies of the Principal underwent a shift with less emphasis on school (14-18) developments and more and more on the prospects for a properly integrated provision of school and community college. The 'one college' ideal of the head reached its climax in the year here studied in depth, 1973-74 with a series of general and sub-committee meetings.⁽¹⁾ The staff changed greatly in character from 1969-1974. By 1974-5 only 14 of the original 24 Redmond Grammar School staff who had transferred to the new site remained. The newcomers had on the whole been younger or had more experience of comprehensive schooling. They introduced new subjects for the less able and integrated subjects for mixed ability.

The conflicts among staff in 1973-4 reflected these historical events as well as being influenced by the career positions and subject loyalties of the staff at that time. 1973-4 was the year when the carefully erected structures outlined in School for the Community received their strongest challenge to date. The school had gone through a stage of innovation with the setting up of a fairly liberal and progressive organization which was designed to secure most of the traditional aims of education in terms of qualifications and socialization into acceptable

1. See Appendix B for a full account of 'college unification'.

norms of behaviour, but sought to achieve them by liberal and humanitarian means. The 1972-3 and 1973-4 intakes were the first to be affected by ROSLA (the raising of the school leaving age from 15 to 16) and the students were thus compulsorily transferred from their high schools in contrast to previous years when students could either remain at their high schools for a further year or undertake to complete at least two further years at the upper school. 1973-4 was thus the first year when the school had a full compulsory intake. The presence of some 10% of students who would otherwise have chosen to remain at their high schools and leave after only one year and the change of recruitment from a pseudo-voluntary to a fully compulsory basis were associated with a series of problems which struck at the very heart of the liberal-progressive philosophy outlined in the official description.

The staff responded in a variety of ways to the challenge posed by students whom the school could not involve or control. The attempts made to change school policy can be characterised as advocating moves towards a more open school model or towards a more closed school model (see 'Open schools, open society?' in Bernstein 1977 and discussion to follow.) One way of representing the allegiance of staff in these conflicts is to construct a continuum with staff located according to their advocacy of more open or more closed school policy. Those who consistently championed the open ideology may then be designated 'open ideologists' and similarly their opponents may be described as 'closed ideologists'. In general, open ideologists wanted the school

to move towards a more radical type of organization on Countesthorpe⁽¹⁾ lines with more student autonomy and less boundaries between staff and students. Closed ideologists were those who sought a reversion to more traditional means of regulation and attachment and who championed traditional academic virtues. They were alarmed by problems posed by students who seemed to reject the involvement on which the whole liberal philosophy of the school was based. They were generally more experienced and more committed to a specialist discipline than their opponents. The open ideologists were mostly from the integrated subjects teaching to mixed ability or less able groups (e.g., Environmental Science, General Science, Humanities, Drama) and were committed to these sorts of teaching in career choice. The closed ideologists were predominantly teachers who were most committed to the teaching of their own specialist subjects or groupings, (e.g., Chemistry, Geography, certain Design specialists and Supplementary Education teachers.) They had established career patterns in these fields and had already invested several years of work on those lines. These groups were not fully consistent in their membership. Each issue brought together different people committed to one or other of these viewpoints, but those who consistently supported one or other ideology tended to share other characteristics as indicated above. Some staff resisted involvement in the process of discussion and negotiation, but this possibility was limited in that all were 'expected' to attend at least one decision-making

1. See Bernbaum (1973) and Minchin (1975). These papers are referred to in the 'Review' Chapter to follow.

meeting a week after school. Senior staff who occupied posts such as Principal, Vice Principal, Lady Vice Principal, Senior Master, Senior Academic Tutor, Director of Studies, etc., were known to the other staff as 'the hierarchy' and they tended to adopt positions which can be typified as 'conservative', i.e., they resisted change towards either a more closed or a more open school. These staff had relatively small teaching loads and took major administrative responsibilities. Their conservative stance can be attributed in part to their common interest in stability for administrative purposes and for clarity of presentation of the school's policies to outside groups such as parents.⁽¹⁾

It is argued here that conflicts amongst staff in the discussion of school problems were the product of oppositions between open and closed ideologies in a school combining open and closed elements in its organization, faced by a challenge from students who rejected the values on which the school was based. The study proceeded by way of a dual focus on staff and students, with the emphasis on the former as a source of information on the school as a whole. The decision-making process was fairly open and democratic and provided the means for observing the negotiation on issues and the construction of school policy. The term 'negotiation' is not used here to imply equality in terms of power between opposing forces. The criticism made by Sharp et al (1975) of action approaches on the grounds of their ignorance of power differentials is misplaced, as any reading of Goffman (1961) would witness. The outcome of

1. A full discussion of the definition and use of the terms 'ideology' and 'interest' is given at the beginning of Chapter Seven, 'Conflicts'.

negotiation is the product of staff conflict mediated through the power of differentials located in the structure of the organization. Thus the students were also involved in the decision-making process, but in a relatively minor way, through the School Council. The School Council had 22 student members, 3 staff and the Principal or the Principal's representatives and was entrusted with making decisions on matters of school policy, but it was effectively powerless to act in a way contrary to the Principal's wishes. This subservience was emphasised by the Principal's veto of a proposal passed by the Council for excluding him from alternate meetings. No veto was ever exercised on staff decisions at Pastoral or Curricular or Joint Pastoral/Curricular committee meetings, the major committees of the staff decision-making process. It is argued that the process of formulation of school policy is best understood in terms of the conflict of ideologies and interests located in the social structure of the school. These ideologies and conflicts are in turn related to political issues in the wider society. The process of formulation of school policy is inherently political and the outcome expresses the prevailing balance of power and influence.

The thesis is presented in the following manner. A review of some relevant literature is used to describe the origins of the study and to provide the basis for a preliminary theoretical model. A 'Methods' chapter describes the researcher's stance as 'participant observer' and sets out the developments of the study. The chapter on 'The School' outlines some of the history of Redmond College and examines several features of its organiz-

ation in 1973-4, including the assumptions underlying its official policies. Chapter Five is an attempt to provide an account of the staff's definition of the major problems facing Redmond in 1973-4, i.e., the involvement and control of 'the unmotivated'. There follows a chapter which offers some information on 'the unmotivated' and discusses their reaction to the school's policies and organization. Chapter Seven presents a detailed analysis of the staff's response to such problems in terms of the opposition of ideologies and of interests in the negotiation on issues and the formulation of school policy. The concluding chapter reflects on the contributions of the study to the sociology of the school, the study of the school as an organization and the sociology of innovation.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW

Studies of schools are not uncommon, perhaps because teachers and pupils are so accessible to others just further up the academic ladder who want to look back at their origins. Despite the abundance of such studies, many problems remain unanswered. One of the early stages of any science is observational, a stage where the collection of data is a necessary preliminary to the construction of theory. Most natural sciences too start with in-depth analyses of individual specimens before going on to generalise and to test such generalisations with larger populations. The sociology of the school is likewise engaged in a piecemeal strategy of observation and case study. Another strand of development, however, is that of grand theory where trail blazers such as Young (1971) or Bernstein (1977) soar off into the realms of model building in the search for theories of the stratification of knowledge or the reproduction of social class. Here the development of a theoretical insight is considered a necessary preliminary to the pursuit of observation so that one may look in the right direction at the important relationships. What we lack in the sociology of the school are studies which satisfactorily link the two levels of inquiry, gathering data which may generate new theoretical insights and testing out the models of grand theorists. This thesis attempts to do this by examining the applicability of ideas derived from other work and by generating insights of its own. The review will gather together ideas

from previous work to form the basis for the account of the research findings to follow.

This study seeks to understand some of the conflicts between staff in an innovative comprehensive school at a certain stage in its development and to explain the process of formulation of school policy. There are a number of other studies which have approached aspects of these topics. This review will look first at empirically based works and then go on to evaluate the contributions of 'grand theory'.

1) Pupil sub-cultures.

In the United Kingdom the prime concern of the sociology of education has always been to explain the relative failure of the working class child. The work of Floud, Halsey and Anderson (1961) in documenting the extent of unequal achievement was followed by many studies focusing on the home as the ultimate source of inequality. The consensus arrived at in such research tended to confirm that what was wrong was a prevalent 'cultural deprivation' in the working classes - something was 'lacking'. One of the greatest contributions of the pioneer work of Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970) was to show how the school itself had to be seen as part of the process of selection and that its internal arrangements, in particular its streaming of pupils by ability, could be seen to contribute to the process whereby working class pupils were alienated from the school and labelled as failures. These studies accompanied a shift in explanation of unequal social class educational achievement from 'blame the home' to 'blame the school' and hence the crusading

zeal behind comprehensivization and the move towards mixed ability grouping. The 'new' sociology of education championed by Young (1971) and the School and Society course of the Open University (1972) took further this focus on the content and form of schooling and produced a 'sociology of the curriculum' with some emphasis on the school as an arena for negotiation between pupil and teacher perspectives. The recent resurgence of a Marxist perspective (Open University 1976) has re-directed the focus to the more macro aspects of stratification and schooling, with Sharp et al (1975) and Willis (1977) attempting to show empirically how external constraints and influences determine the nature of organizational outcomes.

The works of Hargreaves (1967), Lacey (1970) and Willis (1976, 1977) have made the biggest impact in this country on the sociology of the school and they all take as their prime focus the development of pupil sub-cultures. Although both Hargreaves and Lacey note the importance of home backgrounds in influencing the pupils' reactions to school their work has been utilised mainly as a critique on streaming and has been interpreted as the source of the argument that pupil sub-cultures are formed as a response to the formal organization of the school, i.e., polarisation of pupil sub-cultures is produced by the differentiation of pupils in the formal organization of the school. Hargreaves has to some extent pursued such an argument in his latest book (Hargreaves et al 1976) where the focus is on how teachers come to label pupils as deviant and how pupils respond to such labels. King (1973) notes how variations in organizational features correlate with the involvement of pupils of different categories (defined with reference to age, sex and social class). Of the range of variables

investigated streaming is seen as the most uniform and far reaching in its effects. The work of Willis, on the other hand, takes a very different stance. In Learning to Labour, (Willis 1977) he argues that the most important source of the development of counter school pupil sub-cultures is the world of work and that the behaviour of deviants in school is less due to the rejection of a system that has labelled them as failures than to the acceptance of a way of life that corresponds to that required of them in the culture of the work place. According to Willis the internal arrangements of the school make very little difference to the nature of the working class 'lads' rejection of conformity and affirmation of an alternative life-style⁽¹⁾, although they may affect the form taken by the counter culture. Indeed, Willis argues that a 'progressive' type of school may serve to accentuate the development of the counter culture:

One of the main consequences of the 'new' methods has been to partially legitimise and routinise the counter-school culture and therefore also the processes which it sponsors. Though an outright confrontation and explosion of the culture is prevented by these techniques, the clogging of its processes with concessions and tactical withdrawals actually gives it a much more massive and less illicit presence in the long run. Not only this, but prolonged skirmishes of classroom interaction give it masses of continuous material with which to work up its forms in a way which would be curtailed in a swifter resolution of conflict. (p.84)

Following Willis' line of reasoning it could be argued that an unstreamed school might nevertheless provide the conditions for the development of the counter-school culture by giving more scope for the informal friendship groupings to become part of the formal organization of the school, e.g., by allowing

1. He is, though, fairly optimistic about his own proposals for change.

pupils to choose to work with their friends on individual or group projects and in general by giving them more autonomy. This point is also made by Bernstein in the 'Open schools, open society?' article (Bernstein 1977) where he argues that

as the open school moves further towards organic solidarity so the pupils may move towards the 'closed' society of the age group.
(p. 74-75)

Presumably a curriculum which really allowed pupils to develop their interests would allow pupils to do projects on aspects of their own culture, e.g., pop music, motor-bike gangs, etc... It is in this manner that the counter-school culture may be legitimised and reinforced. The study reported here kept sufficient contact with pupil sub-cultures to examine some of these questions.

Willis devotes very little of his work to differences among teachers, or to the conflicts within the school about ROSLA, or the impending comprehensivization, or the school's policies on the handling of the 'lads'. It is argued in this thesis that it is important to understand the definition of problems by teachers, the process of conflict over school policies and the location of teacher ideologies if we are to explain how schools operate and how they change. Explanations of this kind would provide a firmer basis of understanding about the nature of the school as an organization and the process of educational innovation for the sort of speculations about 'Monday morning and the millenium' that Willis makes in his final chapter. To change how teachers run schools we must better understand how schools work and how they change, we must under-

stand how external constraints operate and the limits to their influence.

The study which has gone furthest in combining a study of the school as an organization in terms of staff ideologies and institutional policies with a study of pupil life styles has been that by the Center for New Schools (1972). This American study shows how pupils took or failed to take part in the innovatory programmes of the school and analyses their responses and the eventual failure of the innovations in terms of the external constraints and influences experienced by the school, (see discussion to follow on 'Innovation'). Lacey's (1970) study also goes some way to examining the world of staff as well as that of students and his work includes some very revealing information and discussion on the nature and basis of staff-staff relations, such as data on staff qualifications, salaries and other career indicators such as positions of responsibility and seniority, and speculations about friendship groups, career strategies and political realities. Lacey's work is remarkable in its clarity and range of perception, but it is inevitably restricted to musings about informal practices and alliances in discussing inter-staff relationships since the school was such that no public setting existed for discussion of school problems and decision-making power on school policy was kept tightly in the hands of the headmaster. The school studied in this thesis provided an opportunity to observe staff discussion and decision making in a way unavailable to Lacey.

2. Innovation.

Despite the United Kingdom's lead in progressive primary education and the world-wide fame of some of its progressive public schools (especially Summerhill) studies of educational innovation at the school level in this country have been rare until recently. In contrast the United States of America has produced many studies of schools attempting to introduce Leicestershire methods of child-centred learning. The most influential of these have been Smith and Keith (1971) and Gross et al (1971), both studies of elementary schools. Smith and Keith's study employed a systems approach to understanding the school as an organization demonstrating that unintended consequences were the prime source of organizational change. The staff of the school were seen to have a variety of interpretations of the formal doctrine of the school's aims. What came over strongest was the crusading spirit of the innovators, a 'true belief' which sustained them through initial problems. However, contradictions inherent in the setting of the school in a conservative local area, in the existence of a leader's plan as well as the instructions to staff to 'go build a school', and inherent weaknesses in a team teaching approach brought the eventual collapse of the crusade, general disillusionment and the loss of key personnel. Gross et al found a similar process of crusading zeal followed by problems, crises and then disillusionment. Their original contribution to the 'sociology of innovation' was to separate 'formulation' and 'implementation' stages of any innovation. They questioned how far the innovation was actually implemented in the case they studied and

found that the relative failure of the school's programme was not a true test of the innovation since much of the substance of the formulation was lost in the implementation. This finding directs attention to the rhetorical nature of formal doctrine which may be intended for outside audiences such as parents, governors or researchers. The gap between theory and practice may be partly due to the different functions served by theories directed to outside audiences or designed to focus true belief and the ideas guiding action. A similar dichotomy is postulated by Keddie (1971) who talks about the aims of teachers as expressed in 'educationist' and 'teacher' contexts. Gross et al do not give a sufficient explanation of why such a gap exists whilst Keddie explains it in terms of the under-developed consciousness of teachers. A recent study by Sharp et al (1975) goes beyond both of these by explaining the constraints which impose themselves on the teacher who tries to implement child-centred pedagogy, the inadequacies of the philosophy itself and the political factors which constrain teachers to advance the formal doctrine in public arenas. Sharp et al improve on the earlier American work of Smith and Keith and Gross et al in seeking to relate innovation in schools to wider considerations about social class and occupational selection. However, in doing so they tend to adopt an exaggerated ideal typical approach where the study itself is used mainly as an illustration and where the insights of Marxist macro-theories are taken for granted. Similar criticisms may be made of the recent work of another American, House (1976) who incorporates uncritically much of the stance of Bowles and

Gintis (1976) into his concluding sections with little relationship to his earlier discussion of the specifics of innovation. Nevertheless House does go beyond other studies in analyzing the source of educational innovation and its process of transmission. He finds in particular that personal contact is of great importance as are local conditions and the prospect of benefits to the teacher who actually implements the innovation. The school itself is analysed in terms of how staff become committed to innovation, the consequences of advocacy and the growth of sagas and political ideologies in conflicts between those who have career interests in innovation and those whose careers are built on the maintenance of the status quo. Above all the process of innovation is shown to be an act of faith since

Faith in the future of the innovation is required as in any religion, because the innovation can never, in the present, live up to its future promises. (p.186)

The process whereby such faith is undermined is well documented by the Center for New Schools (1972). The staff at the high school studied here had a naive notion of 'organic growth' in an early honeymoon period when they believed they could make the school respond to their ideals alone so that all the inequalities inherent in the wider society could be overcome by a group of committed teachers acting with good faith. Such a honeymoon period was ended by a series of crises which challenged the liberal ethos of the school (e.g., race fights, vandalism) and to which the staff responded by making collective decisions on rules of behaviour which no one teacher was willing to apply.

The inherent contradictions and conflicts then resulted in a widespread feeling of exhaustion or 'burn out' and the collapse of the crusade. This study went beyond others in showing how different groups of students responded to the problems of the school and attempted a link between studies of innovation and studies of pupil sub-culture. There are some noteworthy similarities between the Center for New Schools study and that reported in this thesis, particularly the attention given to conflicts over policy in staff and student worlds. These will be outlined later. However, examples at least geographically closer are also available for comparison.

Two schools have attracted more attention than any other state schools in the country from press, politicians and educationists; William Tyndale junior school in London and the Countesthorpe College in Leicestershire. The William Tyndale school became famous because of the teacher strike and subsequent legal inquiry. It was not well known previously for its attempts at open child-centred education, attempts which later became the subject of so much controversy. Countesthorpe College, on the other hand, although often accompanied by political campaigns and public controversy, has long been world famous as a state secondary school trying to apply the same sort of progressive ideas as the more privileged Summerhill and the more protected primary schools in Leicestershire. One of the earliest studies of Countesthorpe was carried out for the O.E.C.D. ⁽¹⁾ by Bernbaum (1973). Here Bernbaum argues that the emphasis on student autonomy in learning was likely to

(1) Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

disadvantage working class children, that the emphasis on the expressive and personal side of teaching was counterproductive since pupils expected teachers to be instructors, and that conflict was likely to develop between staff stressing the academic side (male graduates) and those stressing the pastoral and personal development side (female non-graduates). Bernbaum's study was carried out in an observational period of six weeks in a school which was only six months old. The main sources of information were informal conversations, official documents and a questionnaire. The main arguments were derived from Bernstein, but little direct evidence was given from the study of working class disadvantage, pupils' perceptions of teachers or actual staff conflict. This thesis tries to rectify this in at least one respect with the observation and analysis of staff meetings discussing problems, deciding school policy and providing the arena for staff conflict over aims and practices.

Bernbaum's study was part of a project launched by the O.E.C.D.'s Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (1973). The project covers central, regional and school based cases of educational innovation. The concluding volume, edited by Dalin, outlines some of the guiding ideas and concepts behind the scheme. Thus,

The term 'innovation' in this study means 'a deliberate attempt to improve practice in relation to certain desired objectives. The definition implies that something better is replacing old practices..... As a model for analysis a process-oriented model of innovation was chosen, referred to in the study as the planning-research-development- and diffusion model. (Vol. IV, p. 11-12.)

The desirability of innovation is taken for granted without its content being specified. In summarizing the conclusions on the case studies of innovative schools, Dalin states:

Only in a few cases did we find that the process (innovation) is mainly a rational and carefully planned one. Although all the phases in the process are important factors in any innovation studied (although severely 'underdeveloped' in some cases) they are seldom sequential. The model also builds on consensus as a basis for action. One of the striking findings is that this basic agreement is seldom achieved, and therefore strategies other than empirical-rational ones are used. (Vol. IV, p. 211)

The original desire to construct a managerial model of educational innovation was thus frustrated by the complexity of the factors determining organizational reality. The wealth of diversity in styles of innovation in schools is well illustrated by the selection of case studies gathered from various parts of the world; schools with a largely traditional curriculum like Oslo have 'very progressive' and egalitarian pedagogical practices, the Finnish school however, maintains traditional pupil-teacher relationships whilst engaging in extensive curricular innovation. It was thus difficult to generalise about the process of change when innovations were often in different directions. The 'real world' of conflicting definitions of what education should be and what sort of world it ought to be helping to shape, keeps disturbing the artificial calm of the mechanistic, consensus based planning-research-development- and diffusion model. Dalin, in the conclusion to the O.E.C.D. studies, reflects a retreat from a managerialist to a more sociological position:

Schools have never been 'free' in the sense of having freedom to determine their own function. Most schools have some freedom to determine their practices as long as these are not inconsistent with the function of the school. (Vol. IV, p. 16)

To challenge this functional limit is to court disaster; a restatement of the traditional Durkheimian argument that education reflects society rather than vice versa. The important factor of ideological conflict hinted at by Dalin is taken up in greater detail in the section to follow.

The case study reported in this thesis makes use of many of the insights given by the studies reviewed above but seeks to go more deeply into aspects of an innovatory school, the conflicts among staff and the formulation of staff policy. The whole business of innovation is fundamentally ideological with elements of crusade, true belief, advocacy, doctrine and saga. What is lacking in most studies is a proper consideration of the ideological bases of opposition as well as advocacy, and an account of how staff respond to problems in terms of their negotiation of new procedures. The American studies tend to take the worthwhileness of innovation⁽¹⁾ for granted and ignore the content of the innovation in an analysis of its success or failure. The commitment to innovation shown by these theorists and researchers is itself ideological - it is too often assumed that innovation is equivalent to progress. It is necessary to appreciate the ideological nature of innovation before any attempt is made to analyse subsequent conflicts or else opposition is interpreted merely as 'resistance' or a 'barrier' to progress.

1. The study by House (1976) is something of an exception.

3. Conflict

The paper by Esland in Young's reader Knowledge and Control (1971) outlined a research strategy for observing and explaining the sources and the processes of change and the cultural restructuring of consciousness and ideation as it occurs in the pupil and teacher career. (p.111)

Specifically he argued that the approaches of teachers to teaching could be classified in terms of a psychometric-epistemological dichotomy. The strategy was to be based on participant observation, interviews and questionnaires whereby Esland hoped to be able to identify how each teacher organized his approach in terms of pedagogical, subject and career perspectives. Esland's outline of a research project directs attention to the importance of the ideological and interest positions of teachers in understanding their behaviour but it fails to direct attention to the actual conflicts between staff in the negotiation of school policy. This thesis focuses in particular on the aspects that Esland neglects and thus produces a more diachronic account.

Eggleston (1973) argued that conflict over curriculum decisions can be understood in terms of four sets of 'pattern variables': traditional/futuristic orientations, determined/innovatory orientations, commitment based/contract based orientations, consequential/causal orientations. He maintained that the left-side categories formed an ideological group in opposition to the right side categories and that the change in our educational system seems to be in a left to right direction. What is lacking in Eggleston's theory is an explanation of the

basis of the identity of left side or right side categories and the nature of their opposition. Why should 'commitment based orientations' be in opposition to 'innovatory orientations'? Most of the literature already reviewed would seem to refute such an argument.

Two studies of inter-staff conflict in schools in this country go beyond theoretical argument and the construction of ideal type oppositions. The first of these, by Richardson (1973) adopted a Tavistock type systems- task approach in an attempt to explain and influence the way in which a state comprehensive school was administered.

Richardson's book is a remarkable document, an account of some one-woman action research carried out in a Bristol comprehensive school. The prologue to the book outlines its contents and methods in the following manner:

We are concerned with a school seen through the eyes of someone who worked with its staff for three years yet remained technically a visitor throughout the period, a visitor who never observed a lesson, scarcely ever spoke with any of the pupils and never directly encountered any of the parents as parents.

The question the book is trying to answer is:

How can teachers - whether young or old, whether new to the job or experienced in it - be helped towards a deeper understanding of the relationship between leadership and consultation so that the feelings arising both from sympathetic partnership and from sharp opposition can be used responsibly in relation to the task upon which all are engaged? (p.xiv-xv)

Richardson saw herself as the school's consultant, attending various staff meetings, when invited, and talking through problems with the major participants. She was the embodiment of the

solution, the living answer to every problem. Her work is based on that of Rice (1963). She is concerned with identifying the 'unconscious' elements in interaction, which to her mostly means emotional reactions which very often subvert the most efficient execution of the task which is to hand. Her theory is concerned mostly with groups and the roles of individuals within those groups and she tries to gauge how each group within the managerial system of the school executes its task. She relates each group to the structure as a whole and the structure as a whole to the overall task. In doing this she inevitably involves herself in defining the task of management and ultimately of the school itself. She does this without referring to the stated ideology of the school or of its participants, relying almost entirely on her own judgement of true purpose. By virtue of her 'scientific knowledge' she is able to uncover underlying currents in the group process and points these out to those she works with. Conflict or disagreement is interpreted as deviation from the task prompted by emotional reaction rather than the opposition of those who define the task of the school differently. Her model of the school is an input-output system based on an industrial analogy. The system 'intakes' children and adolescents, 'converts' them with growth and learning, with the acquisition of knowledge and skills, attitudes and experience of relationships, 'outputting' young adults and what she calls, rather self-consciously, 'waste', though she is reluctant to push the analogy that far. Richardson follows Rice (1963) by using a model of management in which various groups and tasks, or roles and persons, are seen as bounded systems with more or less clearly defined

boundaries through which systems relate with and separate themselves from other systems. The managerial roles are thus analysed in the same way as the contents of curricula in Bernstein's theoretical model.⁽¹⁾

Richardson devotes sections to examining the results in organizational terms in the staff of the blurring of boundaries between pastoral and curricular and between various subjects. She gives an account of the difficulties of redefinition of task, the fitting of persons to roles, that occurs with a series of innovations. All this serves as an original contribution to the study of the school. Certain aspects of Richardson's methodology though are open to criticism. She attended meetings of staff and held consultations with groups and individuals, yet she never used a tape recorder and she never took notes of what was happening whilst it was happening. The data that she accumulated for the study are largely reflective and mostly invisible. In the book we get only one quotation from these reflections or field-notes. We have no way of judging the evidence for ourselves or of examining her changing perspectives and strategies. In resolving never to enter the world of the students she loses an important element in the alternative definition of events and tasks. If nothing else she might better have understood the 'task' if she had attempted to see the 'conversion' of input to output in process. The whole 'task' based approach is inevitably wedded to a managerialist perspective, where a single overriding task is defined. As a systems theory it is subject to familiar criticisms about the use of organic

1. See 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' in Bernstein (1977) and discussion to follow.

analogies.⁽¹⁾

The paper by Minchin (1975) about his own school, the ubiquitous Countesthorpe College, takes a very different stance to the business of education. Minchin defines the task of schooling as 'liberation' on lines set out by Freire (1972). He advocates the active dismantling of the structures of society which are based on hierarchical authority and the denial of man's true nature as creator of himself and his environment. Rather than interpreting conflict amongst staff as the product of emotional reaction he sees it in terms of an opposition between political radicalism and child-centred progressivism. The opposed parties disagree over the nature of the school's task and the appropriate means to be used. The political radicals adopt a Marxist stance whilst the child-centred progressives follow the ideals of liberal education. The former are young and relatively new to the school, the latter are older and part of a friendship group based around staff who were founding members of the school. The inter staff conflicts in the early years of the school were not made public and were confined to a progressive versus a reactionary split. Most of the 'reactionaries' left the school although staff unwilling to fully endorse further innovations remained in relatively insulated specialist departments. The split between political radicals and progressives came over the Houghton proposals for salary scales - the political radicals organizing and supporting a strike in protest against the increased emphasis on a hierarchical scale of salaries and the progressives resisting such action on

1. See later on Etzioni and a 'systems' approach.

the grounds that striking would endanger their position with the local authority. Minchin sees the conflict as an expression of a crisis in the development of the school. The older members of staff who were at the school when it started and who now occupied positions of power in the school's administration had developed a feeling of 'owning' the school and were satisfied with the innovations already institutionalised. The new staff were dissatisfied with such complacency and sought opportunities to move forward at the necessary risk of confronting outside critics. Minchin's study is full of fascinating references to the ideological oppositions amongst staff and offers some convincing explanations, but there is no attempt to offer any kind of systematic evidence. Minchin seems to take too uncritically Freire's ideas and applies them with naive conviction to Countesthorpe without giving proper support to his arguments. As a committed observer Minchin's dismissal of alternative conceptions of the school's task (e.g., the academic aims of the subject specialists), is very apparent. Minchin's work is a significant contribution to the study of inter-staff relationships in an innovatory school, but we need to go beyond this sort of account which uncritically adopts its own value position and makes statements with little support from systematic evidence.

Baldrige's study of an American university, Power and Conflict in the University (1971), is an example of an organizational study which attempts a 'systematic' and 'objective' analysis of the workings of an educational institution. As such it focuses on how the official policy of the university is the product of negotiation in the sense of conflict between those

occupying positions of power and influence. Baldrige argues that the bureaucratic model is an inadequate description of the reality of university life since it emphasises formal structure and processes of implementation (management) rather than processes of policy formation, organizational change and conflicts of interest (politics of governance). He constructs the following basic model to guide his analysis:-

(See page 28).

Thus,

the model suggests that the organizational analyst should focus on the nature of the organisation's social structure, on interest articulation dynamics, on the legislative process, and on the execution of policy. (p.26)

Baldrige's study provides a change in emphasis in organizational analysis. Instead of taking the official aims of an institution for granted and examining the relative efficiency of various sorts of organizational arrangements, he prefers to focus on how those official policies are formulated. It is argued in this thesis that a similar model is applicable to the analysis of the school as an organization. Baldrige's political theory of the institution is of particular applicability at a time when schools are riven by ideological conflicts over the nature of official policy. It may be that in most schools this process of policy formation is dominated by the headmaster, but even in these instances it is important to understand how the policies of the school are produced and maintained in terms of the involvement of teachers and pupils and of the support or opposition of parents, employers and the local authority. Thus

DIAGRAM 1. Baldridge: A Simple Political Model.

(p. 22 Fig. 2-2)

the sort of research reported here has been called for recently in some of the articles contained in Decision Making in British Education (Fowler et al 1973). Bennett and Wilkie (1973a) make claims for the contribution such studies could make to organizational theory in general;

theory that is developed largely from the study of industry is not necessarily valid for the school. If it is valid, then it is not necessarily salient theory that focuses on the problems of innovative and creative organizations will ultimately be much more relevant for the understanding of all organizations where such problems are increasingly inevitable. (p. 403).

They criticize the 'organization chart' approach to understanding the school as an organization since such charts

cannot tell us how the school is perceived by its members, far less inform us how the school will work in practice. (p. 394)

They accept that an analysis of the organizational aims of a school is possible, but point out some of the complexities involved:

It is not very informative to be told that the school is 'trying to educate pupils'. It sounds a little like being told that the aim of a business firm is 'to make a profit' or the aim of a hospital is 'to cure patients' - phrases which are almost locked into the meanings of a business firm or hospital. (p. 390).

They call too for more studies on conflict (Bennett and Wilkie 1973b) such as those they conducted in schools in Scotland, which arrived at the following conclusions:

First of all, they illustrate the many sidedness of organizational conflicts. The first example, an apparent case of competition for resources between Science and Art, was composed of elements of ideology (how much value is placed on Art or Science?), decision-making (who has the right to resolve the issue?), and power (who can in fact resolve the issue and how is the resolution brought

about?). In the second case, the introduction of a new system of pupil guidance raised issues about the methods of introducing such a system into a fairly stable type of organization as well as the ideological implications of such an introduction. There were other issues, too, about the procedures for changing the goals of the schools and about the organizational consequences of introducing a new career structure inside the school. The third example again illustrated the problem of introducing new important posts and new career structures within the school, and also raised the issue of ideology (how much administration, how much teaching, how are these activities related?), and the importance of clarifying job responsibilities.. . . . The second lesson concerns the importance of the headmaster as the chief executive of the school Thirdly, the three studies emphasize the importance to the management of the school of the understanding of conflict. (pp. 474-5)

This emphasis on power, conflict and change resembles that adopted by Baldrige and by the study reported in this thesis. Watson (1973) in another of the articles, makes similar arguments about the need for studies of inter-staff conflict in schools, focusing in particular on the clash of professional and bureaucratic interests.

we have very little knowledge of how schools adapt to the conflicts inherent in their structure. There is a need for well-conducted case studies of educational organizations, focusing upon this question. (p. 415).

A school as large as that studied here, with 1500 students and 100 staff, with a fully developed open decision-making process provides a very good opportunity to study the formulation of policy in an innovative institution at a particularly challenging period in its development.

This thesis draws on many of the ideas put forward in the studies reviewed above and uses them as a basis for comparison. However, the next stage in this review of the literature is to

show how the theoretical stance of the thesis is derived from grand theories and theoretical perspectives.

4. Grand Theories and General Perspectives.

The father of the study of organizations is Weber (1947). His theory of bureaucracy provides an account of the institutionalisation of the legal-rational form of authority. The monocratic ideal type of bureaucracy is described as the ultimate expression of formal rather than substantive rationality. Applying this model to a school has limitations since Weber makes little allowance for the professional allegiance of the personnel and seems to take the setting of formal goals or policy of the bureaucracy for granted concentrating instead on the efficiency of their implementation. This emphasis on implementation and efficiency with the taking for granted of goals has been typical of the managerialist tradition in the study of organizations. Such a model, as Baldrige (1971) has argued (see above), is inadequate as a framework for understanding the very volatile and political nature of the negotiation of policy in an institution such as a university or, as is argued in this case, a school. Given, then, that we need a means of explaining the dynamics of an institution, would a 'systems' or an 'action' approach be more appropriate?

Perhaps the greatest exponent of a systems approach to the study of organizations has been Etzioni. In general, a systems model for analysis stresses the reality of the organization as a whole, possessing its own 'goals', adaptive capacities and functional pre-requisites for its efficient operation. In

Complex Organizations (1961) Etzioni defines organizations as,
 social units which are predominantly oriented
 to the attainment of specific goals. (p. vii)

In Modern Organizations (Etzioni 1964) a more complex
 definition is offered:

Organizations are social units (or human groupings) deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals. Corporations, armies, schools, hospitals, churches, and prisons are included; tribes, classes, ethnic groups, friendship groups and families are excluded. Organizations are characterized by: (1) divisions of labour, power, and communication responsibilities, divisions which are not traditionally patterned, but deliberately planned to enhance the realization of specific goals; (2) the presence of one or more power centres which control the concerned efforts of the organization and direct them towards its goals; these power centres also must review continuously the organization's performance and re-pattern its structure, where necessary, to increase its efficiency; (3) substitution of personnel, i.e., unsatisfactory persons can be removed and others assigned their tasks. The organization can also recombine its personnel through promotion and transfer. (p.3.)

Such a definition pre-emptes the problems of the motivation of members, the locus of power and the reproduction of the organization. It assumes that organizations have goals which transcend the intentions, or the conflict of intentions, of members. The analogy with an organism, with a self conscious animal, is apparent. The organization is presumed to be in possession of 'specific goals', to be committed to 'increase its efficiency', and in general to be able to act 'as an organization' in its own interests.

In contrast to the above is the approach adopted by Silverman in The Theory of Organizations (1970). Silverman defines organizations as :

social institutions with certain special characteristics; they are consciously created at an ascertainable point in time; their founders have given them goals which are usually important chiefly as legitimating symbols; the relationship between their members and the source of legitimate authority is relatively defined although frequently the subject of discussion and planned change. (p.147)

The method of analysis advocated is intended to give the opportunity to interpret the events that take place in the organization in terms of the perspectives, practices and actions of its members, rather than as the automatic reactions of some reified system. This 'action' approach was later greatly re-worked by Silverman who became very much more concerned with the processes whereby members construct accounts of their actions and thereby construct those actions themselves (Silverman and Jones 1973).

The systems approach of Etzioni seems wedded to the managerialist perspective, whereas Silverman's action approach is intended as a programme of study 'for its own sake'. Indeed, action approaches of this sort have long been employed by symbolic interactionists such as Goffman (1961) to give the perspectives of those who are the objects of control and organization, such as the inmates of mental asylums. A notable example of the contribution of symbolic interactionism to the study of organizations is the work of Strauss et al Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions (1964). This comparative analysis of psychiatric hospitals is built around a notion of the institution as an 'arena for negotiation' where advocates of competing 'ideologies' seek to define the rules and their application in a process of conflict and change. In focusing on the negotiable character of the rules, Strauss et al emphasise

the reality of the social relationships as socially constructed. They see competing ideologies as located in professional groups and seek to understand how organizations might be seen as the product of a process of negotiation between different professional groups and between ideological factions of the same professions. Such an approach yields an impressive diachronic account of the organization as an ongoing world - an account which could not be written in terms of a functionalist or systems analogy.

Action approaches, however, have their own flaws. Where does the researcher stop searching for the negotiated nature of reality? Does he have to confront each example of talk within the organization and seek to understand it as part of the process whereby meaningful order is constructed through interaction? Certainly, if both the application of rules and the nature of rules themselves are negotiable, then the certainty about structure which is implicit in Strauss et al disappears. The institutional level of analysis surrenders to an ethnomethodological attempt to understand how members construct accounts of social interaction and thus construct that interaction itself.

Researchers used to resort to studying organizations in an attempt to find small scale societies which could be observed in their entirety without the many distracting complications of the disturbingly complex outside world. Now the level of institutional analysis itself is under attack and the new source of sociological salvation is seen to be the even more micro context of face-to-face interaction. The major limitation of this approach is that the context of interaction itself is taken

for granted and cannot be understood in ethnomethodological terms. There are issues of importance in the theory of organizations which cannot be explained in systems terms nor in terms of an ethnomethodological analysis. The conflicts amongst staff and the formulation of school policy are subjects which demand a different level of analysis.

However, it would be wrong too to take the institutional level of analysis out of its context in terms of both its internal and external determinants. One of the mistakes of the organizational theorists who tried to develop Weber's theory of organizations was to abstract this part of his work from his general theory about the development of industrialised society. Thus, Weber's praise of the technical superiority of bureaucracy gained all the attention whilst his warnings about the growth of its substantive irrationality and the creeping revolution of rationalization which would bring the iron cage of bureaucracy were ignored. Equally it would be misleading to suppose that we could approach an analysis of the organization of the school without considering its relationship to wider social, political and economic spheres. Attempts to combine these 'micro' and 'macro' levels of analysis are, however, somewhat rare. Some of the studies of schools reviewed earlier, notably those of Willis (1977) and Sharp et al, (1975), have attempted such an integration in terms of the interpretation of their own small scale studies. From a theoretical standpoint the work of Bernstein remains the most well developed of conceptual models trying to integrate the socio-structural, institutional and interactional levels of analysis. His work has by no means met

with universal approval, but it has taken the centre of the stage in the debate about linguistics and education and, more recently, on educational knowledge and modes of transmission. Bernstein claims that his work is an attempt to formulate a theory of the transmission of educational knowledge at both interactional and institutional levels, with reference to an overriding concern with the reproduction of social class relationships. The development of the socio-linguistic theory was to some extent matched in early years by a series of articles on the organization of schools, but more recent work, although claiming to incorporate the socio-linguistic theory, has tended to emphasise more macro concerns about the institutionalization of different forms of pedagogy and modalities of control. Bernstein's empirical work has so far been confined to testing his socio-linguistic thesis.

Volume Three of Class, Codes and Control (1977) is subtitled 'Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions' and includes all Bernstein's work on the sociology of the school and the sociology of the curriculum. The book is presented in two sections; part one, 'changes in the moral basis of schools' and part two, 'changes in the coding of educational transmissions'. The first part focuses on the organization of schools in terms of the institutionalization of different types of solution to the problems of social order. Bernstein argues that the culture of the school is a vital factor in the involvement of pupils and that schools are generally moving in the direction of more differentiation and less stratification. In 'Open schools, open society?' Bernstein argues that schools are shifting from a moral

order based on mechanical solidarity to one based on organic solidarity. The change in the principles of social organization is explored in relation to both instrumental and expressive orders. Diagram 2 was offered in a 'Postscript' to Volume One of Class, Codes and Control as a summary of the ideal typical theory presented in the early papers (see page 240 Bernstein 1974).

DIAGRAM 2. BERNSTEIN'S OPEN AND CLOSED TYPES.

Formal Controls
ORDERS
INSTRUMENTAL

Mixing of Categories

Teaching groups:	Heterogeneous - size and composition varied
Pedagogy:	Problem setting or creating Emphasizes ways of knowing
Teachers:	Teaching roles cooperative/interdependent Duties achieved
Curriculum:	Fluid points of reference and relation Subject boundaries blurred (interrelated)
	Progression: deep to surface structure of knowledge Common curriculum
Pupils:	Varied social groups reducing group similarity and difference - increased area of choice Aspirations of the many raised Fluid points of reference and relation

TYPE - OPEN

- (1) Ritual order celebrates participation/cooperation
- (2) Boundary relationships with outside blurred
- (3) Internal organization:
wide range of integrative sub-groups with membership and success roles across ability ranges

If prefect system - wide area of independence from staff, but limited exercise of power
Range of opportunities for pupils to influence staff decisions, e.g., opportunities for self-government.
- (4) Teacher-pupil authority relationships:
Reward and punishment less public and ritualized
Teacher-pupil relationships of control - interpersonal

Mixing of Categories

EXPRESSIVE

Formal Controls
ORDERS
INSTRUMENTAL

Purity of Categories

Teaching groups:	Homogeneous - sizes and composition fixed
Pedagogy:	Solution giving Emphasises contents or states of knowledge
Teachers:	Teaching roles insulated from each other Duties assigned Fixed points of reference and relation
Curriculum:	Subject boundaries sharp (less interrelation or integration) Progression: surface to deep structure of knowledge Curriculum graded for different ability groups
Pupils:	Fixed and stable social groups emphasizing group similarity and difference - reduced area of choice Aspirations of the few developed Fixed points of reference and relation

TYPE - CLOSED

- (1) Ritual order celebrates hierarchy/dominance
- (2) Boundary relationships with outside sharply drawn
- (3) Internal organization:
narrower range of integrative sub-groups with active membership and success roles confined to high ability range
If prefect system - under staff control and influence, but extensive exercise of power
Limited opportunities for pupils to influence staff decisions, e.g., limited opportunities for self-government
Teacher-pupil authority relationships:
Reward and punishment public and ritualized
Teacher-pupil relationships of control - positional

Purity of Categories

EXPRESSIVE.

In the second part of Class, Codes and Control Volume Three Bernstein directs his attention to codes of educational knowledge and modes of pedagogical relationships. The key concepts in this stage of his work are 'classification' and 'frame'. Classification refers to the degree of boundary maintenance between the contents of a curriculum. Frame refers to:

the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship. (p.89)

A curriculum with strong classification is of the 'collection code' type. A curriculum with weak classification is of the 'integrated code' type. A pedagogy with weak classification and weak framing is an 'invisible pedagogy'; strong classification and framing produces a 'visible pedagogy'.

In 'On the curriculum' and in 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' Bernstein appears to be arguing that changes in the curriculum bring about changes in the other aspects of the organization of schools. Thus;

I have implied that the British educational system is undergoing a change from curriculum of the collection type to curriculum of the integrated type. The social consequences of this shift will bring about disturbances in the traditional authority relationships in educational institutions. The move from collection to integration will radically alter the status and range of existing contents. It is likely to alter the relationship between teachers and between pupils. As we move from collection to integration, from closed to open schools, the outside will penetrate the schools in new ways. As we move from collection to integration the moral basis of our educational choices will become explicit and we must expect considerable conflict of values. ('On the curriculum', p. 84).

A naively 'idealist' approach, however, is avoided by relating

the whole process of a shift in codes of curriculum and types of school to changes in the division of labour and moral order of society as a whole. The relationship to societal change is the central concern of the paper 'Class and pedagogy: visible and invisible' which links the move towards invisible pedagogy with the rise of a 'new middle class'. This article differs from the others in concerning itself solely with primary education. In the latest edition of Volume Three Bernstein includes a paper which considers the relationships between education and production, school and work. Here he argues that education is relatively autonomous from the economic sphere and extends his use of the categories classification and framing to include the production process. The extended model is then used for a comparison of the relative correspondence of education and production in a variety of social systems (e.g., England and Rumania.)

Of what use then is Bernstein's work as a contribution to the study of the school as an organization? In particular, how do his theories help us to understand the organization of the school in terms of its constitution, maintenance and change? The rest of this section will attempt to answer these questions by a critical examination of four of Bernstein's papers, 'Open schools, open society?', 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge', 'Class and pedagogy' and 'Aspects of the relations between education and production' (Bernstein 1977).

Bernstein used Diagram 2 to summarise his arguments in the 'Open schools, open society?' paper maintaining that it:

sets out the basic analysis and also provides
a scale for the degree of openness or closure. (1974,
p.239)

This model of open and closed schools, however, cannot directly be used in the analysis of a school's organization for three major reasons. First, Bernstein provides no operational definitions of his descriptive or analytical terms such as 'heterogeneous - homogeneous', 'achieved - assigned', 'sharp - blurred' and 'fixed - fluid'. Allocation to one or other type could be almost arbitrary depending on the vantage point of the observer. Secondly, it appears that Bernstein had some notion of an absolute structure which could be extracted from the ongoing world of the school to be measured against his ideal type. His system does not allow for alternative definitions of what a school is. The headmaster might see ample 'opportunities for self-government' for students, the students might see none or at least none in areas that interested them. Thirdly, the model is presented in a static form as a binary type opposition rather than a developmental scheme. The development from closed to open is not examined in terms of the source, consequences and processes of change - at least in terms of a single school. The presentation of opposed ideal types does little to explain the process of development from one to the other.⁽¹⁾

1. This paragraph was included in the article published in the early days of the writing-up process, 'The problem of the 'unmotivated' in an open school: a participant observation study'. (Hannan 1975). The article continued: This paper will attempt to provide an analysis of some of the problems of the transitional state in terms of a Durkheimian model. Similar limitations to the above are present in attempting to apply the 'integrated code'/'collection code' of curriculum ideal types. In the light of these difficulties it was decided to examine the teachers' perceptions of the school and its structure; to investigate the coexistence and interaction of alternative definitions of the school; and to study the school as an ongoing system. (p.150).

'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' introduced the terms 'classification' and 'framing' as a refinement of the above analysis. They extended Bernstein's reliance on the concept of boundary which had been part of his argument about the shift from mechanical to organic solidarity. The terms are defined with reference to the curriculum, but in that same article he extends their use in unexplained ways to a description of social structures, so that a weakening of classification and framing within schools is seen to reflect a weakening in society's classification and frames. The account Bernstein constructs seems at times to verge on the tautological with little benefit accruing in terms of theoretical understanding from his use of these concepts which seem to do little more than re-describe the world as it was already known. The definition and use of the term 'framing' is particularly susceptible to this criticism since it fails to distinguish between teacher as opposed to pupil control and its use in general is stretched so much that the term becomes almost meaningless. The integrated code-collection code ideal type opposition is similar to that of open school - closed school in some of its aspects with the old concept of the purity or mixing of categories replaced with notions of variations in the strength of boundaries between contents. Here, though, changes in the curriculum are held to bring about other changes in the organization, whereas in the old model curriculum change was seen as part of a general shift. It is difficult to see why curriculum should have a claim to casual primacy rather than any other facet of the school.

In 'Class and pedagogy: visible and invisible' an attempt

is made to re-define the terms classifications and framing so that they become applicable to a wider range of phenomena. In an appendix, 'A note on the coding of objects and modalities of control', he applies the concepts to an analysis of systems of control implied in the arrangement of objects, taking the example of lavatories to illustrate his analysis. Here classification is defined in terms of the strength of the rules of exclusion which control the array of objects in a space and framing as the number of different relationships objects in the array can enter into with one another, where an increase in that number represents a weakening of the frame. This re-working of the concepts does indeed widen their applicability, but this still falls short of explaining how they might be applied to macro-societal features. Here Bernstein is concerned with the principles which underlie different forms of organization, i.e., an invisible pedagogy based on weak classification and weak framing is organized around the guiding principle 'things must be put together', a visible pedagogy on 'things must be kept apart.' This formulation seems to hark back to the old open school - closed school distinction based on the degree of mixing or purity of categories. Yet here, Bernstein talks of individualized and personalized organic solidarity rather than mechanical and organic solidarity. The more ambitious aims of this paper, i.e., to link changes in pedagogy to changes in the division of labour, are not fully met since Bernstein fails to define the new middle class very clearly and he gives little indication as to how exactly the presumed link is effected in historical terms.

The latest paper 'Aspects of the relations between education and production' answers some of the criticisms made above, particularly by refining the definitions of classification and framing and showing their applicability to social spheres other than the educational. However, in the final analysis, apart from his justified criticisms of Bowles and Gintis's 'correspondence thesis' (Bowles and Gintis 1976), Bernstein's model building seems to achieve little more than a redescription of the world as it is in perplexingly complex jargon. What, for instance, is the contribution of a statement such as this:

..... where there is a strong classification between education and production, this creates the condition for the relative autonomy of education, and thus a division of labour between those who are located in production and those who are located in cultural reproduction (education): that is, between power and control. (p. 175).

The plausibility of this statement is the product of a tautology, i.e., 'the strong classification between education and production' is 'the relative autonomy of education.'

Bernstein's theoretical models contained in the 'Open schools, open society?' and 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' articles have been heavily criticised before, e.g., Easthope et al (1975), Pring (1975), King (1976) and Gibson (1977). King and Gibson, whilst making suggestions on how Bernstein's models might be improved, both call for the sort of new research which forms the basis of this thesis:

The results presented here relate to the substantive level. Investigations at the ideological level must involve the who, when, where and why of interest groups asserting the ideologies. (King 1976, p.440).

Whilst it is not denied that the work-order and institutions of higher education influence events within schools in this country, it is suggested that the organization of the school may be seen as an outcome of actions, mainly of those who have most power within the schools - teachers and more particularly head teachers, organizational persistence and change require multiple explanations produced at the level at which the particular persistence or change is found. The sociology of the school must at least explain the school in terms of itself. (King 1976. p. 441.)

What would be vital would be to locate the springs of social action without recourse to such mystificatory devices as classification and framing. Rather, it calls for closer attention to the nature and procedures of the social groups engaged in maintaining distinctions in experience, and in the exploration of the relationships between these groups. (Gibson 1977, p.44)

King overstates the claims for a micro approach; he would be more accurate if he required those making assumptions about macro influences to demonstrate how their effects are felt in small scale interactions. His own attempt to test Bernstein's predictions suffers from an uncritical adoption of the confused and often tautological conceptual framework and from a reliance on data from static situations to test theory about processes of change. Gibson reveals the severe limitations of Bernstein's theoretical work in a determined critique which, however, does not pre-empt the use made here of Bernstein's concepts in the construction of a theory about ideological conflict and organizational change. The theoretical stance originally taken by the study reported in this thesis owed much to Bernstein. The intention to test out the implications of his ideas at the institutional level was gradually re-appraised as it became clear that his models were insufficient to grasp the range of phenomena encountered. The attempts to employ a Bernsteinian

model are outlined in the 'Methods' chapter to follow and in the article published in the early days of the 'writing-up' stage of the research (Hannan 1975). Nevertheless, although the full Bernsteinian framework was abandoned, certain of his concepts, suitably adapted, proved useful. Thus the conflict between staff in the discussion of school problems is analysed in terms of the open-closed opposition; arguments advocating a more open school are taken as expressions of the open ideology, arguments advocating a more closed school are taken as expressions of the closed ideology. Such a reworking of Bernstein is not wholly inconsistent with what he himself has written. Thus he declares that the focus of his work is on ideologies rather than existing institutional arrangements, that the open and closed ideologies are in positions of conflict and that conflict among staff is a power struggle between the competing claims of ideologies to define the structure and distribution of power and property relationships. This side of Bernstein's work has been used before by Hamilton (1975) who sees conflict as endemic in schools which combine open and closed elements. Hamilton's study of two Scottish comprehensive schools analyses the difficulties in trying to change a subject-based curriculum to an integrated one. He points out the difficulties of maintaining the latter over long periods of time and predicts continuing conflicts in schools now split in their functions:

The current co-existence of integrated and collective curricula in secondary education points, I suggest, to a fundamental dilemma if not a crisis for the comprehensive school. Until recently, the role of the secondary school was clearly defined. Each in their own way - junior secondary, secondary modern and senior secondary schools - performed a purely academic (or vocational) function. In this and other ways they

exemplified a 'collection' paradigm. Today, however, comprehensive schools are expected to retain this academic/intellectual function while at the same time paying tributes to new patterns of organization, new boundaries of knowledge and new conceptions of education. In short, they are expected to run collection and integrated ideas side by side. (p.204).

Hamilton thus uses Bernstein's concepts, in his case collection and integrated codes, in an analysis of conflict. This thesis makes use of certain of Bernstein's concepts, especially open and closed ideologies, in a similar manner. The concluding chapter takes further the analysis begun here of the strengths and weaknesses of Bernstein's work in the light of the use made of his ideas in this thesis.

There remains, however, the problem of understanding how the school as an organization is determined or influenced by structural features of the wider society. Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Althusser (1971) see the school as basically derivative in that it serves to reproduce a stratified labour force, legitimises the social hierarchy and ideologically serves the needs of the ruling class. Sharp et al (1975) and Willis (1977) go furthest in their empirical work to incorporating these theoretical considerations about the influence of structural features. The problem, though, is always one of taking one or other level of analysis for granted. Thus Willis assumes that a Marxist theory of the workings of structural factors correctly represents the context which determines the interaction of the pupils and teachers he sees at work within schools. On the other hand studies like that of Bowles and Gintis concentrate on the macro level, focusing on the inputs and outputs to schooling and taking the nature of the schooling process for

granted. Thus, micro studies of schools tend to take the macro theories into which they fit for granted and macro studies of societies tend to take micro processes at the level of the school for granted. The problem is accentuated where macro theorists are so concerned with the structural elegance of their functional models that the dimension of meaningful social interaction is almost ignored and where micro theorists are so concerned with establishing how reality is constructed within the classroom that the wider social dimension is lost. It might be suggested that some of Althusser's work falls into the former category and Keddie's (especially 'Classroom Knowledge' 1971) into the latter. The Marxist and the phenomenologist will always disagree about the assumptions they can make for observing and analysing a micro context, i.e., for the Marxist the participants may be the unconscious products of their circumstances whereas for the phenomenologist the social reality experienced by the participants is real because they perceive it as real. The situation is perhaps best summed up by an analogy: the phenomenologist will be interested in how the goldfish constructs his reality, the Marxist will be interested in demonstrating the presence of the goldfish bowl. This thesis has no pretensions about solving this dilemma. To a certain extent it is interested in both the goldfish's perceptions and the nature of the goldfish bowl. The thesis considers both how the participants formulate school policy and the extent to which their perceptions and actions are influenced by structural factors of which they may be unaware. To some extent the thesis supports Willis' contention that it is the task of 'ethnography' to illustrate how structural factors are actually present at the interactional

level, but it exhibits a healthy scepticism about structural theories themselves. The findings presented in this thesis will, perhaps, provide data for analysis for theorists devoted to either level. Here the prime focus is on the institutional level and an attempt is made to relate this both to more micro and more macro concerns.

5. Beginnings.

This review has presented an account of how this research derives its theoretical and methodological stance from previous work. The substance of this thesis addresses some of the issues which have been outlined above and uses some of the conceptual and procedural devices employed in the works reviewed. As such the focus of this research is on the process of the negotiation of conflicts and the formulation of policy in an innovative school. The analysis employs some of Bernstein's concepts in the explanation of the ideological bases of inter-staff conflict (see Hamilton 1975) and considers how certain stances in the debate about school problems and school policy are derived from shared interest positions (see House 1976 and Minchin 1975). Attention is paid to how both staff and students react to aspects of the school's formal organization (see Hargreaves 1967, Lacey 1970 and Willis 1977). The thesis examines the manner in which the innovative policies of the school are changed or maintained in the face of problems with certain sections of the student population (see Center for New Schools 1972). The research strategy adopted takes an action approach to the organization adapting some of the ideas of Strauss et al (1964) and Baldrige

(1971) on the negotiated nature of organizational reality and the basis of conflict in opposing ideologies. The problems themselves are seen as the product of external and internal forces. The school studied serves as a particularly good example for the case study of organizational change and conflict because of the established nature of the innovations, the open discussion and decision-making process and the challenge experienced by the school in the first year of full ROSLA intake. The influence of ROSLA serves as an example of the importance of external factors.

It is not considered appropriate here to give a list of hypotheses which the research sets out to test. The logico-deductive method undoubtedly has its merits, particularly as regards philosophical purity à la Popper, (Popper 1959) but it relies on the prior existence of the very hypotheses that this thesis seeks to produce. This chapter has shown the origins of some of the ideas which prompted the research and guided the focus taken. Much of the theory discussed herein, however, arose during the course of the research and after its completion. Thus some of the books discussed above were not available until well into the 'writing-up' stage of this thesis. They are reviewed here in order to set the stage for the description of the study and to allow some basis for the comparison and critique which comes with the analysis to follow. It is in this sense only that 'hypotheses' are 'tested'. The next step in this account, then, is to describe the methods employed in the research so that the sources of the arguments are made apparent.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

1. Introduction

Any methodology is in the business of producing knowledge. The debates in sociology about the status of knowledge produced by various methodologists is endless. I⁽¹⁾ do not claim to have solved all the epistemological problems inherent in sociological procedure. I do not, in any case, believe that a solution of such problems is possible by an armchair analysis which precedes field work. Too much emphasis has been placed recently on method for its own sake so that we have an ethnomethodology where all subject matter is equally important, or, rather, equally unimportant. The relationship between subject matter and methodology in this study has been a dialectical one, influences have been reciprocal and a research strategy developed over time through a series of shifts in focus. Thus, for example, a desire to monitor events in the whole school led to an observation of staff meetings as sources of data on the widest available range of phenomena. The observation of meetings led in turn to a sharpened focus on inter-staff conflicts and the formulation of school policy. A full account of the development of research focus and methodology is given below.

1. The first person singular is used throughout this chapter as the nature of participant observation by a single researcher makes this style of presentation the most clear and relevant.

2. Observational Strategy

I entered the school at the beginning of the second half of the first term 1973-4 with the intention of testing some of Bernstein's theories about the sociology of the school but with little idea of how to carry this out. My developing research strategy was set out in this paper presented to my supervisors after a month in the school.

Outline

I think the best way to outline my study, its prospects and pretensions, is to give you some idea of my strategies over the last half of term. I was given a 'label' by the Principal in the issue of the Bulletin which heralded my arrival: 'research sociologist interested especially in the pastoral side of the school and its relations with the community'. This was essentially a misunderstanding of my field of interest, although I began by explaining it in terms of the surviving barrier between pastoral and academic in a school which specialised in teaching the 'whole child' 'integrated curricula'. I was thus able to maintain my grounding in Bernstein's 'integrated v. collection code' via the larger principle of the breaking down of boundaries. I started off by interviewing a few key members of staff, more to try and understand the school than to interpret their opinions and outlooks. The Counsellor tried to involve me in a scheme to questionnaire the students to find the roots of their lack of motivation and to measure how far the school succeeded in involving them over the school year by repeating the questionnaire later. I hedged a little over this, eventually offering⁽¹⁾ to help run such a scheme, but disclaiming real interest. I made this decision a week after being asked, but by then the Counsellor thought things were 'too delicately balanced' and the scheme was abandoned.

By this time I was conscious that I knew best the older, more senior members of staff. The Humanities teachers looked the youngest and most interesting and their course appeared to have an integrated subject matter that I could easily understand, so I decided to investigate the Humanities course.

1. My reluctance was derived from a fear of being identified too closely with the staff's purposes. It would have been all too easy to be sucked into the monitoring procedures used by the Counsellor. Such a position would have endangered my commitment to observation; it would have been difficult to avoid becoming consultant to a school already very self conscious. I had no desire to emulate Richardson, a role the Principal seemed all too eager to grant me.

I got to know most of the Humanities teachers and attended many of their lessons. I became intimately involved in the planning of the course through attending team teaching planning meetings. I felt my observations to be most perceptive when I could attend meetings of this kind, when talk was public but was directed at fellow participants rather than at me, the observer. Attending lessons was the most disheartening of experiences, more through my inadequacies, or my lack of suitable techniques for recording, than through the success or otherwise of the teaching. Too much happens, too much of the interaction is private, too much of the work is of an individual project manner for me to have any hope of doing systematic observation.

Partly because of my greater relative competence in observing staff gatherings that planned or organized the work of the school than in observing the actual interactive process of teaching-learning, I began to re-direct my attention to the organization and running of the school and its component units. I attended all staff meetings of whatever kind, high school parent meetings, Division meetings and many other weird and wonderful assemblies.⁽¹⁾ Again I could work such a perspective into my original Bernsteinian concepts; I could interpret much as the organizational consequence of the 'breaking down of boundaries'.

It was not only the staff with whom I developed rapport, I got and am getting to know an interesting, though admittedly small, sample of the students. I attend a tutor group meeting every morning and have got to know all of the boys and four or five of the girls. They give me information about themselves and the school. I have got to know some of the most notorious of the students, 'the leather jackets'. I have been invited into their world to the extent that I am asked if I want to come down to 'the bog' for a 'fag'. Some students are convinced I'm only a fourth year, though I've heard it said that I'm at least seventeen. I manage to mix quite easily in both worlds, staff and student, because these worlds so infrequently meet. I can be part of one without seeming to be part of the other.

I decided to refocus my work around a problem, a problem defined by the staff, that of the 'non-motivated'. These 'lambs' (less academically motivated brothers and sisters as they are also termed by the Principal) are the subject of constant concern, the cause of frequent despair and occasional chaos. At the moment I'm observing how the school attempts to cope with the problem of the 'non-motivated', how it changes or resists change in response to the continuing concern.

1. A full description of the composition and official function of the staff committees and other bodies is given in the chapter to follow.

I'm more capable of examining how problems are dealt with and how they are perceived and are perceived to arise than examining their actual nature and causes in some pseudo-objective manner.

I write down everything that happens to me, everything that anyone says to me, everything that occurs to me as relevant. My field notes are my principal foundation for insights and further questions.

I see the school as an attempt to set up Durkheim's 'heaven on earth', the integrated individualised world or 'organic solidarity'. I would like to study how far it survives and changes in response to problems thrown up within the school by internal and external causes.

I'm very conscious of limitations in methodology and technique. The 'frame' and 'classification' dimensions of what goes on in a classroom are important in understanding how problems arise. I feel, however, that I would require expensive and complicated machinery with which to do this properly. I now use classroom observation more as a way of getting to know the students and teachers.

How can I use my field notes gathered from conversations, observations, interviews, committee meetings and lessons to systematically provide and test hypotheses? I shall soon have a working knowledge of the school (in Schutz's terms 'recipe-book' knowledge), and ample documentation of my understanding but my data will largely be in interpreted form with little actual talk but much paraphrase and summary. I can tie my interpretations to an hypothesised 'reality' through less subjective measures, such as analysis of documents, figures on absenteeism, policy declarations, minutes, etc..., or through questionnaires and taped interviews. I can reassess my own interpretations through discussion of my work with the participants, the staff and the students - though I see this more as a long term aim, so that discussion will come after observation in order to lessen 'observer effect'.

In conclusion then, I propose a study of the sociology of the school conducted through participation in certain formal and informal groupings, to record ongoing commentaries on the school's performance and monitor the process of defining and dealing with certain problems.'

The strategy outlined in the above document formed the basis for the field work carried out throughout the year. A questionnaire was given to staff in the second term and a series of staff interviews was⁽¹⁾ carried out in the third term as attempts to

1. See Appendix C and Appendix D.

discover the ideological bases of oppositions expressed in the discussion of problems and to gather data on backgrounds, careers and aspirations of the teachers. The problem of the 'non-motivated' was followed by a series of other issues in staff discussions and decision-making. These 'problems' formed the subject matter of the research; I was concerned to see how such issues arose, how they were discussed and how they were resolved. The research strategy thus combined a number of approaches with some contact being kept with both classroom practices and pupil cultures, but most attention being focused on the world of the staff. I sought to understand how a school of 1500 students and 100 staff was organized, maintained and changed by observing how the 100 staff formed and reformed school policy in reaction to a series of problems occasioned by factors both internal and external to the school.

This approach was made possible by the nature of the organization studied. The Principal was empowered by law, subject only to the Governors' supervision, to control the internal organization, management and discipline of the school. In practice he exercised his authority through the decision-making structure outlined in the 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff.' Public decisions about policy were made through the Pastoral, Curricular and Joint Pastoral/Curricular committee meetings, through the participation of the Principal or of his representative. In theory the School Council (including students) was to be another decision-making body, but in practice it did not have sufficient power to compel the Principal's approval for its decisions - the Pastoral and Curricular committees were never

vetoed by the Principal, the School Council was.⁽¹⁾

By observing decision-making committees and other staff gatherings which were part of the representative decision-making process such as the General Staff Meetings, Division meetings and Faculty meetings, I was able to monitor the process of defining and dealing with 'problems' of school policy. This is not to argue that other meetings of staff were not important as part of this process; I had only limited access to private gatherings and to meetings outside the formal decision-making structure such as 'The Colloquium'⁽²⁾. However, discussions of staff in these informal contexts did not make decisions in the sense of making them public and official. Any attempts to change school policy had sooner or later to be discussed as part of the formal decision-making process. Considerable autonomy was allowed in the school to Division Heads, Faculty Heads and individual teachers in the exercise of decisions about the day-to-day running of their own areas of responsibility; decisions at this level were only part of the agenda of formal decision-making meetings when they aroused great controversy among staff.

1. As has already been noted in the 'Introduction', the Principal vetoed a vote of the student members of the School Council to exclude him or his representative from alternate meetings. His prime justification was the need to preserve 'one community', based on a fear of the School Council becoming a source of opposition rather than support, like a trade union rather than a family gathering. Arguments of a similar kind were made by the Lady Vice Principal in urging staff to take part in the Parent-Teacher organization so as to prevent it adopting an oppositional stance as a purely parent body, with the example of Countesthorpe's Parent Action Group put forward as a warning.
2. The Colloquium was a weekly meeting of senior staff which reviewed school policy and current problems. The meetings served as opportunities for executive and senior administrative staff to formulate joint positions on issues raised in the decision-making process. The Faculty and Division Heads were not members of the Colloquium, but all the other members of the Joint Pastoral/ Curricular committee were.

Decisions which affected what was publicly known as school policy, the official description of the school, were made i.e., made public and rendered official, in the decision-making committees. It is this process which I chose as my prime focus on the changing world of the school, supplemented by a very large number of less structured observations of other contexts. It was impossible to monitor every discussion which confronted problems or suggested decisions. I chose then to observe the context where change in the organization was made manifest - the decision-making structure.

A study of this kind which focuses on the formulation of school policy is vulnerable to the criticism that there may be a disjunction between the official description of school policy (the 'formal organization') and unofficial action taken by members (the 'informal organization'). This thesis might be accused of assuming that school policy is the organization rather than establishing how interactions in classroom, staffroom, etc.. are patterned in themselves with reference to a range of factors, including school policy but also taking into consideration personal peculiarities, the influence of internal and external constraints and the demands of particular contexts. In a basic sense the happenings in a school are its organization and the pattern of events and inter-relationships represents its structure. However, it has been the intention of this research to show how the organization of the whole school persists and is changed. The only way I could gain access to a wide range of events in the school was via the observation of staff meetings where events of a problematic nature were raised and discussed.

Data from such meetings constitute information on the school as perceived by staff. The staff in Division and Faculty meetings were concerned to display the inconsistencies in the official policy of the school, to show how staff failed to live up to its requirements or how it proved impossible to implement in practice. The problem raising forums within the decision-making process thus brought school policy down from the level of public rhetoric to the level of constantly questioned parameters for teachers' practices. The focus on the formulation of school policy, then, provided information on how the school worked in practice. School policy itself was in many respects very close to what actually happened in the school, e.g. the decision on whether or not to separate the 'unmotivated' for a 'New Course' and the decision on whether or not to set up pastoral-curricular teams, provided the structures within which action could take place, i.e., the 'New Course' or the pastoral - curricular teams could only exist when they became part of school policy. In the case of Redmond, then, a focus on school policy gave data on more than the official description of the formal organization. The nature of the policy itself, as defined by the decisions of decision-making meetings, represented the substance of the school's major arrangements by which its events were patterned.

3. The Role of Observer.

When I first arrived at the school I had continually to give explanations of my purpose. I tried to explain myself in terms of my interest in studying the school 'as a community' and trying

to understand 'how the school worked'. Some staff, particularly the Humanities staff, were rather wary of me as I had been introduced to the school by Bernbaum whose study on Countesthorpe (1973) had been widely interpreted as an attack on the open school philosophy and on the sort of practices many staff of Redmond admired. I was able to counteract such an impression of reactionary bias by expressing quite radical opinions on political matters which bore no direct relation to education. I did no teaching as such in any course but I did help in preparation of two Humanities lessons, one on questionnaires and one on social class, and was invited to the lessons which followed as a 'visiting expert' much in the same way as other outsiders such as policeman, social workers and clergy were invited in order to contribute to the course.

I attended the school from half term in the first term until the end of the third term of the school year 1973-4. I did my best to cover most sorts of meetings and attempted to observe lessons in every subject area. I was present at the school from three to five days every week, sometimes arriving at 8.30a.m. and not leaving until 10.00 p.m. as important meetings went on throughout the school day and afterwards into the late evening.

In general, staff were very accommodating and appeared to welcome my presence. I was only once excluded from a meeting when I was asked to leave a Division Heads' meeting whilst it was addressed by the Vice Principal on the matter of the suspension of some students who had brought dangerous drugs to the school. Otherwise no restrictions were imposed on my presence at any sort of staff gathering and no objections were ever raised

to my note taking, though some objections were raised to the suggestion that I might tape record meetings. I was thus able to attend a Governors' meeting, a meeting of the Principal and Vice Principals and meetings of 'The Colloquium' which were not open to ordinary staff members. Indeed, staff observers were not allowed to attend even the Pastoral or Curricular Committee meetings until the beginning of the third term, whilst I had no restrictions placed on my presence. Only one member of staff ever objected to my research role in terms of its interference with the normal running of the school. This objection came from a member of the Supplementary Education Department who had interpreted one of my questions at a Department meeting as implying support of a particular faction's position. My transgression of my self-imposed limits to personal expression was reported to the Vice Principal who in turn passed it on to me - my protestations of innocence in terms of intent were accepted by all concerned.

Generally then, the co-operation I received was beyond my wildest hopes. However, on some occasions the enthusiasm expressed for my project caused me considerable difficulties. Thus, on several occasions during the first term the Principal asked me for my advice on how to conduct meetings or on my opinions as to how a particular meeting had gone. These requests were thought to be legitimate since my position was noticeably similar to that of Richardson at Nailsea and The Teacher, the School and the Task of Management (1973) had been read by the Principal and was being circulated by him amongst other staff. I resisted such approaches arguing my difference

to Richardson, directly criticizing her work and being generally non-committal in my comments on meetings. Another member of staff who had worked for the National Foundation for Educational Research and who was a trained psychologist repeatedly questioned me on my interpretation of Bernstein's work on the sociology of the school in terms which showed considerable theoretical insight and which required answers at a fairly sophisticated level. However, in this instance, I expressed the distinctiveness of my own ideas and approach to that advocated by Bernstein. Such attempts to get me to openly theorize about the school endangered my objective status and were resisted for fear of creating an observer effect whereby my views or interpretations could act back on the world I was observing so as to distort my findings.

4. The Data - Collection and Presentation.

Participant observation research is peculiarly susceptible to the criticism that it is subjectively based and to the complaint that it is impossible to replicate. The reports on field study type research often rely on illustrative examples rather than systematic evidence to support the arguments they make. The data presented in this way are often pre-selected and pre-interpreted, readers have no way of judging the criteria by which the writer selects what is important and little chance of reconstructing the process by which the researcher formulates his account. Some of these problems seem insoluble whilst others may in part be answered by a peculiarly open and full manner of presentation. It would presumably be possible for participant observation researchers to keep notes of all they had observed and of the development of their interpretations and

to present these in full in support of their findings. Such research reports would be much more open to alternative interpretation and generally more amenable to the sort of checking which would reveal the bases for any findings claimed. However, books written in this manner would be almost never ending in their length and overpowering in their ability to bore the most avid of readers. Taking this argument to its logical limit, the only way to present a truly accountable study would be to recreate the research experience in its entirety for each reader.

Thus, any account of participant observation research must make a compromise between accountability and readability. I have attempted to provide as much raw data as possible in support of my thesis throughout this work. Wherever possible quotations are given in context and ideas are examined in terms of their general currency among the staff. These precautions are taken so as to mitigate against the possibility that individual instances may be misinterpreted in terms of their significance. It was always my intention to make my 'writing-up' stage an open one, whereby the criticisms and alternative interpretations of members of the school might be taken into account. An article (Hannan 1975) written for a conference and published in Frontiers of Classroom Research (Chanan and Delamont 1975) was widely read in the school before being submitted and early drafts of now redundant chapters of this thesis were taken back to the school for criticism and comment. However, problems of confidentiality and practical problems of time available have made further consultations impossible. It is hoped to produce some follow-up research at a later date which will include staff

comments and criticisms of this account and up-date the research with an account of recent developments.

The data which form the basis of this thesis are in a variety of forms. During or after each day at the school I made a diary type account of the day noting both what had occurred and the latest trends in my thinking. Conversations with staff and students, events observed and information discovered were all reported in field note form in this daily account. Notes were taken in lessons which I observed; these notes were of an unstructured and incidental kind and were composed mostly of records of teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interaction and brief outlines of lesson content. In an attempt to monitor the way in which Humanities lessons were constructed I attended team planning meetings and took notes there of suggestions made and plans formulated. I also made an attempt to record team meetings after lessons which evaluated the 'product'. The note-taking in meetings was mainly of a near verbatim or paraphrase fashion with occasional summary and on the spot researcher comment. Decision-making committees and staff discussions of all kinds were attended and continuous long hand⁽¹⁾ notes of what was said taken in each. After three years of rapid-note taking at university lectures I found it comparatively easy to keep up with what was being said and in most cases I achieved verbatim records or in any case obtained a record of the substance of positions advanced and decisions made. An alternative source of data on such meetings was the minutes produced by committee secretaries. Such minutes were often very full records and provided valuable

1. With some very individual shorthand.

alternative interpretations of what had transpired. They also served as an official record of decisions made and were thus a useful check on the changes made in school policy. Other documents such as the weekly 'Bulletin', the 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff' and the 'Students' Guide' proved valuable sources of information. In addition to these I was provided with a wide range of written materials produced by teachers advancing their cause in staff debates, putting forward new courses or describing internal arrangements to parents, staff or students. In the sense of being willing to provide information to outsiders and to publicise their efforts the staff were very open indeed having published a book on the planning of the school and adding to this a series of follow-up accounts of various aspects of the school known as Redmond Papers. However, this 'openness' was far from evident in relation to the local press when some students tried to get publicity for their 'walk-out' in protest against a lack of heating (see Appendix E, the end of 'The First Term'). On that occasion the Principal was very concerned to avoid the sort of adverse publicity that Countess-thorpe had received from the Leicester Mercury and succeeded in squashing the story through personal intervention. It seems that, contrary to the old adage, only some sorts of publicity were desirable. As observer, however, I had access to both the public rhetoric and the internal processes of negotiation and conflict.

Data of another form were obtained from a questionnaire to staff and a series of staff interviews. These methods were employed in order to discover the ideological bases for opposition

between staff and to gather information on their backgrounds, experience and career aspirations.

The questionnaire to staff was distributed towards the end of the Spring Term (March 15th 1974). Staff were asked to complete and return 'as soon as possible.' Only five replies came in before the end of term (April 5th), the rest arriving after the Easter vacation and before the half term holiday in the Summer Term (May 27th). Two sets of 'reminder' notes were circulated. It was impossible to get back replies any quicker with staff under so much pressure. Replies were thus made at various times over a two month period and cannot be held to represent staff's views at any one point in the series of events in the school year. However, the analysis which follows draws on the information derived from staff meetings, as well as that gained from the questionnaire replies, to identify those who consistently advocated open or closed ideologies. The groups of 'hardcore ideologists' were relatively stable from issue to issue over the limited time of a year. This would seem to justify the use made of questionnaire data collected over the even more limited timespan of two months.

The topics covered ranged from personal details of staff background to opinions on such issues as staff-student relationships and decision-making. The questionnaire was 40 items long, with 26 questions answerable by a phrase or a tick (close-ended) and 14 requiring comment and elaboration (open-ended). The full text of the questionnaire is given as Appendix C. Some items were more successful than others. Several proved redundant as certain lines of enquiry were abandoned, e.g., that on the birthplace of

staff was originally included to gauge the extent to which the staff could be said to be drawn from the local community and that on numbers of children to see if parenthood correlated with any noticeable trend in other answers. Other questions failed through ambiguity or unusual difficulty in categorizing answers, e.g., that on hours worked outside 'official' hours and that on career ambitions. The **information** derived from these questions does not form an important part of the analysis to follow, but is reproduced as far as is possible in tabular form in Appendix F so as to enable any reader engaged in a comparative exercise to gauge the extent to which the staff differed from that of other schools. Out of a possible total of 97 full-time staff (excluding French and Italian assistants) there were 69 respondents, a response rate of 71.1%. The representativeness of the response is discussed in Appendix F.

The questionnaire posed methodological problems in both its construction and its analysis. Most questionnaire research is inherently flawed since it takes the respondents' understanding of the questions asked as non-problematic. In order to analyse in statistical terms a series of answers it must be assumed that the question means the same to all respondents, otherwise dissimilar units are added together to arrive at seemingly elegant statistical computations. This problem is aggravated by closed-ended questions which constrain the respondent by offering a limited set of stereotyped answers. Here even the answer is precoded by the survey designer and it is impossible to judge whether the same ticked box means the same thing to each respondent. Nevertheless, these methods do offer fairly simple and

apparently successful ways of collecting a great deal of relevant data. In order to avoid some of the problems the questionnaire used here was made as open as possible, so that the respondent should not be too tied down by the researcher's constructs. Nevertheless, a good deal of caution must be maintained in the analysis of the results since any attempt at computation rests on assumptions about the comparability of data. For these reasons as much as possible of the interpretative process behind the questionnaire analysis is made available in Appendix F.

The interviews were carried out as a supplement to the questionnaire and served several purposes, i.e., to include people who had neglected to complete the questionnaire, to make use of an alternative data source and method of obtaining records of staff's views, to examine the views of several key groups, to broaden the range of questions and to pursue other issues in greater depth. The interview schedule (given as Appendix D) took between 40 and 70 minutes to complete and was recorded in full on tape. The schedule was not strictly kept to and the opportunity was taken to follow up other points where these seemed appropriate. In general, though, the interview collected new information about the staff's perception of the nature of the school, its problems and the conflicts amongst its staff. The information gathered provided a general resource for insight and analysis and the questions on staff groupings and conflicts are directly utilised in the analysis of staff ideologies to follow. My fairly long regular contact with the staff provided a bonus in the interview sessions as I noted in my field note

reflections of June 18th 1974:

I am conscious of the fact that interviewees do not fob me off with the usual consensus rubbish that parents and others get because I know too much about what's happening. I am able to ask consensus type questions because I have such a knowledge of conflict in committees, etc.. From these questions I get open answers relating to strains, contests and power.

This frankness was also evident in questionnaire replies from many staff.⁽¹⁾ The staff selected for interview fell into three groups (which overlapped in the case of several of them in the first two categories): all the members of the Pastoral and Curricular committees; all the staff who had been at the Redmond Grammar School; and five other teachers who advanced views supportive of an open ideology in staff meetings. Eight staff interviewed had not answered the questionnaire (two from the Pastoral and Curricular committees - one of whom only joined the staff in the summer term, four from the Redmond Grammar School and two 'open ideologists').

The methods used in the collection of information on staff thus included most of the means available to a 'participant observer', i.e., questionnaire, interview, observation and recording of meetings, documents, and a field-note diary on general reflections and informal observations. It was through these methods that I hoped to gain access to the staff's 'world' and to build up an interpretative account. As has been stated previously, a subsidiary focus in the research was concerned with the observation of the world of students. I gained contact with the students through joining a tutor group, attending a wide variety of lessons and tutor group assemblies, and joining with

1. The data derived from these sources would seem, therefore, to come somewhere in between Keddie's 'educationist' and 'teacher' contexts (Keddie 1971).

students in leisure activities and informal conversations. In getting to know students I was aided by my youthful appearance and my familiarity with certain elements of student culture, especially football, pop music, drinking and motor-bikes. The major point of contact was with the more troublesome students who were known by staff as the 'unmotivated'. I built up good access to two groups of 'lads' of this type, Jed's group (or 'The Peters') and the 'leather-jackets' led by Bri and Gez. The methods of data collection on these students are more fully described in the chapter on 'The Students.'

The aim of all these methods was to build up as comprehensive a picture of the school as possible. The nature of the research methods employed was conditioned by the nature of the school studied. The willingness of the staff to be observed and noted and the general easy availability of documentary material made this sort of participant observation approach possible.

5. Anonymity and Confidentiality

Research such as this which deliberately focuses on the problems faced by a school is inevitably open to use or misuse in political discussions about how schools should be. Sociological analyses may be carried out for no other purpose than theoretical enlightenment but their findings become part of the ongoing 'Great Debate' and may be used in ways quite contrary to the intentions of their originators. This thesis is an account of how conflict between opposing ideologies within a school brings about organizational change; it is probable that my work itself will become part of the subject matter of ongoing debate both

within the school and in the wider educational sphere. Unintended consequences of this kind must be taken into account in the presentation of research of this peculiarly intimate variety. I have tried to do this here by preserving as much confidentiality and anonymity as possible so that any criticism of the school or persons within it that arises from this study will not directly affect those concerned. I have given the school and the persons within it pseudonyms to provide something of a protective barrier.

When I first approached the school I gave the Principal a promise that I would not publish anything without his approval. This pledge has not, however, seriously inhibited my work as I have always had an excellent relationship with members of staff at the school and I have been committed towards the aim of allowing them to include their own comments and criticisms in any final published form of my study. I was first able to test the reaction to my work in the first term of the 1974-5 school year when I circulated a series of drafts of the article I was to have published based on a conference paper I had given in September 1974 (Hannan 1975). No objections were raised to my use of records of discussions in staff meetings which were concerned with problems facing the school and no objections were raised to any of the arguments I based on such data. Indeed, I had difficulty persuading the Principal that it would be better at this stage if I kept the identity of the school disguised.

In writing this thesis I have freely quoted from staff meetings and lessons and all contexts where discussion was fairly public and open. Where what has been said was of a more

confidential or restricted nature I have taken care not to reveal the identity of the source when I have used such data in my analysis. Such precautions are still necessary despite the fact that all the names in this thesis are fictional as the staff within the school can nonetheless easily identify one another and I am obliged to protect the sources of some of my information. This applies particularly to the questionnaires and interviews. Here I pledged absolute confidentiality, promising to seek permission for the use of any quotations which could be traced to their source. For an early draft of one of the chapters of this work I went back to the school to seek permission for the use of quotations taken from interviews. The process of consultation was so protracted that I resolved in future to present such data in an anonymous form. Thus, whilst staff are identified by pseudonyms when data from meetings are used, when interview and questionnaire data are presented staff are identified by numbers⁽¹⁾ only. This device has its disadvantages since the reader is not directly able to compare data on individual staff derived from the two types of context. The researcher, however, has been able to do this and has presented conclusions which are based on analysis of all the available information. In some cases even the numbering device proves an insufficient protection of the source's identity since the information itself by its own content reveals its source; such data has had to be excluded.

These devices may sound a little over-elaborate, but to ignore the constraints imposed by confidentiality would be to

1. For example, (33).

destroy the trust on which much of this research has been based. If I were to do this, any sort of publication of my findings would probably be prevented.

6. Conclusion

This research then is a case study based on participant observation which focuses mainly on the world of the staff. As a case study the research is inevitably limited in its scope, but benefits from the opportunity to pursue an in-depth analysis of a single/school rather than covering merely surface features of a number of schools. This may be contrasted with the approach of King (1973) who attempted to break away from the limitations of a case study approach by conducting a survey of seventy two secondary schools in order to find answers to the following questions:

How do secondary schools organize the behaviour and learning activities of their pupils? What are the differences in organization between types of school, and how may they be explained?... To what extent and in what ways are pupils involved in the school? What differences exist in the levels and types of involvement of pupils of different ages, sex, ability and social background, and how may they be explained?... To what extent and in what ways is the pupils' involvement in the school related to the internal organization of the school? (p.1-3).

The answers were based upon two surveys; one of schools, the other of pupils. The school survey proceeded by way of a content analysis of school documents, a self completed questionnaire for headteachers, very brief (normally one morning only) observations in each school, and interviews with headteachers and some other staff. The pupil survey consisted of a questionnaire with fifty five statements with which they were asked to agree or disagree and other questions on matters such as membership of school clubs

thought to indicate the pupils' degree of involvement in the school. The research was informed by a largely systems type approach with some use being made of Bernstein's notions of the schools' instrumental and expressive orders. The whole project is a valuable contribution to the sociology of the school in as much as it offers a research strategy as an alternative to the case study approach. However, although in some ways the field of research is widened, in others it is narrowed. Survey techniques inevitably come up against the problems involved with taking only surface views of the nature of schools since the resources which would be necessary to analyse each school in depth are simply not available. Thus the headmasters' definitions of the organizational make-up of their schools are taken for granted as accurate accounts of the schools as they actually were, rather than as official descriptions of the schools as they were supposed to be. Half-day observations could hardly provide an adequate basis for analyzing official descriptions as ideologies. The 'snap-shot' taken of each school is inevitably a static picture, survey research of this kind makes the processes of organizational change and ideological conflict inaccessible to the researcher. The reliance on questionnaires and statements abstracted from the context of the ongoing world of the school produces a somewhat disconnected and artificial account of the school organizations.

Thus, the findings of this research are supported by data derived from one school. They may or may not be applicable to other schools, but research of this kind has produced grounded theory which can be employed in other instances to gauge its

general applicability. Similarly it has attempted to employ theoretical ideas derived from other studies to test their applicability in this instance. Case studies of this kind also serve as tests of different research techniques. The findings of this study of one particular school may be more easily applied by others to the study of other schools which are in themselves particular instances than would the findings of survey type research which produces generalizations about the average. It might also be argued that the school studied here represents a key case since it may be one of the most advanced examples of a developing trend in school organization. This trend may exist, only research into other instances can demonstrate whether or not it does so. As participant observation the research is limited in the degree to which the process of analysis is accessible to those who have not shared the observer's experience. I have attempted to mitigate this here by making these 'subjective' processes available to the reader so that he may check my own interpretations against the data I have collected. The choice of the staff for the main observational focus has its disadvantages, neglecting as it does much of the world of the 1500 students, but it does have advantages in offering a perspective on organizational change which could not be achieved in any other way. Once again it is the subject matter of the research which has determined the methodology employed.

The next step in this account is to describe the origins of the school and the nature of its organization.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SCHOOL.

The Redmond College has a long and very distinguished history which can be traced back as far as the thirteenth century. In 1969 the school was established on a new site rather nearer Leicester than had previously been the case. The change of sites was accompanied by a change of name, a change of intake and a change of function. On the old site the school had been a small rural grammar school with 400 pupils aged 11 - 18. The catchment area of the Redmond College was the last in the county of Leicester to be reorganized into the comprehensive two-tier system, with Redmond as the upper school taking 14 - 18 year old students from four contributory high schools taking 11 - 14 year olds. The Redmond College was the first Leicestershire upper school to be planned as such from scratch.

This planning process was begun in 1965 with the appointment of John Dent as headmaster of the old grammar school. From 1965 to 1969 John Dent instituted a number of organizational changes in the grammar school in preparation for the transfer to the new site. He set up three committees, to which all staff were invited, to plan the new school. The committees had these titles; 'Social Organization', 'Academic Organization' and 'Sixth Form'. The staff of the old grammar school were given a considerable degree of choice in deciding the internal organization of the new upper school. The headmaster had deliberately set up a framework which would encourage collective decision-

making. In a chapter entitled 'Planning Together' in School for the Community Dent sums up his own part in the process and its general value as a method:

Not once did I find it necessary to veto any proposal. Inevitably there were suggestions with which I disagreed, but almost always my disagreement found expression through others. Clearly it was important that several of us should serve on all three committees so that links between them could be kept, especially in the many areas where their interests overlapped. Equally it was useful, if I was to act as a final arbiter, that I should spare my colleagues from the possibility of going off in unacceptable directions. Even if I had been, by temperament and intellect, a master-minder with a committed view, it would have been quite impossible, without at least a sabbatical year, to devise a plan as detailed and comprehensive as that reached through the services of all my colleagues. But there was another advantage of the committee method which was hardly less considerable. By working closely in such circumstances we learnt to trust one another's judgements, to know one another more fully both as people and professional colleagues, and thus to share in the process of self-education which prepared us more fully than could otherwise have been achieved for the challenge of our shared future. Valuable as I believe our conclusions have been, our method of reaching them was in itself valuable. (p.42).

The new school which opened in 1969 had a new fourth year intake from the high schools as well as the remaining 12 - 18 year olds from the old grammar school. The position as regards the staff turnover in the transfer is given in another extract from Dent's account:

In the event we only lost one member of staff in the transfer. Of the twenty-one I had inherited from my predecessor five years earlier two had died, two had moved with their husbands and two had left for promotion. The other fifteen, together with nine of my appointments (we had been allowed the increase in anticipation of our move), came with us from the old school. (p.43).

By 1973, out of the twenty-four who had transferred, fourteen remained at the school. Three of these left at the end of the school year 1973-4. The number of full-time students at Redmond

increased quite dramatically over the first five years as is indicated by the figures given below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Students on Roll.</u>
1969	600
1970	860
1971	920
1972	1200
1973	1500

The intake for 1973-4 was 579 students, a number almost as great as the original size of the school.

Redmond's catchment area was very widely spread and included large tracts of heavily farmed countryside as well as several suburban and coal mining villages, along with a large council estate on the outskirts of Leicester. The school was situated on the edges of a village surrounded by farming land, winding lanes and occasional mines and small factories. There was no public transport to this site apart from a very infrequent and expensive privately run coach service. Students were taken to and from the school every day by an enormous fleet of coaches hired by the local authority. They were provided with a limited bus service if they wished to stay after school on a Monday, otherwise they had to walk home or rely on lifts. The result of such isolation was a rush for the buses at the end of most school days. The lack of public transport also made the use of the community college facilities less easy for those without cars so that most of the adult college users either lived locally or owned their own form of transport.

Four high schools fed their student leavers into Redmond, but only two of these sent all of their output. One contributory high school was situated on the borders of the catchment areas of

three upper schools and sent students to all three. This led to a number of problems experienced by Redmond in trying to co-ordinate the efforts of the high schools in producing students prepared for the upper school curriculum as two of the schools had to reconcile the demands of more than one upper school. The position was further complicated by the wide differences in the way in which the high schools were organized, with one adopting quite liberal and open forms of staff-student relationships and working on integrated curricula and another relying on firmly traditional disciplinary methods and subject-based curricula. The upper school staff, who received students just two years before their important Certificate of Secondary Education (C.S.E.) and Ordinary level General Certificate of Education ('O' level G.C.E.) examinations, failed in repeated attempts to exercise control over high school curricula. There was, however, a well developed system whereby individual information about students was passed on from high school to upper school through formal and informal meetings. The Redmond timetable relied on each third year high school student making a 'guided choice' from a wide variety of subjects which would constitute 50% of his curriculum in terms of time. This system necessitated close contact between staff and the passing on of a great deal of written and verbal information about the nature of the upper school courses. Information of a pastoral nature was passed on by another set of forms and the Counsellor from Redmond spent a great deal of time, along with Division Heads, in interviewing students and administering sociometric questionnaires for the allocation of students to tutor groups on the basis of friendship choice.

In 1972 all students were transferred from the high schools to the upper schools in Leicestershire in anticipation of the raising of the school leaving age. Previously students not wishing to remain at school until they were sixteen stayed on at their high schools until they were fifteen. In the first Redmond Paper, Postscript 1973, Dent stated that this change in the intake had meant an increase in numbers in the year group somewhere in the region of 10%.

Since John Dent's appointment in 1965, then, the school had changed in a quite radical manner. A grammar school of 400 became a comprehensive upper school with community college catering for 1500 full-time students on a new site. The planning process he had set up in the old grammar school was brought into the new school and gradually evolved into a representative decision-making procedure. The three-fold organizational distinction represented by the titles of the three original planning groups, i.e., social, academic and sixth form, became built into the continuing organizational structure of the school with pastoral, curricular and sixth form parts being distinct features. The rapid growth in the size of the school had meant almost a new school every year with high proportions of new staff and new students. The change in intake brought about by the raising of the school leaving age (ROSLA) made the school fully comprehensive for the first time, i.e., after 1972 it took all those of the appropriate age from the catchment area (apart from those who went elsewhere and paid for their schooling). The full 'comprehensivization' was a gradual process over the five years of the new school's existence with the phasing out of

the old grammar school pupils and the phasing in of a full intake of high school pupils. By 1973-4 the youngest of the old grammar school students were in the sixth form and the ROSLA intake was present in both fourth and fifth forms.

The staff of Redmond College were thus well acquainted with the process of change. They were members of a school which had expanded rapidly and which had been widely publicised as innovative and forward looking. The organization of the school had to cope every year with large new intakes of staff and students and both sets of newcomers went through a process of settling in. In each interview for new staff the Principal and Heads of Faculties or Divisions reiterated the 'philosophy' of the school as expressed in School for the Community, as part of an attempt to socialize the newcomers and ensure some continuity with the ideas and plans which originally guided the school. The Redmond College of 1973-4 was, in some senses, the product of its past. The consequences of recent change lived on in the present.

The new comprehensive by 1973 had many innovative features. It had a youth centre and community college on the same site as the school. It had open plan Design and Humanities areas.⁽¹⁾ It had separate pastoral and curricular structures with Division Heads given only 50% of normal teaching loads. It had a pastoral structure based on six Divisions of 250 students each with 11 or 12 tutor groups in each Division. Each tutor group consisted of a staff tutor and student friendship groups from different years, students choosing their companions in a sociometric questionnaire administered at the four high schools. Tutor groups met every morning to take registration, with a Division assembly following

1. See Appendix A on 'The Buildings'.

on every sixth day. Tutors were responsible for co-ordinating student curricula and over-seeing behaviour, they were the student's first reference point in the pastoral care system. The official description of school policy stressed a reliance on self-discipline with minimal school rules and a rejection of the use of punishments as such. It had a student self-reporting system with student self-assessments kept confidentially between staff and students to the exclusion of parents; parents receiving verbal summaries from tutors and teachers. It had a counselling system with two full-time Counsellors⁽¹⁾ with no teaching or disciplinary responsibilities who were pledged to absolute confidentiality on information gathered from pupils. Students had the right of unhindered access to Counsellors on an individual appointment basis. On the curricular side it had a block timetable system allowing for a compulsory core of subjects (Humanities, Design, Physical Education, Drama, Mathematics and a Science) and a wide choice of about 50% of timetabled time. Subject options ranged from the fairly traditional, e.g., Geography and History, to the innovatory, e.g., Literature and Social Studies. The timetable was organized on an individual basis. The sixth and seventh years had compulsory Games and General Studies with a wide choice of subject options at different examination levels. The school offered most of its subjects at both C.S.E. and 'O' level G.C.E., mode three being preferred where available. It had a Faculty system with the following Faculties, each with a Faculty Head: Science (Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Rural Science, General Science, Environmental Science, Mathematics) Humanities (Humanities, English, Literature, Community Studies,

1. One Counsellor, Kevin Myers, left after the first term 1973-4 and Helen Taylor carried on alone for the rest of the year.

Social Studies, Sociology, History, Geography, Environmental Studies, Modern Languages); Design (2D, 3D, Design-in-the-Home, Engineering Science, Photography, Silversmithing, Woodwork, Metalwork); and, Extra Faculty (Drama, Physical Education, Commerce, Supplementary Education). It had a Humanities course for all fourth and fifth year students which included all the compulsory English and Religious Education teaching, and was taught by teams of three or four teachers with mixed ability groups using individualised and resource based methods. The two year course led to 'O' level or C.S.E. in English and/or Community Studies. It had various integrated courses intended mainly for the less able, such as Environmental Studies, Environmental Science, Rural Studies, Community Care and Plan for Living. It had a Design course based on an introductory 'circus' (with every student sampling each option) and allowing for work crossing over specialities (e.g., carpentry and sculpture) although this was rare.⁽¹⁾ The school was also innovatory in respect of its process of formulating school policies. It had a system of representative decision-making whereby the Principal exercised his decision-making power through the Curricular, Pastoral and Joint Pastoral/Curricular committees, as described in this extract from 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff' (July 1973):

1. Organization

There are two interrelated structures in the school's organization: they may broadly be distinguished as 'social' and 'academic'.

a. Social

The social unit is the tutor group (tutor and 20+ students), each within one of the six Divisions (Division Head and

1. In practice the specialisms within Design became more and more separate, even to the extent of building walls to separate specialisms within the open plan layout.

Deputy of the opposite sex). The tutors within a Division meet with their Division Head after school on alternate Tuesdays. On Thursdays of the same week the Division Heads meet together with the Principal, the two Vice Principals, the Senior Master, the Director of Studies and the two School Counsellors as the Pastoral Committee. By this means there can be two-way communication between the Division and Division Heads' meetings, and every member of staff can be informed on all 'social' matters and involved in the machinery of decision making.

b. Academic

The academic unit is the subject set with its teacher, under the overall responsibility of the Head of Department. Coordinating the work of the Departments is the responsibility of the appropriate Faculty Head, together with the Director of Studies.

There are Faculty and Department meetings for staff after school on alternate Tuesdays, in the following four groups: Humanities, Design, Science and the Extra-Faculty departments.

On the Thursday of the same week the Faculty Heads together with the Principal, the two Vice Principals, the Senior Master, the Director of Studies, the Senior Academic Tutor and a representative of the Division Heads meet as the Curricular Committee. This arrangement provides similarly for the two-way communication of information and involvement in decision making.

Clearly these two structures are related both in staffing and functions and there must be the closest coordination between them. The need for coordination can be demonstrated by the Careers Staff who, in the very nature of their work, provide an obvious link. Again the Principal and his two Vice Principals, with their overall responsibility, combine both functions.

.....
5. Staff Meetings

As outlined in 1 above there is a regular provision for members of staff to meet. A working party on decision-making (1972-3) recommended a six-weekly meeting for all staff in place of a Division meeting. This recommendation will be put to the test in the Autumn term. The meeting will make recommendations to the Principal who will consult with a Joint Meeting of the Pastoral and Curricular Committees held on Thursday of the same week.

Members of Pastoral and Curricular committees were thus able to exercise most influence on decision-making. In particular, those members who were not Heads of Faculties or Divisions (the 'hierarchy')⁽¹⁾ had no responsibility to represent opinions other than their own.

1. The notion of 'the hierarchy' was current among the staff in general, but was most often commented on by the younger members of the Humanities course teams.

The system was thus oligarchic with an element of representative democracy. Parallel to this decision-making process was the School Council which was supposed to be the prime arena for the voicing of student interests and was given decision-making power by virtue of the presence of the Principal. A 'democratic' type of decision-making process also existed in the community college with an elected College Council representing community college and youth centre users, served by community and youth tutors.⁽¹⁾

These 'innovations' however, were somewhat balanced by more traditional features such as the teaching of all subjects except Humanities (and occasionally Design) by single teachers in enclosed classrooms, by the preservation of single subject courses for 'O' Level candidates, by the separation of 'O' level and C.S.E. candidates in most subjects and by the separation of sixth formers in their own social area. In terms of the curriculum the apparent lack of formal differentiation of students afforded by a wide range of subject choice and individual timetabling was something of an illusion. The degree of differentiation may have been low, but it was by no means negligible. Redmond was an upper school and as such geared its courses to the examination system and the imminence of the student leaving full-time education. The high school staff were well aware of this when helping their students to make a 'guided choice' of Redmond's courses. The fourth and fifth year courses may be divided into three categories: 1) 'O' level G.C.E., C.S.E. and non-exams; 2) C.S.E. and non-exam; and

1. See also Appendix B on plans for major long term innovations integrating school, community college and youth centre.

3) non-exam only. Plan for Living, Community Care and Physical Education were the only courses in category 3 (although Community Care did include some provision for a possible C.S.E. combined with work from Humanities). Literature, Social Studies, General Science and Environmental Science, Rural Studies, Drama, Short-hand and Typewriting, P.E. and Games, and Design (including 2D, 3D, Home Economics and Engineering Science) may all be placed in category 2. Every other course was in category 1, a mixture of non-exam, C.S.E. and 'O' level. It is significant here that of the five compulsory subjects,⁽¹⁾ only Humanities and Mathematics could lead to 'O' level. By the end of term four in a six term course all students were committed to either 'O' level or C.S.E. or non-exam courses. For all but one course the choice was made by the end of the fourth year. It was school policy not to allow 'double entries', i.e., students entering for both C.S.E. and 'O' level. Given a block timetable, all Departments had the opportunity to separate 'O' level and C.S.E. sets, at least in the fifth year. Of the subjects in category 1, only Humanities was committed to a mixed ability approach, keeping 'O' level and C.S.E. and non-exam students together.

It can be seen from the above analysis that there was within the curriculum a certain degree of separation of non-exam, C.S.E. and 'O' level candidates. Some students might have been doing 'O' levels in some category 1 courses and C.S.E.s in others, but equally some students might very early in their school careers have been doing all C.S.E.s and non-exam work. Of the category

1. In addition to the five compulsory core subjects (making up 50% of their timetable) the students had to choose a Science course ranging from 'O' levels such as Physics and Chemistry to C.S.E. only courses such as Rural Science or Environmental Science (making up 10% of their timetable).

1 courses only Humanities had mixed ability grouping built into the system, with a common course leading to the different qualifications. The degree of separation of 'O' level and C.S.E. candidates in the curriculum of the school reflected the demands of the separate examination systems and their different syllabuses. The result within the school was a differentiation of students on the grounds of academic ability in terms of 'O' level and C.S.E. sets and subjects. The 'O' level - C.S.E. differentiation is important as the former generally had more status in the world outside the school, and this was reflected in the selection of those students considered as 'more able' for the 'O' level courses. This differentiation was in part a product of student choice (students might have chosen all C.S.E. options) and in part of staff selection for C.S.E. or 'O' level sets in category 1 courses. The system was defended by the Director of Studies in a paper produced for a Curricular Committee meeting at the end of the first term, 'Some Thoughts on the Option System'. The document was reproduced by the Principal in a 'Report to the Governors', prefaced with these words:

..... it so nearly reflects my own thinking that I reproduce it here as a general statement for the Governors.

The paper argued as follows:

It is important to recall the basic principles upon which the present academic structure was based. We were always against any form of imposed streaming or banding (and certainly against banding I hope I shall always be); but likewise we have never insisted on a common policy of non-streaming, believing that, since the argument for and against this will vary from subject to subject, it has been right to leave to each Faculty and Department the choice of organization. It is true that this is difficult for the very small Department, but the flexibility of the large Department makes variable solutions possible, and allows the individual

student a much greater chance of variable levels of work. Similarly, while we have from the start agreed that there is a basic desirable course for all, yet there are so many possible variations in addition to this, depending on the individual student's wishes and abilities, we have arrived at the present position where half the course is 'common core', and the other half optional, providing that within that option there is some science study. Thus we work on a 60:40 course of compulsory and optional subjects..... I have always believed that students 'stream' themselves, and must then be encouraged to work upwards if they can, and not have the band imposed like a manacle from which they cannot escape.

The degree of differentiation produced by this system of self-selection by student guided choice and setting for separate examinations was, however, much less than that which would have been produced by the 'manacle' of streaming or banding.

Despite the stress on the participation of all in decision-making made in the 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff' there was a considerable degree of differentiation of staff on the basis of salary, responsibility and power. The school could hardly be egalitarian in the sense of treating all staff equally when the local authority paid staff according to the Burnham scale which was structured as a steep pyramid with few staff paid a great deal and most relatively little.⁽¹⁾ The Principal did his best to mitigate this in the generous distribution of salary points, which were in fairly plentiful supply due to the size of the school, but moves to publicize the distribution of scale posts and points the previous year had been vetoed by the objections of a particularly insecure member of staff. The power of 'patronage', or rather the power to reward merit where merit was seen, was a significant part of the power of the Principal and of Heads of Departments, Divisions and Faculties through him.

1. The distribution of scale posts among the questionnaire respondents is given in Appendix F, Table 3, Question 17. The figures for the staff in general were not publicly available.

This power disparity was greatest in the case of probationary (first year) teachers who relied on a recommendation from the school to continue teaching, although their advocacy of various causes seemed to be little restricted in consequence. The salary structure had another significant feature in that staff received an annual increment, so that staff senior in experience were rewarded by higher salaries. Apart from higher salaries those with extra responsibilities of an administrative kind also had reduced teaching loads. The Principal had no teaching timetable, the Vice Principals taught very little (one taught French and the other Religious Knowledge). The Lady Vice Principal (June Edmond) was given the task of coordinating the Division Heads and the Vice Principal (Bob Cosnett) in effect acted as a last resort in disciplinary proceedings. Both deputies had full power to represent the Principal in committees and in his absence generally. The 'Big Three', as they were sometimes known, met regularly to review events and formulate joint positions.⁽¹⁾ They had responsibility in a general fashion for the community college and youth centre, although in practice administration here was left to specially appointed community and youth tutors. Others with greatly reduced teaching loads were the Senior Master (Frank Coulson), the Senior Academic Tutor (Lance Leach) and the Director of Studies (Peter Collins). The Senior Master had a title invented to signify the seniority of a member of staff appointed above Scale Five on the Burnham ladder. He had responsibility for the Resources Centre and the Extra Faculty. The Senior Academic Tutor had responsibility for the general

1. The 'Big Three' were also sometimes called 'The God Squad' in reference to their individual active commitments to Christianity. This religiosity contributed to the semi-religious imagery often employed in their statements about the school and its aims.

timetable and for substitutions of absent staff. The Director of Studies had responsibility for arranging individual timetables and for the sixth form curriculum (until in the third term a Sixth Form Tutor (Eric Woodrow) was appointed). These staff, along with the Big Three of Principal and Vice Principals, were commonly known as 'the hierarchy'. They met together weekly as 'The Colloquium' to formulate joint positions on issues raised and exercised considerable voting power in the formal decision-making process, i.e., Pastoral, Curricular and Joint Pastoral/Curricular committees. The weight of their arguments was felt even when things did not get as far as voting but were resolved instead by the Principal's favourite tactic of 'taking the feeling of the meeting' to avoid dissention. It was usually one of the Big Three who, as chairman, performed this function.

Redmond was, then, a mixture of open and closed school models. Despite the relatively open and representative decision-making process the degree of differentiation of staff was still quite marked, although probably less so than in most schools of comparable size and age range. The closed elements of the organization e.g., specialist subjects and sets or subjects streamed according to ability, served as the source of those staff who advocated the closed ideology. In similar fashion the open elements, e.g., the integrated mixed ability subjects, were the source of staff with an opposing open ideology. The structure of the school was thus in itself one of the sources of the conflict. The separation of pastoral and curricular structures within the school however, served to reduce the divisive effect since each Division contained staff members from all the Faculties. The separation of staff

into conflicting groups and the basis of this separation are two of the major concerns of this thesis.

The official description of the policy of the school, as set out in such documents as 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff', the 'Students' Guide', Redmond Papers and School for the Community, was firmly grounded in the ideals of Bernstein's 'open school' type. This liberal ideology stressed the importance of the individual, of choice, of the community, of treating students as young adults, and of 'caring'. These sentiments are apparent in the following extract from School for the Community:

We have some students who have not learnt to adjust to our ways, who bring with them frustrations and deep personal problems which make them a burden to themselves and a liability to others. We have some students who have not learnt to care, who are still suspicious of the care which is accorded them, and resentful of what they are determined to treat as authority. And there are some students who choose to come to us for no good reason of their own, and see school - in whatever form it may appear - as an imposition to be endured and to be cast off as soon as can be. But these are, happily, a small minority. Although they may take up a disproportionate amount of our time, they do not set the tone of our community, and we resist any immediate inclination we might feel to legislate for them.

And it is, of course, an inclination! If there is wilful damage to a piece of equipment, why not lock the classroom? (All our rooms are kept unlocked). If there is a case of bullying, why not cane the bully? If there is a recurrent nuisance of some sort, why not make a rule against it? (I have always regretted, incidentally, that we listed any rules - something which had always been avoided in the grammar school. The School Council may decide to remove them from the 'Students' Guide'). There is nothing against rules as such: a well-ordered society needs them. But, in the sort of community we are building, its members must see their need, and they must authorize them.' (p.50).

What problems, then did this school face in 1973-4, problems which were to bring the locking of classrooms, the expelling of a 'bully', and the firmer stipulation of school rules in the 'Students' Guide, despite their omission by students?

CHAPTER FIVE

PROBLEMS

The sentiments expressed in School for the Community were restated by the Principal and challenged by other staff at a meeting for probationers at half term during the first term 1973-4, although this time the idealism expressed is tempered with a touch of pragmatism:

John Dent: These are difficult times, but this is a squall not a change of climate. The school is now two and a half times its original size. This year half the students and almost half the staff are new. Giving all the major decisions to the staff means a yearly replanning. There are very big demands being made on staff and the 5.30 deadline for meetings to end has been ignored. It seems sometimes that we have an unsympathetic community. Last year there was an unhappy new phase of the city versus the county,⁽¹⁾ with attacks on Countesthorpe and Wreake Valley, which were most widely felt in the County. There will be a difficult two or three years ahead, while the new authority settles down. We are most conscious of all of the raising of the school leaving age. Lambs, that is our less academically motivated brothers and sisters, the unwilling 10%, our 150 or so unmotivated, are attracting more to their ranks. It will be a year or two before ROSLA is widely accepted, the resentment will not persist. The politicking in the new authority will take about two years to clear. The parental support expressed at the meeting at one of our high schools last night was excellent. We're building up a growing body of support and understanding in the community, thanks to the work of Divisions and you as tutors. The numbers of students will go up next year, but they should reach a plateau in 1976-7. Here are some important points:
one, we should state, re-examine, re-state the principles by which we seek to live in this community, 'whisper to our neighbours'. The example set for new students is often unhelpful.

1. The Principal refers here to the conflicts occasioned by local government reorganization which brought city and county authorities together. The city had retained a selective system and favoured a move to a comprehensive scheme with sixth form colleges rather than the county's high school - upper school set up. The local press generally supported the city's views and attacked the county's most 'progressive' schools.

two, squalls should not blow us off course, we should react but not over-react.

three, we should be a steady ship, with change only where it is fully agreed to and is seen as a definite improvement.

four, we should share the burden and stand together. We are increasingly involving the non-teaching staff in decision-making, we will hopefully eventually involve the 1500 students.

The first reaction to a setback is to blame other people. We must respect the whole staff. We don't have common staff room divisions such as senior staff versus the rest of graduates versus non-graduates or wind bags versus practitioners, and so on. We need to share our philosophy with outsiders, which is why we welcome researchers like Andy here. I am concerned with the fact that staff seem to be eating together separate from the students in an enclosed dining area, tutors could lunch with the members of their tutor groups. We can seek other opportunities for seeing people individually. We should be doing very much more here. We must show respect for the individual and help him to make important choices for himself to grow in responsibility. The individual teacher should have every opportunity to share skills and interest. We have concern for the whole person, we wish to extend to all the resources which are ours. I believe we can show the way forward to 'Peace on Earth' by Faith, Hope, and dare I say it, Love, not by violence or authoritarianism.

Stephen Vincent: There is a problem of anonymity. There are 178 students I know personally, the others give me the lip because they don't know me. I'm a bit disillusioned at the moment with the ones I don't teach.

Denise Card: There is no real respect for the teacher.

John Dent: No built-in respect as we are used to.

Denise Card: For example, I come into a class and say 'stop throwing lab stools' and expect to be obeyed.

Brian Griffiths: There is a new element, a different element, these changes in our intake demand changes on our organization, rather than consolidation.

Denise Card: Are there any plans for the unmotivated?

John Dent: These are coming as questions, should I take them as such? I don't want to give the impression that we shouldn't change. We should change not by way of experiment, but because we've thought things through. A slowing down of the rate of change would be a help in certain areas. We should perhaps change practices rather

than structures. On 'respect'. Not a teacher in the place who has not had tremendous problems with discipline in whatever school in early period, this is a common experience. We have what seems an endless process of talk here, sometimes unnecessary debate on matters that should be tradition by now, like the Christmas carol service. We should devote more of our time and effort to actions, we are failing to put into practice things we have already agreed to. On 'lambs'. I think the fact that we are spending 90% of time and effort on 10% of the customers is damaging to the other 90%. Whatever you lay on for them you'll get some rejection. The County as a whole is considerably worried. We haven't been given very helpful instructions from on high for the leavers in the Summer term. There will be an illegal solution with kids just dropping out. We shouldn't encourage this but it will happen. The problem is solving itself even now by truancy. It won't be quite so bad in the Spring and Summer as it is now. (Meeting of Probationary Staff, November 22nd.)

The probationary staff here were expressing their difficulties with students who were not involved in the school and whom they could not control. The Principal defended the status quo and the commitment to a liberal philosophy relying on 'Faith, Hope and Love' and student truancy! In private conversation with the researcher after the meeting he defended his attitude to the 'lambs' on the basis of Illich's idea (Illich 1970) that all learning should be voluntarily undertaken and that such students should be allowed opportunities for formal learning later in their lives. The staff of Redmond, however, were faced with the immediate problems they experienced in interaction with reluctant students. Thus, Stephen Vincent complained about the anonymity of the large school where he had only established contact with the students he taught and where others refused to accept his authority. Denise Card likewise identified the lack of acknowledgement from students of the teacher's authority as a teacher as one of the important problems. Brian Griffiths, who will be identified later as one of the prime advocates of the open

ideology, argued that the change in intake illustrated by these problems demanded changes in the school's structure. The Principal's defence of the school's policies was based on a restatement of the fundamental philosophy of openness mixed with a strong ingredient of evangelical phraseology, identifying the 'mission' of the school and arguing that present problems were merely transient and in part exaggerated by the inexperience of the probationers. There are echoes here of Smith and Keith's study (1971) with John Dent championing the school's 'crusade' and calling on a renewal of 'true belief' to sustain them through difficulties. Similarly the references to the staff's failure to carry out decisions already agreed on and of the feeling of exhaustion have clear parallels to the case reported by the Center for New Schools (1972). These points will be taken up later in the discussion of 'Conflicts'.

What was happening in the school which caused such consternation and dismay amongst some staff? A summary account of all the major problems discussed in the school year is given in Appendix E. The problems discussed all centred on the need to provide for those who refused to be regulated by the pastoral system and who failed to be involved in the curriculum. The students who totally rejected the school in this way were a fairly small group, most of the students being more indeterminate in their reaction, accepting some conventions, teachers and lessons and rejecting others and another minority wholeheartedly accepting the values of the school and throwing themselves into its activities. Students typical of the first category were the 'leather-jackets' led by Bri and Gez and 'The Peters' led

by Jed. Observations on these groups are presented and analysed in the following chapter on 'Students'. The 'Peters', Jed, Bri and Gez were the subject of much debate among the staff both as individual cases and as examples of students the school had failed to involve and control. The major debate on the general issue was focused on the category of the 'unmotivated'. Two weeks at the end of the first term were devoted exclusively to the discussion of the 'motivation of the unmotivated'; the normal business of the Division, Faculty, Pastoral and Curricular committee meetings being left on one side (see Appendix E). The following extracts from those meetings illustrate the range of definitions of the problem, from those stressing its individual and indeterminate nature to those emphasising the identifiable group nature of the phenomenon:

Sam Coleman: We have seen kids for whom school is a completely irrelevant experience. It's just that someone puts them on the bus each morning. For many kids school is meaningless, boring and beyond them...

Chris Bishop: It is a mistake to set up a category of 'unmotivated'. One can diagnose the less able to a certain extent, but all start with some motivation. It varies between subjects and at different times during the week and even the lesson. Putting every seemingly unmotivated student together would not meet their needs or help the remedials.....

Roger Millstone: There is a need for an attempt to be made to identify the unmotivated, the numbers in each particular subject, to find which of these individuals are common problems.....

Julie Greaves: We conducted an exercise to identify those in the fourth and fifth years in our Division and came up with 15 in the fourth year and 20 in the fifth year, which would give approximately one seventh of the school as a whole.....

The raising of the school leaving age (ROSLA) was widely blamed for changing the character of the intake, not only in bringing

10% who would have otherwise remained at their high schools but in changing the full intake from those who chose to go to an upper school for two years to those who had no choice. The Principal frequently remarked on this change from a voluntary to a conscription basis. The removal of the contract of a two year commitment certainly seemed to undermine the feeling that the community of the school was indeed a like-minded body of persons committed to the same ends. The misbehaviour by some students which most clearly expressed their rejection of the school was the widespread vandalism and the 'skiving' from lessons. Evidence for lack of involvement in the curriculum is given by these extracts from a document circulated amongst all staff in connection with the G.S.M. (1) motion that 'action should be taken to motivate the unmotivated.'

1. The rigid structure of the timetable. Should it not be possible for otherwise 'unmotivated' students who do become genuinely interested in some non-timetable activity, e.g., playing chess, helping in the Youth Wing, repairing apparatus in the Science Department, preparing food to be sold at lunch time, to be able to follow these activities during lesson time?

2. Do we all find it much easier to sustain the interest of an 'unmotivated' student for a single rather than a double period? If so, are our lessons too long? Is it really impossible to alter the timing of the school day?

3. Is it right that so many of the subjects should be examination orientated that the 'unmotivated' students find difficulty in making subject choices? The situation will be made worse next year with the loss of Environmental Science.

4. Should we not try to provide facilities for these students to spend time on the activities which they really enjoy, e.g., stripping down old cars, washing machines, etc..? This could perhaps include improving the environment by painting corridors, etc...

1. General Staff Meeting. This motion was first put forward at the G.S.M. on 27th November 1973. See Appendix E.

5. Are we justified in our desire to keep our courses non-vocational?

6. Do we as a staff share sufficiently often our feelings of frustration, even despair, when faced yet again with a class for a double period knowing that half of them will not even have brought a pen to work with?

7. The present situation in the fifth year where a considerable number of students are entered for two or three examinations or none at all. Is this satisfactory? How do we keep these involved for the rest of their time here?

8. Is it not possible for more money to be given to the subjects such as Social Studies which attract the 'unmotivated' students?

This paper talks of 'frustration and even despair' and carries out a fairly comprehensive attack on the provision made for those who were not interested in the sorts of activities available for them in the formal curriculum, the 'unmotivated'. Points 3 and 7 seem in conflict over the use of exams as 'motivators' but elsewhere a fairly consistent argument is made for more flexibility in the timetable and for a less academic and more practical and vocational curriculum. The curricular focus of this paper is worthy of comment since it was put forward as a discussion document by one of the Divisions. One of the most troublesome features of the problem of the unmotivated was that it transcended the pastoral-curricular separation in the formal organization of the school. Indeed, one of the arguments put forward in the third term by some 'open ideologists' was that the problem would disappear with the abolition of this boundary between organizational categories.

Despite Chris Bishop's dislike of the labelling of 'unmotivated'

students as such, the category was sufficiently easily identifiable and enough students were identified in common by staff for the term to serve as the focus for a series of discussions throughout the year. The following chapter focuses on the students commonly identified as the unmotivated, i.e., those whom the school failed to involve or control.

CHAPTER SIX

STUDENTS

The primary focus of this study is on the staff of Redmond College and their response to problems which arose during the course of the school year. The decision-making process provided an arena for staff to describe and discuss problems with students and to propose solutions which sometimes involved changes in official school policy. The researcher was thus able to view the whole school, including the students, through the perspectives of staff by observing and recording such meetings. However, this was not the only source of information on students available to the researcher. In order to provide a balance to the definition of events given by staff the researcher attached himself to various groups of students. This was achieved in a variety of ways.

1. The unmotivated.

The most regular source of contact with students was gained via attendance every morning at the assembly of Ronald Keegan's tutor group. This group was chosen for observation because of the notoriety of its male members. It was made up as follows:

Sixth Year - Imelda Bailey (from Wylde Green High School)

Fifth Year - Janeen Williams)
Liz Holden) a friendship group
Jackie Zaslona) from Wylde Green
Lesley McKie) High School.
Beverley Allner)

	Bobby Ferguson	)	all from Gravelly Hill
	Billy Bonds	)	High School, but not a
	Frank Lampard	)	friendship group.
Fourth Year -	Honor Grantham	)	
	Dale Boyce	)	a friendship group from
	April Nancarrow	)	Wylde Green High School.
	Mary Pugh	)	
	Isobel Hanton	)	
	Susan Crisp	)	
	Peter Brush	)	
	Peter Cushley	)	a friendship group from
	Trevor Brook	)	Gravelly Hill High School.
	Peter Paddon	)	
	Pat Holland	)	
	Tommy Taylor	)	

As can be seen from the list above, the sociometric compilation of tutor groups meant that groups of friends from high schools were kept together. Normally speaking the Counsellor would contrive to balance a 'difficult' group of boys with a more 'academic' group within a tutor group, but this one was an exception with all the male members having poor reputations from their high schools. Gravelly Hill High School contributed the largest percentage of Redmond's students and drew itself from a largely working class catchment area including a very large council estate which had re-housed some of Leicester's 'problem families'. Within this tutor group the 'difficult' boys from Gravelly Hill were somewhat balanced by the more compliant girls from Wylde Green High School which drew its intake from a largely

rural catchment area. Full details about these students with regard to behaviour and academic performance were available to the Division Head and he chose Ronald Keegan as tutor for this group because he was felt likely to be able to deal with possible difficulties.

These difficulties were not long in coming. Two of the fifth year boys were under the care of social workers and drifted in and out of trouble with authority both within and without the school. The fourth year boys quickly gained a reputation throughout the school as part of a troublesome gang and were commonly known as 'The Peters'. These lads were led by Jed,⁽¹⁾ a coloured boy who had also been at their high school, and adopted a distinctive style of clothing as a badge of their culture, i.e., baggy trousers to six inches above ankle length, braces and zipped up cardigans. Trevor Brook had at first been a member of this group but when he fell out with them he was quickly moved on to another tutor group for his own comfort and protection. Most mornings began with acts of petty vandalism, e.g., pulling down curtains, chalking on posters or pushing over stacks of chairs, which the observer had to be careful to dissociate himself from. Through regular attendance at tutor group assemblies and by casual contact during the school day the researcher was able to establish fairly close contact with these students and was frequently party to student gossip about happenings within both student and staff worlds.

The other fairly regular form of contact with students took place in lessons and in lunch and break sessions in corridors and the Youth Centre with a group of fourth and fifth year students

1. Jed had not been placed in Ronald Keegan's tutor group in an attempt to isolate him from the rest of his 'gang'.

known as the 'leather-jackets'. The use of the Youth Centre in the evenings and to a lesser extent during the day was dominated by gangs of leather-jacketed lads with their bevy of similarly attired women. One of the most popular pastimes for youths in the surrounding villages was the motor-cycle cult. The two leaders of the leather-jackets within the school were both from the most rural of the high schools, Woodend. These two lads, Bri and Gez, had come to Redmond with reputations for being violent. The researcher first became aware of the leather-jackets at a specially called Humanities staff meeting on November 13th 1973:

Chris Bishop (Head of Humanities) chaired the meeting. He raised the matter of vandalism and damage and how the 'leather-jackets' dominated the Humanities area during break times. They bullied passers-by and made life difficult for people trying to move through. Chris advocated that the Humanities staff see that area as 'their area', and that they should spend their break times drinking coffee and marking books in this area. He said, 'We're insulted by them if we are just moving through on our own, they think they have control of the place.'

First hand evidence of student culture was recorded in these field notes taken on 6th December, 1973:

In the lunch break I went to the Youth Centre and saw some of Jed's group who said hello. I then went to the Humanities area. When I arrived I found crowds around the Supplementary Education classroom - I walked on. Arthur Moore asked me if there was a fight up the corridor, I said no, though there were lots of people. I went back to the Supplementary Education room when Arthur and Joseph Wood (both members of staff) burst on the scene telling people to move on. Apparently there was a fight between two girls, or so I was told by one of Ronald Keegan's tutor group, Peter Paddon, and some of his mates. He was with Jed and Pat Holland. I said hello to leather-jacket leader, Bri, who returned my greeting. I walked into the big Humanities room at the end of the corridor. Suddenly lots of students rushed in and closed the door, 'Joe Wood's coming!' they shouted. Harold Terry (Head of Division Five) and Arthur Moore came in and talked to male and female students. I sat there and was asked by one boy

if I had a light. I asked a fourth year girl if things were normally like this at lunch breaks. She said no, it was a fight between two girls of two different gangs, there was a 'war' between them. When I asked her why they weren't in the Youth Centre she explained that this was a fight over who the Humanities area belonged to. She asked me if I was a teacher, I said I wanted the students' point of view. She thought my report would be unfavourable to the school. I went outside again to find that the fight had re-erupted in my absence. Joseph and Arthur tried to disperse the groups gathering in the corridor. Joseph beat one boy's head against the wall, the boy had a self-satisfied smirk on his face. Joseph told a girl to shut up, another girl asked why she should and Joseph said because he said so and he was a member of staff. Arthur talked to a group of girls. I stood shoulder to shoulder with some of the lads, the teachers saw me, but made no acknowledgement.

It became apparent after a while that the leather-jackets and Jed's group kept apart in different areas of the school except in occasional clashes like that outlined above. Any fights were mostly between minor members of the groups until a major confrontation between Jed and Bri in a Humanities lesson on December 5th 1973. This fight seemed to settle the 'cock of the school' for the rest of the year, Jed was led away with a bleeding nose and Bri was left to wash his bloodied fist. The clash between these major protagonists was followed by a similarly violent confrontation between their respective girlfriends back in the classroom. More information on the world of the leather-jackets was gained through somewhat unorthodox 'classroom observation', as these extracts from field notes illustrate:

Humanities lesson November 29th 1973.

I ventured over to sit next to Bri. He only spoke to me when I spoke to him. I asked him if he ever found anything worth doing, he said he'd done all his work, referring to his short-lived project on motor bikes. He said he hated school. I asked him whether he would have left at fifteen given the chance, he said he would. Three girls were sitting with Bri, one of whom wore a leather jacket. We talked about the Hell's Angels, how he wanted to be a member, how they didn't cause trouble

but 'saw to' greasers who caused a fight in a coffee bar, getting them a bad name. I asked him how he could join, he said, just hanging around. 'Any girls?' I asked. He laughed and said, 'a few, you know'. He chatted up the girls nearby, obviously they were captivated by him. The leather-jacketed girl was part of the Handsworth gang, he was from Hay Mills. He asked me about where I lived, he thought he'd seen me in Hay Mills. I told him about my motor bikes and swopped stories about Hell's Angels, pop concerts and the Rolling Stones. I agreed to lend him a Jimi Hendrix L.P. I had. He talked about 'boneheads' he and his friends disliked, but couldn't point any out. The conversation was hard to keep going, I eventually went back to the staff room before the end of the lesson without saying farewell.

When I returned to the staff room I was eagerly questioned by Alan Bligh and Jill Norton on what happened. I told them a rough outline. Alan asked for suggestions for topics for him in Humanities Jill told me how she was physically frightened of him, how he had beaten up a lot of kids and threatened people. He was easy to talk to, but nothing else. She had no faith in his humanity. I commented on his apparent attractiveness to girls - she agreed, dwelling on his beautiful eyes, very sexy, etc. She had more faith in Gez who was more human.

Humanities lesson November 30th 1973.

Bri and Gez and a friend I'd seen them with before returned to the classroom after a brief disappearance. It was then that they started talking to me a bit more They asked if I was from Barlow. I said no and they said they thought they'd seen me on a bike in Barlow. Gez seemed particularly convinced of this. Bri started to go out again and suggested having a fag. They tried to persuade me to go with them. I at first resisted, but they persisted and I left rather self-consciously. Jill Norton walked along the corridors with us. She knew where we were going but made only a mocking attempt at questioning. In the lavs at the bottom of the stairs they showed me a fag filled w.c. and asked if I had a light. I said no and had a piss. One of them suggested using the light from the jam-rag machine next door. Gez had meanwhile got a light from a girl in the corridor..... I heard Bri talking about the Vice Principal, I asked if he was the hatchet man - he said, 'yea, do you know him?' I said I did. 'Do you like him?' I replied that he had his good side I left the loo as they began lighting up fags saying that I was 'buggering off'. They gave me friendly farewells.

In addition to getting to know Jed's friends and the leather-jackets the researcher also made contact with several of the more academic of the sixth and seventh years and with all the students

who were withdrawn from lessons regularly for Supplementary Education. Such a list of contacts is by no means exhaustive but it was supplemented by one-off attendances at about twenty tutor groups and at most of the range of fourth and fifth year lessons. The extracts from field notes given above are by no means representative of the normal range of activities that went on in Redmond's school day. To take them as such would be to grossly distort the picture. What has been presented here is some first hand information on the types of students who were to cause the major problems to the staff, these were the students whom the school failed to attach and to regulate.

In what ways, then, might the formation of such student sub-cultures be related to the formal organization of the school?

2. Differentiation.

One of the features of the 'philosophy' of the school as outlined in such official publications as the 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff' and School for the Community had originally been titled 'Planning for the Individual'. The emphasis on the individual was expressed again in the 'individual timetables' which allowed a wide range of student choice and made it unlikely that a student would move through the lessons of a school day with the same companions. Redmond thus avoided some of the extremes of differentiation in the formal organization of the school which prevailed in Lumley Secondary Modern (Hargreaves 1967) or Hightown Grammar (Lacey 1970). A lesser degree of differentiation, however, did prevail due to the system of separating 'O' level and C.S.E. sets and the use of certain

subjects (such as Social Studies and Environmental Science) as 'sinks' for the less able who were 'guided' in their choice of subjects. This differentiation by subject choice and examination separation did, however, allow considerable flexibility in that some students mixed 'O' level and C.S.E. and non-exam courses in their timetables (see the discussion on the curriculum in Chapter Four, 'The School'). This avoidance of streaming and the adoption of the individual rather than the class as the basis for timetabling might be thought to reduce the possibility that sub-culture polarisation would develop among students on the lines described by Hargreaves and Lacey. However, several aspects of Redmond's organization made such a process more likely.

Redmond took students from high schools at the age of 14, an age when, following Willis (1977) as well as Hargreaves and Lacey, they would already have developed sub-cultures committed or opposed to the values of the school. The 1973-4 intake of 579 students amounted to over a third of the total population of the school. Thus, whatever integrative effect the formal organization of Redmond had on students it was likely to be negated by the sheer size of the new intake already differentiated and polarized into their relative sub-cultures. Redmond kept a majority of its students for only two years and could do little to counteract any social processes already under way in the contributive high schools. The friendship groups which had already formed in the high schools were deliberately preserved by the pastoral system at Redmond which tried to soften the disruptive effects of transfer by allowing high school students

to select their tutor group companions through sociometric questionnaires. The formal process by which such friendship groups were broken up in the individual timetables was balanced by an informal process of regrouping by those adopting an anti-school stance. Thus, if they could not meet in the classroom they schemed to meet outside it in the lavatories, on the fields or outside school altogether. In an attempt to trace the interaction of a group of fourth year anti-school 'lads' (to use the term employed by Willis 1976, 1977) the fourth year lads from Ronald Keegan's tutor group were followed through their individual timetables. The official timetables, however, proved little use as guides to the whereabouts of this group over the school day. Although officially they were separated into various subject sets they were to be found either in the same classroom or in one of those areas at the periphery of the teachers' surveillance described above. Where friendship groups were legitimately present in a class they were often used as the basic element of the pedagogic relationship. This was particularly true of subjects which relied on so called 'individualised methods' with worksheets, discussions and projects such as Environmental Science, Humanities and Design. Thus, as the Head of Humanities remarked at one Faculty meeting:

Chris Bishop: I've often noticed how the group a student sits with influences his reaction to the material we offer far more than we do. We need to build this group basis into our philosophy, it's the friendship group not the individual which is our basic unit. Perhaps we could exploit this as it fits into many work place environments these kids will find themselves in, particularly in factories.

Observation of the more informal or open of the lessons supported this conclusion which has also been remarked on by Adelman and

Walker (1974). In addition, the status of student sub-cultures was often legitimised in the curriculum itself, with projects on 'pop' songs in Music, on 'The Osmonds' and the Mormonism in Humanities and on motor bikes in Design, Humanities and Science.⁽¹⁾ Reservations expressed over introducing a new course for 1974-5 in Mass Communications linking Design and Humanities included complaints that the students were being left nothing of their own.

Thus the relatively undifferentiated nature of the formal curriculum at Redmond had not prevented the development of friendship groups among the students. The degree of polarisation of pupil sub-cultures was easily demonstrated by observation of one fourth year Humanities team which contained the extremes of the sub-cultural continuum, i.e., a group of hard working and conscientious girls who complained to their teachers about an excess of noise and distractions and a group of 'lads' who spent much of the lessons either provoking the teachers or roaming the corridors and lavatories. Here the free choice of seating arrangements separated in a very visible fashion those who were committed to pursuing the work offered to them by their teachers and those whose major concern was to make time pass and to have a 'larf'.

How, then, did the staff attempt to deal with the unmotivated in the day-to-day running of the school?

1. This would seem to fit with the arguments of Willis as quoted in the 'Review' Chapter (Willis 1977 p.84).

3. Attempts at attachment and regulation.

The Humanities staff had adopted a special strategy in an attempt to cope with the 'leather-jackets', as is described in this extract from field notes taken on November 22nd:

I returned to the staff room, where I met Alan Bligh who asked me what I thought of the lesson. I talked of the two leather-jacketed boys (Bri and Gez). He told me they had expressed obvious ~~un~~interest in lessons and were being allowed to roam about in the Humanities area in the hope that they would eventually settle on something that interested them..... He told me of a time he had prepared for them a comparison of two types of motor cycle from magazines which had produced two pages of good work from Gez and one page of not so good work from Bri. They had done this at the beginning of the course when the team were trying to motivate them all. Since then he had had no response from them.

The staff were well aware that Bri and Gez were leaders of a counter school pupil sub-culture and that their leadership was based on a fear of their capacities for violence, as is evidenced by these extracts from field notes taken at a meeting to discuss these two on January 28th 1974:

Karen Ladkin stated they were now 'cocks of the school'. Bri had steadily fought his way up the hierarchy and won them all, now he was unchallenged. A group of supporters had grown around them. Bri used his violence more, he was inclined to batter people. Gez was more restrained, used his sheer size as a threat, but when he did have to implement it he was frighteningly effective..... Andrew Kite stressed that it was important to consider the whole problem of the way kids were physically threatened and beaten up. He had had an open discussion with one lad at the end of which he had told him of a protection racket in the school (pay or get beaten up) which was pretty deplorable.

This particular meeting came to no decisions other than to try and extend the sort of special provision made for Bri and Gez in Design where they were taught with seventh year groups rather than students of their own age (fourth years). The full exposure of this sub-culture did not come till the following June

when both lads were suspended and one of them expelled following the uncovering of a protection racket involving bullying and the collection of gambling debts (see Appendix E). The police were brought into the investigations and five students were prosecuted for various acts of violence and intimidation and were found guilty.

The story of the school's attempts to deal with the behaviour of the leather-jackets tells us much about the assumptions built into school policy. The first reaction of the tutors and the Division Head of Bri and Gez to the increasing list of offences was to contact the parents. Communication between the home and the school could not have been better provided for in both these cases. In general, though, the parents admitted to the same inability to control these lads as did their teachers. Bri and Gez were frequently talked to in one-to-one fashion with Governors, the Principal, Vice Principals, Division Heads, tutors, teachers and Youth Centre tutors. Many members of staff attempted to build up personal relationships with these students either in a pastoral or a curricular context in order to win them over to some degree of conformity. Many attempts were made to make special provision in the timetable for the interests of these lads, but in general they seemed uninterested in anything provided for them by the school apart from the opportunity to meet with their mates and girlfriends. When the protection racket scandal broke in June 1974, the Counsellor was put under a lot of pressure about her failure to inform the staff of the goings on in the student underworld as she was known to have had regular contact in her confidential tutorials with the victims

of the racket. Her philosophy of counselling, however, laid great stress on absolute secrecy and on the individuals concerned coming to their own solutions, e.g., deciding to inform the Principal. In any case it is evident from some of the extracts from field notes given above that the staff were aware of many of the goings on by at least February 1974. The decision to involve the police was taken with great reluctance but was agreed to by the more 'progressive' of the teachers on the grounds that the students needed to learn the facts of life, i.e., the full consequences of their actions.

The leather-jackets had proved unmanageable because they could not be accommodated within the assumptions of the school's official policy, i.e., they could not be brought to conform through parental pressure, they could not be integrated into the school through inter-personal contact and one-to-one relationships with staff, they could not be motivated to achieve in the school's terms on any curricular tasks, they could not be dealt with as individuals when their group solidarity made betrayals and informing on offenders unacceptable. The final uncovering of their illegal acts was performed by the police and the Vice Principal acting as interrogators. All the assumptions about the existence of the 'one community' with an identity of values and the possibility of appealing to everyone's true interests were severely challenged by the staff's experience with the leather-jackets. In curricular terms the failure to involve these students challenged the assumption that all students had interests and that all that was needed was for the school to tap these with a relevant curriculum based on student choice. In

this case either the school had not gone far enough in its provision of opportunities (as the 'open ideologists' among the staff argued) or the original assumption failed to take into account the possibility that the students could reject all school based activities just because they were school based. Thus, the behaviour of students such as Jed's group and the leather-jackets could be seen not as the negative rejection of school work but as the positive affirmation of a pupil counter culture. As Willis (1977) argues, these students actively chose their own failure in the school's terms in order to participate in the values of their counter culture, i.e., skiving, having a larf, toughness, masculinity, 'being able to handle yourself'.

To a certain extent the Principal in his speech to probationers quoted in the last chapter had realised the nature of some of the students' rejection of school:

Whatever you lay on for them you'll get some rejection. The Principal, however, stressed the resentment of ROSLA as the major cause of this reaction and argued that it was thus a passing phenomenon. He advocated that the problem could in part be dealt with by improving personal contacts with the students. He tried himself to make such contacts in this letter sent to each student individually:

The Redmond College.
22nd March, 1974.

Dear Student,

One of the difficulties in a large school is to keep in touch. To speak to everyone would take a week and a half of division assemblies, or thirteen weeks of tutor group meetings. Because there is an urgent and serious matter that I want to share with you, I am taking the unusual

step of writing to you like this. I wish I could address each of you by name; please take this none the less as a personal letter to you. When you have spent a few minutes reading it carefully and thinking about it, please use the other side to write a personal letter to me.

You see, for several terms now we have been like most other secondary schools in the country, living through a difficult period. There are some students here, and you may be one of them, who would not choose to be at this or any other school, and are here only because the law requires it. It is understandable that such students feel resentment; it is unfortunate that they should express that resentment in ways which damage the whole of our community, including (though they do not always appreciate this) their own futures.

Look around your tutor base, or almost anywhere in the college, and you will see evidence of damage to fittings, furniture and equipment. Many of you, I know, share my shame and distress at this damage. We live at a time of world shortages of materials, and our country is economically on the rocks. But even if money were available to repair the damage we inflict on ourselves, it would be better surely if we could spend it more constructively.

Let me put a question to you: What would you do when some students damage classrooms? Would you lock the classrooms? If one was locked, why not another? If all were locked, where would students go? In many schools the pupils are turned out on the fields in all weathers.

But the damage that we can all see is less serious than the damage we can do to one another. Schools used to be places where cops (teachers) chased robbers (students - perhaps I should say pupils), hedged them around with petty rules, and gave them lines and canings when they disobeyed. Often the teachers were supported in this by junior cops (prefects). Some schools are still like that today. At Redmond we have preferred to base our life on trust. Teachers are concerned to work with students in their learning, to share in the interest and happiness of that experience. Of the many schools I have known, not one could boast a finer, more devoted staff. But if, by playing at 'robbers' some students turn them into 'cops', the service they can give to all, the energy they can put to positive ends, will be a fraction only of what they might be.

I have no doubt that many of you who are now preparing for public examinations will do better than people in other places: our results have always been well above average, and this reflects the good teaching and good methods of learning. But I have no doubt too that results could be even better if teachers' and students' energies were not being wasted.

So far local employers have **been** ready to judge Redmond leavers on their often excellent merits. It would be a sad day, but one which could come if present trends were to continue, when to have been at Redmond would count as a blot on a student's record.

I ask you to take seriously what I have said, but do not allow yourself to be disheartened. As I have suggested, schools everywhere are suffering at this time, many of them far worse than we are. We live in a world of violence. Bit by bit, however, thoughtful people are coming to see that violence is not cured by violent means. At Redmond we have tried always to work by peaceful means. We owe it to ourselves as a community, and to many in other places who look to us for a lead, to make our ways work. One hundred staff cannot achieve this unaided, nor can twenty members of the School Council, though they have shown much concern, and deserve the support of all. Only if you take a stand for what you believe to be right, and show yourself worthy of the trust placed in you, can we succeed. Can I count on your support?

Yours sincerely,

John Dent.
Principal.

The letter can be seen as an attempt to recruit the conformists, those who valued what school could give them in the way of qualifications, etc..., to a campaign to combat vandalism. The argument about 'cops' and 'robbers' reveals the weakness of the fundamental assumption of open education, i.e., that education can be based on student choice, that it merely has to release the student's potential. This is impossible where schools are compulsory. The teachers are turned into 'cops' not by the behaviour of the 'robbers' but by their role as enforcers of compulsory schooling. It is ironic that the protection racket scandal made the 'cops' and 'robbers' analogy come into force in such a literal manner.

Chapter Five outlined the staff's definition of the problems

facing the school in 1973-4 and this chapter has explored the nature of these problems in terms of pupil sub-cultures and the students' reaction to the school's official policies and formal organization. The chapter to follow describes further the range of reactions to student misbehaviour, to perceived problems in the school, and the attempts made to change school policy and organization to solve these problems. The reactions of staff to the events of the school year are understood in terms of a theory about the nature of their ideologies and interests.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONFLICTS1. Ideologies and Interests.

The call for changes in the school's policies voiced by Brian Griffiths in the probationers' meeting in the first term became louder as the school year progressed. Various attempts were made to change official policy and the school's organizational arrangements, e.g., proposals for a Faculty based lunch-time duty system, for a 'New Course' for the unmotivated, and for the abolition of the boundary between the organizational categories of 'pastoral' and 'curricular' (see Appendix E). The problems experienced with the unmotivated prompted a process of discussion, negotiation, conflict and change. In order to understand the nature of this process and its outcome it is necessary to establish some basis for a categorisation of the positions held by staff, the arguments advanced and the changes made. This thesis constructs such a classification with reference to Bernstein's model of 'open' and 'closed' school types (see Chapter Two, 'Review' and Diagram 2). The official description of the school is taken as the reference point for a classification of ideological positions. As has been established in Chapter Four, Redmond College had both innovatory and traditional aspects, but, in general, it can be seen as more 'open' in Bernstein's sense than most secondary schools in the U.K. Arguments which supported the status quo in negotiations about school policy are here described as 'conservative'. Arguments which advocated moves towards a more open school are said to be

expressions of the 'open ideology'. Arguments which advocated moves towards a more closed school are said to be expressions of the 'closed ideology'. Consistent supporters of each position are termed 'conservatives', 'open ideologists' and 'closed ideologists', respectively. The term 'ideology' is here taken to mean a model of what the school should be like. The ideologies analysed here are not mere armchair fantasies but are expressed in political argument over the future of the school. Every member of staff had an ideology and no two teachers held exactly the same ideals about what the school should be like. The open and closed ideologies represent the extremes of a continuum with the conservative position located in the centre. The conservative position represents a mixture of open and closed ideologies since in some cases arguments for the retention of the status quo would be critical of proposals for moves in a more closed school direction.

An open ideology is one which advocates the mixing of categories, the lessening of boundaries between categories, the weakening of classification. It celebrates the individual and belittles collective ritual and tradition. A closed ideology is one which advocates the purity of categories, the increasing of boundary strength between categories, the strengthening of classification. It celebrates the school or group and favours collective ritual and tradition. The 'categories' are elements of the organization, separate parts of the structure. The 'boundaries' are the official or unofficial devices whereby categories are separated. Individual members of staff may be committed to the open ideology in some aspects and the closed

ideology in others - they may be more strongly committed to a particular ideology on some issues than others.

The moral basis of an open ideology is organic solidarity, the cult of the individual. The moral basis of the closed ideology is mechanical solidarity, the expression of a strong, centralized and traditional, authoritative morality. Punishment in the open ideology is either a redundant term or seen in terms of restitution; for the closed ideology it is seen as an important protector of the right order or as a means of repression. A direct comparison of the organization of the school and Durkheim's (1933) theory of social change is not possible. The forms of solidarity are not necessarily reflections of the degree of the specialization which prevails in the school or in any of its parts. A school with a very highly developed division of labour may be very bureaucratic and thus subject to the rule, 'things must be kept apart' - the rule of red tape. Rather the openness of the school's organization is a reflection of the degree of the integration of its parts.

Thus, in Redmond College in 1973-4 the main conflicts came over proposed solutions to the problems experienced with the unmotivated and the most troublesome students. The discussion of problems revealed a clash of ideologies, in that some staff interpreted the causes as not enough integration and autonomy for students and others blamed too much integration (of pastoral and curricular, of more and less able) and too much student autonomy (too much choice in the curriculum, too little status difference between staff and students). It is argued here that this clash of ideologies is partly a function of different aims

in education but, given the constraints of compulsory schooling and occupational selection, is principally an opposition over the appropriateness of different means. Thus the open ideology favours:-

- 1) a weak boundary between staff and students who are to be close in terms of status with no rituals like terms of address or different styles of clothing keeping them apart;
- 2) an implicit system of rules and punishments, relying on general sentiment and personal influence rather than coercive centralised authority and repressive sanctions:
- 3) a weak boundary between different curriculum contents, i.e., an integrated curriculum;
- 4) a putting together of different organizational categories such as pastoral and curricular or more and less able.

Where an open ideology would favour weak boundaries and the putting together of categories a closed ideology would favour strong boundaries and the keeping of categories apart.

It is not meant to be implied by the definitions given above that the staff were indissolubly grouped into three categories. Rather the definitions are best taken as ideal types and any arguments may then be examined to see how far they correspond to open, closed or conservative types. It is argued, however, that some staff, sharing certain features in common, supported one or other position with some consistency and commitment. The definition of open and closed ideologies and the conservative position enables us to construct a model of the discussion, negotiation, and change or persistence of school policy. In this manner organizational change and persistence are shown to

be the products of a process of political negotiation and ideological conflict in a similar manner to the model employed by Baldridge (1971) in his analysis of a university and Strauss et al (1964) in their analysis of mental asylums.

This thesis takes the analysis a stage further by examining the source of different ideologies and the positions taken in conflicts over school policy. The concept which is employed here is that of 'interest' position (see House 1976 and Minchin 1975) where it is argued that the advocacy of one or other ideology reflects the 'interests' of the member of staff in question. Thus the conservatives are shown to share interests in the stability of school policy, whilst closed ideologists and open ideologists are championing causes which would further their career interests. However, the concept of interests is not meant to indicate a shallow opportunism in the staff of Redmond but rather illustrates the peculiar nature of the teaching profession whereby the teacher who believes in a particular ideology must also invest his future in a particular career choice, e.g., single subject traditional disciplinarian or integrated code resource based pastoral worker. Other common characteristics of conservatives and of open or closed ideologists are examined through the use of questionnaire data.

The membership of the categories of open and closed ideologists was established by means of questionnaire and interview. In the questionnaire, which is reproduced in full as Appendix C, general questions were asked which sought to gauge the respondents' commitment to open or closed ideologies. The respondents were asked a series of linked questions asking for level of satisfaction

with a specific aspect of school policy and for general comments on the topic. The topics included staff-student relationships, the curriculum and the decision-making process. The comments on these three topic areas were then analysed in terms of their support for open or closed ideologies. Thus statements which advocated more open approaches, favoured open approaches or criticised closed approaches were placed in the open category. Full details of the analysis are given in Appendix F. The extremes of the opposition are illustrated by the quotations below with reference to the question on decision-making.

Closed

- (23) Too involved and too democratic, I'd like more direction from the top.

Open

- (56) The General Staff Meeting ought to be the main decision-making body - and all the other committees subservient to it. In the long run ways should be found to involve the students COMPLETELY in decision-making.

This categorisation process enabled a list to be drawn up of those staff who had consistently supported open approaches or closed approaches by taking those who appeared in only one of these categories and who appeared more than once in that category. This exercise produced the following two groups, the composition of which is stated here in name form and in Appendix F in the commentary on Table 13 in number form:

Open

Don Atherton	Ed Madeley	Jonathan Burns
Jim Robson	Vince Goodwin	Harold Terry
Brian Griffiths	Kenneth Thomas	

Closed

Barry Adkins	Roger Millstone	Bob Cosnett	Carla Peters
Adrian Crabb	Jem Wallace	Jane Doyle	Joseph Wood
Maria Hunter	Derek Woods	Andrew Kite	Dave Woodhouse

The two groups differed in some significant respects in terms of background characteristics, career positions and subject

(1) allegiances (for full details see Appendix F, Table 14):

- 1) the open group were all male;
- 2) the open group contained a much higher proportion of trained graduates ($\frac{2}{3}$ as compared to $\frac{1}{3}$);
- 3) the closed group contained a much higher proportion of teachers who were college trained ($\frac{1}{2}$ as compared to $\frac{1}{8}$);
- 4) the closed group contained less newcomers to teaching, more teachers with long experience, and a much lower proportion who were newcomers to Redmond;
- 5) the closed group contained more teachers whose fathers had manual occupations ($\frac{1}{3}$ as compared to $\frac{1}{8}$)
- (2)
- 6) the open group was, on the average, slightly younger;
- 7) over half ($\frac{7}{12}$) of the closed group as compared to one quarter of the open group received salaries on Burnham Scale Four or above;
- 8) a disproportionately large number ($\frac{5}{8}$) of the open group were from Division Five;
- 9) a disproportionately large number ($\frac{3}{4}$) of the open group were from the Humanities Faculty as contrasted with a very small proportion of the closed group ($\frac{1}{12}$);
- 10) a much higher proportion of the open group declared themselves to be members of the National Union of Teachers (N.U.T.) ($\frac{7}{8}$ as compared to $\frac{1}{6}$) - closed group members were more likely
1. It is thought inappropriate to employ more sophisticated statistical techniques than those used here as the total numbers are very small and this method keeps closest to the data.
2. $\frac{7}{8}$ below 34 in the open category as compared to $\frac{2}{3}$ below 34 in the closed category.

to be members of the Assistant Masters Association (A.M.A.)
 $(\frac{1}{3})^{(1)}$;

11) three quarters of the open group taught on a mixed ability integrated subject course whilst all the closed group taught either on a single subject course or on a course to a selected ability group.

An imaginary 'typical' open group member would thus be male, under 34 years of age, new to Redmond College, a member of the N.U.T., a university trained graduate, from a middle class home background, a teacher of a mixed ability integrated subject course, a member of the Humanities Faculty, and a member of Division Five. Similarly, an imaginary 'typical' closed group member would have over two years experience at Redmond College, would be college trained, a teacher of a single subject course or of a course taught to a selected ability group, a member of Division Two receiving a salary of Burnham Scale Four or above. Bernbaum's (1973) conclusion that open ideologists were more likely to be female and non-graduate is directly challenged by the finding in this case that the open group were all male and mostly trained graduates. Clearly Redmond had recruited well qualified male staff committed in career terms to the open ideology.

The degree of commitment of the open group members to an open ideology is demonstrated by these extracts from their answers to question 33, 'Why did you come to Redmond College?':

1. Of the open category seven were members of the N.U.T. and the other's union membership is unknown. Of the closed category two were N.U.T. members, four were members of the A.M.A., one of the National Association of Schoolmasters, (N.A.S.) three were not union members and the union membership of the other two is unknown.

(5) Redmond English seemed to be a natural development of my own teaching in which I was beginning to experiment with individual teaching - causing to learn rather than class indoctrination. Having taught in an authoritarian grammar school I wanted to experience a comprehensive school at first hand. Prevent myself getting into a rut.

(17)

- 1) Comprehensive educational ideal.
- 2) Team teaching/Humanities/Resource Centre and resource based learning.
- 3) Community college ideal - bridging generations through common activities.
- 4) Ideals of trust, humanity and care and respect for persons.
- 5) Democratic procedures = power?

(18) Looking for 1) genuine comprehensive school
 2) good integrated 'Humanities' syllabus
 3) new attitudes to discipline and pastoral work.

Heard of school via Countesthorpe.

(26) Because it struck me as one of the few schools in the country which is seriously attempting to offer equality of opportunity in an unequal society - no matter how idealistic this aim may be. It is also attempting curriculum innovation which is undreamed of in most other English comprehensive schools.

(33) No straightforward answer. I spent the year previous to my coming doing an Advanced Diploma in Education and that gave me time to rethink. I basically wanted to come to a school that had some vision and ideals which roughly coincided with mine. I wasn't disappointed - though I often feel frustrated.

(36) I knew very little about the school when I applied - I'd only heard that it had a good English Department and was working along lines which interested me, hence I applied.

(56) Generally Redmond College seemed to be working towards ideals which I considered important - informal relations with students, democracy, attractive Humanities Faculty, belief in mixed ability.

(67) I liked the philosophy behind it, flexibility of courses, and the pastoral structure.

All but one of the respondents from the open group mentioned aspects of the open nature of the official description of the school as reasons for coming, e.g.,;

- (5) individual teaching - causing to learn, rather than class indoctrination.
- (17) team teaching ... resource based learning community college ideal ideals of trust, humanity and care and respect for persons democratic procedures.
- (18) integrated ... syllabus ... new attitudes to discipline.
- (26) attempting curriculum innovation
- (33) school that had some vision and ideals.
- (56) informal relations with students, democracy..... belief in mixed ability.
- (67) philosophy behind it, flexibility of courses, ... pastoral structure.

This degree of commitment amounts to what House (1976) has described as 'advocacy'. For many of these open ideologists their advocacy involved a career choice, i.e., for a particular sort of subject (integrated code), a particular style of teaching (mixed ability, resource based, individualised), and a particular mode of staff-student relationships (egalitarian). Their special competencies as teachers reflected their ideological commitments, e.g., they were the teachers who could implement a Countesthorpe type pastoral-curricular team approach. Some open ideologists argued that what the school needed was the appointment of more staff of their persuasion to run the sort of system they advocated

Don Atherton This is an important point, the picking of staff to start with. We've got to ensure that new staff have an interest in resource based learning in pastoral-curricular teams in their interviews. They must have interests apart from their academic specialisms, we want generalists with pastoral interests rather than pure subject specialists. (Division One meeting, June 3rd, 1974).

Some of the closed ideologists, however, were wary of the 'young Turks' who wished to re-arrange the school on more open lines:

(43) I think one thing which is one problem which I haven't mentioned for a whole variety of reasons. This school, I think, could do with more older staff. I think that this would make a lot of problems easier.

The response of the closed ideologists was not always a reaction to the proposals for change put forward by the open ideologists, they made proposals of their own, e.g., for a code of conduct for staff and students and an agreed set of 'standards and punishments', which would have moved the school in a more closed direction. These issues are set out below in an analysis of staff conflicts in discussions and meetings.

The conservative stance championed by the Principal in the speech to probationers quoted in Chapter Five was partly a reaction to external pressures. As was mentioned in that speech, the threat of political reaction was thought to be particularly strong because of a full official inquiry underway at Countesthorpe and a virulent local press campaign against Countesthorpe and Wreake Valley in particular and upper schools in general. This press campaign was part of the political conflict over the joining of Leicester City and Leicestershire County authorities. The Leicester Mercury favoured the retention of the city's grammar schools or at least their conversion into sixth form colleges; both schemes implied more selection than took place in the upper schools. The paper took every opportunity to attack the upper schools as lax and left-wing. The senior staff were particularly conscious of the possibility of external criticism, especially from the press, as theirs was the responsibility for projecting the school's image in public forums. Several of 'the hierarchy', particularly the 'Big Three', were strongly committed to the ideal of 'college unification'. During the year a series of after

school meetings of working parties attempted to draw up plans for reforming the college on a 'unified' basis, with joint provision for adults and school age students. The idea was firmly linked with the open ideology philosophy of serving the community - indeed the Principal saw the college as a key instrument in creating a community. The plans eventually arrived at by 5th December 1974 were an ambitious outline of a college for the future, with the breaking down of organizational barriers separating adults and school students, Community College and school. The unified college was to have a multi-sessional day and an integrated representative decision-making structure. The Principal, however, had great difficulty in generating enthusiasm for these plans in the main body of the school staff, although a majority were passively in favour (see Appendix F, Table 3, Question 27). This grand vision of the future served to provide the Principal and his deputies with something of an escape from the immediate problems of the present. The implementation of the plans developed was seen as a long term aim with gradual rather than revolutionary change as conditions allowed. Thus in 1973-4 plans were made for increasing by three the number of across the board appointments, i.e., staff with dual community college and school responsibilities (the only staff who previously had such appointments were community or youth tutors). This, however, was the limit of implementation of the 'one college' ideal in 1973-4. The plans were greatly set back in 1974-5 by the financial cuts made in education and the realisation of the vision of one college was repeatedly delayed. Nevertheless, the college unification schemes served as a means

whereby the conservative senior staff could express their ideas for change for the fairly distant future whilst maintaining an opposition to change within the school as a separate institution in the present. Thus the Principal was able to write in a document submitted to the 5th December meeting:

Again, to speak personally, although I am uncomfortably aware of the effects upon our own community of the unwilling, unmotivated, compulsory student, it would be wrong if we allowed ourselves to be blown off course by what seems likely to prove a passing blizzard. One of the ways in which these at present disgruntled members of our community can be helped to respond more profitably is by developing more fully than we have so far achieved the opportunities of community education, by removing more effectively the barriers between the college and the community in a true spirit of sharing.

A full account of the college unification issue is given as Appendix B. Awareness of external constraints and commitment to the 'one college' ideal thus served to reinforce the conservative stance of senior staff and their resistance to plans for change in the school from either side of the ideological opposition

The presence of an ideological opposition and its basis in different groups of staff can be checked against the data derived from the interview with 27 staff where the following question put the matter directly.

12. Do you perceive any factions or well defined groups in school or college among members of staff?
- a) on what basis.

Of the 23 persons asked this question, only two rejected the suggestion entirely. 17 members of staff named subject identity in terms of Faculty or Department membership as the main basis for group affiliation. Of the 21 persons agreeing that there was some kind of division of staff into groups, 14 were unprepared to accept that they could be called anything as strong as

factions or well defined groups. Something of the range of answers is indicated by the following quotations:

(25)

Interviewer (I) Do you perceive any factions in the staff or well defined groups?

(25) Yeh.

(I) Well, what are these?

(25) Cor, that's a lousy question to ask me to answer on tape Andy!

(I) I wanted to know what you think they are.

(25) Yeh, I know. Umm, yeh. This is something I have seen increasing throughout the year actually. I think that there are increasingly Faculty divisions and breaches between them and this brings down the cooperation. But it's not just groups of friends, I mean, obviously you know that there will be groups of friends, but now I see that, see certain groups being anti other groups.

(I) And this is mainly in relation to Faculties, do you think?

(25) It goes with the Faculties, I think.

(I) How would you say it went with the Faculties, I mean what would you say was your general impression of the alignment?

(25) Well, Humanities Faculty on the whole is a very left wing body. I mean that in a sort of liberal sense. I'm not now just talking about politically. I think the political thing may be the base of it, but it contrasts very clearly with the Design Faculty and I think there is a rift that is growing between these two and an antagonism which is growing between these two.

(33)

(I) Do you think that in the staff there are any particular well defined groups or factions?

(33) Yes, I think, do you mean, yes. Yes I do think there are and I think a lot of it breaks down to sort of Faculties more than anything else. I think the Humanities group of staff tend to be fairly closely linked, so do the Design people, I think there's less obvious linking in Science than in other groups.

(I) So you think Science is more amorphous?

(33) Yes, if you look in the staff room you don't see Scientists sitting together much as you obviously see Humanities and Design people sitting together.

(I) Do you think these groups have labels?

(33) What, labels such as one group is sort of progressive, or.....

(I) Yeh.

(33) Or reactionary sort of? Yeh, I think to a certain extent that's perhaps how groups see each other. I certainly think the Humanities Faculty look upon the Scientists as being fairly, umm, backward looking in their approach. I suspect that the Science Faculty see, well a lot of the

Science Faculty see the Humanities people as pretty vague, woolly thinkers, umm, that are causing a lot of problems in the school.

(I) What about Design?

(33) Design is different, umm. Design are much more a group to themselves. Much more.

(I) They are not so clearly labelled in that way?

(33) I don't think so, no. There's a fairly active, well respected Design Department in the school, I think.

(35)

(I) Are you conscious of there being any well defined groups or more strongly, factions among staff?

(35) No, this is one of the very attractive things about this school. I think there are no factions. There are groups. The groups do good rather than harm in my opinion.... I don't know what will happen when the school develops more. I think it will stay like this because the staff on the whole get a lot more say in what goes on and therefore they don't need to make groups against other staff, and the only groups that are, they will go on, are the teaching groups, that is if you teach Design or Science or Humanities, but there is so much Division/Pastoral structure which crosses over this, General Studies in the sixth form I expect also crosses over it. Sports and so many things cross over these boundaries, I don't think these will ever become mini-schools.

(38)

(I) Are you conscious of well defined groups or factions in the staff?

(38) I don't think we really have either, though the building lends itself to it, and of course the Faculty divisions being Science, Design and so on.

(69)

(I) Do you see any well defined groups or more strongly factions in the staff?

(69) Not well defined, there's certainly sections of of opinions shown by staff meetings. Which is something which makes life so difficult because I think that sometimes if we could speak more as one, as a staff, the staff would feel happier and probably the students would too. Yes I suppose you could say there are certain groups sometimes allied with subjects, which is an identifiable group, but at the same time there is an overlap with other groups as well. It sometimes seems to me there is a Design Faculty staff, a Humanities Faculty staff and a Science Faculty staff, who are rather different, certainly in what we've discussed and we've planned on a Faculty basis. Sometimes there seems a Division grouping, people of like minds, certain ideas are from one Division rather than another one. So it's not a list as it were but a continuous spectrum, one long line.

(71)

(I) Are you conscious of well defined groups or factions in the staff?

(71) Yes, clearly so. Not a bad thing necessarily. People who work together stay together. A natural reluctance to consider other people's approach leads to misunderstanding. There was an attempt to break this down with Kevin Myers.⁽¹⁾ It's not as bad here as in other schools.

(73)

(I) Are you conscious of well defined groups or factions in the staff?

(73) Well, I thought that was going to happen at the beginning of the year. I think it's still in a major state of flux, actually. It's certainly not as comfortable a place, as secure a place for me as it used to be, because there are so many more people here, because I think that opinion has broadened and there's much more diversification in terms of the ideology that people are working at than there used to be, and, err, steps that have been taken against that happening don't seem to be successful. There does seem to be a radical core emerging in direct proportion to a reactionary core and the two things are sort of drifting further and further apart.

The divisions among staff were not then universally or uniformly perceived, but there was a significant degree of agreement that the staff could be said to fit into fairly clearly defined categories, based mainly on Faculty membership. The stereotyped images of the Faculties, the insularity of the Design Faculty, the radical leanings of the Humanities Faculty staff and the mainly right wing stance of the Science Faculty, are apparent in many of the replies, e.g., (25) and (33). One teacher, (73), predicted polarization and conflict between a radical and reactionary core, whereas two replies, (35) and (38), dismissed a view of the staff as factional or as based on well defined and conflicting groups. The Faculty stereotypes fit

1. Kevin Myers was a Counsellor who left after the first term. He ran voluntary 'encounter group' sessions to break down inter-staff barriers.

reasonably well with the picture of open and closed ideologists assembled in the questionnaire analysis with Humanities staff prominent in the open category. However, little mention is made of the Extra Faculty and its ideological make-up, perhaps because of its diverse and Departmentally distinct composition, despite the fact that a large proportion (one quarter) of the closed group members were from that Faculty (see Appendix F, Table 14).

It has been argued earlier that the senior administrative staff had interests in the preservation of the status quo and the power through their entrenched positions in committees to enforce their conservative position. Some of the interviewees touched on aspects of this with references to attitudes towards 'the establishment' or 'the hierarchy'. Thus, one of the members of 'the hierarchy' identified an attitude among some junior staff to those who occupied senior administrative posts, did little teaching and had offices on the upper level corridor above the rest of the school (See Appendix A, Diagram 5):

(1) Do you think there are any areas of conflict between groups of staff?

(28) I suppose that I would have to say that I am becoming growingly aware of an attitude of less than total happiness on the part of some who do not feel themselves belonging to it, towards what they would regard as 'the establishment'. Sometimes I've heard it called 'the corridor' which identifies it even more precisely, I suppose, but not just that. Junior members of staff seem to resent senior members of staff and the committees in which they sit and the decisions which they take. I don't know how widespread it is. One never knows this because one only hears what is said, what is said is only said by those who are strongly feeling it. I don't know how serious it is, it's something that I'm aware of.

This feeling was partly confirmed by one of the Division Heads:

(45) The hierarchy are no longer in touch with the new developments among younger staff who are actually faced with the problems of teaching and contact with students 'on the shop floor'..... The hierarchy on the pastoral and curricular committees don't represent the feelings of other staff, Division Heads and Faculty Heads do, or at least they should. The hierarchy seem cut off.

The degree of polarisation here contrasts with the optimistic claims made by the Principal in the probationers' meeting (see Chapter Five) that the staff of the school were as one community without

common staff room divisions such as senior staff versus the rest, or graduates versus non-graduates, or wind-bags versus practitioners, and so on. (November 22nd 1973).

To make the substance of the ideological and interest conflicts among staff more explicit it is necessary to look further at the opinions and arguments of staff as expressed in contexts more real in their consequences than questionnaires or interviews, the staff discussions in meetings about problems of school policy. The following section deals with some of the aspects of the staff's response to the problems outlined in previous chapters.

2. The Problem of the Unmotivated.

The main proposals about catering for or dealing with the unmotivated, i.e., those whom the school had failed to involve or control, were of three main kinds:-

- a) separation - that unmotivated students should be separated from the rest and provided with special courses,
- b) pastoral - that the pastoral organization should be strengthened so that all students should feel more involved in the school, more part of the community, and more cared for,
- c) control - that the regulation of students should be increased so as both to control and to motivate them more.

These types of proposals naturally overlapped, but are sufficiently distinguishable both analytically and historically to allow separate analysis. The accounts to follow offer an analysis

of proposals made, positions taken by staff and changes made in the school's organization.

a) Separation.

The first issue was the subject of a predictable split between those who advocated the streaming off of the unmotivated and those who supported teaching methods which relied on the presence of mixed ability groups encouraged to exercise a wide choice of subject matter. The case for separate provision for the unmotivated was most clearly expressed in the argument by the Head of Supplementary Education (Jane Doyle) for a 'New Course' designed specifically for them. Jane Doyle argued her case in these terms:⁽¹⁾

In spirit I support the principle of the Lab being used for specific remedial help, but I have morally felt compelled to receive the very large groups of remedial plus unmotivated students on the request of Division Heads, subject teachers, and School Counsellor. Many of these non-motivated students are turning up time and time again, and until we can organize a special course for these youngsters I see no real educational value to their being crammed into this small room. It is a fact that each and every student is involved in useful work - it is not a holiday camp. But there is no consistency to the work they are doing. I have to prepare countless exercises, experiments and group discussions, etc.. to make sure that everyone is usefully occupied. It would be far better if I could offer a real course.

(I propose that) a New Course be offered to at least three groups of 14 fifth years. That these students, now in the fourth, be recognized and on academic, pastoral and Counsellor advice should be offered a six period a week Course in their final year. I would describe them as non-motivated, non-academic students with behavioural problems, and or, students getting very little from the normal school working day.

The problem then of students who did not 'fit in' in normal

1. The quotation to follow is an extract from a paper submitted to the Curricular Committee.

lessons and hence were sent to the 'remedial lab' was a real one, but the response from those supporters of the open ideology who spoke against the 'New Course' was firmly against such a separation of categories. They condemned it as a 'sink', and called for the involvement of Supplementary Education staff in ordinary lessons and the planning by all Departments of provision for all abilities and aptitudes within their subjects.

The Head of Humanities reported his Faculty meeting thus:

Chris Bishop

There was a general feeling against streaming, motivation comes not just from the subject but from the peer group. Placing the unmotivated together merely leads to a decrease in motivation. Each subject area should be and must be ready to teach all abilities. What we need is not new subjects but new methods on an individual level.

The arguments on increasing or decreasing the range of student choice expressed the same ideological opposition.

Roger Millstone (Division Six report)

There was a feeling amongst my Division that we took the idea of choice rather too seriously. We should give more directives to some students, give them less opportunity to chop and change. There were problems with students wanting to change.....

Harold Terry (Division Five report)

There was a plea for more flexibility in being able to change courses around - opposite of Roger. Felt that if a student was switched on to one thing he ought to have more opportunity to pursue it.....

Jacqui Evans (Division One report)

Problem of choice, offering freedom from not freedom for. We couldn't decide whether to restrict choice or offer almost a ROSLA course, a viable option on a flexible basis There were those who wished to reorganise the school day, to allow students who were able to benefit from it to take say only two things in a day. It would require a great deal of flexibility.

After a series of conflict ridden meetings with frequent outbursts and personality clashes the 'New Course' was turned

down by the Curricular Committee. The Design Faculty went ahead with a scheme for unmotivated students to build an adventure playground for the village and Humanities set about appointing a person with special responsibility for the less able to each team of teachers. Generally speaking, though, the school did not as a result of these discussions move towards a more open or more closed model through the separation or further integration of the category of the unmotivated.

b) Pastoral.

The arguments for the strengthening of the pastoral organisation to ensure the involvement of all students were of two major kinds:

- i) those which advocated that teachers gain more knowledge of individual students, relate to them more on a personal level, get to know their families and perspectives;
- ii) those which advocated that the school should combine pastoral and curricular organisations.

No-one really objected to the first of these arguments, although those of a closed ideology persuasion who were more inclined to stress the importance of instruction in academic subjects were less likely to pursue such measures. The Principal, John Dent, had in his speech to the probationers championed these proposals for a solution on an individual and personal level and he gave them full support consistently throughout the year. As proposals they had the advantage of seeming a positive step and of leaving the school's organisation as it was. The conflict over the second argument was, however, profound. The argument for such an

integration was put with some force by Brian Griffiths, who had made the call for organizational change at that same probationers' meeting, at a Division One meeting on 3rd June 1974:

Brian Griffiths

We need to know kids better without traditional supports. The pastoral-curricular split is a 'holy cow' which was a product of the start of the comprehensives. It is a false split, an ideal we cling to in order to emphasise that we are caring for the social side. It is better to relate with people by doing things together, this relationship cannot be created out of nothing. Basing pastoral care in the teaching situation would give a better basis for fifth year careers work. A lot of people find the tutor-student relationship hard to develop, it would be easier to start on the common ground of the classroom relationship.

It is a major fault of Redmond that there is no identification with rooms or places
Doing away with the pastoral-curricular split would resolve a lot of the problems we have been talking about, including vandalism, the whole of the duties problem would vanish in the wash. We need to set up areas where people are based, and out of which students go for specific things. We could have Design members in the teams and Maths, some things we couldn't.....
There are an awful lot of points to make I'll stop there.

.....
Redmond is too big to be a viable proposition as one unit, the present split into Divisions is not strong enough.

Don Atherton

One of the chief defences of the existing tutor groups is the arbitrary nature of the choice of tutor, justified because he doesn't teach them.....

Brian Griffiths.

In my Humanities group they come to me for pastoral advice. It's not just me. Maybe its the nature of the sort of thing we are doing.

Jacqui Evans.

It's the same in English.

Alan Bligh

It is argued that teaching is basically authoritarian, hence it is necessary to divide teaching and tutoring, the tutor deals with the student in a different way. It is these sort of barriers in people's minds that we must break down. We must press the view that the teacher and the tutor should relate to the student in the same kind of way, that there is one role, that these are not different games.

Brian Griffiths

If a kid is going through a bad time it will come out in his work. You won't ever get near that purely as a tutor. The tutor comes in in real crises. As a whole in the morning meeting there is no opportunity to 'feel around'. It is more apparent in teaching.

I see this in Countesthorpe terms They should be able to spend half a week on a project if they go a bomb on it. Someone should oversee their curriculum to make sure they do things they haven't done before. Class teaching in this context becomes impossible. We must learn from the primary school and the integrated day, keep records of what they've done to tell what should be done next.

You could say about a unit or section, 'learn these when you feel like it, look you've spent two or three days on English, try Community Studies or Maths now.' Move them over, 'all those doing Maths now gather round.' This would give freedom of choice within the timetable. We could take it to the point where the students pursue their interests when they feel like it. We would need to overview the process and give it direction, keeping full records.

These arguments clearly expressed the open ideology with Brian Griffiths and Don Atherton prominent in their advocacy - both members of the 'open group' identified by the questionnaire analysis. The arguments were formulated into a proposal which was intended as a step along the way to a fully team based teaching style similar to the Countesthorpe model:

Proposal:

That Divisions should function overtly as a 'Pastoral/Curricular' team and so gain some of the 'personal contacts' benefits of a small school situation. To further this end there are two more specific proposals which reinforce one another.

a) that as far as possible, students are taught by members

of their Division 'pastoral/curricular' team for the 1974/5 academic year and future years.

Supporting points

- i) The phrase 'as far as possible' accepts the limitations there will be in applying this proposal, particularly for sixth/seventh year students, Design groups, etc...
 - ii) There will be longer periods of contact between students and staff who view them in a 'pastoral way'.
 - iii) A tutor's overall knowledge of his/her tutees will be increased because he/she will be in closer contact with some of each tutee's teachers through the Division team, who could make valuable use of the Division tutor meetings for the exchange of thoughts about students.
- b) That tutor bases be in the teaching areas of the tutors as far as possible.

Supporting points

- i) This would reinforce the identity with, and responsibility for, the rooms/areas of the college when they are related to people, (i.e., staff).
- ii) Division areas, as designated at present, are only meaningful for 20-25 minutes each day.

The objections to the proposal came mainly from the following sources:

1. those who objected to any change in organization, arguing that what was needed was consolidation (including John Dent (Principal), Bob Cosnett and June Edmond (Vice Principals));
2. those who wished for an in-depth working party report to assess its impact on mixed ability teaching and the preservation of sociometric groups before implementation (including Harold Terry, otherwise a fairly committed advocate of the open ideology).

The proposal was not endorsed by the Pastoral Committee, despite a heated argument and heavy lobbying, mainly on the strength of votes from the 'hierarchy' (the Committee members who were not Division Heads). As argued previously, this defence of the status quo was typical of the senior staff who were not Heads of Faculties or Divisions (i.e., Director of Studies, Senior Academic Tutor, Counsellor, Principal and Vice Principals). These people had bureaucratic responsibilities and wished to

minimise change in order to stabilise administration. However, the Pastoral Committee reaffirmed that it was up to Faculties to make their own arrangements on how they grouped students. This decision allowed limited Division based grouping in General Science, Biology and Humanities. This limited change did not fulfil the aims of those committed to the open ideology and the implementation of a Countesthorpe type team based model, but it did ensure that the issue would be raised again in the year to come.

c) Control

The most direct outcome of the discussions on the 'unmotivated' was an attempt both to keep a check on 'skiving' and to give students more of a feeling of being 'wanted' by a system of registration for every lesson. The closed ideologists argued for this system which was adopted in committees as school policy. Many open ideologists were won round to supporting the proposal by the argument that students needed more structure and that registration was a way of telling them they were a part of the school and needed for each lesson. The reform, however, was not a success in many Humanities and Design lessons and was only enforced in the subjects which had fixed classes and classrooms. The flexibility of options and units in Humanities and the degree of project work in Design made such a measure of rigidity difficult. The School Council had passed a motion urging the staff to apply the every lesson registration rule but this effort too met with little response where staff preferred to use all the time available for teaching or wished to maintain a liberal

atmosphere. This failure by some staff to implement a policy arrived at after considerable discussion echoes one of the findings of the Center for New Schools (1972) about staff in an innovative school who fail to fulfill jointly agreed policies which mark the retreat from their ideological position. The attempted intervention of the conformist students who made up the School Council again echoes the findings in this American study about the role such students play in attempting to shape the teachers' behaviour through making explicit their expectations. In making their call for more visible controls the students of the School Council were expressing their own interest in reducing the disruption caused by the unmotivated students such as the leather-jackets and The Peters. They had also been asked by staff to consider ways of reducing the amount of vandalism and litter. The Principal frequently exhorted the student members to fulfill their function of helping the staff solve these problems, but he was much less enamoured with their pretensions to act as a student pressure group. This was most clearly illustrated when he vetoed a decision of the student members of the School Council to exclude him from alternate meetings. The Principal's wariness about factional democracy with its implication of opposition is partly expressed in this extract from the letter confirming the veto to the School Council chairman:

What is particularly distasteful about your present proposal is that it would make the alternating meetings you suggest unlike any staff/student meetings in our school community: exclusive. By your terms, three members of our community would be excluded. But each of these three has a responsibility for every member of the community at all times and in all places on the campus. To exclude a headmaster from a meeting in his own school is, when you come to think of it, pretty preposterous! You are asking us therefore to accept a very unreasonable proposition.

(Letter dated 4th December 1973)

Again, the Principal's vision of a unified community with one set of interests is challenged by an attempt at divisive democracy.

The problem of controlling students the school had failed to involve through its pastoral and curricular structures was the specific issue addressed by an after school meeting of the Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee. Long extracts from this meeting are given as Appendix G. Here this meeting discussing 'standards and punishments' is used as an illustration of the applicability of the model of ideological and interest oppositions developed earlier. The classification is again based on the open-closed opposition but here the analysis is refined somewhat further in relation to five sub-categories. The arguments expressed are considered on the following criteria:

unstructured		whether the statement supports more or
	-	less explicit control, more formal or
structured		informal organization.

individualized		whether the statement supports more private
	-	and personalised or more public and uniform
standardized		treatment of students.

egalitarian		whether the statement supports a strengthen-
	-	ing or lessening of the boundary between the
hierarchical		categories of teacher and student.

integrated code		whether the statement supports a strengthen-
	-	ing or lessening of the boundary between the
collection code		contents of the curriculum.

low differentiation		whether the statement supports more or less
	-	mixing of different categories of students,
high differentiation		e.g., age or ability groups.

The arguments which support an unstructured, individualized, egalitarian, integrated code, low differentiation position represent an 'open' ideology. Arguments which support a structured, standardized, hierarchical, collection code, high differentiation position represent a 'closed' ideology. The open ideology advocates the mixing of categories within the organization, the closed ideology advocates the purity of categories. The position of the staff in the open-closed continuum on this issue of standards and punishments (i.e., problems of control) can be ascertained by an analysis of their arguments on the above criteria in relation to this meeting.

John Dent (J.D.)⁽¹⁾

Our system is a bit too loose to give the support some of our students really need.

Advocated the use of detention or community service as a sanction between 'talking to' and suspension. His arguments generally defended the open ideology expressed in the official description, but a plea was made here for some more standardization in the matter of sanctions.

Roger Millstone (R.M.)

We should work out what are our standards.... There is a lot more common feeling among staff than would appear on the surface, we must get down to that....

To say we won't separate these students is a luxury, possibly self-indulgent, better for us not for them ... Right at the beginning I stress I am the boss, 'you're here, you will do what I say.

Argued for strengthening of the boundary between teacher and pupil and the separation of the troublemakers. Advocated the production of more explicit common standards.

L. The initials given here are used in the chart to follow.

Eric Woodrow (E.W.)

We should create the sort of situation where the child perceives he can succeed or fail.....

I have no objection to them using my first name as long as they understand that when I give a direct instruction I expect to be obeyed.

Wanted more visible standards of academic success and failure.

Saw equality of staff and students as a misleading 'veneer', students should be aware of their duty to obey.

Helen Taylor (H.Ta)

Maybe we are not helping them to see where we are at and hence this aggression.....

Perhaps our rules need applying as in the 'Students' Guide'. They consider hidden rules to be unfair and they are angry.

Argued that the staff should make explicit their standards and rules.

Julie Greaves (J.G.)

If we don't set limits we are failing the kids, there is not anything to kick against.....

There are different reasons, there is no one answer.

Argued that sanctions could not be standardised, but advocated more explicit rules.

Chris Bishop. (C.B.)

We tend to look at ourselves as if we were in a traditional school situation. A number of factors in our school are very different ... Now there is no longer a clearly established set of formal values. What is acceptable to us is meaningless unless it is put across to the students.

Argued that Redmond was not a traditional, formal school, that it had informal, flexible values. The real problem for the staff was how to educate students into accepting their norms. Pictured

the school more as an egalitarian community, advocated less of a boundary between the categories of staff and student.

Bob Cosnett (B.C.)

I've never been ashamed of the fact that education is selling values. There have to be statements about that which we will not put up with. We are not talking about a freely consenting society in which we don't need law, a school is not like that.....

This is one of the snares of young teachers - have I the right to override his individuality?

Emphasized school as a compulsory place for students, students to be told what is right, stressed constraint rather than consent. Argued for more explicit rules, and a hierarchical staff-student relationship. Critical of open approach.

Harold Terry (H.Te.)

It worries me that sanctions often lead to a blanket approach. Perhaps it's my interpretation of what the school is, to me it's caring for individuals.....

In an individual approach sanctions are implied by the relationship built up with the student, questioning what the student does and by showing disapproval to an individual student.

Argued for the individualized, unstructured, personalised approach

The diagram which follows attempts to summarise the above analysis, showing the ideological positions of staff on this issue as related to the official description. The arguments of Chris Bishop, John Dent and Julie Greaves stand either side of the 'conservative' category outlined earlier, with Harold Terry being nearest the open ideology extreme and Roger Millstone and Bob Cosnett nearer the closed ideology extreme. This analytical exercise locating staff ideologically in relation to one issue discussed at a meeting of senior staff fits fairly well with the categorisation given by analysis of the questionnaire data. In

DIAGRAM 3. Punishments and Standards: The IdeologicalPositions of Staff.

Official description

(conservative position)

the questionnaire context Harold Terry was a consistent advocate of the open ideology, and Roger Millstone and Bob Cosnett were consistent advocates of the closed ideology. The case of Bob Cosnett, the Vice Principal, is particularly interesting since his closed ideology was expressed in discussions and in the interview and questionnaire but in the decision-making meetings, such as the Pastoral or Curricular committees, his contributions were confined to pointing out the limitations of any proposals for change, be they of the closed or open variety. This conservative stance might have been due in part to the role of chairman he was often obliged to take. However, he also had interests as a member of the administrative hierarchy in conservatism, particularly as he may have been reluctant to advance proposals for moves towards a more closed school approach because of the possibility of disrupting the unified stance the 'Big Three' (Principal, Lady Vice Principal, and Vice Principal) tried to maintain. In any case, he was widely rumoured to be looking for another post as head of a new upper school where he could implement

his own approach without the same constraints.

The outcome of the discussions on standards and punishments which went on throughout the year was some limited changes in the official statements about School rules. Most significant in this respect was a change in the 'Students' Guide.' In School for the Community John Dent had written:

I have always regretted, incidentally, that we had listed any rules - something which had always been avoided in the grammar school. The School Council may decide to remove them from the 'Students' Guide. (p.150)

The 'Students' Guide' produced by a sub-committee of the School Council for 1974-75 did not have a section on 'rules' but when this was discovered by the Principal the rules from the previous guide were reprinted and included with the following change in the introductory paragraph:

1973-74. 'Students' Guide'.

'What is the framework of behaviour within the College?'

We believe that a community such as ours, should be, as far as possible, self-controlled. Our system is such that there is a high degree of responsibility exercised by each individual. Only in this way can we do away with the petty irksome rules of school life. A few rules there must be, but the following points are given for help and guidance.....

1974-75 'Students' Guide'

RULES

From the College's beginning in 1969 there have always been a few essential rules to be observed by all. These still apply, and are reproduced here, from an earlier edition of the Students' Guide.

The 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff' showed a similar change to less open ideology rhetoric.

1973-74.

Punishments

We believe these to be unnecessary. We do demand that students do have a high standard of personal and social behaviour (note guidance given in the 'Students' Guide'). The ultimate sanction is exclusion from the community.

1974-75.

Punishments

Although we have no penal system as such, we expect of all students a high standard of personal and social behaviour. Tutors should draw students' particular attention to guidance given in the 'Students' Guide.'

The strength of statement here is clearly less forceful, reflecting something of a retreat from the liberal ideology so confidently stated in School for the Community. However in the 1974-75 version no reference was made to suspension (not even in the semi-religious terms of 'exclusion from the community') perhaps as a response to criticisms that there appeared to be nothing between 'talking to' and 'suspension' as punishments. An addition to the 1974-75 version also showed some movement towards more equal treatment of staff and students on the matter of smoking:

A sensitive area is that of staff smoking. There is a firm prohibition of students smoking during school hours, and it is unfair to smokers and non-smokers alike if staff smoke in their company.

Despite the strongly voiced arguments of those advocating a closed ideology, no moves were made towards standardising staff response to student misbehaviour apart from arranging an encounter group session on this subject for the beginning of the

following year. The fairly loose restrictions on student behaviour and the principle of individualised rather than standardised treatment of offenders were thus maintained.

The problems of lack of regulation and lack of attachment were thus the subject of conflicts between staff variously committed to open, closed or conservative approaches. The decisions made on school policy largely reaffirmed the status quo, although with some shifts towards a less liberal-progressive official description. The changes chronicled in Appendix E also showed some movement in a more closed direction, i.e., the school policy of making all rooms available for use by students during break and lunchtimes was changed to allow locking of a considerable number of rooms due to repeated vandalism. Contrary to this move in a more closed direction, i.e., taking away some of the responsibility given to students as members of the community and increasing the boundary between students and staff, a change in the duty system can be seen as the breaking down of boundaries between pastoral and curricular within the organization of the school. The previous system has been based on Divisions having a week each 'on duty' to supervise the whole school during break and lunch times. The new Faculty based system gave each Faculty responsibility for the supervision of its teaching space inside and outside of lesson times. The pastoral, in this case perhaps better described as the disciplinary, responsibility thus to some extent switched from Division to Faculty Heads (see Appendix E for a fuller account.)

In general, the failure of both open and closed ideologists to significantly change school policy was due to the weight of

contrary forces and the entrenched positions of conservative interests in the Pastoral and Curricular committees. As argued earlier, the influential conservatives were the senior staff who were not Division or Faculty Heads, and who were greatly concerned with administration and public relations with outsiders such as high school staff or parents. This group, 'the hierarchy', had bureaucratic interests in stability and were able to exercise considerable influence through the positions they held on decision-making committees. They were able to formulate joint positions on issues in the weekly meetings of 'The Colloquium' which were closed to other staff. The dynamics of the school's formulation of policy were thus essentially the product of a political struggle for control between staff who had different positions of interest (bureaucratic, professional, career and subject) and different value positions (open or closed ideologies). The outcome was the product of a process of interaction and conflict in which senior staff and Heads of Faculties and Divisions had greater power than other staff through their membership of Pastoral and Curricular committees.

3. Differentiation and Polarization.

Conflict between staff at Redmond never reached crisis proportions. The polarisation of staff positions was inhibited in part by the nature of the formal organization of the school. The conflicts between Faculties were mitigated by the contacts staff had with members of other Faculties in their Divisions.⁽¹⁾ This degree of mixing, however, was not sufficient to overcome

1. Evidence for this is contained in some of the interview data; see the answers of (35) and (69) to the question on staff factions presented earlier.

the primary subject identity of most staff who were trained first and foremost as teachers of a particular subject or range of subjects. It was apparent also that the degree of differentiation of staff in terms of seniority, salary, power and responsibility was to some extent overcome by the fairly open decision-making system, which at least gave junior staff the opportunity to voice proposals and opinions, even if it did not give them the means of ensuring their translation into school policy. There was an inherent contradiction in the school's organization in that decisions were to be taken by the Principal and the whole staff acting in unison through the decision-making process, yet the Principal and the senior staff had formal responsibilities for decision-making for which they were paid larger salaries than the Scale One and Two teachers. This contradiction was recognized by at least two of the questionnaire respondents, (8) and (10), who called for the people who were paid to take the responsibility to make the decisions. The feeling amongst some open ideologists was that without an egalitarian pay and responsibility system any claims made for the democratic nature of the decision-making process were misguided. The Principal, however, through the 'Notes for Members of Teaching Staff' made it clear that the decision-making system was never supposed to be democratic, but, rather, a device for all staff to be involved in the process which was to be a means for 'the two-way communication of information and involvement in decision-making.' The Principal tried to preserve the 'community' of the school against the risks of the divisive, factional variety of democracy. Thus the parents' organization (the P.T.A.) and the students'

representative body (The School Council) both included staff representatives. Much pressure was put on staff to attend P.T.A. meetings and the Principal vetoed a move to exclude him from alternate School Council meetings. All this was in pursuit of the Principal's aim to preserve 'one community'; an important aim in the light of potential opposition from outsiders such as the Leicester Mercury during the period of local authority reorganization. This fear of divisive democracy was also behind his reluctance to sanction the recent innovation of G.S.M.s and their system of reaching decisions by majority vote. Any vote taking in Pastoral, Curricular or Pastoral/Curricular committee meetings was seen as a defeat for his policy of rule by consensus. He favoured committees reaching decisions via the curious process of divining 'the feeling of the meeting.' Here the chairman (usually one of the Vice Principals) let discussion of any point continue until he or she could sum up the perceived consensus and ask whether anyone wished to dissent or put matters to the vote.

This urge to preserve the identification of all with 'one community' was reflected too in the lack of trade union activity. The Principal's efforts were thus successful to the extent that complaints about such things as the lunch-time duty system were made through the decision-making process rather than through the unions. Nevertheless, the non-involvement of trade unions and political parties in the conflicts among staff in 1973-4 was a little surprising in view of the commitments of some staff, notably some of those in Humanities, to political ideologies of a leftist nature. However, the executive of the school's N.U.T.

branch was still dominated by old Redmond Grammar School staff and staff seemed to prefer to make use of the school's decision-making process to raise their problems. The involvement of committed open ideologists in the school's various activities was so all consuming that they tended to give up any activism of a political party or trade union kind in which they had previously engaged.

Friendships among staff generally followed lines dictated by points of contact and these were most common within Departments and Faculties although they also took place among staff of the same Division. The curricular basis of friendship groups was most visible in the positioning of staff in the staff room when they gathered before and after school and in break and lunch times. The tendency of staff from the same Departments or Faculties to sit together was exaggerated by the Faculty based duty system which further differentiated the staff by isolating Faculties in their own areas during leisure times. The curricular force for friendship groups through close contact was greatest in the Humanities teams who had continually to meet to plan lessons and units, they frequently did so at each other's houses. The friendship shared by the 'Big Three' of Principal, Lady Vice Principal and Vice Principal was partly reinforced by their common commitment to an active form of Christianity, though each was of a different denomination. As noted previously, this active religiosity at the top partly accounted for the missionary imagery often employed about the 'community of the school', with several of the junior staff referring to the 'Big Three' as 'The God Squad'.

Thus, the degree of polarisation of staff to some extent reflected the degree of formal differentiation within the organization of the school. The conflicts which followed were never great enough to endanger the survival of the school since the direct involvement of outside agents was avoided. The model of ideologies and interests outlined earlier in this chapter serves as an adequate explanation of conflicts within Redmond in 1973-4. What conclusions then, can we draw from this study?

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION1. Findings

The major finding of this research is, then, that the conflicts which arose between staff at the Redmond College, a school combining traditional and progressive elements with a rhetoric of liberalism, in the face of problems of failure to attach and regulate certain of its students, represented a clash of open and closed ideologies. Those who consistently supported a conservative approach used arguments from the open ideology to resist moves towards a more closed school and vice versa. They also preached the virtue of stability as a necessity for proper management. Their interests were primarily administrative and bureaucratic. Those who professed and practised the most consistent support for the open ideology shared several features in common, in particular their relative youth and lack of experience, their membership of the N.U.T., and their professional commitment to teaching mixed ability, integrated subject courses. Those who supported the closed ideology were likely to be more experienced, professionally committed to single subject courses or courses designed for particular ability groups and either not union members or members of the A.M.A. rather than the N.U.T. The N.U.T. affiliation of the open ideologists is partly explained by the more militant trade union stance of that union, with its acceptance of strike action as a legitimate weapon. The closed ideologists preferred a more 'professional' stance with a general reluctance to endorse such

'unprofessional' behaviour as striking. Between the extremes of the committed open and closed ideologists, the rest of the staff shifted their allegiance from issue to issue, argued for the maintenance of the status quo or attempted to drop out of the discussions altogether. The changes in the school did not over the year represent a major shift in either a more closed or a more open direction, although it was noticeable that the sense of mission and the strength of liberal rhetoric were somewhat diminished. The Principal was defeated on several issues, e.g., the devotion of two weeks discussion to the unmotivated, the change to Faculty based lunchtime duties and the decision to close certain rooms to students in lunch and break times, but in general the conservative position he advocated triumphed over efforts to change in radical ways in both more open and more closed directions. This was partly due to the balance of forces between open and closed ideologists and partly to the powerful positions of senior staff who had mainly administrative interests and thus resisted change, taking a conservative stance.

It is not argued that the open-closed opposition will always be the basis of conflict amongst staff. Minchin (1975) has shown that, under certain conditions, other lines of conflict may develop. Thus, at Countesthorpe in the early years the staff were seemingly united in the face of external threats, although internal divisions between progressives and reactionaries were resolved by the latter either leaving the school or retreating to insulated specialist subject departments. The change in the pattern of inter-staff conflict came over the Houghton salary

award and the split between those who wanted to adopt a publicly radical stance and those who advocated the consolidation of innovations already established. The split at Countesthorpe came over a trade union matter and had the effect of revealing deep ideological differences between political radicals and child-centred progressives. Such a division was not apparent in Redmond during 1973-4, although the Houghton settlement in the following year produced similar conflicts over whether or not a strike protest was appropriate. The dominant opposition in Redmond, however, remained the open-closed division because the 'reactionaries' were still heavily entrenched in positions of power; they had not left the school nor retreated into subject specialisms as havens from battles over school policy. The two schools were also essentially different in the levels of involvement of their staff in trade union affairs. At Countesthorpe there was always a high level of activism whereas at Redmond during 1973-4, the unions did not make their existence felt on any of the problems discussed in this thesis and in general their meetings were very poorly attended. This neglect of unionism was partly a response to the philosophy of 'one community' upheld also with regard to students' and parents' organizations; opposition to the Principal and school policy was instead channelled through the decision-making process. The team teaching set up at Countesthorpe with the integration of pastoral and curricular was the goal of many of the open ideologists at Redmond, whilst many of the closed ideologists gave Countesthorpe as the example of a school which had gone too far, particularly one influential member of the Science Faculty

who had been one of the 'reactionaries' who had left Countesthorpe. To use a somewhat exotic analogy, at Redmond the February revolution was still taking place whilst at Countesthorpe the struggles of the October rising were in full swing. The staff at Redmond still employed the semi-religious vocabulary of 'community' and 'mission', whilst, if Minchin's (1975) study is anything to go by, the rhetoric at Countesthorpe was much more political in nature. Differences of these kinds need to be taken into account when analysing the process of negotiation of school policy in any one school, any simplistic transposition of dichotomies would be foolhardy. Nevertheless, the process of change Redmond was undergoing is likely to be more instructive in terms of understanding what is going on in other schools merely because Redmond encompassed oppositions more likely to be found in U.K. secondary schools; Countesthorpe is very much a special case. It is also a mistake to see change or innovation a priori as advance in a more open or progressive direction. Whereas the Open University School and Society course (1972) and the 'Open schools, open society?', 'On the curriculum' and 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' articles of Bernstein (1977) shared the same assumptions about the likelihood of moves towards more open approaches, what is increasingly apparent is the current challenge to the open ideology. This challenge is evident in the revival of the closed ideology of 'collection code' and 'visible pedagogy' in the controversy over the Department of Education and Science sponsored 'Great Debate', 'The Bennett Report' (Bennett 1976) and the William Tyndale affair. The case of Redmond College 1973-4 is

instructive as a reminder to idealistic innovators that change does not always equal more openness or progressivism. This thesis advances ^{the} sociology of educational innovation by explaining the process of advocacy and resistance in terms of ideological and political conflict rather than in terms of structural barriers (Gross et al 1971) or emotional responses (Richardson 1973).

Many of the studies of educational innovation are accounts of failure or retreat from innovative ideals, e.g., Gross et al (1971), Smith and Keith (1971) and Center for New Schools (1972). The usual path of failure or retreat is by way of inter-staff conflicts and the collapse of the collective enterprise. Although Redmond had many issues and problems which brought conflict between staff of opposing ideologies and interests the degree of polarization of staff positions was not so exaggerated as to bring about the collapse of the school or its philosophy as expressed in its policies and its official description. The sources of opposition and conflict analysed above were not in themselves sufficient to destroy the school. One of the reasons for Redmond's survival was the efficient management by the Principal and his staff of contacts with the outside world. The Governors were well catered for by the Principal and were very supportive of his policies in the difficult period the school was going through. The Lady Vice Principal made a point of getting staff to take part in the Parent Teacher Association so as to avoid its becoming a pressure group of parents by making explicit the identity of parents' and teachers' interests in the 'community' of the school. The P.T.A. was also very supportive

of the school and raised much money for its activities. Division parents meetings were also fairly frequent and consisted of seminars about the school's structure and policies. Whenever criticism of the staff reached serious proportions in these meetings parents supportive of the school, often members of the P.T.A. executive, came to their defence. Similar seminars were held by the Humanities Faculty to explain the structure and aims of their course. Frequent reporting sessions when parents came to discuss their childrens' progress with teachers and tutors gave staff fairly close and continuous contact with interested parents. In addition to meeting parents in this way tutors often went round to students' homes to discuss pastoral matters. Every year the Principal and representatives of his senior staff went on the rounds of the high schools speaking to meetings of parents of prospective students. These sorts of public relations exercises were generally successful; Redmond had still got the prestige of its grammar school origins to fall back on and was able to boast examination results consistently marginally above the average with frequent successes in Oxbridge entrance examinations. The local authority was likewise well handled by the Principal. Important in this respect was the scheme championed by John Dent for integrating school, community college and youth centre provision.⁽¹⁾ The Director of Education took particular interest in this scheme and came to one of the general meetings on 14th February 1974, appointing some of his colleagues to attend subsequent meetings of the working parties set up to try to bring together adult, youth and school students in 'one college'. This support of the local authority reflected the commitment it had

1. See Appendix B.

made to planning its future educational provision on this basis.

All these measures contributed to the fairly favourable image Redmond had in the outside world. For the conflicts within the school to have reached the point where they endangered the school's existence it would have been necessary for outside forces to penetrate the exterior boundary of the school which was publicly managed by the Principal. This happened to devastating effect at William Tyndale where the conflict was firstly inter-staff with Dolly Walker, a part-time teacher, taking her battle on into the management and encouraging organized parental opposition. None of the problems at Redmond in 1973-4 were sufficiently big to break through this internal-external boundary.

It has not been considered appropriate to attempt here to derive implications from this thesis for 'how to manage schools' or 'how to innovate in schools', apart from describing and analyzing some of the factors involved, e.g., the career and interest based nature of ideological commitments. It would in any case be misguided to produce a theory of innovation when the content and direction of the change is not specified or, as in Richardson (1973), a theory of management when the goals of management are taken for granted. What can be done is to suggest a model of organizational change abstracted from the details of the case of Redmond College 1973-4.

The process of organizational change may be represented diagrammatically as follows:

DIAGRAM 4. A Model of Organizational Change.

Thus in the case of Redmond College external factors such as the social class characteristics of students (including elements of culture), the nature of parental and employer expectations, and the policies of state and local authority all defined the context within which the staff of Redmond operated. Crucial aspects of the nature of the staff's task set for them by external requirements were the element of selection and grading required of a school dealing with prospective entrants to the labour market, and the element of supervision and control imposed on them by the requirements of compulsory schooling. In the case of Redmond both these aspects were of great importance since it catered for students in the 14-18 age range. The staff's role as the enforcers of compulsory schooling became most explicit with the raising of the school leaving age.⁽¹⁾ The students came to Redmond with expectations of schooling moulded by their various experiences in high schools, homes and peer group cultures. The staff were likewise distinguishable from one another

1. Many students were openly resentful of the fact that they had to remain at school for an extra year. Several of them had to be dragged back into school from jobs obtained before their official leaving date.

by virtue of their values and aims (including their political commitments), and their professional and career commitments. Within the school the interaction of students was to some extent structured by the nature of the formal organization, especially with regard to the degree of differentiation. Thus, there was some separation of the 'very able', 'able' and 'less able' in the various 'O' level, C.S.E. and non-exam sets which may have contributed to a polarization of attitudes pro and anti-school. However, the situation in this respect was anything but simple.

The degree of sub-cultural development evident at Redmond could variously be attributed to too much or too little differentiation. It could be argued that the open and informal nature of the Humanities and Design lessons provided just the arena needed for the counter school culture to develop, become public and attain a level of legitimacy (see Chapter Two on 'Pupil sub-cultures'). Bernstein (1977) in his 'Open schools, open society?' article makes just such an argument:

It may be that the open school with its organic modes of social integration, its personalized forms of social control, the indeterminacy of its belief and moral order (except at the level of very general values) will strengthen the adherence of the pupils to their age group as a major source of belief, relation and identity. Thus, it is possible that, as the open school moves further towards organic solidarity as its major principal of social integration, so the pupils may move further towards the 'closed' society of the age group? Are the educational dropouts of the fifties to be replaced by the moral dropouts of the seventies?
(pp. 74-75.)

Willis (1976, 1977) argues that the formation of counter school pupil sub-cultures is basically a response to external influences, i.e., the shop floor culture, parental pressures, etc... rather than the outcome of the differentiation → polarization

process suggested by Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970). On the other hand, King (1973) and Reynolds (1976), who both based their research on small scale surveys of schools rather than relying on a single school each, stress that the particular arrangements a school makes, do make a difference in terms of pupil involvement and behaviour. In the case of Redmond, though, the case was further complicated by several organizational peculiarities: it could be expected to have very little influence as students arrived for only two years at the end of their compulsory education; it helped to preserve pupil sub-cultures formed in the high schools by the sociometric transfer system; it had a mixture of differentiated and undifferentiated elements so that evidence of a counter school culture in mixed ability Humanities lessons might have been an expression of polarized attitudes formed in 'streamed' subject sets. No-one would deny the existence of an interaction between internal and external factors in the production of pupil sub-cultures, what this thesis does is to illustrate the complexity of the factors affecting any one case. Further research is needed of a widely comparative nature to tease out the relative influence of open and closed organization on sub-cultural formation.

The interaction of staff, however, was more obviously structured by formal differentiation, i.e., the division of labour of tasks, power and responsibility. Thus, those staff adopting a 'conservative' position in inter staff conflict shared a similar status in the hierarchy of posts, whilst 'open ideologists' shared several characteristics in distinction to 'closed ideologists', i.e., in terms of experience, salary and Faculty membership. Those

who adopted the conservative position or consistently advocated open or closed ideologies did so as a reflection of their interests, i.e., in terms of career, professional or bureaucratic position. The interaction of staff and students took place within a context defined by the organizational arrangements for curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. The problems which arose in the running of the school were a product of the coming together of all these different factors. In the year examined here the major concern of staff was to deal with or cater for the unmotivated. This 'problem' was defined as such by the staff and was thus the product of their own dissatisfaction with the way things were going. One of the 'causes' of the problem, then, was the image staff had of how a school should run, i.e., they assumed students should be motivated to work and be involved in the school. Equally the events of everyday life in Redmond which failed to live up to the expectations of staff had their own causes, e.g., the dissatisfaction of students, their disillusionment with ROSLA, their home, high school and peer group experiences, their cultural orientation. The raising of the school leaving age may be seen as an external contributory factor to the disillusionment of some students with schooling and their lack of motivation but equally the failure of staff to adapt the school sufficiently to fit their needs may also be seen as a cause. Any calculation of causes, then, must acknowledge the social nature of the problem itself, i.e., its definition by a specific audience. Thus, closed ideologists might see a problem in students calling them by their Christian names whereas open ideologists may actually encourage this.

An example of the 'Problems' category in the model (Diagram 4) is the problem of the unmotivated. It can be seen in Durkheimian terms as the outcome of a lack of regulation and a lack of attachment. The problem would then be an expression of the insufficient integration of students into mechanical or organic solidarity in a school with a mixture of closed and open elements. Willis (1977) would argue that for some students, i.e., the lads, rejection of the attempts made by staff to control and involve them was inevitable whatever form the reforms took. Several of the staff of Redmond, including the Principal in the probationers' meeting, shared the view that some of the students were a lost cause. However, everyday problems of control remained and changes in the school's policies were called for. The closed ideologists argued for more explicit controls and a wider status differential between staff and students (more mechanical solidarity) whilst the open ideologists argued for control to become more personalized and informal with students being won around to accepting the underlying principles of mutual care which formed the 'conscience collective' of the community (more organic solidarity). The staff were in the difficult position of trying to find a style to suit students from a wide variety of backgrounds who were destined for a wide variety of occupational outlets. Was mechanical solidarity suitable for some and organic solidarity for others, or should one regime obtain for all? The working class students may have been used to more 'mechanical' forms in the home and may have expected their continuance in the factory, but was it right to fit their school experiences into the same rut? The problem

of the unmotivated thus involved fundamental questions about the aims of education, questions which were related to problems associated with social class and other external factors. It involved external and internal factors such as the backgrounds and perspectives of students and staff. Attempts to change school policy thus became occasions for conflict between opposing ideologies.

The conflicts reflected the opposition of open and closed ideologies and the influence of the conservative position. The positions taken by staff in these conflicts reflected the influence of both internal and external factors, e.g., their values and aims, their professional and career commitments, and the school's hierarchy of power and status. The outcome of the process of conflict reflected the distribution of power in the decision-making process. The status quo was largely maintained, with some shifts to a less liberal ethos and official description of school policy. The changes which did take place then fed back into the interactive process. Failure to change could also have an effect in terms of the development of staff ideologies, e.g., the increased resentment towards 'the hierarchy' of those members of staff who supported the rejected plans for pastoral-curricular teams. The whole process of interaction was continuous.

This model of the school as an organization differs from systems based theories (Etzioni 1961, 1964) in focusing on the process of the formulation of official policies and formal structures in a manner similar to that employed by Baldrige (1971) in the analysis of a university. It employs a perspective

on professional ideologies and interests similar to that developed by Strauss et al (1964). The model developed here goes beyond a purely action based approach in analysing some of the structural sources of problems, conflicts and change. As such it is a long way from being refined enough to serve as a reliable basis for accurate prediction about the school's future. The imprecision of the first 'box' in Diagram 4 with 'External and Internal Factors' is such as to make any prophesying very haphazard. The examples given above of the interaction of 'External and Internal Factors' and their outcome in 'Problems', 'Conflicts' and organizational 'Change' or 'No Change' illustrate the mode of analysis but do not give sufficiently narrow parameters to serve as a basis for quantification in prediction. It does not allow us to say how big a change in, for example, the ideologies of staff would be needed to bring about a shift to a more open school type or how exactly a large number of highly motivated students in the 1984 intake would affect school policy. The model is thus little more than an abstraction from the analysis of the detailed inter-relationship of events and influences, but it does provide a basis for comparison with research which may follow to refine the analysis and produce more reliable hypotheses. Nevertheless, general directions of change can be suggested on the basis of the inter-relationships so far discerned. Thus, for example, a severe economic depression would probably reinforce the claims of the closed ideologists since more competition for jobs would probably increase the demand for easily marketable examination certificates rather than favouring the broad educational aims of the open

ideologists. Similarly an influx of students more committed to schooling, which might be expected after the initial resentment to the imposition of ROSLA faded away, would probably favour the open ideologists since there would probably be a climate of co-operation which would favour organic rather than mechanical forms of regulation and attachment. It must always be assumed in predictions of this kind that, to use the economists' phrase, 'all other things remain equal', which, of course, they seldom do. Only further research can demonstrate the accuracy of such predictions and the viability of the model.

This study, then provides an account of an innovative school which survives as an institution without a great retreat from open school ideals. It produces a model of the ongoing world of the school where innovation is seen as process and change in the policy of the school is shown to be the product of the interaction of internal and external factors. This thesis recognizes the essentially political nature of innovation and the ideological and interest-based character of conflict and opposition.

2) Discussion

The review of relevant literature in the second chapter includes an exposition and critique of Bernstein's sociology of the school. It would be valuable at this point to see the extent to which the study as a whole serves to utilize, criticize and develop Bernstein's ideas. The ideal types of Bernstein's theoretical framework are not used to describe aspects of the school, but, rather, to describe ideological positions.

The critiques by Easthope et al (1974), Pring

(1975) and Gibson (1977) have seriously undermined the claims of Bernstein's theoretical models and King's (1976) attempt at operationalisation has shown the poor predictive power of his formulations. Rather than dismissing his work entirely this thesis by-passes some of the problems of operationalising ideal types by using them to describe ideological positions. Indeed Bernstein himself claims several times to be describing ideologies rather than existing organizations:

I was discussing what existed at the level of educational ideology, rather than what existed at the level of day-by-day practice of schools ... the positions are those of conflict. (Bernstein 1977, p.7.)

I am interested only in the general movement which at the moment may exist at the ideological rather than the substantive level. (Bernstein 1977, p.69).

It is probably true to say that the code at the moment exists at the level of ideology and theory. (Bernstein 1977, p.100).

By describing ideological positions in terms of open and closed school types Bernstein's ideas come once more to life, offering a means of interpreting inter-staff conflict and organizational change. The sources of change are then located in various features of the organization, its relationship to the outside world and the perceptions of its members. This is a long way from the holistic and idealist features of Bernstein and Durkheim identified by Easthope et al (1975). Change is no longer the inevitable consequence of a shift from strong to weak classification, but the outcome of a conflict which has its roots in many different aspects of the school. The 'open school', and 'closed school' types serve as convenient and informative

descriptions of ideological positions. They go beyond any haphazard collection of attributes (see Eggleston 1973) in identifying common features in one or other position, i.e., the weakening or strengthening of boundaries. This use of the concepts also has explanatory power, e.g., the weakening of boundaries provides more fluidity and possibilities of individual initiative than their strengthening and is thus likely to be favoured by those newcomers to the profession and the bureaucracy of the school who have most to gain by its hierarchy being disturbed and re-shaped around their own qualifications and interests.

What though of Bernstein's predictions about the character of inter-staff relationships in an open school working integrated curricula? He expects that an integrated code would bring junior staff closer together 'through a common work situation', that it would rely on the socialization of staff into accepting a common explicit ideology and that order would depend on a 'covert deep closure of mechanical solidarity'. Before seeing to what extent Redmond fits these predictions it must be pointed out that Bernstein's ideal typical mode of analysis is practically immune to disproof since if predictions are not verified then he can always claim that the school is not sufficiently 'open' or its curricula sufficiently 'integrated'. In fact definition and prediction are so confused that it would probably be true to say that a school would only be an open school if it did fit all the predictions. What this thesis clearly demonstrates is that, much in the fashion of traditional single subject departments, integrated subject departments too become centres for staff

loyalty and parts of the career structure and that they too become embroiled in inter-staff disputes on the allocation of school resources, new staff, etc. There was a constant series of disagreements on ideologies within, but more particularly, between Faculties. The unity of Faculties was more obvious to outsiders than insiders; within Science subject traditionalists fought integrationists and within Humanities those committed to giving students full autonomy fought those who wished to stress reading and writing skills. The openness of the Humanities course, with its wide variety of staff teams, seemed to encourage ideological flux and conflict; this was hardly the 'consensus about the integrating idea' or the 'high level of ideological consensus' that Bernstein predicted. This would seem to agree with the findings of Milsom et al (1976) that, with the integrated curricula they examine:

there is nothing in the evidence to suggest a closed (i.e., agreed and stable) ideology. Some in the negative sense of a lack of interest in, but not suppression of, conservative ideas. Indeed the intense questioning produced by this integrated code, produced strong intellectual movement. (p.20)

The use of Bernstein's concept of boundary in this thesis as the definer of open and closed ideologies avoids some of the problems associated with the concept of classification. Classification is defined in terms of curriculum contents, boundary refers to the purity or mixing of categories which are defined in the 'Open schools, open society?' article to include a wide variety of school characteristics. The use of ideal types of ideology is justified here by their success in describing and accounting for the range of conflicts amongst staff.

The identification of open and closed ideologists has been

based on an analysis of their expressed desires to see the organization of the school changed in one or other direction or their objections to change in the opposite direction. The classification on theoretical grounds was based on a Bernsteinian type use of Durkheim's notions of mechanical and organic solidarity, particularly the concept of boundary between categories. The categorisation process is thus far from arbitrary. It has a developed theoretical basis and an empirical grounding, i.e., it describes the dimensions of opposition of staff who are shown to be in conflict. It might well be argued, following Keddie (1971) that the data gathered to define the position of teachers are of the 'educationist' rather than the 'teacher' context. However, this would be to ignore the special character of the relationship established between observer and staff, i.e., where the observer was known to be fully aware of the real life contexts of the staff room and classroom and was thus not to be presented with an account designed to serve as public rhetoric. In any case, the researcher was able to base categorisations on data drawn from questionnaire, interview, meeting, conversation and observational contexts and was thus able to ground judgements fairly comprehensively. The ideologies are not descriptions of what the teacher actually did, but of the type of school he wanted and was prepared to negotiate for in the school's decision-making process. However, this is not to say that analyses of what teachers say they do in the classroom and what they actually do in the classroom are not useful and valid. Sharp et al (1975), Bennett (1976) and Hammersley (1977a) are all useful pieces of work seeking to identify how and on what basis teachers operate. This

thesis is in some senses wider, viewing teachers' perspectives on all aspects of the school, and in others narrower, since it neglects to focus in depth on classroom practices.

It has been established that inter-staff conflict and the process of organizational change in one school can be understood in terms of the opposition of staff variously committed to open or closed ideologies or the conservative position. The adherence of administrators and senior staff to the conservative position has been explained in part by reference to their bureaucratic interest in continuity.⁽¹⁾ The open and closed ideologies were said to express certain career and professional interests. Thus the teachers of integrated code subjects advanced a change ideology which challenged the established position of single subject departments; their speciality and claim to expertise lay in breaking down the barriers between subjects. This applied too to those who specialized in mixed ability teaching, they challenged the principle of the separation of abilities

1. The somewhat faded controversy about the conflicting professional and bureaucratic aspects of the teacher's role seems to be mostly beside the point, apart from the bureaucratic interest in stability of those in administrative positions. As Hammersley (1977b) points out:

in the organization of most occupations there will be both professional and bureaucratic elements, though one or other may tend to dominate. Indeed, bureaucracy and professionalism can best be seen as two strategies used by actors to gain and maintain control over some aspect of social organization. These strategies are not exclusive of one another..... In the educational system,, professional and bureaucratic orientations and legitimations are not just coexistent but are intertwined. (p.20)

enshrined in streamed sets. The conflict of open and closed ideologies is a battle for the definition of the organizing principles behind school policy. It is to be expected that open ideologists would, for example, support moves towards a common sixteen plus to replace separate C.S.E. and 'O' level examinations. In pastoral terms, the desire of open ideologists to set up pastoral curricular teams challenged the established structure of the organization and confronted those who defined their teaching task as narrowly instructional within an established subject discipline. This is not to say that some staff did not choose to support the open ideology on some points and the closed ideology on others, e.g., arguing for mixed ability teaching and separate subject disciplines. The analysis, however, demonstrates that some members of staff did adopt consistent ideological positions and that it was around the points of conflict between these positions that most problems were discussed. The lines of conflict were thus structural and ideological rather than emotional in their origin, a finding which supports the predictions of Hamilton (1975) rather than Richardson (1973). Indeed, the subject based nature of groupings seems to fit Hamilton's prediction of conflict between integrated and collection codes.

The ideologies themselves have an identifiable history. The open ideology is plainly devoted to change as it seeks changes in the established boundary relationships sanctioned by the closed ideology. This is not to say, however, that the past was ever a utopia for the closed ideologist with strictly hierarchical, highly differentiated organizations or that such

ideologies ever held a complete monopoly over teachers' perspectives. The closed ideology too has its radical aspect claiming that the boundaries between categories should be strengthened. The triumph of the open ideologists at any stage may only bring a new orthodoxy, a new set of boundary definitions to be changed by a later generation. The boundaries between subject areas, for example, could only completely disappear if teachers relinquished any claim to special expertise - an unlikely event in a system which relies on compulsory institutional education administered by officially certificated agents. Perhaps, as Bowles and Gintis (1976) suggest, the open ideology will never gain a complete hold over the educational system in a capitalist country because its philosophy allows of more pupil and thus ultimately worker autonomy than the system would allow. This brings us back to the key controversy over the revolutionary potential of education. One side of the argument was expressed long ago by Durkheim:

even though through some incomprehensible miracle a pedagogical system were constituted in opposition to the social system, this very antagonism would rob it of all effect. If the collective organization whence comes the moral state it is desired to combat, is intact, the child is bound to feel its effect from the moment he first has contact with it. The school's artificial environment can protect him only briefly and weakly. To the extent that real life increasingly takes possession of him, it will come to destroy the work of the teacher. Education, therefore, can be reformed only if society itself is reformed. To do that, the evil from which it suffers must be attacked at its sources. (Durkheim 1970, p. 373).

Such an argument becomes even more pessimistic when a Marxist analysis of the ideological (i.e., in the sense of system reinforcing) nature of education is added to the equation, for

example Althusser's 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' (Althusser 1971). Yet those who derive their inspiration from the early Marx or Gramsci (1971) argue that the formation of revolutionary class consciousness is a necessary prerequisite for the transformation of society and that education has its part to play in the arousal and enlightenment of the masses. To some degree the controversy is misplaced. We are back to the dialectic^{of} change, education cannot change society and social changes do not necessarily immediately transform education. The process is one of mutual influence. The traditional demand in sociology is for research to show how educational processes are influenced by wider social factors. Despite three decades or so in this country of efforts in the sociology of education in this direction, we are still crucially short of good studies of this kind. Would it be too much to ask for research focused on the other direction of the interaction, the social effects of educational change? Research of this kind may do much to break through the armchair arguments of those who dismiss a priori any claims of education as a reforming or revolutionary force.

Interesting questions also arise with respect to the sociology of innovation. Is change always uni-directional or is it part of a cyclical process? Do the change ideologies of today become the challenged orthodoxies of the future? These are all thoughts of a rather speculative kind, but they do provide possible lines of enquiry for further research, e.g., are institutions with no boundary definers viable and stable or are they stages on the path to a new institutionalization of principles of separation? This is the sort of speculation at which Bernstein excels. It is possible that several elements of his conceptual schema as presented in the more recent articles of Class, Codes and Control,

Volume III (Bernstein 1977) may facilitate research in this direction, although this researcher would caution against a too ready acceptance of the details of his theoretical framework. The use of the specific concepts may be misleading but the range of the issues raised is always inspiring.

3) Further research

The method employed in this research developed in direct response to the nature of the school studied. The fairly open discussion and decision-making procedures at Redmond made a great amount of material available for analysis. The observation of meetings, the collection of field notes, the interviews and questionnaire would not have been welcomed in many more closed schools. This is not to say, however, that similar processes of problem formation, negotiation and change are absent from the more traditional type of school with a more hierarchical and closed decision making process. The process of formulation of school policy may be more dominated by the headmaster or other members of senior staff and the views of junior staff may have a more indirect influence but to some extent even a dictatorship relies on the consent of the governed and it is to be expected that some of the processes made visible in the open discussion and decision-making process of Redmond would take place in a less visible and formal fashion in a more closed school, as the articles reviewed earlier from Fowler et al (1973) by Watson and Bennett and Wilkie testify.

The information for this thesis was collected by participant observation with the researcher taking a neutral stance, having

been accepted in the role of 'observer'. The Center for New Schools (1972) has called for observers and evaluators researching into educational innovations to share the participants' commitment to the aims of the schemes. Although such a stance would have advantages in giving easier access and more direct understanding it would also bring all the recognised dangers of 'going native', i.e., taking for granted the problems as defined by members and appreciating only one perspective. This thesis focuses mainly on the perspectives of staff and proceeds by way of an analysis of their definition of the school's problems, but it does so in a detached manner where ideologies are seen as such rather than accepted as desirable bases for action. The study reported in the Center for New Schools' article 'Strengthening alternative high schools' (1972) goes beyond this thesis in incorporating work on the student perspectives, but an adoption of the committed approach as they advocate might well narrow their perception so that the world of the school is interpreted only in the terms of the group to which they become committed. In a wide ranging review of the sociology of educational innovation Whiteside (1978) makes these criticisms of the committed observer role:

Problems for the 'partisan' researcher are likely to arise because while ideally he wishes to confront the various audiences with his findings, in reality his relationships with one group, the staff, are likely to be strongest. These difficulties are recognized in the Center for New Schools study (1972, p.349) where they note that their feedback approaches have been much less effective in reaching students than staff. The implications of 'commitment' have to be faced particularly in situations where there is fundamental disagreement. In conflict situations such as arose at the William Tyndale School it is important to explore what the role of the committed researcher would be. In a situation of conflict who would the researcher be committed to? (p. 109)

Even at Redmond with its conflicts contained within the school

one is entitled to ask whether the researcher would commit himself to the open or closed ideology. This thesis would be the poorer for such a commitment. In all sorts of participant observation research the researcher will find it difficult to avoid observer effect, but a committed stance would serve to amplify any such effects so that analysis and action would become difficult to separate. It is at least desirable for researchers to be seeking an objective stance even if in practice it is unattainable since by so doing they leave more options open than they would if they entered the field pledged to certain managerial aims in the fashion of Richardson (1975). The sociology of educational innovation can make a valuable contribution to the management of schooling by providing information about how the school 'works', not by seeking to provide strategies of management. The sociologist is, in theory at least, interested in the perspectives of all the participants. It is misleading to claim to be able to evaluate schools in terms of the goals they consider to be important when members within them are in conflict about which goals are desirable. To surrender in the struggle for objectivity would be to give up any hope of widening understanding by placing perspectives and commitments in a social context.

For the purposes of developing and refining the model advanced here it would be invaluable to have comparable studies of schools both more open and more closed than the one studied. By such a comparative analysis it might be possible to produce a 'grounded theory' (see Glaser and Strauss 1967) which could better identify the crucial external and internal factors. It would be possible

to launch a widely based study of a variety of school types in relation to a nationally enforced innovation such as a common sixteen plus examination or the imposition of a common core curriculum by the state. Studies of the implementation of integrated curricula are fairly common (Shipman et al 1974 being one of the best examples) but very little is available on how the staff of schools formulate policies and how these are structured by the sort of internal and external factors focused on in this thesis. Thus studies of the reactions of a variety of schools to a common change in their conditions should focus on how they react in terms of formulating new policies and changing their organizational structures, as this thesis attempts to do in relation to one school and the raising of the school leaving age. There is also a need for more studies on the origins of open ideologies and for an explanatory account of their limited takeover of the state education system. This thesis gives a limited account at the level of a single institution. It is to these limitations and their implications for further research, that we now turn.

Like most writers the author of this thesis is probably more aware of its faults than any reader. The process of writing a report of a research project is often a painful one, necessitating, as it does, a great struggle to convey what the researcher has found, a struggle involving compromise and occasional defeat. Participant observation research involves the researcher as the instrument both of the collection of the information and of its analysis and is thus distinguishable qualitatively from a more 'objective' method where the data are distinct enough from the

researcher to be analysable by computer programme. The methods of data collection employed in this thesis involved a great deal of commitment of time, energy and application. As a research 'instrument' the researcher had only a limited range of vision, he had only so much observer time available, and thus choosing to concentrate on certain facets of the organization was to neglect other possibilities. This thesis has tended to concentrate on the world of the staff, mainly because theirs was a perspective that gave a view of the whole school. The study of the students' perspectives is therefore a limited one. This thesis would benefit from more information on student backgrounds, culture and expectations and any future study of this kind should involve a sufficient number of researchers to make the collection of such data possible. Similarly, the focus on school policy as an index of organizational change is somewhat narrow. It is justified to some extent by the manner in which school policy provided the structures within which members operated and by the open nature of the problem raising discussion and decision-making processes (see Chapter Three, 'Methods'). Nevertheless, any future research of a similar kind would benefit from more information on how school policy was executed in the contexts of classroom, corridor and staffroom than it proved possible to provide in this thesis.

Resource constraints are also apparent in the relatively short timespan covered, i.e., one school year. An analysis of this kind would greatly benefit from observation of the school for a period of, say, five years or more. Such a prolonged observation would enable the researcher to better test out the

claims of his model and to identify the crucial components. The focus here on a particularly important year, the first year of the full effects of ROSLA, partly mitigates this criticism, but nevertheless the sort of investigation undertaken would undoubtedly benefit from continuous updating. Again, though, the single researcher is greatly limited in resources available and is often confined to separate periods of data collection and data analysis.

The limitations of this thesis are therefore partly attributable to the constraints experienced by

the lonely, specialized figure of the arts Ph.D.,
a dodo in terms of our current needs. (Bernstein 1977,
p.73)

As a contribution to knowledge this form of research offers an attempt at applying a new method of organizational research and a new mode of organizational analysis, an attempt which may provide the 'first steps' along the road to a more adequate theory of the school as an organization.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A
THE BUILDINGS

The maps on the following pages give the outline of the buildings as they stood at the end of 1974. The 'phase three' buildings (C1 - C10 and swimming pool) did not come into use until after the beginning of the summer term in 1973-4. The Humanities Area was in use from the summer of 1972-3. The other main areas had been in use since the first year of the school, though the process of completing the buildings continued throughout the first six years of the school's existence on the new site. The site is organized on a Faculty basis, with Humanities in the R rooms grouped around a central Resources Centre, Design in the D rooms, and Science in the B rooms (except the mobile or temporary classrooms B29 - 35, of which Geography had rooms B 29, 30, 34, 35, Religious Knowledge B 32 and Drama B 33). The Youth Centre (Y7, Y11, Y12) and Adult Centre (A2-A5) were both somewhat separate from the rest of the school.

What is not apparent from the plan is the peculiar design of the school, both in terms of the strange 'battery-chicken-farm' appearance of the peaked and raised overhead windows and the variety of levels of the buildings. The school was built on a two-way slope which necessitated the connection of different levels by passages and stairways. The administration block, sixth form centre and music rooms were actually on a 'first floor' level above the hall dining area and parts of the Humanities area. The planning of the architects' brief had been carried out by the Leicestershire Education Committee in full consultation with

the staff at the old grammar school, but the building which emerged was far short of the expectations of most of those involved. An ambitious plan for the use of fibre glass as a building material was eventually dropped at the last minute and the construction went ahead with materials not envisaged in the architects' original plans. The structure which was put together had the disadvantages of being very hard to heat in the winter and very hard to ventilate in the summer. The Principal in particular was very dissatisfied with the building which housed his staff and students.

The Design and Humanities areas were deliberately planned to facilitate subject integration - the Design area with very few enclosed rooms and the Humanities area with movable canvas 'walls' in 3 sets of 3 rooms. But the Science area was split into separate specialist rooms and even the integration encouraged in Design and Humanities was internal to those Faculties rather than between them. The Faculty based construction even preceded the establishment of a Faculty based organizational structure with its Faculty meetings and Faculty Heads (the original curricular decision-making structure being based on Departments and the meeting of Department Heads.) There were no specialist social or pastoral areas apart from the Division Heads' Offices, the Sixth Form **Social Area**, the Hall, the Youth Centre and the Adult Common Room. In particular, there was no playground or wet weather play area. It was school policy to have all rooms open at all times so that students could use them during breaks or lunchtimes. The building was not planned to fit a pastoral

pattern with areas designed for tutor group meetings or Division assemblies (indeed many tutor groups had to meet in makeshift areas such as corridors).

Car Park

DIAGRAM 5.

THE REDMOND COLLEGE.

a) GROUND FLOOR PLAN

Scale 1mm:4'

b) UPPER FLOOR PLAN

KEY TO PLAN OF COLLEGE

A Block ADMINISTRATION

- A1 Store
- 2 Community Education
- 3 Community Education Office
- 5 Adult Lounge
- 7 Staff Cloakroom
- 8 Interview Room
- 9 Divisional Office
- 10 Medical
- 11 "
- 12 Staff Room
- 13 Vice-Principal
- 14 Main Office
- 15 Lady Vice-Principal
- 16 Principal
- 17 Registrar of Studies
- 18 Senior Administrative Officer

M ROOMS

- M1 Careers Information
- 2 Counselling
- 4 "
- 3 Office
- 5 Careers Office
- 6 Careers Officers
- 7 " "
- 8 Lecture Room

S ROOMS 6th FORM CENTRE

Division Heads' Offices:
S1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 13

S14 Sixth Form Tutor

Seminar Rooms:

S3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

Y Block YOUTH/DESIGN-IN-THE-HOME

- Y1 Textiles & Interior design
- 2 Fashion & Embroidery
- 3 D.H. Resources Area
- 4 D.H. Flat
- 5 D.H. Consumer Education
- 6 D.H. Entertainment
- 7 General Activities (Youth)
- 11 Hobbies Area (Youth)
- 12 Youth Tutor

DESIGN BLOCKS

- 2D PR Print-making
- 3D J Jewellery
- 3D EM Engineering Metalwork

B Block SCIENCE

- B1 Maths
- 2 "
- 4 "
- 5 "
- 6 Lecture, TV and projection room
- 7 Science
- 8 Animal Room
- 9 Study Room
- 10 General Science
- 11 Biology
- 12 Prep. (Biology)
- 13 Study Room
- 14 Biology
- 15 Rural Studies
- 16 Chemistry
- 17 "
- 18 Prep. (Chemistry)
- 19 Physics
- 20 Physics
- 21 Physics
- 22 Physics Store
- 23 Prep. (Physics)
- 24 Head of Science
- 25 Engineering Science Office
- 26 Science
- 28 Engineering
- 29 Geography
- 30 "
- 31 Lecture Room
- 32 R.K.
- 33 Drama Tub
- 34 Geography
- 35 "
- 36 Commerce
- 37 Commerce
- 38 Lecture Room
- 39 Lecture Room

R Block RESOURCES & HUMANITIES

- R1 Shop
- 2 Director of Studies
- 3 Languages
- 4 "
- 5 Recording
- 6 Store
- 8 Commerce
- 9 "
- 11 Social Studies
- 12 English
- 14 History
- 15 History
- 13 Resources Centre
- 16 Resources Office
- 17 Store
- 18 Workshop
- 19 Audio-Visual
- 20 "
- 21 English Store
- 22 Head of Humanities
- 23 Humanities Store
- 24 Resources Preparation
- 25 Humanities Staff Room
- 27 Humanities
- 26 Vice-Principal: Resources
- 28 Humanities
- 29 "
- 30 "
- 31 Reprographic Unit
- 32 Humanities
- 33 "
- 34 "
- 35 Supplementary education
- 36 Humanities
- 37 "
- 38 "
- 39 Supplementary Education
- 40 Lecture Room

MISCELLANEOUS

- L - Lavatories/Washrooms
- O - Office
- S - Store
- MCR - Male Changing Room
- FCR - Female Changing Room

APPENDIX B.

APPENDIX B.COLLEGE UNIFICATION

The most comprehensive and sustained attempt to change the organization of the college had been underway almost from the opening of Redmond on the new site; it was referred to as 'College Unification'. It had been the Principal's aim from the beginning to work towards a unification of the disparate school, youth centre and adult centre provisions. The following extracts from a document submitted by the Principal to the 'Fourth General Meeting on College Unification' on December 5th 1974 summarize the history and philosophy behind this attempt at organizational change.

Foreword

(a) Historical outline

In a review of School for the Community (1971), Brian Stewart (then Assistant Director of Education for Derbyshire) wrote:

With so much experience and a virtually new organization to work on it is disappointing to read that, even here, the community college is regarded as something separate from the school. John Dent is headmaster and warden; the name board still reads 'School and Community College'.....
..... one would have hoped that by now a philosophy would have evolved which sees the school and the community college as a single entity.

(Adult Education, vol. 44, no. 6. pp.405-6)

In 1972 the Director of Education asked that the title 'Headmaster-and-Warden' in the County should become 'Principal'; and the Governors obtained the Director's agreement that 'The Redmond School & Community College' should become 'The Redmond College from January 1973.

Early in 1973 it was learnt that a scheme proposed by the College in 1970 (see School for the Community) whereby members of the School staff might accept across-the-board appointment to the College was being sympathetically considered by the Education Committee. To plan for its hoped for implementation on a small scale in the

academic year 1973-4, a week-end Conference was held in May, to which representatives of Governors, the College Council, the School and College Staff (both teaching and ancillary), and the local Education Authority were invited.

On 20 June 1973 members of the Governing Body, the College Council, the Parent-Teachers Association (i.e., all parents and all teaching staff), ancillary staff, the School Council, and the local Education Authority were invited to receive the Conference report. The exploratory and non-authoritative nature of the conference was stressed, and the existing decision-making bodies were asked whether or not they wished to commission further exploration. The need for doing so was overwhelmingly supported, and a steering committee was set up to report back to a General Meeting in December.

Although the appointment of staff across-the-board was not in fact authorised until the following academic year, thinking along these lines continued in a number of forums. It is implicit, for example, in a discussion paper prepared in January 1973, (i.e., pre-Russell Report) by Bernard Harvey, County Adviser for Further Education. A final point of the paper read:

Community Education is not youth work and adult education. It is a style of education. Community Education as a style needs to penetrate the school system. It is happening, but not fast enough. It may be as we abolish the idea of separate adult education and youth service buildings, pimples attached to a school building, we shall need to rethink the role or even necessity of Community Education departments.

The steering committee reported to the second General Meeting on 5th December 1973. It had exercised its power to co-opt members of the local community, and in the course of five long sessions had examined the advantages and problems of unification. It recommended that unification should be considered, and that working-parties should look at four named areas. The General Meeting agreed to the setting up of four working-parties, that their members should hold a joint meeting followed immediately by their first separate meetings on 14th February 1974, and that they should report back to a fourth General Meeting on 5th December 1974.

The February meeting was addressed by the Director of Education, Mr. Fairbairn, who gave every encouragement to the thinking, and himself joined one of the working-parties.

Which brings us to the present.

(b) Why 'three into one'?

At the meeting last December a number of reasons were given why the present three-part College organization was failing to offer present members (and others in the neighbourhood) the opportunities it might if it were one. It is worth summarizing these reasons once again:

dual use of premises serves overlapping purposes;
some interests are adequately served by neither
'school' nor 'college';

there are many anomalies in provision for 'school'/'college' students;

the separate decision-making bodies may link with one another, but often duplicate and sometimes contradict one another's business;

a single focus for the local community would help to strengthen neighbourliness and conviviality at a time when larger organizations (new Leicestershire Authority, Common Market) may require decentralization;

the present threat to fuel supplies makes even more urgent an awareness of the need for self-support and interdependence;

there is an awareness both by College and by some branches of the Social Services that we must work together more closely;

there is a recognition by full-time professional members of the College that the way forward is by sharing common resources with the community. This means breaking down artificial barriers which have separated schools/colleges from the communities they serve.

(c) But why now?

Why now, when local government reorganization is already involving the whole country in painful upheaval? - when the Raising of the School Leaving Age is causing country-wide problems for secondary education, and the Redmond College has 1300 students in the 14-16 age range? - when the country is in a financial crisis, and if we believe the Hudson Institute, facing a 'smiling death'?

To take the last point first, and to speak personally, I don't go along with 'futurologists', whether English or American; but of course we must accept, realistically, that cuts in educational spending are going to affect us, that unemployment may well increase, that our material standard of living may worsen. It is surely all the more important in these circumstances that we should use our resources, both human and material, to the greatest

advantage of all. There may be bad times ahead, but that thought should be an encouragement to plan more effectively. The greatest Education Act this country has known dates from 1944, and the foundations of the welfare state were laid during one of the darkest periods of our history.

Again to speak personally, although I am uncomfortably aware of the effects upon our own community of the unwilling, unmotivated, compulsory student, it would be wrong if we allowed ourselves to be blown off course by what seems likely to prove a passing blizzard. One of the ways in which these at present disgruntled members of our community can be helped to respond more profitably is by developing more fully than we have so far achieved the opportunities of community education, by removing more effectively the barriers between the college and the community without, and by using the resources of the community in a true spirit of sharing.

I have suggested elsewhere (Redmond Paper 1, 1973) the need to strengthen and develop the small community when other organizations are tending to get bigger. If and when hard times should come, if money is shorter and travel more difficult, the mutual support of everyone in the community, old and young, able and less able, poor and poorer, will be the more necessary. Now indeed is the time to plan, not for an illusory North Sea oil bonanza, but for the greater hardship which we may be required to face.

And there is a particular, Leicestershire impetus for our present thinking. In 1977 or thereabouts three new upper schools at Groby, Earl Shilton and Shepshed are due to open. In at least one and possibly two of these schools - colleges - it is planned to appoint all staff across-the-board to provide community education. Our own role in contributing to this thinking, therefore, could benefit others besides ourselves.

(d) Three stages of implementation.

But it is easier, of course, when there is only a shoe string, to make a cat's-cradle than to build a castle. It has been a guiding principle in all planning that at no stage should 'integration' be allowed to retard the progress already achieved by any of the separate parts: 'The whole must be greater, and must be seen to be greater, than the sum of its parts'. Equally, to quote from an early recommendation of the Staffing and Programme Planning working-party, 'The total parameter of work should be no greater than at present': it would be unfair to place on already overburdened staff a greater load of work and responsibility. It would be unrealistic, therefore, to go ahead with proposal X which depended on increased

staffing before the necessary increase Y could be provided.

As in all things within the College, our way forward should be evolutionary not revolutionary. At the same time, after all the talk over a period of years, it would be discouraging to say the least if no positive outcome could be seen. I should hope that some, if only a few, of the proposals made could be implemented in the coming academic year, 1975-6. I should like to think that we would be ready to implement other proposals within - say - five years, whenever opportunities could be seized; and that we should continue to dream for 1990!

It is evident here that the commitment to College Unification can be interpreted as an attempt to move the school in an 'open school' direction, with the weakening of boundaries between the school, the community college and the college users. Indeed, the ethic of 'serving the community' pervades the whole approach. It is interesting to see that the Principal regarded College Unification as contributing towards the solution of some of the internal school problems, even the unmotivated:

Again, to speak personally, although I am uncomfortably aware of the effects upon our own community of the unwilling, unmotivated, compulsory student, it would be wrong if we allowed ourselves to be blown off course by what seems likely to prove a passing blizzard. One of the ways in which these at present disgruntled members of our community can be helped to respond more profitably is by developing more fully than we have so far achieved the opportunities of community education, by removing more effectively the barriers between the college and the community without, and by using the resources of the community in a true spirit of sharing.

The full reports of the four separate working parties all express a firm belief in the worth of the College Unification ideals outlined above. This is hardly surprising as those not committed to those ideals would hardly have taken part in the dozen or so meetings of each working party which took place throughout the year.

It would be possible to write another full length thesis on the business of the working parties and the discussions which took place therein. This account will confine itself to the issues raised in the reports which directly refer to the activities of 'the school'. In that respect, each committee had some significant things to say about current organization and plans for the future. The Building and Resources working party advocated that immediate action should be taken to involve more adults in the use and preparation of resources during the school day - acting as assistants to teachers and making use of available laboratories and the Resources Centre. A four session day (9 a.m. - 12 noon, 1 p.m. - 4 p.m., 4 p.m. - 7 p.m., 7 p.m. - 10 p.m.) was advocated for five years hence. The Staffing and Programme Planning working party also advocated a four session day, arguing that staff should be appointed with commitments to sessions rather than being given total hours as requirements. It was suggested that the sixth form should share the third session with adult users and this was seen to require changes in the roles of the Division Heads, the Director of Studies and the Sixth Form Tutor. The Social and Pastoral working party did not function in the normal way with meetings of representatives from different decision-making bodies, but when the normal sort of meeting failed due to lack of attendance, Paul Wilson (Youth Tutor) conducted a question and answer session with college actual and potential users and along with June Edmond, arrived at a document outlining objectives and suggestions. The document stressed a 'public relations' approach with an emphasis on 'image building', 'finding out' and 'publicity' -

a basis from which the college would unify itself and provide its own social and pastoral facilities. The social and pastoral provision in the school and youth centre was warmly praised and recommendations were made to extend pastoral facilities to the adult users of the college. The working party on Government and Finance came up with suggestions for a Community Education Council representing all the providers and users of the college, with each smaller scale committee already in existence in the Community College or school represented. The Community Education Council (C.E.C.) would total about a hundred members and was intended to meet infrequently, most of the work being done by an Executive with members elected from each contributory body with three additional representatives voted for by the whole C.E.C. - the Executive would total 21 members. Within the Executive the full time staff were to be represented by four persons, full time pupils under 16 by two and full time pupils over 17 by two. The Executive would elect its own chairman and the Principal would be entitled to attend throughout meetings. A 'Management Team (Senior Staff)' with unspecified membership was to prepare the programme and implement and allocate resources. The description of the new mechanisms for decision-making does stress something of a social engineering approach which is somewhat at variance with the ideal otherwise expressed of 'serving the community', e.g.,

What we are saying is that a group of education staff, full time and part time, teaching and non teaching should see themselves as responsible in consultation with other similar groups for major changes in the educational growth and development of the local area community over a limited time period and that they should be prepared to be accountable to the human beings they are seeking to

change - and without whom, in the last resort they could not function. This, perhaps, is what liberal democratic government is all about!
(From Report of the Working Party on Government and Finance, emphasis mine).

The above recommendations were met with less than total enthusiasm at the Fourth General Meeting, where agreement to set up a Standing Committee to further the cause was reached only after considerable discussion. The Standing Committee was to meet during the year as required to examine progress in unification and was to be composed of one member of each decision-making body, one from each unification working party, one from the P.T.A. and a County Hall representative, all to be invited to join by the Principal. The minutes of that meeting were preceded by a statement from the Principal:

It might be thought that the delay in publishing Minutes could only be justified if those Minutes were lengthy. There are two reasons, apart from economy, why they are not so. The Reports of the working parties were themselves distillations of an enormous amount of thought and writing devoted to the subject over the previous eighteen months. Even a lengthy meeting could have done little more than offer general approval, which it did, and marginal comment. It has been thought best, therefore, that the Minutes should reflect the nature of that comment, and not seem to outweigh in length or importance the working parties' Reports, in conjunction with which they should be read.

Secondly, since the optimistic call to unity which was echoed by the December meeting, financial cuts have been proposed by the County Council which threaten the entire fabric of Leicestershire's hard-won community provision. I will forbear to repeat here even the gist of arguments which have been fully and publicly expressed against those cuts, notably at a mass meeting at the De Montfort Hall to which I had the privilege of contributing. As was suggested in the general preamble to the working parties' Reports, an economic crisis should give added importance to any scheme designed to supply more effectively the needs of the community by sharing valuable resources. But if, for a farthing's saving on the rates, this aim should become less attainable, the very brevity of these Minutes may be the more eloquent.

The prospects for unification in February 1975 did not then seem as bright as had been hoped for when the process of discussion was set under way on February 14th 1974.

The full time teaching staff involved in all the working parties put together never exceeded fourteen, and all the working parties suffered from under representation from one or other section of the elusive community - particularly local residents and users. The notion of the community itself often came under attack, but the idea survived. The influence of the whole process of discussion under way in 1973-4 on the life of the school is difficult to estimate. Certainly some staff devoted much of their energies to the unification cause - other staff distrusted the whole exercise and blamed it for the dissipation of energies of those who should have been seeing to the immediate concerns of the school. Within the staff the move to integration (open ideology) was seen by some as the threat of more centralization and standardization (closed ideology). The pursuit of unification was by no means seen by all staff as a useful exercise, indeed it was blamed by some (such as Kenneth Hall) for the postponement of internal change in the school itself.

APPENDIX C.

APPENDIX CTHE QUESTIONNAIREABSOLUTELY CONFIDENTIAL.

Many of you will have seen me in the college, listening and taking notes. I wish to add to this 'participant observation' a method of enquiry which would yield more easily quantifiable data. Hence this questionnaire.

My work here goes towards a Ph.D. thesis for the University of Leicester. Nothing would be published without the approval of the college. Any recognizable reference to persons involved would only be used with their explicit approval. I will submit the various drafts of my thesis to the staff and if thought suitable, the students, so that your comments will become part of my final account.

Questions that would or might reveal your identity I have marked with a⁺. Please feel free not to answer these or any questions you feel to be inappropriate, though I would appreciate an indication of the reasons for your decision in place of an answer.

All of your answers will be absolutely confidential and analysed in the strictest secrecy - any results being circulated in aggregate form only.

I would welcome any queries, suggestions or comments on my work in general, or this questionnaire in particular.

Please return the completed questionnaire to my pigeon hole or direct to me, as soon as possible.

Many thanks,

Andy Hannan.

N.B. PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX (OR BOXES).

1. <u>Sex</u>	Male
	Female
2. <u>Age</u>	Under 25
	25-29
	30-34
	35-39
	40-44
	45-49
	50-54
	55-59
	60 and over

3. Qualifications

('Good honours' from the Burnham definition).

Trained non graduate

Untrained non graduate

Trained graduate good honours

Trained graduate other than good honours

Untrained graduate good honours

Untrained graduate other than good honours

4. Where did you do your degree (if at all)?

.....

.....

5. Where did you do your 'teacher training' (if at all)?

.....

.....

6. What sort of secondary school(s) have you attended as a pupil?

Secondary Modern

Grammar

Independent

Comprehensive

Others (please specify)

.....

.....

7. Before working at the Redmond College how many years of full-time teaching experience did you have?

None

1 year

2 years

3 years

4 years

5 years

6 - 10 years

More than 10 years

8. At what type or types of 'school' have you previously taught as a full-time teacher?

None

Secondary Modern

Grammar

11-14 High School

14-18 Upper School

11-18 Comprehensive

Technical College

Independent

Primary

Special

Others (please specify)

.....

9. Please state as exactly as possible what is/was the main occupation of your father

.....
.....
.....

10. Place of birth

Within 20 miles of Redmond
20-50 miles of Redmond
Elsewhere

11. Marital status

Married
Single
Other

12. How many children do you have?

None
1
2
3
4
5 or more

13. How many children do you have between the ages 5-18 receiving full-time education?

None
1
2
3
4
5 or more

14. How many years have you worked at the Redmond College (not including the old grammar school)?

Started this year
1 year previous to this
2 years previous to this
3 years previous to this
4 years previous to this

15. Do you hold a position of special responsibility in the college?

Yes
No.

16. Please state your particular position(s) of responsibility (if any).

*

17. Please indicate your position on the Burnham scale.

Scale 1
 Scale 2
 Scale 3
 Scale 4
 Scale 5
 Above

18. Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the relationship between staff and students in the college.

Very satisfied
 Generally satisfied
 Not satisfied

19. If you have any comments on relationships between staff and students in the college please write in the space below.

.....

20. Of which Faculty or Faculties are you a member?

Science
 Humanities
 Design
 Extra Faculty
 None

21. What subject(s) or course(s) do you teach?

*

22. Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with each of the courses or subjects you mention above using only the terms 'very satisfied' 'generally satisfied' and 'not satisfied'.

(e.g., Subject A Very satisfied
 Subject B Generally satisfied
 Subject C Not satisfied.)

.....

23. If you have any comments on the course(s) offered in your particular subject area(s) please write in the space below.

.....

24. Are you satisfied with the courses offered in the college as a whole?

Very satisfied
 Generally satisfied
 Not satisfied

25. If you have any comments on the courses offered in the college as a whole please write in the space below.

.....

26. What new development in curriculum and/or methods of teaching would you like to see in the college in the near future?

.....

27. Are you in favour of 'college unification' (of Youth Centre, Community College and School)?

Yes
 No

28. If you have any comments on college unification please write in the space below.

.....

29. How many hours a week, on average, do you spend on work for the college outside official hours?

.....

30. Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the decision-making procedures in the college.

Very satisfied
 Generally satisfied
 Not satisfied

31. If you have any comments on the procedures and practices of decision-making in the college please write in the space below.

.....

32. What do you consider to be the major problems facing the Redmond College?

a) In the short term?

.....
.....
.....
.....

b) In the longer term?

.....
.....
.....
.....

33. Why did you come to the Redmond College?

.....
.....
.....
.....

34. Do you intend leaving the Redmond College either during or at the end of the year?

Yes

No

Maybe

35. If 'Yes' or 'maybe' why are you thinking of leaving? (Please give reasons as fully as possible).

.....
.....
.....
.....

36. If 'No' why are you staying? (Please give reasons as fully as possible).

.....
.....
.....
.....

37. What are your long term career plans?

.....

38. Do you think my presence as 'observer' or 'resident sociologist' has so far had any affect on events in the college or on the way it has been running?

Yes

No

39. If Yes please give as full an explanation as possible.

.....

40. Any matters you would like to raise (please write in the space below)

.....

Name

(this information is not essential but would be much appreciated).

Thank you for the effort you have put into completing this this questionnaire. Please return it to my pigeon hole or direct to me as soon as possible.

Thanks again,

Andy Hannan.

APPENDIX D.

APPENDIX D.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.

I want to discuss your approaches to education, teaching and your own particular subjects. Please don't be afraid to question my questions or to criticize my assumptions.

- 1) Would you say you had or had not a general 'philosophy' or set of general aims in education?

Supplementary I would be particularly interested in your views on the function of education for this particular age group. What should this school or college be trying to achieve?

- 2) Do you think the school or college has a general philosophy, set of aims or ideals?

What are these?

When did you first become aware of these?

- 3) Would you say you had an overall approach to the business of actually teaching?

Supplementary What would you consider to be the attributes of a good teacher? a poor teacher? Do you approve of so-called child-centred resource-based approaches to teaching? mixed ability? streaming?

- 4) How do you see the subjects you teach in terms of their contribution to a students education?

Supplementary Why teach (subjects)?

- 5) Do you think your opinions as a teacher have changed since you came to Redmond?

- 6) Could you describe in some detail what happened to you when you came for interview and what you thought to be the most important factors influencing your appointment?

- 7) What aspects of the college were stressed most?

OR

- 6) Were you at the Redmond Grammar School? What was your appointment at Redmond Grammar School?

- 7) What were your impressions of the planning process for the establishment of this school and how great a part did you play in it?

- 8) What do you think of the pastoral system and its operation in this college?

Supplementary How well do you think the tutor group system works? What do you think about the role of Counsellor?

- 9) How far do you think the school or college has changed over the last year and how different do you think it will be next year?
- 10) What problems do you think the college has encountered over the last year?
- 11) Would you consider there to be any major faults in the structure of the college and its methods in dealing with problems?
- 12) Do you perceive any factions or well defined groups in the school or college among members of staff?
On what basis?
- 13) Would you say there was any conflict, competition or areas of strain between staff?
Where? On what issues?
- 14) How far do you think the college offers an equal opportunity to all its students?
- 15) Any questions?
- 16) Do you think I've obtained a good record of your opinions?

Thank you.

APPENDIX E.

APPENDIX E.THE SCHOOL YEAR: A SUMMARY ACCOUNT

The agendas of committee meetings were composed of a variety of items, some minor and administrative with attention to detail, and some major constituting attempts to change the whole organization of the school. In this account of the school year, it has been necessary to exclude the former items and concentrate on those which played a major part in the organization during the year. Thus, I have chosen to focus on those issues which involve some element of the official description of the school - on proposals which would necessitate a change in the official description or discussions which challenge some of its central facets. Taking the most evidently important of such issues we can produce the following summary of the school year.

a) The First Term (Autumn)⁽¹⁾

The first Curricular Committee meeting of the year reviewed the previous year's examinations results and found cause for alarm in the large number of grade nines at O-Level. It was decided to put candidates of such potential into C.S.E. in future, comfort being taken in the knowledge that Redmond entered far above the national average of its students for public examinations. In the first half of the term the Curricular Committee received three requests for the institution of new courses, Engineering Science A-level, a Mass Media C.S.E., and

1. The participant observation at the school began on November 5th, 1973. The account of the school year prior to that date is based on documents and staff recollections, etc...

a major fourth and fifth year German course new to the school. All these requests were accepted and plans were made for their implementation. However, there was considerable conflict between Physical Education (P.E.) and Drama about their joint use of the two double and two single periods they had timetabled per week. Negotiations ended with the retention of a status quo unwanted by either side but considered better than the alternative of rearranging the total timetable structure.

The Curricular Committee minutes of 20th September were the first to mention problems caused by the presence of students who were to leave school at Easter. The meeting agreed to contact the parents of the students concerned in order to urge them to continue until their courses were completed in the Summer. The minutes of the Pastoral Committee of the 27th September asked all tutors to,

identify students who intend to leave at Easter 1974
and who are causing problems in classes and to report
to Faculty Heads,

in order to clarify the size of the problem. At this meeting a 'search and return to classes' exercise to 'flush out' all those who were avoiding lessons by staying in toilets, fields, etc.. was organized. At the November 1st meeting the tactic was reported to be successful, but very transitory in its effect.

Other issues discussed in the Pastoral Committee included the following: an attempt to decentralise the Parent Teacher Association (P.T.A.) which eventually brought Division based parent meetings in addition to the central committee; calls for campaigns against the proliferation of litter; an attempt to extend to the fourth and fifth years the right of the sixth

and seventh years to go out into the village at lunch time, with parents' permission. The latter attempt failed, the reason given being based on the possibility of overwhelming the local village with large numbers of students.

The G.S.M. on the 9th October was the first of its kind. It accepted the report of the working party on Supplementary Education, though general agreement was only reached on that working party's recommendation that more Supplementary Education staff be appointed.

A proposal by Harold Terry,

that we discuss possible ways of coordinating the academic and pastoral roles of teachers, particularly with regard to helping uninvolved students

prompted much debate on the possibilities of team teaching.

In a circular produced in advance of the meeting Harold Terry raised many issues which were returned to throughout the year. At the meeting on October 9th Chris Bishop made a proposal to set up a working party to discuss the matters raised, but this was rejected by the meeting which voted by 61-8 (with five abstentions) to invite specific proposals for the next G.S.M.

A further item arguing that,

Now that the college seems to be organized on a geographical basis, Departments/Faculties take responsibility for their particular zones of the school with regard to lunchtime supervision.

was left to 'lie on the table' by a vote of 48-23 (four abstentions). It was discussed again at the G.S.M. on 29th January.

On December 5th there was a major public meeting to receive the report of the working party on college unification.⁽¹⁾

1. A term referring to the establishment of a college integrating the disparate school, community college and youth centre elements.

The meeting set up four sub-committees, i.e., Building and Resources, Staffing and Programme Planning, Social and Pastoral, and Government and Finance, which were to report by the 5th December 1974.

At the Pastoral Committee meeting of the 1st November proposals were made to institute some variety of afternoon registration in order to keep a check on those students who disappeared from the school after the morning registration. The Counsellor, Helen Taylor, argued that registration also gave students a sense of being wanted and of belonging, so that their presence made a difference. She proposed that at the beginning of every lesson each teacher would take a register and pass on notes of 'suspicious absences' to the respective Division Head. This proposal met with the support of four out of the six Divisions and was sent to the Curricular Committee for further discussion. That Committee on November 22nd argued that,

there seems little agreement on what should be done.
and decided merely that,

class teachers should enquire into all absences
in their periods.

without suggesting a suitable procedure. The Pastoral Committee meeting of the 17th January attempted to clear up the confusion by suggesting that registration should be taken on the lines put forward at the meeting on the 1st November. The various committees had taken over two months to produce this statement of school policy.

Another item raised at the November 1st meeting was that of tutor group assemblies. The matter was also discussed on the

15th November and again throughout the meetings devoted to the discussion of the 'motivation of the unmotivated'. The problem posed was how to make tutor group periods into valuable group activities in the short time available (20 minutes at the most at the beginning of the school day.) Several staff thought that such activity would be one answer to the problem of how to involve the students more in the school. No structural changes were made to the tutor group **system** at this time, although further attempts were made throughout the year.

The Curricular Committee meeting of 8th November accepted the recommendation of the Science Faculty to phase out Environmental Science from the timetable. The reason given in the minutes was the lack of available laboratory space. At that meeting, and again on the 22nd of November, links with high schools were discussed and attempts were made to improve liaison by **arranging** subject meetings between the respective high school and upper school staff.

The G.S.M. of the 27th November had on its agenda an item proposing that tutors should be enabled to teach members of their tutor group. This specific item had arisen from the proposal at the previous G.S.M. to discuss the coordination of the academic and pastoral roles of teachers. It was overwhelmingly defeated, in part on the strength of Helen Taylor's arguments for the retention of the system of sociometric allocation to tutor groups in order to facilitate the transfer of students at the age of 14.⁽¹⁾ Item 4 on the agenda was that,

action should be taken to motivate the unmotivated.

1. The third years at their high schools were given the opportunity to choose which of their friends they would like to share a tutor group with at Redmond.

The discussion of this proposal was to overlap the boundaries of the G.S.M. and was to dominate the rest of the term's meetings. The Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee voted by 9-5 to ask the whole staff whether or not to devote the next two weeks meetings to the discussion of the 'unmotivated'. The Friday morning gathering of the staff on the 30th November voted to do so by 33-30. The discussions which followed included debate about most aspects of the official description of the school. During this period of discussion a section of students among the fourth and fifth years drew up a petition which collected a large number of signatures protesting against the cold in the school (which had lost most of its already inadequate heating in the current energy crisis). On Monday 10th December a large number of students stood out in the car park refusing to return to lessons as a protest against the lack of heating. Estimates of numbers varied from 100 to 400. The whole student body was seen by the Principal, three Divisions at a time, and informed of the stupidity of their actions, told of the culpability of some students who removed heater fuses, and notified fully about the measures taken to minimise the effect of the shortage of fuel. The term ended with frequent false fire alarms, but some joviality at the traditional Christmas Carol concert and parties.

b) The Second Term (Spring)

The 17th January meeting of the Pastoral Committee marked the beginning of a campaign against vandalism which was also to take up most of the time at School Council meetings throughout the term. The discussions centred around three issues: i) how to

make students aware of the gravity of the situation; ii) how to prevent the vandalising of toilets; iii) how to provide acceptable alternative activities for lunchtimes. The School Council explored the possibilities of producing questionnaires and pictorial slides to achieve the first objective, whilst the Principal began to plan a letter to students eventually issued on 25th March. The Pastoral Committee sought to greatly restrict the students' use of the toilets during lesson times, but this suggestion was opposed by the Divisions and the School Council in their meetings. In response to the third issue many fund raising schemes were launched in order to purchase entertainment equipment. The School Council also called attention to the confusion over whether or not students were to be registered for each lesson and asked for a tighter check to be kept on students' attendance at lessons. At the February 7th meeting a further attempt to change the tutor group system was made. A proposal put forward by Peter Collins suggested that tutor groups in future be organized in year groups so as to facilitate administration and provide a more realistic basis for group work. This was defeated, but prompted much debate about the aims of tutor groups and in particular the claim to treat the students as 'young adults'.

The Curricular Committee meeting on the 24th January discussed the various demands for the eight extra staff to be appointed in 1974-5 and declared priority for an extra Supplementary Education teacher and appointments to cover the commitment of four teachers who were taking up 60-40% school-community college timetables. The decision on other staff was postponed until after the

appointment of a Registrar of Studies⁽¹⁾ and a Sixth Form Tutor so that their teaching subjects could be taken into account. The Staff Bulletin announced the inception of a 'Facts About Smoking' course to be attended after school on Mondays by those who broke the School rule on no smoking. The course was planned by the Principal in the last two weeks of the first term whilst the normal decision-making process was taken up with discussing the 'unmotivated'.

The G.S.M. on the 31st January rejected a proposal on the restructuring of the school timetable. This involved the placing of the tutor group period at the beginning of the afternoon, rather than in the morning, so as to avoid the disruption caused by buses arriving late. The major item on the agenda, however, was the revival of the proposal to make Faculties and Departments responsible for staff lunchtime supervision duties - a proposal which had lain 'on the table' since the first G.S.M. The proposal was carried and the Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee set about planning the details of allocating areas which were to be the responsibility of a particular Faculty during lunch or break times. This system was to replace one based on Division duty where each Division had responsibility for the whole school once every six weeks. The Faculty based system was to be reviewed periodically. It was implemented from Wednesday 27th February.

The Curricular Committee meeting of the 14th and 15th February approved a project put forward by Derek Woods to take a group of 'unmotivated' students to help build an adventure

1. To replace the Senior Academic Tutor.

playground in the village. It also gave a guarded welcome to plans from the Supplementary Education Department for a 'New Course' and asked for more detailed plans. The Supplementary Education Department was to be the subject of continued discussions at each of the subsequent Curricular Committee meetings on March 14th, and March 28th. Eventually the 'New Course' intended for the 'less able' and the 'unmotivated' was put aside for another year. The debate, however, had emphasised a marked split which existed in the Supplementary Education Department.

The new duties system was not well received by many staff, particularly the Humanities Faculty who regretted the extra work it caused them. The debate was directed towards the locking of classrooms outside of lesson times, which was against official school policy and which was blamed for directing students to the open Humanities area. The school policy was eventually changed at the Curricular Committee meeting of the 28th March when several staff successfully argued for their areas to be locked.

The Pastoral Committee meeting of the 21st February discussed a proposal that tutor groups should be based in the teaching area of the tutor, but rejected it by a narrow majority. The G.S.M. of the 7th March spent most of its time discussing the following motion,

That the latest spring on the staff room door be removed because it is an impediment to staff-student communication.

with the addition of the amendment,

But that students should not be invited into the staff room to any greater extent than at present.

The proposal was passed by a vote of 25-22, but was promptly

left to 'lie on the table' by the Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee.

The final meeting of the term, that of the Pastoral Committee of the 4th April, rejected a proposal to mark the end of the morning and afternoon sessions with a bell being rung.⁽¹⁾ A decision on whether or not to allow students to attend Division tutor meetings was postponed until the next term. The problem of continuing vandalism was met on the 25th March by a letter written by the Principal and sent to every student advising them of the seriousness of the situation and asking for support.

c) The Third Term (Summer)

The third term began with a G.S.M. which adopted a proposal to open Pastoral, Curricular and Joint Meetings to staff observers (non-voting). This innovation was agreed to by the Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee. A proposal to renew the 'open door' policy of leaving all rooms unlocked was rejected overwhelmingly.

A third proposal put by David Allen asked the staff to consider a document raising a whole series of issues centred around the topic of 'staff-student relationships'. The proposal asked the Chairman of the G.S.M. to summarize points in the discussion on which there had been agreement so that these points could be voted on and then passed on to the Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee for translation into action. A full discussion followed, but the only really concrete point to arise was a proposal for a staff 'simulation' or 'planning' exercise. The next G.S.M. and Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee

1. No bells were rung as indicators of the beginning or ending of periods. Bell ringing was avoided because, it was argued, it would make Redmond seem more like a school for children rather than a College for young adults.

meetings on June 4th and 6th respectively, set up the machinery for such a planning exercise, which was to be an attempt to address the problems associated with staff-student relationships by acting out the situations and roles involved. This unusual meeting was fixed to take place one Saturday the following term and was to be organised by Max Crawford, Frank Coulson and Helen Taylor. The Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee meeting on April 25th responded to the discussions on staff-student relationships by reconvening a private meeting of senior staff originally planned for the 12th March. This meeting took place on the 6th May and served mainly as an attempt to create a consensus among senior staff on how to deal with problems raised by student misbehaviour and how to set an example to other staff on standards of staff behaviour.⁽¹⁾ The 25th April Joint Pastoral/Curricular Committee meeting had raised some points about the standard of staff behaviour, recording in its minutes a reminder to staff that attendance at G.S.M.'s (which had fallen below 65) was 'expected'. The meeting of the same committee on June 6th took the item of 'the spring on the door' off the table, Bob Cosnett announcing that the spring was to be removed during the Summer Vacation.

The Curricular Committee meeting of the 2nd May reviewed the lunchtime duty system with reports from all Faculties. It found that most of the problems with students were concentrated in the Humanities area, but again the system was retained substantially unchanged. The Design Faculty had come under some criticism in this discussion for the manner in which it organised

1. See Appendix G.

its duty supervision and the Design Faculty was again the subject of complaint in the Curricular Committee meeting of the 16th May. The system of substituting staff from other Faculties for Design teachers doing C.S.E. examinations was much criticised and agreement was reached not to repeat the arrangement.

The Pastoral Committee meeting of 9th May accepted the decision of the Division meetings to invite students to their discussions, but some reservations were expressed by senior staff about the possibility of undermining the position of the School Council by setting up an alternative representative structure. The major item for discussion was 'smoking' and how to deal with second offenders who had already completed a 'Facts About Smoking' Course. A decision was postponed in the absence of the Principal and the discussion recommenced at the 23rd May meeting. It was eventually decided to require second offenders to spend 30 minutes for 5 days at lunchtime doing some sort of community service work of a manual kind, parents being informed and invited to discuss the breaking of the school rule with the respective Division Head.

The most dramatic problem posed in the third term was the question of how to deal with the network of gambling and intimidation discovered amongst a group of students. The students involved in this series of offences made a great show of their physical power and the existence of a sub-culture of violence lead the Principal to call in the police to deal with the culprits. These measures were handled mostly by Bob Cosnett, the Vice Principal, but the issues involved were discussed in

retrospect by the Pastoral Committee on the 13th June and The Colloquium on June 19th and 26th. One of the factors most keenly discussed was the fore-knowledge of the Counsellor, Helen Taylor, who had not given any more than broad hints of the goings on for fear of breaking her agreement with students to keep absolute secrecy on the matter.

The Finance Committee meetings of the 5th and 25th June were concerned with an attempt initiated by Frank Coulson to find out the cost per subject per student per period of time in order to make comparisons and examine priorities. The exercise led to much debate but no immediate changes in school policy.

The last Pastoral Committee meeting of the term on the 13th June raised very large issues in an attempt by the members of Division One to reform the organization of the school so as to minimise the split between pastoral and curricular. Division One made two proposals which asked for Divisions to be treated as pastoral/curricular teams with students as far as possible being taught by members of staff from their Division, and for tutor bases to be placed in the teaching areas of the tutors. The second of these proposals was left to 'lie on the table' and the first was passed on to the Faculties and the Curricular Committee. The Pastoral Committee in its minutes called for the formation of a working party on this matter. The Curricular Committee in its turn gave each Faculty a free hand to implement the above proposals if it so wished. The reform proposal did not, then, achieve all its aims, but it had not been completely defeated.

The final meeting of the term was the first Colloquium attended by the new Registrar of Studies, Clive Mariner, where plans were made to revise the structure of the timetable, so long the basis of the curriculum in the school.

APPENDIX F.

APPENDIX F.THE STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE: ANALYSIS1) Introduction.

The analysis presented here provides the basis for the identification of those who consistently advocated open or closed ideologies. For the full text of the questionnaire see Appendix C.

2) The Questionnaire

As stated previously in the 'Methods' chapter, 69 out of a possible 97 staff responded to the questionnaire (a response rate of 71.1%). Before categorising the replies it is first necessary to establish how representative the respondents can be said to be. In terms of the male-female ratio the response was fairly representative, 49 of the replies were from males, 20 from females, a ratio of 2.5:1 as compared to 2.7:1 in the total staff population. The representation of Faculties and Divisions was as follows:

TABLE 1. Faculties

Faculty	Total Staff		Respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Science	23	23.7	16	23.2
Humanities	27	27.8	19	27.5
Design	20	20.6	12	17.4
Extra	10	10.3	7	10.1
Across	5	5.2	4	5.8
Other	12	12.4	11	15.9

Notes on Table 1.

Extra Faculty includes P.E., Drama and Commerce.

Across Faculties includes 4 doing Drama and Humanities, and 1 doing Modern Languages and Mathematics.

Other includes a part-time Commerce teacher based at a local technical college (who took on many of the duties of a Head of Commerce), the Principal, Vice Principals, Senior Master, Director of Studies, Senior Academic Tutor, the Head of Community Education, 4 Community College Tutors and the Counsellor.

TABLE 2 Divisions

Division	Total Staff		Respondents	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Division 1	15	15.5	9	13.0
Division 2	16	16.5	12	17.4
Division 3	15	15.5	10	14.5
Division 4	15	15.5	10	14.5
Division 5	15	15.5	12	17.4
Division 6	15	15.5	9	13.0
Other	6	6.2	6	8.7

Notes

One respondent remained anonymous and is thus unclassified in terms of Division membership.

The Other category here includes the part-time Commerce teacher, the Counsellor, the Principal, Vice Principals and Senior Master.

The questionnaire asked for identification in the following manner:

Name (this information is not essential but would be much appreciated).

Staff were also told in the introduction that:

Questions that would or might reveal your identity I have marked with an*. Please feel free not to answer these or any questions you feel to be inappropriate.

Only one respondent remained anonymous, but she did supply the information that she was a member of the Design Faculty, teaching in particular Design-in-the-Home. Taking this into account it is possible to deduce the following about the non-respondents, who

totalled 28 in number:-

1 was a Deputy Division Head,

1 was a Head of Faculty,

5 were Heads of subject Departments

7 were members of the Science Faculty.

8 were members of the Humanities Faculty

8 were members of the Design Faculty

3 were members of the Extra Faculty

1 was a Drama/Humanities teacher

1 was a Community Tutor.

From the above statistics it is possible to deduce the following things about how representative the respondents were of the total staff population:-

- 1) Design Faculty slightly under-represented (20.6% of total staff population, 17.4% of respondents)
- 2) Division One slightly under-represented (15.5% of total staff population, 13% of respondents)
- 3) Division Six slightly under-represented (15.5 of total staff population, 13% of respondents)
- 4) For both Table 1 and Table 2 the 'Other' category is slightly over-represented. All staff not attached to Divisions answered the questionnaire, only one member of staff outside the Faculty system (a Community tutor) failed to answer.

In addition to the above it is worthy of note that all members of the Pastoral and Curricular Committees bar one (The Head of Design) answered the questionnaire. It is possible to say then, with the reservations above noted, that in terms of

male-female ratio, Faculty and Division membership, the respondents do constitute a fairly representative group. However, there is a noticeable over-representation of senior staff, i.e., those in the Pastoral and Curricular Committees, (16.5% of total staff population, 21.7% of respondents). It is important to bear the above in mind when reviewing the following analysis of questionnaire returns.

3) Closed-ended Questions.

The answers to the close-ended questions are here given in tabular form:⁽¹⁾

TABLE 3. Closed-ended Questions

<u>Question 2.</u>	Age	Number	Percentage
	Under 25	11	15.9
	25-29	27	39.1
	30-34	11	15.9
	35-39	8	11.6
	40-44	4	5.8
	45-49	5	7.2
	50-54	1	1.4
	55-59	1	1.4
	60 and over	1	1.4

1. Not all of the items are used for further analysis, e.g., marital status and number of children. These are included here to offer data for any comparative analysis others may wish to make.

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 3.Qualifications ('Good Honours' from Burnham definition)

Category	Number	Percentage
Trained non-graduate	14	20.3
Untrained non-graduate	0	0
Trained graduate good honours	32	46
Trained graduate other than good honours	10	14.5
Untrained graduate good honours	4	5.8
Untrained graduate other than good honours	4	5.8
Other	5	7.2

NoteThe Other category includes:

- 1 trained non-graduate with '1 year' alongside box ticked
- 1 trained graduate other than good honours with a question mark alongside box ticked
- 1 with untrained graduate other than good honours ticked along with the addition of a ticked 'Higher degree' category
- 1 with American qualifications of B.A., M.A., Ph.D.
- 1 who failed to answer.

Question 4.

Where did you do your degree (if at all)?

Category	Number	Percentage of those having done a degree
Cambridge or Oxford	12	26.1
Other	34	73.9

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 5

Where did you do your 'teacher training' (if at all)?

Category	Number	Percentage of those trained as teachers
School of Education, University of Leicester	12	20
Institute of Education, University of London	3	5
Other	45	75

Questions 4 and 5

Place of teacher training

Category	Number	Percentage
College of Education	15	21.7
University ⁽¹⁾	47	68.1
Art College	4	5.8
Domestic Science College	2	2.9
Drama College	1	1.4

Notes (1) The 'University' Category includes those who obtained degrees without a teacher training component.

Question 6

What sort of secondary school(s) have you attended as a pupil?

Category	Number	Percentage
Secondary Modern	4	5.8
Grammar	42	60.9
Independent	9	13.0
Comprehensive	0	0
Other	14	20.3

Question 6. (Continued)Notes.

The Other category includes:

2 from secondary modern and grammar; 1 secondary modern and technical grammar; 5 direct grant schools; 1 American comprehensive; 1 County Council boarding school; 1 'intermediate'; 1 independent and specialist art school; 1 grammar and independent; 1 bilateral and comprehensive.

Question 7

Before working at the Redmond College how many years of full-time teaching experience did you have?

Category	Number	Percentage
A ⁽¹⁾ None	22	31.9
B 1 year	5	7.2
C 2 years	4	5.8
D 3 years	4	5.8
E 4 years	4	5.8
F 5 years	3	4.3
G 6 - 10 years	10	14.5
H more than 10 years	13	18.8

Note

In addition to the above:-

Three respondents added some sort of comment or query.

Comments: A? ⁽²⁾ Except for one year at a Junior School
prior to going to University (as a 'student teacher')
A/B Less than 1 year
B plus $\frac{1}{2}$ a year

One respondent did not answer this question.

1. The capital letters used to designate categories are referred to in the additional information and notes.
2. A question mark indicates an additional comment, query or the addition of an actual question mark opposite the ticked box.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Question 8

At what type or types of 'school' have you previously taught as a full-time teacher?

Category	Number	Percentage
A None	20	29.0
B Secondary Modern	2	2.9
C Grammar	5	7.2
D 11 - 14 High School	1	1.4
E 14 - 18 Upper School	0	0
F 11 - 18 Comprehensive	7	10.1
G Technical College	1	1.4
H Independent	1	1.4
I Primary	0	0
J Special	0	0
K Others (Please specify)	see below	

Note

In addition to the above:-

32 respondents either ticked more than one box or specified another sort of school in the Others category or added some sort of comment or query. These replies are further classified below:

Comments: I? As 'student teacher' before going to university
 BC? Secondary Modern and Supply teacher at Grammar
 F? Mostly administration and organization with some teaching.
 G? 1 term at a technical college.

Other Experience.

HK - Preparatory School
 BGK - College of Education
 BCJK - " " "
 CK - Schools in Africa
 EK - " " "
 CK - H.M. Forces Education
 CDGIK - " " "
 HK - Direct Grant Grammar School

Question 8 Notes (Continued)

GJK - University
 K - Independent Arts Centre

Other Multiples

2(BD), 2(BF), 2(CH), 2(BE), 2(FH), 2(CE), (BG), (BC), (DI),
 (DF), (CF).

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 9

Please state as exactly as possible what is/was the main occupation of your father.

Registrar General's 1970
 Classification.

Social Class	Number	Percentage
1 Professional and managerial	11	15.9
2 Executive and other non-manual	24	34.8
3a Routine non-manual	18	26.1
3b Skilled manual	12	17.4
4 Semi-skilled manual	3	4.3
5 Unskilled manual	0	0
Manual	14	20.3
Non-manual	54	78.3
Unclassifiable	1	1.4

Note

One respondent wrote only 'deceased' in answer to this question. The Registrar General's Classification places 'caretaker' in the 'non-manual' and 'social class four' categories, hence the title 'semi-skilled manual' is inaccurate since the category includes one caretaker.

Question 10

Place of Birth	Number	Percentage
Within 20 miles of Redmond	6	8.7
20 - 25 miles of Redmond	9	13.0
Elsewhere	54	78.3

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 11

Marital Status	Number	Percentage
Married	48	69.7
Single	18	26.1
Other	3	4.3

Question 12.

How many children do you have?	Number	Percentage
None	38	55.1
1	10	14.5
2	13	18.8
3	4	5.8
4	1	1.4
5 or more	1	1.4

Note 2 respondents did not answer this question.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Question 13

How many children do you have between the ages 5 - 18 receiving full-time education?

Category	Number	Percentage
None	52	75.4
1	6	8.7
2	6	8.7
3	2	2.9
4	0	0
5 or more	0	0

Note

3 respondents did not answer this question.

Question 14

How many years have you worked at the Redmond College (not including the old grammar school)?

Category	Number	Percentage
A Started this year	27	39.1
B 1 year previous to this	12	17.4
C 2 years previous to this	10	14.5
D 3 years previous to this	7	10.1
E 4 years previous to this	12	17.4

Note

In addition to the above one box was ticked (B) $1\frac{1}{2}$ years

TABLE 3 (continued)Question 15

Do you hold a position of special responsibility in the college?

Category	Number	Percentage
A Yes	45	65.2
B No	18	26.1

Note

In addition to the above 4 boxes were ticked (A?) and one (B?)

Question 17

Please indicate your position on the Burnham Scale

Category	Number	Percentage
Scale 1	14	20.3
Scale 2	10	14.5
Scale 3	13	18.8
Scale 4	10	14.5
Scale 5	11	15.9
Above Scale 5	5	7.2

Note

Six respondents did not answer this question.

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 18

Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the relationship between staff and students in the college.

Category	Number	Percentage
A Very satisfied	4	5.8
B Generally satisfied	50	72.5
C Not satisfied	11	15.9

Note

In addition to the above one respondent ticked more than one box - (BC), two boxes were ticked (B?)
One respondent ticked all three boxes.

Question 24

Are you satisfied with the courses offered in the college as a whole?

Category	Number	Percentage
A Very satisfied	3	4.3
B Generally satisfied	44	63.8
C Not satisfied	15	21.7

Note

In addition to the above three boxes were ticked (B?)
Four respondents did not answer the question.

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 27

Are you in favour of 'college unification' (of Youth Centre, Community College and School)?

Category	Number	Percentage
A Yes	46	66.7
B No	9	13.0

Note

In addition to the above 12 replies were unclassifiable.
Two respondents did not answer this question.

Question 30

Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the decision-making procedures in the College.

Category	Number	Percentage
A Very satisfied	1	1.4
B Generally satisfied	33	47.8
C Not satisfied	32	46.4

Note

In addition to the above one respondent did not answer this question, one ticked boxes B and C and wrote 'half way' and one just wrote a question mark.

Question 34

Do you intend leaving the Redmond College either during or at the end of this year?

Category	Number	Percentage
A Yes	11	15.9
B No	40	58.0
C Maybe	16	23.2

Note In addition to the above one respondent ticked more than one box - (BC) and one box was ticked (B?)

TABLE 3 (Continued)Question 38.

Do you think my presence as 'observer' or 'resident sociologist' has so far had any effect on events in the college or on the way it has been running?

Category	Number	Percentage
A Yes ⁽¹⁾	11	15.9
B No	42	60.9

Note

In addition to the above one box was ticked (A?), four boxes were ticked (B?) and five replies were unclassifiable. Four respondents did not answer this question.

1. Those who explained their answer of 'yes' did so in terms of the observer's presence helping to keep staff 'on their toes' and acting as a stimulus to thought with questionnaires and interviews. Nobody mentioned any effects on problems, conflicts or policy.

This information on staff was used to discover the background characteristics of those staff who consistently advocated open or closed ideologies.

4) Open-ended Questions

The open-ended questions which make up the survey pose difficult problems of analysis⁽¹⁾. Four of these questions, 19, 23, 25, 31, were linked to closed-ended questions in the following manner:

18. Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the relationship between staff and students in the college.

Very satisfied

Generally satisfied

Not satisfied

19. If you have any comments on relationships between staff and students in the college please write in the space below.

(15 lines of space followed)

The use of the closed-ended question on degrees of satisfaction was intended to give the researcher a guide to the interpretation of the comments to follow as well as providing a basis for preliminary computations. It was thought preferable to ask for comments rather than offering a set of alternative statements for approval so as to avoid pressing the researcher's definition of events on the respondent. Nevertheless there are considerable difficulties in analyzing data of this kind. As noted previously,

1. Only those items which proved useful in the analysis of staff ideologies are analysed here. For the full list of questionnaire items see Appendix C. Answers to question 29 on hours worked proved impossible to analyse as the interpretation of 'official hours' varied greatly.

it is a mistake to assume that the question means the same to each respondent and equally erroneous to assume that ticking the same box means the same answer. Thus what constitutes satisfaction to one person, may be dissatisfaction to another - some people are clearly more easily satisfied although they may all perceive the same situation. One respondent may see many faults with the school but be 'very satisfied' while another may see the same faults but be 'not satisfied' - it is not the perception of the situation which differs but the degree of satisfaction. Hence the closed-ended questions tell us more about the respondent than they do about the school.

The replies to questions 22/23 are not suitable for content analysis because of the range of replies which vary according to subject taught and in terms of the type of comment given. The comments cannot be reproduced here because, linked to information on subjects taught, they allow respondents to be identified. A variety of methods, however, will be used to analyse the replies to the other questions of this kind.

c) Staff-Student Relationships⁽¹⁾

In answer to question 18 four teachers ticked the 'Very satisfied' box, 50 registered themselves as 'Generally satisfied' and 11 ticked the 'Not satisfied' box. One respondent, (6), ticked both 'Generally' and 'Not', two (33) and (64) ticked 'Generally' with reservations noted, and one (13) ticked all three. The answers to question 19 varied from fullsome praise of the system in operation to very critical attacks. Nine offered no answer to this question (one of these referred to a document submitted to a G.S.M. for relevant information).

1. Numbers appearing in brackets represent respondents, See Chapter Three, Section 5, for a discussion on the use of this device.

TABLE 4 Question 18: Staff-Student Relationships.

Those undecided and those ticking the very satisfied and not satisfied boxes for Question 18.

Very satisfied	(<u>10</u>), (<u>29</u>), (<u>30</u>), (<u>51</u>)
Undecided	(<u>6</u>), (<u>13</u>), (<u>33</u>), (<u>64</u>)
Not satisfied	(<u>4</u>), (<u>21</u>), (<u>27</u>), (<u>32</u>), (<u>41</u>), (<u>42</u>), (<u>46</u>) (<u>50</u>), (<u>52</u>), (<u>53</u>), (<u>55</u>)

The first stage in the analysis of the answers to question 19 was to categorize them in terms of their reference to the following issues:-

(E - H) Egalitarian - Hierarchical: a strengthening or lessening of the boundary between the categories of teacher and student.

(U - S) Unstructured - Structured: more or less explicit control, more formal or informal organization.

(I - S) Individualized - Standardized: more private and personalized or more public and uniform treatment of students.

(I - C) Integrated code - Collection code: a strengthening or lessening of the boundary between the contents of the curriculum.

(L - H) Low differentiation - High differentiation: more or less mixing of different categories of students.

Statements which made no apparent reference to the above were placed in one of the following categories:

(F) Further explanation of the degree of satisfaction

(O) Other

These categories were not thought of as mutually exclusive. It was necessary to place some statements in more than one category and some statements had to be broken up into parts which related to different categories. The analysis which follows refers to each of these categories,

i) Egalitarian - Hierarchical

The 'Egalitarian - Hierarchical' category includes all those items which directly refer to the issue of the strength of the boundary between the categories of teacher and student. The quotation from respondent (1) refers explicitly to such a boundary:

(1) 'Firstly there is the danger of staff becoming too 'familiar' with the students. Whether one likes it or not, there is a barrier between staff and students and however hard a teacher tries he will never become "One of the gang".'

Included in this category are the following aspects of the controversy as to how far staff and students should differ in status: the supposedly 'adult' or 'young adult' position accorded to students; the commitment to 'one community' of equals; the use of Christian names; and the admittance of students to the staff room. Most comments are in the form of discussions of the issue, which merely identify possible dangers or suggest the advantages of the present arrangements. Some, however, make explicit judgements on the official school policy and do so in terms which place the statement in the open or closed ideology category, for example:

(18) Generally good - but general staff attitudes may still be paternalistic and distant.

This respondent appears to be arguing for a reduction in the boundary separating staff and students - he is against the too paternalistic and distant general staff attitude. However, these inferences are not beyond question, and it is important not to read too much into them. Respondent (33) is more clearly in favour of an open approach, but his comments do not relate so directly to the Egalitarian - Hierarchical issue:

(33) Generally, they are the most relaxed and friendly I have known at any school. Not surprisingly (to me anyway) when young people are treated as human beings worthy of respect then in the main they react in a like manner. Problems do arise when teachers try to revert to more traditional ideas of teacher/pupil relationship.

More straightforward are these criticisms of open attitudes:

(4) I think too many staff expect our youngsters to respond as young adults to any situation - the vast majority of our students are boys and girls. Mutual respect between staff and students is required, but the 'we're all the same' attitude results in appalling behaviour on the part of students being accepted as 'just one of those things!' I think we do our students an injustice, particularly the less mature or unstable youngster who will find many problems when he goes out to work unable to cope with adults who have very different ideas about discipline.

(55) I find it difficult to believe that the use of staff Christian names by students is other than a destructive influence on standards of behaviour. We seem, as a staff, to fall into the trap of believing that familiarity leads to a better relationship (more productive in development of character and work) between staff and student. I do not allow students to use my Christian name. Also, the familiarity existing seems to lead to requests to do this or that and unproductive/destructive interchanges whereas firm but fair direction suits me better in my dealings here - and I would think suit others better too, as it might rid us of the 'here to liberate the students from bondage' type of attitude occasionally evident in some staff.

The two respondents quoted above, both of whom ticked the 'Not satisfied' box directly criticized the weak boundary between the

status of the staff and students seen as evident in the school and may be seen as advocating a closed ideology. There is a great range of answers between the two ends of the open-closed spectrum and some comments discuss the merits and demerits of open and closed approaches. The following quotation is somewhat critical of 'open' approaches but argues for the preservation of diversity among the staff:

(5) In general there is a natural friendly relationship between staff and students. In a few cases this may develop into over familiarity - particularly with very young members of staff. This is only harmful if discipline is affected. Students need to learn, as part of their education, that the level of familiarity depends on the circumstances and to appreciate what is acceptable behaviour in a given context. We, with a staff of many varying ages, provide a good opportunity for students to be educated in this aspect of personal relationships - far more than in a school where a rigid code of behaviour is laid down.

The 'in-between' comments are not easily classifiable in terms of the open-closed opposition, however respondents (20) and (64) most clearly supported an open approach:

(20) The Christian name approach reflects also a general willingness to survive on personality and genuineness, rather than "legitimate authority" of status, etc...

(64) Generally very good. Sometimes worries me how little respect a few of the students have for staff (and other students). I feel the majority of the students benefit from our approach - whether Christian names or not and that there are only a few (less than 50) who take advantage.

Respondent (10) ticked the 'very satisfied' box but called for a 'uniform policy' to be agreed on 'common codes of behaviour between staff and students' including 'terms of address'.

Respondent (50) ticked the 'not satisfied' box but made a fairly neutral comment relating to the Egalitarian - Hierarchical issue:

(50) Although the majority are friendly to/with students this is still interpreted as 'familiarity' by some and disapproved of.

In the light of the range of comments listed above, it is possible to construct a rough classification in terms of the open-closed opposition in the following manner.

TABLE 5 Egalitarian - Hierarchical

Arguments	Respondents	Total
Advocating more open approach	(18), (33)?	2
In favour of an open approach/ critical of closed approach	(20), (64)	2
Stating advantages and disadvantages, neutral	(5), (10)V, (40), (50)N, (69)	5
In favour of closed approach/ critical of open approach	(1), (2), (6)? (7) (9), (14), (16), (22), (23), (25), (28), (48), (54), (62), (65)	15
Advocating more closed approach	(4)N, (55)N	2
	TOTAL	26

KEY: ? = undecided, V = Very satisfied, N = not satisfied

The apparent preponderance of comments critical to an open approach (seventeen against four) is balanced somewhat when the number of those in this category who ticked the 'very satisfied' and 'generally satisfied' boxes is taken into account (one and nineteen respectively). The Egalitarian - Hierarchical issue was one which was widely perceived as worthy of comment as it was referred to in some way by 26 respondents.

ii) Unstructured - Structured

The comments included under this category refer to the issue of control, whether it should be more or less explicit, more formal or more informal. Again the quotations can be roughly distributed among a range of categories from open to closed ideology.

TABLE 6 Unstructured - Structured

Arguments	Respondents	Total
Advocating more open approach	(<u>33</u>)	1
In favour of open approach/ critical of closed approach	(<u>20</u>), (<u>38</u>)	2
Stating advantages and disadvantages, neutral	(<u>5</u>), (<u>30</u>)V, (<u>35</u>)	3
In favour of closed approach/ Critical of open approach	(<u>13</u>)?, (<u>16</u>), (<u>48</u>) (<u>59</u>)	4
Advocating more closed approach	(4)N, (37), (42)N, 6 (50)N, (55)N, (69)	

KEY: ? = undecided, V = very satisfied, N = not satisfied 16

Of the respondents whose quotations fitted into the U - S category, four ticked the 'not satisfied' box, one ticked the 'very satisfied' box, two were undecided and nine ticked the 'generally satisfied' box. Eleven of the quotations were critical of the open approach and only three in favour. It seems then, that again a majority of staff who commented on the issue of control were critical of an open approach though most were generally satisfied with the present~~state~~ of affairs in the school.

iii) Individualized - Standardized

The same analytical procedure may be pursued here in relation to the issue of the form of treatment of misbehaving students, whether it should be more private and personalized, or more public and uniform.

TABLE 7. Individual^{ized} - Standardized

Arguments	Respondents	Total
Advocating more open approach		0
In favour of open approach	(<u>5</u>), (<u>36</u>), (<u>38</u>)	3
Stating advantages and disadvantages, neutral	(<u>26</u>)	1
Identifying disadvantages of open approach	(<u>9</u>), (<u>12</u>), (<u>63</u>)	3
Advocating more closed approach	(<u>1</u>), (<u>45</u>), (<u>60</u>)	3
		10

All of the above ticked the 'generally satisfied' box. Of these three were supportive of an open approach and six critical.

iv) Integrated code Collection code.

Only one quotation can be said to relate directly to the issue of the strengthening or lessening of the boundary between the contents of curriculum. Respondent (50) was 'not satisfied' with staff-student relationships and amidst a long quotation made the following argument for a more open, integrated approach to the curriculum:

(50) The lack of subject integration overall means that students' interests are still curtailed rather than exploited to the full. The academic emphasis to build up a good reputation has meant that the less able/less motivated students are only just being recognised as people for whom we are not yet adequately catering.

v) Low differentiation - High differentiation

Here too only one quotation is included under this category and again an argument is made in favour of an open approach, or rather, critical of a closed approach:

(7) This (confrontation) is something that arises out of the pastoral/curricular split; I think streaming is the precursor of difficulties in staff-student relationships.

Respondent (7) registered himself as 'generally satisfied'

vi) Other

The remarks included under the category of 'Further explanation of the degree of satisfaction' will not be analyzed here since they are qualifications of the answers to Question 18 rather than further comments of substance.

In all 40 quotations are entered in the 'other' category. Only a few of these items refer to aspects of the open-closed dichotomy, most are concerned with facets of the situation not directly linked to that of ideological opposition. The following quotations however, refer to the separation of the pastoral and curricular categories in the school's organization.

(22) I'm not sure that the pastoral system works - I have generally a better relationship with those that I teach. I think one advantage of the team teaching situation in Humanities is that it gives a student more opportunity to be able to 'get on' with a member of staff in that framework. I'm sure that it's true to say the majority of students don't have that much relationship with staff - and don't want one.

(65) I have a good relationship with those I teach, but not with others where it tends to be very much an 'us' and 'them' thing - a fault almost inevitable in a 'community' as big as this.

(34) There is too sharp a distinction between pastoral and curriculum matters - and as a result too heavy an emphasis on pastoral matters. To some extent the system creates the problems it seeks to solve. Large pastoral staff, high numbers of free periods, many administrators, all mean larger classes, behaviour problems, lack of individual treatment, student boredom.

(17) I have my own doubts as to the wisdom of separating curricular and pastoral matters as we do at Redmond - perhaps relationships build up more easily when students/staff are engaged on some common activity - this is difficult with our present arrangement.

(18) Feel that much work comes to no avail - why? School size; bussing; division of pastoral and curricular roles?

(7) This (confrontation) is something that arises out of the pastoral/curricular split; I think streaming is the precursor of difficulties in staff/student relationships.

(8) On the whole I think that the place is great for me to make worthwhile relationships with the kids who I teach but this does not apply to my relationships with the general mass of students when I am outside my area. I become fascist and impersonal May I restate however, that I do not share the same opinions about my relationship with those kids who I have the most contact with - those I teach.

Thus it appears that the system of staff-student relationship built on personal contact in a school of 1,500 students and 100 staff posed problems of control outside the limits set by the number of students each member of staff knew through teaching or tutoring situations. In the above quotations, respondents (22) and (65) and (8) expressed the unease felt by staff faced with problems of controlling those students they did not know, as contrasted with the good relationships built up with those whom they had contact with through teaching. Respondents (7), (17), (18) and (34) specifically criticized the perceived 'split' in the organizational structure of the

school between pastoral and curricular. The issue of the pastoral/curricular split was the focus of much staff discussion in the Summer Term (See Chapter Seven). Arguments in favour of integration of pastoral and curricular aspects of the school's organization can be classified as supportive of the open ideology.

d) Curriculum

Questions 24, 25 and 26 all concerned themselves with the general curriculum of the school:

24. Are you satisfied with the courses offered in the college as a whole?

Very satisfied

Generally satisfied

Not satisfied

25. If you have any comments on the courses offered in the college as a whole please write in the space below.

(10 lines of space)

26. What new developments in curriculum and/or methods of teaching would you like to see in the college in the near future?

(9 lines of space)

The answers to questions 25 and 26 will be analyzed together with reference to the level of satisfaction indicated, since the content is closely related and several respondents made replies which linked the questions.

TABLE 8. Question 24. Curriculum.

The 'level of satisfaction'	Respondents	Total
Unclassifiable	(<u>11</u>), (<u>13</u>), (<u>18</u>), (<u>20</u>), (<u>30</u>), (<u>33</u>), (<u>64</u>)	7
Very satisfied	(5), (42), (44)	3
Generally satisfied	(The remainder)	44
Not satisfied	(<u>3</u>), (<u>4</u>), (<u>6</u>), (<u>15</u>), (<u>17</u>), (<u>19</u>), (<u>21</u>), (<u>26</u>), (<u>34</u>), (<u>37</u>), (<u>46</u>), (<u>49</u>), (<u>52</u>), (<u>55</u>), (<u>68</u>)	15

The answers to question 24 indicate a fairly high level of dissatisfaction (21.7%). The nature of staff views on the sort of changes needed in the curriculum is summarised in the following table, which consists of a summary of items with reference to source quotations:

TABLE 9 Curriculum Changes.

a) Suggested Changes

Less accent on examinations	(3) (<u>29</u>) (<u>31</u>) (<u>45</u>)
More accent on examinations	(<u>24</u>) (<u>34</u>)
More emphasis on 'creative' work	(<u>33</u>) (<u>50</u>)
Less emphasis on 'creative work'	(<u>58</u>)
More extra-curricular activities	(1) (<u>2</u>)
More mixed ability groupings	(1) (<u>17</u>) (<u>18</u>) (<u>26</u>) (<u>33</u>) (<u>51</u>) (<u>56</u>) (<u>60</u>)
Against mixed ability grouping	(<u>43</u>) (<u>57</u>)
More vocational courses	(<u>2</u>) (<u>9</u>) (<u>15</u>) (<u>28</u>) (<u>29</u>) (<u>31</u>) (<u>32</u>) (<u>54</u>)
Against vocational courses	(<u>33</u>)
More practical work	(<u>31</u>) (<u>34</u>)
More integration-between Faculties	(3) (<u>50</u>) (<u>56</u>)

Table 9 (Continued)

More integration in Science (7) (27) (36) (63)
 " " " general (9) (49) (67)
 More individualized and small group instruction (5) (27)
 (33) (36) (39) (54)
 More class teaching (43)
 More emphasis on basic skills (37)
 Less emphasis on basic skills (31)
 More flexible timetable (3) (9) (19) (65)
 More resource-based teaching (17) (18) (50)
 Consolidation (22) (32) (40) (69)
 More 'out-of-school' learning (26) (33) (47) (51)
 Core for the Sixth form (27) (36) (38) (51)
 More team teaching (38) (50)
 Against team teaching (41) (47)
 Introduce German (2) (34) (47)
 Smaller groups at fourth and fifth year level (34) (51)
 Referring to most able (31) (35) (37) (39)
 Referring to less able and less motivated (4) (17) (18) (20)
 (24) (25) (28) (35) (37) (38) (39) (41) (45) (46) (53) (56)
 (59) (60) (62) (64) (67)

b) Other.

Community Service on the curriculum (1)
 A C.S.E. in P.E. (2)
 Administrative staff should do more teaching (3)
 A uniform set of standards for behaviour (4)
 A return to more thorough-going approach to written English(8)
 More formative rather than academic courses (12)
 More flexibility in options (15)
 Better team planning, better use of area (17)

A community education course, a recreation and leisure
course (20)

More consensus in High Schools on curriculum(21)

4 O-Level minimum entry to Sixth form (21)

Stricter discipline in teaching methods (21)

Abandon open plan (21)

Humanities needs readjustment (26)

Anthropology (27)

Humanities - team teaching in large areas reviewed (28)

Link courses with further education developed (28)

More study of world religions in R.K. (32)

More Social Science (34)

Critical of Humanities course (37)

Staffing of some 'difficult' courses unwise (37)

Punctuality (37)

More activity (40)

C.E.E.⁽¹⁾ Mathematics (41)

More use of self-instruction in Sixth form (41)

Develop Humanities (47)

More formal methods adopted (48)

More resources (51)

English taught as English (52)

Less repetition (53)

Courses more geared and linked to outside world (53)

More structured control of work (55)

Integrate Science for mixed ability across all years
but impossible with pressure on resources (60)

Anonymity of large school needs seeing to (62)

1. Certificate of Extended Education.

More variety of Sixth form courses (63)

New Geography syllabus (63)

Streaming by subject investigated (64)

In Science too academic, not enough for less able (64)

More need for the unmotivated - is school the right place?(67)

Mixed ability should have multi-level resources (68)

Need to have courses for post C.S.E. Sixth (68)

Of the items above the following can be classified in terms of the open-closed dichotomy:

TABLE 10 A Classification of Items.

a) In support of and advocating a more open approach:-

Less accent on examinations (3) (29) (31) (45)

More mixed ability (1) (17) (18) (26) (33) (51) (56) (60)

More integration (3) (7) (9) (27) (36) (49) $\frac{(50)}{(63)}$ $\frac{(56)}{(67)}$

More individualized and small group instruction (5) (27) (33)
(36) (39) (54)

More resource based teaching (17) (18) (50)

More team teaching (38) (50)

- b) Identifying disadvantages of open approach and advocating more closed approach:

A uniform set of standards for behaviour (4)

A return to a more thorough going approach to written English (8)

Stricter discipline in teaching methods (21)

Abandon open plan (21)

Humanities - team teaching in large areas reviewed (28)

Critical of Humanities (37)

More formal methods adopted (48)

English taught as English (52)

More structured control of work (55)

Against mixed ability (43) (57)

Against team teaching (41) (47)

More class teaching (43)

More accent on examinations (24) (34)

Less emphasis on creative work (58)

The above classifications are at best subjective interpretations of the available data and not too much weight can be placed on any further analysis. However, it is worth noting that:

- 1) most references, 22, were made to provision for the less able and the less motivated;
- 2) 24 persons made statements classifiable as directly supportive of an open approach;
- 3) 15 persons made statements classifiable as directly supportive of a closed approach;
- 4) 8 persons made statements advocating the adoption of more vocational courses, 1 specifically rejected such an approach.

- 5) 10 persons called for more integration in the curriculum;
 6) 8 persons called for more mixed ability grouping, 2 specifically opposed such approaches.

e) Decision-making

Questions 30 and 31 asked the following:

30. Please indicate your degree of satisfaction with the decision-making procedures in the college.

Very satisfied

Generally Satisfied

Not satisfied

31. If you have any comments on the procedures and practice of decision-making in the college please write in the space below.

(10 lines of space).

The answers to Question 30 were as follows:

TABLE 11 Question 30: Decision-Making.

Category	Number	Respondent(s)
Very satisfied	1	(29)
Generally Satisfied	33	(The Remainder)
Not satisfied	32	(3) (4) (7) (8) (10) (13) (18) (20) (21) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (37) (38) (40) (43) (45) (46) (47) (49) (50) (52) (55) (56) (57) (59) (60) (67) (68) (69)
Miscellaneous	3	(6) (51) (53)

The number of 'not satisfied' respondents was thus higher for this than any other issue on the questionnaire, representing 47.8% of respondents. The comments given in answer to Question 31 vary very greatly, mentioning a wide range of items. Of the

17 respondents who praised the present system in answer to question 31, or made points in its favour, 14 went on to give criticism. Such respondents generally praised the open, representative or democratic nature of the system or the ideals behind it and went on to criticise its operation in practice. The critical comments made by respondents to Question 31 were in some cases just criticisms of the present system, but others went beyond this to offer suggestions of possible improvements. The suggestions made by some respondents can be classified in terms of the open-closed opposition, i.e., as supportive of more open or more closed approaches, where more open is taken to mean more democratic and egalitarian and more closed is taken to mean more authoritarian and hierarchical.

The following table presents an item-summary of the replies grouping in three categories, i.e., 'In favour of a more open approach', 'in favour of a more closed approach', and 'other'.

TABLE 12 Decision-making.

a) In favour of more 'open' approach:-

Students should have more say in decision-making (33) (56)

The G.S.M. should have real decision-making power (26) (56)

Staff should be able to attend all meetings as observers
(17) (26)

Staff meetings should be able to deal with important matters such as salary scales and appointments (18) (33)

Would like more democracy on departmental matters (9)

Need more discussion of questions of school policy,
school organization, suspensions and tutor groups (63)

Need more consultation (24) (36) (57) (67)

TABLE 12 (Continued)

b) In favour of more 'closed approach -

Decision-making process should be more consultative
and less representative/democratic (28) (38) (40) (60)

Need more direction from the top (13) (23) (43) (53) (55)
(58) (59) (60)

People paid to take responsibility should make decisions
(8) (10)

Too involved and too democratic (23)

Decisions with no time limit may be discussed
in staff meetings but those made by those in
positions of authority should not be (41)

'Business' decisions should be made by fewer people (37)

c) Other (critical):-

Too time consuming (1) (16) (31) (40) (45) (69)

Hierarchy too remote from needs of students (4) (36) (59)

More should be left to individual responsibility (6) (21)

Not really a democracy (7) (8) (20) (47) (50) (64) (65)

Too much attention to detail in staff meetings (6) (14) (17)
(57)

Democratic procedure leads to no action being taken (25) (27)
(34)

Clumsy and cumbersome (31) (40)

Often members do not conform to a 'democratic'
decision because they don't agree (60) (69)

Use of structure not wholehearted (3) (37)

Inexperienced teachers in school too theoretical (1)

Fear of frankness (3)

Double-talk (3)

Too much idealistic theorizing - few decisions (6)

Staff need to put decisions into practice (6)

Liberal idea soaking sponge, the same as more traditional
hierarchical systems (7)

Too many working parties with too many procedures (10)

Needs to be more organized, too at staff meeting
not best way to exchange views (12)

Tendency to be indirect and therefore to an extent inadequate
(14)

G.S.M.s are only opinion finders and are not decision-
making (17)

Table 12 continued.Other (Critical) Continued.

- No intention to create 'community of responsibility' (18)
- Division meetings don't produce significant ideas (19)
- Faculty meetings leave me heated and anxious, we discuss real issues afterwards (19)
- G.S.M.s leave much to be desired (19)
- Too much repetition in committees (20)
- Uncertainty of power clusters (20)
- Too many disfunctional committees, e.g., College Council split up into sub-committees (20)
- Suspect total system confused and unwieldy (20)
- Lack of togetherness of staff (21)
- Abandon official procedure in G.S.M.s (25)
- School Council should meet in the school day and be better publicised (26)
- Procedures ambiguous (27)
- Failure to recognize desire for a sense of involvement as much as a real sharing in decision-making (27)
- Potential of G.S.M. not being realized because of time taken to formulate and to think up data to support proposals (35)
- Attempts at working system self-indulgent (37)
- Discussion of general principles should be kept in its place (37)
- Confusion between legislative and executive decisions, the latter is determined by terms of appointment (38)
- In some cases meetings don't make decisions (40)
- Neither efficiently autocratic nor genuinely democratic (43)
- Hierarchy too remote (43)
- Need more acceptance of delegation by staff and Principal (50)
- Much time wasted because of lack of strong chairman (54)
- Need for more agreement among staff and students (59)
- Democracy hides lack of decision-making (60)

Table 12 continued.

d) Other (in favour)

Pleased with opportunity to air views (1) (6) (9) (32)The structure is not bad (3) (34) (37) (54)Generally good (14)Enjoyable (15)Genuine desire to consult on some issues (18)I appreciate the openness (30)Reasonably democratic (31)Helps to involve people (33)Staff have a very real say and in the past have influenced change (33)I think a genuine effort is made to share decision-making and I applaud this (62)On pastoral matters within the Divisions there is a great deal of consultation (63)

Looks good in theory (67)

It would seem from Table 10 that thirteen members of staff made statements which are classifiable as advocating a more closed approach and ten of a more open approach. The items most often mentioned were:

Need more direction from the top	8 respondents
Not really a democracy	7 respondents
Too time consuming	6 respondents
Should be more consultative and less democratic/representative	4 respondents
Need more consultation	4 respondents
Too much attention to detail in staff meetings.	4 respondents.

The decision-making system, then, was widely criticized, only one member of staff identifying herself as 'Very satisfied' and 32 ticking the 'Not satisfied' box. The criticisms made identified a wide range of faults, and in general, two sets of solutions were proposed, i.e., a move in a more closed or in a

more open direction. The answers to questions 18 and 19, 24, 25 and 26, 30 and 31 were used to identify those staff who consistently supported open or closed ideologies.

5) Staff Opinions.

All the above data on the ideological positions held by staff on various issues was put together to provide an identification of those staff most committed to open or closed approaches. This is done by grouping together all those who made statements fitted into open or closed categories for questions 18/19, 23/24/25 and 30/31.

TABLE 13. Staff Opinions.

- a) Open i.e., those advocating more open approaches, in favour of open approaches or critical or closed approaches.

Question Number	Respondents
18/19	(5)(7)(17)(18)(20)(33)(34)(38)(50)(64)
23/24/25	(1)(3)(5)(7)(9)(17)(18)(26)(27)(29)(33) (36)(38)(39)(45)(49)(50)(51)(54)(56)(60) (63)(67)
30/31	(9)(17)(18)(24)(26)(33)(36)(56)(57)(63)(67)

- b) Closed, i.e., those advocating more closed approaches in favour of closed approaches or critical of open approaches.

Question Number	Respondents
18/19	(1)(2)(4)(6)(7)(9)(12)(13)(14)(16)(22)(23) (25)(28)(37)(45)(48)(50)(54)(55)(59)(60) (62)(63)(65)(69)
23/24/25	(4)(8)(21)(24)(28)(34)(37)(41)(43)(47) (48)(52)(55)(57)(58)
30/31	(8)(10)(13)(23)(28)(34)(38)(40)(41)(43) (53)(55)(58)(59)(60)

It is possible to identify the most consistently supportive of open or closed approaches by taking those who appear in only one of those categories throughout the questions and who appear more than once. This procedure yields the following two groups:

Open (5) (17)(18)(26)(33)(36)(56)(67)

Closed (4)(8)(13)(23)(28)(37)(41)(43)(48)(55)(58)(59)

What characteristics does the open group have in common and in what way does it differ from the closed group? A comparison can be made on the basis of the information given in answer to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17 and 20 as shown below:

TABLE 14. Open and Closed Groups.

Question	Categories	Open (total 8)	Closed (total 12)
1. Sex	male	8	9
	female	0	3
2. Age	under 25	2	2
	25-29	3	4
	30-34	2	2
	35-39	0	0
	40-44	0	1
	45-49	0	2
	50-54	0	1
	55-59	0	0
	60+	1	0
3. Qualifications	Trained non-graduate	1	4
	untrained non-graduate	0	0
	trained graduate good		
	honours	5	1
	trained graduate other		
	than good honours	1	3
	untrained graduate		
	good honours	0	2
	untrained graduate		
	other than good honours	1	2

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Question	Categories	Open (total 8)	Closed (total 12)
4. and 5. Place of training or degree	College	1	5
	University	7	6
	Specialist	0	1
	college		
7. Teaching experience before Red- mond.	None	4	4
	1 year	0	0
	2 years	0	1
	3 years	1	0
	4 years	1	0
	5 years	0	1
	6-10 years	1	2
	More than 10yrs.	1	4
9. Social class of father	Class 1	2	3
	2	4	4
	3	2	4
	4	0	1
	5	0	0
	Manual	1	4
	Non-manual	7	8
12. Number of children	None	7	9
	1	0	2
	2	1	1
	3	0	0
	4	0	0
	5+	0	0
14. Years worked at Redmond	Started this year	5	1
	1 year previous to this	1	4
	2 years " " "	2	2
	3 " " " "	0	2
	4 " " " "	0	3
17. Salary - Burnham Scale	Scale 1	2	1
	Scale 2	2	1
	Scale 3	2	3
	Scale 4	1	4
	Scale 5	1	2
	Above	0	1
20. Faculty	Science	1	3
	Humanities	6	1
	Design	1	5
	Extra Faculty	0	3
	None	0	0

In addition to the above it is possible to provide the following statistics on Division membership.

TABLE 15 Division Membership.

Division	Open	Closed
1	1	1
2	0	3
3	1	2
4	0	2
5	5	1
6	1	1

Note

One member of the closed group was not a Division member, another's Division membership is untraceable.

6) Conclusion.

This analysis provides the basis for the account presented in the 'Conflicts' chapter by identifying 'closed' and 'open group' members and establishing which characteristics each group had in common.

APPENDIX G.

APPENDIX G.

MEETING OF SENIOR STAFF

A meeting of Senior staff took place on May 6th in Chris Bishop's house and was attended by all the members of the Pastoral and Curricular committees except Sam Coleman. The meeting was called by the Principal and was intended to provide an opportunity for senior staff to forge a consensus of opinion, a joint position that they could speak from in giving guidance to others. Some of the field notes taken at the meeting are reproduced here in order to examine the arguments expressed by various members of staff:⁽¹⁾

Frank Coulson: What do we do if there is direct disobedience to a member of staff?

Julie Greaves: There are different reasons, there is no one answer.

John Dent: It is being said that it is wrong to have only one real sanction - exclusion, that it is desirable to have something in between. There is also a discussion of the affects of ROSLA. Last year we had one of the biggest ROSLA entries in the country.

Last year we devised a system of detention - didn't call it that - community service during lunchtime. 2 or 3 miscreant students were sent. This system was disliked by a number of staff, it was a generally unused punishment. A number of us, however, thought that we needed more support of this kind in the system.

Harold Terry: Sanctions! It is wrong to begin by talking of punishments.

John Dent: Our system is a bit too loose to give the support some of our students really need. Some of our high schools are very different.

June Edmond: Are we talking about our students or our staff?

Kenneth Hall: The detention system wasn't well organized.

(A debate followed on the merits of the now defunct system of lunchtime detention).

1. See Chapter Seven, the section on 'Control'.

Roger Millstone: We are in danger of talking only about how to deal with students. We do not live up to our standards. We should work out what are our standards. Each of us has too different a set of expectations from others for us to expect students to cope with us. How can we expect 1,500 students to go along with 100 staff all doing their own thing? It is a hopeful sign that they are confused and react to that confusion. We must thrash out what we expect. Not a recipe book for a perfect community college, but honest with each other about what we want to do. There is a lot more common feeling among the staff than would appear on the surface, we must get down to that.

Frank Coulson: The way forward is to say what we all agree, or the majority of us do. Do we object to words beginning with 'f', stealing?

Roger Millstone: Sounds a simplistic exercise, but would give some sort of picture.

Bob Cosnett: But what if we don't all agree, count heads?

Frank Coulson: It is impossible for 100 to agree.

June Edmond: We could privately disagree, with some of the things, but publicly agree - though this worries me.

Frank Coulson: There must be areas, but which? Swearing? Stealing? (Some discussion followed on how much consensus there was on such offences).

Eric Woodrow: It is quite confusing as a new member of staff. It is confusing to see staff not entirely agreed. Without a consensus we have nothing.

Children perceive non-consensus, no restraints, ultimately no support of consensus, no reason to do what asked to do. In a Humanities team I was asked to help with a group of notoriously difficult fourth year kids - there was confusion because I didn't know what I had support for from the rest of the staff.

John Dent: We must have teachers in their first year who are even more confused.

Frank Coulson: What do we do?

Eric Woodrow: Discipline should be an expression of care towards our students. I stand behind 'no stealing'. We should create the sort of situation where the child perceives he can succeed or fail. Some of the looseness is an over-stressed care not to give a sense of failure, we therefore don't give the possibility of seeing whether they have succeeded or failed. If a student knows he has succeeded in one instance he knows how to repeat the performance. They don't really know, consequently, anything goes.

Helen Taylor: I reinforce that. I have been longer at Redmond, observing. Our group desperately need success, a large number see themselves as dirt. I have a feeling which comes from my dealings with staff.

Roger said we are in effect asking the kids to deal with us. Maybe we are not helping them to see where we are at and hence this aggression. There is a feeling that we are going for mediocrity in every direction. There is a core of common feeling. There are those who would like to speak out but who are afraid of being seen as reactionary, wanting to wield a big stick.

Maybe just me.

Feelings from staff - growing common core.

Students should feel success and accept failure.

They need to feel success to know how to value themselves.

I also think we don't praise the staff enough. If they feel success they can pass it on to the students.

Frank Coulson: I'm not sure about the reasons given for the aggression. If we set limits they are likely to break them, yet I see your point about aggression in all directions. I wouldn't like to see more than the aggression against staff I've seen - mostly verbal. It should be our priority to circumvent violence.

June Edmond: We are ignoring the case of some kids who aren't working are we doing them any good at all?

Julie Greaves: With our own children we set the limits. To kick against the traces is an essential part of growing up. If we don't set limits we are failing the kids, there is not anything to kick against. We take away all - anything goes - nothing to measure self against.

Harold Terry: This is not a place where anything goes.

Julie Greaves: But this is the way the kids perceive the situation. It is the perception rather than the reality which is important.

Helen Taylor: Kids feel there are hidden rules. They get the basics but hate to see more. Perhaps our rules need applying as in the 'Students' Guide'. They consider hidden rules to be unfair and they are angry.

John Dent: Such as?

Bob Cosnett: On our working party on the school guide the students criticise vague generalities like 'be nice and decent' - seems to them meaningless, needs to be more specific, what does it mean in terms of this and that.

John Dent: Makes things very narrow.

.....

Chris Bishop: We tend to look at ourselves as if we were in a traditional school situation. A number of factors in our school are very different. The important thing about standards is agreeing what is extreme misbehaviour and what is petty. But however much we agree amongst ourselves the controlling factor is what they find

acceptable - the norm among kids. Sociologists tell us so.

A school with staff and prefects and senior pupils which relies on traditions is formal.

Informal organization acts against these. Now there is no longer a clearly established set of formal values, now there is a vast set of informal values. Staff cannot change these on their own.

We have to establish among students what is acceptable to them and what is not.

A huge amount of vandalism will continue to go on.

We must face the enormous problem of how to change the norm of what goes on.

The sixth form are now separated with no prefect role - we don't want one but in a normal school their influence is stronger than that felt through our tutor groups. Students come to a new situation in the upper school, it is fluid.

What is acceptable in one situation is not in another - there is no single standard.

We must primarily consider how we put across what is acceptable.

What is acceptable to us is meaningless unless it is put across to the students.

Bob Cosnett: But what is it we put across and how? Some think it is wrong for us to transmit our values, if we are. The law of the land is not just maintained by common consent. How long would it last with just talking to and deportation? I've never been ashamed of the fact that education is selling values. The influence one has is counterbalanced by the differences between teachers. It is not consensus, but conspectus, approaches to life. There have to be statements about that which we will not put up with. Harold might object that this is something to do with sanctions, but we are not talking about a freely consenting society in which we don't need law, a school is not like that.

Harold Terry: It worries me that sanctions often lead to a blanket approach. Perhaps it's my interpretation of what school is, to me it's caring for individuals. In an individual approach sanctions are implied by the relationship built up with the student, questioning what the student does and by showing disapproval to an individual student. It is wrong to impose blanket detentions and so on.

(A discussion followed about the best use of the Vice Principal as a person to fall back on when the teacher's control of the situation was overturned, and a consideration of various strategies for dealing with such situations, 'the minimisation of confrontation situations').

Eric Woodrow: Here are some of my perceptions as a new member of staff. There is an appearance of equality. Members of staff are called by their first names, even the senior members. Equality is what the children perceive, but they discover hidden rules - there is a veneer of equality. This realization comes the moment a member of staff has his way. This is potentially a very confusing thing. I have no objection to them using my first name as long as they understand that when I give a direct instruction I expect to be obeyed. Sounds authoritarian, but wasn't meant like that.

.....

Bob Cosnett: This is one of the snares of young teachers, they want to be loved at all times - respect doesn't come by being wanting to be loved. Some of our colleagues are confused about what to expect, 'have I the right to over-ride his individuality?' They feel they would be disliked if they laid down the law. This adds to the confusion.

.....

Roger Millstone: I think we could and perhaps should deal with these troublesome students in this particular kind of way. I've been persuaded by colleagues to see this as labelling and setting apart. No, I won't say what I was going to say, it would cause trouble - all right I will. To say we won't separate these students is a luxury, possibly self-indulgent, better for us not for them. I will not make tactical withdrawals whatever cost to the rest of the group. Right at the beginning I stress I am the boss, 'you're here, you will do what I say'. If everyone did this we would be better off, in a short time, must establish I am the boss, setting pace and standard.

(A discussion followed about the students who resented being kept on at school for an extra year. Bob Cosnett mentioned the dangers of caring for these individuals at the expense of others. Helen Taylor stressed the low self-assessment of many of these students and their need to feel themselves as successes. Helen Taylor called on Senior staff to give a lead by making clear their position

and 'by exuding a quiet confidence', so that junior staff might be given a reference point.)

Eric Woodrow: In the old sort of schools there was a clearly defined structure which expressed certain clearly defined values, which could be looked to for support. Here there is not such a clearly defined, obvious hierarchy of values. The teacher is cast more and more on his own personality.

.....

Chris Bishop: It is not the structure of staff that matters, but the kids.

Eric Woodrow: They rest on one another.

(Terry Gregson argued that the sorts of experiences faced in the school were very different from the environments teachers were prepared for in their training courses. Chris Bishop cited several practices of young members of staff as examples which senior members could well learn from. John Dent concluded that more attention should be given to the great majority who were not causing disciplinary problems.)

The meeting ended with this statement from the Senior Master:

Frank Coulson: The feeling doesn't seem to be that we are sitting on a powder keg.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADELMAN, C and WALKER, R. (1974) 'Strawberries' in M. Stubbs and S. Delamont (eds.), Explorations in Observation, London: Wiley
- ALTHUSSER, L. (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' in L. Althusser, Lenin in Philosophy and Other Essays, London: New Left Books
- BALDRIDGE, J.V. (1971) Power and Conflict in the University, New York: Wiley
- BENNETT, S.N. (1976) Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress, London: Open Books.
- BENNETT, S and WILKIE, R. (1973a) 'The school and organization theory' in G. Fowler et al (eds). Decision Making in British Education, London Heinemann
- BENNETT, S and WILKIE, R. (1973b) 'Structural conflict in school organization' in G. Fowler et al (eds). Decision Making in British Education, London: Heinemann.
- BERNBAUM, G. (1973) 'Countesthorpe' in O.E.C.D., C.E.R.I., Case Studies of Educational Innovation III: At the School Level. Paris O.E.C.D.
- BERNSTEIN, B (1974) Class, Codes and Control, Volume I, second edition, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- BERNSTEIN, B. (1977) Class, Codes and Control, Volume III, second edition, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- BOWLES, S and GINTIS, H. (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- CENTER FOR NEW SCHOOLS. (1972) 'Strengthening alternative high schools in Harvard Educational Review, 42.
- CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION. (1973) Case Studies of Educational Innovation: Vol. 1. At the Central Level, Vol. 2. At the Regional Level, Vol. 3. At the School Level. Vol. 4., Strategies for Innovation in Education, Paris O.E.C.D.
- CHANAN, G. and DELAMONT, S (Eds.) (1975) Frontiers of Classroom Research, Windsor: National Foundation for Educational Research.

- DURKHEIM, E. (1933) The Division of Labour in Society, London: Collier-Macmillan.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1970) Suicide, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- EASTHOPE, G., (1975) 'Bernstein's sociology of the school' in Research Intelligence Vol.I.No.1.
BELL, A. and
WILKES, J.
- EGGLESTON, J. (1973) 'Decision making on the school curriculum; a conflict model' in Sociology Vol. 7. No. 3.
- ESLAND, G. (1971) 'Teaching and learning as the organization of knowledge' in M.F.D. Young (ed.), Knowledge and Control, London: Collier-Macmillan.
- ETZIONI, A. (1961) Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader, New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston.
- ETZIONI, A. (1964) Modern Organizations, New York: Prentice-Hall.
- FLOUD, J.E., (1961) Education, Economy and Society
HALSEY, A.H. and
ANDERSON, C.A.(Eds) London: Collier-Macmillan.
- FOWLER, G. (1973) Decision Making in British Education.
MORRIS, V. and
OZGA, J. London: Heinemann.
- FREIRE, P. (1972) Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- GIBSON, R. (1977) 'Bernstein's classification and framing a critique' in Higher Education Review Vol. 9. No. 2.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1961) Asylums, Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- GLASER, B.G. & (1967) The Discovery of Grounded Theory,
STRAUSS, A.L. Chicago: Aldine
- GRAMSCI, A. (1971) Selections from the Prison Notebooks, London: Lawrence and Wishart
- GROSS, N., (1971) Implementing Organizational Innovations
GIAQUINTA, J.B.
& BERNSTEIN, M. New York: Harper and Row.

- HAMILTON, D. (1975) 'Handling Innovation in the classroom: two Scottish examples' in W. Reid and D. Walker (eds.), Case Studies in Curriculum Change, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- HAMMERSLEY, M. (1977a) Teacher Perspectives, Open University Course E202, Units 9 and 10, Milton Keynes; Open University Press.
- HAMMERSLEY, M. (1977b) The Social Location of Teacher Perspectives Open University Course E202, Unit 12, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- HANNAN, A. (1975) 'The problem of the 'unmotivated' in an open school: a participant observation study' in G. Chanan and S. Delamont (eds.), Frontiers of Classroom Research, Windsor: N.F.E.R.
- HARGREAVES, D.H. (1967) Social Relations in a Secondary School, London: Routledge
- HARGREAVES, D.H., (1975) Deviance in Classrooms, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- HESTER, S.K. and MELLOR, F.J.
- HOUSE, E.R. (1976) The Politics of Educational Innovation, Berkely, California: McCutchan.
- ILlich, I. (1970) Deschooling Society, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- KEDDIE, N. (1971) 'Classroom knowledge' in M.F.D. Young (ed.), Knowledge and Control, London: Collier-Macmillan.
- KING, R. (1973) School Organization and Pupil Involvement. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- KING, R. (1976) 'Bernstein's sociology of the school' in British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 27, No. 4.
- LACEY, C. (1970) Hightown Grammar, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MILSON, R., (1976) 'Curriculum and order: an experiment in student control' in Higher Education Review, Vol. 8, No. 2. Spring 1976.
- BLACKWELL, T.
MURPHY, T. and
NEWTON, H.

- MINCHIN, M.F. (1975) Countesthorpe College - Problems and Possibilities of Radical Innovation, University of Nottingham, School of Education, Diploma in Education, July 1975. (unpublished)
- OPEN UNIVERSITY (1972) School and Society, Course E282, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- OPEN UNIVERSITY (1976) Schooling and Society, Course E202, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- POPPER, K.R. (1959) The Logic of Scientific Discovery, London: Hutchinson.
- PRING, R. (1975) 'Bernstein's classification and framing of knowledge' in Scottish Educational Studies, Vol. 7 No. 2. pp. 67-74.
- REYNOLDS, D. (1976) 'The delinquent school' in M. Hammer-sley and P. Woods (eds.), The Process of Schooling, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- RICE, A.K. (1963) The Enterprise and its Environment, London: Tavistock.
- RICHARDSON, E. (1973) The Teacher, the School and the Task of Management, London: Heinemann
- ROGERS, T. (ed.) (1971) School for the Community, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- SHARP, R., (1975) Education and Social Control, London: GREEN, A. and Routledge and Kegan Paul. LEWIS, J.
- SHIPMAN, M.D., (1974) Inside a Curriculum Project, London: BOLAM. and Methuen. JENKINS, D.R.
- SILVERMAN, D. (1970) The Theory of Organizations, London: Heinemann.
- SILVERMAN, D. and (1973) 'Getting in' in D. Child (ed.), Man JONES, J. and Organization, London, Allen and Unwin.
- SMITH, L.M. and (1971) Anatomy of Educational Innovation, KEITH, P.M. New York: Wiley.
- STRAUSS, A. (1964) Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions SCHATZMANN, L., London: Collier-Macmillan. BUCHER, R. and SUBSHIN, M.

- WATSON, L.E. (1973) 'Office and expertise in the secondary school' in G. Fowler et al. (eds.), Decision Making in British Education, London: Heinemann.
- WEBER, M. (1947) The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- WHITESIDE, T. (1978) The Sociology of Educational Innovation London: Methuen.
- WILLIS, P. (1976) 'The class significance of school counter-culture' in M. Hammersley and P. Woods (eds.), The Process of Schooling, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- WILLIS, P. (1977) Learning to Labour, Farnborough: Saxon House.
- YOUNG, M.F.D.(ed.)(1971) Knowledge and Control, London: Collier-Macmillan.

A.W.HANNAN

Ph.D. THESIS 1978

PROBLEMS, CONFLICTS AND SCHOOL POLICY:

A CASE STUDY OF AN INNOVATIVE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

ANDREW HANNAN

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the school as an organization in a sense which has been neglected in previous work. Here the aim is to understand and explain how the school changes in terms of the conflict of ideologies amongst staff and the process of formulation of school policy. The study is set within the context of previous case studies of educational innovation as an attempt to analyse the forces behind organizational change and persistence in a school pledged by its official description to an innovative programme aiming at the ideals of 'openness'. The case study upon which this thesis is based was carried out in the first year that this upper school had a fully compulsory and comprehensive intake in both fourth and fifth years. The school had previously been partly voluntary in the sense that students could opt not to join the upper school for two years but to remain in their high school for a further one year only. The effects of the raising of the school leaving age to sixteen served as a challenge to the prevailing liberal ethos of the school and the series of innovations it inspired. The data, in the form of information from interviews, questionnaires and field notes, were collected by means of a year of participant observation. This thesis gives an account of problems and conflicts experienced in this year and shows how the changes in the policy of the school can be seen as the outcome of a process of ideological conflict and political negotiation. The study thus focuses on the institutional setting as one of the levels of educational reality and shows how innovations in educational policy are challenged by factors both internal and external to the school.