THE RESEARCH PROCESS : THEORIES AND METHODS

IN AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF INFANT SCHOOLS

FOUR VOLUMES : VOLUME 4

by

MARGARET WENDY BOWEN

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

APRIL 1990

VOLUME FOUR

CONTENTS

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE MATERIAL PROVISION IN, AND THE ROUTINE OR STRUCTURE OF NURSERY AND INFANT CLASSROOMS

INTRODUCTION

While the three previous chapters have been concerned with heads' and teachers' perspectives, this chapter and the following one comprise an attempt to describe and discuss aspects of classroom practice in some detail.

As noted in the Review of the Literature, the initial interest of the researcher in research in infant schools was partly motivated by having read the work of Sharp and Green, and King. It was also stated that, in relation to the former, apart from any theoretical problems, there was dissatisfaction with their account of classroom life. It was difficult to know exactly what 'Mapledene' children were being so 'busy' at. Hence, one of the concerns of this research was to devote time to some detailed account of practice in the classroom. As part of that, this chapter sets out to show the kind of materials and activities available in the classroom, and the degree to which, using this material, was 'ordered' by teachers. The following chapter deals more directly with the issue of teacher control of pupils and their response, but the concept of 'order' implies some control of the organisation of the classroom. However, because of the complexity of the issues, it was deemed advisable to have separate chapters. Although they both deal with similar related concepts, they do so rather differently.

In general much of the discussion centres upon information obtained from Moorland in particular, as the main research school, and from Larkway, supplemented by references to the other schools where possible and where relevant.

This chapter thus discusses the routine or 'order' of the classroom in terms of the materials and activities available, and the use to which these are put by teachers and children. A model based on a version of 'framing' is used in relation to this routine and the 'structuring' by teachers. 'Framing' as originally defined by Bernstein, was used to refer to,

> "the degree of control teacher and pupil possess
> over the selection, organisation and timing of
> the knowledge transmitted and received in the
> pedagogical relationship."

(Bernstein, B., 1975 p189)

The whole question of the usefulness or otherwise of Bernstein's concept of 'framing' has been the subject of argument. However, the idea of who controls the materials and activities, and the manner of use of these, seemed to provide a useful basis for discussion. The model used is set out below. In part it is referred to again in the following chapter. It refers to the 'what', 'when' and 'how' of activities.

THE CLASSROOM 'ROUTINE'

1.	MATERIALS/ACTIVITIES AVAILABLE	WHAT
2.	THE PATTERN OF USING THE MATERIALS/ACTIVITIES. THE ORDER OF EVENTS	WHEN & WHERE
3.	MANNER OF USING MATERIAL/ACTIVITIES	HOW

It must be emphasized that this is a very simplified model, one formed after the data as a peg on which to hang a discussion. No model, simple or complex, can

portray the flow of classroom life and its complexity, nor any description. However, with this proviso, the model is utilised to try and show the routine of infant schools.

The first section of the chapter discusses the materials and activities found in the nursery, and the organisation of the 'timetable' or pattern of events. The question of a work/play distinction is raised. As in Chapter Six, this is done in order to be able to make comparison later with the infant school and so highlight the main features of both.

The second section discusses the same issues as seen in infant classrooms. So within it, the materials and activities which were available are described, and the differences and similarities between the nursery and reception infant classrooms, and between those and classrooms for older children, are pointed out. Similarly, the work/play distinction is also dicussed. The rest of the section is devoted to a discussion of the organisation of the infant classroom in terms of the 'timetable' and the regular pattern of events.

The third section considers the concept of progression, oft the way pupils proceed through activities which are graded according to ability at a particular stage, particularly in relation to the '3Rs'. The monitoring and recording of pupils' progress is also discussed. Finally, there is a discussion of the reading schemes in use at Moorland.

The final section of the chapter contains a brief discussion of language use in the classroom, first that of teachers and then of children. This is a complex question in

itself, but only formed a part of one aspect of the research. Hence the discussion is limited in extent. However, it is an important area, because most communication in the classroom takes place through the medium of language. In respect of teachers, it has both teaching/learning and control aspects, so plays an essential part in the routine.

SECTION ONE: THE NURSERY 'ROUTINE' OR 'STRUCTURE'

The materials and activities available are discussed first, then the 'timetable' of events.

In the case of Moorland nursery an attempt was made at a detailed list of the materials available by the use of an 'inventory'. This consisted of a checklist of the equipment available. This checklist was used on two separate occasions, one morning and one afternoon session.

The categories used were those of the researcher, although in general agreement with the way in which such materials were described by teachers in both the nursery and reception classes. However, categorisation can itself be narrow, ignoring the fact that materials can have more than one use or purpose, both for children and teachers.

Basic 'activity' materials included dry sand, water, clay and pastry, together with a 'Wendy House' and 'dressing up' and other material for use in connection with this, such as prams, dolls, a 'cooker' and an ironing board and pegs. There were 'colouring' materials which included pencils, thick crayons, felt-tip pens and coloured chalks, and paint, together with paper.
'Construction' toys included large building blocks and 'Lego'.

There were also 'stacking' toys (or a series of shapes fitting in sequence) and inset trays. The latter were trays with appropriate spaces to accommodate the insertion of a number of shapes, from geometrical to those of fruits or cars. There were also peg boards, where again different shapes were fitted into holes.

A number of 'floor toys' were available. These included interlocking floor shapes, and floor layouts of a railway track with trains and a 'farm'.

A number of 'games and puzzles' were observed, such as picture Lotto and Fuzzy Felt for making 'pictures', and jigsaws. Coloured straws were observed in use for making shapes or objects, and threading beads.

What was not in evidence at Moorland nursery was such 'mathematical' apparatus as plastic money or counting material, or scales and weighing material. However, counters and a set of plastic cubes called 'Unifix' were seen in the Fairfield 'pre-fives' class.

At Moorland, there were a number of 'wheeled toys' and some larger apparatus. The former included pedal cars, tricycles, and various 'push and pull' toys. The latter included a rocking horse, a climbing frame, a slide, and ropes.

Apart from all these, a number of musical instruments were seen, including shakers, tambourines and triangles, and drums. There was also a record player.

The 'routine' nursery day consisted of 'activity time', when the materials provided were available to the children. The various 'activities' ran concurrently, and this period was

referred to as 'free play'. This 'free play' was interspersed with periodic re-assembly of all the children for events such as 'snack-time', 'story time', or for music, and P.E. in the hall of the main school (when this was free). Mrs Raynor, the nursery teacher, was not wholly satisfied with this arrangement. She stated that if the nursery had been larger she would dispense with some of these 'class activities', and, for example, run 'snack time' along with the other activities so that children could choose when to have their 'snack'. She said that the size of the room dictated to a great extent the organisation of the activities by the children within it. Thus, what happens in a nursery, or indeed the infant classroom, is not wholly a matter of the teacher's choice, or that of the children.

However, given this proviso, it was observed that children in the nursery at Moorland used the various materials with apparent freedom during 'free play'. Neither the nursery teacher nor the assistant directed the children as to what they should do, nor when, where or how they should do it, for the most part. One exception was that the wheeled toys and the larger apparatus were mostly outside, so were used there. Also, these could not accommodate all the children at once, so a little judicious 'sorting-out' was observed if the children argued - or fought - over the use of this material. However, in general the principle of minimal direction seemed evident. Observation notes give some idea of the general pattern. For example, it was recorded that

"The children came in in ones and twos. Some
made for the climbing frame, others got out

various toys e.g. a plastic house shaped like a
mushroom, or 'Lego' and started to play with
these. One or two children stood looking round,
watching what others were doing. Some children
put on aprons, helped by the teacher and
assistant. Four or five of these started to
play in the water, filling containers with water
and emptying them out. The other half dozen
or so with aprons went to the easels on which
had been placed by the assistant sheets of paper.
The teacher had mixed different colours and put
them in pots - two or three to each easel. The
children began to paint. Other children played
with the sand. One child sorted plastic
animal shapes and started saying the names of
each to himself, horse, dog ...'. Outside
four children rode tricycles round a concrete
area. Another sat on the slide, while two
more pedalled small cars.
... Children change ... activities frequently ...
They appear to have complete free choice over
what they want to do and when they do it."
                    (Observation notes)

Within this 'free activity' the children were occasionally

shown how to do something. For example, the nursery assistant

would do a particular 'art and craft' activity, perhaps making

something, with a small group of children who had come up to

her and asked her to do this. Within this limited context the

assistant would show and tell the children what they had to

do, and how to do it, as a practical helping activity.

There were other occasions during 'free activity' when there

was some direction as to 'how' to do something. Usually this

involved behaviour, and was often a request <u>not</u> to do

something, such as the comment to two boys observed to be

throwing sand at each other while playing in the sand tray.

        Mrs Raynor: "Don't throw sand, boys. You're being
                    silly."

This was said in a slightly raised voice. The boys looked at

her and stopped what they had been doing.

        There was more teacher direction of activities on the

occasions when the whole class was called together for certain

activities.   One of these was the music session.   It was

recorded on one of these occasions that

> The class is divided up into groups, who are
> assigned different musical instruments, such as a
> large drum and small drums, tambourines, 'jingle
> bells', triangles, clappers and shakers.   The
> groups are arranged in a semi-circle around the
> teacher.   Mrs Raynor tells them that they 'must
> watch' her, because she will tell them 'which
> groups to play when'.   She also says 'Don't play
> anything until I tell you to'.   Some children
> start shaking instruments.   Mrs. Raynor says
> sharply
>   'Oh, I did tell you not to play with them'.
> She then explains to the children how the instru-
> ments are to be played, showing them by examples.
> For example, she said to the 'jingle bells'
> group,
>   'Show me how you shake them'.
> She told the tambourines group how to hold them,
> and, turning to the group holding clappers said.
>   'Let's call these ... What do we call these? ...
> What do you call them ..castanets?'
> Assistant: 'Clappers'.
> It seems a little bit of vocabulary teaching as
> an extra.
> The 'shakers' group are also told:
> 'These are shakers and you shake them'.
> This seems fairly obvious, but Mrs Raynor is
> clearly emphasizing points."
>
>   (Observation Notes)

Mrs Raynor said later that these group sessions were used to

teach things, but she also added that if there had been more

space in the nursery then musical instruments would have been

laid out for the children to use as and when they wished,

instead of being a whole group activity at a particular time

always.

    'Snack time' was also an occasion for 'teaching'.   One

example of this activity shows what was being taught.   On this

particular occasion the children had all been across to the

main hall of the school to watch a T.V. programme.   When they

returned to the nursery Mrs Raynor told them that they could go outside, although some chose to stay inside. While most were outside Mrs Raynor and the assistant put out beakers for milk, and apples. While the assistant poured out the milk, one of the children put out the chairs, although not told to do so. Other children also helped. Mrs Raynor swept up some sand from the floor meanwhile, and cleared away puzzles. She then went outside and called to the children outside to "Come in now". They came in and sat down, or at least some did; the rest were reminded by Mrs Raynor saying "Sit down". She then called up the <u>boys</u> first to have their milk, then the <u>girls</u> (this seemed odd - she said it was to get them settled down, later). After milk each child was given half an apple. (On other occasions this could be a marmite sandwich, or biscuits.) Each child was reminded to say "Thank you" as this was done. Mrs Raynor on this occasion used the researcher's presence to emphasize the point, by asking her.

"Did you hear them say 'Thank you'?."

Just after this a little boy went up for some more apple (something allowed if there was some left over). He said "Thank you", and Mrs Raynor said to him "Thank <u>you</u>", again making the moral obvious.

On other occasions, 'Snack time' was announced by the teacher looking round the room and drawing the attention of the children by raising her voice. They were told to put away what they were doing and come and sit down on the chairs already set out by the two staff and 'helpers'. The same procedure of giving out the milk and food followed. In

892

'Snack time' children were thus being taught to listen to the teacher, and that at certain times they must stop their chosen activity and do as they were told by her. They were also being tought the 'social graces', or skills, including 'good manners'. Thus, children were being prepared socially for later school experience. As noted when discussing teachers' perspect ives,. Mrs Raynor thought that teaching 'social skills' was important.

'Story time' was also an activity involving the whole group where the children were observed being told to "sit down" and "listen to me now". They were admonished for not "settling down", and for "talking while I'm talking", or for "being silly". These were 'school skills' quite apart from the language aspect or imaginative development - of the story itself.

Thus the nursery at Moorland apart from the range of activities available for 'free choice' 'play', also had more direct teaching relating to both 'work' in such things as music, and social behaviour. What went on in the nursery was, therefore, directly related to preparation for the infant school proper. As noted in Chapter Six, Mrs Raynor considered it to be part of her task to help children develop 'skills', apart from social ones. These skills were said to include, as noted,

> "manipulative and co-ordinative skills, fine and
> gross motor skills, sorting and counting, and
> listening skills."
>
> (Mrs Raynor, Moorland)

However, she considered that the main way in which most of these skills were to be learnt was through "play", or "free

activity" with a variety of materials.

Cleave et al. argued that

"the nursery is traditionally oriented towards play"

while in the infant school a distinction was made between 'work' and 'play' (Cleave et al., 1982, p.53). However, as indicated in the previous chapter Mrs Hardy, the 'pre-fives' teacher at Fourfield did not accept that 'play' was her major concern. She considered that children in the 'pre-fives' class there come to school ready to start reading, or some simple number work. Accordingly, it was not surprising to observe that in this class activities were going on which Mrs Raynor at Moorland would have classified as '3R's work'. It was recorded, for example, that

> "... Two children take a reading book and start to
> read. A third table has ... sum cards on it, such
> as 00 + 00 =? and 4 + 1 = ? Two children go and sit
> at this table and begin to do sums in a book."

Children were also seen "tracing words", and "copying words", and reading words on 'flash cards'.

At the same time activities which Mrs Raynor would have regarded as 'play' were also seen. For example it was noted that

> "The children disperse to various tables. On one
> are laid out construction games such as Lego and
> plastic bricks ...

Mrs Hardy did concede that 'play' served a particular purpose.

This was to

> "develop manual skills and co-ordination - play
> is constructive play, not just doing anything.

> (Notes, Fairfield)

Mrs Raynor took a rather broader view of 'play', considering that children were learning necessary social skills such as

sharing and taking turns, as well as listening to the teacher, and also that most activities provided children with opportunities for learning 'work-related' skills. Therefore, any distinction between 'work' and 'play' clearly depends on how these terms are defined, and by whom. Mrs Raynor obviously believed that children who appeared to be involved in 'just play' to 'non-professionals', were actually doing 'work', in the sense that they were learning what might be termed 'pre-academic' skills and were not just amusing themselves. Moreover, Moorland had a different catchment area from Fairfield. In the main school, as noted elsewhere, there was a belief that Moorland children had 'special needs', particularly the learning of 'social skills'. Mrs Raynor, although she did not think this her only task, as stated, did speak of the children as being "like little wild animals", a description easy to understand in view of the observed behaviour of some of the children. Therefore, she did not see them as 'ready' for the kind of 'formal' activities that Mrs Hardy considered her children capable of. These two contrasting views were both based on the teachers' experience, and there is no way to judge which view of 'nursery age' children was more accurate.

It is important to note that, whatever the teacher's view of the activities available and children's use of these, children within the nursery at Moorland, as noted in Chapter Six, were never heard to distinguish between 'work' and 'play'. In fact, neither word was mentioned by the children there in the researcher's hearing. Not enough time was spent

in the 'pre-fives' class at Fairfield to comment from observation. However, the researcher suspects, from some observations in reception classes in infant schools, that where teachers seem to distinguish between activities in terms of a higher priority being given to children doing some, then children come to follow this, whether or not the actual terms 'work' or 'play' are used.

One aspect of the 'routine' of nursery life was that at both Moorland and Fairfield teachers prepared the context within which children 'learnt', however they defined the actual activities of the children. It was they who made available to the children the various materials, apart from the larger apparatus which was always out at Moorland. Some of the smaller materials differed from day to day, although all were available over time, if they wanted to encourage particular activities for a particular purpose. The teachers set out the materials before the children came in.

Teachers also controlled the overall timing of events such as the start or finish of activities, signalling when 'free choice' gave way to other activities. For example, the meaning 'timetable' at Moorland, where there were two separate sessions, was as follows. Between 8.45 and 9am the teacher and her assistant set out the activities. The children arrived between 8.50 and 9am, and hung up their coats, came into the nursery, and dispersed to activities. Thereafter the timing was:

> 9am to 11.15 - Activity time. 'Free Play'
> 11.15 to 11.30 - 'Clearing-up Time' (Signalled by Mrs Raynor)

11.30 to 11.50 - 'Snack time'
            11.50 to end of session -'Story' or 'Music' time.

Variations occurred on occasions, such as watching a T.V.
programme or sometimes doing P.E., both in the main school
hall.

        Similarly at Fairfield, although activities ran
concurrently, as at Moorland, the teacher told the children
when to 'clear up', or start 'Playtime, or come to a group
activity such as 'Story time'.

        Thus within 'free choice' of activities by the children
in the nursery groups, there was an underlying direction or
overall control. However, more certainly in the case of
Moorland nursery, this control was exercised gently and
relatively unobtrusively. Indeed, as observed elsewhere,
Moorland nursery seemed to display more features that might be
termed 'progressive' than in some infant classrooms seen.

        This concludes the discussion of nursery 'routine'. The
section has indicated the materials available and what the
children did. It has been shown that opinions varied as to
the purpose of 'pre-school' activity as between Moorland
nursery and the 'pre-fives' class at Fairfield, with some
differences in particular on the idea of 'play' as the
principal means by which children learnt necessary 'skills',
as well as what these 'skills' should be.
The next section discusses the 'routine' of the infant school
in similar terms to those used for the nursery, contrasting it
to the latter where relevant.

SECTION TWO: THE INFANT 'ROUTINE'

As with the nursery, this section begins with a discussion of
the materials and activities available in the infant
classrooms seen, noting the similarities and differences in
these respects as between the 'infant' and 'pre-school'
settings.   The 'work-play' distinction is also discussed, and
also the definition of 'play'.

The organisation or 'timetable' within which these
materials and activities were used is then discussed, again
noting similarities and differences both between pre-school
and reception classes, and between those containing older
children.   Between-school similarities and differences are
also noted.   Within this 'organizational' part of the section,
other features noted in the introduction to the chapter are
discussed.

The infant classrooms observed contained some materials
and activities which were similar to those found in the
nursery and 'pre-fives' class, but there were also
differences.   In general, the findings in this respect were
similar to those of King, who found that

> "classrooms for older children contained fewer
> toys and games than those for younger ones..."

(King, 1978, p.31)

This was more true of Larkway than Moorland.   At Larkway the
top infants' teacher considered that children in the reception
classes could have more choice in terms of activities with
"games or toys", but that this should be reduced as children
moved up the school, where organising one's 'work' became the
important choice for children.   At Moorland, there was a

898

belief in the therapeutic value of 'play' with toys and games, so these tended to be still in evidence in classrooms for older children there.

All the reception classes at Moorland and Larkway had, like the nursery, sand, water and a Wendy House or 'home-corner'. These items were also found in the other two classrooms at Moorland, which contained older 'middle' and 'top' infants, as against the two 'reception' which contained also younger 'middle' infants. However, at Larkway in the top infants' class which was observed there were no sand or water trays in evidence, although there was a 'home-corner' which could be used for 'dressing-up'.

In two other schools visited Wendy Houses were seen in classes containing lower age groups but not in 'top infant' classes. Fairfield had 'family-grouped' classes, with children from 5 to 7 years old, and in these sand, water and a Wendy House were also seen in use.

'Colouring' materials like those in the nursery, such as pencils and crayons were available in all infant classrooms seen, but there were also present more painting materials and paper, and a wider range of 'art and craft' materials in general, such as various items of 'junk' collected from ordinary household objects and other sources, and used for making models and collages, and clay, also used for modelling.

In the reception classes at Moorland there were seen 'construction toys' similar to those found in the nursery there, such as wooden building bricks and blocks, and Lego.

The Lego and building blocks were also found in the

other two classes at Moorland. At Larkway the top infants'
class only had Lego in evidence.

'Floor toys' such as railway layouts were less visible
in infant classrooms, but there were some 'games and puzzles'
similar to those found in the 'pre-school' classes. In the
reception classes at Moorland, for example, there were
jigsaws, inset trays and peg boards. There were other games
also used for sorting and matching activities. However, there
were other 'games' which were more directly related, in the
view of the teachers, to the acquisition of 'literacy' and
'numeracy' skill development. These included picture and word
matching games, and others aimed at encouraging 'visual
discrimination' between, for example, different shapes and
colours. There were also 'matching' games which related to
the pictures of 'objects' and the appropriate number to be
attached to these. In general teachers appeared to attach a
higher value to the use of these 'games' than others less
related to 'basic skills', though not disparaging those with
other 'educational' attributes.

In the reception classes at Moorland, which, as noted,
also contained 'middle infants', there was a 'shop' with
plastic money, weighing scales, objects to weigh, counters and
plastic cubes, also used for 'counting'. As noted, these
items were not seen in Moorland nursery.

In the other classes at Moorland these materials were
also present, but in the top infants class at Larkway there
was only a limited supply of ' Unifix' blocks and other
counting apparatus. Children in this class were 'discouraged'

from using this material when doing 'number'. It was thought that they should no longer need it.

'Wheeled toys' were a type of equipment which was much less in evidence in the reception classes at Moorland than in the nursery there. There was a 'rocker' and see-saw in Mrs Knowles' class, however. A truck and wheelbarrow was seen in a reception class at Larkway., None of this kind of material was seen in use at Briarfield or Fairfield.

However, this lack of certain kinds of 'physical' material did not of itself mean less activity. While in Moorland nursery children were observed climbing and sliding on the various apparatus designed for that purpose, there was in fact more diversity in terms of physical activity, and a greater range, for children in the infant school. At Moorland and Larkway, and at Fairfield, and in other schools, children in both reception and top infants' classes were seen as

> "playing with bean bags, throwing, catching,
> balancing them; throwing, catching and kicking
> balls; using hoops to jump in and out of and
> skipping; climbing wall bars, swinging from and
> climbing ropes; using forms to jump on and off,
> and sliding down; using different parts of the
> body to move around on apparatus."
> (Observation Notes.   Category:
> Types of P.E. Activity)

However, in the infant schools as distinct from the nursery this kind of activity was restricted to a specific time, rather than being freely available, something Cleave also found (Cleave et al., 1982).

Musical instruments were present in infant schools just as in the nursery, and were basically similar, although recorders were available for top infants. Music, like P.E.,

tended to have a specific time, sometimes related to radio/T.V. programmes. At Moorland this was a 'hall' activity, taken by a teacher with special responsibility.

In terms of individual provision of materials, children in infant classrooms generally had a special box for keeping such things as their own writing, drawing and number books, a reading primer, and pencils and crayons. These were usually stored in trays.

One item which was not present at all in the nursery situation was work-card material. At Moorland children did use work cards on occasions, but these were given to children by their teachers as they saw fit. At Briarfield, Fairfield and Larkway, however, such cards were more in evidence. In the classes in these schools, children worked through graded schemes at their own pace.

So far, it has been shown that there were both similarities and differences in the materials available in infant and nursery classrooms, and between infant schools, and within schools.

However, there were changes in the nature of the tasks or activities as between pre-school and infant children, something Cleave et al. also found. They argued that, while in a nursery there was an emphasis on 'gross motor activities', those which "promote co-ordination of large muscles", such as climbing, these were confined to periods called P.E. (Cleave et al., 1982). As noted, this was found in the infant schools seen.

In the reception classes, Cleave et al. argued, what

they called 'manipulative skills' such as

"Threading, stacking, screwing or hammering,
        almost disappear."   (p.62)

Certainly in the reception classes seen there was less evidence of these particular tasks. On the other hand, as Cleave et al. also argued, children in infant classrooms have, in fact, to learn more complex 'manipulative skills' than in the nursery/pre-school classes. These include such things as the use of scissors and paste, as well as paint, in the making of models and collages. These demand greater precision. Thus it can be argued that the range and difficulty of such tasks increases the 'skills' demand in the reception classes in particular, when compared to the nursery. In general, the activities in 'art and craft' and 'physical activity' cover a wider range in the infant school.

A distinct change was found in the reception classes, in comparison to the nursery, at Moorland, in relation to what is termed the '3R's'. Cleave et al. also found that the 'balance of the curriculum' altered in reception classes, which, according to them,

        "... swing away from these (manipulative)
        activities to those of a verbal and symbolic
        kind ... more colloquially the 3R's."
                        (Cleave et al., 1982, p.62)

The increase in 'games' aimed at developing 'literacy' and 'numeracy' skills has been noted. It was also recorded in the chapter on 'Teachers' Educational Perspectives' that both the nursery and the reception teachers at Moorland believed that in the latter classes there was more emphasis on the 3R's. Fairfield pre-fives' class has been shown to differ from

Moorland nursery in this respect.

This emphasis on the 3R's was observed in all the infant schools, and not only in reception classes. As noted in Chapter Six, it was one aspect of teachers' perspectives where there was a consensus. It was also shown there that parents would put pressure for a school to 'get down to basics', even where, as at Larkway, teachers themselves viewed the curriculum in much broader terms, as indeed most teachers in other schools did.

On different occasions, at Moorland, a form of 'content analysis' was carried out to record the type of activity going on in reception classes. These were found to include many which would be classed as '3R's', such as

- " learning letters, recognition of sounds/word building
- tracing, copying, writing letters, words, sentences,
- writing 'news' - stories,
- weighing, shopping, counting money, measuring - Doing sums, i.e. addition, subtraction."

(Observation Notes. Category:
Types of Activity)

Similar activities were recorded in reception classes at Briarfield and Larkway, as well as in the pre-fives class at Fairfield. Apart from the tracing of letters, or numbers, they were also seen in other infant classes.

It can be argued that as children move from the pre-school to the reception classes in infant school, and from there to 'top infant' classes, a range of 'choices' in terms of materials and activities is closed off, to be replaced by others. These 'alternatives', although they may involve the acquisition of more complex skills, tend to be more 'formal'

and more teacher directed. Thus, in infant classrooms, life for the children becomes more 'serious'.

As noted previously, Cleave et al. spoke of a different orientation in infant schools from that found in nurseries. They considered that in the former the 'work-play' distinction was found. It was also recorded that in the case of Fairfield pre-fives class, the teacher was not wholly 'oriented' towards 'play'. However, in the infant school proper at Moorland, in contrast to the nursery, this distinction *appeared to exist*. Teachers classified verbally some activities as 'work'. Children also distinguished between "doing work" or "playing", and "work" and "choosing". In the reception classes at Moorland, this distinction was recorded in conversations between teachers and children, and with the researcher and children. The following example, also used in Chapter Six, shows the use of these terms.

> Teacher: "Susan, have you done your work?"
> Susan (to the researcher): "I've finished all my work now."
> Researcher: "What work have you done?"
> Susan: "Writin' an sums."
> Researcher: "So what are you going to do now?"
> Susan: "Choosin', 'cos we've finished our work."
> To Teacher: "I've finished my work, Mrs ---, can I play with the Lego?"

Children stated to the researcher that 'choosing' was doing "anything you like". This included "playing" with Lego, or bricks, or in the sand, or "playing" with plasticine, or in the Wendy House. Children never refused to 'play', but did sometimes try to refuse 'work', though this was reprimanded by

the teachers. On one occasion in Mrs Knowles' class at Moorland, a boy shouted at the teacher, saying that he did not want to do his sums and wasn't "going to do them". In response Mrs Knowles told him very firmly indeed that.

> "We all have to do things we don't want to, and
> you've got to do your work every day."

She remarked to the researcher after this directive that,

> "They know they've got to get work done."

Children did apparently know this. However, as was observed at Moorland, compliance with the requirement was not automatic, at least in the short term. In the end, though, most children were obliged to conform to it, by one means or another. It remained generally true that, as King commented, in the infant school,

> "Play may be chosen, work cannot be refused.
> (King, 1978, [p.207)

The 'work'-'play' distinction, and the priority given to the former, by teachers, and hence by children, was made more evident in the rewards or sanctions attached to doing or not doing 'work'. For example, 'play' was presented as a reward for finishing 'work'. However, this last had to be 'satisfactory' for the teacher, as the following comment shows. The teacher of Class 3 at Moorland was heard to say,

> "Those who have done nice work can do choosing."

Evidence had to be provided that the 'work' had been finished first, and if this condition was not met then 'play' could be withheld. For example, on one occasion at Larkway, some boys were 'playing' with Lego. The teacher was not entirely happy about this. She came up to them and asked.

> "How many cards have you done? Have you

finished _all_ your work?

The children all replied "Yes". Nevertheless the teacher was still not satisfied with them 'playing' at that time, and, after a pause, said

> "Well, I'd rather you _made_ something ... I'll
> come over in a minute and talk to you and ask
> you about it."

'Choosing' was also presented on occasions as a 'filler' activity between 'work' activities, as when the Class One teacher at Moorland said to a child,

> "You can choose for the time being, until it's
> time to do your work."

Similar comments to all of the above were heard in other classes at Moorland and at Larkway, as well as in other schools.

Whatever teachers said about the importance of 'play', and, as noted, not all teachers laid the same stress upon this, it was evident that the 'work'/'play' distinction existed for them and was picked up by the children.

Even though 'play' was seen either as a means of learning, or as having a "therapeutic" value, or both, the actual meaning of 'play' in terms of what was counted as 'legitimate', was defined by the teachers. As King also observed, the children's definitions did not prevail (King, 1978). For example it was recorded that the teacher of Class 2 at Moorland left the classroom briefly on the occasion observed in order to find a reading book from the cupboard outside the classroom door. When she came back two children were under a table 'playing', according to them. The teacher demanded sharply,

> "_Who_ is being silly?"

The children - boys again - did not reply to this but instead said that they were "playing dogs". The teacher was having none of this 'play', and said emphatically,

> "We are <u>not</u> playing dogs, I'm afraid. Go
> and find something to <u>do</u>!"

At Larkway also, this time in the 'top infants' class, the teacher similarly rejected a definition of 'playing' by some children. In this instance, five children were seen to be sitting on the carpet occupying themselves happily with some 'Matchbox' model cars. The teacher looked round and saw what they were doing, because they were getting rather noisy in their 'game'. The teacher directed her comment to one boy, and said

> "<u>No</u> thank you, Matthew, <u>not</u> on the carpet."

She remarked to the researcher <u>not</u> quietly, that,

> "They brought these toys from home on Friday.
> They should have gone home then. I don't really
> allow that sort of thing."

> (Notes, Class Five, Larkway)

'Play' could have the same content but, according to context, could be defined as a legitimate or unacceptable activity. For example on another occasion in the top infants' class at Larkway some children were observed to be making, and eventually throwing, paper aeroplanes. The teacher stopped this, asking

> "What are you boys doing? We <u>finished</u> those
> last week."

She then explained to the researcher that during the previous week the class had been doing a project on 'flight'. As part of this, the children had made model aeroplanes with paper or card in various designs, and had then tested how far they would fly. Since the project was ended, the boys should no

longer have been 'playing' with aeroplanes.

Thus, in various ways, it was teachers who decided what counted as 'play' in the infant classroom, quite apart from any work/play distinction. The term thus appeared to cover a narrower range of activities than in the 'pre-school' classes.

It has been shown so far in this section that there were some differences in the materials/activities provision as between pre-school and infant classrooms. It has also been shown that there were differences in such provision between classes for younger and older children, although such differences were much less prominent at Moorland than at Larkway. In general, it has been indicated that more complex skills were required of 'infant' children than those of 'nursery' age, with greater emphasis on particular 'learning skills' related to literacy and numeracy, with 'games' more designed for these purposes.

It has also been shown that, while in nursery groups, at any rate at Moorland, children did not recognise the work-play contrast, this was not the case in infant classrooms. It has also been shown that 'play' itself was teacher, not child, defined in terms of legitimacy.

In the rest of the section, the actual 'organisation' of the materials and activities, in terms of their use in practice by children is considered. This differed considerably between schools, and sometimes within them, but one feature was common; activities took place within an 'ordered' environment. There is nothing unusual in this particular feature. Hammersley, for example, argued that
"A concern for order ... is one feature of all

social action."

(Hammersley, 1977, p87)

Jackson also considered that there was an order, which tended to become routinised, even in informal classrooms (Jackson, 1968).

However, if 'order' was normal, it was clear that, unlike some 'progressive' rhetoric, or attacks on 'progressivism' by its critics, it was the teachers who controlled the 'structure' or context of learning, in the infant classroom as in the nursery, not least by controlling the availability of materials, in terms of what was available and when and how it was used.

Eggleston argued that

"in theory, and even to some extent in practice most of the activities of the individual classroom are a consequence of the decisions of the individual teacher."

(Eggleston, 1979 p.1)

King also considered this to be the case (King, 1978). However, Bernstein argued that while the teacher controlled certain aspects, that is, while he or she arranged the context within which children 'explored', within this context the child had wide powers. In Bernstein's view, the child could choose or select from what was made available, and also decide how he might structure activities, and the time-scale in which this 'choice' and 'structure' took place. These were what Bernstein termed features of "The Invisible Pedagogy" (Bernstein, 1975, p116). King, though, from his study of infant schools, argued that the evidence showed that teachers were in control. For example, they decided when 'work' was completed, not the children. Also, while sometimes children

could choose, within limits, when to do activities, they could not necessarily choose the content of these, the 'what' to do (King, 1978).

Research by Hartley into primary school practice also indicated that amongst the infant teachers included none of them revealed any aspects of an 'invisible' pedagogy. Instead, a direct 'didactic' style of teaching was evident. Control, in fact, was very 'visible'(Hartley, 1986, p263).

The present research also found the prevalence of 'structuring' of activities by teachers, and thus of control in a very direct way, despite differences between or within schools.

It was noted in Chapter Six, as well as in Chapter Four, that the head of Moorland and the teachers there, believed in the importance of 'structure'. The reception teachers at Moorland, as shown elsewhere, considered that one of the main differences between their classrooms and the nursery was that in the former there was more structuring of activities, that is, there was more control over what, when and how activities where done. However, as noted in the first section of this chapter, the idea of structure was also present in the nursery.

The head of Larkway, which was in many respect a differently organised school than Moorland, believed, like the head of the latter, in the importance of 'structure', and also that providing this was part of the teacher's task.

However, although 'structure' or 'order' was thus a common feature in the schools seen, the actual pattern of

daily activities, the 'time-table' of events aspect, varied

considerably between and sometimes within schools. As noted

in Chapter Four, the position and views of head teachers had

an effect on such organisation.

As noted when discussing teachers' 'educational

perspectives', some schools operated with versions of 'the

integrated day' while others, including Moorland, did not.

As also shown in that chapter, the most popular version of

'the integrated day', where one was in use, was that where a

range of activities were present at the same time, with few

formal breaks. This corresponded broadly with the definition

given by Dearden (Dearden, 1971). Some teachers, as also

recorded, mentioned the idea of some integration of different

areas of the curriculum, such as maths and art, for example,

At Moorland, there were general views held by teachers,

including the head, that the children there, because of their

'home backgrounds', needed stability. An orderly routine was

seen as helping to give children this. There was also

scepticism about 'free choice'. It was considered, again

because of their background, that Moorland children could not

cope with this. Such views affected the provision of the

particular routine or 'structure' within the classrooms.

There was a considerable difference between the nursery

'routine' and that found in the reception/middle classrooms in

the main school at Moorland. The 'time-table' of events

indicates the main differences. The example is that of Class

2 at Moorlands, but Class 1 was similar.

    8.50 - 9.10. Teacher enters classroom, lays out games,
                  sorts out materials. As the children come
                  in, they "choose activity/game".

9.10 - 9.15.	Teacher calls register. Children told to "Sit down."	
9.15 - 9.30.	Short Assembly.	
9.30 - 9.45 (approx)	1) 'ORAL WORK' -discussion of topic chosen by teacher	
9.45 (approx)	2) After 'oral work' - sitting on the mat, children told what activity to do. This instruction to individuals, group - sometimes class.	
9.45 - 10.25	'3Rs' 'work',/'choosing' - Individual/group/ class.	
10.25 - 10.30.	'Clearing-up'	
10.30 - 10.45.	BREAK	
10.45 - 11.00	More 'oral work' for CLASS.	
11.00 - 11.55	'3Rs' work/choosing/ (as above)	
11.55 - 12.00	'Clearing-up'.	
12noon- 1.15	DINNER TIME	
1.15 - 1.30	'ORAL WORK' CLASS	
1.30 - 2.35	Art/Craft - free choice/topic	
2.35 - 2.45	'Clearing-up'	
2.45 - 3.00	BREAK TIME	
3.00 - 3.15	STORY TIME - HOME	

This was the typical daily pattern. It does not indicate physical education and music activities, because, as noted, these were assigned to specific periods fitted in during the week. Also, as noted, they took place in the hall rather than the classroom.

The 'daily' pattern shows several things. Not least, the infant day is compulsory, as indicated by the calling of the register. It is also much longer than in the nursery. It is also evident from this timetable that, while in the pre-school setting the children could disperse immediately to

a range of activities, and this 'free play' lasted most of the time, in the 'infant' classrooms access to certain activities was restricted to particular periods. 'Free play', in particular, took place in 'Choosing-Time'. This was usually first thing in the morning, then otherwise at the teacher's discretion. This was the general pattern in other classes. For example, an observation of the early period in Class 3 recorded that,

> "On three tables various materials/activities
> are laid out, e.g. Lego, plasticine, painting
> materials, wooden bricks. Children come into
> the classroom. Some chat to the teacher.
> Others collect pieces of paper, crayons/pencils,
> go to a table and start drawing. Others
> disperse to Lego and other activities.
>
> (Notes, Class 3, Moorland)

After this 'choosing-time', the day was divided into periods set aside for different activities. A feature of this daily pattern was that 3R's work was set for the morning, though 'choosing' was set alongside it, with art and craft and less formal activities taking place in the afternoon. This was the pattern also in Class 1. In the two other classrooms at Moorland there was a similar division between morning and afternoon activities, although not a rigid one, as the teachers concerned pointed out. They said that reading, writing and number work could continue through into the afternoon if they were not completed by the children in the morning, and also art and craft was occasionally done in the morning.

The pattern of '3Rs' in the morning and art and craft in the afternoon was one which King observed in the schools he visited. He stated that,

> " In the morning most of the 'work' was done
> ... also called head-work, the 3R's, basics,

academic things, and writing, number and
reading. The afternoon was the main time for
'play' or handwork, freer activities, games,
messy things, projects or choosing time. Only
one teacher reported doing 'work' consistently
in the afternoons and not in the mornings."

(King, 1978, p21)

Cleave et al. found a similar division. They stated that

"Time is divided up into periods of
prescribed blocks of time for numeracy,
literacy and creativity, 3R's in the
morning and messier activities in the
afternoon."

(Cleave et al., 1982, p55)

They also found that 'free choice' was restricted to specific

times, and stated that in the infant schools they observed,

"the average infants class spent over 80% of
their time in no choice situations." (p.55)

These latter were those where the class was brought together

for a specific purpose such as 'news', or 'story time', or

when 'work' tasks were being organised and assigned.

Although the 3R's work at Moorland was shown as set

along with 'choosing-time', it was actually marked off quite

clearly from it in the teachers' directions, and this 'work'

took priority.   It usually involved some 'writing' and

'number' work each day, though, as the class teacher told the

researcher, the latter could "often be practical", and did not

always involve "recording on paper".

What particular 3R's 'work' was to be done, and when,

and how, was controlled by the teachers. This 'work' could be

assigned to an individual, part or the whole of a group, or to

groups, or to the whole class.

The Class 2 'timetable' shows periods set aside for

'oral work'. This was a formal activity for the whole class.

It was particularly stressed at Moorland because of the belief

there, recorded elsewhere, that the children had "poor language development". Some examples of this 'oral work' are discussed in the last section of this chapter.

There were numerous examples recorded of teachers assigning 3Rs' tasks, and directing activities, only a brief selection of which can be given. As noted, tasks were assigned variously.

The first examples are taken from observations in Class 1. In the first instance, direction is being given to an individual. The teacher said,

> "I want you to come here and do some sorting
> now, Tony."

The next instruction was given to a group, for a particular reason. The teacher stated,

> "Sunflowers, I want you to go to that table."
> (pointing to it) "I'm going to do some new
> work with you."

On another occasion, this time after an 'oral work' session, different groups were told to do particular activities. Mrs Dale said to the class,

> "In your books some of you are going to do some
> writing and a picture. Remember that the
> picture is as important as the writing."

She then added,

> "Oaks, you get pencils" (to do picture/story)
> ... "I think we'll have Beeches ... and I
> want you as well Simon, to come and do
> some sorting."

In the next example the whole class was told what to do. The teacher on this occasion had just been doing some number recognition work with the class, using 'flash cards'. She then directed,

"I want you to get out your writing books

> and pencils now."

She then drew a pattern on the blackboard of some vertical lines followed by a circle, then horizontal lines and more circles. She gave very precise directions as to where the children were to start in their books, and also <u>how</u> to draw the pattern, telling them,

"You start here" (pointing to the first pattern)

(Notes, Class 1, Moorland)

In relation to the 'how' of activities, there was a difference between Moorland nursery and the infant classrooms. In the nursery Mrs Raynor or her assistant sometimes <u>showed</u> or indicated to individuals how to do something, as in the following example. Here, Mrs Raynor asked a small group of children who had chosen an activity,

"Could we have a go at this puzzle? It's the railway station ... If we get a few bits to start with, and this one goes there like this, doesn't it?"

(Notes, Nursery, Moorland)

She was helping the children, who were rather 'stuck'. On other occasions she showed children how to paint models, or make sweets. The point was that children were only shown <u>how</u> to do something if they requested help, or had specifically chosen to be shown how to make something. In contrast, in the infant classrooms, children were told how to do something whether they wanted help or not. This indicates the greater degree of formal control in the infant classroom. Also, teachers there are more concerned with children knowing how to do things 'properly'. The directions can be very detailed, as in the following example from Class 1. Here, the whole class again was being directed to an activity. Mrs Dale told the

class to,

"Put down your pencils and look at the board.
Sit properly, you cannot write properly if
you're not sitting properly. Now this is
how we write number two, dot on the spot,
hook, diagonal line ..."

(Class 1, Moorland)

Similarly, in Class 2, during copywriting, or copying letters
from the blackboard, the class was shown how to form the
letters, and reminded of this, as in the following example.
The teacher asked,

"What do we do first, when we do that letter
m? What do we do, first a line straight
down ...."

(Class 2, Moorland)

This also happened in the other classes, as far as copywriting
was concerned. However, directions as to how could be less
precise in other areas. For example in Class 3 the class was
being asked to write a story. Mrs Martin said to the class,

"Think what you could write about. This is
the title of the story ... You could start
your story like this, 'Once upon a time John
was running a race. He fell over and ..."

(Notes, Class 3, Moorland)

Such 'suggestions' can, however, exert considerable influence.
Many of the children's stories started off like this.

Apart from examples of children being told how to do
things, there were others showing the general direction of
activities and the division of children during 3R's work. In
Class 2, for example, on one particular occasion the class had
previously been in the hall watching a television programme
called "My World". On returning to the classroom there had
been a short discussion of the programme. The teacher, Mrs
Knowles, then told the children what she wanted them to do

next.   She said,

> "You can go quietly and get on with what you
> were doing. I'll have <u>some</u> of you to get on
> with some <u>work.</u> Peter, <u>you</u> go and copy that
> card <u>there.</u> You sit on <u>that</u> table."

On another occasion, the class had been told to go and sit

down after coming in from break. Books were given out. Mrs

Knowles then called out a group of children to come to another

table. She ordered,

> "Michael, Jason, you come and sit here, Tracy
> Tina ..."

She then said to them, pointing to a writing book,

> "We are going to draw a picture at the top of
> the page. <u>Listen</u> ... Draw me a picture of
> you going to the seaside."

<div align="right">(Notes, Class 2, Moorland)</div>

As noted, 'work' was marked off from other activities.   For

example, Mrs Martin in Class 3 was heard to say on several

occasions,

> "We are going to do our work <u>now</u>."

Another comment also heard, indicating a change, was,

> "Now we are all going to sit down and do our
> writing."

Similar comments were head in the other classes.

This 'work' was clearly separated from 'choosing', as

the following example shows.   It is again from Class 3, and

also shows the direction of groups.   In this instance Mrs

Martin was heard to say,

> "The Red group, and Donna and Susan from the
> Blue group, you can write a story. The rest
> of the Blue group, boys <u>and</u> girls, I want you
> to do a picture and story.
> It's <u>not</u> choosing time <u>now</u>.

This last comment was because some children were being rather

slow in realising it was 'work' time.

The direction given was quite precise as to the order

of events. Another observation gave the following. This time

Mrs Martin was giving out exercise books. One child asked,

"Shall we do our sums first?"

To this Mrs. Martin replied,

"No. Everyone must do their writing first."

She had put some writing on the board for certain children to

copy. These were told who they were and exactly what sequence

to follow. She said,

"The Blue group and Ian Smith ... writing on
the board. When you've written the sentence,
I want you to draw Michael or the mask." (items from
a story).

She added,

"Now then, girls, I want you to do name,
date and writing, and then come to me for
some more work."

Similar directions about 3R's work were heard in Class 4. It

was recorded that when children came into the classroom after

break they were sorted by the teacher, Mrs Neaves, into

different groups. One observation was that.

"Four children are sent to a table and told
to do 'number-snap' (a matching type game).
At another table children are given money
activities."

Another group of children was told

"David, Lee, Sharon, Tracy and Sarah, I want
you to come and try these sums."

in Class 4 it was noticed that 'number work' often seemed to

be allocated to the period just after morning break, although

the pattern was not rigid. Children might sometimes be

directed to writing. It partly depended on circumstances.

For example one piece of observation noted that while other

groups were doing 'number ', Mrs Neaves gave out exercise

books to one group and told them

"I want you to do a picture and story."

She did some writing on the board, then told the group

"Now, I want you to copy this into your books."

After this they were to draw a picture.

These children were seen as needing extra writing practice. Also, she had more time to concentrate on the groups doing number .

Whether it was an individual, or group/s, or the whole class which was given an activity to do depended on several things. These included a teacher's estimation of a child's 'needs' at a particular time, or children's behaviour, her own particular purpose or aim at any one time, and also her own 'style' or general approach. Thus, there was some flexibility within classrooms at Moorland, and also differences between them in this respect. For example, Mrs Martin of Class 3, who described her approach as "more formal", in the sense of telling pupils what activities to do and when, said that she often taught the children as a class. Mrs Dale, of Class 1, as seen above, varied, as indeed did the others, but worked quite often with groups, while Mrs Knowles, the other reception teacher tended to work more often with individuals. Mrs Neaves of Class 4 also did a good deal of group work. However, the differences were more a matter of variations of emphasis at times. As noted, class teaching at times took place in all classrooms, as well as group and individual 'work'.

So far the morning activities of 'choosing' and 3R's work at Moorland have been discussed. In relation to 'choosing', this could happen after the early period under

certain conditions. These included waiting for 'work' to be assigned, or when some had been finished. The Class 2 teacher made this clear when she said to the researcher that

"When the children have finished their writing
and number they can go and find another
activity to do, a drawing, a puzzle, tracing
or playing with construction toys."

(Mrs Knowles, Class 2, Moorland)

As noted previously, children were well aware of the 'work', 'play' distinction, and when other activities than 'work' were permitted. Children who had been in a reception/middle class for a few months were quick to inform 'new' children of the 'rules'. On one occasion in Class 2 the children had come back from assembly, and writing books had been given out to the whole class. All the children were told to draw a picture about "harvest time" and then write about it. One of the 'new' children started to play with some plasticine which had been left out from the earlier 'Choosing Time'. His neighbour, another boy, soon reminded him this was not permitted, saying,

"No, you can't play with plasticine, you're
not allowed to now. I'm telling on you"

and in fact did call out to the teacher about it.

The 3R's work was not the only area where teachers directed activities. Physical education was also so organised. It was pointed out earlier in this section when discussing 'physical materials' that in relation to the nursery, there was a greater diversity of physical activities in the infant school at Moorland. However, this was, as was also noted, reserved for special periods, unlike the nursery. This was also true for all the infant schools seen. It was

922

partly a matter of the organisation of space, for P.E. was often an indoor activity. The hall was generally used, and this had other uses such as music, so it was allocated to classes rather than being freely available.

At Moorland P.E. was signalled by the teacher. The usual instruction was, as recorded in Class 1 in this instance,

"It's time for P.E. now. Go and put your
pumps on."

Within P.E. there were divisions of time. These included a period of warming up, floor work, and then work on the apparatus. Children were only allowed on the latter when specifically directed, for safety reasons. This was made clear to the children, as when Mrs Martin, for example, said

"It's not <u>time</u> to go on the apparatus. You
must <u>not</u> go on the apparatus until I tell
you to."

What activities were to be done, and when and how were clearly specified. In the following example, taken from Class 2 observation notes, the children were using materials such as bean bags, amongst others. Mrs Knowles was using a tambourine to mark the rhythm and as a signal. When the class went into the hall Mrs Knowles told them,

"I want you to <u>walk</u> round the hall
<u>quietly</u> using <u>all</u> the space. When I shake
the tambourine like <u>this</u>" (shaking it)
"I want you to <u>stop</u>. When I hit it hard
like <u>this</u>," (demonstrating "I want you to
stamp your feet."

The children followed this sequence for a while. Then Mrs Knowles said

"Right, stop what you are doing and sit
down in a space. <u>Girls</u>, go and get a
bean bag."

The girls did this. The boys were instructed to do the same. The teacher then said,

> "First, I want you to practice catching
> your bean bag. Throw it up in the air and
> try to catch it."

The children carried out this activity and various others using bean bags. Before each one the teacher told the children what to do, and then the children practised, as above. Sometimes individual children were picked out for direction and shown how to do something. To one child she said,

> "Right, sit down on the floor - make sure
> you've got space. Put the bean bag between
> your legs like <u>this</u>... lie flat, put your hands
> by your sides and see if you can lift the bean
> bag up without dropping it."

The class had been doing this, and this particular child had not been very successful, so was being given individual help, before being left to practice (Class 2 Notes, Moorland).

An example from Class 3 shows also the control of the order of events. In this, Mrs Martin was recorded as saying,

> "When you get into the hall find a space and
> run on the spot."

After a brief interval of this she ordered,

> "<u>Now</u>, <u>stand</u> <u>still</u>. I want you to do
> stretching and curling. Right <u>now</u> you are
> going to stretch up as tall as you can."

> (Notes, Class 3, Moorland)

From these examples it seems clear that physical education in the infant classrooms had some of the characteristics of 'work' rather than 'play', as compared to the nursery. However, it was not as obviously seen as such by the children, at least in comparison to the 3R's activities. It did, however, lack the relative freedom of activity with the physical materials of the nursery.

In the afternoon activities such as art and craft children at Moorland were allowed rather more choice, though direction was not entirely absent. It was usually available in the afternoon though occasionally in the morning. Beside it, other 'free choice' activities were also available. In Class 2 these included playing in the Wendy House and dressing up. These were not allowed in the morning because, in Mrs Knowles' view, they disturbed children who were trying to do 'work'.

An observation note from Class 1 gives the general picture. The pattern described was repeated in the other classrooms. It was recorded that

"The teacher asks the children what
activities they want to do. They put up
their hands for the ones available as these
are called out. Mrs Dale chooses two to
play in the Wendy House, two others to play
in the sand, and two for the water tray.
She tells the rest, 'You can choose
plasticine, Lego or big bricks, or art and
craft."

The art and craft available included painting, 'junk' modelling, and clay modelling, and working on individual scrap books. For those who chose modelling or painting, Mrs Dale offered suggestions as to the appropriate materials for a model and how it might be made, and what colours might be used.

Thus, the afternoon activities, compared to the morning, offered more freedom, though 'work' unfinished might have to be done first. Also, within an art and craft activity there was sometimes direction as to what to do and how to do it. For example in Class 4 one day, the children had just returned to the classroom after dinner, to find paper laid out

on a table. Mrs Neaves told them it was for making hats.
She told the children they were going to make either a
"pirate's hat" or a "witch's hat". As recorded when
discussing 'Gender' in a previous chapter, girls and boys were
directed to make the different hats. Mrs Neaves directed,

> "Girls, make a witch's hat. Boys ... make
> a pirate's hat."

Mrs Neaves then drew the outline of the hat shapes, which were
then cut out by the children. Mrs Neaves drew a skull and
crossbones on one example, and indicated what colour the hats
should be painted. These were for the pirate's hat. However,
some of the boys had their own ideas, as the following
exchange indicates. The researcher was involved in working
with these children. David, one boy, said, -

> "Pirates have patches over their eyes."

His friend Michael joined in

> "and swords, they have swords."

Both then said to the researcher,

> "We could make patches and swords, Miss -."

The researcher said, diplomatically, not wanting to disrupt
the teacher's plans, that

> "Perhaps you'ld better ask Mrs Neaves first."

They rushed across to do this, and returned, saying happily,

> "She said yes."

David then said,   "I'm going to make a patch."

Michael joined in, "And me."

They both did so, and painted them black. A little 'swords'
industry then followed. Previously, Mrs Neaves had said on
another occasion that, if children were interested in doing
something particular then she would allow them to continue

with these 'interests'. Hence, although in this instance there was a whole class direction of art and craft, flexibility was also shown.

So far, the general pattern of the infant day at Moorland has been described. It has been shown to be circumscribed in relation to 'free choice', and with a general routine of 3Rs in the morning and 'messier' activities in the afternoon, a fairly 'traditional' course of events. The 'integrated day' as noted, was not the custom at Moorland. This, as stated, was because the teachers were convinced that, given the children's 'home background', they needed the stability of an ordered routine, and 'free choice' was something they could not cope with. However, it has been noted elsewhere that in one class, Mrs Neaves's, the established pattern was altered in particular circumstances, and this initially temporary alteration challenged the perceptions regarding the suitability of 'free choice'.

During the first Autumn Term, until near the end of it, the organisation in Class 4 was, as indicated in the previous extracts, similar to that of Class 3 and the other two, with children being directed to specific activities, whether singly or in groups. Near to Christmas Mrs Neaves was in charge of the hall decorations for that festival, and became very busy. She had to be out of the classroom at times, and even when present had things to make for the project. Consequently she was not able to be constantly directing the children as usual in this period, so, to solve the 'management' problem, as Sharp and Green might have said, children were allowed to

choose what they wanted to do in terms of the activities present. After an initial day or two when they mostly drew pictures or 'played', children were seen to 'choose' to do '3R's' activities such as writing stories, doing "work books" and sums. Mrs Neaves was surprised that the children seemed to cope so well with 'free choice'.

As a result of this enforced experiment, in the following Spring Term, the new pattern was partially continued. What happened was that in the morning Mrs Neaves would suggest various activities, such as copywriting and number work, including work cards, and stories. Mrs Neaves provided these activities in the sense that she wrote sums in children's books, or sentences for them to copy, and so on. The children were then able to choose the order in which they did these activities. However, the children to whom this 'choice' was given were those who wee seen by Mrs Neaves as being capable of working "on their own". She identified these quite clearly, as the following comment shows. She told the researcher,

> "I start with the best readers in the Red
> group, the ones that will be able to read
> the instructions ... the Reds are the top
> infants."

These would be rising sevens. The instructions she was referring to were those on work cards, which were used at Moorland, as stated, at the teacher's discretion.

She also said that some Blue group children (mostly middle infants who were 'sixes'), also did work cards, and like doing them. One reason for their liking these was that these children saw themselves as doing something that "older

928

children are doing". This acted as a spur.

Observations confirmed that the children concerned did change from one activity to another of their own accord. It was recorded, for example, of one group that

> "Five children were drawing pictures in their work books, then writing stories. When asked, three of them said that they belonged to the Red group, two said the Blue. Later the same children started doing number work cards, and after finishing those they fetched comprehension work books. In these they had to fill in missing words and then colour the pictures of animals. In all this they did not go and ask the teacher what to do next."

(Notes, Class 4, Moorland)

When 'work' was finished 'choosing' was permitted, as usual. These 3Rs could be done in the afternoon, however, if there was a particular interest a child or children wanted to follow. Otherwise the afternoon pattern followed the art/craft and 'free choice'/topic pattern.

Those children who were not deemed capable of working by themselves were directed as previously. These were mostly the sixes or middle infants who had been the shortest time in the class.

Also at times Mrs Neaves, for particular reasons, might direct some in the 'top group'. Mostly, however, in the Spring Term at least, there was a significant reduction in the amount of detailed direction of the timing of '3R's' work. Whether this newer pattern continued indefinitely the researcher did not know, as other matters occupied her attention. However, what was seen of the change, even though this was not to 'the integrated day' as practised elsewhere, did indicate that Moorland children were not so different in

their capacity to cope with 'free choice' as had been suggested by teachers previously.

This section has discussed the 'structure' or routine of the infant classrooms at Moorland. It has shown that in general, with the exception noted above, children's activities were highly and extremely 'visibly' teacher directed in that children were told what activities to do, when to do them, and how to do them. This 'structure' was most apparent in the 3R's activities, but was also a feature of other curriculum areas such as P.E. and, to some extent, Art and Craft. 'Choosing' time, or free choice of certain 'play' activities, was also not freely available but was restricted by the teachers to specific periods of limited duration, and access to it at other times depended upon children having finished their 'work' to the teacher's satisfaction. This 'work' thus took priority, something which the children were shown to be aware of.

In all of this there was not much difference between the reception classes at Moorland and those containing older children. However, there was a considerable difference between the nursery routine at Moorland, described in the first section, and that of the reception classes. In the nursery 'free choice' was the paramount activity. There, there was little direction as to what, when and how, except for some special group activities, or when children requested help.

The difference between the nursery and reception classes at Moorland was in agreement with the views expressed

by the nursery and reception teachers there in "Educational Perspectives", that the latter were "more formal". The routine of the infant classes was also in agreement with the belief of Moorland teachers that children there did not have "a proper routine" at home and were "allowed to do what they like". The 'structure' was designed to counteract this alleged lack of control by parents and to provide the "stability" which was believed to be needed by the children.

The remainder of this section describes the 'routine' in other schools, some of which were similar in whole or part to Moorland, and some which were quite different in organisation. Given the lesser amount of time spent in these schools, compared to that spent in Moorland, this part is less detailed.

At Stone Street, the daily pattern was 3R's work in the morning, followed by Art and Craft and 'free choice' activities in the afternoon. In the top infants class seen, and also in the reception class there, the morning pattern was further subdivided. 'Maths' was the activity followed by all the children until break. After this, reading/writing activities were also done by all children. There was no discretion in this, for the children, because it was the established pattern in the junior school of which the infant department was a part. However, it was not all class teaching within these '3R's' periods. As at Moorland, individuals or groups were given tasks according to teachers' perceptions of their 'needs'. In the reception classes of infant schools, particularly, this is inevitable because children are entering

it at different times, so there are always 'new' children to start off.

In the afternoon, the period sometimes termed "free activities" at Stone Street, children were allowed more latitude, and could play with construction toys or the Wendy House, as well as painting and drawing. The latter could sometimes, though, be a 'whole class' activity.

Some of the classrooms at Rushside followed a similar routine to Moorland and Stone Street, with the same division between morning and afternoon activities. 3R's work in Class 3a and 5 took place in the morning, and art and craft and various 'games' in the afternoon. In one other classroom there was a further division, as at Stone Street, with maths being done by all the children during the first part of the morning, followed by writing activities and reading until dinner time. This was Class 3, whose teacher made it quite clear that 'free choice' was not the order of the day. She stated that,

> "No group has a choice of what to do. In the
> morning the children come in and I tell them
> what they have to do ... usually reading,
> writing and number."

As at Moorland and Stone Street, children might be directed to particular tasks within the general activity, depending on their ability.

In two other classrooms seen at Rushside there was a different pattern. In these, children were observed to be doing a range of activities in the afternoons when these classes were visited. The activities included those classed as '3Rs'. Children were doing sums and writing, as well as

carrying out projects involving various activities, and also painting and modelling with dough, amongst others. The teacher said that in the morning there was a similar variety. These two classrooms were following a version of 'the integrated day'. However, even here they preferred children to do the 3R's work first if possible. The 'work' was again set for individuals or groups, in terms of the actual content, depending on their 'needs'. However, compared to the more 'formal' classrooms, there was more choice over when tasks were to be done, though not over what or how, at least in the 3Rs.

Rushside was interesting, since it seemed to be a school in transition. As stated elsewhere, there was a new head, and the teachers as a group were still adjusting to the change from the rule of the reportedly rather autocratic, closely supervisory, rule of the previous head.

The daily 'routine' at Briarfield, Fairfield and Larkway was different in at least some respects from that at Moorland, Stone Street and the more 'formal' classrooms at Rushside. It was more like the two Rushside classrooms noted last above.

At Briarfield, in two of the three classrooms the teachers said that various activities went on through the day, with no specific periods for 3R's 'work'. Thus, the activities available included 'number' of some kind, reading, writing, doing 'projects', art and craft activities, and so on. The teachers in these classes also said that at the beginning of the day, in 'discussion time', they told the

children what tasks were to be done during that day, but added that after this assignment the children were free to tackle them in the order they chose. These assignments were basically to do with the 3Rs, although other areas were covered.

Observation in these two classrooms indicated that children to some extent did have some choice as to when they carried out the tasks they were given, though not over what these were and how they were done. However, such 'choice' did not seem absolutely free. In one of the classrooms the teacher was heard to tell some children to "go and finish your work first". This 'work' included number and writing tasks that the children had begun in the morning. They wanted to go on to the art and craft available, but were not allowed to. Later, the teachers of these two classes did say that they "discouraged" children from starting with arts and crafts activities "first thing", as the children, it was thought, might otherwise always begin with these.

With the 3R's work itself, again individuals or groups were not given the same tasks. The Class 3 teacher stated that,

> "As far as reading, writing and maths and art
> and craft are concerned, each child works at
> his or her own pace."

(Notes, Class 3, Briarfield)

The addition of art and craft to the more usual 3R's work in this list was interesting. It was noted in relation to Moorland that art and craft there, although 'freer', was not devoid of direction. The above comment indicates that art and craft was indeed seen as part of the 'formal' curriculum

rather than, as in the pre-school setting, as simply an enjoyable activity.

It was evident from observation in these two Briarfield classrooms that a certain amount of 'work' was required of the children on either a daily or sometimes weekly, basis. Children were aware of these demands, and of the amount of choice they had. They made this clear to the researcher, as the following example shows. The researcher asked one child, doing 'writing',

> "Do you have to fill all the lines where there
> are dots?"

She replied

> "Yes, but I can write more if I want to ...
> lots more, twenty four lines."

Another child sitting by the first joined in at this point saying,

> "We've got to do some 'practical mathematics'".

The observed inquired,

> "Practical mathematics, what's that?

The child replied,

> "Weighing, measuring, money, shopping.
> We have to do that once a week."

This was later confirmed by the class teacher. The degree of choice in relation to the amount of work done varied to some extent with the age of the children. For example, on another occasion a boy called David, and two others, Michael and Simon, were also being asked about the work they had to do. David said,

> "I did six pieces of work yesterday, two
> stories and two mathematics cards."

The researcher asked the boys,

> "Can you choose what you want to do then?"

Michael replied that,

> "The older ones can. They can do writing
> one day and then mathematics another day."

Simon disagreed with this. He said,

> "No-o. We have to do some maths each
> day and some writing."

Again this was confirmed by the teacher. However, in spite of

the disagreement, it is clear from the children's comments

that they were aware of the 'direction' of work by teachers.

✗ They were also aware that if 'work' was not done there would

be sanctions. Although less directly told when to do certain

activities than at Moorland, teachers still reminded children

of what was expected of them. For instance, a child, in

response to a question by the researcher as to what would

happen if children did not get their 'work' done, replied,

> "Well, if you were talking, and didn't do any
> work she (the teacher) would tell you off."

<div align="center">(Notes, Briarfield)</div>

Also, as noted, teachers could disallow some favourite

activities in order that 'work' could be completed. Thus,

'free choice' seemed in practice rather constrained.

In the third classroom at Briarfield a different

arrangement was observed from that seen in the other two

classrooms. In this class 'work', or '3Rs', took place in the

afternoon and 'play' activities in the mornings, according to

the teacher. King, as recorded, also found one instance of

such a pattern. The reason for the arrangement, as noted when

discussing 'Gender' in a previous chapter, was that boys were

more ready to settle to work in the afternoons. The

researcher did wonder privately whether the girls might have

wanted to 'work' in the mornings, and why the boys' 'need' to

'play' first was the determining factor in the daily arrangement. It was noted in that earlier discussion that, in general, boys were often more troublesome in behaviour for teachers. At Moorland, though, there were some problems of this kind with quite a few of the girls as well as some of the boys.

In this particular class at Briarfield there were more boys than girls, which perhaps explained the particular division of the day. In any event, because of the pattern, there was little of the integration of activities found in the other two classrooms.

At Fairfield, the general pattern was similar to the two classes at Briarfield. Teachers in all the classrooms stated that a full range of activities went on through the day. During observations during the afternoons this was seen to include, for example,

"... writing stories, water play, printing,
Lego, painting, 'number' work and writing
practice."

(Class 1, Briarfield)

The teacher of Class 1 said that at the start of the day the children came into the classroom and started straight away on some activity. A morning observation confirmed this. It was recorded that,

"The children arrive at about 8.30am, and
start an activity as soon as they are in the
classroom. Some choose a number card, others
start writing a story, others do a 'writing
card' (or comprehension/writing practice
card), some do art and craft."

(Class 1)

In two other classrooms at Fairfield a similar pattern and range of activities was seen. In Class 4 these included

"... art and craft (making flowers) writing
from cards, number work."

In Class 2 were seen such things as

"number work, copying stories from books,
painting models."

However, the apparent 'free choice' had limits. On questioning the teachers, it emerged that at the beginning of the week the various tasks which the teachers wanted the children to do were assigned to them. The day often began, though not always, with 'discussion time', during which reminders would be given. Moreover, in spite of the fact that children seemed to have much more freedom of choice over when to do activities than children as Moorland did, the 3Rs still seemed to have a higher status for the teachers. These all stated that they 'encouraged' children to start with number and writing, and certainly children were pressed to get such 3Rs' work' finished by the end of the day. Once again, children seemed well aware of what was expected of them, as the following brief exchange indicates. The researcher was asking children what *they were supposed to do.* One replied

"We have to do three pieces of work by the end
of the day, number and writing and if you
finish that you can do <u>extra</u> work."

The researched asked

"But what's <u>that</u>?

A second child commented

"More of the same <u>really.</u>"

This the researcher found quite amusing. It seemed to show that the children had grasped the 'reality' of school life.

There was indeed 'extra work' available. In one classroom a special box was seen which contained cards with children's names on them. If a child had finished the

'assigned' work a card could be chosen from this box. On the individually named cards were printed additional activities to be done by that child.

Work cards were used at Fairfield, graded according to experience, in number and writing. The 'what' was thus carefully controlled by teachers, as well as the 'how'. No child could go on to another card before the teacher was satisfied with the previous effort.

Moreover, although, as indicated, children had some choice as to 'when' activities were done, there was pressure from the teachers for 3Rs' work to be tackled, if not in the morning, at least by the end of the day. As noted also at Briarfield, 'sanctions' of various kinds were utilised by the teachers to make sure 'choice' worked as they wished it to. For example, in one of the classrooms at Fairfield it was observed on the particular occasion that the teacher remained sitting at one table all the afternoon. Since this was unusual the researcher asked why she had done this. The teacher replied that she had been doing so in order to supervise some 'middle infants' who had not been doing their "set work". Because of this, she had put these children at one table in order to "check what they were doing" and to see that work was completed. She added that she had made them all do the same activity then because they could not "choose properly". She said also that

> "Some of these children still have no idea
> about completing different pieces of work."
> (Notes, Fairfield)

In Class 4 the idea of being sent to a table to finish work

was also mentioned. On this occasion a group of 'top infants'

were sitting at a table doing number work, with the researcher

observing them. One boy announced that he had finished <u>his</u>

work. The researcher asked,

> "What happens if you <u>don't</u> finish your work
> by the end of the day?"

Two children answered together,

> "You get sent to a special table if you
>
> don't finish."

Two others disagreed with this, however. One said,

> "<u>No</u>, you <u>don't</u>. You just have to do it the
> <u>next</u> day."

The other added a little to this, saying that

> "Yes, if you <u>haven't</u> finished, you <u>start</u>
> with it the next day."

From this account of the 'routine' at Fairfield it

can be seen that although in this school, as in two classrooms

at Briarfield, the version of 'the integrated day' was

followed, this did not mean that 'free choice' ruled. The

'choice' was regulated by the teachers, with 3Rs given a

priority.

The pattern at Larkway was similar to the two classes

at Briarfield and all at Fairfield in that the various

activities were available all day. However, unlike Moorland,

there were some differences between the reception classes and

those for older children

The day at Larkway began with registration, then after

this came a short period, of some fifteen minutes, of what was

called "Family Time". As at Moorland, this was a time during

which teachers might hear children's 'news', or might talk

about topics the children were doing or were going to do. It

was also a time when different groups or individuals were

started on different activities. Whereas at Fairfield the

tasks which children were expected to do, particularly 3Rs,

were set at the beginning of the week, at Larkway they were

set daily. However, there was no fixed time for doing these,

nor any period set apart for 'choosing'. The children were

free to do activities in any order. The only fixed periods

were those for P.E. and music. As at Moorland, this was a

matter of managing space,

However, although all classes began in the same way, it

was observed that the reception classes at Larkway were in

this respect similar to those at Moorland, that the teachers

of those classes told individuals or groups what activities to

do and when. However, the aim was to train them in the

Larkway manner of working, and such direction was therefore

not an end in itself. As shown in Chapter Six, one of the

main aims of teachers at Larkway was

> "to get children controlling their own
> learning ... encouraging them to work on
> their own by the end of the infant school."

(Notes, Larkway)

Though this was the aim, reception teachers at Larkway argued

that such a pattern of working could be a problem for children

coming to the school for the first time straight from home.

These children, the teachers argued, had to get used to a

different type of relationship with the adults in school from

those at home, and also to adjust to other children. This was

enough of a problem for them, so working by themselves needed

time, and direction, at least in the early stages. A typical

example of direction at the start of the day was the

following. A teacher was heard to say,

"Ladybirds, Beetles, you do your <u>writing</u>
first, and you people" (pointing)"I want
you to do work with me today. The rest
of you can do choosing."

As well as what and when, teachers in the reception classes at
Larkway were also observed, when working with individuals or
groups of children, showing them 'how' to do an activity. For
example, in one period of observation, in Reception Class One,
the teacher went to the 'book corner' with a 'Stern tray'.
This is a number apparatus designed to help children learn
'number bonds', in this case from 1 to 20 based on colour.
The teacher then asked a boy, David, to come to the book
corner. She then said to him,

"I want you to build a staircase to ten,
and carry on until you reach twenty."

David built the 'staircase' to 10, but then stopped,
instead of going on to 20. The teacher then told him,

"Break down the number into tens and units,
like <u>this</u>. <u>This</u> is a <u>'ten'</u> rod, and this is
a <u>one</u>, one unit. What do you think this
makes?"

David said hesitantly,

"er, - eleven"

The teacher said, <u>"Good"</u>.

She then took a blue rod and a yellow one, and asked,

"What do you think <u>this</u> makes?"

After a pause David said "Fifteen".

The teacher said, "<u>Yes</u>, fifteen".

A similar example, this time with a group, was observed in
Class 2. The teacher was also using a Stern box, of numbers
from one to ten. She was heard to say to the group,

"There is a space for <u>every</u> block ... Who

thinks they've got the block that belongs in
this space ... Which colour belongs here,
green? It's green, isn't it?"

The children in the group all said "Yes".

The teacher then asked,

"Who's got number two?"

One child replied,

"I have".

The teacher asked,

"Who's got number four?"

Another child said,

"Me. I have"

The teacher asked,

"What colour is number four?"

A third child answered, "Brown".

The teacher and children went on like this until they had

identified all the blocks from 1 to 10, and given the correct

colour for each.

In another instance, in this case when introducing a

new art and craft activity, the same teacher demonstrated how

it was to be done. The group were starting 'Bubble prints'.

The teacher took a piece of paper and said,

"If you are going to start a blue one, bend
down and blow" (through a straw) "Don't
blow too fast."
                    (Notes, Class 2, Reception
                    Larkway)

As children moved up the school, there was a change. In the

middle and top infants' classes, children were expected to

take more responsibility for the organisation of their time.

Although they were told 'what', in the sense that tasks were

assigned, there was less emphasis on 'when' or 'how', though

this could happen, particularly in relation to individuals.

In Class 5, a top infants' class, taken by the Deputy, it sometimes appeared as if children did activities by themselves. They were seldom told how to do things, apart from 'copywriting' which was a class activity, or on an individual basis for particular reasons. One such reason was when children started to use a new 'work card'.

These cards were used in the older children's classes, and children worked through them at their own pace. These work cards were graded, and covered a range of activities. Within the number scheme, for example, were cards on addition, subtractions up to twenty, and measuring, among others. The class teachers were aware of where individual children were in the scheme. When a child had finished a particular section it was usual for "See me" to be written in his or her exercise book. Children were not allowed simply to continue on to a new pack. In Class 5 a child was heard to say to another,

"You've got to see Mrs - , because you've got
a new pack."

It was thus at these times that children as individuals were shown 'how' to do an activity. This was observed quite frequently. In one example in Class 4 a boy, Colin, was starting some new number cards. The teacher said to him,

"You just take one card at a time and copy it
down. Tell me what this card says, Colin.
What do we do with these?"

Colin replied briefly, "Add."

The teacher confirmed this, and said,

"Yes, we add, add one more, so seventeen plus
one is eighteen, nineteen plus one is twenty.
So these are adding ones."

(Notes, Class 4, Larkway)

Having thus seen that he knew what to do, the teacher left Colin to get on.

Similarly in Class 5, a child had just finished one set of number cards, and was looking at a new set, and had just started working on them, when the teacher called him over to her. She said to him,

> "Mark, I'd like you to come and see me about what number cards you are doing. Now, have you discovered the secret of these sums, that is, they're always the same, minus. So what is <u>this</u> one, 14 - 7?"

Mark answered, "Seven".

The teacher continued,

> "And this one, 16 - 8?"

Mark said, more doubtfully,

> "Er - eight".

The teacher <u>then</u> came to the point, and said

> "So <u>why</u> have you got <u>sevens</u> <u>all</u> the way down the page?"

The unsuspecting Mark had walked straight into this! However, what came across was that he had obviously not grasped the concept. (See Bennett et al., 1984).

Another example from the same class arose when the teacher was trying to get across the idea of <u>longer</u> and <u>shorter</u> in measurement to a child starting a work card. In this case she started by asking the child,

> "Is the paint brush <u>longer</u> than the ruler?"

The child answered.

> "The paintbrush is shorter".

The teacher accepted and confirmed the reply, saying,

> "<u>Yes</u>, <u>shorter</u>. Then put the word <u>shorter</u> in the space. You <u>write</u> the <u>paintbrush</u> is <u>shorter</u> than the ruler."

Here again, it was not clear whether the child had <u>really</u> grasped the concept.

Apart from instances like these the older children at Larkway were expected to go and find out for themselves where possible how something might be done.   For example, during one "Family Time" in Class 5, the teacher, after asking about the work children had done, and what they were going to do next, said to one boy, in connection with a topic on oil rigs,

> "You can make a model ... you can choose someone
> to help you. Think how you could make it.   Go
> and look at the reference books to see what oil
> rigs look like."

Other children were then told to go and start writing, number or painting.   The children's <u>first</u> activity was set by the teacher.   After this they were able to choose what to do, which was seen sometimes to include 'playing' with Lego or in the 'home corner'.

In Class 5, this 'routine' of greater responsibility by children was acknowledged by the Deputy to be different from that in the reception classes.   She said that when children moved into her class that they'

> "have to get used to <u>my</u> way of doing things."

This way included making decisions for themselves, working more independently, completing work properly, and also putting materials away tidily after use.

Although children in the middle and top infants' classes at Larkway had, like those at Fairfield and Briarfield, a considerable degree of 'free choice' over when

things were done, and, within restraints, over what they would

do within the range available, such 'choice' was supervised.

Children were expected to do some 3R's work each day.   They

were usually asked to at least

> "complete a piece of writing, number work and
> a story each day."

<div align="right">(Notes, Larkway)</div>

It was recorded when discussing the 'curriculum' in

Chapter Six that the 3Rs was important in all schools.   In

that chapter and in the Heads chapter, the effect of parental

pressure was also noted.   At Larkway the Deputy had pointed

out that parents coming to the school on Open Evenings only

looked at children's number and writing books, and not such

things as art and craft work.   Hence the teachers felt

constrained to persuade children to do 3Rs' work as early as

possible.   Usually children did start their number work or

writing in the morning, but there was flexibility.   There were

always some children doing these things in the afternoon.

Moreover, if the children were engaged in some approved

activity in which they were interested, they were not forced

to leave it for 3Rs' work.   For example, in Class 5 the

children working on the oil rig model were asked by the

teacher if they had done any writing that day.   The children

replied that they had not, but asked if they could finish the

model first.   The teacher allowed them to continue, but she

did say that they would have to do some writing before the end

of the day, even if they did not complete it all that day.

She did not insist on them leaving the model then and there,

however.

A similar example of this was of a child who was asked,

"Are you going to finish your number work first
and get it done?"

The child replied,

"I'd like to finish <u>this</u> first."

This child was also making a model in this instance.. The

teacher replied to the request by saying,

"Well, alright, as long as you do your number later
in the day."

In general, children whom the teacher thought could be trusted

to work without regular prompting were allowed more freedom.

It was usual that in those cases where 'work' was not

completed in one day, it would be carried on to the next.

Children were then required by the teacher to <u>start</u> with this

work the next day.

Although 'free choice' was important, and children in

the upper classes at Larkway had more latitude than those at

Moorland, children could not choose to do <u>nothing</u>. They were

closely observed, and the children were left in no doubt about

this. 'Messing about', meaning doing nothing constructive,

wasting time, or doing one activity before completing another,

especially if the latter was 'work', was frowned on. For

example in Class 5 one boy called Simon was seen to be looking

at the work of another boy called Tom, and saying to him,

"You've done that wrong."

'That' was a word. Tom rubbed this out and rewrote it. The

teacher meanwhile had looked across. She asked Tom,

"Tom, are you messing about?"

Tom replied "<u>No-o</u>."

The teacher did not press him further, but merely 'encouraged'

him by saying,

"Well, don't spend too long on that picture

Another boy, James, was regarded by his teacher as being "lazy". She therefore would remind him to get on by saying such things as

"Come on, James, it's time you finished".

On another occasion in Class 5 two boys were observed playing with Lego. The teacher came over and asked them,

"How many cards have you done? Have you finished all your work?"

Another instance of this regular supervision of what children were doing was when a child was told,

"It's time you came to me to have your work checked. You should have done something by now."

(Class 5, Larkway)

As elsewhere, 'sanctions' of one kind or another were possible if 'choice' was not exercised 'properly'. For example James was told on another occasion,

"James Stock, I've been watching you for the last five minutes. Get on, please, or I shall put you on your own."

'Extra work' could also be a punishment imposed, as when the researcher was told that the class

"are having to do two number cards because they made such a dreadful row yesterday."

This again made the point that 'free choice' depended upon its being exercised 'responsibly'. If it was not, in the teacher's view, then more direct control came into play.

Thus, the 'integrated day' and 'free choice' at Larkway, as at Briarfield and Fairfield was carefully regulated by the teachers there, in the middle and top infants' classes. As shown, there was more direction in the reception classes in any case. Children's choice was more related to the when,

rather than the what or how, although there was some degree of choice over the two latter aspects, at least in relation to 'topic work'. But in general children could choose from what the teacher made available, as in most schools, whether 'integrated' or practising 'free choice' or not. In the specific case of the '3Rs', the 'what' and the 'how' as well as eventually the 'when', were directed by the teachers. Again, this applied in other schools.

As Larkway was the last school visited, the account of the 'routine' there brings this section to a close.

In it, the materials available in infant classrooms have been described. It has been shown that, in spite of differences in organisation itself, infant schools had very similar materials, and many of the things found in Moorland nursery were also present in the main school there. It has also been indicated that in some of the infant schools seen, though not at Moorland, there was some absence of certain materials in the upper classes as distinct from the reception classes.

It has also been shown that there were differences as well as some similarities in the tasks and activities undertaken by children in pre-school settings and infant classrooms. In part, this was because more complex skills had to be mastered by school age children.

The 'work-play' distinction has been shown to be present in infant schools, though this was not found in the pre-school setting. This distinction was shown as present in teachers' comments to children, whatever their intentions, and

to be well understood by children in these schools. The 'work' referred to was that of the 3Rs.

The 'timetable' of the daily routine, given for a nursery and an infant class, has indicated the greater formality of the latter, and the setting aside of particular times for certain activities in some of the schools, including Moorland. It has also been shown that in some schools which, unlike Moorland, did not restrict activities to particular times, there was still some pressure by teachers for children to complete 3Rs' 'work' 'first thing'.

It has been indicated in this section that, whatever the actual 'routine', the majority of the decisions made about the 'what', 'when' and 'how' of classroom activities are those of teachers.

Eggleston's comment that theoretically and "to some extent in practice" this was so was noted earlier in this section. This section has indicated that 'theory' and 'practice' were more in agreement than Eggleston seemed to suggest (Eggleston, 1979). Like Hartley, this researcher did not find much evidence of an 'invisible' pedagogy.

Those schools like Larkway which contained more of the features associated with the 'progressive' ideology, outlined in Chapter Three, were no less 'structured' than Moorland, which accepted neither 'the integrated day' nor 'free choice'.
In talking about 'structure' in relation to such schools, the researcher is not implying that 'progressive education', in so far as this has a firm meaning, meant no control by teachers. No one, as far as the researcher knows, ever

suggested this, except some 'Black Paper' supporters. However, the control exerted by teachers over pupils' activities was seen by 'progressive' supporters as 'guidance' rather than 'direction', or 'invisible' rather than 'visible'. This was not found, particularly with regard to 3Rs' 'work'. Common to most descriptions of 'progressive' education was the idea of 'free choice' by pupils. In this section it has been indicated that there is much more direction by teachers of the 'what', 'when' and 'how' of pupils' activities than the idea of 'free choice' might imply, even in those schools which saw this as important. Teacher control seemed to go well beyond 'guidance'. In general, while children in schools such as Larkway had a degree of choice over the order of activities, 'what' and 'how' seemed to be controlled by teachers, especially in the case of the 3Rs. Also, while there <u>was</u> more choice over 'when' 'work' could be done, or other activities undertaken, in that 'work' could be done at some time in the day rather than a fixed period, and that work not completed could be finished next day, it still had to be done. Children were reminded of this. Moreover, teachers in these schools 'encouraged' pupils to start with 3Rs' work, even if there was flexibility in this respect. Thus, in the underlying aspects of classroom decision making, there seemed more similarity between schools such as Moorland and Larkway than their outward organisation might suggest. This is not to imply that there were no important differences between school 'routines', nor that there were not differences in what teachers expected children to be able to achieve. Larkway

undoubtedly had higher expectations that children could take responsibility for their own work than teachers at Moorland held of children there.

Having looked at the 'routine' of infant classrooms, or the 'structure' of activities, the next section considers a different but associated aspect of 'structure', that of 'progression', and, allied to this, the monitoring and recording of pupil activities in 3Rs, and some consideration

SECTION THREE   PROGRESSION AND RECORDING: ANOTHER ASPECT OF STRUCTURE, READING SCHEMES, A NOTE

This section discusses briefly three things. First, it considers the concept of progression in relation to the activities of reading, writing and number. Secondly, it looks at the monitoring of pupils' activities in these areas of the curriculum, and the recording of their progress by teachers, along with other things. Thirdly, there is a short consideration of the reading schemes found at Moorland, the main research school. Although such schemes are 'structured' in terms of 'progression', those found at Moorland raise a slightly different issue, so are discussed separately.

The structuring of activities in terms of the 'what', 'when' and 'how' by teachers which was discussed in the previous section has associated with it the concept of 'progression'. This means children proceeding through a series of activities which are graded according to ability, or the particular stage which children are deemed by teachers to have reached. It is a process particularly related to the

'3Rs'. However, as noted in the first part of this chapter, and when discussing teachers' "Educational Perspectives" a progression in terms of the acquisition of skills is also seen as occurring in physical education and art and craft. This section, though, is concerned with progression in the basics.

The official statement of aims provided by Moorland indicated the importance of progression. For example, under the heading of writing it stated that,

> "Writing skills are acquired steadily, beginning
> with copywriting ... correct letter formation
> (and) as the children are able to make a neat
> and accurate copy, they begin to write their
> own stories. Gradually, phonic skills are
> introduced."
>
> (Notes for teachers, Moorland)

The head teacher at Larkway also alluded to progression in her notes for teachers, although, in accordance with her perspective, she also indicated that a flexible approach was required. Her notes stated that it was important to
> "make sure that progression is within a fluid
> framework."
>
> (Notes for Teachers,
> Larkway)

In practice, teachers in the classroom did present activities in a particular sequence. In the reception classes at Moorland the teachers, for example, in writing, first provided tracing activities, such as tracing one's name, then tracing over sentences, which had been dictated to the teachers by individual children, which were then written in the children's books ˏby the teachers. From this children 'progressed' to copying underneath the teacher's writing, and

finally to 'writing on their own'. Mrs Dale, one of the reception teachers, said that at first, when they did this, children drew "squiggles", but gradually they started to form individual letters.

The same structural progression was also observed at Moorland in reading and number.

In relation to reading, Mrs Dale stated that before a child started a 'reading book', he or she needed to be able to discriminate and differentiate between different shapes. Developing this visual discrimination was an important task. Therefore, she sought to provide children with various 'games' which would develop this skill.

These included such things as sets of circles with different markings inside them, or sets of lines pointing in different directions, or forming different angles. Children had to find the one in each set which corresponded with a given card. Children then progressed to matching words with pictures, such as the drawing of a house, with a part which fitted like a jigsaw piece into the picture, with the word house on it. The next stage was individual words which were written on cards, and which were chosen from the first reading book in the main reading scheme. When children knew all these words, they were given their first 'reading book'. The main 'reading scheme' used at Moorland was the Ladybird series, but one of the reception teachers said that she also used books from various other schemes, in order to provide "variety" for pupils. 'Slow readers' would then read books at the same

level of difficulty across these schemes.

The teachers made judgements about when children were ready to progress towards a new skill. For example, Mrs Knowles, the other reception teacher at Moorland said, during the second term of the year, that some of her children knew a number of words by sight but that they were then coming across words in their reading books which required them to blend different sounds, such as sh - op. When it was appropriate to introduce a new skill such as this blending was seen as an important part of 'professional knowledge'.

In number, children in reception classes began with 'sorting' games, in which shapes and objects were put into 'sets'. They progressed to the recognition of number symbols. Then children moved on next to filling in missing numbers alongside the pictures of objects, and also starting to use number apparatus and games to help recognition. Later, and in the other classes, there was progression to knowing such computational skills as bonds to ten, and later twenty, and then addition and subtraction. As with reading, the teachers decided when children were ready to move on to a new skill, on the basis of children's achievement.

Moorland did not make much use of work cards, and where these were used it was at the teachers' discretion. At Briarfield, Fairfield and Larkway such work cards were in regular use and were systematically arranged as part of a scheme. However, the use of these cards was regulated by teachers. Although children worked through these 'at their own pace', another feature associated with the 'progressive ideology', they did not choose when to start to use them by

themselves, nor when to proceed to a new one, as indicated in the previous section. This again was a matter of 'professional knowledge' on the part of teachers. For example, in Class 2 at Fairfield, the teacher stated categorically that children did not automatically use cards on their own. She stated that new children in particular

> "never go straight on to the cards, I devise
> tests to see what each child knows."

She mentioned as an example one child who had come to her class from another school. She said of this child in relation to number that,

> "She was unable to write numbers properly. It
> was no use putting her on cards. I gave her
> various activities which would help her to
> learn to write numbers properly, such as
> tracing numbers."

> (Notes, Class 2, Fairfield)

The teacher said that she had also given this child 'matching activities', such as matching beads to numbers, written on cards. She had then moved her on to small 'sums' using shapes, and finally to recording answers to these 'sums' in numbers. It was then said that

> "She was ready to start the work cards."

> (Class 2)

The same processes for pre-reading and pre-number work that were seen at Moorland were also present in these schools, before the use of work cards. The example above shows the way in which teachers used their professional judgement about when to start work cards.

At Fairfield, the work cards in use were seen in Class 4 set out in labelled boxes, something also seen in the other classes. Each box was divided into a series of numbered

envelopes. There was a set of language cards, and one for maths. Another box, called a "busy box", contained phonic cards, sentences for copying, and pictures to write about. The children took cards from this box if they had "finished all their work". (Notes, Fairfield). All of the cards were graded, and children programmed through them according to ability, with their work checked by teachers.

At Larkway,the reception teachers developed their own system of cards for the pupils to use as soon as they had progressed through the pre-reading and number stages. In language, the sets of cards were designed to be used in conjunction with the reading scheme. These included word recognition cards and sentences for copying. The maths scheme included cards for the recognition of numbers, and those involving some computational skills with numbers first to ten and later to twenty. There were also work cards for measuring, weighing and money activities, which children had to do in a particular order, a process checked by the teachers.

As children moved up the school, the work cards became more complex. In reading and writing, they included phonic cards and those containing comprehension tasks. In maths, the cards included, besides measurement and weighing, those introducing computational skills involving tens and units. Again, children's progression through the various levels of difficulty was checked by teachers.

This part of the section has looked briefly at the notion of progression, the idea that children go through various stages in the various learning activities provided by

teachers. It has indicated that such progression is a feature of schools, whatever their form of organisation. It has also been suggested that although children may work 'at their own rate', it is teachers who, as a matter of professional judgement, decide when children move on to the next stage, whether 'free choice' is exercised or not.

The concept of 'progression', in professional terms as teachers saw this, entails the idea of teachers 'knowing' what stage children had reached. This requires the careful monitoring of pupils' achievements, and the recording of this knowledge. This can therefore be seen as a subsidiary of 'structuring'. This is discussed next.

As shown in the second section of this chapter, teachers did keep a careful eye on what children were doing, whether they were completing 'work', and whether they were ready to start new work. Such monitoring was part of the classroom routine, and so, although not available to the children, was the keeping of records.

Teachers kept records about children's 'progress'. These included comments about work, but also about other aspects such as social and emotional development. King, discussing types of records, argued that teachers in the infant schools he observed made evaluations of children which included both 'public' and 'private' evaluations. He also stated that the contents of individual records were not "publicly revealed" to the children, or other teachers (King, 1978). This was true at Moorland in respect of the pupils, but they were available to other teachers. Nor were

they available to parents. Comments about progress in work

might be passed on, but not more 'private' comments.

The general nature of records in the infant schools is

indicated by a Fairfield teacher, who said that as a teacher

she   thought   that   she   was   responsible   for   children's

development in cognitive terms. She stated that

> "I write a general outline of what I am going to do
> ... the work the children are doing. In my record
> book I have a list of all the cards in the system,
> and a space for each child recording their
> progress in writing and number. These
> individual record cards contain information about
> each child's progress, and comment about any
> difficulties they might have.
>
> (Class 1 Teacher, Fairfield)

Teachers in other pilot study schools and at Larkway made

similar comments.

In relation to entering the infant school, Cleave et al.

noted that, for those children who had pre-school experience,

one difficulty was that such a transition could be traumatic

for some children who found it difficult to adjust to the more

structured day of the infant school (Cleave et al., 1982). It

has been shown that there were differences between nursery and

reception classes at Moorland, and records there included

indications that the teachers there were aware of the

potential problem. Also, at Larkway, reception teachers were

aware of possible problems with the home-school transition.

The records at Moorland indicated first, and primarily,

attainment and progress in work. Thus, for example, there

were individual reading records. The reading record was

divided into six stages, each containing reading books of a

similar level of difficulty. When a child had completed a

particular book a tick was recorded on his/her personal card.

The individual cards also contained a record of word-building

skills learnt. For example, 'Mary Jones' card listed,

'Janet and John - Here We Go'
'Ladybird 1A'
"Knows all single sounds
"Can blend unknown words."

                              (Record Card, Reading)

Similar records were kept about progress in maths. Here, the

sheets were divided up into 'skills' mastered, for example

Addition - 1 - 10
Subtraction 1 - 10
Recognition, Numbers 10 - 20.

They also included other areas such as weighing, capacity,

time and money.

Also in the infant school proper at Moorland records

were kept of language development. These included, for

example, such comments as

"Vocabulary restricted - never can think of
anything to say"

and

"speech immature".

There were others such as

"He has learnt all the words from Ladybird books
1A & B."

These records might be termed a practical necessity, one

intended as a guide to where children actually were in

achievement, and useful to other teachers when a child changed

classes.

However, other records were kept which were perhaps of

more doubtful use, which also followed children as they moved

from one class to another. These covered areas such as a

child's 'social' and 'emotional' development, and could

include references to 'home background' factors, such as a

father being "in prison", or of their being a succession of 'fathers' in the home.

In the nursery a child's 'social skills' were emphasised in records. In the infant school also there were frequent comments about the way children related to one another, which were in part value judgements, such as, for example,

"He talks freely to his peers"

and

"individualistic ... unco-operative".

In the reception classes at Moorland there were also comments about the way children were 'fitting in' and 'coping' with the school situation. For example,

"has difficulty fitting into a more structured day"

and also,

"has difficulty conforming to the school situation".
(Records, Reception, Moorlands)

Comments like these have some possible effect on teachers' perceptions of pupils as they pass from one class, or one school, to another. Two of the Moorland staff had reservations in private, as recorded elsewhere, about the use of school records and their possible effect on children's future progress, but said nothing of this in staff meetings.

School records, whether of actual achievement or of 'social and emotional' development, are a legal requirement, and are passed on when children move. While the achievement record may be helpful, it is possible that even this could create lower expectations of 'low achieving' children in their future school career. The more private comments about such

things as home conditions could reinforce this. This is perhaps why the issue of school records has been contentious in recent years.

Having outlined the nature of school records, the nature of the reading schemes in use at Moorland is discussed. Such schemes are a structured series, and hence they are part of 'progression'. However, those in use at Moorland presented a particular issue, the question of how far 'reading books' should be related to the 'real life' of children. The 'Nipper' series of reading books were produced because it was considered that 'working class' children found it difficult to relate to certain 'middle-class' themes portrayed in, for example, 'Ladybird' books. This was one answer to the question. Another response was that different worlds portrayed in reading books were acceptable to children and were in effect no different from other non-realistic stories, such as those about fairies or animals, just one of various 'multiple realities'.

However, it was shown both in the heads' chapter and in the chapter on teachers' 'Social Perspectives', that teachers at Moorland thought that the children there generally had "poor family backgrounds". Parents allegedly did not talk to their children like 'middle-class' parents did, children did not know how to play, and so on. The children were said to bring nothing to school. The general impression was that the teachers did not value the children's families and homes very positively. It is at least possible that the children might have recognised, at some level, this view of their

'background'.   In the case where such views were held by
teachers, the question of the particular choice of a reading
scheme becomes more important.   King, in his study of infant
schools, said of reading schemes that though the teachers had
not written the books in these themselves, that they

> "in many cases had chosen them and so implicitly
> and sometimes explicitly approved of their
> contents."

> (King, 1978, p.26

If the contents of a reading scheme portray a world which
differs from that of children, and one which is more valued by
teachers, this would reinforce the negative impression which
children may receive from teachers about their 'family
background'.

The main reading schemes used at Moorland was the 'Janet
and John' series, and 'Ladybird' books.   However, a number of
other _were_ used, such as 'Methuen Story Readers'.

In the 'Janet and John' scheme, the manual accompanying
it stresses that the themes on which the earlier books are
written are

> "the happy carefree incidents which are found in
> the everyday lives of most children". (though
> they are, however) "not the humdrum everyday
> things that all children have to do but rather
> the perfectly possible but delightful things
> that most children would like to do." (p2)

The manual openly states that

> "situations suggesting horror, fear or anger
> should not be included"

> (Munro, 1954, p2)

Yet at the same time the author stresses that

> "real life themes are dominant." (p3)

Thus, from the author's standpoint, the world portrayed
in the 'Janet and John' scheme is one which is partly 'ideal'

964

but also one where 'real life' situations are presented to children.

A content analysis of the books in the scheme showed families who lived in nice houses with gardens, and who were shown as happy and comfortable. The children were taken on visits by their parents, for example to the seaside or the country. In general, a 'middle-class' background seems to be the one presented (O'Donnell & Munro, "Janet & John" 1949, 1967).

The 'Ladybird' books were of a similar nature. The homes and gardens in the pictures seemed not to be like council house estates, they were large and again had good sized gardens. The characters in the stories all seemed to like one another and always seemed to be happy and having fun. The parents also took children out on trips, perhaps in the car. The children did not appear to quarrel or to be spiteful to each other. They did not connive at practices which were not 'helpful' or 'good'. They liked to help their parents, and were also obedient. They put toys away when told to by their parents, and also went to bed when told (Various authors, "Ladybird", Wills & Hepworth, 1956-72).

The 'reality' presented in these schemes did not match that which Moorland teachers 'knew about' in relation to the homes of Moorland children. As has been stated previously, the general consensus of opinion among Moorland staff was that children's 'family background' was such that the school had to supply the deficiencies, and give children what their homes did not, security, a stable environment where children could

learn to co-operate and not behave like "little animals", and "language", as well as treating them how to play. It is true that Moorland children were not like those portrayed in the schemes noted above. They were not always nice to one another. For example both boys and girls on occasions were seen to bite, scratch, punch and kick each other (and occasionally try this with a teacher!), However, not all 'middle-class' children have 'ideal' behaviour either, in school or out of it.

However, the schemes did seem to present a form of 'moral', implicitly, a world where things were as they should be. This world was in many respects different from what the children experienced. Whether the contrast was deliberate it was difficult to tell. Teachers acknowledged that some of the books used presented images of home life that were idealised or different, but argued that the children 'enjoyed' reading these books. However, this would not prevent children from picking up the 'silent message' about their own family life. Alternatively, as noted, the stories could have been accepted as a modern 'fairy tale'.

Some of the other books used at Moorland did present some ideas and images that might be more real for children. In one story in the Methuen series, entitled "David and Brian", one boy, David, did not want to go to school because he thought that Brian, who was an older boy, would "get him". This raised the issue of bullying, which is not unknown even to infant schoolchildren. There were fights at Moorland in the playground. At Larkway, also, some children were said to

have "ganged up on' 'Travellers' children attending this school.

In another story in the same series some children were asked by their mother to go and fetch some bread from the shop. On their way home, however, they ate the bread. Their mother told them this was "naughty" of them. So children were not shown as ideally obedient as in the other books. Nor were children always shown as playing happily together. In another story, for example, the children could not go outside to play because it was raining, so they decided to 'play schools'. The younger sister of the other children shouted, and would not play properly. In the end there was a quarrel and the children would not play with each other. So in these ways these stories were slightly more realistic.

Another feature of these books was that in them both sexes were shown as participating in such activities as helping in the kitchen, or making tea. Also, a boy is depicted as helping his <u>father</u> prepare a meal. This contrasted with the other schemes, where girls 'help Mummy' and boys 'help Daddy', the first with home activities and the latter with more exciting 'outdoor' matters. In these, gender stereotypes were not challenged.

In this part of the section the reading schemes in use at Moorland have been briefly discussed. It has been argued that the main reading schemes used portrayed a form of 'story world', an idealised picture of family life created by the authors. In some respects this was similar, in terms of relationships and atmosphere, to the classroom world created

by, or attempted to be created by, the teachers, in their efforts to provide elements which, in their view, Moorland homes failed to provide.

Earlier, the section discussed the concept of 'progression' as an aspect of structure, noting that teachers, not children, decided when the latter were 'ready' to move on to new work. Also, the use of school rewards was considered, and the question of whether these might, in some cases, have negative consequences for children was also raised.

The final section of this chapter looks briefly at the issue of classroom language.

SECTION FOUR: LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM

Classroom talk, as Tough pointed out, is a "complex phenomenon" (Tough, 1979). It performs many functions, among which are the promotion of learning, at least in intention, that of control, and the social aspect of interaction between teachers and pupils, and pupils and pupils. In a sense, this whole chapter has been concerned with language use in the classroom. The spoken language was shown, in various examples, to be the main means of communication in the classroom. The effect of written language of teachers in the compilation of reports has also been mentioned. Although language in use has therefore been a feature of the chapter, this section is concerned with making some general points about it, to emphasise the various uses it has in the classroom.

Therefore, it discusses first the 'learning' aspect. It

considers first language in terms of teachers' aims for its development in children and the purpose of this development.

It then looks at how teachers themselves use language in the classroom in terms of their 'structuring' of activities. As seen elsewhere in this chapter, such 'structuring' contains both 'learning' and 'control' aspects.

Finally, the classroom use of language by children in their interaction with others is considered.

Teachers generally in the schools visited were concerned with the development of children's spoken and written language. As part of the 'basics' of reading and writing, it was an important part of the curriculum in their 'educational perspectives'.

Others concerned with providing guidance for teachers through books have stressed that language development in children is a major aim, and should play an important role in classroom life.

Webb, for example, in a practical guide for teachers called "Modern Practice In The Infant School", argued that,

> "It should be a major task of the infant school
> to help children use the spoken word easily and
> well - and long before they can write or read."
>
> Webb, 1969, p30)

He further argued that it was the teacher's task,

> "to provide opportunities for active involvement
> and ensure that appropriate words for
> experiences are given, as the child is
> engaged in the activity." (p31)

Moyle, concerned with the teaching of reading, saw other aspects of language as bound up with this. He saw

> "the development of spoken language" (and)
> "listening,"

as part of a whole "language arts programme" which should

include these skills as well as reading and writing (Moyle, D., 1968, p128)

These various aims were in agreement with those expressed by teachers.

Moyle also argued that where children had lived in what he termed "a deprived environment" prior to entering schools, there was a need for the school to "provide compensatory activities" in order to extend both children's vocabulary and their 'experience' (Moyle, 1968, p129)

As stated in the chapters on teachers' "social" and "educational" perspectives, and again in this chapter, Moorland teachers believed that the environment of Moorland children was 'deprived', and that as a consequence of 'home background' they had "poor language development". Hence they stressed "oral work" as a means of compensating for the deficiency by extending children's vocabulary. Some examples of this 'oral work' are given below.

The 'poor language' also included grammatical errors. There was some confusion here between 'poor grammar' in Standard English terms, and 'dialect'. This is itself a complex debate, and not one in which the researcher wished to become involved. However, as a passing comment it was observed that the teachers also had a local accent, and, like most people, were not always free from grammatical errors.

Teachers' aims in relation to children's language were basically to promote particular language skills, especially the ability to discriminate between letters and shapes, and also to develop children's general learning through the medium

of language. Thus, there was an interest in not only extending vocabulary, or words, but also in extending knowledge in terms of the content of what was talked about, in broadening experience. Hence the importance of 'discussion time' in infant schools, whether 'news' or 'topics' were being discussed, as well as the assignment of activities.

The other learning aspect of language was noted in the earlier parts of this chapter when teachers were reported explaining to children 'how' something should be done, and bring out the ideas behind such things as number.

Thus far, what has been considered, though very briefly, are the general aims of teachers in relation to the development of children's language, and language as a medium of learning.

Next, language in use by teachers in interaction with pupils, the putting into practice, in a sense, of these aims, is looked at. The learning aspect is considered first, the controlling aspect later.

Some general ideas about language as a means of learning are noted first.

Resnick, in a study of infant classrooms, found in teacher-pupil interactions the predominance of a question and answer form, with teachers asking the questions (Resnick, 1972.

Wiles argued that even in the nursery school the interaction was of a limited kind, where the emphasis was on children taking information from the teacher, or instructions (Wiles, M.J., 1978)

Edwards and Furlong, in contrast, argued that such a pattern was found only in what they termed 'traditional' schools (Edwards & Furlong, 1978). The use of this term implies the existence of a dichotomy such as 'traditional'-'progressive', which, from the present research, seems a mistaken view. In any event, it was found in this research that much 'teacher-talk' was of this kind, with teachers asking questions. Moreover, they often seemed to have answers in mind. However, there were differences between schools, and sometimes within them, which were related to the perspectives of teachers. At Moorland there was more teacher-initiation of discussion and 'learning', while at Larkway pupils were given more latitude in taking responsibility for 'finding out' though, as indicated, this was more in relation to 'topic work' than the '3Rs'. The general view behind the findings noted above is that language as a medium of learning in the infant classroom can be a means of opening up opportunities for children to explore ideas, or alternatively of closing off certain avenues. It depends on the degree to which children are free to offer alternative information or ideas to those presented by the teacher, and to have them accepted, or whether they have to accept teachers' definitions. In general, when it came to 3Rs' work, the examples given previously indicate that it was teachers' ideas which prevailed.

Earlier, mention was made of the importance of "oral work" at Moorland, and examples of this are used to discuss the 'learning aspect' of language. Although stressed at

Moorland, there were similar class periods of 'discussion time' in other schools. These followed a pattern like that at Moorland, especially in relation to children's 'news'. Moreover, several examples of teachers explaining to children have been given elsewhere in this chapter, but not of this 'oral work' at Moorland.

Interaction in terms of learning was highly structured at Moorland. Indeed, teachers there saw such structuring as part of their task. Although this view was, as seen, not unknown at schools like Larkway, it had a particular reason at Moorland. As noted, teachers there did not consider that the children brought with them from home many ideas which were of use in school. The teachers saw themselves as having to provide knowledge and experience which were lacking in the children's families. They did not consider that parents talked much to their children, or, if they did, did not 'explain' or 'discuss' as more 'middle-class' parents might. The role of 'oral work' was to remedy this lack.

The following examples of such work from Moorland show the process, and the degree to which information was directed by teachers.

In the first, Mrs Knowles of Class 2 was listening to the children's 'news'. It was at the beginning of the week, and Mrs Knowles had begun by asking the children to tell her what they had been doing at the weekend. Some children had reported that they had "been to the seaside". Mrs Knowles then added her contribution to the exchange by introducing the question of what forms of transport they might have used

to get there, with some further questions. After eliciting

ideas from the class, she summed up,

> "coach, car, train. These are three things we
> can go to the seaside in."

She then asked.

> "What do we have to do if we go by train?"

A child mentioned taking a bus to the station, and then going

from the bus stop to the station, taking the teacher very

literally. However, the teacher had another idea in mind, as

her next question indicated. She asked

> "Yes, but what do we do then? We don't just
> get on, do we? We have to get the tickets,
> give the tickets to the ticket collector and
> then go on the platform."

A child interrupted,

> "Sometimes you go upstairs."

It was not clear whether she was referring to the previous

idea about the bus, but the teacher took it as meaning the

steps to other platforms at the station, for she replied

> "Oh yes, because there are lots of platforms,
> trains go all over the place."

> (Notes, Class 2, Moorland)

This exchange shows that the teacher had some information

which she wished to give the children about using a train,

rather than having a free flow of ideas.

The second example was taken from Class One. In this

instance, the children had just come back from assembly. In

this the head had talked about 'friendship' as the theme.

Mrs Dale continued with this topic during the subsequent

'oral work', which was always first after assembly.

After telling the children to sit on the mat, she asked

the children what they could remember about assembly. Having

gained the response from several that it was "about friends",

Mrs Dale then said to one child, as an example,

"I want you to tell me about _your_ friend.
Who _is_ your friend?"

The chosen child replied

"Mandy, she's nice."

The teacher then asked Mandy to come and stand by her at the front of the class. While Mandy did _so, a second child_, not the first 'friend', called out,

"_I_ play with her in the playground."

The teacher took no notice of this, but went on with her 'lesson'. She said,

"Let's see what we can say about Mandy."

and then asked,

"Is she tall or short?"

Yet another child responded, saying succinctly,

"Short."

The teacher accepted this, and went on to ask how old they thought Mandy was, and then told the class

"She's five. Tell me what she looks like."

The child who had answered the question about height answered the last request by saying,

"She's beautiful."

The teacher made no comment, and began asking questions about what they could tell her about Mandy's hair. She had one or two suggestions, such as that it was "fair." At this point in the proceedings Mrs Dale noticed that a boy, David, had started to eat an apple. She broke off the 'lesson' to admonish him, which shows that the learning and control

975

aspects of language are often mixed in the classroom. She told him sharply,

"<u>David</u>, you've no need to eat your apple.
It's <u>not</u> <u>lunch</u> time. Put it in the lunch
box, <u>please</u> ..."

She then returned to the theme of the 'oral work', saying,

"<u>Now</u> what <u>else</u> could we say about her <u>hair</u>?"

A fourth child replied, briefly,

"Fair."

Mrs Dale rejected this, saying,

"<u>No</u>, we've <u>said</u> that. Her hair is <u>curly</u>, isn't
it, not <u>straight</u>.

She went on,

"Who else likes Mandy? <u>Tony</u> (who had put up
his hand) Why do <u>you</u> like Mandy?"

Tony replied,

'She's <u>nice</u>."

Mrs Dale rejected this answer saying

"<u>No-o</u>, <u>another</u> word, <u>not</u> <u>nice</u>."

The child who had earlier answered 'Short' suggested,

"helps."

The teacher accepted this, and went on to talk about kindness and helping other people.

What seemed clear from, this exchange was that Mrs Dale was trying to develop both vocabulary, the '<u>not</u> <u>nice</u>' shows this, and also knowledge of concepts, the 'tall - short' opposition and so on. It also seemed that Mrs Dale was controlling the information, by accepting or rejecting children's ideas, either directly in the latter case, or indirectly, by ignoring them. But it also seemed that the children were not quite sure of what was expected of them. Since the assembly had been about 'friendship', and Mrs Dale

had begun by asking about a 'friend', the children seemed puzzled by the 'descriptive' questions. This is shown by the mostly one word answers to the teacher's suggestions, and the tentative nature of the 'helps' answer at the end. Mrs Dale, in accepting this, did not point out the difference in kind of words like 'nice' or 'helps', but turned from the description to what might have seemed the more obvious attributes of 'friendship', which might have been what the last child had in mind, thinking of the assembly theme.

The exchange seemed to close off ideas rather than expound them.

The second example of 'oral work' is taken from the same class. What the teacher was intent on in this was to promote conceptual understanding, to help children to identify the properties of a certain type of learning apparatus, and develop visual discrimination. The apparatus in question, designed to develop logical thought, had arrived the previous day.

Mrs Dale first called the children to come and sit on the mat. Then she asked them,

> "What came yesterday? Do you remember what
> came yesterday? The postman brought some
> games, didn't he? I want to talk about these."

She pointed to the apparatus, which was a box full of coloured plastic figures. She asked generally,

> "Who can tell me something about this figure?
> holding one up. I want you to tell me three
> things about this figure."

One child said,

> "He's walking."

Another added

"He's _red_."

The teacher prompted, "and he's a -?"

A third child filled in the required word "_man_."

While the two previous answers had been accepted, the teacher apparently considering that the two conceptual characteristics of colour and means of locomation had been grasped, the third answer was rejected. Mrs Dale, in response to it,

> "_No-o_ - he's _red_, he's _walking_ (reiterating what had been 'learnt') _and_ - he's a _boy_. _Umm_, wait a minute, Peter, see if _you_ can tell me three things about _this_ figure" (holding up another).

Peter replied, rather doubtfully,

> "_Um_, yellow."

He added after a pause that he could only think of _one_ thing.

Mrs Dale then asked another child, Donald, to see if he could think of anything else. Donald replied,

> "Sitting."

A fourth child added, uninvited,

> "It's a _lady_."

Mrs Dale accepted both these answers, and went on to restate the three characteristics that would be found in the figures shown, namely, colour, whether moving or not, and whether man/boy/lady.   She then went on to discuss another characteristic, the way movement could be divided into different kinds. She said first,

> "There's sitting".

A child added, "Standing."

Mrs Dale agreed, "Yes, _standing_ and - ?"

A second child contributed, "_Walking_."

This was accepted. Mrs Dale went on to distinguish in the same way the types of figure. She talked about the distinction between "men" and "ladies", and said that these belonged to one 'set' called "adults". She then spoke of "boys" and "girls", who "belong to the <u>children's</u> set".

She then took a small set of cards from her table. Some had faces on them, while others showed 'adults' and 'children' sitting, standing or walking. Another set showed different colours, red, blue, green and yellow, like the figures. Mrs Dale picked out some children to hold up certain cards. One child held up a 'blue' card, and one a card with a 'lady's' face on.

Mrs Dale asked the rest of the class to "think about" what the two cards were showing, and obtained the response "blue" and "lady". The teacher thought that the class had grasped the idea, so went on to the next stage. A child was asked to hold up one of the plastic figures. Mrs Dale said

"What cards do we need to go with it?"

(The figure was a <u>boy</u>, coloured <u>green</u>, who was <u>standing</u>.)
She asked again,

"What do we need to find?"

A child replied

"Green."

Mrs Dale accepted this, saying

"Yes, - we need to find a <u>green</u> card."
She added, "We need to find a <u>green</u> card with a
            little <u>boy</u> on it -
            What else do we need to find out about it?"
Another child replied, "Standing."

Mrs Dale agreed, saying "Yes, he's <u>standing</u>."

She then summed up what had been 'learnt', stating,

"Yes, he's <u>green,</u> <u>so</u> <u>he's</u> <u>green</u>, he's a <u>boy</u>, and
he's <u>standing</u>."

This session of oral work continued in the same vein with
more figures and cards for some twenty minutes. It ended by
her telling the class that it was time for another activity,
an instance of direction.

"Well, it's time for P.E. <u>Quietly</u> go and
put your pumps on, if you've got some ...
<u>quietly</u>."

While the children in the class were more involved in
<u>this</u> piece of oral work than they had seemed in the 'news'
exchange, and seemed to grasp the ideas required, the session
was still teacher dominated in terms of the giving of
information and the asking of questions. Again, the children
tended to give predominantly one-word answers. The teacher
was trying to elicit principles of set analysis, but did not
seem to be allowing the children to explore possibilities for
themselves. In her concern to get the 'right' answers, she
was not really letting them bring out the principles through
discussion or question, with children perhaps asking <u>her</u> to
explain. Children on the whole seemed to accept what the
teacher said. This form of 'teacher talk' may thus 'frame'
children's thinking, and orientate it towards a particular
direction chosen by the teacher. In providing a structure
for pupil talk in this way, the effect can be to limit
children's opportunities to explore ideas through language.

The above examples of 'oral work' at Moorland were
typical of this type of work. It has been stated earlier in
this chapter that teachers here and also in other schools
'structured' children's learning in the 3Rs. It was teachers

who told children what was wanted, whether explaining the writing of letter shapes, as in the following, rhetorical question.

"What do we do first? A line straight down."
or in the query, by a teacher

"What is this number?" On being told "one", the teacher told the child "Right, draw one."
There were many other examples from schools of this kind of direction, which admits of little discretion or exploration on the part of children. These features seemed to be found in 'topic work', and even then more in schools like Larkway than those like Moorland.

Thus, from a brief look at the use by teachers of language as a means of learning, it seemed that the pattern which Edwards and Furlong suggested was found only in 'traditional' schools was more widely in use.

The other use of language by teachers, its controlling, or directing aspect, has also been shown in earlier parts of this chapter. It has been noted that teachers 'structure' activities in the classroom in terms of their control of the 'what', 'when' and 'how' of activities, and use language as the means of doing so. Teachers used language thus not only to give information about specific aspects of learning. At Moorland, and schools or classrooms which were similar to it, language was used to direct closely the 'what, when and how'. At schools like Larkway, the pattern was more flexible, within limits. Even here there were clear distinctions between what counted as 'work' or 'play', and appropriate or

non-appropriate choices. Also, in all the schools observed, there were some 'rules' common to all, such as rules about untidyness, silliness, noise and politeness or its lack.

In this 'controlling' function of language use by teachers, the same opposition between *relative freedom to explore meanings* and reasons or take these as given as in the 'learning' use was found.

In this area, some work by Bernstein was seen as providing a possible basis for consideration of how teachers exercised control through language.

Bernstein wrote of two types of control, which he termed "imperative" and "appeals". Although initially discussing language used as control in family situations, he saw the 'learning' involved as having an application in schools.

According to Bernstein, "imperative" control was that which

> "reduces the role discretion accorded to the (regulated)."
>
> (Bernstein, 1971, p180)

In other words, children were given orders which left no room for discussion and which they were just expected to obey.

> "Appeals", on the other hand, were,
> "modes of control where the regulated is
> accorded varying degrees of discretion in a
> sense that a range of alternatives ... are
> available to him."   (p180)

In other words the children were asked, rather than ordered

to do something. However, Bernstein divided "appeals" into two types, "positional" and "personal", which differed in the degree of choice available.

In "positional" appeals, the appeal was to the child's position in terms of status, as child against adult or older child. He argued that this form meant that

> "... learning about objects ... events and
> persons is reduced, and the child comes to
> learn that the power which inheres in
> authority may soon be revealed." (p183)

This seemed to have some similarities with the 'imperative' mode in effect, because of the 'authority' involved.

In the case of "personal" appeals, the focus was on the child as an individual, treating him/her as 'reasonable' and able to appreciate the grounds for the request. This form also seemed to imply some choice for children in whether or not to comply with the "appeal" (p183). There was some indication that Bernstein considered that parents in 'working-class' families were more likely to use the "imperative" form, while a certain type of 'middle-class' would be more likely to use "positional" appeals, whereas the 'intellectual' middle-class would be more inclined to use "personal" appeals.

Applied to schools where pupils were deemed to be 'working class', this concept perhaps suggested that the 'imperative' or 'positional' form of control might be expected where pupils were not seen as able to be reasoned with, whereas, with pupils who were, like most teachers, from 'middle-class' homes, the 'personal' type might be more in evidence.

However, in the schools seen teachers seemed to make more use of direct commands when telling pupils what to do and when they might do it. Though, as noted, there was some flexibility over 'when' in schools like Larkway, if children did not 'choose properly' they were brought into line with the 'understood' rules of work by comments such as "Get on or I'll move you". At Moorland the order was more directly controlled, as shown in comments such as "Maths first, then writing", or "You can write a story now". Children were left in no doubt in all the schools that the teachers were the authority, sooner in some cases, later in others.

Sometimes, evaluative comments on the 'work' produced by pupils were direct, as in, "I'm <u>not</u> having <u>this</u> scrappy work", and sometimes indirect, as in "I can see <u>nice</u> writing", but in both cases children were being made aware of what was expected of them.

The same mixture of direct and indirect forms of speech were also found in connection with unacceptable behaviour apart from work. A child could be told directly, "You are being rather rude", or else reminded more indirectly, as in "We don't eat sweets in school".
The same indirect command was evident in a remark such as

"We can run without making a noise, can't we?"
This form of indirect command, which might be termed a 'negative imperative', was much in use in schools, as King also found (King, 1978).

However, again children were not given much room for

manoeuvre, and were aware of the limits.

The forms of language in use in the 'controlling' aspect of structuring by teachers was seldom found to be of the 'personal' type, with appeals to reason, except that a child might be, for example, told, "You know better than that" rather than being told "Stop it". Sometimes, however, there were 'positional' appeals, where children who were older were reminded that because of this they knew what to do. But both these forms were exceeded by the more direct/indirect forms.

This part of the section on language in the classroom has looked at the learning and controlling aspects of teachers' use of language. It has been indicated that, in general, with some differences between schools, children had not much scope for exploration of ideas or of definitions of behaviour. In the former case this was more true of 3Rs' work, but in all schools, in terms of behaviour, children were reminded of the 'rules'.

Finally, the use of language by children is looked at. This has already been seen in the responses to questions by teachers. However, children, within the framework set by the teacher as 'structuring' agent, did talk together, sometimes about work, sometimes about 'rules', and sometimes about non-school events, and sometimes about imaginative play. The following examples show this. The first was taken from Larkway, from the boys making models of oil rigs. One of them said,

    "Why don't we make it go rigid down to there?
     It's the drill."
As noted, they had been sent to look at reference books, and

had obviously picked up some idea of the construction of rigs.

This boy was later seen cutting card into strips. His 'colleague' asked him,

"What are you doing? What have you done that for?"
The first boy explained that it might make the drill part stronger.

Here, children were using language to explore ideas, but, as noted, this was a topic, which had arisen out of an interest brought out in 'discussion'.

In other cases, children were heard to remind each other how to do something, as in the following from Moorland. One child in a group said to another, who was drawing a picture,

"That's how you do a nose, like that."
Two other children in the group were copying letters. One said,

"I'm doing an m."
The other said

"I'm doing a c."
They were looking at each others' work, to see how they were doing the letters. Another child pointed out,

"You've got to do those first."
pointing to some other letters.

As noted earlier, when children knew the 'rules' they were ready to point them out, as in the 'plasticine incident, to other children. In another instance, one child said to another,

"You've got to do the writing first, then the picture."

Children in a group also talked to each other about such things as playing out of school, or TV programmes, or outings with parents. This talk was often interspersed with talk about the 'work activities' they were engaged in, as a form of light relief. For example, the following was recorded at Moorland, in a group of three girls. One, Jane, said,

"We was splashing in the puddles this morning."

Samantha joined in, "And I was." Jane added another comment, saying

"We was, weren't we, Tracy?" Tracy replied,

"Yes, cos' it was raining."

Samantha agreed with this. "Yes it were, weren't it?" Jane said to her, as if to reject her joining in,

You wasn't splashing, cos' you haven't got

no wellies."

Samantha did not like this, and said angrily, "I have." Tracy at this point looked at her book, as if to break off the conversation, or else remembering they were supposed to be working. She enquired,

"Which way round is number six?"

Samantha showed her, and added, pointing to a line of Unifix cubes (a maths apparatus) "Look, I've got fifteen."

Apart from talk of these kinds, children also engaged in "imaginative talk" in which they cast themselves in roles such as 'mummy', 'bus driver', or, as in the example below, 'cafe-owner'. Sometimes this 'play', as in this instance, could involve the teacher. The setting, at Larkway, was in the Wendy House in Class 1 there. The child, a boy, was

playing there, talking to himself about what he was doing.
The teacher went over, having been listening, and said to
him,

> "I'm coming for a cup of tea. What are you
> having for dinner today?"

The boy replied,

> "Egg and one of these."

pointing to some pretend food. The teacher asked,

> "Are you going to make me a cup of tea?"

The 'owner' replied, "Yes, in a minute" in quite a 'grown-up'

way. The teacher reminded him, before going back to her

table,

> "I don't want sugar in my tea."

Later the boy took her a 'cup of tea', or rather a jug from

the property box. The teacher said in mock outrage,

> "I'm not drinking out of _that_. I don't
> _drink_ out of a milk jug."

She might have been making a teaching point, but it was still

a joke, and the boy recognised this, since he grinned at the

teacher. He went and fetched another 'drink'. The teacher

looked at this for a moment and then said to him, again in a

joking tone,

> "You haven't got any _milk_ in this. You're
> hopeless. I'm, not coming to your cafe any
> more."

Thus, language in the classroom can be used by children in

different ways, and interaction is not always teacher

dominated. When talking to each other, children seemed able

both to explore ideas and also to reiterate those of the

teacher. In the last example, it was shown that teachers

and children _could_ enjoy a joke together, even though for the

most part life in infant classrooms was a very busy affair,

with 'work' taking pride of place.

Language in the classroom has been shown to be in this section and the rest of the chapter an important means of communication. It has been indicated that for teachers, language has both a learning and controlling function.

In seeking to develop children's language, extending vocabulary and experience, teachers sometimes in practice seemed to close off opportunities. It was indicated that teachers did most of the questioning, and gave most of the information. In the controlling function, teachers used language to make expectations regarding work and behaviour very clear, leaving little discretion for pupils.

Children's own use of language was shown to be partly 'work' related, but was used to reinforce the teacher's directions as to when and how to do things, and also 'rules' of behaviour. However, it could be used for exploring ideas, or, in 'non-work' talk, developing imagination as well as used for some relief from 'work'.

This rather brief discussion of language in use in classrooms brings to an end the concerns of this chapter.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has attempted to show something of the nature of classroom life in infant schools. It has shown the materials and activities available in pre-school and infant classes, and the way in which these were organised for use. It looked at the degree of choice available to pupils.

Certain other aspects of infant school life were considered. These were the 'progression' of pupils, and the

monitoring and recording of this by teachers, and the nature of reading schemes in one school. Finally, language in use in the classroom was discussed.

One finding was that, compared to *nursery classes*, the reception classes in infant schools were more formal and organised, with less time for free choice of activities. The infant day was also longer. Though in some cases the materials and activities present in the nursery were also found in infant classrooms, there were omissions, and in some schools there was a reduction in certain activities between reception classes and those for older pupils.

In infant schools the 3Rs were found to have priority over other activities. In infant schools, though not in the pre-school setting, this seems to have brought about the 'work-play' distinction which was found to be well understood by children, and to be present in teachers' talk to them.

It was found that, whatever the form of organisation in schools, it was teachers who in <u>practice</u>, as well as in <u>theory</u>, made most of the decisions with regard to 'what' was available, 'when' it should be used, and 'how' things should be done. This 'structuring' of pupils and activities related mainly, though not exclusively, to the three Rs. Though there were differences between those schools which operated a version of integration of activities and those that did not, these differences related to children's having, in the former case, some control, within limits, of the 'when' with regard to 3Rs' 'work', and the 'how' mainly in connection with topic work.

One interesting finding was that while in the main research school there was scepticism about 'free choice', an experiment begun partly accidentally indicated that children in this school could cope with some choice over when they undertook activities.

It was shown that the concept of children progressing through activities which were graded according to ability was usual, and was part of teachers' structuring of events. Records were shown to include both achievement and, more dubiously, items about social and emotional development and home matters. It was suggested that in some cases this kind of record might affect children's future school careers.

The reading schemes in use in the main research school were analysed in terms of themes. It was indicated that the main scheme presented a picture of family life that might be at variance with the experience of pupils in terms of social class. It was suggested that two possible results might follow. Either children might take such stories as a form of 'fairy tale' as part of a world of 'multiple realities', or they might receive a negative impression of their own 'background', given the teachers' negative views of this.

It was found that teachers' use of language in relation to their aim of encouraging language development in children could have the effect of closing off exploration of ideas. The teacher question, pupil answer, form was found to be dominant, as was teacher control of the provision of information. In areas like topic work in some schools, children had more freedom to use language to explore.

Otherwise, children's use of language showed that the teachers' ideas about how to do 'work' and when, and rules of behaviour, had been taken in. Children also used language in imaginative play, and to develop 'non-work' relationships.

To sum up, in looking at the 'routine' of infant schools, it was found that, despite variety, teachers 'structure', in various ways, the practical activities of the classroom.

In this, schools may not have changed much, despite differences in externals, from schools in earlier years. While looking at the history of infant education, the researcher came across a book containing a series of photographs of infants' schools showing "Then and Now". A school in the 1870s showed children sitting in a gallery, so that they were all visible to the teacher. An infant classroom of the 1900s showed children sitting in rows of desks facing the teacher. All were doing the same activity.

In the 'Now' photograph of the same school in the 1950s the children were seated in small chairs at small tables, or standing talking to one another. This photograph was said to show the different climate in 'modern' classrooms (Bourne & MacArthur).

As noted in 'Setting The Scene, the classrooms visited in this research were shown to have similar small tables and chairs, and classrooms on the whole seemed bright and cheerful. A range of materials and activities were available, and the children did not seem all to be doing the same activity at the same time. These were the first

impressions.   As Berlak and Berlak observed, such first impressions are apt to be misleading.   This chapter, showing that teachers are in control of classrooms, suggests that in this, at any rate, schools have not changed.   The chapter on 'Educational Perspectives', as well as this chapter, have indicated the priority given to the 3Rs.   In this respect also, schools have not changed so much.

The next chapter considers teacher 'control' in relation to the compliance of pupils.   It thus discusses teachers' 'structuring' of classroom activities, as this chapter has done, but is concerned to show more of the content of control, and the response of pupils, instead of, as in this chapter, concentrating on the teachers.   As stated at the beginning of this chapter, these two chapters are complementary in that they are discussing the same issues though doing so rather differently.   They are intended to be taken together.

CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE?

TEACHER AND PUPIL INTERACTION IN THE INFANT CLASSROOM

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with the efforts of teachers to control the situation in the classroom, in the interests of stability and order to enable 'work' to proceed, and with the degree to which children accept or resist such control.

Several studies of school and classroom interaction have considered such issues of teacher control and possible non-compliance by pupils. These include, for example, Denscombe (1980), Gannaway (1976), Hargreaves et al (1975), Willis (1977) and Woods (1979).

Most of these studies have been of secondary schools, but some have looked at middle schools, such as Hargreaves (1979). Others have been of primary schools. (Pollard, 1979). Few have considered these issues in terms of the infant school, although Sharp and Green (1975) and King (1978), and later Lee (1984) and Hartley (1985) have done so.

As stated elsewhere, the researcher had several reservations about the work of Sharp and Green in particular. One point is especially relevant for the concerns of this chapter. As noted, Sharp and Green held that teachers in infant schools operated with a 'child-centred ideology', as indeed did King. In Chapter Three it was shown that there are contrasting views about the prevalence of this 'ideology', and it was also shown when discussing teachers' 'educational perspectives', that not all would regard themselves as being in agreement at all with its supposed tenets, or, even if there was agreement over some points, not with all. This is not the issue here, It is mentioned because, since Sharp and Green took this stance, their comments on the issue of teacher control were, in the researcher's view made less generalisable. This was for two reasons. First,

they claimed that:

> "many of the key categories in the teacher's perspective
> on her work relate to control rather than learning,
> teaching or instruction."
>
> (Sharp and Green, 1975, pp. 121-2)

These authors did not make it explicit what such 'control' referred to,

but they seem to separate it from cognitive aspects of classroom life.

The present research indicated that teacher control (defined later)

covered all aspects of such life, 'social' and 'cognitive', because they

could not easily be separated.

Secondly, Sharp and Green stated in respect of Mapledene that because

the school had a 'child-centred' philosophy, teachers were expected to

put into practice its 'key features'. This presented them with practical

problems in 'managing' classroom life. (Sharp and Green, 1975).

This present research has led to the view that it is not a particular

type of pedagogical or 'ideological' approach which makes 'control' of the

classroom a problem for teachers. It is something inherent in the meeting

of groups of people, such as teachers or pupils, who may have different

expectations of each other, as well as separate interests in the situation.

Thus classrooms are, at least, a setting for conflict.

Other writers have taken a similar view. Denscombe, for example, cited

the idea of Delamont that the classroom was like a battlefield. He argued

that this metaphor, although it had its limitations, did draw attention

to "the negotiated element of activity in classrooms". He stated that:

> "It is patently absurd to consider classrooms as settings
> in which social order is by fiat and where pupils accede
> to every word of the teacher [and that] to a greater or
> lesser extent, the social order of the classroom is
> negotiated ... with teachers and pupils adopting strategies
> which promote their particular interests."
>
> (Denscombe, 1980. p. 65)

Pollard expressed a similar view, as did Hargreaves. (Pollard, 1979; Har-

greaves, 1979). However, Hargreaves also observed that social order in the

classroom could not be seen as entirely a consequence of negotiation.

As stated previously, these particular studies were not of infant schools, but this present research indicated a similar position assisted in the infant schools seen.

This view contrasts somewhat with that of King, who seemed to offer more of a 'consensus' picture of classroom order in the infant school. King did see the teacher as the definer of reality in the classroom, arguing that social order was created by the teacher and maintained by teacher control. However, he argued that most children complied willingly with the teacher's demands, even though he admitted that "all forms of control are slightly tenuous", and that children could resist the teacher's authority. (King, 1978, p. 494). However, King considered that such resistance was rare. This present research led the writer to hold a different view, that such non-compliance can be, in certain situations, a common occurrence. Children can also be powerful reality definers, depending on various situational factors.

King also claimed that behind teachers' forms of control was a view of young children as "innocent in their intention". He seemed to be arguing that the teachers he saw did not interpret:

> "naughty behaviour as an outcome of the children's
> free choice."

That is, when the children did misbehave, the teachers did not see them as "intending ... to be naughty".

In the classrooms seen in this research, some teachers did blame 'poor homes' or a particular family background for 'naughtiness'. However, they did not necessarily absolve children from intention. They did see children as sometimes choosing to be 'naughty', or to fail to comply with their requests. This was indicated by comments such as "Susan can be good when she likes" and "Tony can do good work when he feels like it", or in

some cases "when he [or she] wants to".

These comments imply the possibility of active choice by the child. In several cases children seen did appear to know what they were doing and that this was not only not what the teacher wanted but also an active rejection of her 'authority'. Two examples of this last both came from boys, but although, as noted elsewhere, boys tended to be more troublesome, girls could be, on occasions. In the first, Nevil angrily remarked about his teacher, that "She's not going to tell me what to do". In the second, Charlie, aged six, was heard to say, "F... off" when the teacher told him to do something. In these cases, both the children and the teachers concerned recognised a degree of deliberateness in the response to the teacher's requests. Both these last examples came from Moorland. Such extreme rejection was not usual in other schools, though not entirely absent. At Moorland it was not at all uncommon.

Riseborough, in an unpublished paper, quoted a teacher in a secondary school who said that one child set out deliberately to destroy teachers. (Riseborough, 1983, p. 144). In the present research some children were seen who, while they may not have set out to 'destroy' teachers, did deliberately try to disrupt activities and refuse point blank to carry out instructions. In the view of one Moorland teacher, such children had made her life "a misery" at times because of the way they had behaved, engaging in such things as fighting, kicking, swearing and so on. At times, she said, she had gone home in tears. And she was an experienced older teacher, not a young probationer.

However, even 'difficult' children were not always non-compliant. Children's reactions seemed to depend in part, on the particular situation, and the teacher they were with sometimes.

These, then, were the considerations which formed the starting point for this chapter, based on observations in the classroom and reflection on

the work of other writers in the light of these.

The first section of this chapter considers attempts by teachers to control both pupils' social and work/play related behaviour and thus establish 'rules', noting briefly why teachers believed such control to be necessary. In part this section is a development of the theme of teacher structuring of classroom 'order' discussed in the previous chapter, but is not concerned with the activities themselves as with the rules of behaviour associated with them.

The second section discusses the issue of pupils' responses to those efforts by the teachers. A typology of such response is used, again as a basis for discussion.

SECTION ONE : TEACHER CONTROL: THEIR EFFORTS TO DEFINE AND MAINTAIN CLASSROOM ORDER

As a generalisation it seemed clear that teachers did attempt to establish and maintain a stable classroom order of the kind they desired, so that classrooms could run smoothly and the routine proceed with as few disruptions as possible, and as few challenges to the teachers' authority as possible. They attempted to 'socialise' children into their preferred regular patterns of behaviour, both social and 'academic'. Their reasons for doing this were to some extent inferred during discussions of teachers' 'perspectives', which often took place in their classrooms, as well as less formal conversations in connection with observed events. There was also direct discussion of rules and routine with some of the teachers. On other occasions teachers, having read the researcher's interpretations of their actions in relation to classroom events, had discussed these with the researcher subsequently. The teachers agreed with the researcher's interpretations regarding classroom 'rules'.

Some of the reasons for teachers attempting to control classroom order are instanced later in this section.

The patterns or routines teachers sought to establish and maintain related both to general social behaviour, that is how children were expected to act towards each other, and to the teacher, which might be called general rules of conduct, and also to activities such as reading, writing, number, art and craft and so on which were connected basically with cognitive development.

For a model of teachers' attempts to produce their version of classroom order the modified model of 'framing', set out diagramatically in the previous chapter is used here to cover both the work and behaviour aspects.

As noted in Chapter Seven, there are arguments about Bernstein's 'framing'. However, the main point for the researcher was that the definition he gave, quoted in that chapter, seemed to be concerned with 'work' or 'cognitive' aspects of classroom life. In contrast, it is argued that the idea of 'control' used below covers both general behaviour and pedogagical 'work' demands, because in the infant school and probably elsewhere also, these are seen as inextricably bound together. There are 'good' and 'bad' ways of doing work quite apart from the activity itself, and also a pupil who is misbehaving 'socially' is unlikely to be 'working properly' either. In different contexts teachers were seen to emphasise one aspect at times more than another, but no teacher in any school was seen to neglect either.

Pollard also used a modified version of 'framing', which he also used to apply to behaviour, but not in quite the same way as the model used here. (Pollard, 1980, p. 47).

The dual model of classroom order which seemed to cover teachers' efforts is set out diagramatically below.

CLASSROOM ORDER – TEACHERS' CONTROL OF PUPILS

REGULATION OF GENERAL BEHAVIOUR	REGULATION OF 'ACTIVITY' BEHAVIOUR
What	What
How	How
Where	Where
When	When

Again, the first point to be emphasised is that any model is, of course, a simplification. No model can adequately convey the complexity and the continuous flow of classroom activity, its 'sound and fury'. In action teachers were continuously shifting from concern with pupils' general behaviour to that for 'activity' behaviour. Both teachers and pupils also engaged in selection from a range of possible behaviours.

It sometimes seems that teachers 'select' behaviour from one set of principles, and attempt to persuade pupils to act in accordance with these. For example they are exhorted to try to be tidy, get on with their own work, be sensible, while pupils are acting from another set. It is the possible clash between the two that may give the teachers problems. The pupils' principles can derive from group rules of friendship, as much as, or more than differences of social class, between them and teachers, although these can of course, link to class. The following example indicates what is meant here. It is taken from Moorland.

> "Occasionally I became part of a children's group. One day when sitting at a table I was talking to the children. There was one boy 'good' at drawing Indians according to the others. Other children were asking him to help them with their drawings, which he did. One boy suddenly asked me if I could draw an Indian on a horse because the 'artist' had too many customers. The boy said, 'I'm no good at Indians and horses'. So I drew a horse. After this I was inundated with requests to draw things.
>
> However, afterwards the teacher came to me and commented that, 'It's not a good idea to give them too much attention. It stops them from doing things on their own'.
>
> The point was, though, that the children had not been working on their own, even before I started to help them. They had appeared to communally organise themselves, rather than work individually."

(Observation notes : Moorland)

It could be said that attempting to generate 'shared' understanding is what the teacher is about in the classroom, to lessen the problem of dealing with individuals, and be able to deal with the 'crowd'. In some ways the situation is like that of a parent with a number of children. As Hargreaves argued, the relations between teachers and pupils revolve around similar themes to those between parents and children. (Hargreaves, D., 1976).

The second point about the model used is that the rules which are quoted are decontextualised. The importance of context must be emphasised. As Hargreaves noted elsewhere, the existence of a rule cannot be inferred just from the reported speech. (Hargreaves, 1975, p. 62). If an observer gives the context, the rule or rather the observer's interpretation of it as a rule is made clear. Giving the context also allows for other interpretations such as the teacher's own. A different, though related, point about context is that the teacher also considers pupil action in a given situation, so whether pupil behaviour was acceptable or not depended upon the situation. It was noted previously that children also react according to the situation and the teacher. Hargreaves referred to this differential reaction when he stated that in many aspects of school life one teacher's deviant is another teacher's darling. (Hargreaves, D., 1976). A boy called Charlie was considered by one teacher, Mrs. Dale, to be a "lovely child", but his next teacher, Mrs. Knowles, to be a nuisance, and a "thoroughly bad lot". What is being pointed out here is the essential fluidity of rule definitions by the teacher, and the complex nature of interpretations by all the actors involved in a situation. This includes an observer.

A small example of situational definition by the teacher concerns pupil talk. The example is taken from a top infants' class at Larkway.

> "Two boys were going to make a model in connection
> with a topic ...

> Teacher: "Well you boys go and talk about it ... what
>   you will need ... how you are going to make it." "

Here talking is 'good'. Two other boys were doing writing and were talking

to each óther. The teacher said sharply: "Will you stop talking and get on

with your work". Here talking is 'bad'.

With these points kept in mind the diagram seems a useful framework

for considering concrete examples.

Rules about 'general social behaviour' and rules, connected with

activity related behaviour can be analytically separated, but in practice

as stated often operated concurrently in a situation. *King made a similar*

point. He stated that:

> "... the control of learning and the control of behaviour
> were often exercised together in the same situation."
>   (King, 1978, p. 80)

The following example comes from Mrs. Knowles' class at Moorland. It

was also used in the previous chapter to illustrate that children could not

choose to define 'playing' and 'choosing for themselves'. It shows how

control of behaviour and activity related behaviour can occur together.

The context was that:

> "The teacher had previously set some children to work.
> Some of them had finished it. They were then told to
> do 'choosing'. [Free choice of bricks, lego, box games,
> etc.). Mrs. Knowles had to leave the room for a few
> minutes. She came back to find them underneath a table.
> She looked directly at them, and demanded in a loud
> voice, 'Who is being silly ... what are you doing?'
>
> Two boys: 'We are playing dogs ... (rather truculently).
>
> Teacher: 'We are not I'm afraid ... Go and find something
>   to do.' "

Here, the teacher is not only reminding them of what counts as legitimate

'activity' but also saying something about general 'good' behaviour, the

requirement to be "sensible". (A word the teacher used quite often to

praise behaviour).

The researcher did not always necessarily ask whether the rules existed

or what they were. She watched and listened to what was said and done by the teachers and the pupils. In this sense an observer is like a child who also has to 'make sense' of what others do in the classroom. When a child did something that was either praised or criticised then the existence of a rule was made visible to the observer just as it was to the children. In the same way, teachers also watched and listened to what children said and did in order to estimate their compliance with the 'rule'.

The points about fluidity and complexity are illustrated by giving here partial accounts of one session in each of two different classrooms in one school, with a shorter excerpt of one from another school, since these give a more adequate picture of the continuous nature of the teachers' efforts than a series of single examples. The examples also show some of the strategies teachers used to try and obtain compliance from the pupils. This point is discussed after the two examples, in analysing how teachers made the rules clear.

The first example is taken from a reception class for 4+ to 5+ children at Moorland. The session was early in the day. The children came into the classroom from the hall, where they had been going to watch a television programme which was not on, however, as the teacher had mistaken the day.

They came in rather noisily, so the teacher first tried to settle them. She said:

'All of you come and sit on the carpet and face me.'

Most of the children did this but some did not and instead ran round the table. The teacher checked this as soon as she saw it and said:

'There are four children who <u>don't</u> seem to know where the

carpet is.' [She looks straight at them]

The children came in and sat down but still fidgeted, she she ordered, using <u>naming</u>:

'Paul <u>turn</u> round and <u>face</u> me please and I want to see

1003

everyone crossing their legs ... <u>David</u> cross your legs.'

. David's reply was quite funny, at least to the observer. He said:

'I <u>can't</u> cross my legs.' He glared at the teacher when he said
this, and was quite adamant about it as well as cross.

The teacher ignored the reply and went on with 'news', a regular
morning activity. Her efforts to <u>make the lesson happen</u> were
constantly interrupted. For example, one child called out:

'Mrs. Knowles, someone's kicking me.'

Mrs. Knowles replied:

'Is she?' in a voice without much expression.

The teacher ignored the kicker, *who stopped for a minute or two, but*
started again a few minutes later, and also started talking in a
loud voice to a neighbour. The teacher looked at her and said in
a cross raised voice:

'<u>Susan you</u> are being <u>rather</u> rude. <u>Someone's telling me</u>
something.'

Susan stopped. The teacher continued to ask for news. Whilst she
was doing this, some children stroked each other's hair, and one
boy started quietly punching another in the back. The latter turned
round and said:

'Stop it ... stop playing about.'

The teacher stopped what she was doing and looked at the boy who
had been doing the punching. He stopped this activity and grinned
at his neighbour.

The teacher went on to talk about transport, listing types and
asking for suggestions from the children. This part of the session
continued without interruptions ... when she had finished she indi-
cated this by saying:

'Please ... would you like to go and <u>clear</u> the tables and
go and <u>sit</u>.'

She gave out some books to some of the children, and called others
to a free table. Some of the ones she called out did not come to
the table, and some of the rest did not sit at theirs. The teacher
reacted to this quite sharply using names.

She said:

> 'I <u>told</u> you all to <u>sit</u> at a table. Michael ... Jason you come
> and sit here now - Tracy - Tina - Tina you sit down.'

They did so.

> 'We are going to do a picture at the top of the page. <u>Listen.</u>
> [children were talking] <u>Draw</u> me a picture of you going to
> the seaside.'

She gave out some crayons and told the children to find a clean page
in their books. The researcher looked over a few children's
shoulders and saw that the page was divided into two parts by a
line. Some of the children started a picture. One child asked:

> 'Do you do it like this, Mrs. Knowles?'

Mrs. Knowles replied:

> 'No, you do it <u>there</u>.'

Another child had started her drawing. The teacher looked at it
and said:

> 'No---o, <u>here</u> on this side.' [Points to the page]

She continued walking around the room looking at what the children
were doing, and writing sentences for some of the children. One
boy, <u>Stephen</u>, got out of his seat and went round to another table.
Mrs. Knowles saw him and said:

> '<u>What</u> are you doing <u>there</u>, <u>go</u> and <u>get on</u> with your writing
> if you have finished your <u>picture</u>.'

The teacher looked at another <u>boy</u>. The observer saw him change his
book with that of his neighbour and start drawing on it. The teacher
saw him do this as well. She said to him:

> 'You do it in <u>your</u> book, <u>NOT</u> in <u>anyone else's</u>.'
> [Raised voice, face close to child]

Meanwhile two other boys, <u>Jason and David</u>, start making miaowing
noises and swaying backwards and forwards on their chairs. The
teacher saw and heard this and said:

> '<u>Who's</u> being <u>rather</u> silly?' [Looking at Jason and David]

King noted this form of control of behaviour. (King, 1978).

<u>The two boys</u> continued miaowing. The teacher spoke to them again.
She said sharply:

> '<u>Look</u>, if you <u>can't</u> be <u>sensible</u> David and Jason, you'll go
> and sit on your own. <u>Get on</u> with your own work.

The boys at this point did start to write but continued to laugh and
giggle.

The teacher in the first example seemed to be expressing considerable difficulty in her attempts to establish order. This statement is based not only on observation but also on the specific statement by this teacher that she was having problems with this particular class. Her attempts to establish order are shown by the frequency of her verbal utterances designed to monitor both social and work activity behaviour, and in particular the control of pupil movement and noise (shouting and miaowing).

Gannoway noted the significance of noise for the teacher relative to other teachers. (Gannaway, 1976). It came to the researcher's knowledge that the adviser came to the school to see Mrs. Knowles, at the instigation of the head teacher, who quite often popped in for some reason or another. It is possible that the teacher was aware of the head's concern although this could not be discussed because the information was confidential.

This example shows the number of disruptions that hinder the teacher's attempts to establish continuity, or rather order. It was very difficult for the researcher to perceive any pattern, and the noise level was very high.

The example also shows the teacher's attempts to establish continuity in the activity and the pupils' resistance to this. She was trying to get the lesson going but several of the children seemed to be trying equally hard to stop her. The situation reported in the above example was fairly representative of events in this particular classroom. Things were usually like this for this particular class. At any one time three to a dozen children were behaving like this though it was not always the same children. Equally some children were never like this. The researcher went through all the observations in this classroom in order to find out if such behaviour was only attributed to one or two children and whether it occurred each session observed).

The above example also indicated that certain boys were more of a problem behaviour issue than girls. During the observations, Jason, David and Paul were reprimanded by Mrs. Knowles as well as a boy called Charles. However, Susan, who appeared in the above example, was, as noted in a previous chapter, considered to be a nuisance by Mrs. Knowles.

The next example is taken from a middle/top infant class of six to seven year olds, also at Moorland. In this instance break had finished.

The researcher returned with the teacher and her 'class' to their classroom. The children sat on the mat. Some children were fighting each other on the floor. The teacher looked at these children. Her first words were directed at this 'illegal movement' [a term used by the researcher]. The teacher said briskly but not in a loud voice:

'Sit properly ... you are being very noisy.'

Then she reminded them 'legs crossed please'.

This showed the idea of sitting in a particular way.

One boy had then started to talk so she said sharply to him:

'Why are you making that noise? Sh:sh.'

Again King noted this type of question which did not require an answer as a form of control. It indicated rules about the noise level.

Her facial expression changed. Her face became quite stern and her voice more emphatic, although still low. She said:

'Somebody went in the lunch box and helped themselves to biscuits.'

A child interrupted at this point with the remark:

'Amanda had three bags of crisps, Mrs. Martin.'

The boy appeared to be thinking of another rule, that of bring your own lunch, and not sharing it with other people. Mrs. Martin replied to this point. She asked:

'Did everyone in this class eat their own lunch? Don't give your lunch to anyone else.'

She added to another child:
'Stop fiddling.'

... Mrs. Martin went to pin a '100 square' on to a wall of the classroom. She told the children to count to twenty. She pointed to each

number and said it, and then the children repeated it. When they
reached twenty she stopped and told the children:

'Stop there.'

She then called on one boy and pointed to a number on the chart.
She asked this boy:

'David, what is this number?'

'Twenty.'

Mrs. Martin continued to nominate other children in the same way.
The activity was not interrupted by the children and they 'joined in'
by putting up their hands. After ten minutes of this activity, Mrs.
Martin changed to an 'I Spy' game. She began:

'I spy with my little eye something beginning with T.'

One boy put up his hand and said in a quiet voice:

'Trousers.'

At the same time another child put up his hand. He was wriggling
about. Mrs. Martin said to him:

'Bottom on the floor sitting properly. I'm not choosing you.'

This was clearly pointing out that a certain type of behaviour was
associated with this activity. The teacher went on with the game.

'T for trousers.'

The boy who had previously given this example said in a slightly
aggrieved tone:

'I said trousers and I was sitting still.'

However, Mrs. Martin ignored him or else she had not heard him. She
went on with the I-spy game for a few minutes and then changed to
another activity. Mrs. Martin said thàt she was going to continue
with the class topic. She then read a story to the children which
was connected with the topic and then talked about the topic. After
this she instructed the class what she wanted them to do next. She
said to them:

'Now we are all going to sit down and do some writing. Just
sit on your chairs and I'll choose someone to give the books
out - Now look at the blackboard.'

She hard someone talking at this point. [It was the boy she had
reprimanded for not sitting properly on the mat]. Mrs. Martin
ordered him in a cross public voice to:

'Go and sit on the carpet and stop fidgeting.'

She said it in the kind of voice familiar to any teacher which indicated that 'I have just about had enough of you'. The boy walked slowly to the carpet and sat down. He looked at the floor. Another boy also started to rock backwards and forwards and giggle and was ordered to:

'Go and sit at the front of the room.'

He did.

Mrs. Martin enquired of the rest of the class:

'Are you ready?'

This was not really a question.

... Mrs. Martin then wrote a sentence up on the board. She turned to the class and asked if anyone could read it. Several hands went up and Mrs. Martin called on one child to read the sentence. She repeated the process twice and then she said:

'Listen, I want you to write - just the writing.'

She had emphasised in previous sessions that writing had to be completed before starting a picture.

Mrs. Martin told all the children to 'do the writing on the next clean page' and then how she wanted it to be written.

'Spaced out using all the page.'

All the children opened their books and started to write. On this occasion no one talked much. On previous occasions if the children talked too much, or were observed talking all the time that they were doing writing then they were reminded that this was not acceptable behaviour, as when told for example:

'Quiet over there or you'll do extra work.'

'You are talking too much. Get on with your work.'

The teacher spent the rest of the morning at her table checking children's work, and hearing reading. She made comments to some children about lining up at her desk. Where they pushed into the queue by her table, for example:

'If you want to see me get in the queue properly.'

During the 'process of checking' she also commented on 'the way' work was done. For example:

'What's the matter with you today. You're going

to have to do this <u>all over again</u>. It's <u>really</u>

<u>rubbish</u> isn't it.'

In reply the child nodded her head. She returned ten minutes

later. Mrs. Martin looked at the child's book and said:

"That's a <u>bit</u> better at least.'

In the second example the teacher appeared to be experiencing fewer

challenges to her attempts to control the class. Although there was

still speech directed at stopping unauthorised movement, what seems more

evident in this class was speech directed at activity. This was more con-

tinuous. The children were moved briskly along from one activity to

another. There was more class activity controlled by the teacher. The

children were told quite clearly what the activity requirements were, both

for behaviour and content, and the order in which these were to be done.

In this classroom there seemed more 'control' related to activity (or

'framing') whereas in the first example the stress seemed to be more on the

control of 'social behaviour', although both teachers dealt with both

aspects.

Both examples, apart from indicating the flow of events and the shift

between both aspects of 'framing' or control, also indicate that these

teachers have different abilities to realise their will in the classroom.

This issue is one which the researcher did not want to go into. The re-

searcher merely wished to indicate that among various tentative explanations

for such different abilities, there exists the possibility of the evalua-

tion of pupils by the teachers, and the possible consequences for the

pupil reaction. It is at least possible that the teacher in the first

example had lower expectations with regard to her pupils' cognitive

ability, and thus put primary stress in classroom practice on the social.

It is worth pointing out here that the children in the first class were not

regarded by the head as being as difficult as those in the second class,

rather the reverse.

It has been noted in previous chapters that the area from which the children at Moorland came was regarded as a problem one by the head, and also that three of the teachers stressed this and two acknowledged it but were non-commital about attaching too much importance to it. However, the difference between the two teachers in the examples above indicate that social class does not necessarily account for some of the difficulties the first teacher experienced. If background was the only factor, both classes would have displayed the same problem. However, this particular issue is not a consideration here.

The third example is taken from Larkway. As noted, this had a different catchment area. This is done to indicate that it is not just in a 'priority' area that teachers consider both aspects of control (or 'framing').

The last example is taken from a class of top infants 6+ to 7) and is from an afternoon session, but the pattern *of activities in this* classroom was fairly similar whether morning or afternoon.

> The teacher, the deputy head, talked briefly about what the
> children were going to do that afternoon. She told the
> children:
>> 'Today is a short day so we'll have to get a move on.'
> (It was shorter because the class had had someone from the Green
> Cross Code come in and give a talk during the morning).
>
> In her hands the deputy held some books with 'topic' written
> on them. She told a few children that she wanted them to finish
> their topics on oil rigs. After this she asked one or two children,
> both boys and girls, whether they were going to finish off a certain
> activity. She asked:
>> 'Kali, are you going to do your number work ...?'
> and
>> 'Simon, are you going to do your number work first?'

Both boys nodded their heads and went to collect books and number
cards from a box. Previously they had been working on models.
The deputy had not disturbed them as they were 'getting on', she
said.

By 1.55 pm all the children were sitting at tables. The teacher
walked around the room looking at the children's activities. One
boy was doing a 'tens and units' sum card. The teacher looked
over his shoulder and frowned as she observed the card that he was
doing. She said sharply:

> 'You've got the wrong one again. I'm losing patience
> with you.'

She looked cross and annoyed. Matthew, the boy concerned, just
looked miserable.

A girl asked the researcher:

> 'Would you like to see my writing on oil rigs?'

The researcher noticed that the deputy had written 'excellent' on
it, and drawn a smiling face. She asked what the face meant, and
the girl said:

> 'It means I've done good work. You get a miserable
> face if you haven't.'

Meanwhile other children were doing various activities. One boy,
Robert, was finishing a model on the 'making' (art and craft)
table reserved for this practice. On another table children were
writing. One boy was drawing a picture. Another boy came up with
a work card in his hand. He looked at the drawing and remarked:

> 'A picture isn't important.'

The other boy looked up and said:
> 'I'm doing it in a minute.'

He carried on drawing and the other boy went away.

The teacher continued walking round the tables. One boy, David,
had been wandering round the room, but eventually sat down. How-
ever, he did not start work, but chatted to his neighbour, who was
not saying much. The deputy, had instructed David twice before to:

> 'Get on with your work.'

Now she went across to him and said in a very quiet voice, stressing every word:

'I - am - going - to - put - you - OVER THERE. [Pointing to a table].

She did not actually move the child. This seemed to be more of a threat for future behaviour. Next she ordered:

'Get on.'

and pointed a finger at his writing. The boy looked at her wide-eyed when she first approached him, and when she started to threaten action he stared at his book. He did not reply.

The teacher then sat down at the corner of one of the children's tables and children brought her their books and showed her what they had done. While looking at what they were doing, she periodically glanced round the room, occasionally passing some comments about 'talking' and 'movement'. For example:

'Come on John, it's time you finished.'

John was talking to his neighbour.

Matthew now brought his writing to the teacher. She looked at it enquired sharply:

'Was I talking all that time for nothing?'

It was not clear what she was talking about. At this point she raised her voice and demanded:

'When I was talking this morning where were you - I want to know what oil is made of.'

Matthew looked glum. The deputy told him to:

'Go back and do it again ...'

Her comment referred not to the manner in which the writing was done, but the content.

The deputy continued looking at the children's work. About ten minutes later she reprimanded another child. She said:

'You've been messing about .... You haven't been getting on with your work.'

A girl brought up her work. The deputy looked at it and smiled. She ticked the book and said:

'That is nice writing.'

She drew a smiling face on the page of writing. The girl looked at the teacher. She smiled at her. The smile was acknowledged.

At this point Robert came up to the researcher and showed me his writing. He had done half a page of close writing on oil rigs. The researcher asked him:

'Is this the usual amount that you have to write?'

Robert replied that it was, adding that the teacher had told him that he did not have to do any more than that. He went over to a tray and told the researcher:

'You have to show the teacher first, because you put in
  in the tray.'

The researcher saw several children show their 'work' to the teacher and then put it in the 'finished work tray'. The teacher made comments in a low voice so it was not possible to hear what she said.

About ten minutes later, the deputy stood up. She used a 'raised public voice' to announce to the class:

'I've got a funny boy here - he says rigs make oil.
  Is he right?'

She said it in an 'incredulous, disbelieving tone'. Some of the class shook their heads. The teacher told him to 'go and find out' and then do the work again.

During the latter part of the afternoon, about ten minutes before playtime the researcher saw three boys take out a box of lego and start to use it. An argument developed about how many children could play with it. One boy had come up and 'joined in'. The others told him:

'You can't play here - there's too many.'

The last boy ignored this and carried on playing with the lego. One of the other three boys then approached the teacher and complained:

'He won't go away.' [Pointing to the boy]

The teacher stopped what she was doing and went over to the lego group. She looked them over and said:

'Well someone go and play somewhere else.'

She did not ask who the offender was, nor was the activity itself
questioned.

In this third example the teacher is shown to be strongly concerned
with 'keeping the children busy'. She appeared to be controlling both
the pace and the content, and the manner of 'doing work', including
the prevention of 'messing about', or disturbing others. However, the
children appeared to have some choice over the timing of their
activities.

In this classroom the rules seem to be made quite clear and judging
by the responses of the children, or at least most of them, they seem to
be quite aware of them, and some seem to have internalised them.

Yet when talking to the teacher afterwards, she pointed out that
some of these children could be, or rather could "cause problems", if
given the opportunity. This talk took place after a student had been
taking the class, with not entirely happy results. This awareness seemed
one of the justifications for her obviously close monitoring of what
the children were doing. There seemed to be less stress on social
behaviour apart from work, simply because the children are not often at
a loose end.

From all these examples, many of the teachers' 'rules' can either
be inferred, or are explicit. These are summaried briefly.

Summary of Classroom Rules

All these examples show that several of the teachers' 'rules' for the
classroom are related to their definition of what counts as 'work', or
'messing about'. This latter category covers a multitude of sins, anything
which the teacher deems not to be doing what is required whether this is

through pupils' speech or actions.

The 'illegal' speech acts include 'chatting' or non-work directed talk, including talk while the teacher is talking, and talking too loudly when speech is permitted, or making silly remarks ('those not defined as useful by the teacher), or giggling. 'Illegal actions' include any pupil movement that is defined in a given context. Children never seem to just 'sit' in an infant classroom.

Whether speaking or moving, children are clearly not expected to disturb others, or prevent them from working. The reminder to be polite seems to be directed at preventing this.

Teachers seem here to be constantly exhorting children to be sensible. In fact 'being sensible' seems to be the teachers' shorthand for following the rules.

Having said what the 'rules' seem to be, the means that the teachers employ to 'get the message across' to the pupils is now considered.

Means Employed by Teachers in Seeking Control

As a general comment the researcher observed that the teachers seen relied principally on speech to indicate the rules. Rarely did they resort to physical sanctions, although these were not unknown when a teacher became too exasperated by a child. There were a few instances of this happening.

The next point is that the rules were frequently stated rather obliquely, although the teachers could be and often were quite explicit if this was seen as necessary. Some of this obliqueness is evident in the classroom sessions given as examples, as well as quite noticeable direct statements.

Thirdly, in all the classrooms that were observed the rules, whether

explicitly stated or left to be inferred, were in constant need of re-affirmation by the teachers. At times some bargaining appeared to take place berween the teachers and the pupils, amounting to a partial re-definition, even if sometimes on a temporary basis. The degree to which re-affirmation took place varied from class to class and school to school, but was never entirely absent.

King stated that there are "two circumstances" in which teachers take action directed at control, either "adventitiously as the situation required" or "in anticipation of a situation". That is they react to the immediate happening, or to prevent possible future trouble. (King, 1978, p. 50).

Both from the examples given above, and from other data the researcher reached the same conclusion. Teachers seemed to be constantly keeping an eye on what was going on, and to react quickly. They also seemed to have an awareness of trouble brewing, and tried to head this off if possible.

In disoussing means, a closer look is first taken at 'anticipation' using the concept of 'cueing'. By this is meant the giving of signals by the teachers to pupils as indications of what was required. Usually these 'cues' were a sign that the pupils should listen to or look at the teacher. Such cueing seemed to be an important means of attempting to control classroom order, especially in the initial stages. It was most obvious when pupils were to change activities, as for example, from and to written work, or to get ready for break.

Cueing at the most explicit or primary level merely signalled this change, directing the children's attention to the required action.

These cues were mostly verbal, and were given in a public voice, but were accompanied usually by eye-scanning,looking round the room and so

catching the eye of pupils, and also on occasion by clapping.

The cueing indicated to the children both what the activity was to be and, where and when it was to take place, and who was to take part, often using cue words such as 'listen', and 'now'. For example these signals were heard at various times:

1. "All of you come and sit down on the carpet."

2. "Now we are going to do a picture at the top of the page."

3. "Now we are going to do some writing."

4. Listen everybody don't start a new job now - it's time to clear up."

Cues could be given to individuals or groups, or to the whole class as in 1 to 4 above. Individual reminders were quite common, such as:

5. "Now Charlie, it's time to clear up."

6. "Kali, are you going to do your number work now?"

and groups were told for example:

7. "I want the red table to come and do their writing now."

or

8. "Has everybody on that table finished their number cards?"

Examples 6 and 8 indicate the use of questions as signals. The context is not given here, but the actual situation was that it was quite clear that in neither case was the teacher actually asking a question to ascertain a fact, but instead was reminding the children of what they should be doing.

King argued that the typical method of control used by teachers was oblique. He commented that teachers prefer "to make requests" rather than give orders, and reward good behaviour rather than punish the bad. King noted examples of teachers using this non-information requiring question, as when for instance a teacher asked, of a child who was obviously was not:

"Are you getting on with your work?"

He also noted the use of impersonal pronouns, as in:

"When everyone is ready we will choose somebody to bring
in the milk."

(King, 1978, p. 62)

which avoids stating directly that some people are obviously not ready.

Several instances of this were observed by the researcher such as:

9.   "There's somebody here who's talking and running about."

and

10.   "I think someone's still talking."

However cues did not always appear to be detected by the pupils.   Even when

they were, they did not _always_ elicit the required results.

For example, in the third classroom, when the teacher enquired:

"Where were you this month? Was I really talking to
myself?"

She was indicating that the cues had been missed, and was reminding the boy

that during the morning, when she had been talking to the class, he had not

been listening.   She was thus invoking the rule that when teachers are

talking they expect the children to listen.

If the cueing was not picked up by the children then this provoked a

little more direct attempt at control.

Sometimes this was still in question form though it was not really a

question, such as asking a group:

"Would you like to clear the tables?"

"Can you run without making a noise, boys?"

If the cues were still missed usually the teachers became explicit, and

stated the rule.   One example of this was:

"Ian, you've got to listen when it's listening time.   It's
not talking time now."

And another was:

"Ian, we don't eat sweets and chewing gum in school."

It is perhaps not irrelevant that this boy was new in the school and

in the reception class.

Turning to the question of reacting to the situation, the majority of the teachers seen made frequent use of direct commands. These were generally given to the children who were indulging in illegal acts. In the first classroom example there was the boy who was told about his work, when he was drawing in another boy's book.

"You do it in your book and not in anyone else's."

The command "Come on it's time you finished" was common. Sometimes such commands were a negative injunction such as:

"Stop messing about."

or

"Stop fidgeting."

rather than the positive request to do work for instance.

Another means of attempting control was 'naming'. This was often used after a teacher had given a general cue or command. A teacher in the reception class at Moorland was heard to say for example:

"All of you come and sit down on the carpet and face me."

Five minutes later, not getting the response she wanted, she said sharply:

"Paul, turn round and face me - Matthew Smith will
you stop talking."

Teachers seemed to use evaluation as a means of control, especially in relation to the manner in which work had been carried out but also with reference to behaviour. King, in his remarks in infant schools also found that:

"the control of learning and the control of behaviour were
often exercised together in the same situation."
(King, 1978, p. 50)

Teachers express 'approval' and 'disapproval' of certain types of behaviour and make value judgements. Emmet defined a value judgement as being:

"an expression of approval or disapproval which carries
the implication that what is approved of should be done
and what is disapproved of should not be done, if the

expression is used in circumstances where action is called for."

(Emmet, D., 1966, p. 37)

The term evaluation like value judgement, involves the use of criteria for assessing the value of something against some standard. It includes a notion of what is 'desirable' and 'worthwhile'. Evaluation implies the existence of standards both for activities and general behaviour.

Teachers made judgements about how work was done and doing it 'properly', noise levels and talking whilst 'working' as well as about general behaviour.

Judgements were made about children's work when they 'showed the teacher' what they had been doing. In the infants' school this was compulsory, for example:

Teacher: Patrick, get on with your writing.

Patrick: [Scowls] I've finished.

Teacher: Well show it to me please.

[Patrick still scowling gives it to her]

(Moorland)

It is interesting to note that in Moorland nursery children were never heard being 'told' to show what they had done to the teacher, although they did 'show' the teacher voluntarily.

[Child goes to Mrs. Raynor and shows her a picture he has drawn]

Teacher: What a lovely picture.

Simon: Dat's a big horsey and dat's me.

As stated, teachers made judgements about how work was done and what counted as doing it properly. There were several examples:

"If you hand in untidy work again you will have to do it all over again."

(Fairfield)

and at Moorland:

1. "Best writing please. I don't want peculiar letters
   any more."

2. "I'm not having this scrappy work any more Samantha Smith."

3. "I can see some nice writing. Wouldn't it be nice if
   we did nice writing every day?"

4. "This is messy work, do it again."

                    (Moorland)

and at Larkway:

        "That's untidy. You've rushed it. You will have
        to do it all over again."

                    (Larkway)

As can be seen from some of the above examples the penalty for doing

'untidy' or 'messy' work was having to re-do it.

Teachers also 'evaluated' children's efforts in other areas apart from

'writing' or 'work' including colouring pictures and painting. In the

following examples the teacher was concerned about the use of colour.

1. "I want you to colour the picture properly, no
   scribble please."

                    (Moorland)

2. [To child who is painting a bus he has made out of
   cardboard boxes]

Teacher;   "What colour are you going to paint your's,Michael?"
Michael: "Black."
Teacher: "Oh I don't think that's a very nice colour. Buses
            aren't black are they?"
Michael: "Red."
Teacher: "That's a nice happy colour."

                    (Mrs. Knowles, Moorland)

The researcher asked the teacher why she had told Michael to paint his

bus a different colour. She said that recently Michael had been using black

in his pictures all the time and she was rather worried about it.

On other occasions children were rebuked for colouring 'squirrels' and 'grass' blue. In King's terms children were being asked to 'reproduce' 'conventional' reality rather than being left to define painting for themselves. This was not the case in the nursery at Moorland where children were left to 'choose' what colours to use and use them in any way they wished. For example during one session a child was observed painting the whole of a sheet of paper red and then painting over it in a different colour.

Children themselves 'evaluated' each other's activities but such criticism was not always accepted by the recipient, for example:

> [Two children doing writing]
>
> Child 1: : [Looks over neighbour's shoulder]
>   and says: "That's scribble."
>
> Child 2: [Throws book on the floor, rushes to the book
>   corner and starts to cry and shout]
>   "I'm not doin' no more writin' now."
>
> (Moorland)

There were also rules about noise levels and talking whilst work was being done, for example:

> "Don't waste time chattering ... you are going to have
> to do this all over again. It's really rubbish."
>   (Mrs. Dale : Moorland)

During other activities such as P.E. similar restrictions on noise operated and shouting was discouraged, for example:

> "We can run without that noise can't we." [To class of boys]
>   (Class 4, Moorland)

Teachers not only 'evaluated' the way in which activities were done, but also commented on 'general behaviour.' Such 'evaluation' covered aspects such as 'being silly'/'sensible', 'messing about', 'sitting properly', 'rudeness', interrupting when the teacher was talking, and 'answering properly'. For example:

1. "Don't make silly murring noises."

(Rushside)

2. "I'm not having <u>silly</u> children in my class."
   [To child pulling faces]

(Moorland)

3. "Don't throw sand boys. You're being silly."

(Moorland Nursery)

If children were being silly they were told to be "sensible".

1. "If you can't be sensible you won't be able
   to play in the Wendy house."

(Fairfield)

and

2. "Stand up straight, stop being silly and be sensible
   please." [To child]

(Moorland)

<u>'Messing about</u> was also 'disapproved of':

"There's somebody there who's just messing about and
not doing their writing."
[To child talking to neighbour but not 'writing']

(Larkway)

<u>Rudeness</u> was also not acceptable to teachers, for example:

"Susan you are being rather rude."

and neither was interrupting while the teacher was talking and not

'answering questions properly', for example:

1. "Don't interrupt when I'm talking John ...."

2. "Lisa Taylor, I'm telling a story."

(Moorland)

"Stop talking."

(Moorland Nursery)

and

<u>Teacher</u>: "Did you like the poem?" [To class]

<u>Children</u>: Yea." [Only a few children reply]

<u>Teacher</u>: "I'll ask you again and you can answer properly."

(Moorland)

Appeals were sometimes used by teachers. Sometimes these were made with reference to the child's status in terms of age because there were general expectations as to what children of a certain age were capable of, for example:

"You should know better. You are one of the oldest in the class."

Teachers expected older children to 'behave better' than younger ones and also to do more work. Conversely they expressed surprise when younger children did work they considered would usually have been done by an older child.

1. "I expect the tops [oldest infants 7 yrs old] to do a page and a half of writing."

(Fairfield)

and

2. Teacher 1: "Look at this Mrs. Doyle. He's only reception and look what he's done. He started these [_ + _ =] ... then went on to do this card, and all this week."

Teacher 2: "Yes, that's very good for reception, You don't expect that."

(Fairfield)

The teacher of Class 5, at Larkway distinguished between top infants and 'reception' children in terms of what she expected from them. The researcher had asked her if she saw any differences between the top infants and reception classes. The teacher. herself came up with the above distinctions. She stated that she expected her children (top infants) to be able to "work on their own" and to "develop responsibility" for their own learning. However, it was interesting that at Moorland one teacher adamantly denied expecting anything from children of different ages because in her view children developed at different rates.

Some appeals were made on a personal level, such as:

"Come on Susan. I know you can do it when you really try."

although this coaxing was much less evident in the schools seen.

The tone of these appeals in the nursery class at Moorland was different to that heard used by teachers in the infant schools, for example:

"Oh I _did_ tell you not to play, _honey_."

(Nursery : Moorland)

King argued that the use of 'endearments' such as 'my love' and 'little one' were part of being an infants' teacher and that "professional pleasantness" was a feature of their relationship with children. (King, 1978). However, endearments, like this and in the example above were only ever heard in the nursery at Moorland, never in the infants' school.

There were other forms of appeal. Another means used occasionally was reference to an external authority, whether outside the classroom or outside the school. Such reference was used either for encouraging 'good behaviour' or as a threat for bad behaviour.

One boy in the top infants' class of Moorland was told:

"You did read that nicely. Mrs. Warner [the head] will be pleased."

This speech was also heard. It was directed at another boy in the same class:

"You are bone idle - I'll have to talk to your parents about your work if you do not improve."

Sarcasm was occasionally used by one teacher. In one instance this was observed during 'family time', a period when the class was brought together to sit on the mat at the start or end of the session. Two boys were leafing through a book and giggling. Everyone else was quiet watching the teacher. The teacher stared at them coldly, and the rest of the class turned and looked at them as well. Perhaps alerted by the silence these boys looked up, saw the teacher's expression and quickly put the book away. She said "_Thank_ you" in the kind of tone that implied '_so kind_ of you to give me your attention'.

The above example also contains an instance of the use of non-verbal means of exerting control. In this case the silent stare. Other forms of facial expression were observed. Teachers were seen to look pleased, rather cross, even sometimes rather angry. Eye contact was frequently observed. Teachers were continually seen to 'look' at 'misbehaving' pupils.

A related means of exerting control was the use of <u>different</u> intonation. A particular tone of voice alerted children to praise or criticism. Also the same remark could have different meanings according to the emphasis and inflexion it was given.

When children were seen by the teachers as failing to comply more continuously, teachers seemed to escalate sanctions. One such sanction was the threat of the loss of some favoured activity. For example, a boy who had previously been warned three times what would happen if he kept on talking was told the next time:

"You have lost your playtime."

Children could also be threatened with more work, for example:

"Be quiet over there or you will do extra work."

This particular sanction might seem likely to provide the wrong attitude to work however. Moving a child from friends was another ploy in this category. For example:

"Get on or I will put you by yourself."

was heard. Also a child who had only copied half a sentence was asked "Why are you so slow today?" Consequently the child was ordered to "Go and work at my desk."

Occasionally one or two teachers resorted to physical means of control. In one class at Moorland a boy who had been wandering about for about ten minutes, and constantly getting in and out of his seat, was caught hold of and placed firmly in his seat.

In the reception class in the same school one boy, Charlie, for reasons

best known to himself, was going round kicking other children. The teacher
told him to "Stop that at once". He ignored her and carried on so she
repeated the command. He said "No" emphatically and when she went to
take hold of him he kicked her, whereupon she ordered him to take off his
boots. Charlie shouted "No" again and stamped his feet and glared at the
teacher, so she attempted to take them off herself. Charlie resisted
vigorously. Finally she simply upended him by the ankles and took the
boots off. She could perhaps be said to have been practising a form of
'mortification'.

In another instance an equally exasperated teacher used removal,
this time of herself, from a situation which was 'getting out of control'.
This was used as a tactic to allow a child time to recover. The child, a
boy, had been told quietly by his teacher that one of his sums was
wrong and that he had to do it again before dinner time.

The boy responded to this request by screaming and sobbing almost
hysterically for half an hour. The teacher went out of the room it was
dinner time) remarking to the observer that:

"It's best to leave him alone. He will get over it in time."
Although so far what has been noted have been examples of what might be called
negative forms of control in that they were directed by teachers at the
prevention of certain acts. Teachers did of course use praise
as well, as a means of sustaining preferred behaviour. Such praise was
given for good work, for example:

"That is nice writing."

"What a lovely picture."

"That's brilliant Linda." [She gave 'glowing' as a word
  beginning with 'gl' in I-Spy]

"You have been working well today."

As noted, in Class 5 at Larkway the teacher drew 'smiling faces' on 'good' work.

A child drew the researcher's attention to this information during obser-

vation in the classroom one day.

> Child: "Would you like to see my writing?"
>
> Researcher: "Yes please ... what does the smiling face mean?"
>
> Child: "It means I've done good work, and you get a
> miserable face if you haven't."
>
>   (Child : Larkway)

Praise also was given during P.E., for example:

> "Oh Michael touched the floor with his hands ... we'll
> all watch Michael. That's good, you're really trying."
>
>   (Teacher : Larkway)

Praise was also given for "sitting nicely" and also being 'sensible',

for example:

> "You are all being very sensible ...."
> [To class as whole. They are sitting quietly]
>
>   (Class 3 : Moorland)

It was also given when behaviour had improved as in the case when a child

whom the teacher had previously categorised as "being silly" and "rather

rude" was reported as having been "really good" with the further remark,

to the head that, "she has a good side".

As well as praising good behaviour teachers also gave rewards as

well as taking away a favoured activity as a sanction. This often took

the form of choosing, to those who had completed the required work. This

'choosing' was often extra to the set time for the activity.

Those then were the principal means which teachers were seen using

in the classrooms visited. Such means were used to attempt to control

most aspects of classroom life.

Before looking at pupil compliance some of the reasons which teachers

gave for their efforts to be in control of both social behaviour and

'learning' are noted briefly, since they have been referred to in the dis-

cussion of teachers' perspectives.

Moorland school had a nursery class attached to it and the majority
of the children in the main school attended this. The nursery teacher
gave several reasons for the school attempting to control social behaviour,
reasons which were also given in the main school, although two teachers
there stressed the need to develop 'skills'.

The nursery teacher stated that:

> "The staff have to start right from the beginning on
> social skills."

This was because she thought that:

> "Parents do not provide basic training such as learning
> to clear away toys or sharing."

This implies that parents in a different area might teach their children
to do these things. This teacher also remarked that "order and stability"
were "necessary" because:

> "children want order, whatever the area, but more
> so in one like this."

Such a remark seems remarkably reminiscent of the 'missionary approach' to
working class schooling in the Nineteenth Century. She also referred to
the children as "little animals". (See also King, 1978).

Variations on these comments were made by other teachers in the main
school, including the head. The latter remarked that "the mark of a good
teacher is being in control", which can add point to the previously noted
possible importance for teachers of classroom noise.

The researcher remarked to the deputy at Moorland that there
appeared to be certain 'standards of behaviour'. She agreed with this
analysis while also emphasising that there were 'standards of work' too.
She considered that the teacher had to control activities, rather than
the pupils. She said that the children "are more directed. They are told
when to start and when to finish". She said that this was because:

> "keeping them busy is very important. You've got to keep
> them occupied otherwise there would be chaos. They'd be
> running round doing nothing."
>
> (Deputy : Moorland)

1030

The same teacher also admitted that although children could be given

a series of tasks to do and a free choice of when these were to be done, in

her opinion:

> "That would be no good here, children would not know
> how to organise themselves."

Yet this teacher was one who never made constant reference to the children's

home background, and stressed that the work of the teacher was to 'help

children to learn'. This is an instance of the complexity of teachers'

beliefs. There is no simple relationship between actions and beliefs.

On the need for control in general a teacher in another school made

the point that:

> "You've got to clamp down on these children. They've
> got minds of their own. If you don't, they'll do
> what they want."
>
> (Deputy : Larkway)

This comment was made after the teacher has observed a student taking

her class and who in her view had allowed the children to do what they

wanted and had not clamped down on certain behaviour which she herself

would not have accepted. The comment in a sense sums up why teachers

feel the need to control. In the 'normal classroom', whether secondary

or infant, there is always the possibility of things getting out of hand.

The next section of the paper looks at the question of the degree of

pupil compliance with teachers' attempts to control work and behaviour

in the classroom.

SECTION TWO : PUPIL COMPLIANCE

This section looks at the nature and extent of pupil compliance with the

teachers' efforts at control.

It was argued in the introduction that the infant classroom, like the

secondary classroom, could better be regarded as at least a potential

'battleground', rather than a 'consensus' situation, full of 'innocent'

and compliant pupils. The examples discussed in the previous section indicate that such conflict can and did arise in the infant classroom, and that this did not necessarily relate to the catchment area of the schools.

Having looked at the data a very tentative model of pupil compliance and teacher control was constructed. This model represents a simple ordering of the data. It appeared to be reasonably useful, although such categories are artificial constructs, and as such do not necessarily account for all the data.

Pupil compliance is seen as capable of being divided into four basic categories; active compliance, passive compliance, active non-compliance and passive non-compliance:

TEACHER IN CONTROL	TEACHER NOT IN CONTROL
1. ACTIVE COMPLIANCE	3. ACTIVE NON-COMPLIANCE
2. PASSIVE COMPLIANCE	4. PASSIVE NON-COMPLIANCE

In three and four pupil behaviour requires sanctions as teacher control is challenged to a greater or lesser degree.

Some general points need to be made about the model. First, pupils do seem to react to different teachers in different ways so that pupils may pass from one category to another depending on the teacher they have. Secondly, even with the same teacher other variables influence children. Because of this their behaviour in either aspect is not fixed. They can pass from one category to another in the course of a day, or even an hour.

A third point is that the categories can relate differentially to 'work' activity and social behaviour. It was quite possible for a child to exhibit both some degree of compliance in 'work' activity but also some degree of non-compliance in terms of general social behaviour, such as shouting or punching a neighbour, for example.

Observations of children's speech and actions in the classroom, some
of which have been given in the examples in the first section, indicated
that they did in fact know quite well what they were expected to do in the
classroom, both in relation to the amount of work, and the type of general
behaviour which was acceptable, 'sitting properly', not fighting, not talk-
ing loudly, not running around and so on. They were also aware of the
limits of choosing as the following example shows:

<u>Researcher</u>: "What do you have to do?"

<u>Child 1</u>:   "Two number cards and writing."

<u>Child 2</u>:   "Yes, but you can do more if you want to."

<u>Researcher</u>: "Could you choose not to do anything if you
                 wanted to?"

<u>Both Children</u>: "Oh <u>no--o</u>."

Other pupils nearby also joined in this denial and there was
considerable laughter at the idea of being able to do nothing.

These children were clearly aware of the limits of freedom. Another
example which indicated that pupils do know the rules and therefore are
aware of 'wrong doing' when they do not comply is the following. Here
one of the reception classes at Moorland had been taken over by the head
teacher, while its own teacher went to take music elsewhere. One girl,
Mary, was getting on with her work while her teacher was in the classroom,
but as soon as this teacher left Mary stopped writing and started turning
round in her chair. The researcher happened to be sitting next to her.

Suddenly the class teacher returned. She said to the head that she
had forgotten some books. As soon as Mary saw her she sat bolt upright
and gave the observer a conspiratorial grin - almost as one adult to
another and started to write again, whispering to the researcher:

"Mrs. Dale is back ... I'd better get on with my work."

Awareness of rules therefore did not necessarily bring compliance.

Whether it did or not depended upon a variety of factors, not least the particular teacher. In terms of the model, active compliers are those pupils who not only do what is expected of them, but do it with some degree of enthusiasm, e.g.

"I've finished all my writing, can I do some more?"

or

"Are there any more number cards I can do?"

or in the case of general behaviour, are the first to do what the teacher asks, for example:

"I'm sitting properly."

and who do not talk or call out. It is fair to say that such active compliance, although it was in evidence, was not the regular behaviour of many of the children (particularly at Moorland), that was seen. Such active compliance seemed to occur more often in the reception classes. Those children who did comply, and the proportion varied both between classes in the same school, and between different schools, fell more usually into the category of 'passive compliers'. These pupils were those who did just enough 'work' to prevent the teacher from taking action. They would do sums and a few lines of writing, or they would at least begin an activity when told, even if they did not finish it completely. In terms of behaviour these children might talk, but not too much and might even punch or fidget but not so much as to attract attention. They could be seen as having worked out a 'strategy' for survival without too much effort.

Active non-compliers such as Charlie, would also vary in the degree of their 'awkwardness'. One minute they would be fidgeting, and the next working quite quietly. It was the sheer unpredictability of their behaviour that seemed to present those teachers who had such pupils with most problems. It could not be said that Mrs. Knowles, who had Charlie, was ever really in control, as no regular pattern was really ever established with him, and others like him, both girls and boys. Such children, and there

were several of them, could effectively set the pattern of the day both for the teacher and to some extent their more 'compliant' classmates, because they could and did disrupt the routine. When these pupils refused to work, or screamed, or shouted, kicked, bit or fought and swore (all this kind of behaviour was seen in classrooms), when this behaviour of such children was at its most extreme, teachers seemed to back off, practising strategic withdrawal for the time being. In doing so the pupils here seemed to gain a partial re-definition of the situation. They gained a breathing space, in so far as the teachers, in such a situation, did not appear to push as far as they might, in the hope of diffusing outright rebellion. This was partly because it was considered that a child left alone might calm down, a view experienced in relation to one individual:

> "It's best to leave him alone. He will get over it
> in time."

>   (Mrs. Neaves : Moorland)

To some extent the children were seen as victims of circumstances and so to a degree 'innocent of intent' as when Mrs. Knowles at Moorland said:

> "These children have enough to cope with."

However, others were seen as far from 'innocent' in this way. Comments such as:

> "He's a thoroughly bad lot."

were sometimes heard.

Into the category of passive non-compliers fell those children who were not obviously noisy or disruptive, but who nevertheless seldom did much work of the kind that was required of them by the teacher. One girl for example, was very quiet indeed. She often went to sleep during discussion time. The teacher thought that this child was "putting it on a bit" since "if I say anything interesting she opens her eyes". However, in the nature of things this tactic is difficult to be sure about, given that some of the children, at least, came from difficult homes by anyone's standard.

Even in the most ordered classrooms, there were undertones of non-compliance. For example a teacher who was very 'organised' (in the sense that activities were well prepared, children knew what they had to do, and were usually observed engaged in 'work' activities) announced:

"We are going to do some writing now."

Some children muttered quietly,

"Ugh, writing."

They complied with the teacher's request at first, but at best could only be described as "passive compliers". The teacher left the room for a few minutes, and the children stopped work. One or two of these children were also heard to mutter:

"It's boring"

but this was said quietly.

The boundary between compliance and non-compliance was never static, even with the 'good' children. Children were quite capable of being compliant in one situation, and not in another, as well as with one teacher and not another.

The non-static and therefore tenuous nature of teacher control or pupil compliance was made visible at Larkway where on one occasion a student teacher took over from the teacher of the infants' class (the deputy). With their own teacher those pupils had been observed to appear extremely well behaved and able to 'choose' without chaos ensuing. They never answered back, never interrupted, sat still when they were asked to, and generally appeared to be a 'model' infant class. By contrast, when the student took over, there were several children who constantly interrupted and others who giggled, whispered, wriggled about and generally 'misbehaved', in terms of what their own teacher normally expected and received from them.

The noticeable fluctuation in children's compliance, not just in this

instance but in several classrooms, made the researcher wonder if there
might be any connection between their behaviour and their reasons for
liking or not liking school. At Moorland a few children aged between
six and seven were asked if they liked coming to school, and if they did,
whether they liked their present class or not.

Most of these children seemed to accept that they should come to
school. One child for example said:

> "You have to learn to read and write. It helps you
> get a good job."

<div align="right">(Child, Top Infants Class : Moorland)</div>

This might have been something this child had heard at home. Most of
the children said that they liked school. One reason for this was that:

> "We can be with our friends."

This comment indicated that pupils who liked school are not necessarily
going to comply with teachers' control, if their friends are non-compliers.
There were one or two groups of such 'friends' at Moorland.

What was most striking was that those pupils, and others who were
spoken to at different times were very clear about what they liked doing,
and clear about their reasons for liking to be in a particular class.

The most popular activity was 'choosing' by a wide margin. Most
children mentioned this in some form, such as:

> "I like being in Mrs. Neaves' class because you
> can do more choosing."

Other children mentioned specific activities like:

> "playing with lego and bricks."

apart from playing with their friends, as their preferred activity. At
times, though not exclusively in one classroom, several children could be seen
fighting and arguing abqut the chance to do these activities. They seldom
demonstrated quite the same enthusiasm over writing or number work.
Sometimes the content of these last activities might make the children's
lack of enthusiasm understandable. What did strike the observer, however,

was that where there was more 'choosing' there seemed less active non-compliance.

As noted when discussing the effect of gender in a previous chapter, one boy offered a rather different reason for his non-compliance. This boy had remarked to the observer that he would be glad when he went up to the junior school. When he was asked why he replied that this was because he felt a "man teacher" would make him work more. He said that he did not work now, when asked. Not only did the exchange indicate that this boy knew the rules and actively chose not to comply, but also indicated the presence of sex-stereotyping by pupils. His comment also indicated that pupils may bring to school different expectations from those of their teachers. This presents a possible difficulty, through mis-matching of such expectations, for teacher control. It is another indication that classrooms are complex social meeting places.

The presence of choosing in the classroom, and the children's preference for this activity, seemed sometimes to offer opportunities for bargaining. For example, teachers often made comments such as the following:

"You can do choosing when you've done your writing."

This tactic persuaded children to get the work done. Children were similarly often heard to say things such as:

"I've done all the red cards - can I play on the rocker now?"

Whether this 'bargaining' on the part of the pupil was successful depended upon teacher evaluation of the work done, it was not guaranteed.

By complying successfully, in teacher terms, with the minimum work task set, pupils gained some 'free space'. The teachers, with the reward of choosing at their disposal, were able to extract such compliance, either of work or behaviour or both, and so feel 'professional' in that their status as teachers was not challenged.

As noted, these ideas about pupil compliance were only tentative. There is always a sense in which no behaviour, whether by teachers or pupils, can be fitted into neat categories without serious distortion of the real behaviour of real people.

However, these concepts of both 'framing' in the first section, and of the typology of compliance in the second, seemed a useful means of organising data, and of providing a basis for discussing the activities of teachers and pupils in classrooms.

CONCLUSION

Using examples from observations, the reasons for contending that the infant classroom is likely to present as many problems for teacher control as secondary classrooms have been studied. It has been indicated that teachers do attempt to structure fairly tightly both behaviour in the general sense, and behaviour connected with work. The examples also indicated that pupils do know the rules, but do also at times choose to break them. When they do, teachers may blame 'home background' and absolve children from 'evil intent', but may also blame the individual children themselves.

This research also indicated that there were considerable differences between teachers even within the same school, in their ability to control. Though not a direct concern here, such differences may relate both to teacher personality, to their possible different expectations of the children, and also to the relationship between teachers and the head, in a particular school.

This chapter and the previous one have been concerned with the actual practices and activities in the classroom and the relationship between teachers and pupils, in contrast to those which dealt with the aims or perspectives of heads and teachers. The next two chapters deal with different aspects of the historical content of infant schools, the first

with the social discipline and social welfare aspects of the development

of 'infant' education, and the second with the development of educational

ideas and their influence on the infant school in the Nineteenth and

Twentieth centuries.

CHAPTER NINE

SOCIAL DISCIPLINE AND SOCIAL WELFARE ASPECTS OF THE 'INFANT TRADITION' IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

INTRODUCTION

Several writers have argued that a separate infant tradition exists (e.g. King, 1978; Featherstone, 1972; Silberman, 1971). The idea of such a tradition seems to contain the implication that infant schools in some way stand apart from other sections of the educational system. However, it is argued in this chapter that such a representation may be misleading. If the historical development of schooling for young children in the Nineteenth and the early Twentieth Century is examined, together with that of elementary education in the same period, it is readily observable that both sectors were equally concerned with social discipline and social welfare.

Observations made in a present day 'urban' and 'working class' school (as defined directly or by implication by the teachers themselves) indicated that a concern for both 'social discipline' and 'social welfare' was still very much present. Recollecting the various teachers' accounts of the home life of Moorland children, and their descriptions of the children, together with the views of 'outsiders' such as welfare workers, health visitors, the social psychologist and infant adviser, what came across most vividly was the persistence of certain views about the children, rather than how much ideas have changed and how different infant education is today compared with a hundred years ago. Other writers argue on this point. For example, Marriott contended that change was a feature of the history of education for young children over the last hundred years, and that this schooling could be seen in terms of: "changing ideologies in a changing society". (Marriott, 1986, p. 11).

On the other hand Grace has argued that: "continuity is as much a feature of the urban school as is change". (Grace, 1978, p. 53). The argument of this chapter is that, for infant schools in a 'working class' situation, Grace's view seemed the most valid.

The first section of the chapter considers the ideas of social discipline and social welfare in the Nineteenth Century. The first subsection begins by discussing the idea of a separate tradition of infant schooling, and then continues under two sub-headings, to discuss first the ideas of social and moral discipline and then those of social and moral welfare which were prevalent in educational discourse of the period. It notes the variety of groups who expounded these ideas.

The second sub-section notes the 'radical' views of Robert Owen, and the degree to which these have been seen as influential.

The third and final sub-section indicates respectively views of teachers and parents on Nineteenth Century education. The examples are drawn from the elementary system, but are included because they show that those on the receiving end of such education were not necessarily passive recipients. They are also included as evidence for a lack of overall consensus on the purpose of that education.

The second section considers the degree to which ideas of social discipline and social welfare have continued to influence the Twentieth Century development of schooling, for young children.

The first sub-section notes the development of nursery education, and the passing downwards of ideas relating to the elementary system. The interest of the researcher in this area was awakened by observations in the nursery at Moorland, with some from other schools. Attention was focused on the idea of differences between the nursery and the infant school, but certain similarities were also found.

The second sub-section notes the ideas contained in the 1904 Code for Elementary teachers and the 1905 Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers, showing that social discipline and moral training was still a concern. It points to the link between these two sources and later reports, such as Hadow and Plowden.

The third sub-section discusses the Plowden Report and the concept of compensation for deficiencies in home background.

The final section of the chapter refers back to ideas expressed in earlier chapters by Moorland teachers in relation to children and their home background, and views about the education necessary. This section picks up the view that ideas about social welfare and social discipline are very much present in one infant school at least.

SECTION ONE : SOCIAL DISCIPLINE AND WELFARE AND INFANT SCHOOLS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

1. The Idea of a Separate Tradition

Both Silberman and Featherstone speak about an infant tradition, for example of:

> "the one hundred year old tradition of separate schools for infants."
>
> (Silberman, C. E., 1973, p. 211)

and that in terms of approach and atmosphere the infant school is "radically different" from that found in schools for older children". (Silberman, C. E., 1973, p. 211).

In terms of 'physical separation' there were separate infant schools more than a hundred years ago. An infant school was set up in Westminster in 1818 by a group of 'Radicals' and 'Whigs' led by Lord Brougham and James Mill. A second one was established in Spitalfields in the 1820s. In the area in which the study was done the 'Report of the Committee of Manchester Statistical Society' noted that there were three infant schools which were receiving financial help from the public during the period 1836 - 1837. By 1826 there were ten infant schools for children up to the age of seven. (Benson, E., 1932). Thus Silberman is correct in arguing that a separate tradition existed in physical terms. However, Silberman's statement concerning separateness encompasses more than a physical division.

It also includes a division in terms of ideas, and in this sense, it is

argued in this chapter that schooling for young children was not wholly

separate, but that this and the elementary sector shared similar concerns,

those of social and moral discipline, and social welfare.

2.   Social and Moral Discipline

It has been argued that one purpose of schooling in the Nineteenth

Century was to: "inculcate appropriate habits and attitudes ... sobriety,

diligence and regularity." (Marriott, 1985, p. 13). Such qualities were,

it was argued, necessary for economic and social reasons. However, they

were also important in that:

> "they contributed to the maintenance of ... class
> divisions of Victorian society and averted the
> revolutionary possibilities inherent in an increas-
> ingly educated and politically aware work force."
>
> (Marriott, 1986, p. 13)

A concern for social discipline was expressed by various groups wuch

as religious, political administrative bodies, and also by those working

in schools themselves. Their views on education as the source of moral

training were in many ways like those of Durkheim later.

Religious groups, for example, the National Society (Anglican) and

the British and Foreign Schools Society (Dissenters), founders of the

Monitorial System, spoke a common language as far as the purpose of elem-

entary schools was concerned. (Johnson, 1976). Both viewed 'education'

as a social necessity, as a means of preserving social order. Stewart and

McCann have argued that the religious influence affected infant schools

as much as elementary ones, and that however infant schools were initially

conceived their purpose was modified by religious influences. (Stewart and

McCann, 1967). Lancaster, for example, (British and Foreign Schools Society)

saw infant schools for the under sevens as 'initiating schools' where

"children could be trained in good social and moral habits in preparation

for the elementary school". (Whitbread, 1972, p. 6).

A Reverend Wilson, founder of the first church infant school at Waltham-

stow, considered that its purpose should be to 'correct moral feeling' and

that the school was a place where children could be:

> "prepared at least to think ... feel, obey [and] ...
> The ground will have been broken up and the obnoxious
> weeds removed."

>   (Rev. Wilson, 1925 cited in Silver,
>   1965, p. 142)

[This must have been Daniel Wilson who was connected with the Evangelical

movement. (McCann, 1977, p. 1)].

This view of education as social discipline was also expressed by both

sides of the political spectrum. For example, Lord Shaftesbury, a Tory

philanthropist, deplored a situation in which a large group of people

were uninfluenced by moral and social discipline. (Briggs, A., (ed), 1959).

Lord John Russell, a Whig, also considered that there was a large group of

children who required moral and religious training in order to make them

decent members of society. (Lord John Russell, 1839, cited by Simon, 1960).

The Whigs, like the Tories, saw education "as a means of habituating the

people to the existing social order and the dominance of the landed

aristocracy". (Simon, B., 1960, p. 134).

Educational administrators, like Kay Shuttleworth, who later became

Poor Law Commissioner, saw education as a means of promoting "security of

property and maintenance of social order". (Kay Shuttleworth, 1962, p. 232).

Robert Lowe, responsible for setting up the 'Poor Law Commission'

favoured the establishment of infant schools on the grounds that they

'provided a public nursery for the children of the poor' and an environment

in which habits of docility and submission were formed'. (Newcastle Report,

cited by Raymont, 1937, p. 210).

The social discipline ideas was also expressed by some members of

the inspectorate. Leonard Horner, a chief inspector appointed after 1937,

considered that the establishment of elementary schools was essential and should include infant schools, in which children would receive:

> "an education suited to their circumstances, calculated
> to improve their religious, moral and intellectual
> character."
>
> (Horner, L. 1838, cited in
> Blackstone, T., 1971, p. 20)

It has been argued that social discipline as a motive for the development of elementary schooling co-existed with a 'social welfare' or 'missionary' view of education. (Grace, G., 1978, p. 10).

3.   Social and Moral Welfare

As stated previously, Lancaster was concerned with social and moral discipline in the infant school in the Nineteenth Century, however he also expressed concern for the welfare of:

> "forty thousand impures (who) drag a miserable
> existence .... Let something be done to lighten
> their intolerable load of human misery."
>
> (Lancaster, cited in Silver, H., 1966)

Wilderspin, a promoter of infant schools in England and a teacher at Spitalfields infant school in London in the Nineteenth Century, considered that those people who disapproved of educating the poor would come to see the necessity of educating them and keeping them safe from harm. (Wilderspin, 1840). Thomas Pole, the earliest writer on the infant school movement, argued that children should be protected from the influence of their parents before they picked up evil habits which could destroy social order. (Pole, T., 1823). He considered that educating such children would make them better members of society. (Pole, T., 1823, cited in McCann, 1977).

Social discipline and social welfare ideas were also reflected in teacher training. Kay-Shuttleworth, for example, considered that training should instil in teachers the idea that their purpose was "rescuing their class from misery and attending vices". (Kay-Shuttleworth, 1862, p. 309).

The Home and Colonial Infant School Society, founded by the Reverend

Charles Mayo and his sister, saw one of the aims of the infant school as

being 'the development of moral and religious sentiments' and of the

schools as 'outposts of virtue'. (Mayo, cited in Silver, 1965, p. 146).

This society also helped promote the training of infant teachers and

considering the views just stated which were held about infant schools

the society may also have seen teacher training in the same light.

There were also very different views of what infant schools should

be in some respects as will be discussed next.

4.   The Radical Views of Robert Owen

Silberman, as stated previously, argued that infant schools were 'radically'

different from other sectors of the educational system. In the early

Nineteenth Century there was a 'Radical' movement within the field of

infant education, epitomised by the ideas of Robert Owen. It has been

argued that Robert Owen founded the first infant school in Britain.

(Whitbread, N., 1972, p. 8). However, there is some controversy about

this, Silver noted. (Silver, H., 1983, p. 67). Owen viewed education

as a means of social change, and New Lanark was seen as the first

practical means of bringing about such change and changing the basic

principles on which society had previously been based. (Owen, 1858).

Robert Owen also held a 'missionary view', however, in that 'efficient

corrective measures' were required in order to prevent 'general disorder'.

(Owen cited in Silver, 1983, p. 106). Silver, however, considered that

Owen's arguments went beyond social rescue and instead:

> "turned the whole rescue argument into an attack
> on the effect of circumstances on society."

(p. 136)

Views differ on the actual continued influence of Owen's ideas.

On the one hand they are seen as a minority view at the time and also as not

having a wide influence subsequently. On the other hand such views are
seen as an over-generalisation. For example, it is claimed that Owen's
notion of the infant school did not become widespread because of its
'Radical' associations and that by the 1850s the trend was towards the insti-
lling of godliness, and infant schools were seen as a means of preparation for
the monitorial schools. (Stewart and McCann, 1967). Silver likewise argued
that Owen's views were:

> "... too entangled with vast schemes of social
> re-organisation for them to continue to feature
> for long in educational debate."
> (Silver, 1983, p. 66)

Further Silver believed that while Owen was the:

> "... founder of the first infant school, which had
> an important relationship to a wide set of ideas,
> Wilderspin was the founder of the first infant
> school movement, and he and Mayo brought infant
> education into an unambiguous relationship with the
> existing social order."
> (Silver, H., 1983, pp. 66-7).

Others like Whitbread argued that:

> "socialist educational theory persisted within the
> Labour movement and his [Owen's] infant school [was]
> revived by the Chartists in the 1840s."
> (Whitbread, 1972, p. 16)

Whitbread also stated that an attempt was:

> "made to include [Owen's] kind of infant school as
> part of some Mechanics' Institutes, but success was
> very limited."
> (Silver's idea cited in Whitbread,
> 1972, p. 16)

McCann stated that Spitalfields infant school was "the only one where
submission was not taught partly due to its Owenite pedigree". This was
founded by a Joseph Wilson, cousin of the Reverend David Wilson, and also
part of the Evangelical movement. (McCann, 1977, p. 23).

Turner argued that the view that Owen's influence declined has "too
often been assumed", and that it is a "well worn generalisation". (Turner,

D., 1970, pp. 152-3). The Burston school strike of the 1920s indicated that at the grass roots level some teachers attempted to put socialist principles into practice. Whatever the view of 'administration', attempts were thus made to resist 'dominant' views. Silver has argued that historians should critically examine presentations of Victorian education. (Silver, 1983). One should be aware of oversimplification in terms of social control, but nevertheless, more recent examples of attempts to change the system by such schools as Risinghill in Islington, and William Tyndale primary school also in Islington, show that 'radical' ideas persist, and are still resisted.

5. Teachers

Thus far no mention has been made of teachers' views. In view of some notions of the purpose of the infant school outlined previously, it would not be surprising if teachers in these schools themselves considered education in similar terms. However, as stated, one has to be aware of oversimplification. Kay-Shuttleworth viewed teachers as central to the educational system in terms of 'civilisation'. He stated that:

> "We hoped to inspire them with a large sympathy for their
> own class ... implant in their minds the thought that
> their chief honour would be to aid in rescuing that class
> from its misery ... ignorance and attending vices."
>
> (Kay-Shuttleworth, 1862, p. 309)

It was hoped, as the quotation shows, to recruit members of the working classes to the teaching 'profession' but what Kay-Shuttleworth's statement seems to imply is the existence of a homogenous working class, and neglects a possible gulf between the 'respectable' and the 'scruffs'. Members of the former may in fact have little sympathy for other sections of their own class. Grace showed this gulf. He cited a master of a Ragged school, who argued that:

> 'in any decency of behaviour or in respect for the teacher
> or in discipline of any kind, they are totally unparall-
> elled ... the very appearance of one's coat is to them a

badge of respectability ... at least they feel that
we are representatives of beings with whom they have
ever considered themselves to be at war."

(Master cited in Grace, 1978, p. 32)

Grace cited other teachers' 'typifications' of pupils as 'utterly destitute

of feeling or propriety, lazy and degraded' (p. 32) and:

'They require more training than teaching'.
'The power of paying attention is most wanting in them'.

(Runciman, 1887, in Grace, G., 1978, p. 46)

Grace argued that:

"What is revealed is the teachers' sense of culture
shock at a social and cultural reality never
previously encountered and a sense of revulsion from
the values, language and behaviour of members of that
world."

(Grace, G., 1978, p. 32)

This type of shock was also witnessed at Moorland. Some teachers were

horrified that parents lived the way they did. These views will be dis-

cussed later.

Grace considered that many teachers in the elementary schools in

the Nineteenth Century viewed the urban working class as heathens in

need of rescue from the effects of deprivation and that 'they saw the

failure of many working class mothers' to overcome poverty as being due

to 'personal deficiencies in the home'. (Gautry, 1885 cited by Grace,

1978, p. 41). Such children were seen as needing 'a structured, orderly

environment', It will be shown later how similar this view is to that

expressed by some Moorland teachers in the 1980s.

However, Grace distinguished another radical strand or group.

These teachers, he noted, saw the pupils as "victims of an oppressive

economic system", and were more politically sware. He also pointed to

teachers' dilemmas in urban schools, that though they were aware on the

one hand of their role as 'civilising agents' on the other hand they were

sympathetic towards the children. However, whatever their views, the

demands of the work situation were such that 'order' and 'discipline' were

primary concerns. (Grace, 1978, pp. 32-3).

6.   Parents

Evidence concerning parents' views of the system would seem to indicate

that they rejected a view of education as social and moral discipline,

and were rather more concerned with learning such skills as reading and

writing and also with 'getting on with life'. Frith, in a discussion of

elementary education in Leeds prior to 1870, stated that parents actively

rejected the public system, not out of apathy but because:

> "Some parents resented the public schools' restraints
> ... fixed curriculum and discipline, others rejected
> any education that smacked of charity and there was
> a strong anti-religious feeling."
>
> (Frith, 1977, p. 87)

Like Frith, McCann argued that the "labouring population" saw schooling

mainly in "instrumental terms", and that social and moral indoctrination

were; "not seen as an essential element of education by many Spitalfields'

artisans". (McCann, 1977, p. 30).

7. CONCLUSION

As stated earlier, Silberman argued that a separate infant tradition existed

which was radically different from other sectors. It has been argued so

far in this chapter that this is an oversimplification of matters. First,

infant schools were not necessarily separate from other sectors. Like the

elementary system there was a concern for social discipline and social

welfare. Silberman stated that the infant tradition was 'radically

different'. It has been shown that a 'Radical' strand did develop within

infant education. However, there is a controversy over how far this strand

did develop, just as there is argument over the influence of progressive

ideas on primary practice today.

It is possible to lay too much emphasis on the importance of social

discipline and welfare in the Nineteenth Century, and one should be aware

of creating stereotypes ('progressive' also) and also that intentions should

1051

not necessarily be confused with practice. However, from the evidence
that Grace has presented a concern for social discipline and welfare was
expressed by some Victorian teachers, and only a minority expressed
more radical concerns. What Grace does show more than anything is that in
the daily work situation itself matters were more complex, that even
where teachers conceived of their role in 'missionary terms' that this
was tempered with a certain sympathy. At the same time practical con-
straints, the sheer size of classes for example, meant that whatever
teachers' views, sheer disquiet or sympathy, their main concern was with
'order' and 'discipline'. This seemed similar to Moorland, for however
teachers viewed the pupils and their homes what their main concern was
in the classroom was to get children to sit still, and listen and to 'learn
to do as they are told'. In other words their concern was with social
discipline, as the Head's was 'social welfare'.

The second section of this chapter attempts to show that ideas
about social discipline and social welfare have persisted in the Twentieth
Century.

SECTION TWO : SOCIAL WELFARE AND SOCIAL DISCIPLINE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The section is headed thus because in the Twentieth Century the concern
for social welfare seemed more apparent than the ideas of social discipline.
Nevertheless the latter were still present.

1. The Rise of Nursery Education

In the Nineteenth Century social welfare was a major reason for the
development of infant education and this continued into the Twentieth
Century, but spread downwards. In the early part of the Twentieth
Century the idea of schooling "as rescue work was carried over into the
new conception of pre-school education". (Blackstone, 1971, p. 30).

Blackstone argued that both infant and nursery schools were seen as "a response to dissatisfaction with the operation of familial roles". (p. 19). Whitbread also argued that:

> "social rescue and health considerations were the
> primary motives behind provision in the Twentieth
> Century."
>
> (Whitbread, 1972, p. 55)

Blackstone distinguished between two strands in nursery education, a "middle class strand" and a "working class strand". She argued that both strands were concerned with the idea of nursery schooling as a means of providing something which parents and the home could not provide, but that the former strand was more concerned with 'education' than social welfare. She claimed that the 'working class strand' was more interested in 'social welfare'. Blackstone considered that the middle class strand was represented by the Froebelian kindergarten and only identified with a small group who set up privately run institutions. The 'middle class strand' was also distinguished from the 'working class strand' because, in her view it was set up in response to parents' demands whereas the move to set up nursery schooling for the 'working classes' came from 'outsiders' who were concerned not simply to help parents but to preserve order in the best interests of society. (Blackstone, 1971, p. 15).

Whitbread argued that both the social welfare and moral and social discipline remained dominant motives in nursery schooling until child psychology advances indicated the educational advantages of nursery schooling. (Whitbread, 1972). Both Whitbread and Blackstone distinguished between 'education' and 'social welfare', and appeared to imply that the former contained the intellectual aspect. Schofield, however, argued that the term covers more than this. It included training in 'suitable' habits, the transmission of what was 'worthwhile', and of knowledge and under-standing. It also contained the idea of a process of initiation. (Schofield, P., 1972, pp. 30-36).

The social welfare motive was expressed by various individual

reformers, for example the McMillan sisters. They established a nursery

at Deptford. One point of view was that reformers such as the McMillan

sisters were interested in the value of nursery schooling in promoting

"the health and physical welfare of children living in urban poverty".

(Woodhead, 1976, p. 26). However, it is also claimed that Margaret

McMillan was more than a philanthropist, that she had Socialist connections.

It is said that she was a member of the Independent Labour Party in

Bradford which, in 1926, recommended that:

> 'a working class trained in the nursery school
> spirit would not tolerate existing conditions.'
>
> (I. L. P. cited by Blackstone, 1971,
> p. 47)

Blackstone, however, considered that this was an unrealistic aim.

Whitbread stated that the Labour Party, the T.U.C. and the W.E.A.

viewed Nursery provision "as a matter of social justice" and cited Bertrand

Russell as stating that:

> "'universal nursery education' [could help]
> 'remove profound differences in education which
> at present divide the classes'."
>
> (Russell, B., 1926 cited by
> Whitbread, 1972, p. 76)

Such a view would seem to indicate a change in attitudes from ideas

expressed earlier, concerning the education of young children. However,

it was not universal. A 1904 Departmental Committee on "Physical

Deterioration" advocated 'extensive provision of nursery schools' but stated

that there was no clear idea of their purpose. Whitbread, however, claimed

that the early nursery schools were seen as:

> "child minding havens in the slums fostering better
> health and developing good habits."
>
> (Whitbread, 1972, p. 65)

In 1908 the 'Report of the Consultative Committee' set up by the Board of Education stated that for a minority of children under five there was a case for nursery schooling where "home circumstances were unsatisfactory". (Woodhead, 1976, p. 19). This view seems familiar today.

The next sub-section notes the ideas about the purpose of elementary schools found in the 1904 Code and the 1905 Handbook for Teachers showing the concern for social discipline as well as moral training.

2. The 1904 Code and the 1905 Handbook of Suggestions

It was stated in the first section of this chapter that infant schools were part of the elementary tradition in the ideas that were dominant. Thus, the 1904 Code for elementary schools may be considered also to have some relevance for ideas about the education of even younger children. Morant was partly responsible for this Code, and in it his aim seems clear, for it states that:

> "The purpose of the elementary school is to form
> and strengthen character."

Teachers were exhorted to:

> "implant in children habits of industry, self control
> ... perseverance in face of difficulties [and] reverence
> for what is noble."
> (1904 Code)

Morant also considered that parents should be involved with the school to assist in individual development, and also to help the parents themselves to become "upright and useful members of the community". (1904 Code).

This latter point seems similar to views expressed by the Head of Moorland in relation to parents.

The 1905 Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers also stressed the role of the teacher in character training and the inculcation of "good conduct" by "moral training". The Handbook stated that the:

1055

"high function of the teacher [is] to prepare the
child for the life of a good citizen ... foster an
orderly disciplined habit of mind."

(1905 Handbook)

Both the Code and the Handbook of Suggestions indicate that teachers

in elementary schools were expected to concern themselves with social

discipline.

On the ideas of 'character development' and being a 'good citizen',

different views have been expressed. Eaglesham argued that this meant

"training in followership rather than leadership". (Eaglesham, 1967, p. 53).

Morrish on the other hand, stated that it represented an emancipatory and

enlightening influence. (Morrish, 1976). Gordon and Lawton also regarded

the ideas of the Code and Handbook:

"In spite of the high flown phrases ... a blueprint
for an inferior curriculum for the majority."

(Gordon and Lawton, 1978, p. 22)

It could be argued that while the tone of the Code and Suggestions

were less pejorative than in the Nineteenth Century, nevertheless they

were expressing similar sentiments. This comment could also apply to more

·recent reports of the Twentieth Century, with regard to social welfare.

The Hadow Report, for example, drew attention to the role of the

nursery school in promoting health and also the education of parents. It

noted deficiencies in the environment of pupils, stating that:

"in the ordinary environment there is little to satisfy
the child's natural impulses, it is important therefore
to provide an environment that will do so."

(Hadow, 1933, cited in Whitbread, 1972,
p. 74)   -

The Plowden Report of 1967 also drew attention to alleged deficiencies

in the homes and neighbourhoods of children. The next sub-section discusses

briefly this Report and its ideas of compensatory education.

3. The Plowden Report and 'Compensation'

The Plowden Report on primary education stated, amongst other things, that in certain areas,

> "homes and neighbourhoods from which children come
> provide little support and stimulus for learning.
> The schools must provide a compensatory environment."

(Plowden, 1967, p. 57)

These children and their neighbourhoods were regarded as deprived. The Report proposed the setting up of Educational Priority Areas so that extra resources could be channelled into these deprived areas, and thus compensate for the deficiencies.

Plowden came in for considerable criticism for its view of deficient backgrounds.

Grace, for example, argued that the sentiments expressed by Plowden were old ones in a different vocabulary. He claimed that it presented as much a picture of demoralised working class life as did inspectors in the Nineteenth Century, and added that the legitimation of a 'missionary' ideology was 'transmitted over time' into the vocabulary of 'deprivation' and 'maladjustment'. (Grace, 1978, p. 41). It does seem that implicit in the Report's view of primary education in 'deprived' areas is the notion of it being a 'rescue operation' with teachers as salvage agents or 'missionaries'. It could thus be viewed as much of an attempt at 'social engineering' as was Nineteenth Century schooling for the working class.

On the other hand Plowden was concerned with equality, for it considered that primary schools should try to equalise opportunities and compensate for handicaps. (Plowden, 1967). It was concerned that the unequal provision of resources in 'poor areas' would affect the life chances of children living in them. Thus in intention the Report was somewhat different from the Nineteenth Century conception of schooling for the working classes which was to maintain class divisions, not alter them,

even if better education for them was also seen as enabling Britain to compete with the rest of Europe, which was seen as having a better educated work-force.

The setting up of Educational Priority Areas, of which project Halsey was a director, with the idea of compensatory education, and ''positive' discrimination had as its purpose:

> "to enable these pupils to compete equally with their more privileged peers."

> (Flude, 1974, p. 27)

This project and the whole idea of compensatory education was heavily criticised. Bernstein, for example, did so because "it distracts attention away from the deficiencies in the schools." (Bernstein, 1973, p. 82).

Concentrating on 'home background' may also distract teachers from attention to 'academic' aspects of learning.

Mrs. Warner's objections to the idea of Educational Priority Areas were given in Chapter Four, but there are many others.

Glennerster, for example criticised the choice of schools as being arbitrary. (Glennerster, 1972). It was also pointed out that in some areas designated as having priority status many children were not disadvantaged, while many disadvantaged children did not live in priority areas. Disadvantage was said to include multiple needs, and these were not necessarily distributed evenly in particular areas. (Barnes, 1974).

However, there seems little doubt that poverty existed at the time in material terms, amongst sections of the population.

Holman, in an examination of the meaning and extent of poverty, argued that whatever definition was used:

> "the conclusion is still that numbers in poverty are to be counted in hundreds of thousands or millions."

> (Holman, 1978, p. 41)

He argued further that:

> "the relative distance between lowest incomes and
> the rest of society appears to have been maintained
> over a long period."

(Ibid)

However, such poverty or disadvantage, it was argued, were not confined

to inner city areas:

> "... joblessness and attendant poverty ·became the
> common experience for many people in both the inner
> city and the less desirable areas of peripheral public
> housing."

(Holman, 1978, p. 41)

Moorland might come under the latter category. However, the analysis of

paternal occupations in 'Setting the Scene' showed that unemployment was

not 'the common experience' for most fathers there. Also, the idea of

rural poverty is seldom mentioned. Larkway, for example, contained some

"travellers", and Fairfield some "farm workers' children". Both groups

were seen as relatively less advantaged, yet the areas served by the schools

were not seen as deficient. This indicates that Barnes' criticism of

E.P.A.s was at least partly justified.

However, the notion of deprived areas did seem to enter into the

popular imagination. As noted, Moorland had 'Social Priority' status.

The next section picks up points from the empirical chapters on the views

of Moorland teachers in relation to children's home background, and

educational needs.

SECTION THREE : MOORLAND : THE CONTINUITY OF SOCIAL WELFARE AND

SOCIAL DISCIPLINE

This final section attempts to show, by reference back to ideas from the

earlier empirical chapters, that social welfare and social discipline are

still an important aspect of the life of an infant school in a 'working

class' urban area.

It was noted previously that the Moorland parents were not necessarily

considered materially poor, although an informant, in contrast to the Nursery

teacher, stated that Moorland school's catchment area included: "the two

most poverty stricken areas of the estate". (Informant), and that two

of the teachers had themselves spoken of the poverty of homes in the area.

Some houses were said to have "broken windows, stairs without treads ... no

lighting". (Informant).

> Observations of children themselves show:

> > "underclothes in a bad state of repair. The children
> > strip for gym to reveal grey underwear ... David wears
> > his big sister's pants ... Susan often wears her mother's
> > old pants which reach to her knees. Even in the winter
> > some children arrive at school in thin anoraks and kagouls."
> >
> > (Informant)

In 1973 the previous head of Moorland infant school described the area as

an area with "depressing social problems". (Record Book, 1973).

> Some of the teachers, as stated previously, described the children as

respectively:

> > "like little wild animals ... no idea how to behave themselves."

> > "apathetic"

> > "unable to concentrate"

> > "unco-operative"

> > "aggressive"

> > > (See also King, 1978)

It was argued that they had no idea of sharing or playing together, and

lacked 'appropriate' experience necessary for starting school. In terms

of language it was argued that the children's was very poor. Grace, looking

at "typifications of urban working class pupils", (p. 38) stated that these

included: indiscipline, coarse speech and manners, restlessness, vicious-

ness, inability to pay attention, and that pupils were regarded as disorderly

untamed heathens, and as requiring training rather than teaching. (Grace,

1978, pp. 38-42).

It was noted in Chapter Five that the 'way children were' was blamed upon the home which was thought to have a contaminating influence. As noted in this chapter, the 'blame the parents and the home syndrome' is not a new one and has a history much longer than Plowden. It was also a theme constant in the Nineteenth Century. At Moorland, as noted in 'Social Perspectives on Children', the word deprived was used to describe the area rather than the children themselves.

The area was seen, as stated, as one having many problems, including: increased unemployment, divorce, an increased number of problem families, such as single parent families moving into the area. This image of Moorland was, as noted, also held by outside agencies such as social workers, a speech therapist and an educational psychologist.

Parents' attitudes and the 'home' and family were regarded as one of the causes of the pupils' problems at school, as noted in Chapter Five. Teachers argued that parents had little control over their children, and allowed them to do as they liked, and also that parents failed to provide any kind of 'order' or 'discipline' at home.

"The children can do what they like at home".

"The parents don't train their children".

"There is a lack of order in many homes".

It was also considered that 'homes' failed to provide the right kind of experience for starting school. A contrast was made between what the 'good' and 'bad' home provided. The former was seen, as noted, as providing an 'orderly home life', 'social' and basic preparation for school, i.e. pre-learning skills, use of crayons. The 'bad' home on the other hand did not provide these things, and did not provide: "the right kind of experience necessary for learning at school". (Head Teacher : Moorland).

It was argued that the infant school was concerned with social discipline and social and moral welfare, the inculcation of 'appropriate'

habits and attitudes, and good order.   Education was explicitly seen as
a means of social and moral training.

At Moorland, the idea that the school should attempt to compensate for
the deficiencies of pupils' home life was held by the head teacher and the
nursery teacher. Mrs. Warner, the head, said, as noted in the head's
chapter, that she was "... more concerned with social skills than purely
academic ones". (Head : Moorland). The nursery teacher, as noted, spoke of
the need for "social training". ·

Grace argued that in the Nineteenth Century schools were not concerned
with understanding the situation of the pupils, in contrast to today
where, in his view, schools were more concerned with:

> "understanding and breaking down barriers, improving
> relationshops with parents and social welfare."
>
> (Grace, 1978, p. 143)

In one sense Moorland teachers did not understand the Moorland children
and their environment. Their attitudes towards school and learning appeared
alien to the teachers' own beliefs and their experience of family life and
their views on how children should be 'brought up'. Mrs. Warner did
deliberately set out to improve relationships between the school and
parents, but her attempts were regarded as a waste of time by some of the
staff. Parental involvement was regarded with suspicion by some teachers,
as noted, and seen as an excuse for parents to place more responsibility on
the teachers because they couldn't be bothered. However, even though the
head was concerned with closer co-operation the concern seemed to be with
improving parents' attitudes and understanding of the school's purpose and
with re-educating them as to their proper role in the educational enter-
prise, rather than the school increasing their understanding of why parents
felt and acted as they did. Mrs. Raynor, in contrast, considered that
parents did not want anyone telling them how to run their lives but
instead wanted someone to listen to them.

Grace argued in his study of secondary teachers in an urban school, that they:

"showed little desire to blame the pupil and his
upbringing for problems of behaviour and achievement
at school."

(Grace, 1978, p. 177)

This was not necessarily the case at Moorland, although, as noted, it was not the same for all teachers. The nursery teacher saw the parents as "victims of circumstances", that they were unable to cope with the demands of married life. It was considered that they were not old enough to have learnt how to cope with their own problems, let alone their children's. Another teacher saw the "issue of unemployment and the general economic situation" as being responsible for problems on the Moorland estate, and at the same time attempted to adopt a neutral position, saying that her job was to teach. Both she and one of the reception teachers refrained from generalising too much about 'problems' at Moorland.

It has been shown so far, in this, and in the empirical chapters, that there was a strong emphasis at Moorland on 'social training'. In this their views seemed very Durkheimian. The view that children were disadvantaged by poor home lives and did not receive certain training at home was expressed by the head teacher and nursery teacher, and also by the previous head. The latter saw children at Moorland infant school as "disadvantaged ... handicapped by poor homes, require social training", and spoke of the "need to compensate for such disadvantage". (Record Book). Compensation was seen both in terms of social training and also in terms of the provision of order, stability and a structured environment.

The need for children to experience stability and security in school was stressed by both the head teacher and Mrs. Raynor, the nursery teacher. This was because it was felt that children's homes did not provide these features.

This section has attempted to show by reference to earlier empirical chapters that with respect to one infant school in an 'urban' working class area that social welfare and social discipline are still important and also that there is a similarity in terms of the language in which such concern is expressed, with nineteenth century views on these concepts.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has attempted to show that social discipline and social welfare have been important features of 'the infant tradition'. The chapter also attempted to indicate that continuity as well as change have been a feature of infant education. This is not to say that infant schools are the same as they were one hundred years ago, but that the social ideas which were a feature of infant schools in the past have not disappeared with changes in style.

It has also been argued that infant schooling in the Nineteenth Century was not necessarily a separate tradition, because it shared similar concerns with the elementary sector, namely moral and social discipline and social welfare. Furthermore, a concern for social welfare and social discipline did not disappear in the Twentieth Century.

While the Twentieth Century reports no longer spoke of submission, nevertheless the view still appeared to be that schooling could 'improve pupils', their morals, behaviour, attitudes, language and social skills, and also that certain types of homes failed to provide an 'appropriate' environment for the children to grow up in. The idea of the detrimental influence of the 'poor' home was still apparent in the Twentieth Century despite support for the notion of 'equality' and behind it, an implicit view of what experience was worthwhile.

It was stated in the Introductory chapter that some research into Primary education considered that great changes have taken place within it.

Marriott argued that the development of education for young children over the last hundred years can be seen in terms of "changing ideologies in a changing society". (Marriott, S., 1985, p. 11). He also argued that there is a close relationship between beliefs about primary education and the economic and social conditions in which the system exists, and that changes in these have brought about changes within the primary education system.

Grace, on the other hand, as noted earlier, pointed to continuity as well as change, and argued that schools for the urban working class in inner city areas are both:

> "arenas of change but also repositories of continuity
> and as such they reflect the social configurations
> of the localities in which they stand."
>
> (Grace, 1978, p. 51)

While he argued that:

> "The progressive pedagogy of many infant schools in
> the inner city stands in marked contrast to the
> controlled uniformities of their predecessors"
>
> (p. 51)

He also argued that the populations in inner city schools still "reflect the most impoverished, disadvantaged ... sections of the city". and that the teachers themselves are still essentially engaged in a domesticating activity. (Grace, 1978, p. 53). As noted earlier, in Chapter Five and in the last section of this chapter, it was certainly the view of some of the teachers at Moorland that the children and their parents were 'disadvantaged' and that the former, and to some extent the latter, required 'training' of some kind.

The next chapter looks at the development of educational ideas and their influence on the infant school in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, and to point out that there was no one rationale behind infant school development.

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INFANT EDUCATION; THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL IDEAS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE INFANT SCHOOL IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter attempts to provide an historical dimension to the concept of the 'infant school'. It was argued in the Review that this was important for as Raymont stated, such schools cannot be fully understood without examination of their historical genesis (Raymont, 1937). The idea of such an examination developed from the argument in the Review that one should adopt a more critical stance towards the 'nature of practice and ideas' in infant schools, and that it should not be taken as given that these are or were 'child centred' and 'progressive'. This is what this chapter is concerned to do, though of necessity, for reasons of time, the attempt is somewhat superficial, and more reading of secondary sources than the author would have liked is included.

This chapter, therefore, picks up certain points, first raised in other chapters. These were, first from the Review chapter, the argument over the extent of the influence of 'progressive', .'child-centred ' ideas on infant practice. It was indicated that a number of educationalists had promulgated an image of primary school practice as 'progressive', including for example Featherstone (1972). However, the 'rhetoric' of this image was also denounced for a variety of reasons by others. Richards for example, claimed that the

" dominance of child-centred education was
illusory at the level of theory (let alone

practice ..."

As noted in the Review chapter various studies on
primary schools, such as those of Bennett (1976a) and Galton
and Simon (1980) came to question the idea that primary
schools were necessarily progressive. The picture presented
in such studies was confirmed by various Reports as stated in
the Review.

Secondly, it was also pointed out in the Review
that the term 'progressive' was imprecise and ambiguous.

The third point, noted in Chapter Nine, is the
argument that it is misleading to speak of an 'infant
tradition', because this gave the impression that infant
education was separate from other sectors of education. It
was argued that while a tradition of physically separate
infant schools did develop, that they were not separated in
terms of the motives for their establishment from elementary
schools, for they shared with the latter a concern for
'social descipline' and 'social welfare'. Nor were they
immune from other later political and economic influences.

The main argument of this chapter is that apart
from ideas on these last two points, in 'pedagogical' terms
there was no one 'rationale' behind infant school development
but many which were often at variance with one another. It
attempts to show the lack of coherence in infant school
development, and the lack of consensus. This chapter
indicates that a lack of consensus has been a feature of
infant education since its inception in the early Nineteenth
Century. As Blackstone stated, attitudes towards infant
school provision

" were neither uniform nor consistent"

(Blackstone, 1971 p22)

This chapter relates directly to the data from the research schools, since if a lack of consensus has been an historical feature, it is not surprising if there appears a similar lack today.

The first section outlines briefly some of the ideas of the 'Great Educators'. This is done because Sharp and Green drew attention to what they regarded as the historical antecedents of 'progressive' education such as Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel and Montessori.

The second section looks at developments in the Nineteenth Century. It presents some evidence supporting the view that an 'infant tradition' was being developed in the last century, but also notes that there are also indications that this was slow to develop, and that certain practices hindered its development.

The final section is concerned with aspects of infant school development in the Twentieth Century. It points out that while various writers have presented evidence to suggest that changes took place within the infant school it has also been argued that, as in the Nineteenth Century there have been factors which inhibited change.

SECTION ONE: THE GREAT EDUCATORS

It has been argued that the 'progressive' tradition "informed various experiments" in the education of young children and that whilst many experiments took place outside the State system "some of the key ideas have filtered through into the State system" (Sharp and Green, 1975 p40). This

1068

view was also held by Stewart and McCann (1967 p23). Blyth used the term "developmental" rather than 'progressive' and argued that this tradition was influential in the infant school (Blyth, 1965)

Various theorists who are said to belong to the 'progressive tradition' include Rousseau, Froebel, Montessori, Pestalozzi and Dewey. They are regarded as the fathers of the child-centred approach (Sharp and Green, 1975 p40). The educational theories are usually stressed in 'progressivism' but both Rousseau and Dewey, as indicated in Chapter Nine held 'political' views about what 'society' ought to be.

However, some common ideas can be extracted from the different theories. They proposed a positive role for the child (learner). The latter was not seen as an 'empty vessel' to be filled with 'facts'. Children should be actively involved in their own learning, rather than being passive recipients of knowledge.

An important feature of 'progressivism' was views about the nature of childhood and development. Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Dewey and Piaget considered that childhood was a distinct period with its own pattern of development, and further that it was not simply a preparation for adulthood. The purpose of education was, therefore, to allow for such development to occur. Rousseau, for example, claimed that education should be natural following the interests of the child, rather than those imposed by adults (teachers for example) (Moore, T.W., 1974). 'Natural' here appears to mean following the child's development. Education according to

'nature' therefore means that form which recognises individual 'interests' and 'needs' of the child, rather than those of adults. However, the term can be interpreted in a number of ways (Schofield, 1972).

Dewey held similar views, and distinguished three stages of development ranging from a period of play characterised by spontaneous activity and then a techniques period in which the child learns to distinguish means and ends and follow simple procedures and finally a period of reflection in which a more 'critical' approach to the solving of problems is adopted (Moore, T.W., 1974).

Piaget much later, delineated certain stages through which children passed, each one being distinctive, building on the former ones.

Such theories proposed a different view of childhood to the one in which children were considered as miniature adults, and in which education was viewed as a preparation for adult status.

As stated, progressivism proposes a more active role for the child. Both Rousseau and Pestalozzi emphasized the importance of activity based on first hand experience, not merely acquired from books.

Rousseau considered that the emphasis should be on activity, expanding experience and exploration of the environment, and also that the child should be concerned more with things than words and also with the concrete world (Moore, T.W. 1974).

Pestalozzi, it is argued, considered that observation was important.

" Particularly important was his emphasis on

observation leading to verablisation so that
children would more readily form concepts.
This was the essense of the object lesson ...
He wanted the children to discover all they
could through their own senses before being
told of the object's qualities."

(Whitbread, 1972 p19)

Pestalozzi advocated learning by doing, and
that knowledge should be acquired through activity and
thus perceived through the senses and not imposed from
without.

Pestalozzi stated that,

" ... education of the intellectual results
from the experience of objects which act as
stimuli upon our senses ... All our know-
ledge of the outside world is the result of
sensory experience."

(Pestalozzi, in Mellor, 1950 p14)

Froebel expressed a similar view to Pestalozzi.
The child was not something to be moulded into the teacher's
(or society's) view of knowledge
" but was much more like a plant which should
be allowed space and opportunity to grow as
in a well-planned garden."

(Gordon and Lawton, 1978 p65)

Like Pestalozzi, Froebel emphasised the
" importance of language as a means to under-
ing and verbalisation of concepts but gave
priority ... first to self-knowledge, second
to knowledge of God, and third to knowledge
of nature."

He also stressed the importance of play, and matching
activities to each child's stage of development, and be-
lieved in the view "that teachers should wait until the
child felt a need before teaching basic skills". Whitbread,
1972 pp32-34) A reading of the literature about the 'great
educators', suggested that 'structure' was important. As

noted in Chapter Six, the term 'structure' came up quite frequently in teachers' discussions about their work. Whitbread, writing about the work of Pestalozzi, argued that

> "... he in no way abdicated from the teacher's responsibility to direct children's learning"

(Whitbread, 1972 p19)

Other 'progressives' also appeared to see 'structure' or 'direction' as necessary. Dewey, for example, saw man as "an active problem solving animal" wishing "to master his environment in co-operation with others" (Gordon and Lawton, 1978 p17). He also considered that:

> "learning is active. It involves reaching out of the mind"

(Dewey, in Mellor, E., 1950 p19)

However, it was considered that such learning should be directed in some way. Direction, control and guidance were necessary because the child's natural impulses were not always in agreement with group customs and therefore needed to be guided. Dewey considered that control could only be gained through co-operation not by coercian (Dewey, 1966). Such a definition of control, though different from that of some 'philanthropists' and those concerned with 'social discipline' in the Nineteenth Century (the concerns of the previous chapter) which was explicitly coercive, nevertheless seemed to deny the principle of autonomy, or free choice between known alternatives. Such control might be benevolent, and achieved through co-operation, but it still seems coercive. Someone external to teachers and pupils had an idea of a good society. Thus, these ideas bore a strong resemblance to those of Durkheim on the need for 'moral discipline' as well as social reform. These ideas were

discussed in Chapter One.

Montessori also regarded learning as an active process for the basis of her teaching was to allow freedom of action in order to encourage children to do things for themselves (Montessori, M., 1912). She also believed that the promotion of sensory development was important (Whitbread, 1972). However, teachers' freedom was restricted because the role of the teacher was clearly defined by Montessori, and no deviation from the Montessori method was permitted. Those schools which failed the 'method' were not recognised as Montessori schools (Selleck, 1972). In relation to the children Whitbread argued that the environment was structured and

> "Order was essential if the children were
> to profit from this 'prepared environment'
> ... But it was order based on 'active
> discipline' by which she meant 'self-
> discipline', not repressive discipline which
> she condemned as destroying individuality."
>
> (Whitbread, 1972 pp57-58)

This emphasis on 'self-control' was also advocated by Froebel, who

> "unlike many of his contemporaries ...
> says that the real object of training is
> establish self-control not sensless
> obedience."
>
> (Raymont, 1937, p299)

As stated, both Rousseau and Dewey conceptualised a future 'better' society. Their ideas about the purpose of education were linked to these conceptualisations.

Rousseau considered that society was composed of different, frequently conflicting interests. However, he believed that if at some point all interests were not the same then society could not exist (Rousseau, 1762). Rousseau

was concerned to bring about a society based upon the actual interests of every member rather than one based upon aristocratic privilege (Moore, 1974).

The education system could be viewed as a means of developing individuals to fit into society, although Rousseau was said to have conceived of education as having a more liberatory purpose,

"not to teach children to fit into society
but to be free from its shackles."

(Gordon and Lawton, 1978 p53)

In the 'good' society actions would be guided by reason "but one task of education was to avoid premature, irrational obedience by children".: (Gordon & Lawton, 1978 p52). Thus 'rules' would be developed through action and use of reason rather than being imposed from without.

Dewey was similarly concerned with the creation of a better society, one which in his view would be a 'democracy'. The latter was "primarily a mode of associated living of conjoint communicated experience." (Dewey, 1916 p87). He believed that individuals and groups should be encouraged to develop mutual interests and co-operation.

Schools were seen as an integral part of society. Dewey considered that activities in them should be relevant to the 'real' world dealing with real life problems based upon children's interests rather than ones imposed by the teacher. It was considered that the pupil and teacher should work closely together and as a result face the problems in working in co-operation with one another and acquire certain values such as tolerance, self-control and social responsibility (Moore, 1974).

Dewey's version of society and the role of education with it, like Durkheim's, stresses the 'integrative' function of education, and its value for creating a feature of community.

Dewey also attended to the problem of 'order' and change and how the latter might be brought about without destroying the former. He was concerned that education should provide individuals with "habits of mind which secure social change without introducing disorder." (Dewey, 1916 p99). He was also concerned with education as a means of promoting equality, in the sense of opportunity and also enabling

> "each individual ... to escape from the
> social limitations of the social group in
> which he was born ... to come into contact
> with the broader environment."
>
> (Dewey, 1916 p20)

Thus, on the one hand, Dewey appeared to be concerned with order and stability, and on the other concerned with education as a means of transforming society.

Dewey considered that in order to transform society it was necessary that individuals should reflect upon actions. According to Skilbeck, Dewey's view was that

> "Reflective thinking is essentially a
> process of changing or modifying situations,
> beliefs and knowledge itself. Thus educa-
> tion founded on processes of reflective
> thought itself becomes a change process,
> the means whereby the individual learns to
> take a measure of responsibility for his
> environment."
>
> (Skilbeck, 1976 p41)

The assumption that reflection can change situations has links with the phenomenological standpoint. However, one belief is that those challenging prevailing notions of

education should consider the boundaries within which the redefining of knowledge is possible (Whitty, 1977). However, it appears that Dewey was well aware of existing constraints and "true to his philosophy of pragmatism he operated consciously and knowledgeably within them." (Bowles and Gintis, 1976 p181).

Dewey's ideas about the purpose of education might seem to entail certain consequences for the teacher such as that there should be a less formal pupil-teacher relationship, one based on co-operation with the teacher as a person to be consulted. Thus the relationship would not be authoritarian. If the school is considered to be an agent of change then necessarily so must the teacher be, but in order to be effective in this respect a teacher would have both to reflect on ideas and have knowledge of alternatives and the freedom to choose between these. This presupposes that teachers are expected to be reflective, and that they can easily change from one type of teaching to another, namely from transmitting 'established' ideas to a passive audience to co-operative teaching and learning.

Thus so far the ideas of the 'Great Educators' have been reviewed and their pedagogical implications noted. The next section considers the nature of practice, in terms of teaching methods and curriculum, in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. It looks at arguments which suggest a link between progressive ideas and infant school development and also those which present a different view of any such relationship.

SECTION TWO: THE LINK BETWEEN 'PROGRESSIVE' IDEAS AND INFANT

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT: TWO CONTRASTING VIEWS.

The previous section outlined the main ideas of the 'Great Educators', who are considered to form part of the 'progressive' tradition (Sharp and Green, 1975). This section discusses the view that an 'infant tradition' was being developed in the Nineteenth Century, presenting contrary evidence.

1. Physical Separateness

It was indicated in Chapter Nine that Silberman was correct in stating that there was a separate infant tradition, if this is seen in terms of physical separateness. Some early infant schools were also noted in that chapter. The first British infant school as a separate building in fact was founded at New Lanark in 1816 by Robert Owen, as noted in Chapter Nine. The first attempt to set up an infant school outside Scotland was at Westminster. This was founded by a group of 'Whigs' and ~Radicals' led by a Lord Brougham and James Mill (1819). Another infant school was established in Spitalfields in the 1820s by a Joseph Wilson. This school, as noted, showed Owenite influence. Another was opened in Walthamstow in 1824 by Reverend David Wilson. This was a church school. (Joseph and David Wilson were cousins.) As noted in Chapter Nine, Wilderspin was regarded as the promoter of infant schools. He open helped fifty infant schools in a ten year period (Whitbread, 1972).

Platts and Haughton, as stated, wrote about the establishment of infant schools in Gloucestershire in the early Nineteenth Century.

In the year 1836-7 the Manchester Statistical Society, writing about the state of education in the area

under research, noted that

> "There were three infant schools which
> received financial aid from the public."
>
> (Benson, 1932 pp157-58)

Whitbread stated that many infant schools were founded in the Nineteenth Century. She also noted that provision was made in 'Elementary' schools for infants, or children under seven (Whitbread, 1972 p24). Later during the 1870s up to 1902 that there was an increase of under fives in elementary schools (Whitbread, 1972 p41). Likewise, Stewart noted that by 1870 nearly half of the Elementary school population was under eight, and that there was pressure for the separation of older from younger pupils. Matthew Arnold stated that

> "In the institutions I have visited during
> the past year I have continually felt the
> want of infant schools ... schools are dogged
> and impeded in their operations by a mass of
> children under eight years of age"
>
> (Matthew Arnold, 1820 in
> Stewart McCann, 1968 pp8-9)

Thus there was evidence of separate infant schools in the physical sense.

2. Official Support for Infant Schools

1839 marked the formation of the Committee of Council in Education. It is said to have marked a "period of definite ... action on the part of the State", and that their first report in 1839-40 recognised infant schools "as part of the elementary school system." (Raymont, 1957 p153). The Committee of Council also encouraged 'training' for infant teachers. They offered an additional grant for training schools which provided 'a separate and complete course of training for females intending to take charge of infant schools.' (Minutes, 1864, cited in Whitbread, 1972 p26).

Likewise in 1861 the Report of the Newcastle Commission was said to have stated that more training colleges were required for infant teachers, for

> "Their office requires a special qualification and therefore special education"
>
>> (Newcastle Commission, 1861
>> cited in Hadow, 1933 p18)

and that the Royal Commission was 'completely sympathetic to the infant school' and that

> "the principles elaborated by Mr Fletcher are substantially common to all public infant schools.
>
>> (Newcastle Commission, 1861
>> cited by Turner, D.A. 1970
>> p162)

In the 1830s inspectors argued for provision for a 'babies' class. The Parliamentary Committee of Education in 1838 expressed the view that provision was desirable from the age of three (for working class children), and

> "directed that a collateral series of plans of school houses should be drawn, in which an infant school, and playground are added to schoolrooms for children above six years of age."
>
>> (Minutes, 1840 cited by
>> Whitbread, 1972 p25)

In 1871 the London School Board recommended that the starting age of Standard One (The Elementary School was divided into 'standards') be set at seven, and that there should be separate infant schools for children up to seven. It was also recommended that infant classes should be taught by a woman. This form of organisation was adopted by the London School Board, and also by "the higher school boards" (Stewart, 1968 p9).

Planning rules in 1871 also indicated that infants should be physically separated from older children (Board of

Education, 1871 Rule 12, cited in McCann, 1968).

It has been stated that the 1870 Code was 'sympathetic' to the infant school idea. The Code of 1892 was also sympathetic. It is argued that it reformed the curriculum and methods in the infant school (Blackstone, 1971 p26). Elsewhere it is stated that the 1892 Code recognised the 'Froebel Certificate' as a qualification for assistant mistresship and that

> "infants were no longer to be examined in the three Rs.
>
> Woodham-Smith, P., 1976 p59)

The accompanying Circular 232, in 'Instructions for Infants' stated that the education of young children should recognize,

> "the child's spontaneous activity and stimulation of this activity in certain well defined situations." (p59)

and also that

> "the harmoneous and complete development of the whole child's facilities"
>
> (Woodham-Smith, P., 1976 p59)

Sir George Kekewich was responsible for the introduction of the 1892 Code. He advocated enlightened teaching methods and the need to "encourage children's spontaneous activity in the teaching of ... infants ... in the habit of questioning" and also "The ability to reason" (Middleton & Weitzman, 1976 p89).

It was noted in the previous chapter that Kay Shuttleworth, an educational administrator in the 1860s, was concerned with social and moral control. It has been argued that this focus on, Kay Shuttleworth's interest in control has drawn attention away from his other interest, in the 'Continental reformers' (Stewart & McCann). It was argued that Shuttleworth visited Scotland and Holland and suggested

the replacement of 'monitorial methods' by

> "the methods of Pestalozzi as reduced to
> practice by Mr Prince in the schools of
> Holland."
>
> (Kay cited by Stewart &
> McCann p182)

although he was not aware of "the philosophical basis of Pestalozzi's position." (p187).

Thus far it has been argued then that from the early Nineteenth Century infant schools as separate establishments did begin to develop, and that their development received official support.

3. Other Support

The infant school movement received support from other organisations, or bodies. It was noted in Chapter Nine that a society called the 'Infant School Society' supported the development of infant schools during part of the Nineteenth Century. In 1824 'The London Infant School Society' was set up, its object being to train infant teachers. The society helped to promote the foundation of infant schools, but ceased its activities in 1835.

In Chapter Nine the formation of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society was mentioned. It was formed by J.P. Greaves "a Pestalozzian" (Turner, 1970 p153) and by Mayo. Whitbread argued that this society publicised Pestalozzian methods and that it was interested in the promotion of infant schools (Whitbread, 1972 p22). Turner believed that this society helped to maintain a supply of trained teachers and materials "required for the establishment of infant schools" (Turner, 1970 p152).

It has been argued that the efforts of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society were apparent by the 1840s

when
> "Inspectors   made a distinction between 'the
> more modern infants schools' and the rest where
> the teachers' lack of training was deplored."
>
> (Whitbread, 1972 p22)

By 1846 a Joseph Fletcher reported to the Committee of Council that 'The Home and Colonial Infant School Society is required to supply trained teachers for nearly the whole of the current appointments.' (Minutes, 1846, cited in Whitbread, 1972 p22).   The Home and Colonial Infant School Society founded a training college at Holborn.   It was stated that it

> "tried to impress ... upon the Committee
> of Council the value of infant training, for
> by mid century the earlier supply of teachers
> was drying up and the number of infant
> schools increasing."
>
> (Turner, D.A., 1970 p162)

In 1874 the Froebel Society was set up.   It has been argued that this movement was restricted at first to a few schools for the well to do but that it soon became

> "recognised by responsible authorities for
> schools attended by ... children of the masses."
>
> (Raymont, 1937 p241)

It has been said that the British and Foreign Schools Society remodelled its training course along Froebelian lines.   In 1865 a Training College for infant teachers was opened at Stockwell, and another at Safron Waldon in 1884.

Froebel also had some influence on the Home and Colonial Infant School Society.   In 1857 a Heinrich Hoffman left his post as director of kindergarten training in Hamburg to take up an appointment with the Home and Colonial Infant School Society, to introduce Froebelian methods.   In 1874 the London School Board appointed a Froebelian trained Miss

Bishop

"to lecture to their infant school mistresses"

(Raymont, 1937 p238)

In 1894 the Froebel Educational Institute for training teachers was set up in West Kensington in London. In the 1880s a college on Froebelian lines was set up in Bedford, and later became known as the Maria Grey College.

Hadow argued that

"Some School Boards and Inspectors advocated
his (Froebel) methods in their training."

(Hadow, 1933 p38)

Some reference has already been made to the 'Inspectorate' and that some of its members were sympathetic to the development of infant schools, and the ideas of the 'Continental Reformers' such as Froebel. One H.M.I., a Reverend Mitchell

"'hailed the commencement of what I hope to be
a new era of infant life - the introduction
of a plan ... which owes its origin to Froebel'"

(Rev. Mitchell, cited by
Rusk, 1933 pp177-78)

Another inspector, Fletcher, in the Report of 1864 concerned with infant schools drew a distinction between the newer and older infant schools

"in schools conducted by the newer types of
teacher ... 'instead of being stultified ...
with the technicalities of written language'
are led to be interested in familiar objects
and events around them."

(Raymont, 1937 pp164-65)

It was noted earlier that the London School Board (1871) had recommended that those teaching in infant classes should be women. Roberts stated that by the mid Nineteenth Century most infant teachers were female (Roberts, A. 1976 p257).

It is interesting to note, however, that women were not always regarded as the most suitable people to be infant teachers. Wilderspin, for example argued that the presence of a man was *required*, because

"as a father figure in the family (he) will
ensure a greater degree of respect and
attention on the part of children" (p114)

than a woman would. It was also considered that women in the home were

"less promptly obeyed than a father" (p114).

The presence of a man, it was felt, would ensure "attention and gain respect" but it was also considered that women were also unsuitable for infant posts because they did not possess enough

"physical strength, nor at present
intellectual powers, sufficient for the task."
(Wilderspin, 1840 p114)

This view can be compared to the view recently expressed that men are needed now in the infant classroom as 'father figures'. The view of a boy noted in Chapter Five about men teachers as being better for 'work' is also interesting.

Thus far it has been shown that there was official support for, and sympathy for the promotion of infant schools. Support was also provided by various societies who attempted to promote 'progressive' thinking into training and practice and also by members of the inspectorate. There is some information regarding practice too.

Whitbread argued that the infant schools set up by Robert Owen and Stowe in Scotland were part of an "older more democratic tradition" in which "there was more concern for broader educational aims appropriate to young children." It

is argued that the school in 'New Lanark' was "By contemporary standards child-centred" (Whitbread, 1972 p20). New Lanark was described "as the first in the developmental tradition of primary education" (p10). Owen like Rousseau and Pestalozzi, emphasised the active role of the child, and education based on practical experience rather than books (Owen, cited by Stewart & McCann, 1977).

It has been argued that New Lanark was visited by Henry Brougham (who later founded an infant school at Westminster). Spitalfields, too was said to be modelled on New Lanark. McCann argued that the latter "belonged to a genre very different from other day schools" and where Wilderspin "experimented with unorthodox teaching methods" (McCann, 1977 p23). Wilderspin believed in engaging the senses and that the teacher must begin with the study of the child and educate the spirit of enquiry and also foster natural development (McCann, 1977).

It has been said that features of Owen's model "were ... present to a greater or lesser extent in the infant schools after 1870" and that this was not accidental (Turner, 1970 p53).

In conclusion to the first part of the section on Nineteenth Century developments in infant education it has been shown that there is evidence to suggest the development of an 'infant tradition' in this period. However, in the second part of the section evidence will be presented which suggests that the 'infant tradition' was hampered in its establishment by certain factors such as the 'monitoral system', the 'Revised Code' and Payment by Results for

example. It is also indicated that there were deficiencies in the system of training, and the inspectorate whilst endorsing new methods and advocating change believed that progress was sporadic. It is also indicated that the reality in the classroom did not necessarily correspond with the official promulgations about infant schools.

4. Factors Which Hampered the Development of the 'Infant Tradition'

Infant schools during part of the Nineteenth Century appear to have been affected by the 'Monitorial system'. A Reverend Francis opened an infant school in Gloucestershire which was condemned by Wilderspin as a

"travesty of infant school practice ... for it was conducted as a monitorial scriptural train- ing institution."

(Platts & Haignton, 1954 p62)

It is considered that by the 1830s infant schools had become training grounds for the lower classes (an issue looked at in Chapter Nine) and were a preparation for 'National' 'British schools'. While 'learning through play and experience' were gradually being accepted in infant schools these methods often deteriorated into rote learning (Turner, 1970). Likewise, Whitbread argued that in the early English infant schools the New Lanark model was transformed,

"into a much more rigid instrument of instruction and discipline"

(Whitbread, 1972 p11)

and that even Wilderspin, cited earlier as a critic of the monitorial system by Platts and Haignton (1954) was concerned to adopt elementary education to the needs of young children (Whitbread, 1972). Wilson, who founded the third infant school in England, is said to have regarded his infant school

as an initiatory school to the monitorial one. Whitbread also stated that the presence of the monitorial system was a constraint on infant teachers practice and that there was pressure to begin 'formal' instruction as soon as possible (Whitbread, 1972). As noted in Chapter Six the term 'formal' was used by some teachers in the infant schools observed in this research.

The monitorial system has been blamed for the failure of Pestalozzi's ideas to influence practice. Rusk believed that Pestalozzi's contribution was not fully realised because,

"the times were unpropitious for the recogni-
tion and adoption of his methods ... due to
the spread of the monitorial system."
(Rusk, 1933 p28)

Whitbread, whilst arguing that Pestalozzi's "greatest contribution in Britain was in the field of education" stated that his main influence was "on preparatory schools for the middle classes" (Whitbread, 1972 pp21-22). Whitbread gives a detailed account of the influence on the kindergarten movement.

It was stated earlier than infant school practice was affected by the 'Revised Code' and 'Payment by Results'.

In 1858 the Newcastle Commission was set up to enquire into the state of popular education, to ascertain whether value for money was being obtained. In Part One of this section it was indicated that the Commission was sympathetic to infant education. However, the Commission also proposed 'Payment by Results' whereby grants were made payable to schools on the basis of achievement of satisfactory results in 'basic subjects'. One view is that

this affected the Elementary school teacher (Grace, 1978 p36) but not the working world of the infant teacher (Blyth, 1965). However, the latter does state that infant education was "severely strained" by 'Payment by Results' (p.37).

Other writers are more specific about the effect of 'Payment by Results' on infant schools. For example, Raymont agreed that,

> "The Code failed to appreciate what an infant
> should be and do. It cared only for
> reading, writing and mathematics."

(Raymont, 1937 p216)

and that

> "The prospect of the examination in the 3Rs
> in the top class came to dominate the whole
> situation in infant schools." (p217)

Even in the infant school it appears that teachers' salaries "depended on the amount of grant earned by the pupils, to begin five and six year olds for the standard examination in the 3Rs." (Whitbread, 1972 p27).

Infant pupils like elementary ones were subject to testing,

> "No exception was to be made for infants.
> To them the inspectors were to apply
> individual tests in reading or narrative
> in mono-syllables, writing small and
> capital letters .. naming figures up to
> twenty and adding and subtracting figures
> up to ten."

(Raymont, 1937 p215)

Whitbread agreed that in such a situation where the emphasis was on efficiency, economy and mass literacy for elementary education for the working class that Froebel's ideas were innapplicable in method and intention (Whitbread, 1972). Likewise Raymont argued that attempts to introduce Froebel's ideas were hampered by the Revised Code, and that there was also "contentment with patching up the old system"

(Raymont, 1937 pp25-26).

The Home and Colonial Infant School Society was critical about the effects of the Payment by Results system on infant schools, and considered that the emphasis should primarily be on the "physical conditions and intellectual and moral training" not on the 3Rs.(Raymont, 1937 p216).

Payment by Results was also condemned by some members of the inspectorate. Raymont stated that in the Inspectors' Report of 1865 an inspector remarked that

"'one is driven to the inference that the 3Rs
had come to be regarded as the be all and ...
end all of all Elementary school teaching,
even of infants and that the whole atmosphere
of the schools had become one of drill and
discipline'
                              (Inspector, in Raymont,
                                1937, p223)

A Mr Mitchell in 1864 was more emphatic,

"'I regret the almost total abandonment of the
infant system of instruction. The grand
object now is to make children read, write,
cypher, so as to secure the extra grants for
their subjects'"

                              (Mitchell, cited in
                                Raymont, 1937 p223)

There were, it appears, Inspectors who agreed with the emphasis on reading and writing and who had "no sympathy with the view that good reading is not a fair criterion of the efficiency of infant schools" (p166).

The Cross Commission was set up in 1886 to enquire into the working of the Elementary system but it is argued that it took little account of infant schools, and that only a few recognised work that had been done in "the study and dissemination of the principles of infant training" (Raymont, 1937 p254).

In 1894 inspection replaced the exam for top infant classes. Whitbread, however, argued that there were many factors which still hindered progress, namely large classes, architecture of the schools, and lack of training (Whitbread, 1972 p49). The Revised Code in fact reduced class size so that for heads the size was limited to sixty nine, for assistant teachers - fifty eight and for probationers - twenty three. However, class sizes were still large and it could be argued that it was a factor weighing heavily against change, presenting teachers with both management and resource problems.

Sharp and Green, in their study of an infant school in the 1970s noted that 'resource management' was a stronger influence than theory on actual practice. During observations in infant schools in this research teachers remarked that they could work differently, and might do so if they had smaller classes.

An examination of the training of infant teachers in the Nineteenth Century indicated that it was not always very satisfactory. A Reverend Mitchell cited earlier stated that certain qualities were essential in a 'good' infant teacher, namely,

> "'a wide ... extensive deep knowledge of human
> nature ... human passions, of ways of
> thought.'" (p202)

but that in practice the situation was rather different, for

in his view the infant teacher was likely to be a

> "'weak unskilled ... girl of sixteen, who has
> no range beyond her mother's cottage door'"

> (Mitchell, cited in
> Raymont, 1937 p202)

The apparent failure of the infant school to progress and improve the learning situation of pupils could be attributed to a lack of educated and trained teachers, according to Raymont (1937).

Mitchell also considered that infant teachers should be trained separately from those in 'juvenile' schools, and that a particular type of training was required, one in which attention was 'chiefly directed to practical duties of her work ...' (Mitchell, cited in Raymont, 1937 p206).

The Home and Colonial Infant School Society mentioned previously, was set up with the aim of training infant teachers. Raymont argued that while many women's colleges were set up they did not deal specifically with the problems of the infant school. It was stated that in an examination paper for female students in training schools in 1854, that out of one hundred and fifty questions

"... only one had the slightest bearing upon the special work of the infant teacher."

(Raymont, 1937 p205)

However, the Code of 1871 did state that the infant school should be taught by a 'certified' teacher (p239). It has been noted earlier that there had been one view that women might not be the best equipped to teach infants, because of a lack of authority. Roberts, argued, however, that by the mid Nineteenth Century

"The majority of infant teachers were female (for) purely financial reasons."

(Roberts, 1976 p257)

Nowadays, as noted, men are beginning to be seen in infant classrooms.

Whitbread has argued that during the Nineteenth Century efforts were made to improve the training facilities for infant teachers but that certain factors "hindered progress" including the fact that

> "A generation of teachers had learned their trade under the discipline of payment by results and nearly half the certified teachers had never been trained."
>
> (Whitbread, 1972 p49)

It was argued in the first part of the section that the 1892 Code was also sympathetic to infant education and that it advocated enlightened methods. However, it has also been suggested that new ideas were slow to make headway and that

> "in spite of the liberalisation of the Code of 1892 the curriculum still gave cause for some concern."
>
> (Blackstone, 1971 p28)

She cites one H.M.I. talking about conditions in one infant department,

> "'He (the child) is told to fold his arms ... He is then subjected to learning letters from the blackboard by monotonous repetition ... discipline is military rather than maternal.'"
>
> (Bathurst, 1905, in Blackstone, 1971 p29)

It was indicated earlier that Wilderspin had argued that the presence of a man was required in the infant classroom and that he had stressed the importance of a father figure who could ensure respect and attention from the pupils. From Bathurst's comments above, it can be seen that requirements were now for a 'maternal figure'. This may be is not surprising considering that in this period there was an idea that the purpose of the infant school and later nursery school was to provide what 'good homes' and

'mothers' should provide, but was thought didn't. This issue
was discussed in Chapter Nine. Thus King's notion of the
infant teacher as a mother figure does have an 'historical'
basis. King considered that

> "it is not too fanciful to see resemblance be-
> tween infant teachers and middle class mothers
> of the Newsons' ... survey."

> (King, 1977 p74)

There is some information even from secondary
sources on the reality of life in the classroom. Whitbread,
using material from Rouse, argued that the infant classroom
of the mid Nineteenth Century was characterised by a gallery
and walls lined with black boarding for children to draw and
write on, and a playground with swings and a see-saw and a
curriculum which included a minimum of 3Rs (Whitbread, 1972).

However, a view of a child in a London school in
the 1870s and of a teacher in another London school would
seem to indicate that for some children and teachers the
situation was rather different from that described by
Whitbread and that infant schools could have been very
dreary, unhappy places.

> "'My mother and I were ... led by somebody into
> a classroom ... an enormous apartment ...
> filled up with babies arranged in galleries up
> to the ceiling ... I hated school it was never
> anything else than a nightmare and a torment
> for me.'"

> (Child, 1870, cited in
> Raymont, 1937 p254)

An infant teacher (mistress) in 1893 claimed that
the infant school that she taught in was akin to a factory
and a prison,

> "'a prison house for babies comparable with the
> factories and the mines ... a ghastly prison
> for all ... in it. The iniquitous drill ...
> every movement whether of body or not, the
> down sittings and uprisings, the goings out
> and comings in, were all performed auto-

matically to numbers.'"

An examination of local archive material of various areas might indicate that the position varied from one area to another. In one the position that Whitbread outlined might be the true picture. In another, however, the situation might be akin to that described above.

It has been shown in this section that efforts were made to promote infant education in the Nineteenth Century and that the ideas of Pestalozzi, and Froebel, for example did receive some recognition, for example from the Home and Colonial Infant School Society. However, it was also shown that certain factors such as the introduction of the 'Revised Code' interfered with the development of infant schools. It has been pointed out that attempts to introduce Froebel's ideas were hindered by this Code, at least in infant schools (Raymont, 1937 pp25-26). Whitbread, too, argued that despite the efforts of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society to promote Pestalozzian methods, that

"rote learning became firmly entrenched in
infant schools for many decades."

and also that,

"... The instructional tradition remained
dominant, resistant to influence from child-
centred developmentalists."

(Whitbread, 1972 p27)

Rusk also indicated that whilst Froebel's ideas influenced practice in some London schools, there were some inspectors who had no faith in the Froebel system, and argued that it suited the upper class but not necessarily elementary school children in the state system (Raymont, 1937 pp245-48).

1094

Thus, it has been shown that in the Nineteenth Century there were various conflicting attitudes towards infant provision and that while efforts were made to promote a particular kind of infant education certain factors appeared to hinder its development.

SECTION THREE: IDEAS CONCERNING INFANT EDUCATION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

INTRODUCTION

This section is concerned with a range of ideas about infant school development in the Twentieth Century. The concern overall is with the extent of the promotion of 'progressive', 'child-centred' ideas, and any resistance to these. Thus, various sources of ideas are examined.

For example, the 1902 Act, the 1905 Code, the Hadow Suggestions of 1931, the 1944 Act and the 1967 Plowden Report are considered. Also discussed are the findings of the H.M.I.s Report of 1978. The work of some groups set up to promote change in infant education such as the Conference of New Ideals in 1915, is also briefly examined.

The influence of the 11+ is also considered. Because there are numerous ideas, it seemed easier to arrange the discussion into periods, rather than deal with them separately.

Accordingly, the first part of the section looks at some of the developments in infant schooling in the early Twentieth Century from 1902 to just before the Hadow Report of 1938. The second part of the section considers the period from then to the present day.

1. The Development of Infant Schooling From 1902 to Hadow

Whitbread argued that

"The infant school gradually developed an ethos
of its own in the course of the first third of
the twentieth century."

Whitbread, 1972 p81)

At the very beginning of this period was the 1902
Act. This was seen as an important landmark in the
development of infant schooling because as a result

"infant schools and elementary schools with
infant departments or classes were taken
over by 330 new L.E.A.s.

Whitbread, 1972 p82)

This had some consequences for infant education,
though change was not widespread. For example, Whitbread
argued that children under seven were more likely to be
taught separately from other pupils but that infant schools
and infant departments also contained 'babies', or those
children under five, because of the lack of nursery
provision. However, she also claimed that the former did not
adapt "in any significant way" and that the 'Payment by
Results' still influenced infant teachers. It is stated that

"Inspectors commented that infant teachers
felt 'obliged to show results of their teaching'
and began preparation for inspection in
Standard I from the babies upwards."

(Whitbread, 1972 pp82-82)

It also appears that class size was an in-
hibiting factor against substantial change. (This was
also a factor slowing down change in the Nineteenth
Century as noted in the previous section.) Class size would
be upwards of sixty to eighty in a class. Whitbread stated
that

"'London heads were unwilling to appoint
teachers trained at the Froebel Institute
for fear they would be unable to cope with

the larger classes.'"

Whitbread argued that a typical classroom in the early 1900s still had fixed, tiered galleries, large classes of children, sitting in rows, and a curriculum dominated by the 3Rs and mechanical drill, and rote learning, and that, even where Froebel's ideas had infiltrated, practice degenerated into "merely exercises into stereotyped questions and rote answers" (pp83-84).

Blackstone argued that the Report of the Consultative Committee in 1905 was an important landmark in the history of primary education, that it,

> "marked the first public statement of what Blythe
> ... described as the developmental tradition in
> English Primary education."

This Report was said to have introduced greater freedom for teachers and to have affected the infant school.

The Handbook of 1905 reflected the ideas intended for practice. The 1905 Handbook stated that

> "The only uniformity of practice that the Board
> of Education desire to see in the teaching of
> Public elementary schools is that the teacher
> should think for himself [and use] ... methods
> of teaching as may use his powers to the best
> advantage."

It was further stated that a fixed standard of attainment in basic skills should be discarded and 'subordinated to the general aim of encouraging mental and physical growth and of developing good habits' (1905 Handbook cited in Whitbread, p84).

Change had been advocated, it appears, by some inspectors who had criticised the nature of teaching in

infant schools during the early Twentieth Century. Their criticisms also appeared in the 1905 Handbook.

> "The Inspectors argue that the mechanical
> teaching in many infant schools seems to dull
> rather than awaken the little power of
> imagination which these children possess."
>
> (Report, 1905, cited in
> Blackstone, 1971 p29)

However, there was also evidence to suggest that change was slow in being achieved. A woman inspector in 1905 claimed that practice was very much dominated by the demands of Standard I. She stated that the aim of the big town infant school was primarily,

> "often to produce children who at the age of 6
> have mastered the mechanical difficulties of
> Standard I work."
>
> (Inspector, cited in
> Blackstone, 1971 p29)

Nevertheless, Evans argued that by the early Twentieth Century a variety of influences had combined to "challenge ... the insensitive misguided pedagogy of the Victorians." (Evans, 1975, pp73-75). There was an alleged freedom to experiment apparently co-inciding with an increase in the awareness of 'progressive' methods. Both Whitbread and Raymont noted these influences. The former pointed out that in 1906, for example, Dewey's essays were published. She stated that a J. Findley of Manchester University, brought Dewey's ideas to the attention of British 'educationalists'. These included a Miss E.R. Murray, then Principal of the Maria Grey Training College, who re-interpreted Froebel's principles in the light of Dewey's ideas (Whitbread, 1972 p85).

Raymont argued that Montessori's ideas received more attention during the first part of the Twentieth Century, and had a "marked influence" on infant schools, becoming more

widely known in
"England and America after the publication
in 1902 of an English translation of her work."

(Raymont, 1937 p30)

In 1911 an inspector, Edmund Holmes, published a programme of progressive reform. He argued that he,
"Had been strongly influenced by a 'noble'
band of pioneers among elementary teachers."

(Holmes, 1911 p3)

However he also said that their achievements had been "isolated" (p3). Selleck similarly argued that the 'progressives' were a band of outsiders and that the term 'progressive' could only be applied to a small group. He also stated that it was difficult to experiment. However, Selleck also argued that these ideas did have some influence on the Inspectorate. He cited as an example, a Phillip Ballard, and a C.W. Kimmins who, he stated, showed Montessori
"round some London schools which had adopted
her methods." (p43)
He also stated that a Jesse Mackinder acknowledged Montessori's ideas, but developed cheaper and more suitable methods for the large classes of English schools (Selleck, 1972 p43). On the other hand it was also said that Montessori would not visit an infant school in Chelsea "because she felt that her views had been plagiarised" (p43).

One view of why ideas had not become widespread was that the 'Great Educators' assumed that education was primarily for their own class, that "They almost ignored the existence of any other class" (Raymont, 1937 p35). However, Whitbread, discussing Montessori's influence on the development of nursery education, stated that ideas had been
"systematically developed ... in a context similar
to the slum conditions where a new type of
nursery education was urgently needed."

Whitbread indicated that a conflict existed within the progressive movement itself, amongst Froebelians and supporters of Montessori. She stated that while the latter's ideas,

"became known in England from 1919 to 1938 ...
a six month training course was run in London
every alternate year".

She stated that there was a reaction against Montessori's "theory and practice" on the part of the supporters of Froebel because the system was seen as too regimented (Whitbread, 1972 p59).

Blackstone argued that Montessori's ideas did not become extensive in nursery schools for a different reason than any argument between 'progressives'. She argued that

"her methods did not accord with the prevalent
notion of nursery schools as little more
than school welfare centres."

Despite some differences expressed by these authors, this influence of the 'Great Educators' in the early Twentieth Century may have been more evident in the nursery/pre-school sector. For example, the Froebel movement in Britain was the first to provide free nursery education for children aged three to six in 'working class' districts (Whitbread, 1972 p55.)

Later, 'progressive' ideas began to infiltrate infant schools. In 1915 the 'Conference of New Ideals in Education' was held at the instigation of the 'Montessori Society' one of whose members was the Edmund Holmes referred to earlier. Whitbread argued that prior to World War I there were pressures for changes to be made in education which came

together in 1915 (Whitbread, 1972). Grace noted a reaction against 'Payment by Results', for example, which Holmes was involved in. (Grace, 1978). Holmes saw the function of education as being

"to foster growth (and) the development of the latent power of his pupils."

(Holmes, 1911 p5)

He also argued that the atmosphere of a 'good' infant school was freer and more creative (p11).

Whitbread argued that after World War I opinion was more "receptive to ideas from the progressive education movement in America", including those of Dewey. (Whitbread, 1972 p90). Likewise, Wardle stated that the 1920s to 1930s period was productive in the innovations in methods of teaching.(Wardle, 1976). The Dalton plan was said to be one such innovation. Gordon and Lawton stated that by 1926 about 2,000 schools had adopted it (Gordon and Lawton, 1978).

However, Selleck observed that its popularity was not due to any strong desire to put progressive ideas into practice, but that it was rather pragmatic, because adopting it, or even looking as if one was going to do so, meant a degree of protection from criticism because the charge of being a reformer could not be levelled (Selleck, 1972). Likewise, Whiteside stated that schools which did adopt the Dalton Plan integrated it with standard methods and the maintenance of a powerful teacher role ,(Whiteside, 1978). Gordon and Lawton argued moreover that its practical implementation was hindered by the lack of skill in planning assignments, and a lack of materials and resources, and that work degenerated into copying from books.(Gordon and Lawton,

1978).

Whitbread argued that <u>Dewey</u> was an important influence on the development of infant education, and that in 1920 the 'progressive Education Association' published his views, and that his ideas were influential on the work of Susan Isaacs. Both Blackstone and Whitbread discussed the development of nursery education and both pointed to Susan Isaacs as being an important innovator within it during the early Twentieth Century. It was shown in Chapter Nine that there was a strong social motive behind the development of nursery education in the late Nineteenth Century, but that in the 1930s other motives began to be discussed. There was a growing interest in the "emotional needs of young children" and the notion of the nursery school as "an educational institution". (Blackstone, T., 1971 pp50-51).

Both Blackstone and Selleck argued that the late 1920s, and the early 1930s were a period of great interest in the ideas of 'child-centred' education and that such ideas were being "advocated with increased force", particularly in the nursery school.(Blackstone, 1971 p53). Gradually, these ideas spread to infants schools. For example, Gardener and Cass stated that in the 1920s there was a break away from "chalk and talk" methods and that important influences included Montessori and "Pioneer infant teachers, such as Jesse Makinder .." who advocated more 'individual' work in infant schools".(Gardner & Cass, 1965 p2). They also argued that change was possible in infant schools because they were independent from schools for older children. However, these writers did not see the 1920s as wholly a period of change.

They said that while changes had taken place in education, particularly in infant schools, that there was a period in the history of infant schools even during the 1920s when "the infant teacher was expected" to function in a particular way, as "a purveyor of information or moral training simultaneously to large numbers of relatively passive children". (p1). Gardner and Cass further argued that while

"the pioneers did the most intelligent and successful work ... the later 'followers' tended to stereotype schemes of work ..."

(Gardner & Cass, 1965 p5)

The spread of 'progressive' ideas was noted by Selleck, who argued that 'child-centred' ideas were transmitted by the Training Colleges and published in books and reports, and that

"a watered down version of the child-centred approach was becoming 'intellectual orthodoxy' among training college lecturers and H.M.I.s by 1939."

(Selleck, 1972 p53)

He stated that, for example, 'child-centred' ideas were adopted by the Maria Grey Training College in London and that its former principal, then a Miss Alice Woods,

"a publicist for progressive education ...claimed that educators wanted to free children from the traditional convention of many of (their teachers') own plans and rigid timetables."

(Selleck, 1972 p53)

(The influence of this college was noted earlier in connection with Froebel's ideas.)

However, Blackie, in contrast, argued that in the 1920s and 1930s many colleges had a limited conception of their role, and were also out of touch with modern ideas. These were also not receiving favourable publicity at the time in any case.(Blackie, 1967).

Thus far, it is concluded that in relation to the early period of the Twentieth Century there were conflicting viewpoints as to the extent of changes taking place within infant education as well as in nursery education.

The final part of this section considers the period from 1931 onwards until the present day. It looks at various reports which have referred to primary education, namely the Hadow Reports (1931 and 1933) and the Plowden Report of 1967. The Review of the literature dealt with more recent reports. The final part of the section also comments upon the effect of the 11+ on infant schools and how one teacher in an infant school saw 'reality' in the classroom in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Finally it considers post-Plowden research, some of which was referred to in the Review of the literature. It indicates that some of this research adopted a 'critical' stance towards the notion that primary schools were 'progressive'.

2. The Development of Infant Schools: 1931 to the Present Day

Marriott argued that 'progressive' ideologies in education "found their first official expression in the Hadow Report of 1931" (Marriott, 1985 p15). Likewise, Whitbread argued that

> "Official opinion had not been converted to
> 'child-centred education' when the 1924
> Revised Code was issued"

but that during the following decade there was a "marked change" (Whitbread, 1985 p95).

> The Report of 1931 stated that "the curriculum
> is to be thought of in terms of activity and
> experience rather than of knowledge to be
> acquired and facts to be stored."
> (Hadow, 1931 p75)

A 'horticultural' view of education was proposed (see King,

1978).   The Report stated that

> "'any realistic view of education must
> consider the infant school not as a place of
> instruction but as an instructive environment
> in which the child under the sympathetic
> care of his teacher, may cultivate his own
> garden'"
>
> (1933 xviii, cited in
> Whitbread, 1972 p96)

The Report also condemned any form of streaming in the infant

school, and a "mixture of class teaching, individual work and

teaching in small groups .. [was] advocated" (Whitbread, 1971

p98).

Whitbread concluded by arguing that the new type of

infant school was "slow to supercede the old", with many

children sitting in rows, and that often a compromise was

made, and a distinction made between periods of formal

instruction and those of 'free activity' (p99).   Gordon and

Lawton, similarly pointed out that the Hadow Report was

expressing a desire rather than showing what was present in

actual practice (Gordon & Lawton, 1978).   (A similar comment,

as noted later, was made in the Plowden Report of 1967.   This

is ironic in view of later criticism of Plowden itself.)

Whitbread also stated that the Hadow Report

considered the nursery/infant stage to be one (Whitbread,

1972).   Such a unified stage had in fact been advocated

earlier in 1926 by the Bradford Independent Labour Party.

Later in 1943, the Nursery School Association advocated one

stage.

> "Extending infant schools into nursery schools
> would unite the ideals of the nursery school
> with the best traditions of the infant
> school."
>
> (N.S.A., cited in
> Whitbread, 1972 p55)

The 1944 Education Act required L.E.A.s to organise

public education into three stages: primary, secondary, and further education. One view is that linking infant and junior stages together "... reversed the tendency to think of the nursery infant stage as ideally the first stage." (Whitbread, 1972 p105). However, many separate 'infant schools' remained, hence the problem with the literature, since a 'primary' did not automatically refer to 'infants'.

The effect of this act on the primary sector is seen differently. On the one hand it has been argued that the 1950's was a period of innovation, and one in which the 'progressive tradition' was strengthened in what was now known as the primary sector (Middleton & Weitzman, 1972. On the other hand, however, Marriott argued that the tripartite system recommended by and implemented as a result of the 1944 Education Act was

> "based on psychological theories of the fixed
> and inherent nature of intelligence, with
> the selection of pupils for different types
> of school," (p15)

and that it often meant that primary schools became "obssessively concerned with obtaining good results in the 11+ examination." (Marriott, 1985 p15). Owen and Selleck make similar points (Owen, 1973; Selleck, 1972).

One claim advanced was that infant schools were unaffected by the 11+ examination because they were separate from the rest of the primary sector and therefore free to experiment (Gardener & Cass, 1965). However, infant schools were still required to send children on to the junior school with 'basic skills'. Jackson argued that selection affected the internal organisation of primary schools because children were generally streamed at the age of seven on the basis of

intelligence tests and reports from the infant school
(Jackson, 2964). It is hard, therefore, to see them as
wholly separate and uninfluenced by problems in the sector
above them (something noted by teachers of older children at
Moorland). Whitbread argued that while the Hadlow Report of
1933 had "specifically deprecated segregation by ability
grouping", it was also the case that

> "The 11+ ... brought increasing pressure for
> earlier classification in the junior school,
> and this in turn brought pressure on infant
> heads to classify their six year olds." (p118)

Whitbread, however indicated that there was also a campaign
for non-streaming which "gained ground in primary schools in
the late 1950s", and that non-streaming and vertical grouping
were encouraged in infant classes,

> "accelerated in infant schools as the
> developmental tradition was reinforced by a
> better understanding of Piaget's and Susan
> Isaacs' research and by the work of
> sociologists."
>
> (Whitbread, 1972 p119)

Simon argued that there might have been a movement
towards free activity in the late 1940s and "epitomised by
the work of M.V. Daniels entitled 'Activity in the Primary
School' (Simon, B. 1980). However, even Mellor, a strong
advocate of child-centred education, argued that the
acceptance of his form of education was not uniform, and that
while in the 1950s,

> "Most of the galleries have now gone ... the
> gallery pattern of education dies hard, and in
> all too many of our infant schools one still
> sees young children seated most of the day in
> static tasks all facing the blackboard
> receiving instruction rather than education."
>
> (Mellor, M. 1955 p48)

Extracts from a book by Jean Goldman, who was
herself an infant teacher, indicated that there were various

constraints on teachers' practice in the fifties and early 1960s, namely the 11+, the views of the head teachers, and parents' notions of what 'school was for'. It showed that the 11+ put pressure on the head teacher who in turn pressurised the infant department. She remarked.

> "Mr Collins has been accused of setting too
> much store by the 3Rs ... of grading children
> into sheep and goats ('A' or 'B') before
> they've had time to take off their coats on
> their first morning of school. Mr Collins
> claims that by the time children have been in
> school for six months ... he can tell which of
> of them will be invited to occupy a seat in the
> local grammar school and which of them won't."
>
> (Goldman, J. 1963 p30)

Parents transmitted their anxieties to the teachers.

> "We have parents who, when their children
> have been in school no longer than six
> months start worrying about the child's
> chances in the 11+."
>
> (Goldman, 1963 p30)

Goldman said that this sort of parental pressure may have discouraged the head "from flirting with modern methods" (p30). As has been shown in a previous chapter, the Deputy of Larkway, as well as other teachers, also considered that the main concern of most parents there was how well their children were doing in the basic subjects, despite the absence of the 11+.

Goldman argued that her college did attempt to transmit new ideas about methods, and the notion that education meant "drawing out and not putting in" (p31). However, when she got into the school situation she found that idealism was tempered by the realities of classroom life, namely large classes. She stated that,

> "the state gave me thirty-five infants to teach
> and I spent the first two years of my career
> just learning how to keep this mob from
> running amok." (p31)

She added that while she
> "did her bit for modern methods when I could
> ... naturally it's not much of a bit when
> you're given such a pack of children to use
> it on."

(Goldman, 1963 p22)

(In the early 1970s the researcher had 40 'middle infants' in her class.)

Goldman also said that, while infant teachers were making attempts to understand modern methods, the 11+ was a drawback and a hindrance to their expression (p67). She stressed the difficulty of individual teaching in a large class. She argued that
> "No one can teach more than 25-30 children
> properly. No child in any class any bigger ...
> can be an individual in it and nothing in the
> way of modern methods of teaching or child
> psychology can get round it." (p72)

It was interesting, given this comment, that during observations in this research, teachers in the infant schools seen were frequently heard to make similar comments about the problem of teaching individually. However, they were referring to difficulties when the class size was in the region of 25-30. The Deputy of Larkway thought individual teaching was 'an impossible task in these circumstances'. One of the reception teachers at Moorland remarked that a 'large, difficult' class of infants was a drain on 'personal inner resources'. She argued that so much more was possible when numbers were below 20. These comments perhaps indicate that infant education can be difficult whatever the numbers.

Whatever the argument about numbers, and the effect of the 11+ it has been shown so far that there were some indications that 'modern methods' were finding their way into some schools, although there were different views as to the

extent of this change. Blackie argued that change towards
'child-centred' progressive ideas was not "universal" and
that changes in primary education varied from one area to
another. He argued that

> "In some areas it is ... the commonest pattern
> in a few it is non-existent."

(Blackie, 1967 p677)

Silberman cited the West Riding of Yorkshire as being one
such innovative area. He argued that Clegg, who was the
Chief Education Officer there from 1945 to 1972 was himself a
leading advocate of change in primary education after the
Second World War (Silberman, 1975).

Clegg himself stated that as a young administrator,
used himself to the elementary pattern, he was forced to
reconsider this pattern in the light of some of the schools
visited, where a completely different pattern was observed.
In these, teacher control of children's activities was not
immediately visible, and where children were engrossed in
these activities. He became a supporter of this approach,
and encouraged others Clegg, 1980, Chap. 1).

The head teacher at Fairfield said that she, as a
young teacher in the West Riding, had been very much
influenced by Clegg's vision.

Silberman claimed that there was an increasing
spread of 'progressive ideas' after World War Two but that
this went unnoticed until after the Plowden Report of 1967
(Silberman, 1975).

As noted, the training colleges, or some of them,
had some influence. The head of Larkway, who initially
trained in the early forties, told the researcher that she

herself had been initially junior trained.   She said that

there   were   then   differences   between   infant   and   junior

training.   In   the   former,   there   was,   she   said,   a   strong

emphasis on

> "child development .. physical, social and
> emotional development as well as intellectual
> ...   In fact they were child-centred, geared to
> providing learning situations appropriate to
> age, aptitude and ability. Emphasis was on
> 'doing' and it was the teacher's job to provide
> the situation and climate and then intervene
> and further the child's learning in this
> context."
>   (Head, Larkway)

She   compared   this   with   the   junior   training.   She

said that in the latter the tendency was

> "for the tendency of the course to be on the
>
> curriculum."

She added that a consequence of the 'junior' emphasis on

curriculum was the idea that

> "the child was to be tailored to the
> subject and the assumption was made that
> chronological age coincided with an
> appropriate development stage."
>
>   (Head, Larkway)

The result of such training was practice in which the

emphasis was on

> "class teaching which in turn led to a more
> formal set up ... a pouring in and con-
> sequent regurgitation of knowledge rather
> than a broader and deeper learning
> appropriate to the individual."
>   (Head, Larkway)

These comments indicate that there was by this time

something of an 'infant tradition' of 'progressive' pegagogy

in the colleges, though this did not necessarily mean that it

was widespread in schools and Plowden merely brought this

out, as Silberman had suggested, as noted.   There is no doubt

that the Plowden Report had an influence on many people,

teachers, administrators and politicians, for example.
However, the extent to which its ideas reflected or
influenced classroom practice in general is a matter of
debate.

The purpose of Plowden was to look at all aspects of
primary education (Plowden Report, 1967).

It emphasized that each child was an individual
developing at his own rate, and that each child was the agent
of his own learning (p.194). The report also mentioned the
notion of 'readiness', for it stated that

"Until a child is ready to take a particular
step forward, it is a waste of time trying
to teach him to take it." (p.25)

It also argued that "finding out" was better than "being
told" (p.460). Its general argument was that children were
at the centre of "the education process". (p.7).
Accordingly, the teacher's role should be that of consultant
and guide, not "purely didactic" (p.198). It also advocated
grouping based on interest, attainment or needs, but not on a
permanent basis (Plowden, 1967).

The various aspects mentioned by Plowden, such as
'readiness', became the features of 'the child-centred
ideology' noted in Chapter Three.

As noted there were arguments about the extent of
the spread of 'progressive' or 'modern' ideas.

According to Marriott, Plowden "strongly hinted"
that an increasing number of schools were putting such ideas
into practice. Such schools represented a "general and
quickening trend" (cited by Marriott, 1985, p.26).

However, the Plowden Report argued that relatively
few schools were practising in this way at the time, and also

1112

that it would be hard to find teachers who did relate their classroom practice to any particular theories. Further the Report noted the tendency of schools towards conservatism.

Simon argued later that while Plowden may have provided official endorsement of the progressive approach no-one was really able to say what actually occurred in schools because of the lack of classroom research at that time (Simon, 1979). This position has since been remedied as noted in the Review of the Literature.

Sharp and Green claimed that 'progressive methods' were endorsed in training colleges (Sharp & Green, 1975). However, as noted previously when discussing the spread of ideas before Plowden, even if an infant tradition was emerging in the colleges, and it was 'child-centred', this was no guarantee that it was established necessarily in the actual practices of all teachers in all infant schools.

The head of Larkway stated that she herself had been influenced by Plowden in the 1960s. After taking up her post at Larkway in the late sixties she had gone on a special induction course set up after Plowden, and had encouraged her staff to do so as well.

King noted in his study that for one head 'Plowden' was a 'Bible' (King, 1978).

As noted in the Heads' chapter, both Mrs North of Larkway and the head at Fairfield, also a supporter of 'new approaches', had met with opposition from some older members of their staffs against the introduction of these, and to forms of organization such as family grouping.

This seems to indicate that while there might have

been a 'spirit of change' in the late 1960s, following Plowden, the change was not necessarily automatic, nor the ideology 'axiomatic' even in infant schools, even if methods changed. (Moreover, even if these changed, the content of the curriculum did not appear to have altered greatly, as noted in Chapters Six and Seven.)

Sedgewick questioned the extent to which change did occur in fact during the period after Plowden. He wrote of those finishing training in the 60s who then went into schools that were mostly very much as they had been earlier (Sedgewick, 1980).

Even though some infant schools were regarded by him as having been influenced by Plowden, in his view these were few in number, and it did them a disservice if they were called 'progressive'. He considered that on the whole it was those responsible for administration in colleges and schools who were 'progressives', together with a 'few journalists' (Sedgewick, 1980).

Certainly after Plowden there was a spate of 'educational' literature which extolled the virtues of 'child-centred' education, or alternatively condemned it. Both supporters and opponents assumed its existence, as noted in the Review chapter. For example Bassey, Featherstone, and also Gardner and Cass, among others, presented an image of primary education as having undergone changes (Bassey, 1978, Featherstone, 1972, Gardner & Cass, 1965). Pollard also, in 1975, pointed to a developing 'progressive' image of primary schools in the sixties following Plowden (Pollard, 1975).

The 'Black Papers' were ferocious critics of

'progressive education', which they, like proponents, assumed to be general.

As noted in the Review, in the late seventies a more critical approach to this assumption began to develop. Simon's comment, noted earlier, that evidence about the state of affairs in classrooms was unknown, began to be less true. As stated in the Review, a range of studies investigated actual practice, such as those by Bennett (1976), Galton et al. (1980) and the D.E.S.C. (1978a; 1982) among others.

What such research showed was that some teachers did not fit into any particular pattern, nor did they "conform" to a "particular type". Instead, they were seen as "blending different points of view" (Ashton, et al., 1975, p83).

Richards also argued, as noted in Chapter Three, that what emerged in primary practice far from being the result of a simple ideology, was the consequence of
> "an interplay and conflict amongst ... diverse
> sets of beliefs and the practices they inform."
(Richards,

The H.M.S.O. Report of 1978 also found that teachers in fact varied their approach according to different circumstances and that because of this it could be 'misleading to classify their methods.

A much later author summarised the classroom research as showing that
> " It is clear that there is no such thing as a
> typical primary school and that descriptive
> dichotomies such as traditional-progressive
> formal-informal, didactic-discovery are too
> simplistic."
(Gipps, 1988)

However, by this time critics of the alleged 'progressive revolution' had gained a considerable degree of

support despite the lack of evidence at the time. The 'Black Papers' blamed their assumed generality for alleged failure in terms of achievement and falling standards, as well as a lack of moral discipline (Black Papers, 1969, 1970). In one of these Papers, Dyson argued that the school's function was to teach numeracy and literacy, civilised manners and morals. However, the evidence that teachers were no longer concerned with literacy or numeracy was thin, to say the least, as noted in the Review and above. At the time when this current researcher was visiting schools these concerns were evidently major objectives whatever the type of school. 'Socialisation' (in the Durkheiman sense) was also not an unregarded concern, though it was particularly prevalent at Moorland.

In 1972 the main contributors to the Black Papers formed the 'National Council for Educational Standards' a pressure group which demanded greater 'control' over schools and greater accountability, and a concern for increased efficiency. It was argued that the 'progressive ethos' if it was allowed to remain paramount would produce future generations who would not be able to keep up standards in the face of strong competition from abroad (Cox & Dyson, 1975). It would have been nice if evidence could have been produced by them that such 'progressive' ideas were 'paramount'. Moreover, the idea of falling standards implies that there was something to be 'falling from' which means that a 'standard' was established by accurate measurement over time in the first place, by comparing like with like. No hard evidence was presented as to such rigorous measurement.

However, the idea of 'Falling Standards', or rather concern about their alleged existence, then entered public opinion through publicity of such views. The Tyndale case in 1975, for example, brought 'progressive methods' (or what they were thought, without any real evidence, to be) and their critics into public prominence, and effectively created a climate in which bringing schools under visible control appeared to be a useful means of gaining electoral support. In 1974 the Conservatives won the election and in 1975 the D.E.S. set up the 'Assessment of Performance Unit' with the intention of monitoring the whole curriculum (Kay, 1975). The view was that if the performance of teachers could be improved then education would become 'efficient' (Watson, 1978).

Since few people then knew much about teachers' performance it was hard to se how it might be 'improved'. As with 'falling standards' there were a number of assumptions about what had been happening in schools.

As a consequence of the idea of assessment becoming popular, local authorities began to devise means of carrying it out (Gamage, 1986, p697). For example, one local authority, the London Borough of Hillingdon, carried out an inspection of all Hillingdon schools as part of a scheme to bring together, support and monitor the work of schools, and guidelines were produced in Maths and others projected for English which suggested certain objectives for various age groups and ways of achieving these.

These ideas spread, and the D.E.S. began to propose the regular assessment of pupils' attainment from the age of seven, together with the introduction in schools of a

national curriculum in 'core subjects'.

Gipps, while noting that testing was "not unusual" in primary schools, since reports in 1981 and 1983 had shown that most LEAs had

> "standardised tests of reading, maths etc.,
> given routinely to all or part of an age
> group"

or tests aimed at

> "identifying children with special needs (p68)

argued that the national curriculum being introduced would have an adverse effect on primary schools. She argued that

> "Primary schools under the new arrangements will
> be a good deal more like secondary schools in
> being under the influence of exam board
> constraints."
>   (Gripps, 1988, p75)

Although they might lead to greater precision with regard to objectives, and give parents more information, she argued that testing and examining was likely to be stressful for children and make teaching more 'formal'. She also considered that where assessment was "differentiated", with the level being based on a child's ability, this would necessarily have to be described "in advance of assessment". This, she considered, would lead to "ability grouping" in the classroom. Gipps noted that Barker-Lunn (1984) suggested that this was happening already. Gipps thought that the process would intensify (Gipps, 1988, p76).

In this context, the title of Goldman's book, in which the effects of the 11+ were mentioned, as pointed out earlier, was "Selected at Six".

Testing at seven seems likely to have similar effects on teaching in infant schools below that age. However, this is a 'new' development in education, and so

beyond the scope of this section. Suffice it to say that the idea of assessment of pupils and the monitoring of teachers' performance seems to bear more than a passing resemblance to the ideas behind 'Payment by Results'. As shown in this section, this practice of the Nineteenth Century lingered on into the Twentieth.

Overall, the section has been concerned to show the ideas which have had some influence on infant education in the Twentieth Century in terms of educational ideals, and the extent to which these have passed into practice. It has shown that there have been conflicting views about both the purpose of education and the extent to which any new ideas were put into practice. It has been indicated that 'new' developments in recent years have their counterpart in some older ideas.

CONCLUSION

The chapter has examined various sources of ideas which have affected in some degree the development of infant education in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. It has shown that educationalists began to suggest new models of child development during the Nineteenth Century. These had the view of the child as an active learner, going through stages of development, and learning through exploration and 'doing'. The idea of the need for 'structure', direction and order was also present, however. These ideas were developed further in the Twentieth Century by supporters of some of the 'Great Educators' such as Dewey, Montessori and Froebel.

Thus, built into ideas of 'progressive' education were the dual notions of freedom and restraint, the balance

of the development of children as seen by these educationalists with the teachers concerns with order. The same duality was evident in those schools seen in this research, like Larkway, which had some of the features associated with a 'progressive ideology'. Schools like Moorland, on the other hand, seemed more concerned with order and with social welfare. It was the existence of these differences that was the deciding factor in the decision to consider the history of ideas about infant education.

It has been shown that, while in the Twentieth Century 'progressive' ideas in the early period found some support in some schools and areas and among the inspectorate and administration, the evidence suggests that there were conflicting attitudes to these ideas, as well as doubt as to how extensive they were.

The Plowden Report was noted as an important landmark in the attempt to promote 'progressive ideas'. It was shown that there is some evidence to suggest that these ideas spread in the training colleges, and the researcher's own training in the early seventies would support this view.

In spite of widespread assumptions about the degree to which the 'progressive, child-centred' ideas had reached classrooms, it has been shown that later classroom research, not present earlier, pointed to the continued presence of different ideas, and to conflicting beliefs among teachers, not just along 'traditional'/'progressive' lines.

The empirical evidence of this research supports this view of the extent of 'progressive' ideas, since a range of beliefs, practices and forms of organisation were found.

The latest developments in education have been seen as showing the continuing presence of conflicting ideas. It may well be that infant education will reflect these as it did in the Nineteenth Century. 'Testing' may inhibit any further spread of 'modern methods' as the 11+ was considered to do.

In many ways, the continuance of Nineteenth Century ideas seems as evident in 'educational' matters as in those of the 'social' aspects discussed in the previous chapters. With this comment, the necessarily brief survey of ideas which have had some effect on infant education is concluded.

The two history chapters arose out of ideas suggested by the empirical research, as noted. They have shown the continuity in views of infant education 'then and now', as well as the existence of conflicting beliefs.

With them, the thesis itself is concluded. It remains to summarise the conclusions derived from the research as a process.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Because each chapter of this thesis has its own individual conclusions, this final part is restricted to presenting the general findings fairly briefly. Before doing so, it seems important to point out that, in producing this thesis, research has been viewed as a process, one in which the researcher is actively engaged throughout and is continually reflecting upon. Because the researcher is subjectively interpreting the research experience, in all its aspects, as the process is gone through, it is regarded that making these interpretations 'visible to others' as well as the researcher, is as important a part of 'interpretive' research as the presentation of the empirical findings. It is necessary to show that the researcher has studied him/herself as much as the others in the research setting. Therefore, the thesis has been concerned to indicate the 'learning process' that has been going on.

Thus, this thesis has had both theoretical, methodological and empirical concerns as the research proceeded. However, it is pointed out that this does not mean that there was a linear progression involved.

Theoretically, the thesis has attempted to show the development of ideas about the existence or not of two separate 'traditions' in sociology. In presenting the meanings the researcher found in the study of these, it was pointed out that at various points which ideas were found useful in some way for the researcher's purposes during the research.

There was an initial interest in 'phenomenology' as used by Sharp and Green, which led to an examination of this and also 'symbolic inter-action', because these authors had seemed to have confused these two terms without defining them. Then there was the suggestion that 'methods' should be compared. These two ideas were shown as leading the researcher into a study of both 'positivism' and 'the interpretative tradition', and the thesis has shown how the 'taken for granted' ideas of the researcher were

challenged during this part of the 'learning process'.

'Positivism' was found to be ambiguous, meaning different things at different times. Nor was 'the scientific method' it was alleged to use something which had a clear and universal meaning. In fact, there <u>was</u> no <u>one</u> method, as critics of positivism had suggested, nor one method of reasoning. Both deduction and induction were used. Nor was there a reliance purely on quantitative methods, since 'survey research' also used 'participant observation'. Moreover, there were those among scientists and philosophers, as well as designers of surveys, who pointed out the role that human perception and interpretation played in scientific theories, and who argued that a concern for 'understanding' was not limited to the 'humanities'.

The 'interpretive' tradition was also shown as being comprised of several strands, with differences in their views of 'society' as well as research. Anthropology, for example, was shown as associated with 'structural-functionalism', itself linked by critics to 'positivism'. Yet 'participant observation' was borrowed from it.

While those in the 'other' tradition were shown as aware of the need for 'understanding', it was shown that there were those within the 'interpretive' approach, from Weber to Schutz, who were as concerned with being 'scientific' and 'objective' as any supposed 'positivist'. Also, as with 'the scientific method', both deductive and inductive reasoning was found to be used. The idea that 'interpretive' research was not concerned with generalisation was also discounted. Also, it was found that as with 'survey research', a range of methods had been used, particularly in 'symbolic interaction'.

Neither this, nor phenomenology, was found to be as depicted by Sharp and Green in other respects. The idea that because they were concerned with the 'subjective meanings' of actors they were unable to deal

with issues of power and constraint, was found to be invalid. So was their claim that phenomenology was ahistorical. It was found that Schutz, among others, argued for a wider context for such 'meanings', and the idea of an historical dimension to this was not discounted. Symbolic interaction, in the person of Thomas, pointed out that 'folk ideas' had a history which needed to be studied because it could affect the present.

The general conclusion reached from a study of the 'two traditions' was that any presentation of them as a rigid dichotomy was a gross over-simplification. This conclusion was reached as a result of reading and reflection. It was not 'knowledge' held before the research began. However, it is now known that this conclusion has been reached by other writers in both 'traditions', so the research in this respect is not showing anything new, but is supportive.

Methodologically, apart from comparing the methods associated with both traditions, the thesis has been concerned to show exactly what methods were used in this research, in the light of initial reading, and how they were used in practice. It has also been concerned to show the problems encountered with the use of these methods in this research and in the accounts presented by other researchers as found during later reading.

One conclusion is that 'participant observation', a shorthand for a combination of methods, takes many forms, but all these are very dependent for their effective use on the experiences of the researcher. Each type of role 'taken' or 'made' makes its own demands on the resources of the researcher and has its own problems. The need for training has been raised by this researcher and others such as Hammersley,and Atkinson and Frake.

Another conclusion, reached both in the light of experience and reading about this method and others, is that eclectism is more likely to

1124

provide a researcher with the tools to pursue research than a rigid insistence on one procedure or another. It has been shown that researchers have tended in practice to take this pragmatic line.

However, the more general conclusion is that the methods involved in participant observation may be no more able than 'survey research' to 'get at' the meanings of actors. In fact, both share similar problems in this respect, in that respondents to questions may either withhold or distort information, because of their perceptions of the questioner, or be genuinely unable to say what something 'means' to them because they do not reflect. Richards, as was pointed out in 'Ideology', found this with some teachers, as did this researcher. Also, when discussing Schutz, it was pointed out that, although meeting his 'postulate of adequacy' an account by a researcher might be 'understood' by those researched, it did not follow that this 'understanding' meant agreement. However, when discussing validity and the procedures used to try and establish this in this research, it was pointed out that the longer term methods of 'interpretive' research are more likely to bring out discrepancies in actors' statements, and are therefore more likely to get closer to discovering 'meanings'.

As well as showing the 'learning process' in the development of ideas about theories and methods, the thesis has also been concerned to present the empirical findings from a largely 'ethnographic' study of some infant schools, as these have been interpreted by the researcher. Some reservations about the use of the term 'ethnographic' have been pointed out when discussing anthropology, one of the strands of the 'interpretive' tradition.

As stated when giving the justifications for beginning this research, there were two principal initial interests. These were, first, the degree to which 'a progressive ideology' was present in infant schools, something Sharp and Green had seemed to take for granted and which King stated was

"axiomatic". Secondly, there was the view that what people - teachers and children - actually did in the classroom had not been brought out, particularly by Sharp and Green.

During the research process, other interests developed or were expanded from a vague concern. These were the role of head teachers, differences between nursery and infant classrooms, and the effect of teachers being in a 'working class' school, on their perceptions of pupils, as well as on the curricular provision. A concern for the history of infant education in general, and the history of 'progressive ideas', was sharpened by the research experience, particularly in the main research school.

In relation to the 'progressive ideology', this research concluded that this was by no means 'axiomatic' in the schools seen. As discussed in Chapter Three, there were several features associated with this 'ideology'. No school in this research was found to contain all these features. Though some schools had some of them, others had only a few and some had none. The idea of a single 'ideology' dominating teaching in infant schools was not supported in this research. Teachers in the schools were found to have a range of ideas. What seemed more important as an influence on practice was previous 'experience', a term covering many aspects of the 'situation'.

From reading of other later studies after the field-work was completed, this research is now seen as complementary to those which have similarly found that 'the progessive ideology' was not, in fact, 'axiomatic'. Moreover, the concern with the development of ideas about infant education, discussed in Chapter Ten, brought out the point that conflicting ideologies, rather than any consensus, have been a consistent feature of infant education.

In the discussion of 'classroom life', an attempt was made to show what

was in use in the classroom, and what teachers and children did, and to place the activities in context. One criticism of Sharp and Green, as well as the 1980 study of Galton et al, was that they failed to do this.

One of the main findings of this research in this area was that in all types of schools visited, teachers were found to 'structure' the activities that pupils were shown as engaged in. They controlled the 'what', 'when' and 'how' of activities, although there were some differences between and within schools over the 'when', with some schools allowing pupils some discretion here. Thus, in practice, teachers were found to make most classroom decisions.

Also, language as used by teachers in the classroom was found to 'close off' rather than 'open' opportunities for children to explore meaning. This again complements studies such as that by Galton et al.

In all the schools it was found that a high priority was given to the three 'Rs'. The external pressures for this, including the concern of parents, were pointed out.

The pupils were presented as being aware of 'classroom rules', though not necessarily complying with them. It was shown that teachers did not necessarily impute 'innocence' to children, as ideas of a 'child centred ideology' suggested, although they might.

Boys were found to present teachers with more behavioural problems than girls, on the whole. Gender stereotypes were found to exist amongst pupils, particularly in relation to certain activities. An individual teacher made some efforts to challenge these, as indicated, but aid meet with resistance. In other cases, such stereotyping was partly reinforced by activity divisions by teachers, and reading schemes did not always challenge it either.

In relation to the concept of a 'shared ethos' in schools, discussed in Chapter Three, it was found that the role of the head, and her actual position, was an important factor in the presence or absence of any such 'ethos'. In particular, the length of time that a head had been in post was seen as influential, given the power of heads in relation to the appointment of staff.

Head teachers were shown as well aware of their 'legal authority', although there might be limits, in practice to the exercise of 'power'. They were shown as actually or potentially able to control the methods of teaching within schools, and the approach to the curriculum.

Heads were shown as well able to articulate their 'philosophies'. This was seen as an attribute of their legal position in relation to external bodies.

In relation to head teachers, the general conclusion was that they were, as King suggested, the most 'powerful reality definers' in the schools seen. However, it was considered that this research brought out this position more clearly than his study. The idea for devoting a chapter to head teachers came from a remark by a teacher that King had not really shown the power of the head over teachers.

Although not an initial concern, the researcher devoted some time to a study of pre-school settings. This arose from observations, and also from comments by reception teachers. These settings were both found interesting in their own right and as a useful comparison with infant schools proper. Nursery classes were found to be far less structured and more informal than infant classes, and the approach and language used was also shown to be different.

A general conclusion was that nursery classes seemed to contain more of the features associated with a 'child-centred' approach than infant schools,

in general. 'Play' was seen as an important means of learning, but nursery teachers placed a differing emphasis on this in the two settings seen.

The effect of social class differences between teachers and pupils was something which became an interest as a consequence of researching in a particular school. It was found that perceptions of the children's 'home background' affected both the teaching approach and the content of the materials and activities provided. It was found that there was something of a 'culture clash' as between teachers and pupils and also the latter's parents. It was found that 'fixed stereotypes' about 'background' had come into being over time. Children in this school were seen as 'deficient' and 'deprived'. In this, the research was seen as linked to other studies which had dealt with 'inner city' areas, such as that by Blackstone and also Quinton.

While the idea that children needed 'schooling', in the sense of learning to 'fit in' at school as distinct from home, was found in other schools, the idea of the school as concerned with 'social welfare' was not. In looking at the history of education again, after the field-work, with particular reference to the idea of 'infant education', it was found that a concern for social welfare as well as social discipline had been a continuing feature of this education. In the main research school, the 'missionary' approach to working class pupils, prevalent in the development of infant education, was found to be alive and well.

These, then, have been the general conclusions arising from the research. On the whole, the research is now seen as complementing the work of some of the later research reported in the Review of the Literature. However, in relation to the role of the Head and the presentation of teachers' perspectives and the practice of classroom life, this research is seen as extending knowledge. Although there are more studies of

infant classrooms than there were, these are still much less in evidence than those of secondary or 'primary' schools.

As a final comment on the research, it is pointed out that it is at best only a 'snapshot in time'. The researcher is always looking at a school in the historical 'now'. The future is not accessible, unless, like Burgess, return visits are made at a later date. Generally this is not feasible.

As stated, this research has been presented as a process in all its aspects. The attempt has been to show the researcher 'making sense' of the journey through the theoretical, methodological and empirical concerns. It has been a journey started across unknown territory with few maps, and some of those available have seemed to relate to some other territory.

APPENDIX 1

AIMS AND PRACTICE OF TEACHERS IN INFANTS' SCHOOLS

A questionnaire for teachers

SECTION ONE: THE SCHOOL AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

Please answer the following questions by placing a tick in
the space where appropriate. Some questions are open-ended
to enable you to give your own views. .

1) In which of the following kinds of Inner Urban ......
       area   is   your   school   situated?
....   Suburban
                                              Rural ....
                                              Other ....

2) What is the socio-economic   Middle class .....
    background of the children?   Almost wholly
                                           Middle class .....
                                           Working class ....
                                           Almost wholly
                                           Working class ....

3) Has your school any special
    characteristics, e.g. large numbers
    of immigrants, designation as an
    E.P.A school? Please give details.

       ....
       ....

4) Could you give a brief description of the nature of the
    catchment area.

       ....
       ....

5) Has the nature of the catchment area changed during the
    last ten years?

       ....
       ....

6) Is the nature of the catchment area similar to or
    different from those of other schools that you have
    taught in?

       ....
       ....

7) Which of the following attitudes   Highly interested....
    to school is closest to that of   Interested ....
    parents in your school?   Uninterested ....

1131

8) What do you think parents see as
   the function of the school?

   ....
   ....

9) Do you think parents understand what the school is
   trying to do?

   ....
   ....

10) How do you see the relationship between parents and the
    school?

    ....
    ....

SECTION TWO: TRAINING AND TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Please complete the following questions by placing a tick
where appropriate. Some questions are open-ended to enable
you to give your own views.

11) Nature of present position   Head teacher ....
                                       Deputy head ....
                                       Class teacher ....
                                       Nursery teacher .....
                                       N.N.E.B. ....

12) How long have you been teaching?   0-5 years ....
                                        6-10 years ....
                                        11-15 years ....
                                        Over 15 years ....

13) How long have you been teaching   0-5 years ....
    in your present school?   6.10 years ....
                                        11-15 years ....
                                        Over 15 years ....

14) What age group do you teach   Under 5a ....
    at present?   5+ - 6+ ....
                                        6+ - 7+ ....
                                        mixed age
                                        groups   ....

15) If mixed age groups please indicate
    the age range.   -

    ....

16) Have you taught any other age groups?

    ....
    ....

1132

17) What age range were you trained for?

. . . .

18) How adequate was your training in the light of your subsequent teaching experience?

. . . .
. . . .

19) Have you attended any other courses during the last five years? If so please indicate below.

. . . .
. . . .

20) Were any of the courses useful, or not, and in what way?

. . . .
. . . .

SECTION THREE: THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

Below are a list of statements. Please read them carefully and then indicate using the following scale. the extent to which you agree with them by circling the appropriate number.

    e.g.   Entirely agree   5

           Agree   .   4

           Neither agree nor
           disagree   3

           Disagree   2

           Entirely disagree   1

           5   4   3   2   1   =   Agree

21) There are certain basic language and number skills that should be taught in the infants' school.

                        5   4   3   2   1

  22) There are other areas that should form part of the curriculum.

                        5   4   3   2   1

  23) The teacher's task is to present work in each area of knowledge so that each child can learn as much as he is capable of.   \

                        5   4   3   2   1

  24) Children learn best when involved in individual work.

                        5   4   3   2   1

1133

25) 'Children should be given as muchfreedom as possible in what they learn, when, and how.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

26) The teacher's task is to provide opportunities to learn and practice basic number and language skills, so that the child has the tools to use in self chosen activities.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

27) Basic skills should be taught in logical progression to groups of children of equal ability.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

28) It is the teacher's task to set the pace of learning.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

29) Children learn best when they want to learn.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

30) Children's needs and interests should constitute the curriculum.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

31) The teacher's task is to guide rather than direct.

<div align="center">5   4   3   2   1</div>

32) You may feel that you agree with some of the above statements but not others. If so please indicate below, giving your reasons.

    ....
    ....

33) Using the previous descriptions as a guide how would you describe your own approach which you use in the classroom.

    ....
    ....

34) Has your approach altered during your teaching career? If so, in what way and why?

    ....
    ....

SECTION FOUR: AIMS OF INFANT EDUCATION

Below is a list of statements. Please read them carefully and then indicate, using the following scale the extent to

which you agree with them by placing a circle round the appropriate number.

e.g.   Entirely agree   5

       Agree   4

       Neither agree
       nor disagree   3

       Disagree   2

       Entirely disagree   1

       5   4   3   2   1

35) The purpose of infant education is to encourage independence, to help children learn for themselves.

                    5   4   3   2   1

36) The purpose of infant education should be to provide the basic skills the child will need as an adult.

                    5   4   3   2   1

37) The purpose of infant education should be to encourage the physical and emotional development of the child.

                    5   4   3   2   1

38) The purpose of infant education is to teach children certain standards of behaviour.

                    5   4   3   2   1

39) The purpose of infant education should be to provide children with an understanding of the world around them.

                    5   4   3   2   1

40) The purpose of infant education should be to teach the 3Rs, reading, writing and arithmetic.

                    5   4   3   2   1

41) The purpose of infant education should be to develop interests related to children's lives.

                    5   4   3   2   1

42) The purpose of the infant school should be to provide children with opportunities to talk and listen.

                    5   4   3   2   1

43) The purpose of infant education should be to help children adapt to a changing environment.

                    5   4   3   2   1

44) The purpose of the infant school should be to

encourage co-operation between the home and the school.

5 4 3 2 1

45) How would you describe your own aims in relation to your school and your classroom.

....
....

46) How is your classroom or school organised to achieve these aims?

....
....

47) Do you consider that there are any influences or constraints on what you do in the school or classroom? If so, please indicate.

....
....

48) What do you consider to have been the main influences on your teaching?

....
....

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION

If there are any comments that you would like to make, please do so below.

....
....

****

1136

APPENDIX 2

AIMS AND PRACTICE OF TEACHERS IN INFANTS' SCHOOLS

A Questionnaire for Teachers

A. Below is a list of statements. Read them carefully and
    then indicate using the following scale the extent to which
    you agree with them by circling the appropriate number

                Entirely agree   5

                Agree   4

                Neither agree
                nor disagree   3

                Disagree   2

                Entirely disagree   1

                5   4   3   2   1   =   Agree

1. One purpose of the infants' school is to teach the 3Rs.

        5   4   3   2   1

2. One purpose of the infants' school is to teach certain
    standards of behaviour.

        5   4   3   2   1

3. One purpose of the infants' school is to provide
    children with an understanding of the world around them.

        5   4   3   2   1

4. One purpose of the infants' school is to teach social
    skills.

        5   4   3   2   1

5. One purpose of the infants' school is to encourage
    independence.

        5   4   3   2   1

6. One purpose of the infants' school is to provide a
    curriculum based on children's needs.

        5   4   3   2   1

7. One purpose of the infants/ school is to provide a
    curriculum based on children's interests.

        5   4   3   2   1

8. One purpose of the infants' school is to guide rather
    than direct.
                5   4   3   2   1

9. One purpose of the infants' school is to give children free choice in what they learn.

         5   4   3   2   1

10) One purpose of the infants' school is to prepare children for Junior School.

         5   4   3   2   1

B. Below are some open-ended questions. You are invited to put forward your own views

11. How would you describe your own aims in the classroom?

12. Describe your own approach in the classroom (or if a head teacher, in your school).

13. Do you consider that there is a common approach in your school?

14. Do you consider that there are any influences or constraints on what you can do in the classroom or the school?

15. What have been the main influences on the way you teach?

16. Below is space for any comments you would like to make about this questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your co-operation.

Margaret Wendy Bowen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMSON, J.W. (1964) (Ed.) English Education 1789-1902, Cambridge Press.

ADELMAN, Clem (1977) 'Sociological Constructions: teacher's Categories' in Woods, P. and Hammersley, M. School Experience, Croom Helm, 1977.

ADELMAN, C. & WALKER, R. (1976) 'Strawberries, strawberries' in Stubbs, M. & Delamont, S. Explorations in Classroom Research, Wiley & Sons, 1976.

AGAR, M. (1980) The Professional Stranger: An Introduction to Ethnography, Academic Press.

AGGLETON, P. (1987) Rebels Without a Cause, Falmer Press, 1987.

AITKIN, M., BENNETT, S.N., & HESKETH, I. (1981) 'Teaching styles and Pupil Progress: A Re-analysis', British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51, pp. 170-86.

ALLAND, A. Jnr. & McCAY, Bonnie (1973) 'The Concept of Adaptation in Biological and Cultural Evolution' in Honigmann, J.J. (Ed.), Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. Rand McNally, 1973.

ALEXANDER, J. (1984) Primary Teaching, Holt Educational.

ANDERSON R.J., HUGHES, J.A. & SHARROCK, W.W. (1987) (Eds.) Classic Disputes in Sociology, Allen & Unwin.

ANDERSON, R.J., HUGHES, J.A. & SHARROCK, W.W. (1987) (Eds.) Classic Disputes in Sociology, Allen & Unwin.

ANGLO-AMERICAN PRIMARY EDUCATION PROJECT (1971-71) British Primary Schools Today, Schools Council, Macmillan.

APPLE, M.W. (1976) Review Article 'Rationality as Ideology' in Educational Theory, Vol. 26 (1), Winter.

APPLE, M.W. (1979) Ideology and Curriculum, R.K.P

APPLE, M.W. (with KING, Nancy) (1979) 'Economics and Control in Everyday School Life' in Apple, M.W. (1979) Ideology and Curriculum, R.K.P.

ARGRYS, C. (1951) 'Diagnosing Defenses Against the Outsider' in McCall & Simmons (Eds.) (1969).

ARMSTRONG, M. (1976) 'Bennett: the challenge answered', T.E.S., 25.6.76

ARMSTRONG, M. (1980) 'Clockwork Analysis', T.E.S., 18.4.80.

ARMSTRONG, M. (1981) 'Closely Observed Children', London, Writers-Readers.

ASHTON, P. et al. (1975) The Aims of Primary Education: A Study of Teachers' Opinions, Macmillan Educational.

ASHTON, P. (1981) 'Primary Teachers' Aims 1969-77' in Simon, B. & Willcocks, J. (Eds.) Research and Practice in the Primary Classroom, London, R.K.P.

ATKINSON, P. (1979) 'Research Design in Ethnography' in Open University Social Sciences: A Third Level Course. 'Research Methods in Education and The Social Sciences'. O.U.P.

ATKINSON, P. & DELAMONT, S. (1986) 'Bread and Dreams or Bread and Circuses? A Critique of 'Case Study' Research in Education' in Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (1986) Controversies in Classroom Research, Open University Press.

BADCOCK, C.R. (1975) Levi-Strauss: Structuralism and Sociological Theory, Hutchinson of London.

BALL, S.J. (1981) Beachside Comprehensive: A Case Study of Secondary Schooling, C.U.P.

- ditto - (1982) 'Competition and Conflict in the Teaching of English', Journal of Curriculum Studies, 14.

- ditto - (1983) 'Case Study Research in Education: Some Notes and Problems' in Hammersley, M. (Ed.) The Ethnography of Schooling, Nafferton Books.

BALL, S.J. & GOODSON, I.F. (1985), Teachers' Lives and Careers, The Falmer Press, 1985.

BANKS, O. (1968) The Sociology of Education, London, Batsford.

BANKS, O. (1974) 'The 'New' Sociology of Education', Forum, Autumn, 1974.

BANKS, O. (1976) The Sociology of Education, London, Batsford.

BANKS, O. (1982) 'The Sociology of Education 1952-82' in British Journal of Education Studies, Vol. XXX, (1), February.

BARATZ, S. & BARATZ, J. (1970) 'Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Constitutional Racism' in Harvard Educational Review, 40 (1) pp.29-50.
BARKER-LUNN, J. (1970), 'Streaming in The Primary School', N.F.E.R.

BARKER-LUNN,J. (1982), 'Junior Schools and Their Organiza-
        tional Policies', Educational Research, 24, 4.

BARKER-LUNN, J. (1984), 'Junior School Teachers: their
        methods and practices', Educational Research,
        26, (3), pp.178-88.

BARNES, Jack (1974), 'A Solution to Whose Problem?' in
        Glennerster, H. & Hatch, S. (Eds.) (1974)
        'Positive Discrimination and Inequality Units
        Units 25-6, Deprivation, Disadvantage &
        Compensation. Open University: Educational
        Studies: A Second Level Course, E202 Schooling
        & Society, Fabian Society.

BARON, G. (1968) 'An Overview' in Allen, B. (1972) Headship
        in the 1970s, Blackwell.

BARTHOLOMEW, J. (1972) 'The Teacher as Researcher: A Working
        Party Discussion'.

BARTON, L. & MEIGMAN, R. (Eds.) (1978) Sociological inter-
        pretations of Schooling and Classrooms,
        Nafferton.

BARTON, L. & WALKER, S. (1981) (Ede.) Schools, Teachers and
        Teaching, Falmer Press.

  -- DITTO -- (1984) Social Crisis and Educational Research.

BASSEY, M. (1978) 'Nine Hundred Primary Schools', N.F.E.R.

BASSETT, G. (1970) Innovation in Primary Education,
        London, Wiley

BATHURST, K. (1905) 'The Need for National Nurseries, 'Nine-
        teenth Century, May 1905' in Blackstone, T.
        (1971).

BAUMAN, Z. (1976), Towards a Critical Sociology; An Essay
        in Commonsense and Emancipation, R.K.P.

BAYLISS, S., DOE, E., GARNER, R. & HEMPEL, S. (1982) 'Modern
        Buildings and only 10 Children: What went
        wrong?', Times Educational Supplement, 26.2.1982.

BEALING, D. (1972) 'The Organisation of Junior School Class-
        rooms' in Educational Research, Vol. 14 (3) June.

BEALS, Ralph L., HONER, H. & BEALS, Alan R., (1977) An Intro-
        duction to Anthropology, 5th Edition.

BECHHOFER, F. (1974) 'Current Approaches to Empirical
        Research: Some Central Ideas' in Rex, I. (Ed.),
        1974, Approaches to Sociology, Routledge Kegan
        Paul, 1974.

BECK, R.N. (1979) Handbook in Social Philosophy, Collier Macmillan.

BECKER, H.S. (1952) 'The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School'. Journal of Educational Sociology, 27, November 1951.

BECKER, H.S. (1958) 'Problems of Inference & Proof in Participant Observation', American Sociological Review, 23.

BECKER, H.S. (1963) 'Outsiders', Studies in the Sociology of Deviance, Free Press.

BECKER, H.S. (1969) 'Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation' in McCall, G.J. and Simmons, J.L. (1969) Issues in Participant Observation, Addison-Wesley.

BECKER, H.S. (1970) 'Sociological Work', Method & Substance, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.

BECKER, H.S. (1982) 'Becoming a Marijuana User' in Rose, G. (1982) Deciphering Sociological Research, The MacMillan Press.

BELLWINKEL, M. (1979) 'Objective Appreciation Through Sub-jective Involvement' in Spring, M.N., Shah, A.M. & Ramaswamy, E.A., The Fieldworker and the Field, OUP, 1979 (Bombay, Calcutta, Madras).

BENDIX, R. (1966), Max Weber. An Intellectual Portrait, Methuen.

BENNETT, N. (1976a) Teaching Styles & Pupil Progress, Open Books.

BENNETT, N. (1976b) 'Teaching Styles & Pupil Progress' in T.E.S., 30.4.76.

BENNETT, N. (1987) 'After 'Teaching Styles & Pupil Progress': Issues in Dissemination & Theory Development' in Walford, G. (1987).

BENNETT, N., DESFORGES, C., COCKBURN, A. & WILKINSON, B. (1984) The Quality of Pupil Learning Experiences, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

BENSON, E. (1932) 'A History of Education in Any Town 1780-1902'. Ph.D. Thesis, University of London.

BERLACK, A. & BERLACK, H. (1975) 'Teaching & Learning in English Primary Schools' in Hammersley, M.(Eds.) 'The Process of Schooling: A Sociological Reader, Vol. 1, R.K.P.

BERLACK, A. & BERLACK, M. (1981) Dilemmas of Schooling; Teaching & Social Change, London, Methuen.

BERNBAUM, G. (Ed.) (1979)   Schooling in Decline, London, Macmillan.

BERNSTEIN, B. (1971) 'A Critique of the Concept of Compensatory Education' in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 1, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971.

-- ditto -- (1973a) 'Education Cannot Compensate for Society' in Raynor, J. & Harden, J. (Eds.) (1972), 'Equality & City Schools': Readings in Urban Education, Vol. Two., R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1973b) Class, Codes and Control, Vol. I, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1975) 'The Sociology of Education: A Brief Account' in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

-- ditto -- (1975) 'Open Schools - Open Society? in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1975) 'Class & Pedagogies: visible and invisible' in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, R.K.P.

BERSNTEIN, R.I. (1979)   The Restructuring of Social and Political Teory, Methuen.

BEST, R.E. (1975) 'New Directions in Sociological Theory?, British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 26, 2nd June, 1975.

BEYNON, I. (1985)   Initial Encounters in the Secondary School, Falmer.

BIERSTEDT, R. (1978)   'Sociological Thought in the Eighteenth Century' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (1978)   A History of Sociological Analysis, Heinemann.

BLACK, M. (1973) 'Belief Systems' in Honigmann, J.J. (Ed.) (1973),   Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Rand McNally, 1973.

BLACKIE, J. (1967) 'Inside the Primary School', H.M.S.O.

BLACKIE, J. (1974) Changing the Primary School, London, Macmillan.

BLACKSTONE, T. (1971) A Fair Start, Allen Lane.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'The Challenge of the Inner City' in Marland, M. (1980)

BLADES, D.W. (1980)   'Too Young for Groups', T.E.S., 28.11.1980.

BLEASE, D. (1978) 'Teachers' Perceptions of Slow Learning Children: an Ethnographic Study' in British Ed. Research Journal, Vol. 4 (1) April.

-- ditto -- (1982) 'Observer Effects on Teachers and Pupils in Classroom Research' in Educational Review, 35 (3) 1983.

BLOLAND, M. (1969) Sources of Professional Autonomy: The Physician and the Public School Teacher, Educational Forum XXX111, (3), March.

BLUM, F.H. (1970) 'Getting Individuals to Give Information to the Outsider' in Filstead, W.J. (1980).

BLUMENSTIEL, A. (1972) 'The Sociology of Good Times' in Psathas, G. (Ed.) (1973) Phenomenological sociology; Issues and Application, John Wiley & Sons.

BLUMER, H. (1969) 'Social Implications of the Thought of G.H. Mead' from 'Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method' (New Jersey) in Williams, R. (1976) Symbolic Interactionism: The Fusion of Theory and Research?

-- ditto -- (1969) 'The Methodological Position of Symbolic Interactionism' in Hammersley, M. & Woods, P. (Eds.) (1976), Open University Press.

BLYTH, W. (1965) English Primary Education: A Sociological Description, Vols. I & II, R.K.P.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (1905) Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools' in Maclure, J.S. (1968).

BOAS, F. (1966) Introduction. Handbook of American Indian Languages. Lincoln University of Nebraska Press. Originally published 1911. In Black, M.B. (1973) Belief Systems.

BOGDAN, R. & TAYLOR, S.J. (1975) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods, John Wiley & Sons.

BOISSEVAIN, I. (1970) 'Fieldwork in Malta' in Spindler, G.D. (Ed.) (1970) Being an Anthropologist, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1970.

BOTTOMORE, T. & NISBET, R. (1973) 'Structuralism' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (Eds.) (1973) A History of Sociological Analysis, Heinemann.

BOURDIEU, P. (1966) 'The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities' in Dale et al. (1976), Schooling and capitalism: A

Sociological Reader.

BOURGUIGNON, E. (1973) 'Psychological Anthropology' in
    Honigmann, J.J. (Ed.) (1973) Handbook of Social
    and cultural anthropology, Rand McNally.

BOURNE & MACARTHUR (1970) The Struggle for Education,
    School Master Publishing Company.

BOWLES, S. & GINTIS, H. (1976) Schooling in Capitalist
    America, R.K.P.

BOYCE, E.R. (1945) Infant School Activities, James Nisbet &
    Co. Ltd.

BOYDELL, D. (1978) The Primary Teacher in Action,
    London. Open Books.

  -- ditto -- (1979) 'Classroom Groups in Theory & Practice'
    Education 3-13, 7 (2).

  -- ditto -- (1980) 'The Organisation of Junior Classrooms:
    a Follow up Survey', Educational Research, 23, 1.

BRAUN (1976) 'Teacher Expectations: Sociopsychological
    Dynamics' in Review of Educational Research,
    Vol. 46 (2), Spring.

BRIGGS (Ed.) (1962) Chartist Studies, Macmillan.

BROWN, R.H. & LYMAN, J.M. (1978) Structure, Consciousness
    and history, CUP.

BROWN, C.H. (1979) Understanding Society, John Murray.

BROWN , N. & FRANCE, P. (Eds.) (1986) Untying the Apron
    Strings, Open University Press.

BRUNER, I., BURCHELL, B., PETRIE, P. & TIZZARD, B. (1980)
    'Beyond Play', T.E.S., 3.10.80.

BRYANT, C.G. (1985) Positivism in Social Theory and
    Research, Macmillan.

BULMER, M. (Ed.)(1977) Sociological Research Methods, The
    MacMillan Press Ltd.

BULMER, M. (1984) 'Concepts in the Analysis of Qualitative
    Data' in Bulmer, M. (ed.) (1984) Sociological
    Research Methods: An Introduction. Second
    Edition, Macmillan.
BURGESS, H. (1985) 'Case Study and Curriculum Research:
    Some Issues for Teachers and Researchers' in
    Burgess, R.G. (1985) Qualitive Methodology,
    Falmer Press.

BURGESS, R.G. (1980) 'Some Fieldwork Problems in Teacher
    Based Research, British Educational Research

Journal, Vol. 6 (2).

-- ditto -- (1981) 'Keeping a Research Diary' in Cambridge Journal of Education, Vol. 11, No. 1, Lent Term.

-- ditto -- (Ed.) (1982) Field Research: A Source Book & Field Manual, London, Allen & Unwin.

-- ditto -- (1983) Experiencing Comprehensive Education, Methuen.

-- ditto -- (1984a) In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research, London, Allen & Unwin.

-- ditto -- (Ed.) (1984b) The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies, Lewes, Falmer Press.

-- ditto ((Ed.) (1985a) Field Methods in the Study of Education, Lewes, Falmer Press.

-- ditto -- (1985b) Qualitative Methodology and the Study of Education, Lewes, Falmer Press.

-- ditto -- (Ed.) (1985c) Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods, Falmer Press.

-- ditto -- (1986) Sociology, Education and Schools, London, Batsford.

-- ditto -- (1987) 'Studying and Restudying Bishop McGregor School' in Walford, G. (Ed.) (1987).

-- ditto -- (1987) 'Studying and Restudying Bishop McGregor School' in Walford, G. (Ed.) (1987.

BURSTALL, C. (1978) 'The Matthew Effect in the Classroom', Educational Research, Vol. 21 (1), November, 1978.

BYNNER, J. & STRIBLEY, K.M. (Eds.) (1979) Social Research: Principles and Procedures, (1978).

CALDERHEAD, J. (1981) 'A Psychological Approach to Research on Teachers' Classroom Decision Making' British Educational Research Journal, 7 (1).

CENTRAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (1967) 'Children and Their Primary Schools'. Plowden. H.M.S.O.

CHANAN, G. (1976) 'Adding Up the Statistics', T.E.S., 14.5.1976.

CLARRICOATES, K. (1978) 'Dinosaurs in the Classrooms - A Re-examination of some aspects of the 'hidden curriculum' in the primary school'. Women's Studies International Quarterly, Vol. 1, 4, pp. 353-64.

-- ditto --   (1987) 'Child Culture at School. A Clash
              Between Gendered Worlds?' in Pollard, A. (Ed.)
              (1987)   Children and Their Primary Schools,
              Falmer Press, 1987.

CLEAVE, S. et al. (1982) And So To School, N.F.E.R., Nelson.

CLEGG, A. (1980) About Our Schools, Blackwell.

COHEN, L. (1976) Educational Research in Classrooms and
              Schools: A Manual of Materials & Methods, Harper
              & Row.

COHEN, L. & MANION, L. (1980) Research Methods in Education,
              Croom-Helm.

   -- ditto -- (1981)   Perspectives in Classrooms,   Holt-
              Rinehart, Winston.

   -- ditto -- (1987) Research Methods in Education, Croom
              Helm.

COLBY, B.N. & PEACOCK, J.L. (1972) 'Narrative' in Honigman,
              J.J. (Ed.) Handbook of Social and Cultural
              Anthropology, Rand McNally, 1973.

COOK, SCOTT (1973) 'Economic Anthropology: Problems in
              Theory, Method and Analysis' in Honigmann, J.J.
              (Ed.) (1973) Handbook of Social and Cultural
              Anthropology, Rand McNally.

COOK & MACK (1971)   The Head Teacher's role, London,
              Macmillan.

COOKSON, C. (1980) 'Grade Grind', T.E.S., 19.9.80.

COOPER, B. (1976)   'Bernstein's codes: a classroom study',
              Occasional Paper 6,   University of Sussex
              Educational Area.

COPE, E. (1973) 'School Experience & Student Learning' in
              Lomax (Ed.) The Education of Teachers in Britain,
              John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

CORRIGAN, P. (1979) Schooling the Smash Street Kids,
              London, Macmillan.

COSER, L.A. (1979) 'American Trends' in Bottomore, T. &
              Nisbet, R. (Eds.) (1979) A History of Socio-
              logical Analysis, Heinemann.

COSER, L.A. & ROSENBERG, B. (Eds.) (1982)   Sociological
              Analysis, 5th Edition, Macmillan.

COSIN, B. (1972) 'Ideology' Unit 13 of Schooling and
              Society, E202, Open University.

COX, C.B. & DIXON, A.E. (Eds.) (1969) 'Black Papers: Fight for Education', Critical Quarterly Society.

-- ditto -- (1970) Black Paper III 'Goodbye Mr. Short' in Critical Quarterly Society.

-- ditto -- (1977) Black Paper 77, London, Dent.

CUFF, E.C. & PAYNE G.C.F. (Eds.) (1979) Perspectives in Sociology, George Allen & Unwin.

CUMMINGS, C. (1985) 'Qualitative Research in Infant Classrooms' in Burgess, R.G. (1985b).

DAVID, M.E. (1987) 'On Becoming a Feminist in the Sociology of Education' in Walford, G. (Ed.) (1987).

DALE, R. et al. (Eds.) (1976) Sociology and Capitalism: A Sociological Reader, Open University Press.

DALE, R. (1977) 'Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching' in Gleeson (Ed.) Identity & Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education, Nafferton.

-- ditto -- (1979) 'From Endorsement to Disintegration: Progressive Education from the Golden Age to the Green Paper, British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XXVII (3) October.

DAVIES, B. (1980) 'An Analysis of Primary School Children's Accounts of Classroom Interactions' in British Journal of Sociology of Education, (B.J. of Soc. of Ed.) 1980, I (3).

-- ditto -- (1982) Life in the Classroom and Playground: The Accounts of Primary School Children, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1983) 'The Role Pupils Play in the Social Construction of Classroom Order' in B.J. of Soc. of Ed., Vol. 4 (1)

DAVIS, K. (1989) 'The Myth of Functional Analysis as a Special Method in Sociology and Anthropology', American Sociological Review, 24, 6, pp.767-72.

DEAN, I.P., EICHORN, L. & DEAN, L.R. (1969) 'Diagnosing Defenses Against the Outsider' in McCall & Simmons (Eds.), 1969.

-- ditto -- (1969) 'Establishing Field Relations' in McCall & Simmons (Eds.) (1969), Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

DEAN, I.P. & FOOTE WHYTE, W. (1958) 'How Do You Know if the Informant is Telling the Truth?' in McCall & Simmons, op. cit.

D.E.S. (1978) 'Primary Education in England: a survey by H.M. Inspectorate of Schools. London, H.M.S.O.

D.E.S. (1982) 'Education 5-0', H.M.S.O.

D.E.S. (1985) 'Better Schools: a Summary', London, H.M.S.O.

DEARDEN, R.F. (1976) Problems in Primary Education, R.K.P.

DELAMONT, S. (1975) 'Participant Observation and Educational Anthropology' in Research Intellitence 1 (Part 1), July.

  -- ditto -- (1976, 1983) Interaction in the Classroom, Methuen.

  -- ditto -- (1980) Sex Roles and the School, Methuen.

  -- ditto -- (1987) 'The Primary Teacher 1945 to 1990: Myths and Realities' in Delamont, S. (1987) The Primary School Teacher, Falmer Press.

  -- ditto -- (1987) The Primary School Teacher, Falmer Press.

DELAMONT, S. & ATKINSON, P. (1980) 'The Two Traditions in Educational Ethnography: Sociology and Anthropology Compared' in B.J. of the Soc. of Ed., Vol. 1 (2).

DELAMONT, S. HAMILTON, D. (1986) 'Revisiting Classroom Research: a cautionary tale' in Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (1986).

DENSCOMBE, M. (1980) 'The Work Context of Teaching: an analytic framework for the Study of Teachers in Classrooms' in B.J. of the Soc. of Ed., Vol. 1, (3).

  -- ditto -- (1980) 'Pupils' strategies and the Open Classroom' in Woods, P. (Ed.) Pupil Strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the School, London, Croom Helm.

  -- ditto -- (1984) 'Classroom Control and Initial Teacher Training: The Contribution of Ethnography' in Barton, L. & Walker, S. (1984) Social Crisis and Educational Research, Croom Helm.

DENTAN, R.K. (1970) 'Living and Working with the Semai' in Spindler, G.D. (Ed.) (1970) Being an Anthropologist, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. 1970.

DENZIN, N. (1978) The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods, McGraw-Hill.

DESFORGES, C. & COCKBURN, A. (1987) Understanding the Mathematics Teacher: A Study of Practice in

First Schools, Falmer Press.

DESFORGES, C. & McNAMARA, D. (1979) 'Theory and Practice: Methodological Procedures for the Objecetification of Craft Knowledge' in British Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 6, (2) May.

DEUTSCHER, I. (1970) 'Words and Deeds: Social Science and Social Policy' in Filstead (Eds.).

DEWEY, J. (1916) Democracy in Education, N.Y., Macmillan.

DIAMOND, N. (1970) 'Fieldwork in a Complex Society: Taiwan' in Spindler, G.D. (Ed.) Being an Anthropologist, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1970.

DINGWALL, R. (1977) The Social Organisation of Health Visitor Training, Croom Helm.

DIXON, A. (1972 'Infant to Junior, the Continuing Hazards, Forum, Vol. 15, Spring.

-- ditto -- (1978) 'How Unstreamed are Infant Schools?, Forum, Vol. 20 (2), Spring 1978.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'Small is Beautiful When ...' Forum, Vol. 22 (3), Summer.

D.O.E., T.E.S., 2 April, 1978.

DOUGLAS, I. (1974) Understanding Every Day Life, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1976) Investigation Social Research, Sage Publications.

DOUGLAS, J.B. (1964) The Home and the School, Panther.

DREEBAN, R. (1971) 'On What is Learned in School. An Excerpt' in Silberman, M.L. (Ed.) The Experience of Schooling, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

DUA, VEENA (1979) 'A Woman's Encounter with Arya Samaj and Untouchables' in Srinivas, M.N., Shah, A.M. & Ramaswamy, E.A., The Fieldworker and the Field, OUP (Bombay, Calcutta, Madras) 1979.

DUNKERTON, I. 1981) 'Should Classroom Observation be Quantitive? Educational Research, Vol. 23 (2), Feb.
DURBIN, M. (1973) 'Cognitive Anthropology' in Honigmann, J.J. (Ed.) (1973) Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Rand McNally, 1973.

DURKHEIM, E. (1915) The Elementary Forms of Religious Life, Allen & Unwin.

-- ditto -- (1933) The Division of Labour in Society, New York, Free Press.

-- ditto -- (1956) <u>Education</u> <u>and</u> <u>Sociology</u>, Free Press.

-- ditto -- (1970) <u>Suicide:</u> <u>A</u> <u>Study</u> <u>in</u> <u>Sociology</u>, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1982) <u>The</u> <u>Rules</u> <u>of</u> <u>Sociological</u> <u>Method</u>, The MacMillan Press Ltd.

EAGLESHAM, (1967) <u>The</u> <u>Foundations</u> <u>of</u> <u>Twentieth</u> <u>Century</u> <u>Education</u> <u>in</u> <u>England</u>, R.K.P.

EASTHOPE, G. (1975) 'Bernstein's Sociology of The School, in <u>Research</u> <u>Intelligence</u>, July.

EDWARDS, A.D. (1980) 'Patterns of Power & Authority in Classroom Talk' in Woods P. (Ed.) (1980) <u>Teacher</u> <u>Strategies:</u> <u>Explorations</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>Sociology</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>School</u>, Croom-Helm.

EDWARDS, A.D. & FURLONG, V.G. (1978) <u>The</u> <u>Language</u> <u>of</u> <u>Teach-</u><u>ing</u>, Heinemann.

-- ditto -- (1985) 'Reflections in The Language of Teaching' in Burgess, R.G. (1985), <u>Field</u> <u>Methods</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>Study</u> <u>of</u> <u>Education</u>, Falmer Press.

EGGLESTON, J. (1975) 'Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education', <u>Research</u> <u>Intelligence,</u> <u>Vol.</u> <u>1</u>, P + 1, July.

EGGLESTON, J. (Ed.) (1979) <u>Teacher</u> <u>Decision</u> <u>Making</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>Classroom</u>, London, R.K.P.

EISEN, A. (1978) 'The Meanings & Confusions of Weberian Rationsality', <u>Brit.</u> <u>J.</u> <u>of</u> <u>Sociology</u>, <u>Vol.</u> <u>29</u>, (1).

-- ditto -- (1978) 'What is Action Research in Schools?' <u>Discussion</u> <u>Paper</u> <u>presented</u> <u>at</u> <u>the</u> <u>'Classroom</u> <u>Action</u> <u>Research</u> <u>Network'</u> <u>Conference</u> <u>held</u> <u>at</u> <u>Wolfson</u> <u>Court,</u> <u>Cambridge.</u>

-- ditto -- (1979) <u>Methodology</u> <u>&</u> <u>Ethics.</u>

-- ditto -- <u>(1976)</u> <u>Developing</u> <u>Hypothesis</u> <u>about</u> <u>Classrooms</u> <u>From</u> <u>Teachers'</u> <u>Practical</u> <u>Constructs</u>, University of North Dakota.

ELLIOT, J. et al. (1981) <u>School</u> <u>Accountability</u>, Grant McIntyre.

ELLIS, et al. (1976) <u>William</u> <u>Tyndale</u> <u>-</u> <u>the</u> <u>Teachers</u> <u>Story</u>, Writers-Readers Publishing Co-operative.

EMERSON, R.M. (1982) 'Introduction' in Emerson, R.M. (Ed.) (1983) <u>Contemporary</u> <u>Field</u> <u>Research</u>, Little, Brown & Company.

EMMET, D. (1966) 'Rules, Roles and Relations', London, Macmillan.

ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA (1985) Vol. 14, Grolier International Incorporated.

-- ditto -- (1987) Vol. 25.

ENTWISTLE (1973) 'The Nature of Educational Research. O.U. Educational Studies: A Third Level Course, Methods of Educational Enquiry, Block I, Open University Press.

EVANS, K. (1975) The Development and Structure of the English Education System, University of London Press.

EVENING PRESS (1930-37) Local Newspaper Reports.

FARBER, M. (1966) The Aims of Phenomenology. The Motives, Methods and Impact of Husserl's Thought, Harper Torch Books.

FARBER, M. (1967) The Foundation of Phenomenology: Edmund Husserl and the Quest for a Rigorous Science of Philosophy, Albany, State University of New York Press.

FEATHERSTONE (1972) An Introduction. British Primary Schools Today 2, Macmillan.

FEYERABEND, P. (1970) 'Consolations for the Specialist' in Lakatos, I. & Musgrave, A. (Eds.) Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, CUP, 1970.

FILSTEAD, W. (1970) 'Qualitative methodology' First Hand Involvement with the Social World, Markham, Chicago.

FILMER, P., PHILLIPSON, M., SILVERMAN, A. & WALSH, D. (1972) New Directions in Sociological Theory, London, Collier-Macmillan.

FISHER, B. & STRAUSS, A.L. (1979) 'Interactionism' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (1979) A History of Sociological analysis, Heinemann.

FLETCHER, R. (1971) The Making of Sociology, Vol. 2, Michael Joseph.

FLUDE, J. (1961) 'Sociology and Education' in Sociological Review Monograph, No. 4.

FLUDE, M. (1974) 'Sociological Accounts of Differential Educational Attainment' in Flude, M. & Ahier, I. (Eds.) Educability, Schools and Ideology, Croom Helm.

FLUDE, M. & AHIER, J. (Eds.) (1974) Educability, Schools

and Ideology, Croom Helm.

FLOUDE, J.E. (Ed.) HALSEY, A.H. & MARTIN, F.M. (1957) Social Class and Educational Opportunity, Heinemann.

FLOUDE, J. & HALSEY, A.H. (1958) 'The Sociolog of Education', Current Sociology, Vol. 7, No. 3.

FORD, I. (1969) 'Social Class and The Comprehensive School, R.K.P.

FRAKE, CHARLES O. (1983) 'Ethnography' in Emerson, R.M. (1983) Contemporary Field Research, Little, Brown & Company.

FRANCE, P. (1986) 'The beginnings of sex sterotyping' in Browne, N. & France, P. (Eds.) Untying the Apron Strings, (1986) Open University Press.

FRANCE, P. & MACLURE, M. (1979) 'Getting the Right Answer and Getting the Answer Right' in Research in Education, No. 22, November.

FRANKENBERG, R. (1957) Village on the Border, Cohen West.

-- ditto -- (1966) Communities in Britain, Penguin.

FREUND, J. (1978) 'German Sociology in the Time of Max Weber' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (Eds.) (1978) A History of Sociological Analysis, London, Henemann.

FRISBY, D. (1974) 'The Frankfurt School: critical theory and positivism' in Rex, I. (1974) Approaches to Sociology, R.K.P.

FRITH, S. (1977) 'Socialisation and Rational Schooling: Elementary Education in Leeds Before 1820' in McCann, S. (1977).

FULLER, M. (1984) 'Dimensions of Gender in a School: Reinventing the Wheel?' in Burgess, R. (Ed.) (1984) The Research Process in Educational Settings, The Falmer Press.

FURLONG, V.G. (1976) 'Interaction Sets in the Classroom: Towards a Study of Pupil Knowledge' in Hammersley, M. & Woods, P. (Eds.) The Process of Schooling, R.K.P.

GALTON, M. (1979) 'Strategies & Tactics in Junior School Classrooms' in Brit. Ed. Research Journal, 5 (2).

GALTON, M. et al. (1980a) Inside the Primary School, London, R.K.P.

GALTON, M. & SIMON, B. (1980b) 'Where the Wild Men Aren't' in T.E.S., 4.4.80.

-- ditto - (1981) _Progress & Performance in the Primary Classroom_, London, R.K.P.

GALTON, M. & WILLCOCKS, I. (Eds.) (1983) _Moving From the Primary Classroom_, London, R.K.P.

GAMMAGE, P. (1986) _Primary Education: Structure and Content_, London, Harper & Row.

GANNAWAY, H. (1976) 'Making Sense of School' in Stubbs & Delamont (1976) _explorations in classroom observations_, London, Wiley & Sons.

GARDNER, D. (1966) _Experiment and Tradition in Primary Schools_, Methuen.

GARDNER, D. & CASS (1965) _The Role of the Teacher in the Infant & Nursery School_, Pergamon Press.

GARDNER, G. (1978) _Social Surveys for Social Planners_, Open University Press.

GARFINKEL, H. (1967) _Studies in Ethnomethodology_, Prentice-Hall.

GEER, B. (1969) 'First Days in the Field' in McCall, G.J. & Simmons, J.L. (1969) _Issues in Participant Observation_, Addison;Wesley.

GERTH, H. & MILLS, C.W. (Eds.) (1967) _From Max Weber, Essays in Sociology_, R.K.P.

GIBSON, R. (1978) 'Chimeral Concepts in Education Research Classification and Framing', _Brit. Ed. Research Journal_, (2).

- ditto - (1979) 'Book Review: All Things Bright and Beautiful' by King R. (1978) Wiley, in _In. of Further 7 Higher Education_, Vol. 3 (2), Summer.

GIDDENS, A. (1974) _Positivism and Sociology_, London, Heinemann.

GIDDENS, A. (1976) _New Rules of Sociological Method_, Hutchinson.

GIDDENS, A. (1979) 'Positivism and its Critics' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (Eds.) _A History of Sociological Analysis_, London, Heinemann.

GIDDENS, A. & TURNER, J. (1987) _Social Theory Today_, Polity Press.

GIPPS, C. (1988) 'What Exams Would Mean for Primary Education' in Lawton, D. & Chitty, C. (1988) _The National Curriculum_, The Bedford Way Series, Institute of Education, University of London.

GLASER, B. & STRAUS A. (1968) The Discovery of Grounded
         Theory, Weidenfield & Nicolson.

GLEESON, D.C. (1977) 'Editorial Introduction: Society,
         Education and Identity, Towards a Redefinition'
         in Gleeson, D. (Ed.) (1977) Identity and
         Structure, Nafferton.

GLEESON, D.C. (Ed.) (1977) Identity and Structure: Issues in
         the Sociology of Education, Nafferton Books.

GLEESON, D. & MARDLE, G. (1987) 'Theory and Practice in
         Fieldwork Research: Some Personal Observations
         in Perspective' in Walford, G. (1987).

GLENNERSTER, H. (1972) 'Education and Inequality' in
         Townsend, P. & Bosanquet, N. (Eds.) (1972)
         Labour and Inequality, Fabian Society.

  - ditto   -- (1974) 'A Basic Philosophy for Resource
         Allocation' in Glennerster H. & Hatch, S.
         (1974).

GLUCKSMANN, M. (1974) 'The Structuralism of Levi-Strauss and
         Althusser' in Rex, . (Ed.) (1974) Approaches to
         Sociology, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

GOFFMAN, E. (1968) Asylums, Penguin.

  - ditto   -- (1969) The Presentation of Self in Everyday
         Life, Penguin.

  - ditto   -- (1971) Relations in Public: Micro Studies of
         the Public Order, New York Basic Books.

GOLD, R. (1958) 'Roles in Sociological Field Observation' in
         Social Forces, No. 36, March.

GOLDMAN, I. (1963) Selected at Six, Hodder & Stoughton.

GOODACRE, E. (1967) 'Reading in Infant Classes: A Survey of
         the Teaching Practice & Conditions in One
         Hundred Infant Schools and Departments',
         N.F.E.R.

GORBUTT, D. (1972) 'The New Sociology of Education',
         Education for Teaching, 89.

GORDON, P. & LAWTON, D. (1978) Curriculum Change in the
         Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, Hodder &
         Stoughton.

GOULD, J. (1969) in 'Raison, T. (1969) The Founding Fathers
         of Social Science.

GOULDNER, A. (1971) The Coming Crisis of Western

Sociology, Heinemann.

GRACE, G. (1978) _Teachers, Ideology & Control_, R.K.P.

GRAY, J. (1980) 'How Good Were the Tests?', _T.E.S._, 7.11.80.

GRAY, J. & SATTERLEY, D. (1976) 'A Chapter of Errors', _Educational Research_, 19, pp.45-56.

GULICK, I. (1973) 'Urban Anthropology' in Honigman, J.J. (1973) _Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology_, Chicago, Rand McNally & Company.

GURWITSCH, A. (1966) 'Introduction' in Schutz, A. (1966) _Collected Papers III_, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.

HADOW, N.H. (1931) 'Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education' in Maclure, S. (1965) _Educational Documents_, Chapman and Hall.

HALFPENNY, P. (1982) _Positivism and Sociology: Explaining Social Life_, George Allen & Unwin.

HALL, V., MACKAY, H. & MORGAN, C. (1986) _Head Teachers at Work_, Open University Press.

HAMILTON, D. (1977) 'Illuminations & Ruminations', _Research Intelligence, Vol. 3_, (1).

HAMLYN, D.W. (1987) _A History of Western Philosophy_, Viking (Penguin Books).

HAMMERSLEY, M. (1977) 'Teachers' Perspectives' in _Educational Studies: A Second Level Course, E202, Schooling and Society_, The Open University Press.

-- ditto -- (1979) 'Data Collection in Ethnographic Research' in _Research Methods in Education and the Social Sciences, DE304, Block 4, Part 3_, The Open University, 1979.

-- ditto -- (1980a) 'Classroom Ethnography', _Educational Analysis, Vol. 2_ (2).

-- ditto -- (1980b) 'On Interactionist Empiricism' in Woods, P. (Ed.) (1980), _Pupil Strategies_, Croom Helm.

-- ditto -- (1981) 'The Outsider's Advantage: A Reply to McNamara' in _Brit. Ed. Research Journal, 7_ (2) 1981.

-- ditto -- (1983) _The Ethnography of Schooling: Methodological Issues_, Nafferton.

-- ditto -- (1984) 'The Researcher Exposed' in Burgess, R.

G. (1984) <u>The Research Process in Educational</u> <u>Settings: Ten Case Studies.</u>

-- ditto -- (1985) 'From Ethnography to Theory: a programme and paradigm in the Sociology of Education' in <u>Sociology, 19</u> (2).

HAMMERSLEY, M. (ed.) (1986) <u>Controversies in Classroom</u> <u>Research</u>, Open University Press.

HAMMERSLEY, M. & ATKINSON, P. (1983) <u>Ethnography:</u> <u>Principles in Practice</u>, Tavistock.

HAMMERSLEY, M. & WOODS, P. (1976) 'Introduction' in Hammersley, M. & WOODS, (1976) <u>The Process of</u> <u>Schooling: A Sociological Reader,</u> Open University Press.

HAMMERSLEY, M. & WOODS, P. (1984) <u>Life in School: The</u> <u>Sociology of Pupil Culture,</u> Open University Press.

HARDY, M. (1975) 'Attributes of the Integrated Day' in <u>Forum, Vol. 18</u> (1) Autumn.

HARGREAVES, A. (1978) 'The Significance of Classroom Strategies' in Barton & Meighan (1978) <u>op. cit.</u>

-- ditto -- (1979) 'Strategies, Decisions and Control: interaction in a Middle School Classroom' in Eggleston (1979).

-- ditto -- (1987) 'Past, Imperfect, Tense: Reflections on an Ethnographic and Historical Study of Middle Schools' in Walford, G. (1987).

HARGREAVES, A. & WOODS, P. (Eds.) (1984) <u>Classrooms & Staff-</u> <u>rooms: The Sociology of Teachers and Training,</u> Open University Press.

HARGREAVES, D.H. (1967) <u>Social Relations in the Secondary</u> <u>School</u>, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1977) 'The Process of Typification in Class-room Interaction: Models & Methods' in <u>Brit.</u> <u>In. of Ed. Psychol., 47.</u>

-- ditto -- (1978) 'Whatever Happened to Symbolic Inter-actionism?' in Barton, S. & Meighan, R. (1978). <u>op. cit.</u>

-- ditto -- (1980) 'A Sociological Critique of Individualism in Education', <u>Brit. In. of Ed.</u> <u>Studies, Vol. XXVII</u> (3), June.

-- ditto -- (1986) 'Whatever Happened to Symbolic Inter-actionism?' in Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (1986) <u>Controversies in Classroom Research</u>, Open University Press.

1157

HARGREAVES, D.H. HESTER, K. & MELLOR, F. (1975) Devience in
        Classrooms, R.K.P.

HARGREAVES, D.H. & WOODS, P. (1984) 'Introduction' in
        Classrooms and Staffrooms, Open University
        Press.

HARTLEY, D. (1977) 'Some consequences of teachers'
        definitions of boys and girls in two infants'
        schools'. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University
        of Exeter.

    - ditto -- (1985) Understanding the Primary School, Croom
        Helm.

HARTLEY, D. (1987) 'The Time of Their Lives: Bureaucracy in
        the Nursery School' in Pollard, A. (Ed.) (1987)
        Children and Their Primary Schools, Falmer Press

HAWKINS, P. (1969) 'Social Class, the Nominal Group and
        Reference' in Language and Speech, 12 2, in
        Stubbs, M. (1986) 'Scratching the Surface:
        Linguistic Data in Educational Research' in
        Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (1986).

HENRY, I. (1966) Culture Against Man, Tavistock.

HEWINS, A. (Ed.) (1982) The Dillen, Memories of a Man of
        Stratford on Avon, OUP.

HILSUM, S. & CANE, B.S. (1971) 'The Teacher's Day', N.E.R.

HOBBS, A., KLEINBERG, S.M. & MARTIN, P.J. (1979) 'Decision
        Making in Primary Schools', Research in
        Education (21), May.

HOLMAN, R. (1978) Poverty: Explanations of Social
        Deprivation, Robertson.

HOLMES, E. (1911) What is & What Might Be, Constable.

HONIGMANN, J.J. (1973) Handbook of Social and Cultural
        Anthropology, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company.

HORNER, L. (1838) 'On the State of Education in Holland' in
        Blackstone, T. (1971).

HOSTETLER, J.A. & HUNTINGTON, G.E. (1970) 'The Hutterites:
        Fieldwork in a North American Communal Society'
        in Splinder, G.D. (Ed.) (1970) Being an Anthro-
        pologist, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

HOUSING SURVEY (1935-39).

HOWDLE, L. (1968) 'An Enquiry into the Social Factors
        Affecting the Orientation of English Education
        since the early Nineteenth Century, an un-

published M.A. Dissertation (Education), London University Institute of Education.

HUDSON, C. (1973) 'The Historical Approach in Anthropology' in Honigmann, J. J.(1973) Handbook of Social & Cultural Anthropology, Rand McNally & Company.

HUMPHRIES, S. (1981) Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working-class Childhood and Youth 1889-1939, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

HURLEY, A. (1975) 'The Open Classroom Concept', The Forum of Education: An Australian Journal of Teacher Education, Vol.XXXIV, No. 1, March.

HUSSERL, E. (1931) Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. with the Macmillan Company.

HUSSERL, E. (1977) Cartesian Meditations: an Introduction to Phenomenology, Martinus Nijhoff.

HUSTLER, D. et al.(Eds.) (1986) Action Research in Classrooms and Schools, Allen & Unwin.

JACKSON, B. (1964) Streaming: An Education System in Miniature, Routledge.

JACKSON, M. (1987) 'Making Sense of School' in Pollard, A. (1987) Children and Their Primary Schools, The Falmer Press.

JACKSON, P.W. (1968) Life in Classrooms, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

-- ditto -- (1971) 'The Student's World' in Silberman, M.L. (Ed.) (1971) The Experience of Schooling, Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc.

JOHNSON, J.M. (1975) Doing Field Research, Free Press.

JOHNSON, K. (1973) 'Expectations in Classroom Interaction. A Case Study', Hard Cheese, 1.

JUNKER, H.B. (1960) Field Work: An Introduction to the Social Sciences, University of Chicago Press.

KARABEL, J & HALSEY, A.H. (1976) 'The New Sociology of Education' in Theory and Society: Renewal & Critique in Social Theory, Vol. 3 (4), Winter.

KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (1982) Four Periods of Public Education, Lowland/Green.

KEAT, R. & URRY, I. (1975) Social Theory as Science, R.K.P.

KEDDIE, N.G. (1971) 'The Social Basis of Classroom Knowledge' in Young, M.F.D. (Ed.) (1971) Know-ledge and Control, Macmillan.

KELMAN, H.C. (1979) 'Human Use of Human Subjects: the Problem of Deception in Social Psdychological Experiments' in Bynner, J. & Stribley, K.M. (1979) Social Research: Principles and Procedures, Open University.

KING, R.A. (1968) 'The Head Teacher & His Authority' in Bryan Allen (Ed.) Headship in the 1970s, Blackwell.

-- ditto -- (1977) 'Education'. Social Structure of Modern Britain Series, 2nd Edition.

KING, R.A. (1978) All Things Bright & Beautiful: A Socio-logical Study of Infants' School Classrooms, Wiley.

- ditto -- (1979) 'The Search for the Invisible Pedagogy' in Sociology, The Journal of the British Socio-logical Association, Vol. 13, No. 3, September.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'Weberian Perspectives & The Study of Education' in Brit. J. of Soc. of Ed., 1980, 1 (1).

-- ditto -- (1984) 1The Man in the Wendy House: Researching Infants' Schools' in Burgess, R. (1984b) The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies, The Falmer Press.

-- ditto -- (1987) 'No Best Method - Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Sociology of Education' in Walford, G. (1987).

KLUCKHOHN, F. (1940) 'The Participant Observer Technique in Small Communities', American Journal of Sociology, 46, 331-43.

KOHL, H. (1971) '36 Children - An Excerpt' in Silberman, M.L. (Ed.) (1971) The Experience of Schooling, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

KOLAKOWSKI, L. (1972) Positivist Philosophy, Penguin.

KUHN, T. (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Chicago University Press, 2nd Edition.

LABOV, W. (1972) 'The Logic of Non-Standard English' in Language in Education, R.K.P. in association with The Open University.

LACEY, C. (1970) Hightown Grammar, Manchester University

Press.

LA FONTAINE, I. (1985) <u>What</u> <u>is</u> <u>Social</u> <u>Anthropology?</u>,
        Arnold.

LAKATOS, J. (1970) 'Falsification and the Methodology of
        Scientific Research Programmes' in Lakatos, I.
        & Musgrave, A. (Eds.) (1970) <u>Criticism and the</u>
        <u>Growth of Knowledge</u>, cup.

LALLY, A.J. 1976 'Positivism and its Critics' in Thorns,
        D.C. (Ed.) (1976) <u>New</u> <u>Directions</u> <u>in</u> <u>Sociology</u>,
        David & Charles.

LANCASTER, I. 'Improvements in Education' in Silver, H.
        (1965) <u>The</u> <u>Concept</u> <u>of</u> <u>Popular</u> <u>Education</u>,
        MacGibbon & Kee.

LASSMAN, P. (1974) 'Phenomenological Perspectives in
        Sociology' in Rex, I. (Ed.) (1974) <u>Approaches</u>
        <u>to</u> <u>Sociology</u>, R.K.P.

LAWSON, M. (1981) 'Where is the Wendy House Now?', <u>T.E.S.</u>,
        29.5.81.

LAWTON, D. (1968) <u>Social</u> <u>Class,</u> <u>Language</u> <u>and</u> <u>Education</u>,
        Routledge & Kegan Paul.

LAWTON, D. & CHITTY, C. (1988) <u>The</u> <u>National</u> <u>Curriculum</u>, The
        Bedford Way Series, Institute of Education,
        Univ. of London.

LEACH, D. (1970) 'Teachers' Perceptions and Problem
        Pupils' in <u>Educational</u> <u>Review,</u> <u>Vol.</u> <u>29</u> (3),
        June.

LEACH, D.I. & RAYBOULD (1977) <u>Learning</u> <u>&</u> <u>Behaviour</u>
        <u>Difficulties</u> <u>in</u> <u>Schools</u>, Owen Books.

LEACH, E. (1974a) 'Social Anthropology in Search of
        System', <u>New</u> <u>Society,</u> <u>16</u>, May 1974.

    -- ditto -- (1974b) <u>Levi-Strauss</u>, Fontana/Collins.

    -- ditto -- (1976) <u>Culture</u> <u>and</u> <u>Communication:</u> <u>the</u>
            <u>logic</u> <u>by</u> <u>which</u> <u>symbols</u> <u>are</u> <u>connected.</u> <u>An</u>
            <u>Introduction</u> <u>to</u> <u>the</u> <u>Use</u> <u>of</u> <u>Structuralist</u>
            <u>Analysis</u> <u>in</u> <u>Social</u> <u>Anthropology</u>, CUP.

LEE, I. (1984) 'Contradictions & Constraints in an Inner
        City Infant School' in Grace, G. (Ed.) (1984)
        <u>Education</u> <u>and</u> <u>the</u> <u>City</u>. R.K.P.

LEESE, I. (1950) <u>Personalities</u> <u>and</u> <u>Power</u> <u>in</u> <u>English</u>
        <u>Education</u>, E.J. Arnold.

LEIGH, P. (1977) 'Great Expectations: A Consideration of

the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in the Context of Educability' in Educational Review, Vol. 29 (4).

LEITER, K.C. (1976) 'Teachers' Use of Background Knowledge to Interpret Test Scores', Sociology of Education, Vol. 49, January.

LEWIS, I.M. (1976) Social Anthropology in Perspective, Penguin Books.

LEVI-STRAUSS, C. (1968) Structural Anthropology, London, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.

LIGHTFOOT, S.L. (1978) Worlds Apart. Relationships Between Families and Schools, Basic Books.

LINTON, R. (1965) 'The Cultural Background of Personality' cited in Voget, F.W. History of Cultural Anthropology in Honigmann, J.J. (Ed.) (1973) Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Rand McNally.

LLEWELLYN, M. (1980) 'Studying Girls at School: The Implications of Confusion' in Deem, R. (Ed.) Schooling for Women's Work, R.K.P.

LOCAL PAPER REPORT (1930).

LOFLAND, J. (1971) Analysing Social Settings.

LONDON, H.B. (1978) The Culture of a Community College, Praeger.

LUKES, S. (1975) Emile Durkheim, Penguin Books.

-- ditto -- (1982 'Introduction' in Durkheim, E. (1982) The Rules of Sociological Method, The Macmillan Press.

LUNDBERG, G.A. (1942) Social Research, Longmans, Green & Co.

LUTZ, F.W. (1986) 'Ethnography: The Holistic Approach to Understanding Schooling' in Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (1986) Controversies in Classroom Research, Open University Press.

MACLURE, J.S. (1965) Education Documents: England & Wales 1816-1963, Chapman & Hall.

MAIR, L. (1972) An Introduction to Social Anthropology, OUP.

MAKINS, V. (1980) 'The Monday Report', T.E.S., 2.5.80.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'It's The Style That Counts', T.E.S.,

7.11.80.

MALINOWSKI, B. (1922) <u>Argonauts of the Western Pacific</u>, London, R.K.P.

MANN, F.C. (1951) 'Human Relations Skills in Social Research' in Filstead, W. (Ed.) (1970) <u>Qualitative Methodology: Firsthand Involvement with the Social World</u>, Chicago, Markham.

MARLAND, M. (Ed.) (1980) <u>Education for the Inner City</u>, Heinemann.

MARRIOTT, S. (1985) <u>Primary Education and Society</u>, Falmer Press.

MARSH, C. (1982) <u>The Survey Method: The Contribution of Surveys to Sociological Explanation</u>, Allen & Unwin.

MARSH, C.A.A. (1985) 'The English Middle School - the Birth and Death of a Dream' in Walford, G. (1985) <u>Schooling in Turmoil</u>, Croom Helm.

MARSH, L. (1980) 'Finish Your Fletcher and Get On With Your Maths', <u>T.E.S.</u>, 5.12.80.

MARSHALL, S. (1980) 'Adding Love to Authority' in <u>T.E.S.</u>, 31.10.80.

MASON, K. (1985) 'Schooling in Rural England - Jobs for the Girls?' in Walford, G. (Ed.) (1985) <u>Schooling in Turmoil</u>, Croom Helm.

MAYO, REV. CHARLES 'Observations in the Establishment and Direction of Infants' Schools: being the substance of a lecture delivered at the Royal Institution, May 1826.' London, 1827, p.12,

McCALL, G.J. & SIMMONS, J.L. (1969) 'The Nature of Participant Observations' in <u>Issues in Participant Observation.</u>

McCANN, P.(1977) '<u>Popular Education, Socialisation and Social Control: Spitalfields 1812-1824</u>' in <u>McCANN, P. (Ed.) (1977) Popular Education & Socialisation in the Nineteenth Century</u>, Methuen & Co. Ltd.

McINTYRE, D., MORRISON, A. & SUTHERLAND, J. (1966) 'Social and Educational Variables Relating to Teachers' Assessments of Primary School Pupils', <u>Brit. J. Ed. Psychol.</u>, Vol. <u>36</u>, 272-79.

McNAMARA, D.R. (1980) 'The Outsiders' Arrogance: the Failure of Participant Observers to Understand Classroom Events', Brit. Ed. Research Journal, Vol. 6, No. 2.

McNEILL, P. (1985) Research Methods, Tavistock Publications. in Silver, H. (1965).

MEASOR, L. & WOODS, P. (1984 Changing Schools: Pupil Perspectives on Transfer to a Comprehensive, OUP.

MEDEWAR, P.B. (1967) The Art of the Solluble, Methuen.

-- ditto -- (1985) The Limits of Science, OUP.

MEIGHAN, R. (1979) Perspectives on Society, Nelson.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'Locations of Learning and Ideologies of Education: Some Issues Raised by a Study of Education Otherwise' in Barton, et al. (1980) Schooling, Ideology and Curriculum, Falmer Press.

-- ditto -- (1981) A Sociology of Educating, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

MELLOR, E. (1950) Education Through Experience in the Infant School Years, Blackwell.

MENNELL, S. (1974) Sociological Theory: Uses and Unities, Nelson.

MENZEL, H. (1978) 'Meaning - Who Needs It?' in Brenner, M., Marsh, P. & Brenner, M. (1978) The Social Contexts of Method. Croom Helm.

MERSON, M.W. & CAMPBELL, R.J. (1974) 'Community Education. Instruction for Inequality' in Education for Teaching, (1974) Spring.

MIDDLETON, N. & WEITZMAN, S. (1976) A Place for Everyone, Gollancz.

MIDWINTER, E. C. (1972) 'Teaching with the Urban Environment' in Raynor, J. & Harris, E. (Eds.) Urban Education 2; Schooling in the City, Ward Lock Educational.

-- ditto -- (1973) 'Urban Community and Urban School' in Garner, N. (1973) Teaching in the Urban Community School, Ward Lock Educational.

MONTESSORI, M. (1912) The Montessori Method, Heinemann.

MOORLAND ESTATE SURVEY, (1977)

MOORE, T. (1974) Educational Theory: An Introduction,

R.K.P.

MORAN, P.R. (1971) 'The Integrated Day', Ed. Research, Vol.14.

MORANT, SIR ROBERT (1904) 'Introduction: Elementary Code 1904 in Maclure, J. Stuart (1968) Educational Documents: England & Wales 1816-19673, Chapman & Hall.

MORRISH, I. (1976) Aspects of Educational Change, Unwin Education.

MORRISON, A. & MCINTYRE, D. (1969) Teachers and Teaching, Penguin.

MOSER, C.A. & KALTON, G. (1971) Survey methods in social investigation, 2nd Edition, Gower.

MORTIMER, A. et al. (1970) 'Participant Observation as Employed in the Study of a Military Training Programme' in Filstead, W. (1970) Qualitative Methodology, Chicago, Markham.

MOYLE, D. (1968) The Teaching of Reading, Ward Lock Educational.

MUNRO, R. (1954) A Teachers' Manual: For Use with the Janet and John Reading Course, James Nisbet & Co. Ltd.

MURPHY, J. (1974) 'Teacher Expectations & Working Class Under-Achievement' in Brit. J. of Sociology, Vol. 25.

MUSGRAVE, F. (1968) 'Curriculum Objectives', J. of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 1 (1).

-- ditto -- (1979) Schools and the Social Order, Wiley.

MYERS, D.A. & DUKE, L. (1977) 'Open Educating as Ideology', Ed. Research, Vol. 19 (3).

NASH, R. (1973) Classrooms Observed: The Teachers' Perception and the Pupils Performance.

NASH, R. (1976) 'Pupils' Expectations of Their Teachers' in Stubbs, M. & Delmont, S. (Eds.) Explorations in Classroom Observation, Chichester, Wiley.

NATANSON, M. (Ed.) (1967) Collected Papers, Vol. The Problem of Social Reality, Martinus Nijhoff.

NEWCASTLE REPORT (1861) 'Report of The Commissioners appointed to Enquire into the State of Popular

Education in England' in Raymont, T. (1937).

NIAS, J. (1981) 'Commitment and Motivation in Primary School Teachers', Educational Review, 33 (3), 181-90.

-- ditto -- (1984) 'The Definition & Maintenance of Self' in 'Primary Teaching' in Brit. J. of Soc. of Education, 5 (3).

NISBET, R. (1979) 'Conservatism' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbett R. (1979) A History of Sociological Analysis, London, Heinemann.

NORBECK, E. (1970) 'Changing Japan: Field Research' in Spindler, G.P. (Ed.) (1970) Being an Anthropologist, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

OLIVER, R.A.C. & BUTCHER, H.J. (1968) 'Teachers' Attitude to Education', Brit. J. of Ed. Psychol. xxxviii. 48, 59.

OPPENHEIM, A.N. (1966) Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, London, Heineman.

OSTLER, G. (1941) The Little Oxford Dictionary of Current English, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

O'SULLIVAN, D. (1980) 'Teachers' Views of the Effrects of the Home', Ed. Research, Vol. 22 (2), February.

OUTHWAITE, W. (1975) Understanding Social Life: The Method Called Versten, Jean Stroud.

-- ditto -- (1987a) 'Laws and Explanations in Sociology' in Anderson, R.I., Hughes, J.A. & Sharrock, W.W. (Eds.) (1987) Classic Disputes in Sociology, Allen & Unwin.

-- ditto -- (1987b) New Philosophies of Social Science: Realism, Hermeneutics and Critical Theory, MacMillan Education.

OWEN, R. (1857) The Life of Robert Owen by Himself, London, Bell, 1920.

PARK, R.E. (1952) 'The City: Suggestions for the investigation of human behaviour in the urban environment' from Park, R.E. (1951) Human Communities, Glencoe, III Free Press, in Burgess, R. (Ed.) (1982) Field Research: A Source Book & Field Manual, George Allen & Unwin.

PARSONS, T. (1957) Economy and Society, Free Press.

PASSMORE, J. (1966) A Hundred Years of Philosophy, 2nd Edition, Cox & Wyman Ltd.

PATTON, M. (1980) Qualitative Evaluation, Sage Publication.

PAYNE, G. (1976) 'Making a Lesson Happen: An Ethnomethod-
ological Analysis' in Hammersley, M. & Woods,
P. (Eds.) The Process of Schooling, Routledge &
Kegan Paul.

PAYNE, G.C.F. & CUFF, E.C. (Eds.) (1982) Doing Teaching:
The Practical Management of Classrooms,
Batsford.

PELTO, P.J. & PELTO, G. (1973) 'Ethnography: The Fieldwork
Enterprise' in Honigmann, J.J. (1973) Handbook
of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Rand
McNally.

PERRY, L. (1965) 'What is an Educational Situation?' in
Archiambault, E.D. (Ed.) (1965) Philosophical
Analysis and Education, R.K.P.

PHILLIPS, E.M. & PUGH, D.S. (1987) How to get a Ph.D, Milton
Keynes, OUP.

PHILLIPSON, M. (1972) 'Phenomenological Philosophy and
Sociology' in Filmer, P. Phillipson, M. Silver,
D. & Walsh, D. (1972) New Directions in Socio-
logical Theory, Collier-Macmillan.

PINKERTON, J. (1980) 'Nursery Talk and How to Stop It',
T.E.S., 14.11.80.

PIVCEVIC E. (1970) Husserl and Phenomenology, Hutchinson
University Library.

PLATT, J. (1981a) 'Evidence and Proof in Documentary
Research: some specific problems of Documentary
Research', Sociological Review, Vol. 29, (1)
31-52.

-- ditto -- (1981b) 'Evidence & Proof in Documentary
Research: some shared problems of Documentary
Research', Sociological Review, Vol. 29 (1)
53-66.

PLATTS, A. & HAIGNTON, G.M. (1954) The History of Infant
Education in Gloucestershire.

PLOWDEN (1967) Central Advisory Committee. 'Children &
Their Primary Schools', HMSO

POLE, T. (1923) 'Observations Relative to Infant Schools'
in Silver, H. (1965).

POLLARD, A.J. (1979) 'Negotiating Deviance and "Getting
Done" in Primary School Classrooms' in Barton &
Meighan, op. cit.

-- ditto --   (1980) 'Teacher Interests & Changing
        Situations of Survival Threat in Primary School
        Classrooms'   in Woods, P. (1980) Teacher
        Strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the
        School, Croom Helm.

-- ditto --   (1985) The Social World of the Primary
        School, Holt Education.

POLLARD, A. (Ed.) (1987) Children in Their Primary Schools,
        Falmer Press.

POLLARD, A. & TANN, S. (1987) Reflective Teaching in the
        Primary School, Cassell Education.

POPPER, K.R. (1963) Conjectures and Refutations: The
        Growth of Scientific Knowledge, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1972) The Poverty of Historianism, R.K.P.

-- ditto -- (1979) Objective Knowledge, an Evolutionary
        Approach, Clarendon Press.

PORTER, M.A. (1984) 'The Modification of Method in
        Researching Post-Graduate Education'   in
        Burgess, R. (Ed.) (1984b) The Research Process
        in Educational Settings, Falmer Press.

POSTER, C. (1976) 'School and Community: The Concept & the
        Experience', Ideas (32) February.

PSATHAS, G. (1973) Phenomenological Sociology, Wiley.

PUSEY, M. (1987) Jurgen Habermas, Ellis Hornwood &
        Tavistock.

PYE, J. (1988) Invisible Children: Who are the Real Losers
        at School?, OUP.

QUINTON, D. (1980) 'Family Life in the Inner City: Myth
        and Reality' in Marland, M. op. cit

RAIMONT, T. (1937) A History of Young Children, London,
        Longmans.

REAY, D. (1980) 'Hidden Streaming in the Classroom', Forum,
        Vol. 22 (2), Spring.

REEDY, J.E. (1975) 'Informal Methods: mispractised, mis-
        understood'. 25.6.1975.

REID, I. (1986) The Sociology of the School and Education,
        Fontana.

RENSHAW, P. (1974) 'Education and the Primary School.   A
        Contradiction?', Education for Teaching (93),
        Spring.

RESNICK, L.B. (1972) 'Teacher Behaviour in the Informal Classroom' in Journal of Curriculum Studies, 4 (1).

REX, J. (Ed.) (1974) Approaches to Sociology, R.K.P.

REX, J. (1978) 'British Sociology's Wars of Religion', New Society, 11th May 1978.

RICHARDS, C. (1979) 'Primary Education, Belief and Myth & Practice' in Bloomer & Shaw (1979) The Challenge of Education. Change, Limits & Potentialities, Pergamon Press.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'Demythologising Primary Education', J. of Curriculum Studies, 12 (1) 77-78.

-- ditto -- (1982) New Directions in Primary Education, Falmer Press.

RICHARDS, J. (1978) Classroom Language: What Sort?, (Unwin Education) George Allen & Unwin.

RIDGEWAY & LAWTON (1965) Family Grouping in the Infant School, Ward Lock Education.

RISEBOROUGH, G.F. (1983) 'Pupils, Teachers' Careers and Schooling; An Empirical Study', unpublished paper, September 1983. (Conference at St. Hilda's College, Oxford.)

RIST, R. (1970) 'Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations:the self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education', Harvard Educational Review, 40.

ROBERTS, A. (1976) 'The Development of Professionalism in the Early Stages of Education' in Brit. J. of Ed. Studies, Vol. XXIV (3), October.

ROBERTS, A.F.B. (1972) 'A New View of the Infant School Movement' in Brit. J. of Ed. Studies, Vol. XX (2), June.

ROBERTS, R. (1976) A Ragged Schooling, Manchester University Press.

ROBINSON, W.S. (1969) 'The Logical Structure of Analytic Induction' in McCall, G.J. & Simmons, I.L. (1969) Issues in Participant Observation, Addison-Wesley.

ROBSON, E.R. (1887) School Architecture, London, Murray.

ROGERS, V.R. & BARRON (1976) 'Questioning the Evidence', T.E.S. 30.4.76

ROSE, G. (1972) Deciphering Sociological Research, The MacMillan Press.

ROUSSEAU (1762) 'The Social Contract' in Barker, E. (Ed.) Social Contract, OUP.

ROWLAND (1984) The Enquiring Classroom, Falmer Press.

ROWLANDS, S. (1986) 'Classroom Enquiry: An Approach to Understanding Children' in Hustler, D. et. al. (Eds.) (1986) op. cit.

ROYCE, J. (1885) 'Religious Aspects of Philosophy', cited in Flew, A. (Editorial Consultant), A Dictionary of Philosophy, Pan Books (1984).

RUNCIMAN, K. (1887) Schools and Scholars, London, Chatto & Windus.

RUSK, R. (1933) A History of Infant Education, University of London Press.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL (1839) in Simon, B. (1968) Studies in the History of Education 1780-1870, Lawrence & Wisehart.

RUTTER, M. (1967) 'A Childrens Behaviour Questionnaire for Completion by Teachers: Prelim. Findings' in J. of Child Psychol., Vol. 8.

RYAN, A. (1977) 'G.H. Mead', New Society, 15.12.77, 569-71.

SCHATZMAN & STRAUSS, A. (1979) Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness, Free Press.

SCHEINFELD, D.R. & MESSERCHMIDT, D. (1979) 'Teachers' Classroom Ideals, Structural Decisions & Views of the Person World Relationship', J. of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 11 (4.

SCHOFIELD, H. (1972) The Philosophy of Education: An Introduction, Unwin.

SCHOLTE, B. (1973) 'The Structural Anthropology of Claude Levi-Strauss' in Honigman, J.J. (Ed.) (1973) Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Rand Mcnally.

SCHOSTAK, J. (1986) Schooling the Violent Imagination, R.K.P.

SCHUTZ, A. (1967) The Phenomenology of the Social World, University Press Chicago.

SCHUTZ, A. (Ed.) (1966 Collected Papers, Vol. Three: Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy, Martinus

Nijhoff.

SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (1980) 'Learning and Teaching in Primary 4 and Primary 7', Edinburgh, HMSO.

SCWARTZ, H. & JACOBS, J. (1979) Qualitative Sociology, The Free Press.

SCWARTZ, M.S. & SCWARTZ, C.G. (1955) 'Problems in Participant Observation', American Journal of Sociology, 60 (4).

SEABROOK, I. (1982) Working Class Childhood - An Oral History, Gollancz.

SEDGWICK, F. (1980) 'The Myth of Change', T.E.S., 26.9.80.

SELLECK, R..W. (1972) English Primary Education & the Progressives 1914-1939, R.K.P.

SELLTIZ, C., JAHODA, M. DEUTSCH, M. & COOK, S.W. (1965) Research Methods in Social Relations, Methuen.

SHARP, R. & GREEN, A. (1975) Education & Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education, R.K.P.

SHIPMAN, M. (1968) The Sociology of the School, Longman.

SIKES, P.J.,. MEASOR, L. & WOODS, P. (1985) Teachers' Careers: Crises and Continuities, Falmer Press.

SILBERMAN, C. (1973) Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education, New York, Random House.

SILBERMAN, M.L. (Ed.) (1971) The Experience of Schooling, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

SILVER, H. (1965) The Concept of Popular Education, MacGibbon & Lee.

-- ditto -- (1977) 'Aspects of Neglect: the Strange Case of Victorian Popular Educdation', Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 3, No. 1.

-- ditto -- (1983) 'Reputation and the Educational System: The Case of Robert Owen' in Silver, H. (1983) Education as History, Methuen.

SIMON, B. (1960) Studies in the History of Education 1780-1870, Lawrence & Wisehart.

-- ditto -- (1980) 'Where the Wild Men Aren't', T.E.S., 4.4.80.

-- ditto -- (1981) 'The Primary School Revolution: Myth or Reality' in Simon, B. & Willcocks, I. (Eds.) Research and Practice in the Primary School

Classroom, R.K.P.

SINGLETON, J. (1974) 'Implications of Education as Cultural Transmission' in Spindler, G.D. (Ed.) (1974) Education and Cultural Processes: Toward an Anthropology of Education, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

SIVAKUMAR, C. (1979) 'An Apprenticeship Marked by Frustrations: College Students in Mysore' in Srinivas, et al. (1979).

SKILBECK, M. (1976) Ideologies and Values, E203, Unit 3, Open University.

SKUSE, P.R. (1980) 'A Secondary Perspective on Primary Schools', ILEA Contact Issue 29.

SLUKIN, A. (1981) Growing Up in the Playground, R.K.P.

SMETHERHAM, D. (1978) 'Insider Research', Brit. Ed. Research J., Vol. 4 (2).

SMITH, L.M. & GEOFFREY, W. (1968) Complexities of an Urban Classroom, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc

SMITH, W.J. (1981) 'Research in Classroom Management: Studies of Pupil Engaged Learning Time as a Special but Instructive Case', J. of Ed. for Teaching, Vol. 7, (2), May.

SOLBE, R. (1980) 'Other Side of Snobbery Coin', T.E.S., 14.11.80.

SPINDLER, G.D. (Ed.) (1970) Being an Anthropologist, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

-- ditto -- (Ed.) (1974) Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

SPODECK, B. (Ed.) (1975) Open Education, Romance or Liberation in Studies in Open Education, Agathon.

SPRADLEY, J. (1979) The Ethnographic Interview, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

SPRADLEY, J.P. (1980) Participant Observation, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

SRINIVAS, M.N., SHAH, P.M. & RAMASWAMY, E.A. (Eds.) (1979) The Fieldworker and the Field: Problems and Challenges in Sociological Investigation, Dehli, OUP.

ST. JOHN-BROOKS, C. (1980) 'Sociologists and Education, A for Effort B for Achievement', New Society, 4th September 1980

-- ditto -- (1983) 'More Work & Less Play', New Society, 66, (1091).

STANLEY, L. & WISE, S. (1983) Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research, R.K.P.

STEAD, J.L. & YOUNG, P. (1981) 'Teacher Education & L.E.A. Perspectives on Disruptive Behaviour', J. of Ed. For Teaching, Vol. 7, (1), January.

STEEDMAN, J. (1987) 'Longitudinal Survey Research into Progress in Secondary Schools, Based on the National Child Development Study', in Walford, G. (1987) Doing Sociology of Education, Falmer Press.

STENHOUSE, L. (1978) 'Case Study & Case Records: towards a contemporary history of education', Brit. Ed. Research J., Vol. 4, (2).

STEWART, J. (1986) The Making of a Primary School, Open University Press.

STEWART, W.A.C. (1968) The Educational Innovators, Vol. Two: Progressive Schools 1881-1967, Macmillan.

STEWART, W.A.C. & McCANN, W.P. (1967) The Educational Innovators 1750-1880, Vol. 1, Macmillan.

STRAUSS, A. (1969) 'The Process of Field Work' in McCall & Simmons, op. cit.

STUBBS, M. (1986) 'Scratching the Surface: Linguistic Data in Educational Research' in Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (1986) Controversies in Classroom Research Open University Press.

STUBBS, M. & DELAMONT, S. (Eds.) (1976) Explanations in Classroom Observation, Wiley.

STUDY COMMISSION (1982) Values. The Changing Family.

SUDNOW, D. (1967) Passing on: The Social Organisation of Dying, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

SULLIVAN, M.A., QUEEN, S.A. & PATRICK, R.C. (1970) 'Participant Observation as Employed in the Study of a Military Training Establishment' in Filstead, W.J. (Ed.) (1970) Qualitative Methodology, Markham Publishing Company.

SURVEY OF HOUSING (1935-39).

TAYLOR, J. (1971) <u>Organising and Integrating the Infant Day,</u> Allen & Unwin.

TAYLOR, M.T. (1976) 'Teachers' Perceptions of Their Pupils', <u>Research in Education</u>, No. 16, November.

TAYLOR, P.H. (Ed.) (1975) 'Aims, Influence and Change in the Primary School Curriculum', <u>N,F,E,R,</u>

TAYLOR, P.H. et al. (Eds.) (1975) <u>Purpose, Power & Constraint in the Primary School Curriculum: Schools Council Research Studies Series,</u> Macmillan.

THOMAS, G. (1986) 'Hallo, Miss Scatterbrain, Hello Mr Strong': Assessing Attitudes and Behaviour in the Nursery' in Browne, N. & France, P. (Eds.) (1986) <u>Untying the Apron Strings,</u> Open University Press.

THOMPSON, J. (1977) 'Social Class Labelling in the Application of Bernstein's Theory of the Codes to the Identification of Linguistic Advantage & Disadvantage in Five Year Old Children', <u>Educational Review, Vol.</u> 29 (4).

THORNS, D.C. (Ed.) (1976) <u>New Directions in Sociology,</u> David & Charles.

TIRYAKIAN, E.A. (1979) 'Emile Durkheim' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (1979) <u>A History of Sociological Analysis,</u> London, Heinemann.

TOUGH, J. (1979) <u>Talk for Teaching and Learning,</u> London, Ward Lock Educational.

TOWNSEND, P. & BOSANQUET, N. (Eds.) (1972) <u>Labour and Inequality,</u> Fabian Society.
TRANTER, D. (1986) 'Changing Schools' in Hustler, D. et al. (Eds.) (1986) <u>op. cit.</u>

TRICE, H.M. (1970) 'The Outsiders' Role in Field Study' in Filstead, W. (1970).

TUNNELL, D. (1975) 'Open Education: An Expression in Search of a Definition' in Nyberg, D. (Ed.) (1978) <u>The Philosophy of Open Education,</u> R.K.P.

TURNER, D.A. (1970) '1870. The State of the Infant School System', <u>Brit. J. Ed. Studies,</u> Vol. XVII (2).

TURNER, G. (1983) <u>The Social World of the Comprehensive School,</u> London, Croom Helm.

VANDENBERG, D. (1975) 'Openess: The Pedagogic Atmosphere' in Nyberg, D. (Ed.) (1975) <u>The Philosophy of Open Education,</u> R.K.P.

VARADACHAR, B.D. (1979) 'Slums in Madras' in Srinivas, M.W., Shah, A.M. & Ramaswamy, E.A. (1979) The Field Worker and the Field, OUP.

VERMA, G.K. & BEARD, R.M. (1981) What is Educational Research?, Gower.

VIDICH, A.J. (1970) 'Participant Observation and the Collection and Interpretation of Data' in Filstead, W.J. (Ed.) (1970) Qualitative Methodology, Chicago, Markham Publishing Co.

VOGET, F.W. (1973) 'The History of Cultural Anthropology' in Honigmann, J.J. (Ed.) (1973) Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Rand, McNally & Company.

VULLIAMY, G. (1978) 'Culture Clash and School Music: a Sociological Analysis' in Barton, L. & Meighan, R. (1978). op. cit..

WADD, K. (1972) 'Classroom Power', Education for Teaching (89) Autumn.

WAGNER, H.R. (1970) Alfred Schutz on Phenomenology and Social Relations, University of Chicago Press.

-- ditto -- (1973) 'The Scope of Phenomenological Sociology: Considerations and Suggtestions', in Psathas, G. (Ed.) (1973) Phenomenological Sociology, John Wiley & Sons.

-- ditto -- (1983) Alfred Schutz: An Intellectual Biography, University of Chicago Press.

WALFORD, G. (1986) Life in Public Schools, Methuen.

WALFORD, G. (Ed.) (1987) Doing Sociology of Education, Falmer Press.

WALKER, R. (1972) 'The Sociology of Education and Life in School Classrooms', International Review of Education, XVIII.

WALKER, R. (1980) 'The Conduct of Educational Case Studies: ethics, theory & procedures' in Dockerell, W.B. & Hamilton, D. (Eds.) (1980) Re-thinking Educational Research, Hodder & Stoughton.

WALLACE, G.W. (1980) 'Architectural Constraints on Educational Aims and Organisations with Particular Reference to Middle Schools' in J. of Ed. Administration & History, Vo.. XII (2), July.

WALLER, W. (1932) The Sociology of Teaching, New York, Wiley.

WALSH, D. (1972) 'Sociology and the Social World' in Filmer, P. et al. (1972) New Directions in Sociological Theory, Collier-MacMillan.

WARD, C. (1978) The Child in the City, Architectural Press.

WARDLE, D. (1976) English Popular Education 1870-1975, CUP.

WATSON, (1978) 'Bob Doe Reports on the Association for the Study of the Curriculum Conference, Brighton', T.E.S.

WATSON, T.J. (1979) 'Sociology: an Introductory Orientation' in Schooling and Society, E202, Unit 1, Part 11, Open University Press.

WAX, R. (1971) Doing Fieldwork: Warnings & Advice, University of Chicago Press.

WEBB, L. (1969) Modern Practice in the Infant School, Blackwell.

WEBB, R. (1988) 'Outstation Teams: A Collaborative Approach to Research in Schools', Brit. Edu. Research J., Vol. 14 (1).

WEBER, L. (1971) The English Infant School and Informal Education, Prentice-Hall.

WEBER, M. (1964) The Theory of Social and Economic Organisations, Free Press.

WHITAKER, P. (1983) The Primary School, Heinemann.

WHITESIDE, T. (1978) The Sociology of Educational Innovation, Methuen.

WHITTY, G. (1974) 'Sociology and the Problem of Radical Educational Change' in Flude, M. & Ahier, I. (1984) Educability, Schools and Ideology, Croom Helm.

-- ditto -- (1977) 'Experiencing School Knowledge' in Woods, P. & Hammersley, M. (Eds.) (1977) School Experience, Croom Helm.

WHYTE, J. (1983) Beyond the Wendy House: sex role stereotyping in primary schools, Longman for Schools Council.

WILBY, P. (1979) 'Children Get Only 40 Minutes of Teachers' Time a Day', Spectrum, Sunday Times, 2.12.79,

-- ditto -- (1981) 'The Belfield Experiment' in Sunday

Times Weekly Review, 29.3.1981.

WILDERSPIN, S. (1840) The Infant System for Developing the Intellectual and Moral Power of all Children from 1-7 years of age, London.

WILES, M.J. (1978) 'Early Lessons Learned Too Well' in Adelman, C. (Ed.) (1978) Uttering and Muttering, Reading, Bulmershe College of Higher Education (mimeo).

WILKINS, N. (1976) 'The Concept of the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy', Sociology of Education, Vol. 49, April.

WILLIAMS, R. (1976) 'Symbolic Interactionism: The Fusion of Theory and Research' in Thorns, D.C. (1976) New Directions in Sociology, David & Charles.

WILLIAMSON, B. (1974) 'Continuities and Discontinuities in the Sociology of Education' in Flude, M. & Ahier, J. (1974) Educability, Schools and Ideology, Croom Helm.

WILLIS, P. (1977) Learning to Labour, Saxon House.

WILSON, M.J. (1979) 'Styles of Research in the Social Sciences. Part I: Styles of Research in Block I', 'Variety in Social Science Research' in Open University, Social Sciences: A Third Level Course: Research Methods in Education & The Social Sciences.

WINCH, P. (1958) The Idea of a Social Science, R.K.P.

WOLCOTT, H. (1975) 'Criteria for an Ethnographic Approach to Research in Schools', Human Organisation, Vol. 34, No. 2, Summer.

WOLFF, K.H. (1979) 'Phenomenology and Sociology' in Bottomore, T. & Nisbet, R. (1979) A History of Sociological Analysis, Heinemann.

WOODHAM-SMITH, P. et al. (1976) Friedrich Froebel & English Education, U.L.P.

WOODHEAD, M. (Ed.) (1976) An Experiment in Nursery Education, N.F.E.R. Publishing Company.

WOODS, P. (1977a) 'Teaching for Survival' in Woods, P. & Hammersley (1977) School Experience, London, Croom Helm.

-- ditto -- (1977b) 'Stages in Interpretive Research' in Research Intelligence, Vol. 3 (1).

-- ditto -- (1979) The Divided School, R.K.P.

-- ditto --   (1983) <u>Sociology</u> <u>&</u> <u>The</u> <u>School</u>, R.K.P.

-- ditto --   (1986) <u>Inside</u> <u>Schools:</u>   <u>Ethnography</u> <u>in</u>
      <u>Educational</u> <u>Research</u>, R.K.P.

WOODS, P. (Ed.) (1980) <u>Pupil</u> <u>Strategies</u>, Croom Helm.

WORSLEY, P. (Ed.) (1977) Introducing Sociology, Penguin
      Educational, 2nd Edition.

WRIGHT, N. (1971) <u>Progress</u> <u>in</u> <u>Education</u>, London, Croom
      Helm.

YARDLEY, A. (1974) <u>Structure</u> <u>in</u> <u>Early</u> <u>Learning</u>, Evans.

YOUNG, M.F.D. (1971) <u>Knowledge</u> <u>&</u> <u>Control</u>, London, Collier-
      Macmillan.

   -- ditto --   (1976 'On the Politics of School Knowledge'
      in   Beck, J., Jenks, C., Keddie, N. & Young,
      M.F.D. (Eds.) (1976)   <u>Worlds</u> <u>Apart</u>,   Collier-
      Macmillan.

ZELDIN, T. (1977) <u>France</u> <u>1848-1945.</u> <u>Vol.</u> <u>2.</u>   <u>Intellect,</u>
      <u>Taste</u> <u>&</u> <u>Anxiety</u>, Clarendon Press.