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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the student school experience in terms of the paradox that Paulo Freire identifies between education as 'an instrument of liberation' and education as 'an instrument of domination'. Student school experience refers to the ways in which curricula and other aspects of schooling are received and interpreted by students. Observation of and feedback from students in school situations are used to illustrate the means by which the process of schooling predisposes individuals to function unquestioningly in capitalist society.

A review of the available literature on schooling and the student emphasizes three themes which are deemed worthy of further inquiry: (1) students express high levels of satisfaction with schooling, but often in uncertain ways; (2) the student school experience is commonly characterized by writers as being fragmented; and (3) minor changes in schooling are important for students, even when those changes do not address wider concerns. Theoretical approaches which contribute to an explanation of these themes tend to emphasize either the deterministic nature of social structures (in which case details of the schooling process become trivialized) or the autonomous nature of particular situations (in which case limitations imposed by structural and power relationships are disregarded).
An alternative approach, a Marxian theory of praxis, is employed in this thesis. Such an approach emphasizes that structures must be regarded as real, with real consequences for people, although the specific nature of those consequences can be realized only through human activity. Schooling, as part of society's superstructure, is seen to be conditioned but not fully determined by the economic base of society. Hegemony (domination by consent) is discussed in relation to the process by which schools contribute to the maintenance of capitalist class relations.

An examination of this process is substantiated with the use of observational, questionnaire and interview data collected from a sample of 130 grades 8 and 12 students in four Saskatoon public classrooms. The data indicate that the student school experience is conditioned in a dual way: by immediate contextual concerns; and by idealist notions of school as a necessary social 'good'. Students tend to accept school and when they discuss possible school change, feel school should be left alone or modified only slightly. There are class and grade differences in the student school experience, but overall similarities are apparent in the process of schooling and in the limited amounts of student reflection about schooling.

It is concluded that students are educated in a very narrow sense. They have little basis for developing a
framework through which they can interpret the events that have structured so much of their lives. There is little impetus for students to question the world and to suggest alternatives to present, often alienating, social relations.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Sociology has an ongoing concern with the study of social structures, people's experiences in those structures, and people's interpretation of those structures and experiences. This thesis intends to explore relationships among social structures, human experiences and human interpretations by examining the student school experience in the context of Canadian public schooling. Data collected from observation of ongoing classroom situations, questionnaires completed by students and interviews with students will be used in order to substantiate our understanding of the process of schooling and the student school experience. These data will be related in a broader sense to the role that schooling plays in the continuation of capitalist relations of production through the maintenance, in Marxian terms, of a non-unified world.

Throughout the thesis, education refers to the general process of learning about and understanding the world. School(s) and the classroom refer to specific organized systems of education (and when indicated, to particular institutional settings). Schooling is used to describe the overall processes and functions, intended or otherwise, that are carried out in and by schools. Curriculum
indicates the total packages of content, procedures and experiences that are prepared for and presented to students, while student school experience refers to the ways in which curricula and other aspects of schooling are actually received and interpreted by students.

The process of schooling will be examined in conjunction with the societal context in which schooling operates. This examination can help us to recognize some of the unique features of schooling as well as some of the constraints which schooling and people in schools are faced with. For our purposes, because we are emphasizing schools in a Canadian context, we will discuss schooling in relation to capitalist society. We view Canada as a capitalist society because it meets all of the following criteria, used by Giddens (1982:70) to identify capitalist societies:

(1) production for profit, involving the dominance of privately owned capital, remains the main dynamic impetus of the economic system;

(2) ownership of private property, particularly capital ownership, remains highly unequal;

(3) class conflict continues to be of primary significance in both the economy and polity. The capitalist societies are class societies.

Class will be understood as a dynamic concept based on economic relationships that are mediated by cultural, political and social forces. We will follow Livingstone
(1981) in identifying three broad class positions — capital, intermediate elements and dispossessed labour — defined according to categories of ownership, control and activity within capitalist productive relations. We will refer to schools in our research as either working class (dispossessed labour) or middle class (intermediate elements), for the sake of clarity, depending on the predominant class characteristics of individuals who attend a given school or live in the school district.

The main concern of this thesis is to describe and illustrate the relationship between daily life activity and social structure. We will, in particular, examine the process by which schooling helps to reinforce the ongoing existence of capitalist society. Our concern with this process is rooted in the paradox that education, with its liberating potential, is institutionalized in schooling in a non-liberating way — to help produce workers and consumers who are likely to have little control over substantial segments of their life activity.

The thesis will emphasize a Marxian theory of praxis, as opposed to alternative theoretical stances which emphasize either the deterministic nature of social structures or the autonomous nature of human thought and action. The theory of praxis stresses that structures are real and have important consequences for people, but the specific
nature of those consequences is realized only through human activity. Schooling will be viewed as part of the superstructure which is conditioned but not fully determined by the economic base of society. The notion of hegemony, as domination by consent, will help us examine how this conditioning occurs.

The theory will be substantiated with research conducted in specific school situations. The research, because it is intended to suggest how the process of hegemony operates within schooling, will be descriptive rather than explanatory. The student, as a central participant in the schooling process, will serve as the research focus. In order to provide us with insight into the student school experience, observational data will be emphasized in conjunction with questionnaire and interview data about students' interpretations of the school experience. These data were collected from school classes of grade 8 and grade 12 students in middle and working class schools so that possible social class and grade differences could be examined. Although it would be useful to follow students from schools into post-school job and educational situations, our research will look only at in-school processes.

It will be concluded that students' immersion in daily school activity, combined with their pragmatic and idealistic acceptance of schooling as necessary and good, help to
precondition students to accept uncritically their roles and places in post-school life. There are some class and grade differences in schooling and students' conceptions of schooling, but overall, patterns of schooling and student acceptance of schooling are similar. Schooling contributes to the minimization of class struggle and demands for social change by restricting opportunities through which participants can see the world in broader, unified terms; schooling educates only in a limited way.

The organization of the thesis is outlined below:

Chapter 2 - The available literature on schooling, the classroom and students is reviewed. Three trends, in particular, are noted: (1) students express high levels of satisfaction with schooling, but often in uncertain ways; (2) the student school experience is commonly characterized by writers as being fragmented; (3) minor changes in schooling are important for students, even when those changes do not address wider concerns.

Chapter 3 - Sociological theories of schooling are examined. Theories which emphasize either structure or situational autonomy are discussed, and the work of Peter Berger is
suggested as a way to bring these theoretical forces closer together. A critique of Berger's notion of reification brings our attention to a Marxian theory of praxis.

Chapter 4 - Marx's theory of alienation and its application, by analogy, to schooling, are discussed.

Chapter 5 - The structure and dynamics of capitalist society are outlined. Emphasis is given to the process by which class relationships are maintained. Hegemony, as the infusion of the dominant class's ideas and prerogatives into everyday life to such an extent that they come to be regarded as normal and inevitable by individuals throughout society, is discussed in relation to alternate forms of hegemony. A series of research questions is suggested for an examination of how schooling contributes to hegemonic relationships:

(1) What elements constitute the student school experience?

(2) What do students identify as elements of their school experience?

(3) What relationships do students identify
between these elements and other aspects of their social lives?

(4) What (social) class and grade differences are apparent in student school experience?

(5) How do students evaluate their school experience?

(6) What, if any, changes in schooling are proposed by students?

(7) What implications do these evaluations and suggestions for change have for class society?

Chapter 6 - The field research design and related methodological issues are presented. Means for obtaining observational, interview and questionnaire data, collected from 130 students in grades 8 and 12, in four Saskatoon schools, are outlined. Sample characteristics and research limitations are also discussed.

Chapter 7 - The data are presented and analyzed. Emphasis is given to the student school experience, the process of schooling, and class and grade differences in schooling and student conceptions of schooling. The data indicate that the student school
Chapter 2
SCHOOLING AND THE STUDENT

2.1. Introduction

A central part of this thesis will be to examine the student's position in relation to schooling, both subjectively (as expressed by student accounts of his or her own educational experience) and objectively (as approached through sociological explanations relating to particular positions and experiences). A first step towards this task is to review relevant sociological literature.

This chapter will emphasize contrasting tendencies, in content and in form, that have characterized the small body of student-related school research that does exist: first, in tracing American and British research orientations; and second, in examining research findings that portray students (and often students with similar characteristics) as sometimes satisfied and sometimes deeply frustrated with schooling.

2.2. Two Traditions - A Brief Survey

Some insight into methods of examining student school experience can be gained by distinguishing between a long but diffuse stream of American approaches and more recent reflexive British developments.1
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2.2. Two Traditions - A Brief Survey

Some insight into methods of examining student school experience can be gained by distinguishing between a long but diffuse stream of American approaches and more recent reflexive British developments.¹
The American tradition of student-related school studies seems appropriately to be characterized by the generation or more of scholarly work which has either ignored or independently 'rediscovered' the rich and varied patterns of school life that Willard Waller describes in his 1932 work, *The Sociology of Teaching*. Waller presents several images that are still relevant today of the roles and interaction complexes enacted by students and teachers. Robinson (1981: 72) correctly observes that besides Waller and few others, "classroom research by the 1960's had been dominated by social psychologists preoccupied by the nature of leadership and the influence of classroom climates on learning outcomes".

There were outside of this trend some exceptions which placed the school and its participants in a social context. Tenenbaum (1940) stresses as part of an inquiry into student attitudes about school that the community base was highly influential in shaping pupil orientations to schooling. Becker (1977), moving into the classroom in the early 1950's, sees student chances of school success varying according to the interplay between student social class characteristics and teacher conceptions of appropriate or "ideal" student characteristics.

One influential group of structural functionalist studies focuses on student life and experience as part of
an educational subsystem integrated into the fabric of American society. Hollinghead (1949) notes the variable effects that a student's class background has on his or her curriculum selection, treatment by authorities, and participation in school activities. Gordon (1951) more specifically posits a significant association between the student's status within the school's social structure (and especially in the informal student culture) and the student's school activity. This theme is further refined by Coleman's (1961) study of peer group importance in facilitating for adolescents the transition from family life to an increasingly more competitive, specialized adult world. Coleman, without directly acknowledging the connection, in part reiterates with empirical data Parsons's (1959) analysis of the school's role in aiding individual development from a particularistic, ascription-oriented home environment to the universalistic, achievement-based criteria required for contemporary social (working) life. Dreeben (1968) extends this analysis by focusing on specific school experiences that contribute to the learning of norms related to independence, achievement, universalism, and specificity.

The functionalist approach has clearly pointed to several useful links between school and society. In essence, however, these functionalist studies have ignored
several vital elements in the educative process. Most notable is the lack of attention given to the active roles played by teachers, students and others in creating, dealing with, or maintaining the patterns that do emerge in schooling. The school as a focal point, then, remained a subordinate branch in the study of social integration.

An attempt to consider the school organization and its personnel in relation to school outcomes is presented by Cicourel and Kitsuse (1963). Though making no mention of Becker's earlier work, Cicourel and Kitsuse reflect his approach in focusing on how "routine" categories of thought and decisions employed by school authorities affect students' educational careers. College attainment is identified by Cicourel and Kitsuse as the major guiding orientation acting upon students in American secondary schools, but no effort is made to explain how or why this emphasis in schooling has come about.

Methodologically, however, research by Cicourel (1964) and others (Cicourel et al., 1974) opened the way to recognizing the school as a site for potential social scientific fieldwork. Questions like "What happens to a student as a person as he goes through an American high school today?" (Mallery, 1962: xiii) reflected a growing concern for discovering the human interpretative facets of school-based experience. Characteristic observation-based
studies include Stinchcombe's (1964) analysis of expressive or impulsive student responses to ever-present authority faced in school; Jackson's (1968) look at school life in terms of crowds, praise and power; Smith and Geoffrey's (1968) gloomy account of the tensions that pervade the inner-city classroom; and Cusick's (1973) portrayal of varied student subgroups and their importance to school outcomes. A Canadian study by Martin (1976) discusses the limited but ever-present powers of negotiation held by students in bargaining with teachers over selected school issues.

Common to all of these more recent (post-1961) studies, however, has been a neglect of questions that must necessarily supersede contextual school issues. This shortcoming, combined with the macro-deterministic tendencies evident in the earlier structural functionalist studies, has left the American tradition without any sort of unified exposition of the forces that shape and are acted upon by classroom participants and the processes through which these dynamics operate.

British research on schooling has, by contrast, made more claims for being directed at tracing societal influences directly into the school. This task has been partly facilitated by the clearcut class distinctions that permeate various levels of British school organization.
However, British, like American, writers have tended to follow in practice exclusive micro- or macro-level paths.

Two notable "classic" studies involving British school fieldwork have tended towards the former (micro) approach. Hargreaves (1967: 182) focuses on the unintended consequences of school organization and human activity in the school, especially related to undesirable educational outcomes. Lacey (1970) examines differentiation (as in streaming students) and polarization (in student orientations towards or against school) as central aspects in the fluid patterns of competitive school life.

There appears to be some uncertainty regarding the theoretical orientations guiding both these studies. For example, Furlong (1976: 161) locates them along with the studies by Hollingshead (1949) and Coleman (1961), in the social-psychological tradition; Karabel and Halsey (1977: 28) point to their combined functionalist and conflict frameworks, and Robinson (1981: 76-80) focuses on their slightly ambiguous interactionist emphases. For his part, Lacey (1976: 56) acknowledges an eclectic "mix of social anthropological fieldwork techniques, a theoretical concern for social processes and social conflict and his own experiences within schools". The essential points are that these British studies have appeared to be more open than most American studies in their attempts to cut across rigid
theoretical and research boundaries, and that these attempts have not always been successful.

One effort aimed at bridging the gap between structure and process is Sharp and Green's (1975) study of progressive primary education. Drawing on Keddie's (1971) observation that teachers, as agents of particular social interests, are able to impose particular definitions of social reality in the classroom, Sharp and Green (1975: 34) add the qualifying concern that classroom organization and activities are limited by constraints on forms and contents of activity. With this recognition stated explicitly, however, the authors do not adequately move beyond the classroom framework; Sharp and Green's study, according to Robinson (1981: 82) "does not in the end demonstrate how the nature of classroom activity is the product of the material base within which teachers work".

Several recent efforts have shown promise in approaching an understanding of that connection. Woods (1976a, 1976b, 1979), working from a symbolic interactionist approach, focuses on the dualism whereby forces which define and emerge out of the personal realm are constrained or modified by institutional factors. Hence, dependencies established by individuals for self-preservation come to be based on factors which facilitate preservation of the established institutional system (1979: 253). This observation echoes Willis's (1977) depiction of the school as a
collective locale for working class boys and their culture. The forces that operate in school encourage these boys to "choose" behavioral and cultural patterns which eventually entrap them in working class life. Although Willis, like earlier writers, focuses on student subgroups as mediators between school and society, he begins to grasp the complexity of the relationships which exist. He sees students as active and in search of meaning even as they face and help to erect barriers which they cannot identify. Similarly, Reeves (1976; 1978) points to the dilemmas consciously and unconsciously faced by students who resist at the same time as they contribute to their alienation through schooling.

To summarize this section, most student focused school research has tended to consider either the student-in-school or the student-in-society, and to neglect more complex formulations that link student, school and social factors. Recent research in Britain by Woods, Willis and Reeves has demonstrated that these complex linkages can and should be explored. The next section will trace thematically elements which compose the student school experience.

2.3. The Student School Experience

Three sociological themes have relevance for accounts of student school experience. These themes are: a) student
orientation to school, b) the fragmentation of student experience, and c) the school ethos and its manipulation.

a) Student Orientation to School

Considerable debate has emerged over whether, or to what degree and in which ways, students actually value their school experiences. While media voices and popular critics have isolated student hostility and dropping out as major reactions to school, the situation does not appear to be that clear cut. When asked directly, most students and even school dropouts state they like their schooling experience more than they dislike it, identifying a variety of factors to support their stances.

Tenenbaum (1940) reports that nearly 60% of 639 grades 7 and 8 New York City students indicated that they liked school, less than 20% said they disliked it, and 24% expressed mixed feelings. Overall, Tenenbaum notes that students uncritically accepted adult or community notions of school and its symbols, and adopted instrumental views in accordance with expected future jobs or rewards. Significant is the recognition that student expressions were often general and devoid of strong sentiment.

An informal survey carried out by a high school principal concludes that schools are not bad places for students, and that critics are in the minority (Leipold, 1957). Over 75% of 273 grade 9 students declared that they
liked school. Their reasons for liking school favoured the social aspects of schooling, especially being with friends or being active in the absence of interesting alternatives. The weather – surprisingly – was cited, along with boredom, as a major deterrent to liking school.

These earlier findings have seldom been contradicted by more recent research. Jackson (1968: 53), for example, reports that over 80% of a sample of 293 grade 9 students in Chicago expressed favourable feelings toward school, while only 5% claimed their feelings were unfavourable (and these expressions were found to have no significant relationship with "scholastic success"). After reviewing other student-based attitudinal surveys, Jackson notes the restricted range of feelings about school that students tend to convey, and identifies the complexity and familiarity of school for students, and compulsory attendance regulations, as factors that potentially distort or weaken responses that students provide for researchers (1968: 60-61).

Jackson's work was unique at the time in that it attempted to provide an analytical framework (i.e., the hidden curriculum) in which to locate the student's experience. Otherwise, emphasis continued (and continues outside of sociology) to focus on very narrow slices of student life or school practice, without any integration into broader perspectives.
Efforts especially in the 1970's to profile school dropouts are representative of the limited problematics identified in much school research. Nevertheless, data collected for several Canadian school boards have managed to portray the dropout as presumably the most visible manifestation of student dissent (and hence, as a deviant from the educational clientele being served) in relation to school and work. Stobo (1973) reports that dropouts are generally satisfied with courses, teachers, students, and general school atmosphere, but they tend to respond most negatively against either strictness or looseness of school rules. Larter and Eason (1978) note that school leavers tend to direct their dissatisfaction less at school rules and organization than at particular courses, teachers or "everything", while courses having instrumental value in providing specific job skills are regarded most favourably. This focus on jobs is important for the respondents in that out-of-school work, at least on a short-term basis, is claimed by school leavers to be easier and more rewarding than school had been (Larter and Eason, 1978: 79). Usher and Elson (1978), in a parallel Ontario study, find similar expressions by school leavers of preferences for jobs over school, but identify factors external to school (including family, personal and economic pressures) as being as important as, and additive to, in-school forces
for the decision to leave school.

This echoes findings by Morton-Williams and Finch (1968) in a study aimed at informing the decision to raise the British school-leaving age to sixteen. School leavers and their parents tend to value knowledge and skills related to immediate future job success rather than long-term, general preparatory aspects of education, which are deemed more important by teachers. Once again, however, no widespread overt hostility to the general enterprise and conditions of schooling is indicated, even by students who had left school at age fifteen.

From this brief survey, it becomes apparent that all students, regardless of background, tend to evaluate their school experience positively; however, they are also able to identify some negative features in their schooling. Meighan (1977), in a review of literature on student views of schooling, reports that secondary students (both those that are successful and unsuccessful in terms of achievement) are more critical than primary schoolchildren of their schooling, and that the former are also more readily able to offer constructive comments aimed at making their education more acceptable to them. Such comments, however, rarely go beyond boundaries or categories commonly accepted within standard notions of schooling.

What remains to be examined, then, is (1) why this
relatively uncritical, accepting stance on the part of students can usually be expected, and (2) what the significance is of the critical comments that students do make about their schooling.

(1) Responses to the first concern, positive student orientations to schooling, can range from "Students obviously like school because school is good and proper", to "Students say they like school because they are given no alternative or chance to say otherwise". Realistically, neither extreme should be accepted fully. Few critics would agree that students are totally conditioned willingly or forcibly to accept all the provisions of schooling, and it is doubtful that anyone is so naive as to be unaware of several difficulties or contradictions that enter into school life. However, by looking at the second concern - student critiques of schooling - it becomes apparent that student views of schooling are shaped by a complex set of factors that give rise to fundamental questions about schooling.

(2) Meighan (1977: 134) writes that "pupils are able to recognize some aspects of the hidden curriculum, some of the labelling processes and record their feelings of alienation that result". Pupils frequently express boredom associated with the prison-like inevitability of schooling (Blishen, 1969; Reeves, 1978; Weston et al., 1978). Students are sensitive to their lack of control over
education, both in itself (Fisher, 1976), and as it relates to future life goals. The crucial issue is whether these realizations are accidental or haphazard, or the basis for a critical consciousness with potential for revealing underlying inequities in the process and structure of schooling.

b. The Fragmentation of Student Experience

There is considerable evidence which points to schools' roles in shaping students, often against their wills, for productive participation in capitalist society. Friedenberg (1963: 187) has identified the process whereby schools break down the student's own structured identity and conceptual interpretations. The void that is created is to be filled by some socially-useful purposive activity. Friedenberg identifies this process as the "fragmentation of experience". This theme reappears in various forms throughout recent research on schooling.

Life in classrooms implies that, in order to succeed, students must shed particular "everyday" approaches to life in favour of categories established by the teacher (Keddie, 1971; Geer, 1977) or by more oppressive structures (Sharp and Green, 1975). The curriculum, commonly presented as discrete units of knowledge and forms (or in Bernstein's (1971) terms, a "collection" of contents), may act to prevent continuity and making connections in the student's world. In a collection of essays describing positive and
negative features of school (Blishen, 1969), students have stressed their distaste for rigid subject and timetable boundaries; as if to emphasize the point, the prevalent style of student writing demonstrates that several topics or contents can be incorporated within a single sentence.

All of these indications point to the concern that schooling is by no means a neutral agency benevolently aimed at fostering individual growth and talents. Instead, attention must be directed at the role played by schools in conjunction with the reproduction of capitalist relations of production, and the manifestations of alienation in the classroom. These themes will be explored beginning in Chapter 4. For now, however, efforts by students to deal with their schooling, and implications arising from these, will be discussed.

c. The School Ethos and its Manipulation

Schools are unique in that they serve for the most part a captive clientele who 'have to be there', based primarily on the criterion of the clients' ages. Given this limitation, justifications for staying in school and adhering to acceptable standards of school behavior tend to follow two views which Reeves (1976: 156) identifies as idealist and instrumental. The idealist view emphasizes the abstract benefits of education, positing school as inherently good and functional for personal growth. The
instrumental view denies any intrinsic value in schooling and focuses instead on the skills and qualifications that schools provide for individuals towards the attainment of jobs.

While these categories are useful for linking the present with an expected future situation, they do not explain the strong "here-and-now" orientation that is inevitably a necessary feature of eight to twelve or more years of school life. A third, contextual, category is important for capturing the lived part of school. Consequently, it is not surprising that a dominant research focus has been concerned with uncovering and explaining a 'school ethos' which consists of organizational factors in conjunction with human activities, and the mediations which emerge in the process of schooling.

Most importantly, the recognition has emerged that students will accept school more readily if immediate events and environments in their school lives are encountered in a pleasing and, to some extent, controllable manner. A classical line of research has focused on the development and importance of student subcultures (Hollingshead, 1973; Coleman, 1961; Hargreaves, 1967), or groups (Cusick, 1973; Stinchcombe, 1969; Eggleston, 1967; Lomax, 1978), in conditioning the student school experience and providing for the student a human outlet. Recent observations have emphasized ways in which students would like
to see the social and physical environments of the school made more appealing. For example, Davies (1978) stresses older girls' concerns for features that will help them develop a better sense of self-identity. Fisher (1976) and Woods (1978) note students' desires for effective but caring working relationships between students and teachers. Rutter et al. (1979) indicate that student academic and behavioral performance improves where pupils and staff share certain responsibilities and pride in their schools, and work toward certain agreed upon goals. Werthman (1977) had earlier made similar observations in describing the process whereby delinquents accept or reject the legitimacy of rational classroom procedures.

With few exceptions, however, this research has accepted prevailing (i.e., administrative) definitions of education and educational standards, without questioning the bases on which these claims are made. Coleman (1961: 12), as an illustration, argues for controlling the adolescent community in the school in order "to further the ends of education". Shaping educational policy to make certain students more 'educable' or content does not necessarily mean that the grounds for student concern will disappear, even if pupils appear satisfied. Woods (1978: 147) correctly points to the dilemma that appears in interpreting manifestations of student powers of resistance to school authority:
That such powers can be unleashed in a most vicious and destructive manner against teacher and school alike is to state the patently obvious, but few have commented on the students' talents in establishing personalities for themselves, in winning prestige, creating excitement, demonstrating courage, lying inventively, cooperating obstructively, and making time pass in an endless variety of games and gambits. Instead, the extreme manifestations of the culture of resistance found among lower streams have been characterized in a negative manner as a 'delinquent' or 'delinquescent' subculture.

It is perhaps worthwhile to investigate how and why school tasks are accomplished on official terms even when students and school authorities (or researchers) do not hold the same apparent definitions of the situation.

Cusick (1973: 77) has suggested something like this in noting that, although they spend less than one hour daily doing school work in the classroom, students (and, by implication, society) benefit from and are satisfied with the more or less loosely guided peer interaction the remaining school time affords them. Similarly, notions such as bargaining for a contract or a negotiated order between students and teachers, emphasized in interactionist-based research (e.g., Smith and Geoffrey, 1968; Martin, 1976; Geer, 1977), point toward potential conflict which underlies any classroom situation. Therefore, the observed general acceptance by students of school and school procedures must not be viewed as unproblematic; rather, it may be functional in glossing over contradictory social
practices that permit and restrict the degree and forms of effective student school experiences. Stated another way, if students are allowed certain freedoms within a limited range of activities (related in practice especially to social and personal matters), they may be expected to meet more critical role and performance demands as required for school, and for society.

If such a trade-off operates for all students, then it is worthwhile to examine how it affects different groups of students. Specifically, given the contextual frame emphasizing students and schools in capitalist society, school experience can be interpreted in relation to class considerations. How, therefore, do students in different class positions receive and interpret their educational experiences in the process of schooling, and what is the significance of the differences and similarities that exist?

Most research attention along this line has been directed at older working class students, presumably because they are most noticeably difficult to deal with in official school terms. In this regard, working class youth rarely see school as relevant or part of the real world (Willis, 1977). Instead, they look to jobs as means of providing the independent adult status and satisfactory existence that is negated in schooling (Morton-Williams and Finch, 1968; Willis, 1977; Larter and Eason, 1978; Usher

As was noted earlier, however, these students do not wholly condemn school, and even tend to accept it in somewhat instrumental terms. It is this paradox - between students' recognition of the limited importance of schooling in their lives, and their actions and expressions which suggest that school is important in many ways - which remains to be explained.

A few writers have provided some insight by examining the transition by working-class youths from school into the work force. At least in the short run, work provides a continuation and extension of the opportunities for excitement, variety and interactions that are valued in school by youth in Britain (Morton-Williams and Finch, 1968; Willis, 1977) and Canada (Larter and Eason, 1978; Usher and Elson, 1978; Lazerson and Gaskell, 1981). These students recognize certain restrictions which limit their economic, social and cultural activities, but they are nevertheless unaware of the full entrapment into which they are being drawn, partly through their own efforts. Reeves (1976), referring to "illegitimate appropriation", and Willis (1977), discussing "partial penetration", identify the process whereby students fall short of specifying the nature and origin of contradictions which underlie the schooling process. Lazerson and Gaskell (1981: 209) describe the gap in comprehension as follows: "While we see class and sex divisions
being reproduced in the ways these youth move from school to work, they see individual choices, individual frustrations, and individual compensations." Characteristic of the working class student's fragmented school experience, it would seem, are forces which immerse the student in a present - rather than future - group or social orientation, encompassed by a set of individual responsibilities.

What then of students in other class positions? Weber was one of the first to examine connections between class and status groups and particular appropriate educational experiences (Gerth and Mills, 1958: 416ff). Anyon (1981), examining present-day American society, has observed differences in curricular content and expectations as these are presented to students in various class locations: knowledge is fragmented and mechanical for the working class; conceptual and commodified for middle classes; and part of a tradition to be mastered for elite groups. Significantly, despite more observable resistances to school evident in the activities of working class students, Anyon notes that students in all classes experience and have access to a basis for understanding contradictions in schooling and society.

Apart from Anyon's work, and from studies of working class students, little systematic research has been done to locate and explain the implications of educational
experiences for students in different class positions.

2.4. Chapter Summary

Sociological research on schooling and the student has tended to focus on either structural or situational factors, with little interconnection between the two sets of factors. Each approach, however, has contributed useful insights for an overall understanding of schooling. Functionalists, interested primarily in schooling as a subsystem of the social order, have emphasized patterns which operate in schooling to facilitate for young people the transition from home through school to the world of work. Classroom-based interactionist studies, emphasizing themes such as peer and student-teacher relationships and school organizational procedures, have helped to fill in the details of the process of schooling.

Research by Reeves, Willis, Woods, and others has demonstrated that there is a basis for understanding what happens in school in relation to material conditions that prevail inside and outside of school. It is recognized, however, that a need exists for further research in this direction. Furthermore, continued research requires that the existence and patterns of schooling in society (for our purposes, capitalist society) be treated as problematic.
With this criterion in mind, three themes that recur in the literature are identified as useful research guides: (1) students, in general, express overt satisfaction with school, yet their school experiences and guarded comments reflect some uncertainty; (2) students' worlds frequently become broken down and disjointed through the schooling process; and (3) schooling can be understood according to contextual, instrumental and idealistic factors; where immediate (contextual) concerns related to the school day are emphasized by participants, the implications of minor modifications and struggles in the school environment are not always apparent.

These themes will be explored in the following chapters in two ways. First, within the framework of capitalist society, theoretical connections will be made in order to account for the often-overlooked dialectical relationship between the structure of class society and day-to-day activities. Second, these connections will be substantiated with empirical observations of students, their school experiences, and their interpretations of those experiences. Consideration will be given to the general nature of class schooling and particular class differences within school.
Footnotes to Chapter 2

1. Although only certain developments can be highlighted within the scope of this thesis, there now exist several excellent sources which can provide complete and critical histories of research and theory in the sociology of education. One of the best, from which this summary draws, is the introduction by Karabel and Halsey to their 1977 collection, *Power and Ideology in Education*.

2. Braverman (1974) presents a useful analysis of Taylorization according to how changes in capitalism have resulted in reductions in skill and training requirements for increasing proportions of the work force.
Chapter 3

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

3.1. Introduction

Three theory-related concerns make it difficult to adequately conceptualize the role of the school in capitalist society. First, the sociology of education is at times only marginally related to any adequate sociological theorizing. Second, many of the theories that exist have yet to be substantiated with satisfactory empirical grounding. Finally, theorizing about education has tended to focus exclusively on either the inside or outside of the 'black box' of schooling. Each of these concerns will be discussed below. It will be argued that intended and unintended consequences arising from these problems separately and in conjunction with each other have tended to limit any complete representation of the nature of schooling. Alternatively, a Marxist approach which recognizes the role of human activity and struggle within human-based structural limitations will be suggested (and elaborated in Chapters 4 and 5) as a useful framework in which to analyze schooling.

3.2. Sociology and Education

Hansen (1967: 22), in discussing 'the uncomfortable relation of sociology and education', notes a distinction
between the sociologist's "effort to develop knowledge" and the educational researcher's "effort to develop a base for effective action".\(^1\) This separation of tasks and approaches reflects divergent traditions and social forces which have accompanied the development of the respective disciplines.\(^2\)

The sociological enterprise has tended to subordinate or push to the fringe the school and its constituent parts when these have been treated as units of analysis. Thus, there are stratification theories, cultural or subcultural theories, organizational and role theories, and political theories, that relate to selected parts or functions of the school (Banks, 1976), but few of these present a cohesive framework for seeing the school as any sort of unity, in itself or in society.

On the other hand, the pragmatic educationalist studies, insofar as they have considered sociology at all, have displayed what Bernbaum (1977: 36) calls a 'shopping around' for sociological problems and approaches that suit immediate needs. Research directed at specific school practices, such as the search for ideal teacher-pupil ratios and levels of educability, and at input into schooling – notably the 'inequality' debates of a decade ago – have been characterized by efforts, in the first instance, to make schooling more productive, and in the second, to approach a rigorous positivist methodology. In both cases,
theoretical connections are overlooked or sketchy at best.

That is not to imply that theory must preclude particular or contextual concerns. However, theorizing poses unique but necessary dilemmas to inquiries about ongoing activities such as schooling. As Hurn (1978) notes, sociological knowledge of schools is superior to 'common sense' views, but it also remains uncertain; taken-for-granted assumptions which consciously or unconsciously underpin theories cannot be divorced from ideological considerations. Bernbaum (1976) argues more decisively that the study of education is the study of ideologies. Neither writer would argue that ideology can or should be eliminated in sociological work. Instead, assumptions must be explored and ideological purposes uncovered in a reflexive sort of theorizing in order to reduce the strains between thought and practice.

3.3. Theory and Research

Mills (1959) argues in *The Sociological Imagination* that the 'getting together' of theory and research/methodology in relation to the problem at hand is central to any useful intellectual enterprise. Sociological understanding of schools has at times suffered from disjunctures between these two forms of 'craftsmanship'.

Policy-related and pragmatic research has tended to leave too many hidden assumptions and undeveloped connec-
tions in order to limit the scope of inquiry to workable (i.e., apparently solvable) levels. Conversely, theorists in positions to make these connections have generally failed to show how social reality actually operates. Writers like Parsons, Althusser and especially the 'new' sociologists of education⁴ (who stress the linkage between theorizing and empirical activity as a major objective in their approach) are all open to the criticism that their theories and conceptual categories have not been systematically explored or supported through research. Although the same argument can be applied to much of sociological theory in general, this weakness in the sociology of education is especially significant given the profusion of schools and school-related problems in contemporary society.⁵ The problems that schooling is supposed to rectify tend therefore to remain incompletely understood and hence unsolved.

3.4. Black Boxes

Central to the previous chapter was the recognition that school research has been bifurcated according to whether inputs, outputs and structural constraints, or internal interactive processes have been emphasized in looking at schooling. The first approach is frequently identified as a 'black box' view of schooling where internal workings and meanings are overlooked or discarded
as trivia. The second view takes us into the box, but tends to ignore the world around the box, and sometimes even the existence of any box-like features at all.

At the core of the 'black box' debate is the issue of structural determinism versus the situated autonomy of social actors. Structural determinists (ranging from structural functionalists such as Parsons, to neo-Marxist structuralists like Althusser, and materialists like Bowles and Gintis) attribute to schooling an often mechanistic role in reproducing the conditions and functional requisites of industrial, class society. Opposition to this approach, coming mostly from proponents of the 'new' sociology of education, emphasizes instead the active roles of individuals in creating and maintaining particular realities. By addressing different problematics, however, the 'debate' is more an exercise in contrasting levels of analysis than an effort to redress fundamental theoretical weaknesses.

a. Structural Determinism

Parsons (1959) represents the traditional or 'normative' orientation to schooling. For Parsons, the school facilitates the transition for the individual from the family's ascriptive, particularistic emphases to the emergent achievement, universalistic norms of industrialized American society. These processes correspond
functionally with the tasks accorded the school of sorting and socializing youth for appropriate productive roles in adult life.

Radical (Marxist) structuralists do not deny these important school roles. Rather, the assertion that schooling contributes to a more meritocratic social order is strongly attacked. In response, the school is reinterpreted according to its reproduction of a correspondence with structured inequalities in social and economic life.

Althusser (1971) expresses the neo-Marxist structuralist position in his analysis of ideology and the reproduction of productive forces (i.e., labour power). The existence of a given social formation, Althusser argues, requires the coercive power of a Repressive State Apparatus to be reinforced by Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs). ISAs serve to transmit the dominant class ideology to all social classes in order, therefore, to reproduce existing (exploitative) class and productive relationships. In this regard, the school is viewed as the dominant ISA in contemporary capitalist society.6 Because ideology has a material base, however, the sphere of influence of ISAs is restricted. The dominant mode of production retains its primacy and strict limitations are placed on human activity. Althusser, therefore, tends to deny that creative, active possibilities are important in people's lives. His
theory depicts, instead passive, mechanistic and 'overdetermined' beings (Glucksman, 1975; Sarup, 1978; Apple, 1979). As Erben and Gleeson (1977: 83) note, Althusser does not leave room for the emergence of radical, committed individuals, who come to be so important for 'new' sociologists of education.

Bowles and Gintis (1976; 1980) present a materialist position. They argue that political and economic analysis of schooling in a historical perspective is necessary in order to demonstrate how schools have continued to be functional for dominant interests in society. Despite the close correspondence between school and social organization, the ideology of schools as quasi-autonomous liberal-democratic institutions has permitted educational change to serve a role "not of a complement to economic reform, but as a substitute for it" (1976: 240). Class inequalities and roles are reinforced in schools after some allowance has been made for shifting demands in the marketplace. The mechanistic nature of Bowles and Gintis's work is revealed, however, in their analysis of contradictions. The notion of contradictions becomes essentially a residual category for explaining the incompleteness of the correspondences which are posited. Moreover, the rhetoric of their Marxist connections inadequately hides a questionable positivist, structural functionalist hybrid of research and
theory (Karabel and Halsey, 1977; Sarup, 1978). Bowles and Gintis's work contains no true dialogue with Marxian theory. Their observations in many ways echo what Parsons and others, without the Marxist trappings, had already demonstrated.

To summarize the structuralist view, there is a general tendency to overstate the direct links between school and society to the extent that schooling verges on becoming an unfree, automatic process. Hurn (1978: 260) argues that both functionalist and radical views incorrectly regard schools as completely rational institutions; both views

mislead us into believing that schools do indeed teach what they intend to teach; they oversimplify the complex determinants of what schools attempt to convey to the young; and most importantly perhaps, they divert attention away from the study of the schools themselves by seeing these institutions as mere reflections of the wider social order.

b. The 'New' Sociology of Education

The 'new' sociology of education presented itself in the early 1970's as a promising alternative (in its most 'pure' form) to all structural views of education and all studies which had 'taken' rather than 'made' research problems (Young, 1971a). Young's (1971b: 32) starting assumptions

that those in positions of power will attempt to define what is to be taken as knowledge, how
accessible to different groups any knowledge is, and what are the accepted relationships between different knowledge areas and between those who have access to them and make them available

stimulated a somewhat ephemeral movement which came to emphasize, according to Sarup (1978), four approaches - the adoption of anthropological lessons and methods in the study of schooling; reliance on a phenomenological, anti-positivist model; rejection of the dominant liberal philosophy of education; and a focus on classroom and curriculum studies. In reviewing this approach, Sarup (1978: 17-21) further identifies five central propositions:

1. There should not be an absence of theoretical debate in the sociology of education.

2. There should be continuous critical questioning of the 'taken for granted'.

3. There should be a move towards treating knowledge, or what counts as knowledge, as socially constructed, and the implications that follow from this should be studied.

4. There should be a move towards accepting social actors' categories and explanations as valid ways of making sense and giving meaning.

5. There should be a study of how and why certain defining categories persist, of how and why western academic standards are treated as absolutes.

These features are represented in such work as Keddie's (1971) analysis of types of knowledge in the classroom and her (1977) ethnological critique of distinctions between concrete and abstract thought; Esland's (1971) confusing
attempt to create a teaching paradigm rooted in the sociology of knowledge; Gorbutt's (1972) overt call for a new, interpretive paradigm in the sociology of education; and Jenks's (1977) critique of a liberal philosophy of education which denies possibilities that a number of forms of existence and knowledge may in fact have as much validity as the dominant rational forms do.

There is much merit in the 'new' approach to the sociology of education, especially in contrast to weaknesses displayed by the structuralist and pragmatic views of education. Questions relating to the content of education, the assumptions which allow schools and school participants to operate as they do, and possibilities for change were finally being approached in a potentially systematic way.

However, the 'new' sociology of education left itself open to two major and interdependent criticisms. First, the concern with theory and the 'newness' of the approach has tended to result in a disciplinary struggle for territory, often characterized more by rhetoric than by realism and action. Karabel and Halsey (1977), pointing to American symbolic interactionist studies, question how new the 'new' approach really is. Bernbaum (1977) argues that the lack of historical awareness evident especially in Young's work, betrays an uncertain commitment which may actually serve to
legitimate rather than challenge particular power structures. Moreover, Williamson (1974) faults the 'new' sociologists' inability to locate the sources of social and educational power despite declared aims, and Whitty (1974: 132) notes that "there has perhaps been a tendency in some manifestations of 'new directions' to overemphasize the significance of sociological theorizing and demystification in the transformation of lived reality". This has left participants such as teachers or students responsible for initiating changes that they are likely, under given circumstances, powerless to carry out (Sarup, 1978).

All of this is related to the second problem, which is the danger of over-relativising forms of knowledge, meaning and social action. Young (1977) seems gradually to be recognizing the risk involved in viewing all knowledge as socially constructed and linked to actors' situations. A sociology of knowledge approach, he agrees, tends to evade questions that require particular criteria for truth or validity to be identified. In light of the 'new' sociology of education's calls for social action, this tendency to make all bases for knowledge problematic presents a potentially crippling dilemma. No clear insight is possible into the question of 'what should be changed and how should change be brought about?' if all value-stances are relative. Thus the 'new' sociologists of education have not
presented a workable alternative to the overdeterministic tendencies of structuralist approaches.

3.5. On Reification

So far, a need has been recognized for a sociological model of schooling which considers both actors' intentions and structural barriers to activity. The 'new' sociology of education has overcome dehumanized visions of structuralist sociology by bringing back to humans the responsibility for active involvement in their relationships with knowledge (Sarup, 1978). In the process, however, the 'new' approach has left itself open to criticism for its idealism (Hextall and Sarup, 1977; Reynolds and Sullivan, 1980) and its confusion between theory and action (Bernbaum, 1977). The connections that structuralists recognize between material conditions and consciousness are not confronted by proponents of the 'new' approach despite their declared aims. These connections, it is agreed here, must be made if the process of schooling is to be adequately understood.

It is useful, at this point, to examine the work of Peter Berger (Berger and Pullberg, 1966; Berger and Luckmann, 1967) insofar as Berger has presented to sociology a method for understanding social activity through the dialectic between humans as producers (subjects) and humans as products (objects). The 'new' sociology of education,
through writers like Esland (1971) and Gorbutt (1972), has
drawn heavily upon Berger's application of the sociology of
knowledge to ongoing social activities. It will be argued
that Berger's approach represents both the strengths and
the failings of the 'new' sociology of education. Berger
and Pullberg's (1966) article "Reification and the Sociol-
ogical Critique of Consciousness" will be presented as a
reference point because of its direct influence on studies
of schooling and its reference to Marxian theory.

Berger and Pullberg employ the Marxian concept of
reification in order to trace the disjuncture between human
producers and human products. They define four concepts
which they stress are central in the reification process.

Objectivation is the creation by humans of objects or
products. Objectification refers to the partial separation
of these products from their producers such that the
products are recognized, named, or referred to as objects.
Both processes are essential features of our humanity in
that to create, re-create, and communicate are human
activities. The next two processes, in contrast, can be
identified as dehumanizing. Alienation is "the process by
which the unity of the producing and the product is broken
... i.e., by which man forgets that the world he lives in
has been produced by himself" (Berger and Pullberg, 1966:
61). Ultimately, reification is the moment within
alienation whereby objective reality is apparently comprised only of things and not created by people.

The problem for Berger and Pullberg becomes how to recover a conception of the human as producer or how to de-reify a world which in nearly all of its socio-historic manifestations has come to be regarded as thinglike. This is close to a Marxian problematic, except for Berger and Pullberg's claim that reification is an almost universal phenomenon. Consequently, their proposed solution relies upon the de-reification of a false consciousness such that people can locate themselves and their products in a human world. Social structure, it is argued, "is nothing but the result of human enterprise" (Berger and Pullberg, 1966:62).

At this point, several weaknesses must be identified in Berger and Pullberg's analysis. First, reification is defined as a 'moment in' the process of alienation. How this moment comes to be is not explained. However, reification, despite its definitional status, tends to become central to, and even to displace alienation in, Berger and Pullberg's argument (Brewster, 1966; Keat and Urry, 1975). More significantly, alienation as a process of 'forgetting' vastly underestimates the theoretical and real constraints that are a part of an alienated social order. As Geras (quoted in Whitty, 1974: 125) notes, "what [Berger and Pullberg] themselves 'forget' is that, if forgetfulness
were all that were involved, a reminder should be sufficient to deal with the constituent problems of alienation". This is obviously not so, given that alienation and reification are presented as universal phenomena rooted presumably in the terror of chaos and other fundamental horrors of human existence (Berger and Pullberg, 1966:68). But de-reification is only expressed as a possibility in apparently random and isolated situations involving catastrophe, culture shock or social marginality. Therefore, no effort is made to explain and socially locate alienation and reification, nor to explore alternatives involving systematic or collective human action (Brewster, 1966; Keat and Urry, 1975).

Berger and Pullberg have astutely brought sociological attention to the creative and productive role of humans in the world. The processes by which people have lost and may be able to regain their awareness of and control over this productivity have, however, been neglected. Berger and Pullberg have avoided the traps inherent in what Horton (1964) identifies as the 'dehumanization' of the study of alienation by so-called 'value-free' approaches (which Horton identifies as psychological, middle-range and scientific objectivity ideologies). By shifting their focus from the process of alienation to reification, however, Berger and Pullberg emphasize thought ahead of other
activity or praxis. The dialectic that they intend to demonstrate loses its material grounding. Even when human understanding reveals a need for change, thought and intent do not necessarily mean that further empirical investigation and action will follow.
3.6. Chapter Summary

The problem identified so far has been to recognize and substantiate connections between the world of human activity and social structure. The persistence of this problem has been demonstrated by trends in the sociology of education. Tensions have tended to run along two axes: research versus theory motivations; and structuralist versus "new" orientations. Peter Berger has suggested that each of these sets of forces can be brought closer together, but Berger's work and work influenced by him have tended to remain one-sided with little material substantiation.

Questions that must be considered for any society are, "What kind of a world do people create?", "How is it created and maintained?", "How can it be changed?", and "How much do people understand about the structure of their social world?" These questions, certainly, probe far beyond the scope of this, or any, single thesis. What will be suggested, though, are first, an approach that holds promise for dealing with these problems systematically, and second, since schools are important socializing and educative institutions that might be expected to deal with these questions, an attempt to use these questions as guides to understanding the daily school experiences of students.
The Marxian basis of Berger and Pullberg's concept of reification leads us to a deeper examination than Berger and Pullberg present of the concepts of alienation and reification. This will be developed in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5, the Marxist dialectic between social structure and human activity will be explored further. Chapters 6 and 7 will focus on research and human activity in a school setting, with emphasis on the student school experience.
Footnotes to Chapter 3

1. Controversial policies arising from Bernstein's analysis of linguistic codes in relation to social class are indicative of the problems that occur when the two research approaches become confused. See Bernstein (1971) for his development of codes, and papers in Bernstein (1973) as well as Bernstein (1977b) for his response to the compensatory education debate.

2. Karabel and Halsey (1977) repeatedly call for, and formulate with some success, a sociology of educational research that examines the social and historical contexts within which educational research has developed.

3. The same, of course, can be claimed with regard to most areas of inquiry.

4. All of these will be discussed in the next section.

5. It might be interesting to speculate as to the relative importance of factors such as the apparent obviousness of schools and school concerns, political concerns or the complex nature of school-social relationships, in contributing to the theory-research dilemma.

6. Ironically, Althusser's (1971: 147-8) description of the schooling process is here remarkably similar to the analysis by Parsons (1959). Consequently, the critiques applied to the structural approach can apply to Parsons as well as Althusser.

7. The method is a form of Marxian phenomenology.
Chapter 4
ALIENATION AND EDUCATION

4.1. Introduction

Alienation is for Marx a process which is specifically related to the organization of productive activity in capitalist society. It is not (as Berger and Pullberg, 1966, imply; see Chapter 3) simply a form of consciousness. This chapter will outline Marx's theory of alienation. Also, particular representations of alienated existence in the classroom will be discussed.

4.2. Marx's Theory of Alienation

For Marx, conscious human existence depends upon human labour, which contributes to the creation of a world of objects (Marx, 1964). The desired objectification of human species life, as Marx calls it, requires not only active involvement, but also human self-consciousness, within that self-created world. Objectification is therefore a humanizing process insofar as we, our consciousness and our products are interrelated in unitary fashion. The absence of this unity, attributed by Marx to economic conditions and social relations of production required in capitalist society, is alienation. The recognition that this alienation of labour is not universal, that it is tied to
particular socio-historical circumstances and can therefore be overcome, is essential for understanding Marx's theory. Thus, Ollman (1976: 131-134) is not being evasive when he describes alienation as 'the absence of unalienation', for he is underscoring the linkage between the future and a present in which for each of several realms, "a relation that distinguishes the human species has disappeared and its constituent elements have been reorganized to appear as something else."

Marx (1964), in *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, identifies four aspects in which practical human activity (labour) has come to be alienated. These are (1) alienation of people from the products of their labour; (2) alienation from the labour process; (3) estrangement from our own humanness, or our species being; and (4) estrangement of people from other people.

(1) Marx stresses in developed capitalist society the distinction between owners of property and means of production, and workers who do not own property or means of production, and who therefore sell their labouring power for a wage. In this exchange of labouring power for wage, the worker relinquishes control over what he or she produces. That is to say,

The product — the purpose for which it is created, how it is disposed of, its content, quality and quantity — is not determined by those whose labour is responsible for its manufacture
The ends of capitalist production are not defined by the needs and interests of ordinary people but by employers' needs to generate profits and expand capital (Rinehart, 1975: 13).

The products of human labour, in this alien form, come to confront and threaten the worker rather than to unify the worker with the world:

The worker puts his life into the object; but now his life no longer belongs to him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the greater is the worker's lack of objects. Whatever the product of labour is, he is not (Marx, 1964: 108).

Mandel (1970) cites as examples of this hostile relationship the increasing human servitude to machines and the contradiction of economic recessions wherein workers are forced to consume less (through layoffs, wage restraints, etc.) because they have been too productive!

(2) The act of labour itself is also alienating. Work is external to, and does not belong to, the worker. Marx refers to this as self-estrangement because the act of producing is vested in the creation of objects that are themselves separated from the worker. The worker's activity is forced and unfulfilling, and consequently becomes regarded as instrumental, as a means to something else.

As a result, therefore, man (the worker) only feels himself freely active in his animal functions - eating, drinking, procreating or at most in his dwelling and in dressing-up, etc.; and in his human functions he no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal. What is animal becomes human and what is human becomes animal.
Certainly eating, drinking, procreating, etc., are also genuinely human functions. But abstractly taken, separated from the sphere of all other human activity and turned into sole and ultimate ends, they are animal functions (Marx, 1964: 111).

(3) Thus we become estranged from our species being. Our active, objectifying powers become redirected so that we no longer act upon and transform nature and ourselves, but rather we become preoccupied with the business of living itself.

(4) Finally, people are alienated from each other as a consequence of the other forms of alienation. People come to view themselves according to their roles in the productive system, hence they relate to others as owners, or employers, or workers. There is competition for jobs, wages, resources, and profits which contributes to antagonism between people.

Rinehart (1975: 17) summarizes the dominant conceptions central to the idea of alienation:

Alienation always entails a notion of human estrangement — from persons, objects, values, or from oneself. Second, the source of alienation is seen as residing in the social structure rather than in individual personalities; its causes are social rather than psychological.

Moreover, he advises that

we follow Marx in viewing alienation as characteristic of a certain kind of organization of work, one whose source lies primarily in a special set of socioeconomic circumstances which accompanied the development of industrial capitalism, ...
alienation is objective or structural in the sense that it is built into human relationships at the workplace and exists independent of how people perceive and evaluate their jobs (Rinehart, 1975: 17)

Indeed, people's perceptions of and responses to their jobs, and to other people, will tend to reflect alienation. Marx does not therefore leave alienation as a descriptive philosophical phenomenon, but he grounds it firmly in aspects of our lives and social relationships. These relationships must be explained if the concept of alienation is to be an effective theoretical tool.

Mandel (1970) argues that alienation remains central throughout Marx's work, reappearing in later work as commodity fetishism and reification. The concept of alienation is thus not peculiar to a developmental phase in Marx's writing. Rather, alienation can be observed in particular forms once human labour is recognized in capitalist society as the source of all value.

Marx's 'labour theory of value', stated quite simply, emphasizes that fundamental to capitalist society is the relationship whereby capitalist employers extract surplus value from wage labourers (Marx, 1970). Capitalist production is maintained through profit, which is derived from surplus labour, or the number of hours a labourer works beyond the level to which he/she has been paid through wages. The essential point is that profit depends on values
which commodities acquire within the labour process (in labouring itself), and not on any abstract notions of price.

This last factor is important before the fetishism of commodities (commodity fetishism) can be understood. Although people are active in the world as producers of goods (and services and ideas), human social relationships rarely reflect this active, productive role. Instead, given a division of labour in society which requires products to be exchanged for one another, the exchange and the products come to take on independent existences. This attribution of human-like life to objects is what Marx describes in *Capital, Vol. I* (1967: 72) as commodity fetishism:

> A commodity is therefore a mysterious thing, simply because in it the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour. This is the reason why the products of labour become commodities, social things whose qualities are at the same time perceptible and imperceptible by the senses.

However, it is more than inanimate objects that become commodified, as Marx (1964: 107) notes: "Labour produces not only commodities: it produces itself and the worker as a commodity - and this in the same general proportion in which it produces commodities." Marx stresses throughout *Capital* that just as objects are personified, so do people come to be reified or presented as things - in the labour
process, where the wage earner is purchased and used by the employer as a means of production, and in social relations in general.

These twin paradoxes, with things appearing as people (commodity fetishism) and people as things (reification), coexist in an illusory world where subject and object (and truth and falsity) are confused. Thus Ollman (1976: 200) observes that people acquire their conception of reality from what they experience (they reify the forms of value because of what occurs in the metamorphosis of value), and that conception of reality helps determine what they experience (the metamorphosis of value only occurs through the reification of the forms of value).

An inquiry that becomes important relative to a study of education therefore proceeds from the question, 'How is such a world maintained (or transformed)?'

4.3. Alienation in Education

Schools are not organized primarily for productive activity. It is not valid, therefore, to claim that alienation comes about through schooling. However, concepts of alienation and alienating activity can be applied to school situations by analogy. It is likely that most students throughout their lives will relinquish to someone else control over the products of their labour. The role that schools play in facilitating this transfer of control will
be discussed below and in the chapters which follow.

There has been a tendency in the literature on schooling to ignore the Marxian approach to alienation, or to use that approach in a haphazard way. Writers have often used alienation as a label that can be attached to anything in the school which seems worthy of criticism. Three views in particular can be noted. The first view identifies only specific alienated individuals or groups in the school; the second view regards school itself as an alienating institution; and the third view (or, rather, set of views) emphasizes struggles to overcome alienation. This thesis will employ insights presented by the third view in working towards a dialectical understanding of social relationships.

The first view, commonly accepted by educators (and represented in such sociological work as Stinchcombe's, 1964, analysis of 'expressive alienation' displayed through student 'rebellion'), emphasizes a psychologistic explanation that identifies and suggests remedies for particular students or student groups who are not being reached by the services offered through schooling. Such explanations overlook the structural bases of alienation, including the recognition that the social system and not just its parts is based upon alienated (and alienating) conditions.

The case for the second view - that schools are alienating institutions and are therefore harmful - is most
strongly argued by Illich (1972). Schools are blamed for the credential society, for inducing the consumption that is destroying our human and natural resources:

Now young people are prealienated by schools that isolate them while they pretend to be both producers and consumers of their own knowledge, which is conceived of as a commodity put on the market in school. School makes alienation preparatory to life, thus depriving education of reality and work of creativity. School prepares for the alienating institutionalization of life by teaching the need to be taught (Illich, 1972: 67).

'Institutionalized values' are seen to be transmitted through the school in the quantification and categorization of anything that is regarded as worthwhile. Illich's well-known response is to 'deschool' society whereby individuals will reclaim from the realm of bureaucratic institutions and their agents the choices, services, products, and techniques that govern life.

Two problems relevant to the concerns in this thesis emerge in Illich's analysis. First, as Gintis (1976) points out, Illich correctly identifies the institutionalization of commodity fetishism in schooling but he fails to acknowledge that negative criticism and deinstitutionalization of service agencies will not in themselves guarantee a less repressive society. Schools have come to be what they are only over a long period of time and activity, and their removal would not eliminate the conditions of their existence. This is related to a second concern raised by Apple
(1977) which is similar to the criticism made by Hurn (1978) of structural views of education. Though schools are important agents of social control, their role is not fully deterministic. Critical thought and research do exist throughout the history of 'schooled' environments, and political struggle can be effective within a given schooling framework. Thus, while Illich is able to identify those aspects of alienation in which a human-produced world comes to reshape people in a threatening manner, his analysis is weakened by a lack of real (historical and non-idealistic) content.

A third view, which recognizes the role of struggle related to alienation in education, is provided by Woods and Schaffer. Woods (1979: 169) identifies alienation in teaching (but the argument can also apply for students) in the day to day struggle to survive when "meaning is invested into meaningless activity". School is seen by many participants as an unreal world with its own rules and institutional constraints and human energy is consumed merely by playing the game. However, Woods disputes the view that alienation also develops through objectified learning. He correctly criticizes some writers (one might be Hellerich, 1970) who place the blame for alienation on a 'capitalist conspiracy', but he fails himself to look beyond bureaucracy as the culprit.
Schaffer (1970: 121) also recognizes a struggle associated with alienation; in fact, he defines education as "the process of encountering and transcending alienation from moment to moment". Unlike Woods, Schaffer further recognizes that schooling contributes to the process in which humans encounter their own products as alien. By taking a phenomenological stance in which change does not transcend the level of consciousness, however, Schaffer cannot recognize, as Woods does, the institutional and structural constraints upon people's actions.

The identification by Woods and Schaffer of struggle related to alienation is important, but the terms and contexts of that struggle must be clarified. While alienation does not originate in schools, alienated relations (where reification and commodity fetishism characterize our thoughts and activity) can pervade all aspects of our lives including our schooling. Schooling has theoretical and practical interest because it has potential to both heighten and undermine these alienated relationships. Freire (1976: 225) writes in this regard of the paradox between schooling as an "instrument of liberation" and an "instrument of domination".

The liberating potential of even 'bourgeois' forms of education is recognized by Marx and Engels (1952) in the "Communist Manifesto" and by more recent Marxist-oriented
writers like Simon (1976) and Reynolds and Sullivan (1980). These writers all argue that post-capitalist society will still require schooling and a common core of accumulated human knowledge. Schools, with their educative functions, carry with them possibilities for stimulating human interaction, creativity and mastery of the world. All of these features are potentially de- (or non-) alienating.

Capitalist society, however, is premised upon alienated working relationships. Capital accumulation depends upon most people having little control over the products of their work and, consequently, over work itself, their own lives, and their relationships with other people. Within this framework, schools are required to shape a certain type of potential workforce, to evaluate and sort students, to provide certain opportunities and experiences for students over a given period of time, and to meet other expectations for various social groups.

Alienation is, then, a particular structural phenomenon which affects individual lives and individual and collective forms of consciousness. The process of schooling can have tendencies for both alienation and de-alienation. Capitalist society, however, depends upon an alienated workforce. Therefore, by analogy, several alienating predispositions are likely to be found in schools in capitalist societies.
In the first place, students come to schools to learn, or to appropriate new knowledge, skills, values, and roles for themselves. Some coordination — for example, in providing resources, setting goals and pacing activities — is obviously necessary in order for schools to work. However, students soon discover that they may have little control over themselves, their bodies (in needing permission to go to the bathroom, for example), and their activities.

Although the school day is organized around keeping the student active, a large part of this activity is external, only involving part of the student. Holly (1971: 97) defines alienated education "as the educational process externalized, made instrumental instead of expressive and self-realizing". Learning is for him an active process which effects in the subject a change in consciousness (Holly, 1977: 175). In practice, however, the curriculum is more than likely presented to the teacher and to the student as an external facticity and something to be taken or covered. Sarup (1978: 42) describes how this process is analogous to what Marx describes as alienation of people from their products:

The more teachers and pupils 'spend' themselves working on knowledge (usually discrete subject areas separated from the real world), the more powerful and coercive this reified knowledge seems to become. The pupil's knowledge is taken away from him, or to be more precise, he dissociates the knowledge from himself, because the pupil's needs or individuality is not considered.
This is not difficult to understand because the knowledge did not belong to him in the first place but was set up for him by others.

Alienating tendencies are evident even where educational developments have allowed more scope for individualization and increased participant decision-making in the classroom. The Progressive Education movement, which in the first half of this century emphasized optimal individual development through schooling, became fused at several points with Taylorism and its tenets of scientific management, contributing to such widespread devices as streaming, standardized testing and bureaucratic organization in North American schools (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Karier and Hogan, 1979). More recently, Bernstein (1977a: 520) has discussed trends which utilize 'invisible pedagogies' (characterized by high degrees of student and teacher choice over curriculum, activities and learning outcomes within a flexible environment) in primary schooling. He stresses that in such situations uncertainty is common, more aspects of each student are made public, and hence "more of the child is available for direct and indirect surveillance and control". Sharp and Green (1975) substantiate these claims that "child-centered" education allows for social control; they demonstrate that student freedom to act is highly constrained by the information that teachers and others can derive from student activity.
Moreover, Apple (1980) points to pre-packaged curriculum kits and learning aids that are increasingly used in schools to facilitate individualized learning. He argues that only rates of learning are flexible while students and teachers become subjected to the limitations and procedures carried by the predefined products. Macdonald (1975: 88) argues a similar point when he stresses that schools foster a technological, bureaucratic and consumer orientation which subordinates individual human qualities.

The most obvious alienation-oriented aspect of school life is the evaluation that is done of students and teachers and their work. The act of evaluation, by placing a value on particular outcomes, serves to draw attention to the instrumentality rather than the intrinsic merits of activity. The contradictions represented in commodity fetishism and reification are manifest in papers that receive grades and people who are given labels. Hextall and Sarup (1977) identify four alienating characteristics in evaluation: (1) the individual is the basis for evaluation; his or her work is given a value to be made distinct from the work of other students; (2) knowledge is expected to be reproduced more than produced before evaluation can be done; (3) individuals come to rank themselves by distinguishing criteria that differentiate them from others; and (4) evaluation implies a conception that the world is
'given' and that the criteria for learning and evaluating are right or natural. Human activity comes to be constrained by narrow limits of 'rightness' or 'wrongness' within the realm of alternatives. Teachers often teach particular material and students learn it for an exam, or "because it's in the curriculum". The course materials themselves, and not social relationships, are frequently seen as motivating factors in classroom activities, and people are the products.

Although evaluation is effective as a form of social control, it is reinforced by other processes which also have alienating tendencies. Bernstein (1971) describes how particular educational arrangements (which he defines as regulated by a collection code) govern the availability, organization, content, and presentation of knowledge in a series of steps which must be followed if a student is to become educationally successful. For those who do not succeed, or who do not value education as a commodity, schooling becomes a device for 'busyness', where the day is filled with play-like activity that can be enjoyed by the student, presumably until either the school-leaving age has been reached or the student is prepared to accept the more rigid (and more socially valued) standards of traditional educational forms (Bernstein, 1977a). Whatever the case, student activity becomes separated into process and product; few students have the means to comprehend the
existence and nature of this disjuncture. Apple (1975) cites the widespread popularity of behavioral modification in the classroom as an example of how educational 'innovation' can widen this separation. By broadly applying 'treatments' intended for small groups of 'behavioral problems', educators may avoid questions about how 'deviants', 'slow-learners' and 'disrupters' have come to exist and to acquire the significance they have in schools. Emphasis is placed on what is happening, not what the implications are of any process including teaching, learning, and discipline.

These tendencies seem to suggest that alienation may be related to an increasingly oppressive process in schooling. However, alienation may be counteracted somewhat by features like interpersonal friendships, cooperative activity and real learning that are present in schools. Further inquiry is needed about people's awareness of, and responses to, forces which serve to alienate even these 'humanizing' features.

4.4. Chapter Summary

The argument so far can be summarized as follows. There is a need to understand schools as something more than either structurally determined institutions or indeterminate loci of social meaning making. What happens inside
school should be examined in its own right as well as in conjunction with what happens outside of school.

By drawing parallels between alienated labour and school activity, we can begin to establish a comprehensive explanation of schooling in capitalist society. All societies make certain demands on institutions and people. In capitalist society, we can observe that students' lives tend to become reified through the pursuit of commodified objectives. But, like other institutions and individuals, schooling and its products rarely 'fit' capitalist society perfectly.

Precisely how schools are involved in this 'fit' or 'lack of fit' will be the subject of the following chapters. Chapter 5 will focus on the structure and operations of capitalist society. The importance of the relationship between base, superstructure and the dynamics of class struggle will be stressed. Chapters 6 and 7 will move directly to an examination of schooling in order to substantiate elements of this relationship. The process of how students experience and interpret their schooling can then be related to structural features of capitalist society.
Footnotes to Chapter 4

1. The notion of a break between Marx's early and later work, argued for example by Althusser (1969), is dismissed, like humanistic and non-materialist views, by Mandel in favour of a position which emphasizes an evolution of thought in Marx from The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 through the Grundrisse to Capital. Mandel's view, supported by such writers as Meszaros (1970) and Reeves (1976) - who attacks any 'unwhole' views of Marx's work as resulting from distortions of capitalism - is favoured here in a general sense, without reference to the specifics of Althusser's argument.

2. A useful inquiry could be made into the current widespread use of computer technology in North American classrooms. How much control is retained by people relative to the technology and the relationships which accompany its presence and use?
5.1. Introduction

Schooling is related to, but generally separate from, the realm of productive activity. Therefore concepts and explanations that apply to capitalist productive activity will have some relevance to school processes although there will be some important differences. This chapter will present a framework in which schools can be analyzed in Marxian terms.

Marx's conceptions of alienated labour and class emanate from the fact that labour power (potential labour) is bought and sold. The school and other institutions in civil society reinforce this economic base especially in their functions for reproducing labour power. However, class, class struggle, and more specific aspects of social relations appear in a variety of forms away from the work-place. Consequently, there are important limitations to any views that posit social relationships as direct outcomes of fundamental economic organization.

This chapter will provide a framework for analyzing the place of class struggle in schooling. Class will be discussed in relation to class struggle. The position of schooling in capitalist society will be considered, and
Gramsci's theory of hegemony will be presented as a useful tool for linking social structure and human activity.

5.2. Class and the Class Struggle

Marx's conception of class can only be understood in relation to class struggle (see Marx, 1963: 124; Giddens, 1971; Poulantzas, 1975). That is, the fundamental dichotomy between capitalists and workers presupposes a conflict of interests grounded in the relations of production in capitalist society. As Carchedi (1977) argues, all productive activity serves ultimately the functions of either the global capitalist or the collective worker. In the most basic sense, capitalism depends upon the continued accumulation of capital realized through profit derived from unpaid labour; the rate of profit varies according to

the continued struggle between capital and labour, the capitalist constantly tending to reduce wages to their physical minimum, and to extend the working day to its physical maximum, while the working man constantly presses in the opposite direction (Marx, 1970: 74).

This struggle is carried over into most economic, social and cultural relationships with varying degrees of directness and visibility. Consequently, it becomes difficult to locate precisely different class positions in contemporary (advanced) capitalist society.

Wright (1978) provides a useful analysis of class in terms of economic, political and ideological criteria
elaborated by Poulantzas (1975). The polarized conception of diametrically opposed classes (bourgeoisie and proletariat) is seen by Wright to be mediated by three historical processes: worker loss of control over the labour process; the separation of economic ownership and control; and the differentiation of work tasks and authority structures through an increasingly bureaucratic division of labour. Wright, therefore, emphasizes the important implications for the dynamics of capitalist society carried through positions which occupy 'objectively contradictory' class locations. In other words, given the development of capitalism according to three separate (although interrelated) sets of relationships, some class positions are defined according to their varying alignments on different dimensions with both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (as well as in some cases, the petty bourgeoisie).

Livingstone (1976; 1981; Livingstone and Hart, 1980) carries Wright's analysis a step further towards specifying particular class locations. Livingstone (1976: 239) identifies objective class positions according to four criteria:

(1) common position in the economic mode of production;

(2) separate way of life and cultural existence;

(3) social relationships and social community extending across local and regional lines; and
(4) a political organization.

The class structure of advanced capitalist nations is thus a complex set of relationships, activities and struggles. Livingstone (1981:51-60), like Wright, identifies three broad class positions - capital, dispossessed labour and intermediate elements - according to categories of ownership, control and activity related to capitalist productive relations. However, diverse occupational, economic and social factors allow less general class alignments to develop as well.

A class, if it is to be regarded as a class, requires class consciousness (consciousness of itself and other classes as classes). Livingstone (1976:243, citing Mills, 1956:325), defines class consciousness according to "the subjective recognition of different social classes", based on three components:

(1) awareness of classes and identification with one's own class;

(2) recognition of opposition of interest with another class or classes; and

(3) readiness to use collective political means to either protect or achieve one's own class interests.

Contradictory class interests have implications for blocking the development of class consciousness (Wright,
1979). Wright (1978: 89) distinguishes immediate class interests (which presuppose a given social structure) from fundamental interests ("which call into question the structure of social relations itself", and hence have revolutionary significance). Class consciousness emerges when people are able collectively to recognize the relationship between their immediate and fundamental class interests and to act according to their fundamental interests. Thus, contradictory class locations comprise one set of elements that undermines class consciousness, especially for the proletariat. Wright (1978: 91) identifies other cleavages as well:

Because of labour market segmentation, male workers may have different immediate interests from female workers, black workers from white workers. Because immediate interests divide the working class, and because they do not directly call into question the structure of capitalist relations, the durability of capitalism depends, in part, on the extent to which struggles over fundamental interests are displaced into struggles over immediate interests.

Human alienation, or reification, is expressed in this categorization of people when we regard others and ourselves according to their kinds or types, and not their distinct human individualities (Ollman, 1976: 205-6). The ultimate end of class struggle in a Marxist formulation is, of course, the abolition of these alienated life processes through the abolition of property relations from which alienation and class emerge.
But that is not an easy task given the extent to which most of our activity serves in the most general sense to reproduce capitalist social relations:

Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion. Capital is, therefore, not a personal, it is a social power (Marx and Engels, 1952:70).

Because our lives encompass more than merely economic relationships, we do not mechanically accept or reject the dictates of capitalist society. Political, cultural and ideological factors are also important in our social lives: in Wright's terms, our immediate interests tend to prevail in everyday life over fundamental interests.

The social processes involved in the development or reduction of class consciousness are important. If we accept in Marxist terms the nature of class in capitalist society, how are we to explain social activities which have no apparent class relation? How does class - a productive relationship - become embedded into our everyday non-working lives? To begin to deal with these problems, we must examine the structure of capitalist society.

5.3. The Structure of Capitalist Society

One of the most maligned elements of Marxian theory is the base-superstructure relationship (see Williams, 1976). Marx's famous statements that "the ideas of the ruling
class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force" (Marx and Engels, 1970: 64), and "it is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness" (in Tucker, 1972: 4), point to the domination over political and cultural aspects of our lives by persons (classes) with economic power. But, as Giddens (1971: 41) notes, Marx, in referring to social being, does not posit a direct total relationship between power and ideological control. Rather, Marx decries the inverted logic through which we see in class society ideas rather than social relationships governing human activity and, thereby, history. This fetishism of thought and reification of people helps perpetuate and is perpetuated by class relations within the mode of production:

The productive activity of individuals, in inter-relationship with one another and with nature, involves a continual and reciprocal interaction between social behavior and consciousness: the ideas which are thus generated are conditioned in their diffusion or acceptance by the structure of class domination. Hence as Marx wrote the dominant ideology always comprises 'partly ... an elaboration or consciousness of domination, partly ... a moral means for this domination'. (Giddens, 1971: 43).

Consequently, the superstructure comprising state and civil society is not a mirror image of capitalist productive
relations, but instead contains important dynamics of its own. Both sets of forces, in turn, interact with each other.

It is being suggested, following Urry (1981), that the base-superstructure relationship is not a simple dichotomy reducible to the economy or class domination. The state, then, is not merely the political arm of the bourgeoisie. More importantly, civil society is presented by Urry (1981: 31) as an intermediate series of processes and structures operating between the economy and the state: it is the sphere in which individual subjectivity is constituted, and where human practice and struggle are important through individuals, class and other social formations (aligned according to elements such as gender and geographical and generational factors).

Within civil society itself are three spheres - circulation, reproduction and class struggle - which affect the way capitalist relations are maintained or modified. Briefly, circulation is essential for continued capitalist production since surplus labour as profit depends upon products being distributed, exchanged and consumed. Reproduction refers to maintaining over time a corps of workers and consumers who are able to function within capitalist society.

This involves the biological, the economic and the cultural reproduction of individual subjects. The most important aspect of this involves the
reproduction of labour-power. The problem about this from the viewpoint of capital is that labour-power, although a commodity, cannot be produced, or reproduced, as a capitalist commodity. What happens is that individual subjects are constituted principally within the sphere of reproduction, and they may sell their labour-power within the sphere of circulation (Urry, 1981: 73).

Lastly, struggle is important within and between classes, and among other individuals and groups, for establishing the conditions of reproduction. Schooling can therefore be seen in this context of civil society, removed from yet related to the direct mechanisms of capitalist production. Some writers have overemphasized the degree to which schooling itself is or emulates commodity production. Smith and Geoffrey (1958: 50-52), for example, identify pupils as labourers, working for owner-teachers, and Bowles and Gintis (1976) stress the correspondence between the social relations of education and those of production. Marx himself compares a 'teaching factory' to a 'sausage factory' in Capital (1967: 509), although he is referring to teachers who produced surplus value through privately-controlled schools before the mediations of the state confused the relationship. The view of schools as harbours of productive relations is helpful for clarifying such issues as alienation (Chapter 4) and work socialization, but alone it oversimplifies the social realities of the classroom.
A position which offers better explanatory potential comes through regarding domination (of class by class and thought by material conditions) as something other than a direct, determinate relationship. The question that must be addressed is, if capitalism is so exploitative, how does it persist in a world of conscious, active people without the use of force? Obviously there is no simple response to that question, as relations within and among economic forces, civil society and state must all be considered. One approach which falls within the scope and limitations of this thesis is the exploration of the notion of hegemony.

5.4. Hegemony, Schools and Social Reproduction

The concept of hegemony has received much recent currency through a revival of interest in the work of Antonio Gramsci. Some of Gramsci's popularity no doubt stems from his strong stance against economistic reductionism which regards ideology as simply a 'false consciousness' determined by material factors (Mouffe, 1979). Thus, Gramsci (1971: 12) distinguishes between hegemony in civil society, as "the 'spontaneous' consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group", and coercive power in the state apparatus, "which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent'
either actively or passively". In this respect, Gramsci's work is similar to Althusser's (1971) distinction between the repressive and ideological state apparatus. In the final analysis, though, Althusser is not able to demonstrate how these forces operate at a concrete level independent from an economic base, while Gramsci, in developing notions of class struggle through civil society and the state, retains the essential element of human praxis (Mouffe, 1979).

The concept of hegemony has most often been used to support an 'indirect dominant ideology' thesis. Thus, hegemony is seen as the process whereby individuals come for the most part to accept the world and its categories as given. Force is not required for social control inasmuch as people see no realistic alternative to the social order and they, therefore, perform their activities within the limits of capitalist society. According to Apple (1979: 6), schools and other institutions "help create people (with the appropriate meanings and values) who see no other serious possibility to the economic and cultural assemblage now extant". Furthermore, this absence of overt control helps in the cultural sphere to legitimate existing relations of production by creating the illusion of free choice or 'free consent' (Bates, 1975). In historical terms, Mészáros (1970: 34-35) points out the new servitude brought on with the end of feudal society; instead of their bondage as
serfs, workers alienated themselves by 'freely' entering into contractual labour obligations. This self-alienation becomes continually reproduced throughout our lives, contributing to the maintenance of capitalist relations of production.

In this regard, the notions of 'busyness' and immersion in everyday school activities that were mentioned in Chapters 2 and 4 begin to acquire special significance. Students and teachers invest effort and meaning in activities which rarely transcend particular contexts. Pupil concern over such things as adequate peer interaction, getting homework done, participating in various other endeavours, and generally 'making the grade' allows little room for reflecting on the whole process. Moreover, Mann (1975) notes that schooling itself is avoided as a topic of study in schools, thereby discouraging forms of consciousness that effectively penetrate how schools successfully allow some interests to be subordinated or excluded from consciousness and human practice.

This does not mean that participants and observers can never 'see through' the system, to know that schooling has little relevance or benefit for some people. Rather, when these recognitions occur they are usually at the expense of letting other severe consequences escape inquiry. For example, Willis (1977: 120) observes working class students
who readily escape from the school world to the work world, and he emphasizes that

there is a moment - and it only needs to be this for the gates to shut on the future - in working class culture when the manual giving of labour power represents both a freedom, election and transcendence, and a precise insertion into a system of exploitation and oppression for working class people.

And Reeves (1976: 52-3) identifies the dilemma facing those who do recognize several school failings and therefore try to change schooling:

Fitting education to the student's present and future life-expectations may reproduce the exploitative system from which they suffer, while an attempt on the part of progressive teachers to break with the existing patterns carries with it the risk of opposition from the students, who may well see it as having an adverse effect upon their career prospects or neighborhood commitments. Ultimately, it must be the relationship of education to the industrial capitalist system, and not the individual school or teacher, that carries the responsibility for depriving the student of the opportunity to develop his powers.

The concept of hegemony therefore implies that people are active in a world that allows them the apparent freedom to select many of their own roles, while at the same time they are constrained by those roles. People assert primacy on the immediate struggles of everyday life (including, for example, gender, racial and occupational matters as well as more general concerns of social survival) within the limits of a given social order. Gramsci notes the 'dualistic' principles required for successful hegemony: there must be
provided both a 'general conception of life' which can be internalized by the masses as a common sense world view, and a 'scholastic programme' which sufficiently appeals to intellectuals, teachers and other disseminators of ideology in order for ruling ideas to become popularized (cited in Boggs, 1976: 39). Thus Livingstone (1976: 243) notes that even despite 'crises of confidence' in economics, leadership and other capitalist institutions,

opinion polls in all capitalist countries still find a distinct majority saying they are satisfied with their lot .... However, to conclude from such findings that the consciousness of the populace is fully subordinated and encapsulated within the dominant ideology would be highly misleading. There is a growing body of survey data which suggests that most people's legitimation both of the individualistic ideals of liberal democracy and of technocratic forms is not normative adherence as much as pragmatic acceptance of the existing industrial order in the absence of concrete alternatives.

There is a predominant tendency for people to regard their lives as part of a single reality which is fragmented into a variety of categories of values, affiliations, and activities. This is a problem within capitalist relations of production because most people's lives are conditioned by alien forces. Many major decisions have already been pre-defined so that individual choice is often a matter of selecting from a range of 'products' - like school programs, particular lifestyles, and occupations - and then living accordingly (however strictly one does or does not adhere to a particular plan). An alienated conception of
the world is not simply forced on people, but instead it is a matter of lived reality.

A pessimistic view of the world would hold that hegemony signals the full entrapment of people by an oppressive yet bearable society somewhat akin to the Orwellian world of 1984. In contrast, Marxian theory, including the theory of hegemony, does not end with this one-dimensional perspective. Society and human consciousness are to be unified, but in an inclusive—not exclusive—form. Obviously, a ruling group or class depends for success upon its interests being widely accepted or regarded as valid (Marx, 1970: 65-66). But in capitalist society, where social relationships are predicated upon divergent and fundamentally antagonistic interests, this means that large segments of the population do not have adequate representation for their interests. Nevertheless, these interests do not completely die out despite the hegemony and power of the ruling class (e.g., struggles continue over social services, conditions of work, and educational policies and practices).

Consequently, hegemony implies progressive degrees of struggle coming to fruition only when people have regained the world for themselves in a non-reified, unalienated manner. This is what Marx and Engels mean when they write that over the course of history,
every new class, therefore, achieves its hegemony on a broader basis than that of the class ruling previously, whereas the opposition of the non-ruling class against the new ruling class later develops all the more sharply and profoundly (1970: 66).

The oppositional forces remain active in some form within state and civil society as long as there are social and economic relations of domination and exploitation. Hegemony is not merely a static conception serving dominant groups. It is rather a process involving different groups (classes) of people becoming aware of and pursuing their fundamental interests (or being sidetracked along the way). The fragmented spirit within capitalist hegemony discourages most conceptions we may have about building an alternate world, but that does not mean that promise for change is completely shut out. Gramsci (1971: 324) observes that

When one's conception of the world is not critical and coherent but disjointed and episodic, one belongs simultaneously to a multiplicity of mass human groups .... To criticize one's own conception of the world means therefore to make it a coherent unity and to raise it to the level reached by the most advanced thought in the world.

Hegemony is ultimately the unity between theory and practice, or thought and activity, that is absent from so much of our lives. Freire (1973) refers to this unity as the educational process of conscientizacao or critical consciousness which develops as we assert our subjectivity in order to understand and shape the world. However,
changes in consciousness alone are not sufficient to bring about revolutions just as revolutions do not necessarily lead to changes in consciousness.

The essential notion of struggle within a system of domination is maintained through what writers like Boggs (1976) call 'counter-hegemony' or 'hegemony of the proletariat' which eventually encompasses bases of power and popular support that lead to the effective overthrow of capitalism. But to stress the term 'counter-hegemony' is obviously to oversimplify the complex interrelationships which exist among various social groupings, interests and activities, since the concept presupposes high degrees of social consciousness and organization on the part of the working class. Thus, counter-hegemony should be understood for the present purposes as a potential oppositional base which can be effected only when fragmented groupings and bits of information are brought together within capitalist society in such a way that action to transform social reality is a likely consequence. What is significant within a theory of hegemony, then, is how this base does or does not become realized.

5.5. Chapter Summary

This chapter has emphasized the structures and dynamics of capitalist society. Capitalist society depends
upon the existence and maintenance of class relations which develop in the workplace and extend into other aspects of our lives. Although capitalist relations of production tend to be continually reproduced over time, the conditions of that reproduction are subject to change through class struggle. Therefore, the reproduction of culture, ideas and labour power in civil society should be considered problematic rather than absolute. The concept of hegemony, with its dual possibilities for organizing the world, has been presented as a useful tool for exploring this problematic.

The process of schooling can serve as a valuable focal point through which to examine the dynamics of hegemony. The school is called upon to reproduce, through socialization, training and selection, successive generations of individuals who can function adequately within a given society. This reproduction may or may not be direct and complete.

As a major institution within civil society, the school is not directly controlled by and does not completely reflect either the wills of any particular class or dominant group or the dictates of the state. Compulsory schooling provides for a nearly universal gathering of people of particular ages so that alliances and struggles may be potentially operative within several realms - for example, Livingstone (1981; Livingstone and Hart, 1980)
reports that class and group perspectives vary on matters like financial and organizational priorities for education, and Anyon (1981) sees possibilities for both continued reproduction and non-reproduction of social relations through the content and forms of schooling for pupils in different class positions.

Much of this theorizing remains unsubstantiated and removed from actual social practice. What must be supplied are concrete descriptions, with participant feedback, of the processes of 'reality construction and maintenance' (as Berger would say). And, more specifically in capitalist society, the process of maintaining or undermining hegemony which serves the continued reproduction of capitalism must be examined in detail.

Schooling, for our purposes, will serve as a focus for beginning this examination. Schooling and its participants, therefore, will be studied in specific, ongoing situations.

Based on the theoretical challenges which have been outlined so far, a series of questions are posed, below, in order to guide empirical observation of schooling in capitalist society:

(1) What elements constitute the student school experience?

(2) What do students identify as elements of their school experience?
(3) What relationships do students identify between these elements and other aspects of their social lives?

(4) What (social) class and grade differences are apparent in student school experiences?

(5) How do students evaluate their school experience?

(6) What, if any, changes in schooling are proposed by students?

(7) What implications do these evaluations and suggestions for change have for class society?

These questions frame the discussion that follows in Chapters 6 and 7.
Footnotes to Chapter 5

1. Of course, schooling does not operate entirely in the sphere of civil society as it is presented here. The state is becoming increasingly involved with formal education in a variety of ways and at different levels, with significant implications for the purposes and operation of schooling (see Schechter, 1977, and Lockhart, 1979).

2. This can be seen, for example, in Max Weber's notion of the 'iron cage' of rationalization (e.g., see Gerth and Mills, 1958: 50ff).
Chapter 6
METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

6.1. Introduction

Theorizing about social activity, it was implied in Chapter 5, remains empty if it is removed from the social contexts that theory intends to explain. This chapter will discuss research to explore the nature of schooling and the student school experience in particular (Canadian) contexts. The research will emphasize connections between student views and daily life activity.

Field research was carried out because it allowed access on an ongoing basis to students and other school participants in a 'real' setting. Field research is not usually a single method but, rather, an approach in which a variety of methods is employed in order to collect different types of data (Zelditch, 1970: 497). This plurality of methods is commonly referred to as methodological triangulation.

Methodological triangulation can be defined simply as the convergence of data from several data sources (including interviews, questionnaires, observation, performance records, and physical evidence) and/or from various indicators within a single data grouping (Webb, 1970: 450). Denzin (1970a: 472; 1970b: 27; 310) goes so far as to
promote methodological triangulation as the best means of simultaneously increasing validity in field research and linking that research with theory.

For the purposes of this thesis, participant observation was combined with interviewing and the acquisition of questionnaire data. Becker (1970: 25) writes:

The participant observer gathers data by participating in the daily life of the group or organization he studies. He watches the people he is studying to see what situations they ordinarily meet and how they behave in them. He enters into conversation with some or all of the participants in these situations and discovers their interpretations of the events he has observed.

In a school setting, this would include a researcher being present to observe classroom and out of classroom activities, with opportunities to discuss with participants the observed events and their connection with other events. Consequently, research which incorporated these various elements was undertaken.

6.2. Research Definitions

The data were collected and analyzed with particular reference to student school experience, class and student consciousness in Canadian public schools.

Student school experience, as defined in Chapter 1, refers to ways in which curricula (as "the total package of content, procedures and experiences prepared for and
presented to students") and other aspects of schooling are actually received and interpreted by students. Thus, all observational, questionnaire and interview data collected in the field are relevant for constructing a composite image of the student school experience.

The operationalization of the concept class is derived from the work of Livingstone (1981; Livingstone and Hart, 1980:38-39). Class will be regarded as an objective position in the mode of production with mediation by social, cultural and political factors. Three broad class positions - capital, dispossessed (proletarian) labour, and intermediate elements - are significant. Only two, dispossessed labour and intermediate elements, will be considered important for the present research. These two classes, for reasons of simplicity, will be labelled, respectively, working class and middle class in all further references, since few children from capital class families are likely to be found in most public schools (e.g., see Porter, 1965). Livingstone designates specific class locations according primarily to relationships within the work process. This scheme emphasizes occupation and levels of individual control over capital, workers and planning. Five class levels are identified below:

Level 1 (Capital and Middle class): Corporate directors; large-scale rentiers; small employers...
deriving surplus value including physicians, contractors and restauranteurs.

Level 2 (Middle class): Managers and supervisors; administrators; professional employees; self-employed.

Level 3 (Working class): White collar, service and non-productive wage workers.


Level 5 (Working class): Domestic labour; students; retired; unemployed.

These levels will be used to identify 'Occupation of father', 'Occupation of mother', and 'Expected life job or activity of students' according to students' responses to questionnaire items 6 and 10 (Appendix A).

Class was also important in the identification and selection of schools. However, the sampling of schools was conducted with the use of census data and there was insufficient information for the five-level class scheme to be employed. Therefore, income and housing statistics were used in conjunction with occupational data in order to identify working and middle class schools (see section 6.3.1, below).

Class was discussed earlier (Chapter 5) in relation to
class consciousness. Class consciousness can be identified for research purposes as any occasion in which a student writes or speaks about schooling or society in class terms. However, no such occasion was witnessed during the course of the research. An analogous process, though, of school-related student consciousness will be emphasized. **Student consciousness** refers to student understandings of and responses to the process of schooling and school-related factors. Like student school experiences, student consciousness is not intended to be quantified but to guide our observations of ongoing behavioral, verbal and situational processes. Student consciousness will be discussed in relation to students' responses to questionnaire items about the helpfulness of school for students' futures; student choice about school matters; school-related decision-making; school change; and characteristics of an ideal school (Appendix A, items 20 to 24), and to interview items concerning connections between school and society; knowledge; and student understandings about schooling (Appendix B, items 3 to 5d). These data are important for substantiating descriptions of the process of schooling. Their measurement value is only to highlight trends, where any tendencies are apparent or expected.

6.3. The Sample

An observational study of schools requires that the
researcher make at least three main sampling decisions. Those decisions are related to the selection of schools, of participants, and of time. (In addition, of course, observational studies require sampling of content.) All of these decisions are subject to several limitations, including the researcher's resources, consent of school personnel, the organization of the schools, and the research design itself.

6.3.1. Selection of Schools

The research design was aimed at selecting one school class in each of four schools according to grade levels and social class districts served by the schools. For administrative and cost purposes, the universe of schools was restricted to one jurisdictional unit, the Saskatoon Board of Education. Within that unit are two levels of schools - elementary (kindergarten to grade 8), and secondary (grades 9 to 12).

It was intended that the research would be directed at the senior grades in each level of school (i.e., grade 8 and grade 12) because it was felt that students in those grades might be more concerned with their education in preparation for a transition to 'higher' forms of knowledge or life. A further reason for selecting both levels was that, while grade 12 students would have the most experience to draw upon in the primary and secondary school
systems, the grade 8 classes would have the advantage of containing students who might drop out or leave the school system before reaching grade 12.

Two schools at each level were to be selected so that both working and middle-to-higher class areas of the city could be represented. These areas were chosen according to census tract data including income, occupational and housing statistics (Statistics Canada, 1974). A list was compiled of schools within the three highest areas and the three lowest areas. Out of seventeen public schools within these tracts, four were ultimately selected according to the following criteria: (1) the school's location relative to high or low socioeconomic extremes; (2) schools that had students with whom I had not had contact prior to the research; and (3) schools that had a relatively low degree of student turnover during the previous year. Subsequently, a list of schools was sent with the research proposal for approval by the Saskatoon Board of Education. Permission to conduct the research was granted contingent upon receiving support from personnel in each of the schools.

An initial contact was made with the principals in each of the four schools. The principals in turn either directed me to or contacted for me interested and appropriate classroom teachers. In the elementary schools there was little choice, as each had only one grade 8 class. The
selection of grade 12 classes depended upon such factors as timetabling and expressed interest in the research project by the teacher. Because each grade 12 student had a unique timetable, it was decided that only classes that met regularly with particular teachers would be available for the research. Ultimately, within sixty days of receiving tentative approval from the school board to proceed, arrangements had been confirmed and permission granted from principals, teachers and parents (through letters sent home with students) to conduct the research in the four schools described below.2

School A (elementary) - A seventy-year-old school in a primarily working class area of the city. The age of the school is evident (in the heating pipes, for example) although there is a relatively new gymnasium and resource centre, and other signs of continued upkeep. The 1981-82 enrollment was about 300 students with 16 teaching staff. The school has been designated a Community School since 1980, in order to provide services, programs and liaisons with the community and students which the school serves. The grade 8 class had 27 students.

School B (elementary) - A school built in 1966 in a solidly middle class area of the city. Although the school resembles the single-level brick box-like structures that characterize most city schools built in the 1950's and
1960's, the angled floor plan and some of the facilities are unique. The 1981-82 enrollment was about 260 students in 9 homerooms, with 15 teachers. The grade 8 class had 33 students.

School C (secondary) - A large primarily middle class school opened in 1966, and known for its athletic and academic programs. The 1981-82 enrollment was about 1,070 students with 55 teachers on staff. The research was conducted with a grade 12 algebra class with 35 students.

School D (secondary) - The sixty-year-old school, located less than two blocks from School A, serves the area around School A and extends outward to include other lower and middle class areas of the city, including some newer suburban areas. The school stresses its sense of tradition in the community. The 1981-82 enrollment was about 800 students with 43 teachers on staff. The research was conducted with a grade 12 English class with 37 students. Two of these students were not available to complete the questionnaire, and are not, therefore, included in the sample for when tabular data is presented.

6.3.2. Selection and Characteristics of Students

The sample consisted of all students in each of the four classes that had been selected. The total sample size was 132 students. Characteristics of the sample are presented in Tables 1 to 10, and are described briefly below. Because of the nature of the study, these characteristics are intended to have primarily descriptive rather
than explanatory importance.

Grade 12 students outnumbered grade 8 students in the sample (Table 1). This differential in classroom sizes can be attributed to several administrative and situational factors, none of which affected the research in a significant way.

Table 1 - Number of students in the sample, by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ages of students in the sample ranged from twelve to nineteen years (Table 2). Students in Schools A and D (the working class schools) tended to be older than students in schools B and C, respectively.

Table 2 - Age, in years (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>14(52)</td>
<td>28(85)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>42(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>12(45)</td>
<td>5(15)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>17(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>34(97)</td>
<td>25(71)</td>
<td>60(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>9(26)</td>
<td>10(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing responses</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean age</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were more males than females in the sample (Table 3). Boys slightly outnumbered girls in the
schools C and D classrooms, and there were significantly more boys than girls in the school A classroom. Only in school B did the number of girls exceed the number of boys.

Table 3 - Gender (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19(70)</td>
<td>14(42)</td>
<td>19(54)</td>
<td>19(54)</td>
<td>71(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8(30)</td>
<td>19(58)</td>
<td>16(46)</td>
<td>16(46)</td>
<td>59(45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students had attended their present schools for relatively long periods of time, although each school did have some newcomers (Table 4). School A demonstrated the most student mobility, with 26% of the students having attended the school for less than two years. The average attendance span was 5.7 years (out of a potential baseline of nine years from kindergarten to grade 8) for students at school A and 6.9 years for students at school B. Schools C and D students had attended their present schools, on the average, for 3.8 and 3.7 years, respectively, out of the four year high school program.
Table 4 - Length of attendance at present school, in years (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 2</td>
<td>7(26)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>16(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>4(15)</td>
<td>4(12)</td>
<td>32(91)</td>
<td>32(91)</td>
<td>72(55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>4(15)</td>
<td>5(15)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>9(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 7</td>
<td>12(44)</td>
<td>21(64)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>33(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean length of attendance</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-five percent of the students in the total sample lived at home with both of their parents (Table 5). This family arrangement was most prevalent for schools B and D students. A high proportion (30%) of school A students lived in homes without fathers, and 17% of school C students lived with either single parents or boyfriends.

Table 5 - Number (% in parentheses) of students who reside with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father and Mother</td>
<td>19(70)</td>
<td>31(94)</td>
<td>29(83)</td>
<td>32(91)</td>
<td>111(85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>8(30)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>4(11)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>16(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students in schools A, B and C came from unilingual English-speaking homes (Table 6). Nearly half (46%) of the school D students and about one-fifth (22%)
of the school A students spoke more than one language. Close to a fifth (18%) of students in the total sample, including 27% of school B students, spoke only English themselves, although one or more other languages were spoken by someone with whom these students lived.

Table 6 - Language spoken at home, by numbers of students (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>16(59)</td>
<td>21(64)</td>
<td>28(80)</td>
<td>13(37)</td>
<td>78(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and other by student</td>
<td>6(22)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>16(46)</td>
<td>28(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English by student and other by someone else</td>
<td>5(19)</td>
<td>9(27)</td>
<td>4(11)</td>
<td>6(17)</td>
<td>24(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fathers of students, for the total sample, most commonly held middle class (Level II) occupations (Table 7). No Level I (capital or small propertied employer) occupations were represented in schools A and D, while 6% of fathers of school B students and 29% of fathers of school C students held Level I occupations. Conversely, there were no students in schools B and C whose fathers were in Level IV (manual working class labour) occupations while the corresponding figures for schools A and D were, respectively, 21% and 15%. Eleven percent of fathers of school A students and 13% of fathers of school C students were either retired or unemployed.
Table 7 - Occupation of father, by numbers of students (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>9(29)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>11(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7(37)</td>
<td>16(49)</td>
<td>18(58)</td>
<td>16(48)</td>
<td>57(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6(32)</td>
<td>14(44)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>10(30)</td>
<td>30(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4(21)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>5(15)</td>
<td>9(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2(11)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>8(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (respondents with fathers)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Occupational groupings are as follows: Level I (directors of corporations, small employers including physicians); Level II (management and supervisory, professional, and self-employed); Level III (white collar, service and non-production wage workers); Level IV (manual and production wage workers); Level V (homemakers, students, retired, and unemployed).

There were also some differences in fathers' educational levels (Table 8). Sixty-five percent for school C, and 31% for school B, of students' fathers were university graduates compared to fewer than 10% for either schools A or D. More than 50% of fathers of students in schools A and D had not attended school beyond grade 12. High proportions of students in schools A (26%), B (35%) and D (30%) either did not know or did not reveal their fathers' educational levels.
Table 8 - Education of father, by numbers of students (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University graduate</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td>10(31)</td>
<td>20(65)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>34(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university</td>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>3(10)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-university post-secondary</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>4(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>4(21)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>7(21)</td>
<td>19(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Grade 12</td>
<td>8(42)</td>
<td>4(13)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>10(30)</td>
<td>23(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>5(26)</td>
<td>11(35)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>10(30)</td>
<td>28(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (respondents with fathers)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of occupation and education tended to be lower for students' mothers than for students' fathers. Overall, the largest single occupational categories for students' mothers (Table 9) were Levels III (white collar, service and non-productive employees) and V (primarily housewives). Only one mother, reported in school C, had a Level I occupation and one, reported in school A, had a Level IV occupation. Level II occupations were more likely to be held by mothers of schools B and C students than of schools A and D students; this relationship was reversed for Level V positions.
Table 9 - Occupation of mother, by numbers of students (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4(15)</td>
<td>8(24)</td>
<td>12(35)</td>
<td>7(20)</td>
<td>31(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6(22)</td>
<td>11(33)</td>
<td>9(26)</td>
<td>12(34)</td>
<td>38(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>13(49)</td>
<td>9(27)</td>
<td>10(29)</td>
<td>15(43)</td>
<td>47(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>3(11)</td>
<td>5(15)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>11(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (respondents with mothers) 27 33 34 35 129

b See Table 8, note b, for a listing of occupational groupings.

Mothers of school C students were most likely, while mothers of school A students were least likely, to have had at least some university education (Table 10). At the other extreme, mothers of schools A and D students were more likely than mothers of schools B and C students to have had grade 12 or less. Again, as with father's education, high proportions of students in schools A (37%), B (42%) and D (20%) did not know or reveal their mothers' education levels.
Table 10 - Education of mother, by numbers of students (% in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2(7)</td>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>10(29)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>17(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some university</td>
<td>2(7)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>10(29)</td>
<td>5(14)</td>
<td>19(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-university</td>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>5(15)</td>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>9(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>4(15)</td>
<td>8(24)</td>
<td>7(20)</td>
<td>7(20)</td>
<td>26(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>8(30)</td>
<td>4(12)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>13(37)</td>
<td>25(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/</td>
<td>10(37)</td>
<td>14(42)</td>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>7(20)</td>
<td>33(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (respondents</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with mothers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One other sample characteristic, parents' income, is not reported because substantial numbers of students were unable or unwilling to supply adequate information.

In order to facilitate the observational research component and the research interest in the student school experience, each school class will be considered in many respects as a unit. Certain common experiences, it can be assumed, contribute to the realities of students in particular classrooms and schools. Therefore, the sample characteristics will now be summarized by school (classroom).
School A - Most students were male. Students had an average age of 13.7. There were several newer students, although about half of the class had been together through the elementary years. Close to one-third of the students lived in single parent families. English was the predominant family language, but about 40% of students came from homes where other languages were spoken as well. Students' parents tended to have low levels of education and middle to low occupational levels; the mothers of about half of the students did not work outside the home.

School B - Out of 33 students, 19 were girls. Students tended to be younger than school A students, with an average age of 13.1. Only 12 students had attended the school for 7 or fewer years. All but 2 students lived at home with both parents where, like School A, English was the predominant language. Only 3 students were bilingual (or multilingual) but, including these students, a language other than English was spoken in 36% of the homes. Students' fathers had moderate levels of education; students' mothers had less. Most students' fathers and mothers had supervisory, professional or white collar (Level II and III) occupations.

School C - Nearly all students were 16 or 17 years old. The class was nearly equally balanced numerically between boys and girls. Only 3 students had attended the
school for less than 2 years. Eighty-three percent of the students lived at home with both parents. English was the only language spoken in 80% of the homes. Both fathers and mothers were highly educated. Fathers' occupations were predominantly in Levels I and II positions, while mothers were likely to hold Levels II, III or IV positions.

School D - Students tended to be slightly older than school C students, although the gender and attendance ratios were the same for the two schools. Only 3 students in school D did not live with both parents. Besides English, other languages were spoken in 63% of the students' homes. Students' fathers and mothers tended to have low levels of education. Fathers and mothers tended to have Levels II and III occupations, although 43% of the mothers did not work outside the home.

6.3.3. Sampling of Time

It was desired that research would be conducted for a complete (5-day) school week in each of the classrooms. This would allow a wide cross-section of school activity to be observed and would hopefully provide sufficient time for students and teachers to become accustomed to my presence. However, in order to carry out the research before Easter break (when school activities become highly irregular), with the timetable complications in the high schools, and
other special activities, such arrangements were not always possible. The research was therefore conducted on the following basis (not counting several extra visits and interviewing sessions in the high schools) during February and March of 1982: School A - 4 school days; School B - 4 1/2 days; School C - 5 one-hour periods; and School D - 5 one-hour periods.
6.4. Data Collection

The three main data collection procedures - observation, questionnaires, and interviewing - are outlined below.

The **observation** component consisted primarily of my presence at the back of each classroom recording in note form the classroom structure, the intended lesson or activity, the interaction between teachers and students, and student reactions. I was introduced to each class as a university student interested in student feelings about school. I remained mostly 'uninvolved' in classroom activities except where it could provide opportunities for new insights, especially from contacts with students. Two such examples were a cross-country ski outing with school A students and a ball-hockey game with school B students. I was also able to visit other classrooms and school facilities, but most of my research was conducted in the classes which were attended by the students in the sample. In schools A and B, this meant staying with the homeroom teachers about 60% of the time, with the rest of the time divided among 3-4 other teachers. In schools C and D, students were with a particular teacher for the whole observation period.

The **questionnaire** was designed to be mostly open-ended in order to allow for as much respondent input and interpretation as possible (Appendix A). The research
intended to determine what students regarded as important or not important in their schooling experience. This open-ended approach is consistent with other studies dealing with students and their views of schooling (e.g., Blishen, 1969; Fisher, 1976; Woods, 1979; Anyon, 1981). Questionnaire items deal with student background, aspirations and satisfaction with school (Part A); the meaning, nature and purpose of schooling; student likes and dislikes about schooling; the relevance of schooling; student choice in school; and student conceptions of an ideal school (Part B). Earlier versions of the questionnaire were pretested with grades 7 to 12 students in four schools. As a result of this pretesting, some items were eliminated and others were changed or wording was clarified.

The questionnaires were administered by myself. Part A was completed near the beginning of my time in each school, with Part B done near the end. Each teacher allowed me class time to discuss instructions with the students. In three schools (A, B and C) the students were given time to complete the questionnaires in class, while in school D the students were given the choice of completing the questionnaires in class or out of class. Questionnaires were completed by all students in the four classrooms with the exception of two students in school D. For summary purposes, data were coded through content analysis using
categories derived mostly from the pretest data. These data were processed using the SPSS program on the DEC-20 system.

The interviews were intended to provide opportunities for students to elaborate their views and conceptions of school, school-related factors, and knowledge. An open-ended schedule (Appendix B) was used to guide the interviews. Interviews were conducted before and after school, during breaks, and in a few cases, during class time. Each interview lasted from five to thirty minutes. All 27 students were interviewed in school A, with 31 (out of 33 students) interviewed in B, 28 (out of 35) in C, and 20 (out of 37) in D. (Interviews were more difficult to arrange for the high school students because of the varied timetables for each student.) In addition, informal discussions with students, teachers and staff members were useful for providing other information and interpretations related to the schools.

6.5. Limitations on the Research

Observational field research potentially has problems in subject sensitivity and researcher bias.

6.5.1. Subject Sensitivity to Research

One argument used to discourage some classroom and other field research is that the presence of the observer
might cause the research subjects to act unnaturally (consciously or unconsciously) so that the research might lose validity. Teachers and students might seize the opportunity to 'perform' for the researcher or else hide habits or activities which would normally be part of the classroom setting.

These possibilities were to a limited extent realized in my own research. Some students, especially in school A, used my presence to provide minor distractions to the classroom routine. In school C, where the students had been warned by the principal that I would be interested only in the 'normal routine', students responded near the end of the study by staging 'elephant day': the teacher, upon entering the classroom, was surprised to discover two large elephants drawn on the board with the captions "Beware the elephant spotter" and "Today is elephant awareness day"; several students had cutout pictures of elephants pinned to their lapels, and a large stuffed elephant, fitted with the school's basketball uniform, had been positioned in the teacher's chair.

Such disruptions were minor, however, and served to alleviate any tensions there might have been in the situations being observed. The presence of classroom observers is not unusual in Saskatoon schools, with frequent visits by students from education, psychology,
recreational technology, and other programs. Signs that I had been allowed to 'blend' into the classroom came several times in all schools through such situations as teachers losing their temper and students making particular comments or gestures when teachers were not present. The 'normalcy' of activities and behavioral patterns was also confirmed in conversations and interviews with students and teachers. Moreover, Becker (1970: 59) comments that field researchers can often use people's reactions to the observer as helpful research data. I noted, for example, that on one or two occasions each in schools A, B and C, the teachers used my presence as a disciplinary tactic, through comments such as "You don't want Mr. Wotherspoon to think that you're a bad class, do you?" Such situations were rare, but they point to the wide range of resources that teachers draw on in order to maintain social control.

6.5.2. Researcher Bias

It is very difficult to carry out unstructured observation in a highly objective way. Observation of events in an active classroom must be very selective, and there is the danger of misinterpreting or misrepresenting others' activities and views. One example, derived from the field notes, will be used to illustrate these possible hazards.
As the bell rings [before one class in school D], several students are in the room discussing the idea of choice. One boy notes the absence of the several Chinese students who are part of the class. As the teacher prepares to and does take attendance, two or three Chinese students quickly and quietly come and go out of the classroom. Several students in the room joke about the Chinese students, and then run to the door. Another teacher appears at the door, comments that "The speaker from human rights is here now", and leaves. Later, one Chinese student comes to the door and signals to another sitting near the front, who quickly leaves the room. The teacher asks if the first student had made an obscene Chinese gesture. Several students in the room are joking about the Chinese "plot" and "conspiracy". The teacher leaves the room, commenting that "The worst they can do is make chop suey out of me." The teacher returns. Later, two (white) students enter and one claims 'The Chinese are sabotaging the water fountain ... those guys are so crazy." A few minutes later, there is a knock on the door. The teacher moves slowly to the door, opens it, sees no one, and steps out of the room. Two or three students direct her attention to 2 notes on the door, which the teacher reads. She comments, "They spelled it incorrectly," and writes. (She has not yet revealed the contents of the notes.) As she moves the door, the notes are visible: "Quarantined - Prejudiced - Chinese Students Association" and "The teacher is prejudice!", below which is the teacher's response, "I love chow mein". Several students laugh and joke, and eventually settle down to work as the teacher returns and begins marking papers at the side of the room. Three or four small groups of students continue talking (about the incident or other topics, mostly unrelated to the class work) throughout the period. The Chinese students do not return.

This series of events is certainly subject to several interpretations, related both to the major activities and to other minor foci of attention (including two girls who talk about such diverse topics as types of liqueurs, jelly salad, and "cruising" the city). Most obvious, however, was the apparent racism and malice that might have been seen in the class by some observers. While these factors were no doubt present to a certain extent, further investigation
would reveal that the incident developed out of a serious discussion on racism which had occurred in another class that morning. During the event described above, the Chinese students were not protesting against anything the teacher had done, but were rather carrying on an extended joke with the teacher, and were doing their classwork in the library. This was characteristic of the easy, friendly relationship which had developed between the teacher and her students, which was observed throughout the research and confirmed in separate discussions with the teacher and several students. The incident does show, though, how it is useful to have a variety of sources against which to check observational data.

The tempo and variety of much classroom activity both contributes to and helps alleviate possible researcher bias. Many important events, activities, gestures or comments are missed when the observer's attention is focused elsewhere, and the subtleties of particular behaviors may be overlooked or not adequately comprehended. An attempt to overcome this was made in the regular shifting of foci from a general overview of the classroom to two or three isolated interactive situations throughout the process of taking field notes. Efforts were made simply to describe what was being observed, with interpretations, questions and other comments kept separate from these
descriptions. It was possible in each school to identify regular patterns of classroom activity, which made it more convenient to get samples from a variety of isolated types of interaction over the course of the research. The mere act of trying to observe and record these patterns and forms of activity was so involving that any conscious bias was eliminated. Unconscious bias, of course, is a continuing research concern, and can only be checked by honest efforts to record observations accurately and, where possible, by validation through other observations or discussions with participants.

6.5.3. Other Concerns

The generalizability of field research can be limited by the specific locale being studied and the length of time it is studied for. The sample of four classrooms observed for fewer than five days each is a potentially limiting factor, although the procedure was suited to provide access to more information about the students, the schools, and school processes than, for example, sweeping in and out with a questionnaire alone would have. Students and teachers had sufficient time to get used to my presence in each school (and therefore to come forward with information that aided the research) and I was able to get a sense of each of the schools. The restriction of my observations of
the grade 12 students to one rather than all of their daily classes must be recognized. However, some of the possible gaps were filled in through interviews and other observations during my time in the schools.

The research yielded a tremendous amount of data which at times made any analysis, especially of a quantitative nature, a formidable task. Some questionnaire and interview items which yielded responses similar to other items could have been eliminated without significantly affecting the results. Moreover, the shorthand form in which many students responded to the questionnaire items indicated that the open-ended format was not always necessary. Most items were left open-ended, however, because one of the research aims was to determine the terms in which students thought about aspects of their schooling. This stems from one of the originating research problems, the lack of in-school research in a Canadian context.

A final, unanticipated problem was researcher fatigue. The act of observing classes, combined with interviewing in four different settings, was at times a very intense and exhausting experience even in a small research project such as this. Because of that, some insights might have been lost or shortcuts taken unknowingly. This was hopefully compensated for by the unique forms of discovery and involvement in research that field observation allows.
Footnotes to Chapter 6

1. Traditionally (with the exception of some newer suburban developments), Saskatoon's west side neighbourhoods have been regarded as working class and the city's east side, as middle class. As it turned out, the sampling of schools did not deviate from that pattern, with the two working class schools on the west side of the city and the two middle class schools on the east side.

2. It can be noted that approval was granted and arrangements made much more readily in the smaller schools than in the larger schools and with the school board administration. There was apparently some resistance on the part of several high school teachers to the idea of the research being conducted in their classrooms.

3. Only data collected in questionnaires and interviews are included in the tables. For Tables 1 to 10, totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

4. Hargreaves (1967: 196-197) also noted variations in behavior among different types of teachers while they were being observed.
Chapter 7

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

7.1. Introduction

The data are presented as they relate to three main factors: the nature of class education (i.e., schooling and capitalist society); class differences in educational experience; and student consciousness of these experiences. Descriptive and narrative data from the field notes are substantiated with tabular results and verbal and written statements derived from questionnaires and interviews.

7.2. The Overall School Experience

One striking feature made evident through observation in schools (combined with my experience in other schools) is the realization that, no matter what the unique features of each school might be, there is no mistaking a school for any other structure. The four schools in the sample were 'traditional' in the sense that nearly all classes were conducted by individual teachers in enclosed classrooms containing rows of desks, front and/or side chalkboards and bulletin board, printed supplies with a few additional aids, and graded students. School policies, rules and procedures were outlined for students in schools A, C and D in handbooks which were circulated yearly. These handbooks
included specific regulations about attendance, use of facilities, behavioral standards and — in school D — dress. School B did not have such a written statement of policies because, as the vice-principal stated, the school administration wanted to maintain a flexible tone.

The schooling experience can be introduced by looking at student conceptions of schooling. Schooling can be defined according to three dimensions: **idealistic** (where schooling and school learning are seen as inherently good and necessary for individual development); **instrumental** (where schooling is seen as preparing people for jobs or providing specific skills); and **contextual** (where the experiences of schooling such as meeting friends and participating in sports and activities are valued for themselves). Students in the four Saskatoon schools stressed idealist and contextual factors in their definitions of school (Table 11). Surprisingly, instrumental factors were rarely mentioned, especially in school D (a school in which 17% of the students had indicated they would likely be seeking jobs later that year).
Table 11 - Factors used by students to define school, by percent of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total responses)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Total may not equal 100 because of rounding.

The following comments typify student conceptions of what school is:

it is the place where you get an education and where you learn to live the life more comfortable - male, school A.

Work, tests, good times, bad times and thats about all. - female, school B.

School is a place where students in a fairly close age range go to be educated and learn to interact with others. It is a clean, fairly comfortable environment which all young people must attend to receive an education. - female, school C.

A place to go to learn, make friends, and to give me something to do. - male, school D.

The juxtaposition of the 'here and now' orientation with idealist images of school is readily apparent. There is a striking resemblance between these statements and official declarations of school philosophy such as this (from the 1981-1982 school A handbook):
The school provides a stimulating learning environment, relatively free from inhibiting distractions -- to promote growth from the knowledge and experiences that the child has. There are abundant opportunities for physical, social, and verbal interactions to develop skill and confidence and to engender courtesy and helpfulness; there are also opportunities for independent activities.

Students were also asked "For what reasons do we have school?" Over three-quarters of the total responses to this question listed idealist factors (Table 12a), such as "to learn" or "it is necessary for society". Idealist factors were stressed most strongly by high school students. Few instrumental (12% overall) and contextual (11% overall) factors were cited, although elementary students mentioned these proportionately more than high school students did. Students apparently regard schools to be set up for general reasons rather than to provide specific or immediate benefits.

Table 12a - Reasons identified by students for the existence of school, by per cent of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total responses)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

However, students also accepted that these reasons for school were good ones (Table 12b).
Table 12b - Students' evaluations of reasons for the existence of school, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Accepting)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (Not accepting)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/nor no response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n (total students)</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Total may not equal 100 because of rounding.

This acceptance was most evident in school B, where all students evaluated positively the reasons for school. Acceptance was lowest in school A; 15% of school A students either did not respond or indicated they had mixed feelings. The few students who responded negatively tended to want more connection between schools and job preparation or less trouble from teachers.

Overall, then, students define school in instrumental and contextual terms and they see and accept idealist justifications for having school.

It might therefore be suggested that the relatively stable maintenance of school orientations and activities.
depends upon a dual process. On the one hand, students appear to adopt fairly unproblematically those elements which are commonly regarded as the fundamentals of schooling (i.e., the curriculum, the social and physical organization of schooling, and so on). Within these arrangements there is scope for students to create or perceive their own diversions so as to add to the school experience in ways that do not threaten the overall school structure. These relationships can be examined in other forms as well.

7.2.1. Schooling as Education

There is a tendency, especially for elementary students, to equate the concepts of education and schooling with each other (Table 13).

Table 13 - Student comparison of concepts of education and schooling, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are the SAME</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are DIFFERENT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N (total students)</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students elaborating their responses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Total may not equal 100 because of rounding.*
For each respective level of school (i.e., elementary and secondary) the similarity between concepts was stressed more by students in the working class school. Most noticeable are the 85% of school A students who regard education and schooling as the same and the 75% of school C students who regard them as different from one another. (These schools represent the opposite extremes in terms of class characteristics.) Also, school C students were far more likely to give reasons for or qualify their responses. In particular, 46% of school C students indicated that education was something that extended beyond the realm of schooling, as in:

... education comes from experience as well. Education is not confined to a school. One learns from everything in one's environment. Schooling is a part of education, but not the whole area. Education involves learning. Though a place for learning is a school one may not learn anything at a school where as one can further ones education in any of a number of places or situations. (One can become educated on a job etc) - female, school C.

It is necessary to further examine variation among students' conceptions of education and schooling-related themes, between elementary and secondary students, and between different class groupings. First, the broader issue of what students (and teachers) do in schools will be addressed. The context of schooling, because it includes structural and behavioral patterns, is an important factor in the examination of students' views of schooling.
7.3. The Process of Schooling

In all observed schools, reflecting the general organization of public schooling, student tasks were outlined and directed by teachers, who, of course, were limited to some degree by curricular and organizational constraints. High school students were more independent in the sense that each student followed his or her own timetable (covering five one-hour periods daily, usually with different classmates and teachers for each subject) and each student had some freedom with regard to non-class time. Although all students were regimented (by bells, schedules, seating order and the like), this 'herding' was most evident in the elementary schools.

A central concern in school life - the maintenance of order and discipline - is stressed by such authorities as Waller (1932: 196-7). Most school participants know that aspects of the learning process related to the transmission of content are often subordinate to the demands for a stable learning environment. The preoccupation with student discipline was highly visible in schools A and B. Lessons were commonly dotted with teachers' invocations to students to be quiet, settle down or get to work. The manner and frequency of such restraints varied according to teacher and situation.

The Saskatoon Board of Education prides itself on its
efforts to match principals, vice-principals and teachers with each other and with the characteristics of the schools. Students in all four schools expressed an awareness of this shuffling of personnel. Similarly, students were able to recognize variations in and effects of different teaching styles and personalities in the classroom. The classroom teachers in the observed classes were generally respected and spoken well of by the students, but in all schools, some teachers were mentioned who were violently disliked or who lacked respect from students.

The skilful teachers, who were mentioned with respect in student interviews, were able to shift relatively smoothly back and forth between minor disruptions and attentive class work. They often participated briefly in some of the distractions before maintaining a work atmosphere. One notable example occurred during a spelling dictation test in school A:

11:01 a.m. - Mr. C. begins to dictate spelling words (most are 3-4 syllables).
- 3 girls continue chatting between words; 2 or 3 students do other work (cutting paper, etc.), and several students volunteer comments or anecdotes about each word (e.g., abolish - several students mention the death penalty and are joined by the teacher in a discussion of an armed hold-up in a nearby area, focusing on what happened to the robbers).

11:06 - (It is amazing how many topics, and how much preparation for other school
activities, are covered in the 10-15 seconds between words. The teacher also uses the time to reinforce rules about talking and sticking to the topic at appropriate moments.)

11:08 - At times, students prime Mr. C. (or vocally cue him) for clues to spelling.

This contrasted with less respected teachers, of whom two types were observed in both elementary schools. First was the authoritarian who rigidly maintained control and work standards from start to finish. Students tended to respond to these teachers by exchanging quick, disgusted-looking glances or muttered comments in class, and references out of class to "that asshole", "the bitch" or "----- sucks". The second type had clearly not established any basis of control or respect (often related to low-status curricular areas like arts and languages) and was constantly involved in struggles to maintain some semblances of order. The pervasive tension is reflected in the following observation of one typical class in school A, recorded about a half-hour after students had begun writing a test:

3:18 p.m. - (The students have used every opportunity to carry on their own activities or discussions. All efforts by the teacher to settle students go mostly unheeded except for brief cases where individuals are singled out. Miss B. [the teacher], appears more satisfied with quelling a few minor battles than with keeping overall order. Students appear to take some delight in getting a reaction from Miss B., but not out of malice.)
3:23 - Mr. C. reenters the room as Miss E. leaves; a greater degree of student attentiveness is immediately apparent. Although high school students described similar classes where chaos prevailed, none were observed over the course of the research; there was, rather, almost a mild sense of decorum.

To some extent, of course, problems in maintaining order among younger and 'middle-years' students reflect the process of maturation. The sociological approach, by contrast, tends to focus on the 'negotiated order' among students and teachers (e.g., Martin, 1976; Geer, 1977). But these explanations alone do not account for the patterns that do emerge in school life. What is rarely identified as a problematic and fascinating element in school life is how any sort of stability can and does occur.

Through continued observations, I became increasingly aware each day of the ebb and flow of classroom activity. The process of schooling might be depicted as a living mosaic composed of organic patches of official and unofficial colours. Incidents like the following, from a school B science lesson on the composition of various rocks, were observed regularly in all schools:

1:54 p.m. - [male student] asks Mr. P. what the mineral content of a rock like uranium is. Mr. P. replies, "I don't know." [female student] comments she cannot read the teacher's writing. 3 boys
sitting near the girl laugh among themselves; most other students continue writing or whispering in small groups. Leslie (who has been passing notes to Sally throughout the class) yawns visibly to Sally as they continue to pass notes.

1:58 - Mr. P. prepares to use the overhead projector and asks students to leave 16 lines in their books. Students use this chance to relax from writing and talk among themselves. 2 girls get up to pull down blinds on windows. The noise level continues until Mr. P., after turning the overhead on, stresses to hurry so the class will not have to work through recess. Several students complain loudly and ask confused questions about what to copy down and how. Sally rises to adjust the blind complaining about the 'bright light' coming through. Another girl complains about Sally and the teacher asks Sally to sit somewhere else since the glare does not disturb him. Sally moves to the front of the room, then continues to be unsettled for a few moments. Most students are writing quickly, commenting to each other about the difficulty in reading the overhead.

Significantly, these continuous alternations between task orientation and non-task diversions appear as a prevalent feature in school life just as they are common in accounts of alienated productive labour:

"A typical response to rationalized and regimented work is to instill an element of play into it. Long hours of monotonous, repetitive labour are often interrupted by patterned episodes of talk, horseplay, and the sharing of food and drink" (Rinehart, 1975: 76).

This is reflected in observations recorded during a school A work period, and reiterated several times in virtually
all of the observed classes:

The students appear to have set their own standards of work and discipline - i.e., a feeling they need to accomplish a certain level, and anything else is their own. Most stay in desks and carry on their own conversations with people near them, but then there are few limits on activity in these small, semi-private groupings.

This double orientation is carried with students out of the classroom as well. Students in all schools focused their after-hours school-related discussions with friends and parents on general social matters and schoolwork (Tables 14a and 14b).

Table 14a - School-related topics discussed by students with friends, by percent of total responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
<th>SCHOOL C</th>
<th>SCHOOL D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everything</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost nothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n (total responses) | 50  | 63  | 53  | 30  | 196 |

° Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.
Table 14b – School-related topics discussed by students with parents, by percent of total responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job preparation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everything</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost nothing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total responses)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Schoolwork (especially marks) is emphasized more with parents presumably because of the guidance and concern parents are expected to demonstrate with regard to their children's educational careers. Students frequently reported that they were asked about marks, work and problems by parents and only gave information when they were probed. However, several students did indicate that they discussed homework and assignments with their peers or parents. Their other school-related discussions, particularly with peers, tended to portray the school day in impressionistic tones. A common basis for discussion was often 'just things that happened'. Thus, social and teacher-related conversations grew out of specific daily happenings.
The school day served as a period in which gossip and conversations could be undertaken; it also acted as a source of information for these things. In all schools, during both teacher-led lessons and 'quiet' work periods, small groups of students could be observed discussing such diverse topics as upcoming concerts, favourite types of liquor, teen pop heroes, their own and others' sex lives, and techniques for making jelly salad. Similarly, students carried with them out of the school setting varied descriptions of school activities, unusual occurrences, and the characteristics and actions of particular people. Thus, the student has the means to reconstruct the school experience in what can be potentially regarded as his or her own terms. However, the student is also sensitive to predefined elements of schooling, as student emphasis on idealist definitions of school (mentioned earlier) indicate. These tendencies heighten the 'double orientation' that is part of the student's social reality during the actual time that is spent in school.

These dual features are particularly evident in the importance attributed by students to unexpected interruptions, the presence of new persons, slips made by the teacher, and other breaks in the routine. Such incidents become focal points when they occur, and often serve as centrepieces for after-class conversations. Students often
take particular delight in attempting to extend the disruptions that occur to optimal levels of fun and variety. These attempts should not necessarily be regarded as conscious acts of ill-will toward the teacher or class, but rather as a response to an overall situation that has become less than satisfying. Some incidents can illustrate this point.

7.3.1. Example A

A typical break occurs when the teacher leaves the room during a lesson. This often acts as a safety valve for both the teacher - who may use times when students are working to run errands or simply escape from the classroom - and students. There tends to be an aura of mystery when someone knocks at the classroom door or when the teacher disappears, and the event provides opportunities for students to speculate on its nature or become involved in activities more interesting to them than classwork.

In one such situation, for example, school B students had finally settled down in order to complete a math assignment after more than twenty minutes of restlessness and disturbances. After about three minutes of quiet, the teacher left the room. Immediately, a group of five students began to argue loudly about anchovies (i.e., "They're fish, not peppers!", etc.), two boys were discussing a basketball game and several other conversations
could be heard. Within three minutes the teacher reappeared, gestured or talked to two or three students about noise, and then disappeared. At this, the sudden quiet was quickly broken by a number of whispered conversations, some a continuation of earlier ones, and some about what the teacher had been doing. After a further seven minutes, the teacher returned, used the opportunity (since by now no one was doing any work) to announce an upcoming hot dog sale, and fielded questions about the sale (and student complaints about its timing). Following scattered suggestions and comments, several students began to lose interest in the discussion and moved back to their work or their own diversions. Finally the teacher joined a small group of students who were discussing a basketball game. Eventually the teacher introduced new work tasks to the class, but the same unsettled pattern continued for the next hour until recess.

Here again the rhythm of classroom life was apparent. The work itself (i.e., the math questions) was considerably less important to students than the context in which it was presented and than the contents of particular distractions like details about the hot dog sale. Math and other types of work were regarded as inevitable parts of schooling, with interruptions frequently providing welcome 'bonus' relief.
7.3.2. Example B

The same may occur when a visitor, guest or new student or staff member appears. This was most apparent in school A, where an observer from a technical school psychology course was present in the school on several occasions. One notable feature of the school A grade 8 class was that the eight female students (less than a third of the total class) rarely participated or were included in class discussions. They either remained quiet and introspective or else they whispered softly among themselves. The observer, a young woman, provided a focal point for several of the girls, especially for four who sat near her at the back of the room. She became a sort of 'big sister' for the girls (five girls in the class were from single-parent families); she was someone the girls could talk to in and out of class about concerns and general observations, and she was a topic of conversation when she was not present.4

The observer did not cause significant distractions or changes in routine. Instead, her presence enabled energies and tendencies that already existed for the girls to be channeled in new and, for the moment, rewarding directions. All but one of the girls spoke positively about their overall school experiences, mostly as a consequence of opportunities to 'make the school day their own'.

7.3.3. Example C

Humour, comic relief and embarrassment rituals are frequently stressed as important survival mechanisms in school and other social organizations (Waller, 1932; Lacey, 1976; Woods, 1976c). The teacher, as an authority figure, is especially prone to close surveillance by students ever-watchful for errors, contradictions and unusual traits. When these appear, no time is lost for the nature of the deed to become well-publicized:

(School A) 9:27 a.m. (A clanging noise begins to emerge from the heating pipes as the teacher dictates spelling words to the students.) The teacher moves over to stop the noise by banging the pipes swiftly in two or three spots. As the noise subsides, 2 or 3 boys offer mock praise, ("What a hero") to the teacher who responds with a thumbs up sign (a la Fonzie), but when the noise reappears a few seconds later they reproach him mildly ("Ha!;" "You can't finish a job!", etc.) 4 or 5 small clusters of students continue talking excitedly for the next 5 minutes even as the teacher continues the dictation.

(School A) 10:22 a.m. (The teacher is writing names on the board for a salad being prepared for a contest.) Willy suggests the title "Willy's Cheddar Cheese" and several students shout "That's stupid"; "You can't put something like that." The teacher has written "Willy's Cheddar Cheese". Students spot the spelling error immediately and 2 or 3 shout in chorus "Write it ten times ... last year we had to write it one hundred times ..."

(School B) 9:28 a.m. (The teacher is sorting and counting hot dog money collected by students. Students have been instructed to read silently at their desks.)
The teacher points to 3 boys who are whispering, and gestures at them to get reading. The teacher then drops some coins on the floor. Ben, sitting near him, asks just loudly enough for all to hear, "Rough night last night?" There are soft chuckles, and several whispered conversations begin. The teacher does not respond.

(School C) 1:52 p.m. (The students have begun to work on a math assignment given by the teacher. 4 students sitting on the right outside row have bananas on their desks. They are alternating between writing and glancing at the teacher.) The teacher quietly observes the class, then says jovially, "I'm waiting for this place to explode." There is an immediate outburst of laughter, especially from the boys with the bananas. Some students quickly regain their composure and begin working or consulting with the teacher. 3 boys continue laughing and joking about the teacher's 'explode' remark.

1:55 p.m. - The teacher circulates around the room but suddenly faces the boys and begins laughing. The boys begin to laugh, which induces the teacher to laugh more strongly, until one boy attempts to regain composure by muttering, "Stop it, you guys!" Most return to work, but there are continuous outbreaks of joking and laughter (sometimes involving the teacher) for the next 35 minutes.

Again, such incidents provide fodder for after-school discussions and contribute to a sense of anticipation about what could happen next time, reestablishing the school context as a fun, or at least interesting, place to be.
Thus when students discuss what they like about school, they emphasize informal contextual factors like being with friends, having fun and participating in various activities (Table 15).

Table 15 - Student reasons for liking school, by percent of reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social (sports, friends, activities)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork &amp; subjects</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job preparation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational factors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everything</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost nothing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n (total responses given)</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N (students)</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Even when schoolwork, subjects or teachers are mentioned, they tend to be favoured according to the opportunities they provide for incidents such as those cited
above:

[I like the] friendly atmosphere. Also there is some freedom to make the day more enjoyable - female, school D.

I like being with friends, class trips, Home Ec., Math, and usually Language Art. The main reason is because I have fun and learn alot. - female, school B.

I learn - Because I want to. And ... I can have others around me at school - because we learn from each other, and it makes it more fun too. - male, school C.

Often, there appears to be almost a compulsion to identify learning or other idealistic and instrumental factors as likeable aspects of school:

I enjoy the social aspects like dances, parties, athletics etc., but I also realize that the classes are important. - male, school C.

Such responses tend to reassert the sobering reality of official school rhetoric, that fun has its place only within an educational framework. This points to an important class differential that is hinted at in the data in Table 15. In particular, while the trends are similar for all schools, schoolwork and subjects are identified as reasons for liking school more by students in middle-class than working class schools, and the reverse holds when teachers are mentioned. A work orientation was, in fact, highly evident in the middle class schools while more informal teacher-student relationships were noticeable in the working class schools.
7.3.4. Class Differences in School

Teachers in schools B and C emphasized productivity and getting down to business within certain well-defined limits. In both these schools, teachers pointed out to me the capabilities and strong points of each of the observed classes as a group, although the homeroom teacher in school B mentioned that every day the class "needed a chance for the lid to come off". Despite disruptions, students appeared to know that 'work was work' and unquestioningly accepted lectures, assignments, and other tasks. Generally, teacher-initiated questions were responded to promptly and to the point by substantial numbers of students. The work was paced much more evenly and quickly than in schools A and D, with specific objectives either stated or left implicit.

Time was stressed as an important factor in schools B and C. This was most evident in school B where control and disciplinary measures were more overt. Students were continually warned by teachers about the impending end of the school year (i.e., about 3 1/2 months away - "It is frightening how close you are to the end of the school term and to high school ... you can expect more homework for the next few weeks ... there is a tremendous amount of material that still remains to be covered"); permission was denied students to use school time (to determine the nature of a
gift which was to be purchased for parents who helped at a
school camp) because of the amount of work that had to be
done; and time wasted by students was often counted by the
teachers as 'owed time' to be made up after school. Such
warnings appeared to have been internalized by school C
students who used class time both to master the work tasks
and to reduce the amount of possible homework. (Without
saying anything, teachers could simply increase the length
of assignments when they felt the need to impose external
controls.)

At the same time, procedure was important in the work
done by school B and C students. Math and other subjects
were stressed "as a science ... record your work so it's
not lost ... develop discipline in your own methods so you
can avoid helter-skelter thinking", according to the school
B homeroom teacher. Distinct organizational principles were
stressed as work was introduced, with brief pauses in the
teachers' presentations to allow for clarification, reitera-
tion of definitions, or examples. The content did not seem
to matter so much except in terms of something to be done.
Thus, there did not appear to be much variation from formal
curricula with emphasis on problems, facts and processes
that could be reproduced on tests. Much of the work in all
subjects was organized according to charts, formulae and
other systematic, categorical methods.
This can be illustrated by an example from a school B Social Studies lesson. The students, who had been examining Indians in Canadian history, were shown a filmstrip entitled *Native Canadians*. Most of the film involved a historical and descriptive presentation of lifestyles of various tribal groups arranged according to geographical areas (Eastern Woodlands, Plains, etc.). The last few frames presented an informative discussion about contemporary native problems such as the Indian Act, land rights, and other political issues. Following the film, there was no discussion by the teacher. Instead, students were directed to read their textbooks and then to outline a chart in their notebooks, to be filled in with "at least five to ten significant statements" about each tribal group's way of life. There were no questions about the filmstrip except to clarify the assignment (e.g., student - "Northwest coast isn't a tribe, is it?"; teacher - "Northwest coast is a kind of area in which people live.") This assignment was the substance of the unit on Indians, with no further issues raised over the next few classes.

In contrast, the work orientation was often set aside for an issue orientation in schools A and D. Especially in school A, there was less emphasis on getting things done than on keeping things interesting. The classroom teacher was clearly aware of the students' class backgrounds, and
he commented to me that "If you're looking for students in lower class situations, you sure came to the right place!"

Students were given time to discuss attention-getting news items such as family fights, stabbings, controversial incidents at hockey games, and photos of industrial machinery. These sometimes provided the bases for schoolwork, as in writing assignments and discussions about plays. In the assignments, quality and quantity of work were deemed subordinate to effort and showing improvement. Time and procedural rules were stressed not so much for specific assignments as for trying to develop some overall pattern for the whole school day. In school A, students were warned several times about generally poor behavior; they were given a plan for each day's activities; and privileges such as leaving the room, going outside, and early dismissals were used as incentives for good behavior:

1:22 p.m. - Mr. R. - "If things go well, then, who knows? You might get dismissed at 3:30."
Don (sarcastically) - "Oh ... you're generous."
Brian - "Be quiet, Don, it's better than nothing!"

The pattern in school D was very informal, with students having a deadline for producing a given unit of work. Thus, class times were mostly work periods, except when the teacher introduced new material or wished to discuss a particular matter, and students spent variable amounts of time working either on the class work, something
else, or not at all.

Students in schools A and D frequently mentioned that a good teacher – one who was 'nice', interesting and tolerant – was an important factor in making school enjoyable, regardless of the subject matter. On the other hand, teachers without these qualities were despised, especially by school A students. In school A, unlike the other schools, teachers were cited ahead of other elements as reasons for disliking school (Table 16). The schoolwork was mentioned most frequently by schools B and D students, and organizational factors were stressed by school C students.

Table 16 - Student reasons for disliking school, by percent of reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational factors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job preparation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everything</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost nothing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total responses given)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.
While no clear trends seem apparent with these data, there were qualitative differences in the responses given. Teachers, classes and rules were commonly portrayed as intruding into the lives of schools A and D students:

I don't like homework if I don't understand it and don't have time. I don't like getting up early because I'm always tired - male, school D.

[I dislike] some teachers. Because they bitch about stupid things. - male, school A.

I dislike one thing about school and that is you don't have enough time at home or with relatives and friends. - male, school A.

Alternatively, students in schools B and C tended to be more task-oriented and objected to barriers to the learning process and the pressures of work and competition. The contrast is evident in the following comments from school B students:

[I dislike] a test every day of the week of a report due sometime just then. Because I think the teachers should realize just how much they're working us. - female, school B.

[We have] not enough work, because dumb people are passing with low marks. - male, school B.

These sentiments are also expressed by school C students, in slightly different terms. Competition and its effects on peer interactions were strongly stressed by several students:

For me the competition aspects of school are unpleasant. A lot of the opportunities available have to be limited so some kids are rejected. I don't like this system. - female, school C.
I dislike the repetitiveness, the slowness, they are what make school boring. I dislike being forced to learn when I don't want to. I.e. the bell has rung. Calculus is over. Now I must stop thinking about the calculus problem I'm right in the middle of and start thinking about Canadian History when I want to do calculus. — female, school C.

Although schools B and C students generally are, and want to be, successful according to school standards, they are not afraid to express disillusionment with what they regard as extreme manifestations of school procedures and their effects. This conforms with the overall greater articulation on most matters noted for high school students, and for schools B and C students as opposed, respectively, to schools A and D students. Still, with reference to the 'total responses' for Tables 15 and 16, it must be noted that more reasons for liking school than disliking school were cited overall and within each school.

In relation to their views on how they felt they were doing in school, students were asked to rate themselves on a five point scale, to give reasons for their ratings, and to indicate whether they felt they were satisfied with how they were doing. Overall, students rated themselves relatively highly with a mean rating of 2.2 on the scale from 1 (excellent) to 5 (terrible) (Table 17a). High school students, especially in school C, tended to give better self-ratings than elementary students did. The strongest differences were apparent between school C
students (mean rating of 1.7) and school A students (mean rating of 2.5). No students indicated that they were doing "terribly").

Table 17a – Rating by student of how well student is doing at school, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Excellent)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Terrible)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean rating</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Students tended to rely on marks more than other factors for their ratings (Table 17b).
Table 17b - Reasons given by student for rating given to self, by percent of total reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments made by others</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in school activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everything</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (Total responses)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exception to this trend was in school A, where students who gave reasons emphasized personal reasons ("I'm trying", "good behavior", "a feeling") and others' comments more than marks. Personal reasons were also stressed, second to marks, by school D students. Participation in school activities was a slightly greater factor for students in schools B and C than in A and D.

Students in the middle class schools indicated that they were more satisfied than students in the working class schools with how they felt they were doing (Table 17c). Overall, 33% of the students in the sample indicated they
were not satisfied; this lack of satisfaction was most strongly felt by school D students. Several school D students felt that they had to do much better if their schooling was to be of any value to them for university or job competition.

Table 17c - Satisfaction expressed by students in terms of how they feel they are doing in school, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(^{a})</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Class differences also have importance beyond the structure of schooling. The data in Table 18 demonstrate that class differentiation is reflected in student plans for further education. Both high school groups contained several of the more academically and socially successful students, like student council members, in their cohorts. Students in the middle class schools (B and C) are greatly
Table 18 - Students' plans for further education, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expect to quit before Grade 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-university post-secondary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 27 33 35 35 130

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

over-represented in terms of those planning to go to university but under-represented for those expecting to proceed no further than grade 12. Overall, based on correlations with data from Tables 1 to 10, class-related factors such as father's occupation (Pearson's r = .1131, p = .1) and especially father's education (r = .5411, p = 0) and mother's education (r = .3649, p = 0) demonstrate some relationships with students' educational plans, while factors like age (r = - .09), sex (r = .03) and language do not. These trends are generally consistent with findings reported by others (e.g., Porter, Porter and Blishen, 1982).

Although not as clearly defined, similar sets of relationships exist with regard to the job or activity that
students thought they would spend most of their lives at (Table 19). It can be noted that there appears to be more uncertainty about the future for students in the lower-class schools (A and D), based on the proportions of those indicating 'work in general' or 'don't know/no response'. There are few overall differences, however, between the elementary schools. For the high schools, students appear to follow the pattern established by their parents; school C students are concentrated in Levels I and II while school D students who specify a level are clustered in Levels II and III.

Table 19 - Expected life job or activity of student, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V (Homemaker)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in General</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

b See Table 7, note b, for a listing of occupational groupings.
7.3.5 The Process of Schooling (Summary)

Some brief summary comments can be made to conclude this section. Students tend to accept school through a combination of its formal standards and their own devices for passing time. The school day, already fragmented by timetabled classes, bells and other formal disjunctions, is further split up by a continuous series of interruptions, distractions, humorous incidents, and sideshows. This is recreated by the student as a dualistic whole composed of idealistic (or infrequently instrumental) and contextual facets.

Both facets reinforce one another in the sense that things that happen during the school day contribute to an overall orientation to school, and vice versa. Thus, for example, assignments, exams and disciplinary measures enforce the notion that the school work is important or somehow good for the students. They also add real pressures to school life. In addition, school is a gathering place, bringing together students who may have little clear idea about why they are there except for the fact that they are there. Consequently, comments, events and characteristics which might appear trivial to outsiders (including some teachers) often assume an important role for students in defining the school experience. Students may be reluctant to criticize school mainly because school allows them
opportunities to make situations their own. As they experience school there is little need or demand for students to transcend the immediate.

Within this common framework there are differences between working and middle class schooling. The middle class schools display more of a work-oriented approach. Formal school tasks along with corresponding standards of discipline, productivity and procedure are stressed by teachers and accepted by students. At the same time, students are willing to identify troublesome aspects of their schooling, particularly those related to either a perceived reduction of standards or the pressures associated with maintaining those standards. The work, as given, is seen as something to be mastered as one step on the way to mastery of, or at least successful functioning in, the social world.

Working class school students, too, tend to accept their school work, but often for different reasons or in different forms than do students in middle class schools. Specifically, in schools A and D, work is favoured if it is part of a package complete with friendly, tolerant teachers, relevant subject material, and flexible work conditions.

Finally, middle class students more than working class students are satisfied with how they are doing in school.
and expect to attain higher levels of education and occupations.

7.4. Reproduction and Mystification

Except for the anticipated outcomes of schooling, these observations tend to run counter to explanations which depict social relations in the school as directly reproductive of labour power (e.g., Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Working and middle class schooling practices often only remotely resemble the sorts of jobs and social roles students are destined for. While there are certainly significant reproductive aspects in the general form of class schooling, there are important differences between ways in which schooling and working life (whether on the shop floor or around a boardroom table) are organized and experienced. School rarely directly prepares students for anything.

Students feel that school is somehow good for them but they are vague about its precise utility. Table 20a presents student responses to the question, "How helpful do you feel school will seem to you later in life (when you are out of school)?" Overall the indications were very strong that schooling would be helpful, although there was substantial uncertainty for school A students. In explaining their responses (Table 20b), elementary school students were more likely to give instrumental (job- or
Table 20a - Anticipated helpfulness of school for students' later lives, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Table 20b - Anticipated helpfulness of school for students' later lives, including types of reasons, by percent of total reasons given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total reasons)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.
career-related) reasons, while high school students tended to give idealist reasons such as:

1) What I have learned will decide in which manner I can contribute to society.
2) It will be the basis of a new social life.
   - male, school C.

and, I think I will always regard school as helpful because it helped me to mature and has prepared me for future problems. - female, school D.

There was a prevailing feeling of restlessness and sometimes boredom among high school students, related to the desire to move on to new things. For students intending to go on to university - most evidently those in school C - school was also valued as a stepping stone to the future. However, it appears that students who reach grade 12 have an awareness that school has little direct connection with specific jobs. And for elementary school students, the school-job connection is frequently seen as part of some remote promise.

What is significant is that students rarely question what goes on in school, especially in terms of how school is connected with non-school factors.

One quarter of the respondents in the four schools, including fifty percent of school D students, felt that schools operated independently of other forces in society (Table 21a). Elementary school students, especially those in school A, felt much more than high school students
did that school was connected, at least in some ways, with other parts of society.

Table 21a - Indication of whether schools are seen as being connected with other parts of society, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connected</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly connected</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (total students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Factors that were more easily seen by students as having some connection with schools were immediate ones like parents, community, other schools, and school boards (Table 21b). Students in the middle class schools, especially, identified connections with government, and elementary school students saw some ties with employers, but other political and economic forces were rarely mentioned.
Students, however, felt that they understood adequately the operation of schooling itself. Overall, 63% of the students indicated that they had high degrees of understanding of school-related process, while low levels were indicated by only 15% of the students (Table 22a).
School C students appeared to have the greatest degree of understanding about the operation of schooling.

Table 22a - Indication by students of their degree of understanding of school-related processes, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (total students) 27 31 28 20 106

Students were also asked which school-related aspects they would like to know more about. Nearly half of the students in the total sample felt that there was nothing more they needed or wanted to know about (Table 22b). Elementary school students, especially, had few questions to ask. In most cases where information about school-related processes was desired, specific questions (such as "How much do teachers get paid?" and "Why don't they offer us more options?") were emphasized. High school students expressed some interest in the way in which decisions about school and school organization were made. Several students expressed reluctance to know more about school because this information might shatter a particular image, as reflected
in this comment from a boy in school B: "[Knowing more about school] probably'd ruin it for me ... make me more confused."

Table 22b - Elements of school-related processes identified as being worthwhile to know more about, by percent of total responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How school decisions and organizational arrangements are made</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for particular subjects or methods</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about other levels of education (high school, college)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How teacher-related decisions are made</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about teachers (on a personal, informal basis)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about the student (access to records)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for the existence of school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total responses)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (total students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.
One important observation was that students repeatedly commented over the course of the research that they had never before been asked to give their views or even to think about questions related to school. Several found it incomprehensible that anyone would even want to examine schools and schooling. Schooling as a topic of study is ignored and lost in the day to day struggle to get through the curriculum and other forms of busyness. The schooling process effectively mystifies students about the nature of schooling as an institution in capitalist society.

The mystification process can be considered in relation to forms of school knowledge, student input into school decisions, and student conceptions of school change.

7.4.1. School Knowledge

Knowledge is central to schooling insofar as it is an outcome of the learning process. Students were asked to define knowledge and then discuss it in relation to their schooling experience. Knowledge can be defined as an individual state (of wisdom as "something you know"), an interpersonal process, or a received commodity, transmitted directly from some other person or source. Elementary students tended to define knowledge as an individual state, while high school students were more likely to view it as a process (Table 23). Students in all schools found the
abstract notion of knowledge a very difficult one to discuss. Revealingly, though, school C students typically treated the matter as an interesting challenge while school A students were more likely to avoid it or respond in uncertain terms.

Table 23 - Factors used by students to define knowledge, by percent of total factors given in response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual state</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity (received)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total factors)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Overall, however, there were no differences among schools in students' indications of the forms that knowledge takes in their schooling experience (Table 24a).
Table 24a - Indications by students of ways knowledge is used in school, by percent of total responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commodity</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual state</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n (total responses) 45 55 52 37 189

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

School knowledge is clearly regarded as a commodity, something deliberately and simply transmitted by teachers, books and other media; it is rarely seen as a process or something to be worked through together. This contrasts sharply with what students regard as knowledge in general. Consequently, students, especially in high schools, tend to be less accepting of (but they do not fully reject) the uses of knowledge in school than of other aspects of their schooling (Table 24b). The knowledge that seems to count in school is that given or assigned by teachers in ritual fashion, validated by tests and other control devices:

You conform to what your teacher wants. - female, school C.

You learn to do your work - how to do it proper. - male, school A.
Table 24b - Evaluation by students of ways knowledge is used in school, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>N</sup> (total students) 27 31 28 20 106

<sup>a</sup> Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Students are often opposed to this process:

There's too much spoon feeding in the classroom ... no thinking ... We just spit out facts on tests with little chance to discover the objectivity of questions, or things beyond the textbook.
- male, school D.

Knowledge is given out in little bits at a time ... They shoot it out and we shoot it back, on tests. - male, school D.

Still, students who do feel school learning could allow for more individual input are with few exceptions resigned to accepting that a stimulus-response emphasis perhaps is necessary in school. The onus is then placed on the individual to seek and do things with the knowledge that is desired:

[Knowledge] is sort of there like little pieces. If you want to get it, you should be able to get it all. No one can stop them. It's up to the individual. - male, school A.
You can get basics from teachers (for guidance), but you have to go out and get the rest ... There's a lot of spoonfeeding but it's difficult to have it any other way because people are lazy, especially after 12 years. - female, school D.

The belief that individuals can do what they wish with school knowledge, once it is presented, tends to support a view that the world has fallen into place as it should. This is certainly consistent with the classroom observations, which revealed that curriculum-related procedures and contents are presented and received as necessary 'goods'. Students feel that even if they don't get all they want out of school, they have the capacities to pursue their knowledge goals elsewhere. However, the parameters for this potential exploration are severely limited by years of life in an institutional setting which brings into focus neither its own basis for existence nor the structures and ideologies which it supports. The structure and process of schooling are, in effect, reified.

7.4.2. Students and School-Related Decisions

Within these reified notions of knowledge and structure, students develop clear ideas about their place in the school hierarchy. Substantial proportions of students in all schools reported that they had little or no input into choices and decisions about school matters (Table 25a). This feeling was most evident in the middle class schools,
Table 25a - Indication by students of perceived degree of student input into school matters, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

with 64% of school B students and 71% of school C students indicating low levels of input. These reports are consistent with observations of the more structured work-like orientations in these two schools. Students who commented on the input and choices that they did have tended to focus on social activities (such as events sponsored by high school student councils) or immediate areas (like 'shutting out the teacher' or selecting classes). Generally, though, students did not appear to be concerned with their lack of school-related choice. As the data in Table 25b reveal, about half of all students indicated that present levels of student input were acceptable, and fewer than a third in each school reported negative feelings. No respondent suggested that students should have greatly enhanced levels of input.
Table 25b - Student feelings about perceived degree of student input, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (accepting)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total(^a)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

The groups that students could identify as making school-related decisions are presented in Table 26. All students stressed the importance of school administrators and teachers. Students in middle class schools were more likely than students in lower class schools to recognize the role of the board of education and less likely to indicate parents. High school students, especially those who were active with student councils, identified students as having some minor input into the decision-making process. These responses indicate that students tend to have accepted a basic organizational model of the school system working, from their perspective, out from the school itself. Middle class students especially feel that a textbook-like formal structure prevails. There is little
evidence to indicate that students recognize such broad notions as power struggles, class differentials and the use of influence in the organization and operation of formal schooling.

Table 26 - Indication by students of sources of school-related decisions, by percent of total responses (3 sources per student are recorded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School administration (Principal, Vice-Principal)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/No response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (total responses)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (total students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.
7.4.3. Students and School Change

One final way to gauge student consciousness about schooling and school-related processes is to ask them how, if at all, they would change school or create an ideal school. As the responses compiled in Tables 27a and 23a indicate, students are reluctant to suggest anything beyond minor modifications in existing schooling patterns.

Table 27a - Proportions of students indicating changes, if students could make school-related decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Elementary students seem most content with and proud of their own schools, with several students claiming, "This school they attend is the ideal school!" School C students, who would appear to benefit most from the process of schooling, are most willing to discuss potential changes, possibly as a result of their levels of mastery of the school system.
Table 28a - Indications of changes that would be needed to create an ideal school, by percent of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change needed or possible</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major changes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Changes that were suggested tended to refer to very specific aspects of schooling, especially in terms of making the school environment more comfortable (Table 27b). Most often cited were minor rule changes (such as being able to chew gum in class or allowing more spare time), acquiring better facilities and supplies (such as gym or lab equipment and more contemporary textbooks), and having more competent and caring teachers. Several students suggested changes in school subjects and patterns in schoolwork, especially related to adding desired classes or removing unwanted ones, but no overall trend was apparent beyond individual preferences. Moreover, even the few students who felt there should be major or overall changes in schooling tended to have a relatively fixed notion of
schooling, citing added freedoms as the basis for change within the given framework.

Table 27b - Aspects of school that students would change, by percent of factors given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational factors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork and subjects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change nothing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ no response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (factors)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Similar responses were given as factors that would have to be changed in order to create an 'ideal' school (Table 28b). More possibilities for change were suggested, but again suggestions tended to be limited to very specific points. The present school system was seen as adequate, made ideal with simple adjustment to hours,
course offerings, disciplinary matters, school personnel, or recreational activities. Several students, especially in school C, even wanted present regulations stiffened because, for example, they regretted not being able to take all the classes they wanted to in high school.

Table 28b - Aspects of school that would need to be changed to create an ideal school, by percent of factors given

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational factors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwork and subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change nothing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/no response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (factors)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (students)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals may not equal 100 because of rounding.

Despite this overall conformity with the given and the lack of adequate conceptualization of alternatives, however, a few students expressed insights into
significantly troubling aspects in their schooling experiences:

Change [schools] totally. Make them more human give a greater input from students so they do have a say in the affairs of the school more in the form of a union. - male, school D.

I dislike the green locker army image. I hate the bells - we live and work by a bell. I dislike the narrow course selection. I don't like the way people get so upset if you have a good time ... I don't think that things should be spoonfed to us. - i.e. - "Today class, we will learn about ...." We should be able to learn about what we want more - learn about what we're interested in. - female, school C.

The average job can be done (eg. salesclerk, secretary or any office work) without a grade 12 diploma, but they expect you to at least have that, plus other training. - female, school C.

A person must accept by blind faith that we are receiving the best and most obj. form of education. - male, school D.

Teachers should be around for references & help, not to dictate knowledge. Students should be free to learn what they want to .... I also think school should offer more freedom for students to explore the real world, not the artificial one created in schools. - female, school C.

Ironically, this last comment was written just one week after a sign had been placed in the entrance to school B, welcoming university education students to the school and inviting them to "get a sense of the 'real' world of education". The educational world is certainly real in many senses, but the implications of that reality are rarely questioned.
7.5. Differences between Elementary and Secondary Schooling

Overall patterns of class schooling and class differences in schooling have been examined so far. It is useful now to reconsider some of the differences that have been observed between the elementary and secondary schools and students. In particular, we can touch on developmental consequences for individuals' abilities to conceptualize systematically and critically the social world. Perhaps, it could be argued, the fragmented school world is necessary and likely to be accepted uncritically for students who have not yet reached cognitive and moral maturity.

Elementary students tended more than high school students to identify schooling as education and to emphasize instrumental factors in their conceptions of schooling. These tendencies can in several ways be related to the greater concern for order and discipline that was observed in the grade 8 classes. Teachers, elementary students were aware, commonly acted as taskmasters. Elementary school students were more likely than high school students to complain about particular teachers and teacher behaviour, just as elementary school teachers were more likely to complain about students. Student restlessness was a built-in expectation in the school curriculum for grades 7 to 9 students. Work in the grade 8 classes was frequently justified by teachers as being important preparation for
high school and jobs. Grade 12 students did not ask why they had to do particular work; rather, they simply did it or ignored it.

Elementary more than high school students also felt there were strong connections between schools and other parts of society. This difference was seen mostly in relation to inter-school functions and activities, but many grade 8 students did feel that there was a direct link between school and job markets. Few students felt that there was anything beyond what they already knew about schools and school-related factors that they wanted or needed to know. Overall, however, high school students had more questions to ask than elementary students about the process of schooling.

There were important variations in students' definitions of knowledge. Grade 8 students tended to view knowledge as an individual thing or state of wisdom, whereas grade 12 students emphasized processes like experience, developing understanding and applying ideas. However, in terms of the ways students saw knowledge being used in schools, there were no differences; elementary and secondary school students felt that knowledge was given and received (as a commodity) in schools with little emphasis on process. Elementary students, though, were more accepting than secondary students were of this transmission of
knowledge in schools. Similarly, elementary school students were more reluctant than high school students were to identify the need for and suggest changes in schooling, overall.

Clearly, patterns of schooling and student responses do reflect some developmental tendencies. Elementary schools are organized to promote and maintain knowledge, values and behaviour that are built upon in high school. Greater levels of maturity and cognitive functioning are expected of high school students. These tendencies were apparent during the course of the research. In the high schools, discipline appeared to be less of an ongoing preoccupation, and covering course-related content was a greater factor than in the elementary schools. Grade 12 students seemed to be more ready to step back to evaluate the school system as they prepared to leave it.

Still, there were remarkable similarities between the two levels of schooling and between the students in each of those levels: in the dualistic nature of the school experience; in the student acceptance of school procedures; in the absence of schools as topics of study; and in the lack of opportunities for students to view the world in a clearly organized way.
7.6. Conclusions

The school day itself provides the fundamental orientation for school students. Getting from one day to the next, with all the consequent enjoyments and complications, limits students' chances for exploring the full nature of that schooling and its connections with other sectors in society. The student school experience becomes fragmented in a very peculiar way.

In a sense all students are proletarianized. Their possession of and control over the means of educational production are very limited. They are not clearly conscious of the total nature of the educational endeavour. Instead, they recite strongly reinforced jargon about the goodness and necessity of schooling for some uncertain future promise. The worlds that students are expected or allowed to participate in and master through schooling are the given one (with prescribed curricular contents and procedures) or the localized one (with very immediate pressures and gratifications).

Thus, there are few grounds for the formation of a solid student oppositional base. The structure of schooling encourages, and usually gets, student conformity with prescribed goals and means. Where oppositional potential exists, such as in student complaints about authoritarianism or restrictions on knowledge, efforts tend to be
directed at immediate sources of discontent. There are few opportunities for formulating and criticizing an overall conception of schooling and the world in which it operates. In Gramscian terms, such a mystified world lacks any sort of 'coherent unity'. The process of hegemony serves to make alternatives to the present order appear incomprehensible, undesirable or unworkable.

But the non-deterministic nature of schooling implies that some possibilities for change continue to exist. In other words, a broader form of counter-hegemony is not totally impossible. Schooling provides access (however selective) to literacy, resources and forms of interaction, thought and expression that are frequently necessary before particular challenges to existing structures and processes of any sort can be posed. Students do recognize some contradictions in their schooling experience, even if students are rarely able to explain these or locate their origins. Student expressions of satisfaction and suggestions for change are very pragmatic. There is evidence to suggest that their emphasis would change if broader terms of reference were made apparent. The observed class differences, for example, carry within them some transformative potential. Working class students, with their context-bound concerns, are in a position to be able to detect discrepancies between aspects of school that may help them and
those that may harm them over the long run.

The more vigorous and structured pursuits of 'cultural capital' by students in middle class schools and their recognition of pressures and difficulties involved in this pursuit, also point to situations through which new forms of consciousness might emerge. Forms of class struggle that operate within and outside of schools tend to produce variations in the content and transmission of what counts as valid knowledge. Therefore, not all that is taught in school at any given time is necessarily supportive of capitalist tendencies.

As has been seen throughout this chapter, however, it is more likely that students are not presented with sufficient opportunities and insights to be able to put the pieces together in a unified critical form. Student opposition to school-related factors remains mostly dormant and non-threatening. In this way schooling contributes to processes which do not threaten the continued reproduction of capitalist structures and relations of production.

7.6.1 A Note on the Role of Teachers

This research has emphasized students rather than teachers in the process of schooling. Nevertheless, it is appropriate at this point to make some observations about teachers as workers with whom students have daily contact.
Students tended not to view teachers as workers. Rather, teachers were regarded by students as authorities and individuals who were part of the daily landscape; teachers conducted lessons, assigned work and grades, and helped set the tone for particular school experiences. Teachers were viewed in two ways: first, collectively, as a given part of school life; and second, individually, as particular allies, facilitators, obstacles, or enemies. Except as they affected students directly, teachers were not a matter of concern for students.

Teachers, in the discussions I had with them, tended to view their own work at different times as a calling, a duty, a challenge, and a burden. At least in school, they emphasized the teaching part of their roles in order to serve what they felt were the best educational and developmental interests of their students. Nearly all the teachers were clearly aware of their students' aggregate expectations, strengths, weaknesses, and class backgrounds. They tended, in turn, to vary their teaching according to these student characteristics. In school, therefore, teachers as much as students had a dual orientation to contextual and idealistic factors. Teacher activity was directed towards getting through both the school day (or year) and the curriculum, while providing some interest and guidance for their students.
It is likely (although teachers did not reveal this) that teachers come to see through some of the school-related mystifications that exist for students. Schooling, for teachers, is also their work. They have a vested interest in keeping the environment and the clientele manageable. Their authority, in part, can be derived from ignoring or withholding insights which they have contradictory to general expressions of schooling.

Ultimately, the continuation of schooling requires that teachers have neither access to nor opportunities to apply too many contradictory insights. The daily routine, the educational ideals and the need to earn a salary help to militate against teachers becoming overly critical of schooling. These factors are reinforced by the teacher training process, where schooling becomes a requirement for teaching in schools. Teachers (except those who have failed in other pursuits) can therefore defend the view that education is a useful commodity.

These observations require further elaboration and substantiation, which will not be attempted here. Our understanding of schooling may eventually be heightened through investigations into tensions related to what teachers know about their roles, how teachers are constrained in their activities, and the professional wage earner status of teachers.
Footnotes to Chapter 7

1. Spelling and punctuation appear throughout as written by students.

2. This has implications which may be represented by Bernstein's (1973: 200ff) notions of restricted and elaborated speech codes. In interviews and questionnaires there was a notable tendency for working class (especially school A) students to respond in short, unqualified, context-tied statements (or not at all) — characteristic of restricted codes — and for school B and C students to explain responses and pull away from particular contexts in the manner that Bernstein describes as elaborated codes. These patterns were more evident where students were asked to describe concepts or abstract processes.

3. Note, for example, the widespread currency in schooling of developmental theories emerging from the work of Piaget, Kohlberg and others. These approaches have gained such a stature that alternatives are not even deemed possible.

4. There were several indications that my presence could have had similar implications for some of the boys if I had been in a position to become more involved in the classroom. This was represented, for example, in my participation on a cross-country skiing outing, and my being approached conspiratorially by a group of boys to help them in a 'fun night' project.

5. A teacher told me about one incident with the observed class which drove a couple of the students to near-breakdowns. An intern teacher, unaware of the conscientious work habits of the students, had given the students a few days to write a report about a particular aspect of each Canadian province. Taking the assignment to heart, several students spent hours each day and evening writing detailed, voluminous reports within what they felt was the scope of the task. This came to the other teacher's attention when, just before the due date, two parents phoned the school to complain about the exhaustion and tension the assignment had produced for their sons.
6. Eighteen per cent of school A responses and fifteen per cent of school B responses did not indicate that there was any reason for disliking school.

7. Because 3 responses were recorded for each student, the high non-response rate includes from 1 to 3 choices for each student who did not identify 3 sources. Several students, especially in school C, identified more than 3 sources. If these had been recorded, more weight could be given to the students category; these, however, were not presented as priorities by the respondents. The non-response rate can be noted in that students in schools B and C were able to identify decision-making sources in all but one or two instances, whereas in schools A and D fewer total sources, proportionately, were identified.

8. This concept, following Bernstein (1973: 196) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), can be used to refer generally to knowledge, backgrounds and appreciations that are widely emphasized for school and occupational success.

9. These are Bernstein's (1971: 47) terms.
Chapter 5 concluded with a series of questions that were used as guides for the research described in Chapters 6 and 7. The research can now be summarized according to findings associated with these questions.

(1) What elements constitute the student school experience?

School is for students an active patchwork composed of formal learning situations, sports, games, humorous incidents, activities with friends, unique pressures, and other occurrences. It is a very broad experience insofar as opportunities for social interaction and learning are plentiful. Nevertheless, very clear patterns are evident in shifts between work and fun orientations. These patterns are lived, but not necessarily comprehended, by students.

(2) What do students identify as elements of their school experience?

Students identify, often without realizing it, the dualistic nature of schooling. They view schooling, in idealist terms, as a necessary process through which individuals gain an education and conform to society's requisites.
Schooling is seen as an institutional process which has particular organizational features, standards, regulations, and personnel. However, students also identify as important the opportunities schooling provides for friendship and fun.

(3) What relationships do students identify between these elements and other aspects of their social lives?

Schooling tends to be regarded by students as a world unto itself, although, in many ways, it dominates their lives. Students value many of the contacts they make and experiences they have in schools. They also identify school-related factors which they regard as harmful to themselves and others. However, school is most often seen as preparatory to life with little direct connection with non-school factors.

(4) What class and grade differences are apparent in student school experience?

Schooling appears to have more relevance for middle class than for working class student futures. In school, curriculum, work and efficiency are emphasized for middle class students while relevant information and informal processes are emphasized for working class students. Differences between grade 8 and grade 12 schooling
are mostly in appearance and style. Discipline and the work-fun distinctions are more evident in the elementary schools and more subtle in the high schools. Grade 12 students are more ready for, and have more basis for, reflection about their schooling and other experiences. However, like elementary students, they rarely carry out this reflection in a broad way.

(5) How do students evaluate their school experience?

Students accept schooling and their places in it. They regard schooling as a given condition of life, even if some aspects of schooling are considered somewhat unpleasant.

(6) What, if any, changes in schooling are proposed by students?

Students indicate that very little would have to change in order for schools to be improved. Most suggestions for change are directed at specific factors like course offerings, school hours, facilities, discipline, and individuals. Some students feel that widespread restructuring of schooling should occur, but more students agree that schools should be left as they are.

(7) What implications do these evaluations and suggestions for change have for class society?
Student acceptance of the status quo in schooling does not mean that students will necessarily view other aspects of the world in the same uncritical manner. But it is doubtful that, after having spent 8 to 12 or more years in school, individuals will totally reject their society and its institutions. Certainly schooling is important for producing individuals who will 'fit' into any given society.

What is paradoxical, however, is that school, as an educating institution in capitalist society, does not provide students with a clear framework for interpreting the events that have structured and been so much a part of their lives. Human thought and unalienated human activity are restrained in a so-called 'free' society.

Students are 'educated' only in a very narrow sense. Through schooling, capacities for using and transforming the learnings (although none of them could certainly be considered radical) which students have acquired are in some ways discouraged and in other ways not seized upon as viable options. The given world becomes the only real alternative. Mann (1970: 437) elaborates this process in his rejection of notions that value consensus is what
preserves the legitimacy of liberal democratic society: the most common form of manipulative socialization by the liberal democratic state does not seek to change values, but rather to perpetuate values that do not aid the working class to interpret the reality it actually experiences .... A significant measure of consensus and normative harmony may be necessary among ruling groups, but it is the absence of consensus among lower classes which keeps them compliant.

Capitalist reproduction can be effected successfully with a minimum of force and direct social control as long as a mystified individual sense of 'rightness' exists among the populace. Hegemony serves to localize the struggles of life within each community, institution or sector of society so that real, immediate individual consequences overshadow possibilities for seeing these in more comprehensive frameworks.

The analysis presented here indicates that there are significant limitations to both functional-determinist (traditional and critical) and interactionist explanations of society. It is important that any analysis of schooling be elevated beyond levels of definition and process that operate within classroom or organizational boundaries. But while interactionist approaches which give primacy to particular contexts can be faulted for failing to explain the limitations of these contexts, functional-determinist explanations tend to overstress or leave unclear the connections between various social institutions and sectors.
Schools, for example, do not directly reproduce either labour power or class relations, since these become effective only at the point of entry into the labour force, especially within the sphere of production. Until such a point where schools become fully productive institutions, actively producing surplus value, several non-determinist tendencies will remain. Most evidently, schools do not assure the precise entry of students into the workforce. Family background, streaming, grading, and a variety of other factors operate to close off particular options and create predispositions for students, but there is no certainty that schooling results in an exact form of reproduction. In this regard, Hodgson (1980: 264-5) refers to the unique relations that exist at the level of productive activity:

The worker must consciously submit to the discipline and pace of the labor-process, otherwise labor will not be exuded and production will not take place.... the process of social conditioning, the preparation for submission to work-discipline, will take place in the family, the school and through the mass media. But no matter how strong these forces of conditioning and coercion may be, the capitalists can never be sure that the worker will actually submit to the discipline of work unless the worker's autonomy and initiative are eradicated.

Institutions in civil society can approximate characteristics of productive activity through authority structures, alienated conditions of existence and particular forms of social and cultural content. But it can be suggested that
rather than producing certain types of individuals and classes of workers, schools and other institutions are more effective in reducing the possibilities for alternative types to emerge.

The immersion in the everyday is thus both a response to and a precondition for continued alienating life forms for middle and working classes. The given world is made to appear attractive as long as minimal forms of choice have deep significance for individual lives and no broader options become crystallized.

Several implications for further research follow from this. Relationships among activities at the levels of the economy, state and civil society have yet to be clearly conceptualized and supported with grounded data. The roles that classes and class struggle play at each level are often confused, leading to simplified analyses that undermine the importance of social praxis. These roles and relationships must be traced through institutions like schooling in order to link lived and theoretical worlds. Connections between schooling, the work force, class or false consciousness, class intervention, and the state cannot simply be asserted, nor can the autonomy of any of these factors. The danger in such approaches is to further mystify a mystified world.
INSTRUCTIONS: This survey is to help me identify some of the feelings and concerns that students have about school and things that are connected with school. You may write as much or as little as you wish about each statement. Please be honest. I am interested in YOUR reactions. Your names will not be used to identify your responses. These surveys will not be read by other students, parents or school personnel.

PART A: These are background questions that are important to the study as a whole. Please answer them as accurately as you can.

1. What is your date of birth? (month/day/year) __________________________________________

2. What grade are you in? Grade ________

3. Are you male (M) or female (F)? ________

4. How long have you attended this school? ________ years

   a) If you have been at this school less than 3 years, what other school(s) did you attend in the past 3 years, and for how long?

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

5. With whom do you live? (Check one)

   father & mother ______
   father only ______
   mother only ______
   someone else ______ (please specify)

6. Complete the following chart for all the people you are living with now, who are out of school or working (see examples; use the back if you need more space):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Approximate income/month</th>
<th>Education Years &amp; Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. (con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Approximate income/month</th>
<th>Education Years &amp; Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Which language do you usually speak at home? ______________________________________
   a) If you speak any other language(s) at home, please list:

   b) If people other than yourself speak any other language(s) at home, please list:

   ______________________________________

8. How much more education do you plan to get? (give type of education -- such as 'finish high school,' 'university,' or whatever -- and length of time you feel your education career will last after this year)

   ______________________________________

9. What do you plan to do when you are done high school? ______________________________________

10. What sort of job or activity do you think you will spend most of your life at? ______________________________________

11. How well would you say you were doing at school right now? (Check one)
   excellent ___ fairly well ___ average ___ poor ___ terrible ___
   a) What are some of the things that you considered in making your choice for question #11 (eg: marks, things said by teachers or parents, sports, behaviour, etc. Discuss these if you want to.) ______________________________________

   ______________________________________
12. How well would your teachers likely say you were doing at school right now? (Check one)

   excellent ____ fairly well ____ average ____ poor ____ terrible ____

a) What are some of the things that you considered in making your choice for question #12. (eg: marks, things said by teachers or parents, sports, behaviour, etc. Discuss these if you want to.)

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

13. Are you satisfied with the way you feel you are doing in school now? (Check one) Yes ____ No ____

a) Why or why not?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
PART B. These are some general questions about school and school-related activity. The questions refer to your feelings about schooling overall, not just this school or this year. Write about what YOU feel is important for each of these questions. Write as much as you feel you have to say (if you need more space, continue on the back of the page).

14. What is school to you?

15. Are schooling and education the same? If not, what is education?

16. For what reasons do we have school?

16a. Are these good reasons for having school? Why or why not?

17. What do you like about school? Why?
18. What do you dislike about school? Why?

19. How useful is school in your life now? In what ways?

19a. What things do you do at school that are important to you? Why?

19b. What things do you do at school that are not important to you? Why not?

20. How helpful do you feel school will seem to you later in life (when you are out of school)? In what ways?

21. How much choice do you feel you have about what goes on in school?
21a. How do you feel about that?

22. Who do you think makes most decisions about school-related matters? (List as many people or positions as you want; put them in order of importance, from most important or powerful as #1, then #2, and continue down to the least important or powerful).

23. If you could make important school decisions, would you change schools or leave them the same as they are now? Describe what you would do if you were going to make changes.

24. Describe what an ideal school would be like for you.
Appendix B

The Student Interview (guide)

I would like to ask you a few questions about schools and education. Many of them may seem similar to items that are on the questionnaire that you (will be doing/have done). This is because I am trying to get more detailed information about topics that are related to each other. I am interested in your feelings of what schooling is all about. Some of the questions will likely sound very difficult. There are no right or wrong answers, just your feelings.

1. First, I'm interested in what sorts of things usually come to mind for you when people talk about school (e.g., Is school homework and teachers, or friends, sports, or what?).

1a. How often do you think or talk about school?
1b. In what sorts of situations, and with whom?
1c. What things about school are usually referred to?

2. Do you ever think about what schools actually do to people or for people?

2a. What do you think schools do?
2b. Are these things good or bad, or neither?

3. Do you feel that schools operate on their own, or are they connected with other parts of society?

3a. Can you explain your answer, or give some reasons?
3b. Do you think this is a good or bad arrangement, or neither?

4. Now I'd like to ask you about what we refer to generally as knowledge. What do you think knowledge is?
4a. Where does knowledge come from?
4b. Who creates knowledge, or where does it exist?
4c. What sort of knowledge do you use at school, and in what way(s)?
4c1. Are you satisfied with this arrangement?

5. How much do you feel that you understand what schooling is all about?
5a. Are you satisfied with this level of understanding? (Explain)
5b. Where do you get most of this information? (friends, parents, experience, teachers?)
5c. Are there any aspects of school you feel you would like to know more about?
5d. Are there any things (in general) that you would like to take, know about or see covered in school, but which are not now in school?

6. (Elaboration of observations or questionnaires)

7. Are there any other things you would like to talk about, or ask me?
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