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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

It has been widely recognized that the bureaucratization of modern societies carries over into schools. This opens teachers' work to control by their employing bureaucracies. The above position stems from what radical economists and revisionist historians have seen as the centralization, bureaucratic control and organization of schools as a response to the forces of industrial capitalism of the latter nineteenth century (Levin, 1980; Katz, 1971). Common to this view is that schools are organized for predictable outcomes, be they cognitive or affective. As a result, schools have been standardized, and the instructional process and various teacher activities controlled by higher authorities. Thus, to say that teachers' work has become highly routinized and controlled, and that teachers are alienated from the kinds of activities that dominate their lives, for example, a "handed down" from above curriculum, would not be incorrect.

Bowles and Gintis (1976), Cohen and Lazerson (1972), Apple (1982a) and Braverman (1974) have argued that teachers' lives "correspond" to the factory work place. Here, predictable, measurable outcomes are part of the teachers' day. The formality of time, the handed down curriculum, duties within the school, formal and informal relations
with students, and administrators, represent a great part of the day of a teacher.

**Formal and Informal Realm**

For this study, a distinction will be made between the formal and informal realms of schooling. With regard to the former, the school is the zone of the formal. For example, it has its own structure. There is the school building, rules both students and teachers must abide by, an accepted pedagogic practice that teachers follow, and a staff hierarchy.

In opposition to the formal realm of schooling, lies the zone of the informal. It is, says Willis (1977), "where the incursive demands of the formal are denied—even if the price is the expression of opposition in style, micro interaction and non-public discourses." (p. 22) This informal realm of schooling can be viewed in Willis' (1977) terms as a "counter-school" culture which "has its own material base, its own infrastructure." (p. 23)

**Formal Routines**

One way of understanding the difference between the formal and informal realms is from the point of view of routines. Routines can be described as human behavior which is repeatedly engaged in. Thus, an ethnographer is able to look for the meaning behind the summation of these behaviors for an understanding of a situation. In effect then, routines are particular behaviors that are engaged in repeatedly.
In the formal realm, taking daily attendance, hall duty, engaging in recess duties and completing report cards for example, are part of the teachers' formal routines of schooling. These actions can be viewed as behaviors that are repeatedly engaged in.

**Informal Routines**

In the informal realm, any teacher action which does not comply with formal routines can be said to be oppositional. These informal, oppositional routines could also depict behavior as constantly and intentionally deviating from the formal routines of schooling. For example, an informal teacher routine such as purposefully not standing outside a class door at the delineated time could well be done in opposition to a particular authority, like the principal or vice-principal of a school. In this case, what is seen is a notion of resistance, where teachers take it upon themselves to consciously deviate from formal routine behavior to engage in informal routine behavior where administration authority and control is tested. Within this resistance to the formal routines lies the possibility for what Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) call "cultural expression" (p. 98), which is the ability to empower oneself by not only realizing tensions and conflicts, but acting on them as well.

**Official, Pragmatic and Cultural Routines**

Within the institution of schooling there are at least three levels of operations: the official, the pragmatic and the cultural. All three levels can be said to contain routine patterns.
Official Routines

In schools, Willis (1977) has observed, we can give an official account of the school's purpose, "where convergence, not divergence has been the main tendency" (p. 177). Certain teacher behavior is expected by school authorities and guidelines for this behavior are clearly stated in teacher handbooks, teacher contracts and a set curriculum. One would expect that as a result of following these official guidelines, teacher behaviors would become routine: like being in school "x" time every day or following the set curriculum because mandated content must be completed for the upcoming school year.

Pragmatic Routines

Routine teacher behavior, making up the oppositional, informal, counter-culture zone of schooling, can be said to operate within the pragmatic routines. Pragmatic routines can be described as instances in the school day where teachers may act in accordance with what is best for them in order to complete work. Thus, arriving late to class and/or team meetings or breaking policies and rules and using a particular talk code between teachers may be used simply as tools to help manage and control the school day. These could be said to be the informal, oppositional and pragmatic routines that a researcher could repeatedly observe and hear. This could also include what shall be termed "resistant strategies" aimed at undermining the power of school administrators.
Cultural Routines

Cultural routines arise out of the pragmatic daily activities in schools. A typical example can be seen in Anyon's (1980, 1981) research on working class culture. The repeated giving to students of low-level task activities by teachers promoted rote memorization in working class schools. Teachers who do this, even if for practical purposes, consciously or unconsciously, promote that culture not only for the students but for the benefit of society as well.⁶

In their teacher routines then, teachers who constantly turn away from the official routines of schooling for pragmatic purposes to manage their school day, help create an oppositional culture that runs counter to official or expected behavior. The role of teachers in the social order, I shall maintain, may thus be said to have certain cultural effects when this opposition thrives.

Harris (1982) and Willis (1977), among others, suggest that formal institutions like schools perform an extremely vital social function in disguising what, whose and how interests are being served.⁷ One thing is certain though. Contemporary critical theorists such as Giroux and Aronowitz (1985), Wexler (1981), Apple (1982a), Whitty (1985) and Woods (1986) are now searching for avenues other than in the formal realm of schooling in order to better understand the function of schools in the social order.

Lacey (1977) points out that the teacher role is one of isolation. There is also lack of formal structure for teacher-teacher communication. Thus, an informal network can develop among teachers, centering in the staff room, at social outings, in the hall of the
school building, at the back of the auditorium, or in the library. It is this informal network at the counter-culture level that this study attempts to portray. Additionally, this study will show how this counter-culture is part of the social order.

Moreover, the issue of the informal nature of teacher lives at the school site has not been explored in depth. The influence that it has may have repercussions pertaining to school board policy, and teacher rights.

Meaning Making

Berger and Luckmann's (1967) influential book, The Social Construction of Reality, is a portrayal of the reality of everyday life representing itself as an intersubjective world. This is a world shared with others—a world which is as real to others as it is to "myself". This reality is what Berger and Luckmann call the "natural attitude" or "common sense consciousness," referring to a world common to many people. This common sense knowledge is shared in the routines of everyday life. It represents not only official routines of teachers using a "handed down" curriculum, but also pragmatic routines which deviate from the "handed down" curriculum by way of a pragmatic adjustment. It is these latter routines that represent the informal activities of everyday living, the routines of teachers and the creation of meaning making in their lives. Hall (1973) talks about the informal routines as activities or mannerisms which we once learned, but which are so much a part of our everyday lives that they
are done automatically. These informal behaviors prompt people to act in certain ways, and thus are found in everything we do.\footnote{8}

**Ideology of the Informal**

In his acclaimed book, *Learning to Labor*, Paul Willis (1977) demonstrates that at least two cultures exist in schools: one of them represents the formal zone of schooling. Students of this culture are called "earoles." Willis talks about how these students "buy into" the formal system of schooling by readily giving their consent to handed down knowledge. In return, good behavior, obedience and general adherence routines of schooling, such as talk and dress code and the enjoyment of education for qualifications sake, are readily observed and obeyed.

The other culture represents students whom Willis calls the "lads." They are a group of teenagers who refuse to give their consent to formal components of school structure. They constantly defy these by not adhering to school rules and not showing respect for teachers. In short, they withdraw consent from the teaching/learning paradigm.\footnote{9} Willis labels this group a "counter-culture," for the contested terrain is on the one hand a battle of the formal versus the informal and on the other hand, a battle for the "lad's" legitimation of their group.

Willis (1977) elaborates on the nature of this type of contestation. It is, he says:

\begin{quote}
a mode of opposition in this society and it reserves itself as the exception to the rule. It is unaware of its own rules. The analysis of the
\end{quote}
world which actually directs its distinctively cultural responses remains silent. It is to this silence that ideology confidently strides. Whether right or wrong, whether penetrated or not, it is the rule, it is the voice. (p. 166)

Even though the formal routines of schooling such as the following of rules or behaving in a respectful way towards teacher authority are rejected, the "formal lingers on and opposition and alternative interpretation are reserved off into exceptions to the rule" (p. 167).

In large part, studies of the breaks of the formal as I have described, involving routines opposite to both formal and official aspects of schooling, have involved students. In order to provide the basis upon which one can make meaning of the breaches of formal and official routines of schooling, it is necessary to develop an explanation for and have an understanding of how teachers' lives are build around their very creation.10

Whereas Willis (1977) focuses on high school student behavior, this study looks at the routine behavior of middle school teachers. Special attention is paid to oppositional and resistant behaviors that become routines.11

The Informal in Teachers' Lives

Until recently, the issue of the "informal" and "pragmatic" in teacher's school lives has been subject to almost selective inattention. What has been studied about teachers remains problematic because of the inevitable limitations of any one investigation (Bruckerhoff, 1984; Youatt, 1983; Gitlin, 1980). The significance of the informal and pragmatic routines of teachers' lives in school is of
vast importance for understanding more of what occurs there. Interviewing, questioning, and probing into the nature of these routines opens up the subject and makes it visible for further studies.

The importance of this study is to first focus on the teachers' relationship to the official components of his/her day. Next I shall examine the informal and pragmatic nature of schooling which becomes actualized and routinized. Finally, I shall address the question: To what extent are these characteristics present in teachers' lives in schools? It is this question that is central to this study.

Supporting Questions for the Study

Certain questions revolving around themes developed in the educational literature about schools, and teachers' relationships to both the formal and informal components of a day must be answered. These questions concern the nature of resistance, accommodation, cultural reproduction and cultural production, and will be examined in this study for a more in depth understanding of the meaning of teacher informal pragmatic routines:

Does the teacher structure his/her day, both officially and pragmatically; i.e., relationship to time?

Do these relationships get twisted/broken so as teachers can manage and control their day in the school?

What do relationships to other people at work look like?

Are rules revised to suit teachers, making the school day more tolerable?
Are these factors important as they function together in the context of the day at school, in the context of the informal and pragmatic routines that have been described so far?

To what do teachers resist?

How do forms of teacher resistance manifest themselves?

What makes up the rationale behind teachers' actions in both the official and pragmatic domains of everyday routines?

What is teacher "class"?

How is teacher action perceived by officials like the principal or other administrators at school?

What is "reflection" for the teacher?

What is "emancipation" for the teacher?

By answering the above questions, a clearer understanding of the functions of teacher routines as a part of the teachers' role in the social order will be observed.

**Conceptual Frameworks**

In order to arrive at an understanding of how the informal routines arise and operate, it is necessary to look at particular conceptual frameworks that allow for the delineation of the informal nature of teachers' lives.

An ethnomethodological approach is used to understand how informal pragmatic routines were accomplished. A symbolic interactionist approach adds new dimensions to interpreting these routines. These approaches complimented each other and helped in the gathering of data.
Ethnomethodology

Important to the conceptual framework is how members of a group construct social reality. Ethnomethodologists study this construction, or what is referred to as the common sense world of objects and events, common sense knowledge, or the stock of knowledge at hand, the natural attitude of everyday life and the practices of common sense reasoning.

Ethnomethodologists garner meaning by viewing the stock of knowledge at hand, e.g. social types, maxims, rules of thumb. Teachers, for example, may make typifications of their students—mature, immature, independent and so on. Ethnomethodologists purport to study practical reasoning behind what teachers typify as mature or immature. The natural attitude then defines how teachers structure their own world, and how facticities (a factually determined world) are part of the natural attitude. Ultimately, the intersubjective world, or a world common to us all, which possesses or encompasses the stock of knowledge at hand and the natural attitude of everyday reasoning is of concern to ethnomethodologists.  

These methods of reasoning could be used by individuals, or by a group of individuals that would sustain the sense of social reality as a factual environment. Thus, the reasoning by members who use interpretative procedures to recognize the relevance of certain rules forms the rationality of meaning, and understanding of social reality. These interpretative procedures are understood by the group and are intersubjective.
Fundamental to the work of ethnomethodologists are people's accounts that order or structure their lives. The practical forms of reasoning that structure the lives of an individual group can be seen through the account. Also of interest to ethnomethodologists, is how the world of the particular or indexical relates to the general or universal norms. For example, learning how particular accounts, instances or actions relate to other accounts, instances or actions becomes a pervasive part of ethnomethodologists' method of acquiring knowledge about subjects under study.\textsuperscript{14}

Of major importance to ethnomethodologists is the notion of reflexivity. Reflexivity accents whether the verbal or behavioral aspects of a setting reveal features of that setting. The relationship between the verbal, the behavioral and the setting begin to make sense when they mutually elaborate each other—when they reflect on each other.

The Documentary Method of Interpretation used in the structure of daily lives is the notion that parts make a whole. In other words, members act, behave or talk in certain ways in a particular setting that will reflect on each other. This will allow for a documentary method of interpretation where, by viewing the indexical/particular and seeing how it reflexively involves the setting it will be possible to arrive at subsequent explanation and understanding of action.

One of the major strengths of this approach is that it looks at taken for granted action as part of the member's sense of social structure. Social conduct from the perspective of the actor is understood. This is another major strength.
This approach has been castigated for ignoring the relationships between individuals, members and larger social units. Taken for granted assumptions are not viewed in the larger social order. While ideological considerations are implied, they are not dealt with in the depth that would make meaning richer.

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic Interactionism has its roots in George Herbert Mead, Herbert G. Blumer and Manford H. Kuhn. Symbolic Interactionists view social reality as a complex network of interacting persons symbolically interpreting their actions in the social world.

An underlying rule of the symbolic interactionists is that human beings act towards persons or objects on the basis of the meanings that they have for them. The meanings are a product of social interaction. They are modified and interpreted by each person in dealing with what is encountered. The above suggests the shared view that persons construct their realities through interaction with others. Also, self perceptions are mediated by how and what actors think others see and feel about them.

In Goffman's (1959) noted work, Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, he talks about the Dramaturgical Approach as a symbolic interactionist concern of the human situation:

Shared staging problems concern for the way things appear; warranted and unwarranted feelings of shame; ambivalence of oneself and one's audience: these are some of the dramaturgic elements of the human situation. (p. 237)
Goffman's descriptions of the actor's self in interaction with others shows the precariousness of social relations and social reality (as can be viewed by ethnomethodologists as well).  

A major strength of the symbolic interactionist approach is the importance of meaning the actor places on objects. This may allow for an interpretation of phenomena on the part of the researcher.

Major criticisms are that this interactionist perspective is obsessed with meaning, and in the process forgets social structure and social change. Critics view symbolic interactionism as in danger of fetishizing daily activities and over-emphasizing the episodic event.

It was my intention to take both the strengths and weaknesses of each conceptual framework into consideration for this study. To use the strengths and make strengths out of weaknesses helped the researcher arrive at a richer interpretation of the data.

Limitations of the Study

Guba and Lincoln (1981) speak to the necessity and difficulty of the boundaries of a study. These boundaries are limitations of the study. This study involves the broad area of teachers and the informal network of their lives. It takes for granted as Hall (1973) so often points to, the realm of the informal that guides actions. It is this informal realm in which the bending of official routines (pragmatic routines) are embedded that this study portrays and explicates. It also strives to understand possible reasons why
teachers use the mechanisms they do to live in the informal realm created by those breaks.

The conceptual frameworks delineated above are used to gather information for subsequent interpretation. They are however limited in the information which can be provided through them. For instance, one can look for routines of a teacher, but because of the inevitable limitation of the researcher as the only instrument, I could not be in all places at all times to observe all routines. It provides a way of looking at the data, but certainly not the only way.

Other limitations lie in the methodology. Interviews and only my two eyes were relied on for information. There are no videotapes to depict physical action and words at one time. Due to the nature of the study, to set up a videotape in the teachers' room or the hallway where a lot of talk was done, would have been intruding on the privacy of teachers. While this remains a limitation, one asks: would the teachers have been as open as they were with a video at the back or front of them?

Outside constraints acted as limitations. The limited time spent at the research site was one of them. Access to certain areas and not others was another. This raises an issue concerned with the morality of access to areas other than the school building. This will be dealt with in the methodology chapter.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore schools as environments for teacher resistance to the formal and official routines of
schooling. It is hoped that emerging themes and results will direct further research on teacher actions in their daily lives and suggest how school settings can be changed to further teacher growth and an understanding for the need of teacher solidarity that would foster this growth.

The notion of solidarity can be conceived as two-pronged. Solidarity could mean group and/or academic/professional support. Ultimately, an understanding of the role of the teacher in the social order would be the goal of this dissertation. For this study, the nature of both types of solidarity will be intertwined. Finally, I would hope to offer some insights that could be useful in assessing proposed approaches to teacher solidarity that would foster a better understanding of the social order, which in turn would lead to professional development/growth in school settings.
Footnotes


2 Willis, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

3 Ethnomethodologists would be able to view routines and see what they reflexively meant. In other words, applying routines reflexively to a situation will eventuate in the formation of meaning-making and thus an understanding of reality of what an event and what is said about an event means to a subject. For a discussion on reflexivity, refer to Kenneth Leiter (1980), *A Primer on Ethnomethodology*. (New York: Oxford University Press), pp. 106-157.


5 Willis, op. cit., pp. 176-177.

6 One could argue that teachers' work promotes such activities and inadvertently provides a social function in disguising those interests are being served.

7 Same notions as above (as in footnote 6).

8 One should not dismiss Berger and Luckmann's and Hall's theses as capable of not representing what the break of the formal and official aspects of schooling will stand for—as part of everyday living.

9 To understand the network of informal behavior would be to view ideology in action. This is basic to a withdrawal of consent by students to teachers. See Willis (1977), op. cit., p. 64.

10 Again, ideology could be built around the creation of an informal teacher network.

11 This study also takes note of the norms and rules that guide and create routine-like behavior, something that is certainly implied by Willis (1977), but not stated directly.

12 For a more in depth discussion, see Kenneth Leiter (1980), op. cit., pp. 7-11.

13 An example would be the acceptance by a group of students of the informal rules of seating arrangements, or certain other behaviors that would typify the reality of their existence. They may sit in certain seats because that is the way the world is structured and meaningful for them.
It is the interaction of members of a group that define the indexical and universal and/or intersubjective understanding or meaning making about the social world.

For a more detailed discussion on weaknesses of this approach, please see Bernard N. Meltzer, John W. Petras and Larry T. Reynolds (1975), Symbolic Interactionism: Genesis, Varieties and Criticism. (Boston, London and Henly: Routledge & Kegan Paul), pp. 80-81.


CHAPTER 2
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature dealing with teachers provides much information about their role in the social order. In large part, the recent literature is directly or indirectly connected to critical theory in education.

The literature divides itself up into: 1) earlier empirical works such as Waller (1932), Jackson (1968), Dreeban (1968, 1973), and Lortie (1975); 2) recent empirical works such as Boulough, Gitlin and Goldstein (1984), Gitlin (1980, 1984), Willis (1977), Anyon (1980, 1981), A. Hargreaves (1984), D. Hargreaves (1980), Woods (1979, 1986), Denscombe (1984); and 3) theoretical works by authors who deal not only with empirical findings of their own or others, but who undertake theoretical formulations of education in the wider social context.

1971), educators now pose the question: What does this new sociology of education mean to the education community both in and out of the schools and the universities?

The works cited above, among others, deal with what I shall term "opposites" in education. These opposites include: 1) Old versus New Sociology of Education, 2) Interactionism and Neo-Marxism, 3) Cultural and Economic Reproduction versus Cultural Production, 4) Hegemony versus Counter Hegemony through "Resistance", 5) Deskilling versus Reskilling teachers, and 6) a look at the past versus a look to the future.

An examination of such opposites will center the role of the teacher in the social order. It will also serve to bring together findings from various literature which yields a portrait of teacher influence and the conditions by which they are influenced in school settings.

The Old Sociology of Education

There are distinct differences between the old sociology of education and the new sociology of education. The former is described by King (1983) as a "social system containing a plurality of individuals interacting with one another." (p. 18) King depicts Parson's system as "the association of the structure of social relationships with the functions or outcomes of those relationships as related." (p. 18) This can otherwise be termed a structural-functional view of schooling, where the structural forms and functions of individuals fit neatly together.
A basic assumption in the structural-functional view is that a similarity exists between the educational system—the individual classroom and pupil and teacher—where each person's and/or institution's goals and/or attainments are internally integrated to produce a picture of harmony. Such views are input-output factors (Woods, 1979). Here, the relationships of certain variables, say, social class and educational achievement, are integrally related.

Importantly, sociologists note (Reid, 1983) that this structural-functional perspective tempted sociologists interested in studying the macro nature of the relationships between education and the social structure to search for explanations as to how the school operated within the social order. Quantitative methods are used to collect, record and report data on the school and its relationship to society. Thus, both theoretically and methodologically, structural-functionalism had a positivistic, quantitative, causal, behavioral and predictable bent.

The new sociologists of education asked different questions, and in the process, the limitations of the older methods were questioned. They asked: How was knowledge attained? How was meaning constructed? What was the role of ideology? The old sociology of education was one way of viewing the school in the social context. The new sociology of education would provide new lenses for reviewing this age-old issue.
The New Sociology of Education

Young's (1971) seminal work, *Knowledge and Control*, paved the way for areas in the sociology of education to depart from the view that the structural-functional perspective of schooling was the only approach to attaining knowledge about schools. Developments in the sociology of education associated with Young's work provided questions of teacher knowledge as part of general educational knowledge, as well as sociological knowledge. In consequence, authors such as Reid (1978), Banks (1976), Cole (1984), West (1984), Bernbaum (1977), Young and Whitty (1977) and others, attempted to explain how the new sociology of education differs from the structural-functional perspective.

This new sociology of education can be viewed as interpretative, where a marxian, or a phenomenological approach (ethnomethodological, symbolic interactionist) gives new meanings to the function of school. The structural-functional approach accepted the relationships among education, the economy, and society as given, within which the function of school is as Bernbaum (1977) states, to maintain conditions for "social integration based on consensus, where individuals behave in ways appropriate to maintain the society in a state of equilibrium." (p. 18) The new sociology of education, however, made sociological analyses of the everyday world of actors within schools, be they teachers, pupils or administrators. In this approach, symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodological orientations came to the foreground. Many empirical studies using these conceptual
frameworks were ethnographic, and concentrated on actors' meanings of their life world.

Critics of these orientations have argued that the knowledge gained from the above approaches is limited. Knowledge could be widened through considering broader perspectives in the new sociology of education. One way of attaining added knowledge about people in their world was to explore areas of analyses in the new sociology of education that dealt with a neo-Marxist and an interactionist perspective.

**Interactionism and Neo-Marxism**

**Interactionism**

The 1970's were the first years in which researchers that dealt with sociological interpretations of schools in the forms of ethnography, with ethnomethodology and symbolic interactionism as the main constructs. One of the basic arguments cited against these researchers (Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds, 1975) is that they were largely unconnected with social structure and were content to pay attention only to microscopic aspects of the social order instead of also looking at their results from a macro perspective. Wood's (1979) study as well as Whitty's (1985) *Sociology of School Knowledge* suggest that interactionism is one of the leading approaches to the discipline of sociology. It argues that the sociologist should study the intent of actors and their construction of meaning. In other words, the actor's subjective self or "I" should be investigated and compared
with the knowledge of the "me"—the more objective part of the self as perceived by others.

Interactionism is the viewing of behavior from an intentional angle as well as seeing behavior seen as a social product. Woods (1979) calls for interactionists not only to view studies microscopically, but, while learning about the strategies of subjects under study, one should also learn how informal rules are used in negotiation by actors for their role/meaning making in the wider society. In this study, these informal rules play a part in how teachers act towards administrators in the school building, and how work tasks by teachers and administrators are implemented.

Looking at teacher work microscopically then, provides a useful tool to viewing teachers' work as related to the social order. It is here that the neo-marxist orientation comes into play, and provides a formulation on which this study builds.

**Neo-Marxism**

Falling into the neo-marxist camp are authors who deal with such concepts as "Economic and Cultural Reproduction," "Cultural Production," "Hegemony," and "Counter Hegemony." While the orientation espoused by such writers as Bowles and Gintis (1976), for instance, deals with schools through a correspondence principle—the school and the workplace—other authors, such as Willis (1977), deal with school as sites of human agency: cultural production.

What is clear, is that there are varying neo-marxist approaches to schooling. All, however, share one common element. In the Marxian
formulation of the capitalist state, the notion that the state serves people for the common good is negated. Rather, the state serves dominant groups of the ruling class which is the political expression of that class. Because of this, there always exists conflict and struggle (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, Carnoy, 1982), where an educational hierarchy of control and authority in which competition rather than cooperation governs the relationships of actors in the social world.

Neo-marxism in education then, took its roots in Bowles and Gintis' (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*. In an effort to respond to this seminal work in education, the authors previously cited, Willis (1977), Anyon (1980, 1981), Giroux (1981, 1983, 1986), and Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) took issue with the economic determinism Bowles and Gintis (1976) offered. Basically, certain distinctions were made: cultural and economic reproduction versus cultural production and hegemony versus counter hegemony through resistance. In order to present the continuing development of the new sociology of education these distinctions will be examined.

**Cultural and Economic Reproduction Versus Cultural Production**

Cultural and economic reproduction in education suggests the perpetuation of certain knowledge, skills, values and attitudes in schools. Proponents of this view such as Althusser (1971) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) see schooling as primarily reproducing the social division of labor (Apple, 1982a). Schools in this view are strongly determined by outside ideological and economic forces. Actors simply accommodate themselves to the determined forces. "His
majesty the economy" (Willis, 1983) is used as the determining base to explain how social relations exist and perpetuate themselves unflaggingly in the school settings. Power, it seems, is with the state's control of schools, and promotes a willingness to accept the symbols of cultural and economic reproduction, i.e. language, rules, norms, one's position in the division of social relations as natural, normal and unquestioned.

Teachers who are bound to an ideology of cultural and economic reproduction are passive bearers of this particular ideology to their students. As a result, certain types of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that simply reproduce the class division and inequality are passed on to students through curriculum choice and values emphasized. On the whole, teachers are mostly unaware of these consequences. Schooling then, is viewed as the key agency in the reproduction that defines sex roles, social roles, work, marriage, age and gender stereotyping (Walker and Barton, 1983).

Cultural Production

A major attack on reproductive theorists comes from writers such as Willis (1977, 1983), Giroux (1981, 1983, 1985), and Wexler (1981, 1982b). Their underlying assumption is that schooling does not only reproduce certain knowledge, skills, values and attitudes, but also serves as a cultural site for social transformative action (cultural production) in terms of resistance to structural components of school and society. Here, alternative knowledge is created not by passive bearers of the ideology, as suggested by reproductive theorists, but
rather, by students or teachers who actively appropriate and who collectively produce alternative meanings and cultural forms, which are not already determined, but are instead determining and vital political, and theoretical transformative tools.

However, a discussion of the distinction between cultural reproduction and cultural production would not be entirely clear without also describing the distinction between "hegemony" and "counter hegemony."

**Hegemony**

Raymond Williams (1976) discusses the concept of Hegemony as derived from the work of an Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci:

It is Gramsci's great contribution to have emphasized hegemony . . . For hegemony supposes the existence of something which is truly total, which is not merely secondary or superstructural, like the weak sense of ideology, but which is lived at such a depth, which saturates the society to such an extent, and which, as Gramsci puts it, even constitutes the limit of common sense for most people under its sway, that it corresponds to the reality of social experience very much more clearly than any notions derived from the formula of base and superstructure. For if ideology were merely some abstract imposed notion, if our social and political and cultural ideas and assumptions and habits were merely the result of specific manipulations, of a kind of overt training which might be simply ended or withdrawn, then the society would be very much easier to move and to change than in practice it has been or is. This notion of Hegemony as deeply saturating the consciousness of a society seems to be fundamental . . . it emphasizes the facts of domination.

(pp. 204-205)

The crucial idea in this passage is how hegemony acts to saturate our consciousness. Hegemony refers to the body of practices, energy,
lived experiences or common sense interpretations which become our unquestioning world. Hegemony, then, clearly refers to an organized assemblage of meanings, wherein the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and action are lived.

These lived actions which contain meanings and values, constitute the limits of common sense knowledge. They are part of our consciousness. This common sense is shared meaning, perpetuated in social practice through images and ideas embedded in everyday life. Common examples of shared meanings can be viewed through media coverage, and in areas of aesthetics, such as in art, music, painting, theatre and movies. Importantly, it is not one group that deliberately exerts control over other groups. What results is a kind of ideational control that is not the result of conflict or overt manipulation. Rather, social cohesion is an outcome of hegemony in the generalized adoption of ideas, values, images, and feeling structures by a social collectivity.

It is this power of "hegemony" that promotes social control and continuity. Patently, researchers such as Willis (1977), Anyon (1980, 1981) and Gitlin (1980) have explained how processes of hegemonic control over people's ideas, images and forms of consciousness result from a prolonged and continuing struggle.


**Counter Hegemony (Resistance)**

Two issues must be made clear here. First, counter hegemony can be viewed as a form of hegemonic resistance or cultural production. It is a process of meaning making and/or alternative knowledge, the activity, creativity and hope of a possible way out of the determined reproductive aspects of knowledge previously discussed. Second, with the above in mind, counter hegemony can also be ironically viewed as another way of incorporating resistant groups, such as those represented by the "lads" into the reproductive relations already delineated. Put differently, resistant acts are needed and must be incorporated in social relations for reproduction to be accomplished. This double view of counter hegemonic/resistant acts has provided sociologists of education with quite a dilemma. How does one view teachers? Are they passive bearers of the ideology, resisters to structural and hegemonic constraints, both resisters and accommodations, or just one or the other? What are the functions of
teachers in the wider social context? Are they simply pawns in a game manipulated by the state department? That is, are they totally deskilled or are they what I shall term reskilled, political messengers of sorts or productive links to social transformative activities? At this point I would like to respond to these questions by referring to the literature on the deskilling of teachers as a form of hegemony and/or domination, and compare this notion with teacher reskilling, meaning making or alternative ideology, falling under the guise of counter-hegemony.

**Deskilling Teachers**

Empirical studies such as those of Bullough, Gitlin and Goldstein (1984) show through detailed description, how teacher work is reduced to its technical aspects, as in the application of rules, and the exclusion of teachers from curriculum decision-making. Apple and Teitlebaum (1986) also note that teacher tasks are broken down atomistically. Here, teachers lose control over their own labor, therefore allowing outside forces to control teachers' work. Thus, a deskilling of teachers occurs as teachers lose hold of their time, space and forms of knowledge. By making teachers accountable, and by promoting competency based education, systems management and mandating the curriculum as a form of social control, teachers march to the tune of the state (Apple and Weiss, 1983). These types of constructions work to deskill teachers by not allowing them to see a sense of their own self and work identity. This ultimately underpins meanings and
interpretations attributed to their work problems in an educational setting.

Other forms of deskilling are alluded to by Hargreaves' (1984) notion of "zones of control" (p. 252), where teacher and administrative tasks are clearly defined. Harris' (1982) notion of the proletarianization of teachers is also of importance here. Teachers' jobs are defined as salaried, activities are shared, their clientele cannot be selected and there is extremely little occupational independence; the curriculum is packaged and there is little to no control over the labor process. This adds up to teachers as being not only deskilled, but oppressed and not autonomous.

Finally, Roy (1983) notes that teachers are subordinated to the political will of the state, where the individual teacher counts for less and less as the school is seen in the wider social, economic and political context.

Patently the new sociology of education is pessimistic. There seems to be no movement for teachers in the realm of increasing their awareness of domination and exploitation, let alone taking action into their own hands to solve these dilemmas.

I would, however, like to take a more optimistic view about teachers' lives in schools than that which appears to be surfacing through the literature. That is, while it is true that teachers are deskilled, there is a certain amount of optimism in the fact that teachers can be bearers of cultural power. I shall capture this idea as the reskilling of teachers.
Reskilling Teachers

An underlying assumption (Jackson, 1968) is that teachers are bound to busy, mundane, bureaucratic, instrumentally rational and miserable existences. Bullough and Gitlin's (1985) idiomatic notion of teachers as the "public servant" who seek fulfillment of others' interests instead of their own, typifies this situation. However, what Bullough and Gitlin's study does not suggest is that cultural limits are not impenetrable. This in turn may lead to alternative teacher roles and relationships. It is as if Willis' (1983) words about cultural production and its relationship to the "lads" echo in the background:

Cultural production is the active principle of the cultural level and stresses the notion of social agents at their furthest from being passive hearers and transmitters of structure and ideology. They are seen instead, as active appropriators who produce meanings and cultural forms by the transformation of materials into products... Cultural production is the process of the collective, creative use of discourses, meanings, materials, practices and group processes to explore, understand and creatively occupy particular positions, relations and sets of material possibilities. (p. 114)

These cultural productive links allude to the notions elaborated on by Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) as "empowerment." To possess power according to Aronowitz and Giroux would be for teachers to understand concrete sets of practices that produce different social/cultural formations through different experiences. The implication here is that a reskilling of teachers at the social site of the educational institution would involve not only the understanding of the role of the school in the social order, but the empowerment that would suggest
counter-hegemonic probabilities with the teachers countering/combating contradictions at the school site (Harris, 1982; Simon, 1983). This would include not only teaching for survival as Woods (1984) expands on, as in class commands and handing out punishments, or teaching for rewards (Lortie, 1984), but looking to pass the day in different forms than the above, one that would suggest notions of empowerment.

A reskilling of teachers would first entail an understanding that their role is ill-defined (Musgrove and Taylor, 1969). There are always forms of accommodation and resistance in teacher lives, and to accept one's stereotypical maleness or femaleness for instance, as viewed by others (Apple, 1983b) and by oneself, is to simply reinstitute divisions of labor that could lead to domination. A successful reskilling of oneself is to resist typified qualities, such as what an occupational culture of teachers is, as defined by Hargreaves (1980). A reskilling of teachers would ultimately involve transformative thought, subsequent action, and cultural productive activities that create the possibility of change at the practical and policy level. This is a form of empowerment.

It is now that I want to pose the same question that Wexler (1985) did in a recent article. Education, he says:

is ordinarily limited to the stereotyped reproduction/resistance pair. It does not explain what the analysis of culture could mean from radical political practice, beyond the glorification of traditional organistic cultures. Like the right wing reaction that it opposes, it looks historically backward. What then are the present historical directions and possibilities for a radical social theory of education? (p. 220)
It is at this point that one may ask: What directions are teachers facing today? What more besides resistant/accommodative aspects can one look forward to that would be counter-hegemonic in practice, creative, productive, emancipatory (Wexler, 1985), self reflective and moral (Beyer and Wood, 1986)? The last section of the literature review will look at where the sociology of education field is today, and where it is heading in the future.

A Look at the Past versus a Look to the Future

The above review reveals different trends in how schooling is viewed. We have seen that the earlier "old sociology of education" literature has dealt with questions of structure, whereas the present "new sociology of education" literature deals more with questions of meaning and interpretation. A look to the future would be assisted by asking questions that seek for directions to aid teachers in their school site struggles. An attack on Willis by West (1984) suggests that research should not be purely interactionist, or only a separate ethnographic section with an abstract Neo-Marxist analysis. It should entail a personal account, not given by Willis (1977), of one's expectations prior to the study, or a finer methodological account of how one arrives at particular findings (Walker, 1985). Also not considered in schooling studies in general is the relationship of research to policy level decisions. Do researchers in the areas of critical theory have public level policy in mind or only research that is neo-marxist oriented? In other words, how would Willis' (1977) description of partial/full penetrations, limitations, divisions and
confirmations relate to public policy decided at the state or school board level? A look to the future would not be a purely Willis-like pessimistic non-exploratory possibility to leftist intervention (Whitty, 1981), but a combination of interactionist and analytical accounts that take the school to be a political site, where counter-hegemonic struggles take form appropriate to the specific historical context in which they take place.

A look to the future would also suggest that individual teachers take account of collective symbolic relations at the individual level that would partially allow for what Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) call the "transformative intellectual and critical agency and empowerment." (pp. 36-37) Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) suggest that the pedagogy of future teachers must involve a training and involvement in cultural politics. This would lead to an understanding and appreciation of subjectivities, lived experiences, i.e. accommodation/resistance acts.

Other authors such as Whitty (1985, 1986) strongly suggest an involvement in the politics of education gearing interests to the state departments of education. Whitty (1985) especially, suggests the need to reaccess theoretical works and place them within a political project that would allow for wider possibilities of intervention than those now elaborated by neo-marxist theorists. A look to the future then, would also suggest roots of a counter-hegemonic struggle which lead to political action. Here, new territories can be explored to act out these counter-hegemonic forces. The task, says Wexler (1981), is to:
cease congratulating ourselves upon having replaced a passive concept of school socialization with an active, interactionist, "constructionist" one. Perhaps we now begin to think of how an interactive pedagogy can be consciously directed toward accomplishing the sequence of pedagogical events necessary to reach social goals. Without articulating goals, cultural mobilization in society and in school will occur for the realization of ideals other than our own. Preoccupations with cultural reproduction may distract us from pedagogic work . . . deschooling is necessary . . . the processes by which the social educational function is historically reorganized, rather than continued and reproduced . . . political reassessment encourages a re-appreciation of the social importance of knowledge, the defense of autonomous knowledge . . . for critical understanding . . . as a moment in social transformation. Taking knowledge seriously as a text, and as a social practice, replaces its social revitalization. (pp. 162, 163)

With the above in mind, a researcher in the new sociology of education should be asking a particular question. What can one possibly do to further knowledge about educational theory and practice given the pessimistic outlook/dimly lit picture that is presented by a look at the future?

Directions for this Study

Literature on teacher resistance/accommodation in educational fields is sparse. Empirical studies of the same nature have been few. One way of conducting this research is to explore the topic of the role of the teacher in the social order by piecing relevant ideas together from the literature. This study purports to do the above and more, thus exposing inevitable gaps and imbalances that appear in the literature. This study also attempts to sustain attention to
questions that have only been treated indirectly and fragmentedly by current theorists in the existing body of literature.

Following Willis' (1977) lead, this study employs a case study of four teachers. The main aim is to provide the sort of richness and immediacy that other studies on teachers in education and in this particular literature generally lack. This study will not simply be only interactionist or only analytical, but will endeavor to combine the two. While this study intends to complement the existing literature by bringing sociological perspectives to it, i.e. accommodative and resistant tasks as modes of analysis, descriptive and interpretive procedures are used to explore how one might view this study as an addition to the sparse body on teacher activity/functions/role in the social order.
Footnotes

1 Notes given in the College of Education, Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, course no. 862, The Role of the School in the Social Order, Instructor, Professor Richard Pratte, aids this discussion.

2 The concept of deskilling has to do with teachers executing someone else's goals and plans. In industry this can be referred to as the separation of conception from execution. In schooling, this appears as well. Teachers are taught the skills to teach. They are reskilled to execute tasks, assignments, the curriculum, etc. Ironically this works in ways to deskill teachers, as they are not the conceivers of plans over their own work. That is, they do not determine curricular goals or establish content. They are deskilled from conception. For more on the notion of deskilling see Andrew Gitlin, "School structure and teachers' work," in Michael W. Apple and Lois Weis (1983) (eds.), Ideology and Practice in Schooling. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press) pp. 193-212; Michael W. Apple, "Curriculum in the Year 2000: Tensions and Possibilities," in Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1983, pp. 321-326; and Henry Braverman (1974), Labor and Monopoly Capital. (New York: Monthly Review Press). The concept of reskilling has been otherwise used as an opposite to deskilling. For this study, the notion of reskilling has to do with empowerment, through the testing of certain relationships in the school. This leads to an understanding of teachers as part of a culturally productive group. This will be elaborated on in far greater detail in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

To recapitulate, the focus of this study is to look at teacher formal, official, informal and pragmatic routines in the school setting. Major phenomena of interest to me are "items" (Gearing & Paul, 1982) like the use of time, space, teacher relations to each other, to authorities, to school board policy, the curriculum and designated teacher duties.¹ This involved the researcher's looking for official routines of schooling as well as the informal and pragmatic routine network of action that Hall (1973) talks about as guiding the major phenomena.²

As such, the study is comparable in its intention to those of Willis (1977) and Bruckerhoff (1984)—an exploration into the breach of the formal realm of schooling and the eventual establishment of a culture group that defies this formal structure of the school.³ Like those works, this study is sociological, with the micro-sociological qualitative and conceptual frameworks of ethnomethodology and symbolic interactionism being used to answer the main research question and sub-questions.

This study is concerned with certain concepts used by Willis (1977): culture, counter-culture, consent, the withdrawal of consent,
dislocation, confirmation, partial and full penetration, decentering and opposition to authority. The use of these concepts helped reach an understanding of how teachers organize their day at school. Identification and description of such a study required a methodology that was flexible and which was capable of eliciting teacher perceptions on the contexts of their daily lives. Participant observation, intensive interviewing and document collection were determined to be the most suitable avenues for attaining information about teachers' lives. This allowed for an understanding of teacher action and an eventual interpretation of action as part of the context of the school setting.

The school was considered to be a unit of analysis. As such, this study concerns itself with the influence that the immediate school's setting had on teachers' experiences. Ideally, studies of the problems that I attempted to explore which involved the informal and pragmatic nature of teachers at the school site, would require greater investigation by other researchers. Since I am only a single researcher, constrained by the limitations of time, only a single case study involving four teachers was attempted.

Background to the Study

In the academic year 1984/1985, I worked as an Instructor for a Professional Introduction to Education Program (P.I.E.). The P.I.E. program is designed to be a teacher education program. One of the duties as an instructor in this program was to take students to a school site to observe teachers in action. As an instructor, my
obligations were to debrief students about their experiences. Questions pertaining to teacher style, lesson planning, the characteristics of the principal as leader, teacher traits, discipline problems, teacher talk in the lounge, social conditions both inside and outside the school, students' attitudes, levels of academic achievement by students within that school, etc., were discussed in some depth.

I attended this school—Hillview Middle School, during the P.I.E. year, for a period of three quarters, being present at the school for three hours twice a week for four weeks of the quarter for each quarter of the academic year. The area in which Hillview is located can be described as working class. Having read extensively in the literature about working class schools, and student relationships inside and outside of these schools, I decided that this school served my purposes.

I was lucky enough to have spent enough time out at this school before a decision was made for the research site. The exposure to readily given comments by my students, about teachers, students and administrators in the building, indicated to me that this school would be an appropriate place for research purposes.

Setting

The interest in the nature of sociological analysis portrayed by Willis (1977) prompted me to explore the nature of teachers' lives within a similar framework. Thus, the Hillview Middle School was chosen. The decision why this particular school was chosen was
determined by my favorable experiences at the school prior to the initial research period.

For the purpose of this study on teachers, of interest was the relationship of teacher actions that were directed because of the nature of the school, the students who attended it and the administration leadership. The school is one of the largest middle schools in the city. It has a variety of ethnic groups and a large teaching staff.

Entry

Having had a year's experience in the school, entry was not problematical. During the year before my initial research, I developed a good rapport with the "gate-keepers" in the school. Permission to conduct research was granted by the principal, and the eighth grade teachers were aware that I would be at the school for this purpose.

Having talked informally with the principal and staff about conducting my research within the school, their replies were positive. The only requirements placed on me were to describe the study for the consideration by the principal and the staff, and to answer any questions or concerns that the staff might have.

Design

The design of this study called for three phases. The principal as one "key informant" helped me in the first phase of the design. In our initial meeting to discuss the possibility of conducting
research at Hillview, he mentioned that there were problems with eighth grade teachers in general: that they "resisted" his authority. I decided to choose six eighth grade teachers whom I perceived to have different styles of teaching, and different attitudes to students, etc., as gained by my one year experience at the school. This helped me decide who I would ask to be involved in the research.

Initially, I observed each of the six teachers for three days—getting to know their habits in and out of class, their ideas, thoughts and perceptions on various issues at the school. I tried following teachers wherever they went. Discretion was used, as it was impossible to fully intrude on teachers' lives by following them everywhere. I also realized that certain places where the teachers went were not accessible to me.

The next phase of the study consisted of choosing four of the original six teachers for in depth observations. These four teachers were chosen according to my perception of 1) how these teachers were viewed in relation to the research questions I was generating at the time of inquiry, and 2) the key informant's relationship with these teachers. Each teacher chosen was subjected to two weeks of intensive observations, 7:30 a.m. until 11:20 a.m. every day. An interview followed that period of observation. During those two weeks, continued teacher talk was tape recorded in the teachers' lounge.

The third phase of the study involved member checks, peer debriefing and triangulation methods to determine if observations made were accurate, and to further establish a relationship of trust.
between myself and the teachers under observation. Teachers were constantly asked throughout the observation period if my observations were on target. The informal interaction between myself and the subjects was of vital importance in attaining information about the research site and became an adjunct to this third phase. Such interaction became second nature to me, and provided access to certain items of information. The subjects' openness to let me socially interact with them after school hours in the form of parties, get togethers, etc., allowed me an immersion into their lives. It also allowed for a deeper perspective on teacher thoughts. After these outings, I wrote down information that I deemed important. Such information included a description of events as I had recalled them. No tape recording was used in these outings as this would have been awkward at a social gathering. It may have also dampened the trustworthy relations already established between myself and the teachers. I was also aware that information attained at social gatherings, such as perceptions about the administration, may have revealed subjects' biases concerning their own situation in the school. This may have precluded my attaining a whole picture of the social scene in Hillview.

After the study was conducted, the relations between myself and subjects were continued. The subjects were given the opportunity to read and comment on the data collected. This added further information about the problems under study.

After I had spent three months of the school year in the role of the participant observer, I returned periodically during data analysis
to the school to question the principal and teachers, and to maintain
the atmosphere of the participant observer at the school.

**Researcher Presence**

Recent literature on qualitative research has discussed the
personal dimension of studies using the researcher-as-instrument.
What needs further elaboration is how I established trustworthiness,
ways by which conclusions were reached and how I decided on ethical
matters.

The problem statement with which the study began was revised
during the course of the study. The initial question put to teachers
under study related to the first study guide involving the
relationship of teachers to the "hidden curriculum." As the study
progressed, and partial analysis was conducted, teachers became aware
of the change of focus of questions from the "hidden curriculum" and
its relations to themselves and their students, to the questions about
their routines at Hillview. Through the openness of relations between
myself and the subjects, teachers were freely able to voice their
opinions to what they perceived was happening at Hillview. Thus,
questions at this later point were more directed to the relationship
between teachers and official, informal and pragmatic routines, and
teachers and administrators, rather than to teachers and merely the
"hidden curriculum" as was initially supposed.

Only after I left the research site, was the final proposal for
this dissertation written. This had positive effects. First, I was
not confined by my first problem statement at the site. Second I was
able to build further questions as time proceeded. Third, once I had left the site, the full problem statement had become clearer, and a broader picture of what could be analyzed, resulted.

Throughout the study, I struggled with the loose conceptualization, poor questions, too much detail in field notes, such as recording rules written in class, names of books in the teachers' lounge, and poster heading titles in the classes I observed.

Only after the first month of observations, did I determine the teachers I wanted to follow for an intensive observation. At this point I arrived at thematic continuity. It was then that I felt a sense of relief and satisfaction. Upon reflection, the tension I underwent in the beginning phase of the study was appropriate for reaching a clearer understanding of life for teachers at Hillview. As the study progressed, sorting out data into categories became easier as my questions crystallized. Concurrently, while observations crystallized, further themes, headings and subheadings emerged.

After the recording of data, and each two weeks of intensive observation, each teacher's routine was written up into a subchapter. Thus, four subchapters were written. In each narrative, I described patterns that exemplified the particularized categories that followed from my observations and which fitted into the conceptual frameworks. Only after this was completed could a composite portrait of the life of teachers at Hillview be fully described.

As I continued to ask questions both formally and informally during my stay at the school, information received was triangulated. Also, other colleagues knowledgeable about qualitative methods and
familiar with my research, were able to comment on areas that they saw as requiring either more evidence and/or discussion. They were able to help me judge whether particular data was congruent with that suggested in the interpretative chapters.

The writing up of subchapters and methods of triangulation had trustworthy effects. I was able to reflect on particular data through my subchapters. As I observed a different teacher every two weeks, observations were refreshing. This all helped make for trustworthy aspects and helped portray a clearer picture of my data.

Ethics

There is always an ethical issue in qualitative research involving the researcher's obligations to the subjects, in the form of how much of the data should be recorded, etc. The establishment of a friendly rapport during and after my initial stay at the school allowed for open and cordial relations throughout. Some subtle ethical issues were encountered however.

During the course of data gathering, teachers under study were fully aware of my presence in their surroundings: "We're glad we have an objective observer here," commented one teacher under study. This may have allowed for a distortion of speech by the teachers and possible over-interpretation of their speech on my part. It seemed that the Hillview eighth grade teachers clearly wanted someone from the outside to report what they called "true facts." Thus, what to include in the data that would not be detrimental to any teacher, yet
could remain vital enough for interpretation became an ethical consideration.

Another ethical concern had to do with confidentiality. How much of my interpretation to be shared with teachers and the principal became an issue. I had to be careful not to divulge too much of my analysis for various reasons. First, my analysis was always ongoing and changing. Second, teachers in this study may have viewed some of the analysis negatively. This made confidentiality an important issue. There were certain items of information about my interpretation that I had to keep confidential, such as what typified a "resistant" act to administrators, or what administrators knew of certain teacher actions in the school.

Although the data chapter seeks to preserve anonymity, particular incidents that occurred at Hillview endanger this. How to keep data anonymous in its presentation was problematical, maybe even incriminating. However, it is this very personal dimension that provides life in qualitative research and subsequently allows for a further analysis of the data.

Data Recording

Field notes from observations and interview situations were written at the setting and expanded on at home. Field notes were recorded in these areas: observational notes, methodological notes, and theoretical notes. Interviews were recorded on tape and transcribed for precision of data. Any reflective notes such as those
described by Bogdan and Biklin (1982) were recorded at school or home and attached to relevant observational data.11

Data Analysis

Various types of notes were taken. Pure observational and descriptive notes were recorded during class sessions. During class intermissions, theoretical notes were recorded along side these descriptive notes. These theoretical notes usually coincided with my readings, and were related to the type of research questions I was asking. This was an attempt at situational analysis of the data.

Data collection, data display and finally, conclusions were drawn at the end of every phase.12 As themes emerged, conclusions changed. Themes/headings/categories built, and eventually structured the observations. Thus, findings and temporary conclusions became more apparent as the research progressed. For example, continual acts by teachers, for instance, arriving late to team meetings, their own classes, etc. or rule breaking habits began to be significant in my understanding of resistance theory.

By conducting the research in naturalistic settings as the participant observer—being in the presence of others on an ongoing basis, and having some nominal status for them as someone who is part of their daily lives—I was in a position to view the actions of others and garner meaning from the lives of these teachers. In order for me to attain answers to my research questions, this involvement was needed to understand the interactions, reflexivity and typifications of the teachers' day at Hillview.13
Footnotes

1The authors describe an item of hidden curriculum as "any set of unspoken but acted out assumptions which is about the underlying nature of a classroom or school and which is simultaneously about the underlying nature of some saliently germane sector of the wider community." In George Spindler (1982) (ed.), Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. (New York: C.B.S. College Publishing) p. 243.

2In chapter one I alluded to informal behavior which included unwritten or unstated rules that guide action.

3These two authors look at informal group creations.

4Willis (1977) uses these concepts in his study of the "lads" to focus on their relationship to the structure of schooling and society. In other words, Willis describes these concepts, applies them to the lives of the lads and uses this as background for interpretation of the lads' role in society. They will be discussed in detail in chapter 5.

5In other words, I had the advantage of spending a full year at the school making mental notes of goings on, while always thinking that this site would be suitable for exploration.

6Importantly, I realized that certain biases may have been created by my own students' perception of certain teachers and administrators. In retrospect, these perspectives had less of an effect on the researcher due to his unawareness that he would one day be conducting research at this site.

7"Gatekeepers" refers to subjects who grant permission to the researcher to be at the site. More on this in Robert C. Bogdan and Sari Knopp Biklin (1982), Qualitative Research for Education. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.), pp. 58, 122.

8Key informants are subjects who are as Bogdan and Biklin (1982) stress, "more willing to talk, have a greater experience in the setting, or are especially insightful about what goes on. These people become key informants and often you will talk with them, compared to other subjects, a disproportionate amount of time." In Bogdan (1982) et al, op. cit., p. 63. It must also be emphasized that teachers in this study also became key informants due to their emotional involvement and opinionated views with what was happening in the school.

9The problems of "access" provides useful information for the inquirer when in the field setting. Please see Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson (1983), Ethnography. (London: Tavistock Publications Ltd.), pp. 58-72.
For a detailed discussion of these techniques, see Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln (1981), Effective Evaluation. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers), pp. 106-107, 316.

For a more detailed discussion see Bogdan (1982), et al, op. cit. pp. 86-88.


CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction
This chapter presents a general description of Hillview Middle School, the setting for the case study. What will follow is first an overview of the students, staff, and administration. Second, the official routines and breaks of those official routines (pragmatic routines) portraying instances of thoughts, perceptions and actions of teachers will be examined. Moreover, this chapter provides a background for the following chapter which discusses the importance of the relationship of teachers to the formal and informal realms, and the official and pragmatic routines of schooling.

An Overview of the School
If the school in this study (Hillview) were located in a suburban, upper middle class area, one would not be surprised. A peacefulness of sorts surrounds it. As I turn right onto the street where the school is situated, I pass an overpriced Lawsons food store. Often on my way to school, I will stop off for a quick cup of coffee, always astounded at the price of cookies, milk and on the one occasion, a cassette I needed. The placement of Lawsons at this juncture, with
its cleanliness, bright lights and its friendly "have a nice day" attitude presents a major contrast to the atmosphere at Hillview.

As I drive away from Lawsons, I pass a Y.M.C.A. and some open grassland used for recreational activities. Whenever I pass the Y.M.C.A. and arrive at Hillview, there are never very many people outside. It is quiet, peaceful, serene. The grass of the Y.M.C.A. is green or covered with snow during some parts of my stay at the school, and the road leading to school is central to get to a highway leading to town. Thus, there is never a shortage of cars passing by on this narrow road. There are usually five or six busses of school children, who are bussed in from the near east side of town, and a number of teachers' and administrators' cars that arrive either before or after my arrival, which is at about 7:15 a.m. As I turn from Lawsons, I can't help but notice the police station—situated on the left side from Lawsons, not more than a few yards from the local community swimming pool. The drive to school, the stop-off at Lawsons and preparations for my morning in the field, are always pleasurable.

There is this feeling of a factory atmosphere as I leave my car. This is, however, personal, due to past experiences of rising early and going to work both as a factory worker and as a teacher. It is still dark outside as it is in the middle of winter, where the predictions are usually for gloomy sorts of weather outbursts—flurries, snowstorms and dark impinging clouds.

There is no official school time clock, yet the principal stands outside at 7:20 a.m. or so, to welcome the incoming students.
Quickly, I enter the building after paying my morning respects to the principal.

As I open the teachers' room door, I hear the teachers, most with either a newspaper or coffee in hand, chitchatting about one student or another, or some other personal issue. They sit at two round tables and placed next to the tables are three worn out red sofas. It is here also that the school custodians and busdrivers sit. The cooks arrive at 6:00 a.m. to do their duties and are already working busily.

As I sit to have coffee and reflect on my upcoming day and present research, I can't help but feel that after a short stay at this school, I am almost one of the teachers at this institute. "Oh, he's one of us," comments the librarian to a visiting resource person from downtown. "He lives here," he comments. It is no wonder then, that I feel at home here in the teachers' room, a home away from home, in the working atmosphere that other teachers, cooks and custodians are involved in.

Hillview is one of the larger middle schools in the city district. There are thirty-three teachers with an average of thirteen years teaching experience. Most teachers have a Masters degree. A few have only a Bachelors degree.

There are varying sorts of student cultures in this school, most notably for this study though, students who defy authority in countless ways and those students who adhere to the written/unspoken rule of a teacher/student exchange. Dressed in jeans, I play basketball with one of the school's best, talk informally to the
students, and learn about their perspectives on the teachers, school and their life in general.

Students' color, race and sex are evenly distributed, with 60% white, 35% black and 35 Cambodian refugees. The principal prides himself in the English as a Second Language Program (E.S.L.). He is also well aware of the working class nature of the school. He says that is this type of school where research ought to be conducted but isn't. "We are like a virgin school," he comments.

Free or partially paid for meals are distributed to over 70% of the students. In general, the students are from either poor or broken homes and do not come from an atmosphere provoking academics. There is always a rhythm in the hallways—a special tone to the students' talk—the "hoods." There are the "preps" too, who don't have a collective sound.

Hillview was set up as a middle school many years ago. Its large auditorium is gloomy and not well lit. The hallways are usually empty and spacious. Grey lockers line the school's one story in every direction. There are bells, fire drills, and assemblies at designated times. Sporting facilities are at the furthermost end from the administration offices. One always hears the noise of students whistling, teachers yelling across the hall to other students, stopping them from either running or creating some havoc. The look on some teachers' faces express the feeling that, "Oh, another day with these kids." There are old rest room facilities both for teachers and students and a shabby teachers' room. This is quite a contrast to the brightly lit, heated and clean principal and vice-principal's office.
This obvious distinction between working quarters defines how teachers in this study feel about the fact that there is a difference between "them" (administrators) and "us" (teachers) or "they" (administrators) and "we" (teachers). Patently there exists this status difference. It is in the minds of teachers.

For the purposes of this study, I will define certain teachers by a letter X, A, W, or Y. Any other comments made by other teachers in the eighth grade staff, I will refer to as "another teacher." It is imperative to differentiate between teachers, given their different views on schooling and teaching. Both in thought and in deed, teachers X, A, W and Y share a common bond—they are part of the eighth grade team of teachers at this school.

Mr. X

Mr. X is tall, erect and is always well dressed. He wears a tie, and his hair is always combed back neatly. His well kept beard gives him a distinctive look. He is an imposing figure outside his door (which is situated opposite the school office) as he observes students, teachers and administrators who pass by. Mr. X is opinionated about life at Hillview, the people in the building, including students, other people and administrators.

He is hard working, always busy with one thing or another. As he stands in class looking down at students, one judges that Mr. X has things under control. He is quick to hand out both assignments and punishments. He is at times sarcastic to students and rarely smiles in class. Says Mr. X to a student, jokingly: "I know you are up to
no good as usual." To the class: "You guys don't know where you are going," says Mr. X, commenting on the class schedule change, taking for granted that his class will be disoriented because of the schedule change and because they would not approve of the change. He is the epitome of the taskmaster, standing physically and organizationally high above his students sitting in front of him.

He executes Health/Science assignments methodically, going over the student requirements, answering questions, and relaying the answers in an almost non-stop, workmanlike pace. He varies his work activities in the form of movies and guest lectures. His students don't dare talk, for if they do, a punishment is immediately forthcoming. In his classroom, work is the order of the day—task activities, regurgitation exercises or copying notes from books or the overhead projector. Mr. X says that he wants to instill some "responsibility" in his students, and it is from this notion that he does his work.

He is always occupied. He is always carrying his grade books, curriculum materials, looking for suitable places to put them, arranging materials in certain order, being responsible for a clean, neat class—ordered could best describe it.

Yet, Mr. X is frustrated. He wants "out" of middle school, into a high school setting, or out of public education altogether. He stays, however, continuously smirking at the issues of the school that he believes result because of a poor administration.
Ms. A

As with Mr. X, Ms. A is always neatly dressed, with slacks and her hair combed back. She is short but this is not too noticeable as Ms. A stands erect, with an authoritative tone to her voice. Ms. A has been described by the principal as a "workaholic." Ms. A is always doing busy work, both in and out of the classroom, preparing student academic exercises or using the computer to record grades and prepare exercises, or even administrative kinds of things such as reminding teachers about certain extracurricular activities such as intramural sports. She calls this work the real hard work of school, something the administration doesn't want to do.

Ms. A is forceful, yet friendly in her teaching approach. She tries to be innovative in her assignments by allowing students freedom to choose reading materials on their level instead of having them read the designated curriculum which she believes is beyond their reading level.

Ms. A can best be described as "into" or deeply involved in Hillview life. She cares about all administrative decisions, not only those that effect her personally, and voices her opinion about school issues in front of the principal.

On the one hand, Ms. A is reserved. When the issues of school policy (that obviously bother her) become topics of discussion, Ms. A is in the thick of things.

She is not sarcastic to students, and tries to learn more about their home backgrounds. She is caring, always soft spoken to students, and sympathetically listens to students' problems. She is
admittedly "frustrated," and would rather teach a different subject than English. On the whole, she tries to understand students and their plights. She is constantly on the go, with "time" a major factor in her day, always in a rush to accomplish things in a quick, effective manner.

Ms. Y

As with Ms. A, Ms. Y is also short. She dresses differently from the rest. Dressed in jeans, she comes closer to looking like one of the students than the other teachers.

Ms. Y is an innovator, the idea person for the eighth grade students. Both Ms. Y and her students are involved in classroom issues involving racism and prejudice. She is presently a social studies teacher, and has moved through teaching grades 6-8.

A look at Ms. Y's classroom reveals a student sitting on her chair, and other students milling around her table. Y is easy going; she is not perturbed by a student voice out of line or a class with seats that are not ordered in the traditional setting. She realizes the job that has to be done and is efficient. She prefers to experiment for most of the time to achieve results. Thus, every Friday morning she has what is called a QUEST period, which is a group discussion on problematic issues, such as prejudice. Her students write poetry about these issues and she is prepared to give up class time to discuss the issues at length, especially if the class is responding, and they usually do. Ms. Y can also be forceful in her approach and is extremely task oriented and workman like. Time is not
an issue when hard work is at the forefront. The class work simply has to get done.

Both Ms. A and Ms. Y are involved in intramural activities. Ms. Y joins in the fun of playing basketball on Thursday mornings (part of the club activities) and organizing the volleyball when necessary. She is, as the principal describes her, "a great part of the school" and it would be a "shame to lose her." Ms. Y has mentioned that she wants to transfer as she is exasperated with the "tension" at the school. She is, on the one hand, quiet and youthful, and on the other hand, able to forcefully push an opinion before the administration and students, through a letter (administration) or a debate (students). She cares about her students and is prepared to and does spend endless hours after school aiding them in their studies or problems with their personal lives.

The tasks she sets for her students are usually either simple rote tasks or more creative type things, such as poetry writing. In all, she combines a variety of teaching approaches, which may suggest that her easy attitude is offset by a task attitude of getting on with the job at hand.

Ms. W

Ms. W is heavier set than both Ms. A and Ms. Y. Her hair is also longer. It is combed neatly. Unlike Ms. A and Ms. Y, she usually dresses in a skirt.

Ms. W is the language teacher of eighth grade students. She is a combination of jolliness and sarcasm, always smiling, yet putting
students down. When a student comments on a television comedy, Ms. W returns the comment, frustratedly and sarcastically, "What an expanse on your brain. I'm going to grease that mouth of yours." W can be perfectly delightful, and yet, because of various reasons, can be upset with a student the next minute. Moreover, Ms. W is not afraid to talk about her feelings to students.

She possesses the uncanny ability to forget a bad moment concerning a student or a remark she has made about a student and/or the administration with the jolliness of her humor. Students like Ms. W. She is friendly. She talks with them about issues that they are concerned with, like new car models and their personal likes and dislikes. She is involved in school activities such as the school dance and candy sale. She not only collects money, which in itself is time consuming, but she is also responsible for moving candy boxes into place, storing them in certain corners of the classroom.

Ms. W is different from the other teachers. She readily admits that she is "not the most structured person in the world," thus resulting in lesson plans made up in her head at the last minute and a desk cluttered with books, pens and papers, making it hard to find things. She is able to cope with all this and the problem classes with her good sense of humor and empathy for the child's life/present situation. She exhibits the dichotomy of being caring for students, but also extremely critical of them. Additionally, she wants to move on to secondary school because she feels stuck in a middle school--stuck between the two ends that have been described above. This best typifies how Ms. W struggles through her day.
In summary, a casual observer may look upon these four teachers as people just doing a simple but important job, smiling to each other in the corridors, chitchatting to each other in the teachers' lounge about topics unrelated to school life, babysitting their students—having an easy life in general, being the typical public servant. In this case, the casual observer would be wrong.

As to having an easy "teacher's job," it is evident that these teachers work hard. There is rarely time off from the duties of the classroom, and they are extremely task oriented. They assume administrative duties that are not officially their designated duties. They constantly worry about their students' performances. They are always on the move, and as a researcher, it is hard work to shadow them, as they are constantly involved both individually and as a group in getting things accomplished. On the whole, their work is often physical—carrying boxes of computer handouts, organizing storage space for candy, moving bleachers in the basketball gymnasium, carrying boxes upon boxes of pop for the pop machine or trotting to the office during class time to accomplish tasks these teachers literally have no time for. In short, life for these teachers involves more than a casual observer might see on the outside.

All in all, the teachers whom I followed are disillusioned, always complaining: "Oh, we haven't got an efficient administration here." They are frustrated with students and the administration. More importantly, despite the obvious talent that each teacher possesses individually, they are frustrated at their individual positions/plight within the school system, frustrated with what Ms. Y has called the
"tension" at the school. Ultimately, a question to be answered is: how are these frustrations accommodated or disguised? What actions do these teachers take in their daily routine to make them feel more adequate, worthwhile and needed during a day so that teaching may hold more meaning for them?

**Teacher-Administrator Exchange**

Basic to society is the capitalist exchange. Here, the worker exchanges his labor for a wage packet. In schooling, there is another kind of exchange. This involves the teacher/learner exchange. Here, the teacher passes knowledge to students and in return students are expected to respect the teacher and behave well. There exists still another exchange in schooling. This exchange has to do with teachers and administrators (principal/vice-principal and a counselor for instance). Importantly, on a formal basis, the principal and vice-principal have control of the school in the immediate sense, i.e., on school grounds. They possess the authority and control over decisions about private school policies in a public sector.

The exchange between administrators and teachers arises because of the distance between them in their defining roles. Because the principal/vice-principal has the legal and professional authority to be in charge, certain teacher behavior is expected. This behavior entails the teacher providing certain knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that will promote his/her good work in and out of class. Respect is desired by administrators and is part of this exchange. In return for the above, the teacher may receive a good evaluation, a
possible letter of recommendation, and an understanding that would involve the principal being lenient in some cases to teachers who buy into this exchange so as not to give them added burdens to their already trying day. Importantly, one must ask, what happens when the exchange doesn't occur? Why doesn't it occur? What happens when teachers don't buy into all aspects of the exchange is a vital issue at Hillview and can be viewed as forming the tension between cultures at the school. These questions can be answered by noting the tension between the official and pragmatic routines at Hillview.

Tension Between Cultures

To briefly recapitulate, the instances of official routines and the breaks of those routines forms the tension between two types of cultures. One of them is the official version of what a teacher's day is supposed to look like as delineated in official documents such as the Basic Components of Middle Schools, the Teachers' Handbook, teacher contracts and The Official Graded Course of Study for Middle Schools. The other is the actual day a teacher goes through that either meets the official requirements laid out by the written documents or are twisted in informal ways to allow the teacher to more easily survive his/her day at school. All in all, what we are looking at is the dichotomy between what is supposed to happen at schools at the official level as opposed to teacher action that could be termed the pragmatic, informal level.

Because of the tension of the two cultures there exists a teacher counter-culture--that is, a culture that differentiates itself from
the formal, official aspects of what a teacher is supposed to be and doing exists, especially on the practical level. This differentiation manifests itself in numerous ways and can be vividly described as a break of supposed official policy teacher routines.

The Official versus Actual—Confirmation

When trying to define what official means in the Hillview school setting—a middle school consisting of grades six, seven and eight—certain assumptions about the administration including principal, vice-principal and counseling positions define what an administrator should be. It is important for teachers to know what an administrator is officially supposed to be and what he/she is perceived to be.

There are some major issues that fall under the guise of administrative positions. One could refer to the literature on "leadership" and simply pick leadership type qualities. I choose not to do this however, as this is not in the bounds of this particular study. Instead, I will stay within the boundaries of the Basic Components of Middle Schools which lays out certain desired characteristics of administrators.6

Most certainly, a quality needed would be 1) a distinct preference for working at a middle school, as opposed say to an elementary or high school. From a teacher's standpoint, the most important quality is for the administrator to 2) effectively lead all staff members. This would entail close evaluation, reflective strategies to aid the teacher in his/her class, the ability to create harmony between
teachers, to set an example to teachers by not only listening to teacher grievances, but acting on them when necessary. Officially, as described by the Basic components of Middle Schools, an administrator should be able to capitalize on the strengths of teachers. This would mean knowing details of a teacher's weaker teaching traits, the stronger ones, and nourishing the strengths of teachers, i.e., classroom management, humor, clarity. This would eventually aid placing students who may fit into a particular strength of a teacher, and using the weaker traits as a point of development for teachers with particular deficiencies. Fourth, an administrator should demonstrate the ability to be flexible, and be able to facilitate change. This could entail understanding his/her teacher's grievances, and being able to judge their merit or worth, and if flexible, implement change that would not only benefit teachers, but students as well.

A good leader is one who is a jack of all trades, can serve as a resource to the staff; for example, he/she provides research information about teaching or types of students teachers have. He/she should be able to take over a class when and if necessary, and gain the respect of students. He/she would lead or direct staff meetings positively by using the time not only for relaying information about the upcoming school dance, for instance, but rather, utilize the time for teacher, curricula and student development. Finally, the administrator must be task oriented--be able to develop the school schedule efficiently, visit classes frequently and show a personal interest in what is going on in the various teachers' classes.
Vitally important in this study is that some actions of the teacher counter-culture arise because of what teachers perceive as an inadequate administration. Thus, what an administration is supposed to be as an ideal versus how teachers perceive the administration justifies certain teacher resistant acts.

Consent—The Assent to Authority—Actual

The above components only broadly define a role of an effective administrator. A teacher withdrawal of consent may arise due to teacher's perceived notions that the administration is weak and inept. 7

Basic to the exchange of teachers and administrators is the giving of consent by teachers to administrators to lead in their way, without any or much interference. This notion is met with resistance by some teachers at Hillview, as seen at through smirking faces and ongoing disagreements over discipline procedures during staff meetings between the principal and teachers, resulting in fact-to-face avoidance in the corridors between administrators and teachers.

I sensed that teachers wish to do their own thing, quietly going about completing their tasks, and also taking administrative tasks into their own hands, such as building the schedule for the school year. This confirms to teachers that actions taken that defy official and formal aspects of the school are justified.

Basic to teacher withdrawal of consent is oppositional talk. Eighth grade teacher interviews and responses to questionnaires indicate that teachers judge the administration as lacking strong
leadership. The teachers agree that little leadership exists. The judgement of weak leadership is not only expressed behind the principal's and vice-principal's back, but also directly to them.

Mr. X commented about the administration:

My relationship with the administration is not very good. Lack of respect on my part. I don't take them to be professional or to be here for the kids. A general lack of respect as there's no leadership.

This teacher approached me one day and commented that he was physically sick. Part of the reason for being sick, he says, is because "I dreamed about him (the principal) last night and this morning I was just laying on my back in pure disgust thinking of him."

The concern of Ms. A is that the principal is not doing his job. This is a major element of her daily thoughts. On occasion she leaves her students to go about their business, so that she can use the time to meet the principal on an issue concerning money the principal was supposed to have kept for her class field trip. The meeting takes place during the first period, when students are doing their silent reading. While the teacher's misgivings about a weak administration are not shared with the class, they are with other teachers. As the second period ends on the same day, Ms. Y enters the class (from next door) and both teachers begin to talk about the principal, about how it is "his responsibility to take care of things" and how "he isn't doing his job well." Apparently, the principal lost or misplaced the money and would have to replace it from his own pocket. In an interview, Ms. A expresses concern:
He's ready to retire, he's just putting in his years now.

Ms. A is upset because the principal doesn't make the time, or has the patience to even ask what is being done in class. In fact, this teacher admits that she hardly ever talks with the principal, "unless she needs something."

This oppositional talk about the leadership of the administration occurs daily. In another incident, an inspector from the State Department, at the school to inspect physical facilities such as the number of computers and check on teacher written behavioral objectives as part of their lesson plans, addresses the eighth grade team and the principal. The teachers, desiring to get in their word to someone "outside" the school, voice an opinion about a matter under their breath so no one can actually hear them. Says Ms. A to a colleague, discretely, in the meeting, almost in front of the principal: "I hope that we can get a chance to speak to her (state inspector). Hope we can throw him (principal) out. I want to speak to the inspector about him." Eventually, the principal leaves the room allowing the inspector to speak to the eighth grade team alone. Immediately, Ms. A pounces on the State Inspector with these comments about teacher evaluation:

When he said he was going to get out more often into the classrooms, I just about fell out of my chair. He's out in the halls. He rarely handles any discipline problems. He doesn't tell teachers who aren't doing their job to do it. There's a big staff morale problem. That's why it's so low . . . I don't think there is anyone in control here, or any strong leadership . . . kids do what they want around here . . . doing things here like with discipline problems and getting things done is like butting heads all the time.
Ms. A is concerned about the inability of the principal to be a good leader that in a subsequent meeting with the school district area supervisor she makes clear her feelings about his leadership. Upset that nothing is being done at the school with regard to dealing quickly with discipline problems, when the area supervisor talks about how there must be "open communication" lines, Ms. A openly confronts the area supervisor and the principal:

Everything you told us here we already know that stuff you know. We're just talking around the whole central issue, that I personally, I can't speak for the rest of the team on this, I just don't think we have a whole lot of leadership. I'm sorry to say, but he's very inconsistent.

The above judgements of Ms. A are constantly confirmed and reinforced to her through specific actions of the principal. There are days when A's students from S.O.A.R. period, an acronym for "Special Opportunities to Achieve Results Program," don't come to class, and at 8:05 a.m. Ms. A is told by one of her students that everyone is in the auditorium for a special assembly involving a West Point graduate. This situation is judged by Ms. A to represent the administration's lack of ability to get things under control and relate messages efficiently.

On the first day back from winter vacation, Mr. X comments to me and his class that no one was told of the change from S.O.A.R. period on Monday morning to a Unified Arts period:

The principal has screwed this up; everything switches. I hope they understand what a screw-up they've done in this office.
In another incident, Mr. X is visibly upset when he notices that nothing is accomplished in his meeting with the vice-principal over the issue of a girl student who is an ongoing discipline problem:

Well, I went to the office and got a discipline (I-90) form back, and it says, "talked to her." This girl plays games and knows how to work the offices—another reason for my being infuriated . . . my opinion was that she should be suspended. Well, I went to see her (the vice-principal) this morning, and she said that this girl agreed with me that she was wrong. I thought that she'd get at least a Saturday school detention, and she told me (vice-principal) that even if she gave one, she wouldn't show up for it. So I said, "you mean to tell me that because I get a speeding ticket I don't have show up to court?"

Mr. X is deeply concerned that little gets changed or done at the school. In fact, he blames the administration in large part for these failings, especially the principal. Of a proposed meeting with the area supervisor, Mr. X comments:

The principal covered up what we talked to him about in the meeting. He lied to him on the phone. He was covering his ass. He's got a power struggle here. He doesn't like the way he is being mellowed. He's like everyone else in their own little world, and nobody wants to make waves.

He is concerned with the fact that there is much miscommunication, and "therefore no one knows what the rules are . . . we can't follow rules . . . we have no administration support."

X's perceptions of the administration's falterings is evident in a meeting with a State Inspector:

Inspector: What would you like to have the administration do?
Mr. X: To be able to have some authority and
to have complete back-up from the
administrative personnel. There's too
much miscommunication, a lot of
secrecy, and the fact that the
communication between us and the people
downtown is so sporadic nobody knows
what anybody is doing.

In an interview with another eighth grade teacher, she comments
that "the eighth grade team should run the school." While there is
some laughter on both sides (hers and mine), there is a seriousness of
voice tone that prompts her to immediately comment, that "each one of
us has different expertise, we could run the school without the
principal." She also says that they (the eighth grade team of
teachers) "do run the school, but aren't given credit for it."

On the same issue another eighth grade teacher comments that "we
had to change the kids' schedule ourselves and it's the
administration's responsibility, and they didn't end up doing it, so
we ended up doing it in our spare time." These actions by the
administration, be they by the principal or vice-principal, confirm
the teachers' judgements about weak administrative leadership and a
lack of control of immediate and long-term discipline situations.
This prompts the eighth grade team to take certain actions,
individually and as a team, in order to get things accomplished.

The teachers comment that they haven't been evaluated in any
consistent fashion in years. In some cases, they say, the last
evaluation was in 1983. Even though there was some form of evaluation
in 1985, it was done so sporadically, say teachers, that they can't
call it evaluation. One teacher complains:
He doesn't know what's going on in our classes... usually, when I shut the door I do whatever I want as far as some of the rules... they say you're supposed to be following the course of study, but they never come in to know whatever you are doing.

It's little wonder then, that particular strengths or weaknesses of teachers aren't really known. These actions, or rather non-actions, by the administration only confirm to teachers that they must take leadership into their own hands. Such was the case with the school discipline plan and with scheduling.

In another incident involving three eighth-grade boys and two girls, one of the boys was officially accused of sexually assaulting one of the girls off the school grounds. The teachers were upset that they weren't told about the incident until two months after its occurrence, and that nothing was done about the boy except that he was put on probation. In fact, he was still in school, roaming about and confronting the girl daily. This situation was explained by the principal as not being in his jurisdiction—yet the "team" feels otherwise. Even though the principal seems to have covered his non-actions (as perceived by the eighth grade staff) legitimately, a letter of complaint with the signatures of each member of the "team" is sent to the principal and the area supervisor:

It is hard for us to understand two items: 1) why we were not informed of the incident and 2) why there was not school disciplinary action against those involved... from this unfortunate incident we would like to see several policy changes. First, we feel it necessary that we are informed of such events when they occur—not two months later. Secondly, the school needs to respond to such incidents in a swift, effective and visible manner.
Whatever the reasons for things not getting done, the above related incidents confirm a number of things to teachers: the principal and vice-principal do not have the ability to lead staff members or capitalize on their strengths. Says Ms. Y:

They never come in with any resources; they don't know what I'm ever teaching.

According to the eighth grade team, there really is no counseling. Ms. Y comments that "the kids just don't get the counseling they need; we don't know what the counselor is even here for." This prompts Ms. Y to do her own counseling, taking matters into her own hands by either phoning parents or grandparents of students who have problems, or just talking with students about the problems that counselors are expected to take care of, spending extra hours after school doing this.

Additionally, the administration is not flexible, according to the eighth-grade staff. This is apparent in administrative non-actions concerning student touching incidents, like the one involving the sexual assault issue. The schedule, which is the official responsibility of the administration, is completed by the eighth-grade staff and unappreciated by the administration, according to the eighth grade team.

Hence, weak leadership is a key issue that the eighth grade teachers talk about. There is little or none in their eyes. One reason that some eighth grade teachers want to move away from Hillview is because of the administration's inability to lead effectively. The lack of leadership is confirmed to these teachers in countless ways, thereby nullifying the teacher-administration exchange. Teachers take
matters into their own hands. To illustrate this, I will first lay out official components of schooling and then describe teacher routines. It is within the pragmatic routines by the teacher counter-culture or informal group, that teachers as individuals and as a group confront the weaknesses of the structure of schooling.

**Official Versus Pragmatic Routines**

**Middle School Philosophy**

The Middle School philosophy is officially written up in the Basic Components of Middle Schools. The entire school staff is asked to function as a team, along with parents and students. Teachers need "a special attitude," as elaborated by the above official component, so as to work consciously with the social, physical, emotional and intellectual changes of the young. Because of the unique problems that middle school students have, teachers are asked to develop programs to meet their students' needs. The philosophy calls for students to develop their independent learning skills and delve into abstract concepts, and introduces the notion of exploration as part of what the student should be experiencing. One would expect then, for teachers not only to follow, but also to believe in the philosophy for middle school students in order to be teaching at that level.

Certain components of the day are written up within the time schedule set up in the Teacher's Handbook. Officially, teachers are supposed to be in their class at 7:35 a.m., a full ten minutes before homeroom period begins at 7:45 a.m. They are to remain in the school building until 3:00 p.m., fifteen minutes after students have
left. If leaving early, the principal or vice-principal must be notified so that arrangements can be made for a replacement teacher. Concerning discipline, teachers have strict procedures they must follow, and corrective measures they must adhere to. Three procedures of the six that involve discipline are the prerogative of teachers. They are to 1) reprimand, 2) issue after school detentions, and 3) send students to the time-out room. The other three measures, 1) Saturday school, 2) in-school suspension, and 3) out-school suspension are acted upon by the administration only. Basically, after the first three conditions are met by teachers, their hands are tied and they can do no more within the official policy.

The Move from Official to the Pragmatic: Routinization

The Basic Components of the Middle Schools specifies that teachers are expected to 1) maintain a close daily contact with students, 2) meet individual needs of the students, and 3) as individuals and as a staff--exhibit characteristics of warmth, security, consistency and predictability. That is, however, not always the case.

Actual Attitude Toward Students

One of the reasons that the eighth grade teachers I followed want to move out of Hillview is because of what is perceived as a weak administration. Another reason is the impossibility of teachers to reach the ideal goals set by official outlines. This is due to certain limitations of the students as perceived by teachers at Hillview. While Mr. X looks upon matters as "we can't help a lot of
these students at Hillview," other eighth grade teachers are not of the same opinion. Ms. A comments about a fourteen year old girl who has already had a baby and comes to school, often smelling of liquor:

    I want to reach out to her. I feel we both have things in common . . . but it's like she doesn't want to.

Ms. A and Ms. Y are often involved in preparing incentive field trips for the eighth grade students. The details of organization—when and where to meet, which teachers will replace those going—is an intricate and time consuming task. Ms. W works hard on the candy sale a good deal of the time, and all teachers are involved in the selling of candy for the school dance, obtaining parental permission slips, and following up with students who don't have permission slips. Teachers in this study, work overtime for their students.

    One thing is certain though. All but one of the teachers I followed has had enough of working at Hillview. Two want to move to a secondary school, and another is thinking of a transfer to a different middle school. In a team meeting the principal explains that next year's lowered quota of students will mean one eighth-grade teacher will be without a job. Ms. Y says to the team, in front of the principal with the area supervisor sitting by her:

    I've been thinking of a transfer - I hate the tension at this school.

The eighth-grade staff often say that they are frustrated by the "tensions" of the school. One teacher says that "we are frustrated high school teachers teaching in middle school." Yet, through it all, the teachers have one thing in common. Frustrated or not, tired of
the tension or not, they agree that they are basically at the school to "help students." To better understand this, let's take a peek at what goes on in their classrooms.

The four teachers "socialize" with their students by talking about personal issues of the students or about the activities of the weekend. Some teachers socialize more, others less. But it is obvious that talking about students' personal lives is a daily routine of the teacher. It is time consuming, but vitally important to the eighth grade students. This talk often involves activities done at school, like the science fair project, the selling of candy for the upcoming eighth grade dance, and upcoming field trip, or even the kind of car a teacher may own as compared to other teachers' cars. As I follow the teachers, I can see that each teacher has a good rapport with the students. Obviously, each teacher has a different style and personality, but students in general like these teachers, even though one student comments that "Mr. X makes me work, work, work, copy notes all the time. He hard man, but he still good," and A "lets us talk quietly instead of reading silently," and although "W come late all the time," students are generally appreciative of their teachers.

Still, one must take a closer look at the type of talk done in class to picture what other attitudes teachers hold toward their students. It may just be that these attitudes differ from the supposed, formal, official guidelines set up for teachers. Until now, these attitudes have been depicted as falling into the guidelines of the officially expected, making for a positive classroom climate for
all concerned. This, however, is not always the case. Mr. X says to
students who don't pay attention:

Part of the problem is that you don't pay
attention. Are you sure I haven't been transported
to another planet?

Mr. X is at time perplexed not only at the attitudes but also at the
standards of his students:

I know that most of you guys have forgotten your
names. You guys don't know where you are going
... I'm to get your brains started again and that
the only excuse for you not doing your assignment
is if you are in a coma, not your dog pissing on a
paper. Tell your parents how you didn't do this
assignment, and you know what they'll do after they
beat you up.

At this point the class bursts out in general laughter at the apparent
joke made by Mr. X. It is obvious though, that although Mr. X was
being sarcastic, his words had a serious bite. In a talk with another
teacher, Mr. X comments about his attitude regarding the students:

My attitude is to help the kids who want to learn,
and those screwing up and getting suspended - to
hell with them, because we don't have the time or
facility, and there's nothing we can do to change
board policy.

Whereas Mr. X is perplexed at the attitude of students and aware of
the controlling factor of board policy over him, Ms. W is concerned
with establishing order in her classes. As she enters class, usually
late, coffee in one hand, books in another. She says to students:

"Ssh, quiet, shut up, can't you keep your mouths shut?" at the top of
her voice. Most students don't really pay attention to her attempt to
obtain order. Finally, when some semblance of order is established,
it lasts for only a few seconds. While socializing on the one hand,
on the other, Ms. W is quick to comment to me that if one of her students "would get a grade for attitude, it would be below F, that bastard. This girl couldn't pass an orange." This type of talk is part of the everyday talk that Ms. W uses to describe her students. Very rarely does a positive comment about a student's progress get related. In fact, more often than not, Ms. W can be heard talking about the students in the above manner. Simply, she says,

I don't feel like being here with these brats again.

Many a time, teachers will threaten their students to get some work done. Ms. Y to her students:

It would be wise to do your homework, or don't bother coming to school, and if your task is not completed in ten minutes, you'll be in the time-out room for two hours.

Ms. Y also comments to students "to get on with the job and stop talking or else there will be an after school detention. And if that doesn't work an I-90 will be written up." Talk like this to students becomes pervasive within class time.

Out of class talk also relates attitudes of teachers to their students; Mr. X says on his way to grading a test given to all his classes:

It's a pity that I have to give them these objective tests, but I wouldn't do it any other way. It's the easiest, especially when there's 120 people to grade; besides, they haven't got the skills to write comprehensively, which is in great part due to the State Department, federal policy and this school here who don't want to hear about distinctions over individuals. We're not organizing the problem that we have over class differences. The principal's big bitch is not to have ability groups. Therefore, this school is not recognizing the problem of illiteracy.
Again, on his way to the teachers' room for the third period supposed common planning session, really used as a break time, Mr. X comments on a student's hygiene: "It is unbelievable ... he used to make me sick ... I used to say 'stay right there, no closer' ... probably didn't change his underwear for a month." Mr. X's concern is that his last "normal" eighth grade class was over three years ago. He comments to me in the teachers' room:

Some kids will make a career out of lying ... it's like pulling teeth doing work with them, because they can't do it, they don't have the skills, the background, they don't care ... there's nothing we can do for them here.

At this point Ms. W storms into the teachers' room and comments that she'd "like to walk out that door and not walk back, it's depressing ... I want that little son of a bitch out, I'm so tired, those little bastards, they piss me off."

Talk about the students is a large part of the daily activities of teachers at Hillview. It is not only evident in a class, but out of class as well, especially in the teachers' room. Types of talk portray on the one hand, total devotion to their students, and on the other hand, certain talk also represents the frustration about being an eighth-grade teacher at Hillview, thus exhibiting a particular negative attitude about the students that these teachers teach. Ultimately, what issues out of this type of talk are routinized activities.

A very important question is whether the administration inadvertently or directly has anything to do with teacher attitudes regarding students. According to the eighth-grade team, "if the
administration would change its policies, so would we." This, they believe, would change the atmosphere at the school. One must ask then, are attitudes toward students in this school developed because of a weak administration or are students used by teachers to fight the tension they feel with upper level management?

The above description of the tension between what is the official policy—the supposed to be attitudes toward students—as opposed to what actually is, helps for a specific teacher counter-culture. This claim is argued in the ensuing sections.


Period 0 or the S.O.A.R. period, is an officially set aside block of time set aside to provide students with individual assistance, sustained silent reading, extra-curricular activities, student council meetings, assemblies, and music practice sessions. This period is commonly known as "flex" time, an official component of the day, where students and teachers are supposed to share similar activities, be it sustained silent reading for the whole school, clubs or independent studies, etc. In addition to the 0 period, third period is also a common planning time period. These periods, 0 and 3, are non-instructional periods. The third period is a supposed official session for the "team." Teachers in the eighth grade are supposed to attend what is called a "common planning time." The key to this team approach, as advocated in the "Basic Components of Middle Schools," is for teachers to continually interact and exchange ideas, improve and change the curriculum—whatever that may mean. Ideally, the talent
and skills of the team should be capitalized on by a sharing of instructional and innovative ideas.

This period is officially used for counseling students, if need be, assigning various duties designated by the school to teachers, for example: hall duty, academic assist period, or being in the time-out room watching over students who have misbehaved in their classes and is also a time when parents can meet with teachers to talk about students. Also, once a week, on Tuesdays, the principal holds what he calls a "team meeting" during this third period. Since I was only in the school building until the end of the fourth period - or time-off period, I was not able to view the playground or lunch period.

Actual Activities

Commonly Mr. X sits behind his desk and grades papers during the S.O.A.R. period, enters grades in his grading book, puts student papers in order, etc. He is frequently out of class during the S.O.A.R. periods, at times for a fifteen or twenty minute duration. He completes discipline forms by writing out I-90's or follows up on a discipline problem with the vice-principal. During one S.O.A.R. period, Mr. X handed out four punishments to different students for tardiness. The amount of time spent handing out the punishments, talking about discipline to students, and running to the office during S.O.A.R. period sometimes takes more than one third of the period. This becomes part of the daily routine that Mr. X undergoes. It is sometimes overdone, according to Mr. X, "on purpose, just to get the principal angry." Mr. X has a way of turning the discipline cases
into a routine, in order to "get at" the administration whom he has come to distrust on this "SORE" matter of what he feels should be proper discipline procedures.

Not only does Mr. X use S.O.A.R. for acting on discipline problems, he uses it for teaching preparation—preparing his lessons and grading papers and entering students' grades in his grade book. During one S.O.A.R. period, Mr. X raises his voice and comments to his students: "Find something to do or write sentences." With one student folding paper, another tearing paper, another scribbling, Mr. X continues to do his tasks regardless of the activity going on in the class. It takes Mr. X only a few minutes to leave his post and continue with his daily routine, including raising discipline issues with the administration. These actions have become the routine of daily existence for Mr. X. While Mr. X is well aware that S.O.A.R. officially exists as a Middle School concept to assist students, the problems, says Mr. X, is that:

None of the students like it, me neither. I don't think it is effective. The kids don't know how to study. Most of it is a waste of time; there is no study. There is no academic achievement.

When asked why he accepts the official purpose, Mr. X comments that:

Teachers still bitch about it, but there's not much we can do about it unless we have an entire uprising of the staff, and we're not going to do that.

The underlying point is that, at least individually, Mr. X does something about it within his daily activities. While not liking or agreeing with the official purpose of S.O.A.R., he utilizes his time, not to "babysit," as another eighth grade teacher puts it, but to his
own advantage. Getting through the day will be far easier doing it Mr. X's way. The underlying notion is that Mr. X penetrates the way the system of schooling works, or in this case, the uselessness of S.O.A.R. With this understanding, Mr. X manages his affairs and gets through the school day.

In contrast, Ms. A tends to socialize at the beginning of the S.O.A.R. period. On one occasion she compliments some of her students on their science fair projects: "Did you get an award? You guys should be proud of yourselves for going to all the trouble." While twice a week S.O.A.R. is supposed to be used as a silent reading period, this is not always the case in Ms. A's classes. Some students take the liberty to either read or talk quietly to neighbors. Others move around the class slowly, talking to other students. One student tells me that Ms. A lets students choose between "talking quietly" or following the set, official routine which is sustained silent reading for that particular period.

Clearly, Ms. A uses the S.O.A.R. period for a number of purposes. On one occasion, students who hadn't taken the vocabulary test the previous day were tested on the words during the S.O.A.R. period. Ms. A asked one of the students to conduct the test for the eight students who missed the test, and while this is going on, Ms. A was either preparing for the next class, or involved in some administrative duties, like organizing the candy slips for the upcoming school dance. It seems then, that S.O.A.R. is a period not only used for individual studies, but also for various teacher activitites. Twice in my observations of Ms. A's class, the eighth
grade was summoned to the assembly hall. On one occasion, a graduate from West Point came to visit the school, to talk about his success story and the $43,000 he makes a year. More importantly though, eighth-grade teachers are either told very late about the subsequent arrangements for the S.O.A.R. period or are not told when the S.O.A.R. period has officially started, and therefore have to rush to the auditorium without any students, who are already seated in the auditorium.

On other days, Ms. A uses the S.O.A.R. period to either leave class up to ten minutes for what Ms. A describes as "administrative duties," which may involve talking to the principal or just reading the literature book assigned for the two periods directly following the S.O.A.R. period. Ms. A permits her students to speak quietly while she relaxes or involves herself in tasks that prepare her for the day. She calls this time period as a period for "not doing things," or "wagging off." In an interview with Ms. A, she comments that there are a number of problems with S.O.A.R. The first is administrative:

The principal wants to look good downtown, and what is intended, is not achieved . . . teachers use S.O.A.R. as a period of wasting time, where kids socialize.

Sustained silent reading, or study hall, is not always the case in Ms. A's class as well. Penetrating S.O.A.R.'s limitations, Ms. A is able to arrange her school day by making S.O.A.R. her own "free-time" period. More significantly, Ms. A penetrates S.O.A.R. for its
official deficiencies, thus enabling her to manipulate this official component of the day into an informal, pragmatic routine.

Such is also the case with Ms. W. Asked for her impressions on S.O.A.R., she comments that "it's a waste of time, everybody's time, my time, their time." Yet, for Ms. W., S.O.A.R. is more than just a waste of time. As with other teachers, Ms. W. uses S.O.A.R. to her personal advantage by "running dittos some days, grading papers some other days, or reading the newspaper or a book during the silent reading period." Socializing with students is a major aspect of Ms. W's period. As with Ms. A, time is taken to talk to students about affairs that are not academic. When the bell rings at 8:00 a.m. for the start of the S.O.A.R. period, Ms. W talks to students about personal matters and about the sale of candy for the upcoming dance:

Ms. W: What will we do if we sell so much candy that there will be money left over? Maybe we'll go to Wyandotte Lake.

St: No there's no roller coasters, man, no fun.

Because of teacher-student interaction, the official purpose of independent silent reading is not accomplished. Of the eighteen students who are attending Ms. W's S.O.A.R. period, the majority does not do the designated activity. Ms. W does not run after them to check if they are busy. Some students sleep, others draw pictures, stare into open space, or quietly chatter. If not socializing, Ms. W tidies her desk, organizes her side room for the candy to be stored, leaves the class for up to ten minutes and returns with a coffee in hand, or admittedly goes to the office to run some dittos for the
following periods. It is no wonder then, that Ms. W believes that S.O.A.R. is "wasted time." Yet, on the other hand, this structured time period gives her a chance to accomplish teaching tasks that otherwise would have to be accomplished at other times during the day--say, her time-off period.

As with other teachers, Ms. Y uses the S.O.A.R. period "for preparing for the whole day." This however is not the official use as defined in the Teacher's Handbook. Officially, teachers must "supervise" students, instead, Ms. Y concerns herself with such issues as the sexual assault charge brought upon a student in the school. So concerned about how "the young women" in the school who were assaulted will be affected, and concerned with the fact that teachers were notified so late about the incident, she spends many S.O.A.R. periods writing letters of complaint to be sent to higher school authorities.

Whether it be socializing, leaving the room for whatever reason--administrative matters or preparing class lessons for the following periods--it is obvious that the S.O.A.R. period is not only a designated "supervision," or "babysitting" service as a casual observer may perceive, or a supposed individual assistance period. It is a period where teachers adjust their time to suit their own needs, catching up on other work to be done during the day, understanding that if one can manipulate the supposed official aspects of S.O.A.R. into informal pragmatic routines such as "getting at the principal," writing letters of complaint, or doing administrative duties, the day becomes that much more bearable for the teacher.
Official Aspects of Teaching

In the Basic Components of Middle Schools, teaching strategies are delineated under such headings including Planning for Teaching, Lecture, Lecture Recitation, Discussion Groups, Simulation, Independent Study, Performance Contracting, Inquiry Programmed Learning and Interest Centers. My aim is not to determine whether a teacher falls under one of the above and then judge if what is achieved in class is good or bad, but to look at what is actually taught that falls under the discussion groups, lecture type method or other official or informal components of the curriculum. This will be done so to establish a tension between the official and pragmatic aspects of teaching.

The Course of Study from kindergarten through grade twelve is a pamphlet designed solely for the Public Schools. Thus, it supposedly contains the instructional curriculum which teachers follow. It is what the superintendent of schools calls "a significant curriculum document." In all, each subject area outlines general areas of study which are followed by lists of desired outcomes. For example, the subject of Health for eighth graders includes such topics as Nutrition, Mental Health, Alcohol and Drugs, etc. Under these main headings are two or more points under the subheadings, which are supposedly able to guide the teacher as to what content should be taught. These outlines are brief with no follow-up suggestions or activities to aid the teacher in choice of materials. Materials such as booklets on alcoholism, or other story books are generally assigned
and are the property of the school, loaned by the State Department of
Education, and cannot be taken off school grounds by students.

Curriculum—Pragmatic Activities

Ms. A is deeply concerned that her class, which contains a number
of Cambodian refugees who now speak English rather well, do not talk
much in class and are extremely difficult to motivate. As I observe
the English lessons, each student is given a reading turn, and it
becomes obvious that upon questioning students after a story is read,
many students do not understand it. The literature book being used
has been recommended by teachers at the high school that these
youngsters will be attending the following year. It represents the
official part of the curriculum.

It is clear to Ms. A that she cannot use the curriculum
guidelines, and, as a result, for practical purposes, must deviate
from the given curriculum. Many a time during the literature lesson,
Ms. A will tell her students to forget about the present curriculum
while they do something else: "What I'm going to do is let you relax
and read different types of easier literature using the
characterization, time and place, thoughts and feelings. Before we
start doing anything else, I want to read to you Sylvester and the
Magic Pebble." While reading the simpler story, students begin to
show great interest and follow at a greater depth than the discussion
over the regular curriculum choice. By giving the third-grade reading
material to her class, Ms. A has succeeded in meeting the class' standards. At the same time, she is able to keep close to the
curriculum by using the same themes for discussion that she would have for the more difficult literature. Originally, Ms. A was supposed to team teach with another eighth grade teacher next door. Once dependent on the official curriculum and the task-oriented exercises prepared by the other teacher, Ms. A now believes that she must take things into her own hands and do more creative, pragmatic activities with her students than the official curriculum suggests or the teacher next door designates for her own class.

Even though the official curriculum is used at times, the end for which it is used is questioned. Teachers tend to use the curriculum for their own personal ends, which may or may not be useful for student learning. Let us see how this works.

Mr. X gives students an activity to complete by the end of class. The activity involves reading a topic such as alcoholism, disease or drugs; students are expected to read and answer questions prepared by Mr. X on the topic. The students in Mr. X's class are used to working hard for him, thus, exercises on the whole are accepted and done quietly. Many students comment that the tasks are "boring, too many words, we copy notes most of the time in class." Students are always busy, as is Mr. X. It is not uncommon for Mr. X to leave the class for a short duration and return with a cup of coffee while students are completing an exercise. At other times, Mr. X utilizes his time to record in grades, file materials, prepare overhead transparencies with answers to a particular exercise, and deal with I-90 discipline forms so as to "get at the principal," as during the S.O.A.R. period. Mr. X admits that he "doesn't want to work after
school after he leaves." In some ways then, he must organize and manage his affairs so that everything gets done within the school day. Thus, while the official curriculum is constantly adhered to for getting students to complete exercises, it seems that it is also adhered to in the particular way described above so as to gain control over his daily routine.

All teachers whom I follow admit that his behavior is commonly the case. For instance, the movie "Mask" is shown in Ms. Y's class, as a reward and supplementary curriculum material to the current issue of discussion in class on prejudice. While the movie is playing, Ms. Y's concern is with having some free-time and organizing the day by preparing other materials. She also concerns herself with the sexual assault issue, that has the eighth-grade team buzzing, by writing letters to the principal and the area supervisor that will eventually be signed by the eighth grade "team."

The above descriptions are only a few of many instances of how teachers at Hillview adjust the official curriculum to suit their own purposes, be it "to delete things that don't interest me," or to deviate from the handed down curriculum. These actions become routines and make the day more manageable and meaningful for the teachers. The adjustment from the official curriculum to the informal pragmatic curriculum and other teacher controlled activities becomes a major part of the day for these teachers at Hillview. Life is better doing it "my way," suggests one of the teachers.

The commonality across the board then, is the actual activity teachers routinely engage in when students are "working." Some of
these activities involve testing the administrative authority over discipline issue. It is in the testing of authority that these teachers are able to probe the weaknesses of the administration. Teachers exploit these weaknesses to their advantage in order to make their life easier at work. The knowledge that "we" can complain, fight the system, at least "make it work for us," or "get at the principal" suggests a daily existence that is ultimately tied to the informal pragmatic level of teacher routines.

Other Official Routines of the Teacher's Day Versus Pragmatic Routines

All teachers are required to prepare lesson plans. According to the State Department of Education Revised Minimum Standards:

"There should be a lesson plan for each class in order to meet the advanced needs of students . . . and they should be available on a daily basis in an obvious place, preferably on the teacher's desk, for the administrative review." It is also stated in the Basic Components of Middle Schools that desired characteristics of teachers should entail the distinct preference for working in middle school as opposed to, say, the elementary or secondary school level.

One would expect then, that teachers preferring a certain grade level would be committed to the philosophy and objectives of the middle school, entailing a positive attitude to students, including the willingness to understand the educational and personal needs of the students, and in so doing, responding to those needs. Cooperative teacher planning is desired as well. This includes some sort of group
curriculum development and/or other classroom projects that a group of teachers would decide upon. These matters may include attention to discipline problems, policy, curricular agreements and implementations and teaching plans that are group based and cooperatively worked out. Moreover, it is expected teachers will follow school policy and rules, such as being in class before students arrive, informing the administration of leaving school early, for whatever reason, so as a replacement can be found, and not eating in class, thus setting a positive example for students. To follow rules then is a designated official activity.

Lesson Plans--Actual

Not all teachers at Hillview Middle School comply with the using of State-mandated lesson plans. Comments Ms. Y:

I do what I want in class. Nobody sits on us and tells us what to do. I haven't had my lesson plans checked in twelve years.

While sitting in the teachers' room with Ms. Y, and talking to her about the upcoming visit of the State Department of Education representative, she says that she "will make a month's lesson plans on Sunday evening." She laughs mockingly at the idea that lesson plans are taken even remotely seriously by teachers.

Ms. Y isn't the only one not to prepare lesson plans. Ms. W openly admits that she just thinks about lesson plans and rarely writes down stuff. I rarely write objectives, mostly in my mind. I know that I have to - it's a mental thought process.
Most teachers who prepare lesson plans do so during the day. In an interview with Ms. A, she holds a small piece of paper with five or six scribbled and crossed out words. I ask her if that is her "lesson plan," and she replies, "that's it" and as the interview continues, she comments:

You know, we don't even hand in lesson plans here . . . at some schools we had to hand them in every week.

Rules and Rule Breaking

Besides arriving late to faculty team meetings, teachers admit that there are breaches of other school rules. It is interesting to note that one teacher I followed was 10-15 minutes tardy to school on ten occasions during one month. This ultimately drew an official warning in a letter from the principal. On other occasions, teachers were at their posts at the official starting time of 7:35 a.m. However, on other occasions I sat in class, students having already entered with the teacher following, at times four to five minutes later.

Besides the case mentioned above, tardiness played a role in teacher group actions. Comments Mr. X:

We all agreed that standing outside the door at 7:35 was useless, so we just do not do it all the time.

One teacher admits that she is "rarely at the door at 7:35," and as I observe the four teachers, rarely do they follow the rule about standing outside their doors at 7:35 a.m. In class, patrolling the halls, or during lunch, rules are broken by teachers. That is not to
say that teachers are never found standing outside their doors at the
designated, official time, but only that the rules are often broken,
both on an individual level and on a group level. Teachers, in this
school, do either drink coffee or eat in class in front of their
students, while officially not being permitted to. Ms. A readily
admits that she eats in the classroom and is quick to mention that
other rules get broken: "I have parties when I shouldn't." Indeed,
as I partake in a party involving other eighth-grade classes, and
another eighth-grade teacher joins, who has left her class
unattended. I eat donuts and drink orange juice with as much
enjoyment as the students and the three eighth grade teachers. The
party, however, is conducted without consent given by higher
authority, with a group of three eighth grade teachers who don't even
consider asking permission to have it. Ms. A also admits that she
leaves school early and has done so on more than one occasion. On the
topic of why she doesn't report leaving school early, she says:

I know (sarcastically) Monday I had a doctor's
appointment. I left and I didn't tell him (the
principal). I arranged someone else to take my
class.

Ms. A admits that this is all "a challenge to his authority" (the
principal's). The same could be said about her reflecting on the
student sustained silent reading in the S.O.A.R. period. She believes
this is also to some extent, a "challenge to his authority," while
admitting, on the other hand, that her students like to "chatter or
read easier material."
Most teachers admit that they overuse the teacher allotted quota of xerox copies. Ms. A says she does this for practical purposes as sometimes she needs a quick amount of copies for the next class as she is "running short of time." Ms. W says that she is "Miss Queen Ditto" and while realizing that there are limitations on the use of the xerox copies, she admits that "I occasionally break the rules. We all do."

On the whole, it is the notion of the individual and "we" (the group) that justifies actual teacher routines, as opposed to official routines. The former include intentional teacher resistance of authority and defiance to the structural limitations. Resistance and accommodation allow teachers to suit their own personal needs and alleviate their occupational frustrations. There is also a sense of accomplishment and pride in Mr. X's tone of voice when he succeeds in "getting at the principal." The same can be said when Ms. A breaks a school rule. This sense of accomplishment is part of a larger whole. A different culture is created by the teacher, first as an individual and then as the teacher group forms. This group runs counter to the official routines of school. It is an informal counter culture and typifies a new order. Ultimately, the question remains, so what? Caught between two realms, official and pragmatic, formal and informal, with certain routines, where do teachers go from here? What does this all mean?
Footnotes


2 Willis (1977), op. cit., p. 108, distinguishes between "we" and "them" and "us" when he refers to the "lads" and "earoles." In this case, the distinction is also clearly between "us" and "they" when involving teachers and administrators at Hillview.

3 This type of work activity is similar to Jean Anyon's (1980) study in the working class school. Jean Anyon (1980), "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work." Journal of Education, 162, No. 2: pp. 67-92 and Jean Anyon (1981), "Social Class and School Knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry, 11, No. 1: pp. 3-42. Here, working class activities are the important activities in which cultural meaning is attached to it.

4 The exchange is also used by Willis (1977), op. cit., p. 64, in his discussion on teacher/student exchange, which is associated with the educational exchange. Through this exchange, the earoles and lads are clearly defined. In this study as well, an exchange exists that will clearly define teachers and administrators.

5 I have not mentioned the state or city where the document was written. This form of anonymity will be kept throughout the dissertation.

6 As above (in footnote 5).

7 Willis (1977), op. cit., p. 64, talks about the notion of consent in terms of the teacher-student exchange as the "teacher's authority must therefore be won and maintained on moral not coercive grounds. There must be consent from the taught." In the same way, within the teacher-administrator paradigm, there must be consent given to the administration by teachers on a moral basis for an exchange to take place.

8 This is part of the eighth grade team letter sent to the superintendent and the principal.

9 This document is the same one referred to in note five.

10 In the Teacher Handbook.

11 This document is the same one referred to in footnote 5.

12 For the sake of anonymity, the name of the superintendent who describes the curriculum document will not be mentioned.
This is typical of Anyon's (1980, 1981) study on working class culture.

This document originates in the state where the research was conducted.

In the Teacher Handbook.
CHAPTER 5
DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Upon reflection on the data, three questions need answering. First, with all the apparent ill-feeling toward the administration and subsequent pragmatic routines by teachers defying official authority, which include clear resistance, how does a teacher's day remain within the structural bounds of the school? Second, how does this group differentiate itself, and form a counter-culture, from predictable and controlled structural constraints, such as time, textbook policies and schedules, that are all management controlled? Third, why do teachers choose to live in the tension and conflict that they are surrounded by everyday?

To answer the above questions leads to an understanding of the way teachers' lives are constructed in the school setting. To lay this out, it is imperative that certain concepts be elaborated so as to portray the tension between the formal and informal cultures. These concepts are used in Paul Willis' (1977) ethnography, Learning to Labor. Concepts such as individual and group logic, partial and full penetrations, divisions, dislocations and limitations will show how differences between administrators and teachers on the one hand exist,
yet on the other hand are essential in the school for work to be accomplished and for teachers to live in a tension filled environment.

**Individual Logic and Group Logic**

It is important in this study to note the difference between individual and group logics. With regard to the former, the ideological stress on individualism is pervasive in Western society. Harris (1982) is worth quoting at length here:

> The promotion of individualism concentrates on two aspects; independence and individuality. Each aspect stresses the role and importance of individual action in determining the nature of a person's life. . . . As far as independence is concerned bourgeois ideology urges us to make our own way in the world, to be autonomous, to make decisions for ourselves, to act out of conscience, and so on . . . . Students sit at school study individually, sit at their exams as individual centres isolated from and in competition with other students. Independent actions are praised and rewarded . . . . Individuality is the other prized aspect of individualism, whereby what is stressed about people is their particular uniqueness or what they do not have in common with other people . . . the ideological stress on individualism clearly militates against people taking collective action. (pp. 51, 52)

This stress on individual accomplishments, be they through success and/or rewards, acts in ways to subdue group formations. Comments Harris (1982) on the individual teacher:

> Teaching is a solitary, isolated, individualistic job. Classroom teaching is carried out alone, and most of the problems that arise there tend to be seen as the teacher's individual problems rather than as things shared by all teachers or even many teachers. (p. 148)
Significantly, the importance that the formation of a group has for creativity and social mobility, as for example in the case of the "lads," may hold true for teachers as well. Willis (1977) comments on the creativity and importance of group logic:

> Creativity is no individual act, no one particular head, and is not the result of conscious intention. It's logic could only occur ... at the group level. (p. 120)

Group formation involves individuals working together for a particular cause (which might have to do with resisting administrative authority), helping each other out on the job in one way or another (like covering up for a teacher who has left school early), having a particular group language code (that exhibits extremist language usage, as in the case at Hillview), agreeing and acting together concerning the breaking of rules (as in not standing outside the door at a particular time, or constantly arriving late to team meetings, etc.), or even possessing similar values (for instance, as to what defines a good teacher or an adequate administrator). The importance of group logic is vital to this study and is needed as a tool to better understand the role of the teacher in the social order.

The answer as to what does the group (teacher counter-culture) do together to consciously or unconsciously promote its interests will have to be dealt with. For this, I must side-step to Willis' (1977) notions of penetrations for a deeper understanding of teachers' lives at the school.
Penetrations

A penetration is the ability of persons, individually and as a group, to see the operations of a social institution or agency, or a cultural form, for what they really are. A penetration, says Willis (1977), "designates impulses within a cultural form towards the penetration of the conditions of existence of its members and their position in the social whole, but in a way which is not centered, essentialist or individualist." (p. 119) Willis (1977) continues:

We are dealing with collective, if not consciously directed, will and action as they overlay, and themselves take up "creative" positions with respect to finally reproduce what we shall call "outside determinations." (p. 120) ... The penetrations produced, however, at the cultural level in the working class by what I shall call a certain creativity are by no means open ended. They run along certain lines whose basic determinants lie outside the individual, group or class. (p. 121)

Thus, a penetration by any group will test structural facets of an institution. Additionally, a penetration can be viewed in terms of a resistance to particular cultural forms. This will also be discussed in forthcoming sections.

Partial Penetrations

For Willis (1977), penetrations have to do with the unconscious impulse of members to test certain cultural conditions of existence. Says Willis (1977):

I suggest that the smallest, discrete unit which acts as the basis for cultural penetration is the informal group. The group is special and more than the sum of its individual parts. It has, in particular a social dynamic which is relatively
independent of issues and locations, preconceptions and prejudice. (p. 123)

The unity of this informal group is achieved by resistant collective behavior and a restricted language code. Willis (1977) elaborates:

What delivers the group force into the concrete form of the specifically cultural is importantly a deflection from the dominant mode of signification—language—into antagonistic behavioural, visual and stylistic forms of expression. (p. 124)

So basic to the notion of partial penetrations, especially in Willis' (1977) study, and in this study as well, and partial penetrations.

Comments Willis (1977):

There is ultimately a guilty and unrecognized—precisely a "partial"—relationship of these penetrations to which they seem to be independent from, and see into. It is this specific combination of cultural "insight" and partiality which gives the mediated strength of personal validation and identity to individual behaviour which in the ends leads to entrapment. (p. 119-120)

Penetrations are usually partial, because they are always limited by what Willis (1977) calls "divisions." Penetrations tend to backfire, and are not only "skewed and deprived of their independence, but also bound back finally into the structure they are uncovering." (p. 119) These penetrations are cultural "creative insights." (p. 124) For instance, when the "lads" do not consent to teachers to act as "earoles" and show respect, this reflects their penetration of the so-called "fair exchange" between teachers and students. What is commonly accepted and seen as the fair exchange—the teacher gives knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and qualifications and students give in return good behavior, respect for the teacher and conformity
to rules and regulations—is rejected by the lads. The rejection stems from the creative insight that the exchange is not fair or worthwhile.

It is as an informal group, that the "lads" penetrate the individualistic logic of school. The notion that individual interests are different from group or class interests is vital to the functioning of the "lads." Ironically, perhaps sadly, while their group logic penetrates the very ideology of the individualistic logic of school, it also damns them to a working class existence. Thus, to culturally penetrate school relationships works in ways to both promote group solidarity and interests, and concurrently acts to suppress a fuller penetration. It is to this notion of what a full penetration may look like that I now turn.

**Full Penetrations**

Willis (1977) also makes clear the difference between partial and full penetrations. While on the one hand, a partial penetration exposes weaknesses in the school structure, on the other hand it also functions to entrap the individual or the group. A full penetration would involve a more active role in the destruction of the school structure. Willis (1977) informs:

> To the individual working class person, mobility in this society means something. Some working class individuals do "make it" and any particular individual may hope to be one of them. To the class or group at its own proper level, however, mobility means nothing at all. The only true mobility at this level would be destruction of the whole class society. (p. 128)
A full penetration then, would not lead to any entrapments. It would not lead to damnation, as in the "lad's" case, but would promote a culture, class or group that possesses the power to override what it perceives to be its enemy. For this study, what must be looked at is how teacher partial penetrations are exhibited, what similarities there are to Willis' (1977) descriptions, and what the differences are. What will also be looked at, is what might a full penetration entail in the daily grind of a teacher's day.

Teacher Partial Penetrations

First, I will examine the penetrations of the school's individualistic logic. I will then look at how teachers penetrate the teacher-administration exchange expressed in Chapter 4. Finally, I will then look at how teachers penetrate official components of the school day.

Penetrations of the Individualistic Logic

One way that Willis (1977) describes the individualistic logic and group logic is by looking at the "nature of their ideological confusion in education." (p. 128) He says:

The counter-school culture makes a real penetration of what might be called the difference between individual and group logics... The essence of the cultural penetration concerning the school--made unselfconsciously within the structural milieu with its own practices and objects. But determining all the same as inherently collective perspectives--is that the logic of class or group interests is different from the logic of individual differences. (p. 128)
Willis (1977) tells us that partial penetrations are not conscious.

Willis (1977) further comments:

> There is a generalization in the school from an individualistic logic to a group logic without a recognition of the very nature and level of abstraction of the latter. (p. 129)

The teachers I follow are called the "eighth grade team." They are called this by the teachers teaching different grades as well. The teachers of the eighth grade not only share the same students, lounge, lunch quarters and social activities, but many of them share the same ideas and opinions of the administration. They are part of the formal organization of schooling, a "team" that performs tasks together. There is collective work in the organizing of the school dance, where each teacher plays an active role in promoting the dance. Teachers act on issues together, as in the writing of letters of complaint. Importantly, the "team" acts in unison at team meetings. When the principal leaves the teachers' room, teachers say: "We sure showed him." The teachers' meetings, are used not only as a means of relaying information, but are also a way of keeping the "team" together, by allowing teachers a chance to let off steam, such as what to do with hardcore discipline cases.

Teachers say "We all break rules." The group, lest we forget, has also been described by one eighth grade teacher as able to "run the school, in fact we do run the school." This teacher counter-culture group in its formation and cultural form then, penetrates the individualistic logic.
In their classes, the group uses methods and teaches content that help partially penetrate the individualistic logic. For instance, Ms. Y's group work, her class discussions and poetry exercises on pertinent social issues such as prejudice, Ms. W's work group, her class talking and working together regarding parties, candy sales and cars, and Ms. A's democratic-like activities suggest their penetration of the individualistic logic. This penetration is achieved both in class and as a "team" without conscious recognition.

Penetrations of the Teacher-Administrator Exchange

The rejection of official routines and resistance to administrative policy and rules by teachers takes from through their withdrawal of consent to the teacher-administrator exchange. This is manifested or exhibited, at least in part, through a particular language code used by teachers that depicts their opposition and their rule-breaking activities. One teacher says, "the administration stinks," "the principal is ready to retire now," "I nearly vomited when I dreamed about him," "he always screws things up," and "we all break rules."

This teacher-administrator exchange is rejected for a number of reasons. First, teachers believe that they "run the school." In order for teachers to believe they "run the school," the exchange must be rejected. This allows for further forms of teacher control. Second, this rejection promotes group solidarity. To be part of the group means to reject the exchange. All four teachers I follow hold similar judgements of administrative ineptness. This is evident in the talk of teachers in their lounge, in front of a State Inspector
and at social gatherings. In short, to reject the exchange is to define oneself as part of the group or "team." It is a payoff for good relations among teachers in and out of school. Now, to other penetrations.

Penetrations Into the Official Realms of Schooling

Penetrations into the official realm of schooling can also be seen in opposition to authority. Teachers move from following official routines of schooling through practical routines of schooling. This in part helps explain the resistance to structural components of schooling. It also helps define the teacher counter-culture.

S.O.A.R.

Teachers show penetrations that common planning time and S.O.A.R. time (officially a time for academic achievement) is a teacher time constraint and a restriction of their autonomy. This is seen in the words of eighth grade teachers: "It's a waste of their time, my time, everyone's time," or "there's no academic achievement," and "it's a time for wagging off."

The implication of the above penetration is that eighth grade teachers manipulate their time so as to suit their daily needs. Thus, certain routines are engaged in during the S.O.A.R. period, some involving "getting at the principal" and others not permitted in the official guidelines, such as leaving classes unsupervised for lengthy periods or leaving school early. Teachers then, penetrate official routines of the school day by twisting these around as a form of
teacher control. Moreover, the penetration that S.O.A.R. is a "complete waste of time" prompts Mr. X and Ms. A to comment that "the principal just wants to look good downtown, so he has this S.O.A.R. time block." This penetration helps to justify the rejection of official routines in favor of pragmatic routines of schooling.

Mr. X asserts that "we don't have the time or the facility, and there's nothing we can do to change board policy," especially concerning S.O.A.R. This group sees S.O.A.R. as the State Department's control of teacher time and space; "We have no time for ourselves, too burdened with duties to breathe." Individuals in the group agree that "certain kids just don't have the skills and the background to succeed, but are kept on until they are of age to be let out to be useful to society," and "S.O.A.R. is a way of covering the real problem which is that some students will never make it, even if S.O.A.R. is used as an independent period as well." Penetrations of official routines of schooling judged as useless helps define this counter-culture. Thus, the opposition of the teacher group is depicted by the move from the official routines of a school day to the pragmatic routines of teacher control.

As has been shown, one of the ways that teachers gain control over their time and space is to live in their pragmatic routines that oppose official routines of school. It is in these behaviors that the counter-culture of teachers thrives and where further partial penetrations develop that expose weaknesses in the formal realm and official routines of schooling. Thus, S.O.A.R., for example, becomes a fruitful source of teacher penetrations.
Cultural Capital

Within the school, teachers have the power and control of cultural capital. In their office, they teach students so they come to possess not only reproductive capitalistic tendencies, but are socially productive, i.e. emancipatory. The latter effort may involve students in group discussion or writing poetry, tasks which emphasize not rote learning, but rather, creative analytical projects. This would mean teaching different values from those of the working class. It may even mean controlling aspects of schooling by manipulating "items" to the teacher's advantage, individually and as a group, by working as a "team" to break rules and oppose the administration.

Cultural capital that may have emancipatory social consequences is taught to students and kept from the administration. In part, this is due to the administration's lack of interest in content taught. For instance, in Ms. Y's classroom, student discussions of prejudice and racism and of the poetry taught and written is culturally emancipative. Ms. A promotes democratic ideals by letting her class vote on issues that concern them, and Ms. W's flexibility in allowing her students to decide collectively what should be done in spare time in school and out of school on a field trip are but a few instances that suggest cultural expression and penetrations into the official aspects of the curriculum.
Teacher Class

What we see here is a group of teachers whose "class" is defined by social and work relations, knowledge kept from them (as in the sexual assault issue), task differences, and relations of power and authority. Ironically these function to produce their own class—and the knowledge of the culture of the students they nurture.

To define "class" solely on a teacher's relations to economic functions is to acknowledge only part of the teacher's role in the social order. Livingstone (1983) is helpful here:

More specifically, class relations in capitalist forms of education may be regarded in terms of the ownership of major means of cultural production and control of social and technical aspects of relations within the schooling process itself. Relations of ownership in education refer to the possession of major means of cultural production. (p. 99)

Because teachers' interests not only lie in reproductive, economic activities, but in productive ones as well, (as suggested by the cultural expression of the values transmitted in teachers' classes) it is not surprising that teachers have the power to seize the means of cultural production (knowledge, skills, values and attitudes) to serve their own interests, on both an individual and group level. This defines a teacher's struggle within the reproductive nature of their existence, and it enhances the teachers' class status within the school. Thus, teachers serve their own and can serve their students' interests as well.

Resistance to official routines of schooling prompted by the penetration of teachers into the official realm of the school--the
rejection of the principal-teacher exchange and the individualistic logic—leads to the eighth grade "team's partial takeover of the school. The teacher counter-culture thrives. It is emancipatory,\(^{6}\) creative and reflective.\(^{7}\) This ultimately is the defining aspect of the counter-culture and the "class."

While the counter-culture thrives, it does so in the recognition that the State controls curriculum choice, teacher salaries, etc. This denies a full blown opposition. One of the reasons that teachers are not fully penetrative is because of limitations resulting from the divisions that exist between teachers and administrators.

**Limitations—Divisions**

One impeding force to teacher penetrations are what Willis (1977) calls a limitation. By limitation "is meant . . . to designate those blocks, divisions and ideological effects which confuse and impede the full development and expression of these impulses' (p. 119) (penetrations). In this study, the major limitation of teacher penetrations is the division between teachers' work and administrators' work.

Three questions need to be asked. Why does this teacher counter-culture/resistant group thrive? What is the group's eventual accommodation to structural components of the school? What is the rationale for the establishment of the tension between the formal and informal, "they" and "we" and the "them" and "us." One way to answer the above questions is to get clear on one major division: ept and inept work.
Administration Work as Inept

One way teachers distinguish themselves from the administration at Hillview is through the tasks, actions and duties each group (administration and teachers) engages in. Teachers look upon most administrative tasks as inept, as opposed to the good, ept work teachers do. Administrative tasks, such as scheduling classes, handling discipline, assigning rooms and organizing classes for an orderly walk down to the assembly hall, leading faculty meetings (which are usually looked upon as trite because of a lack of substance) are all judged as ineptly accomplished by a weak administration.

The administration is judged as inept for other reasons. It does not deal effectively with the need to counsel students: "We have no real counselor here," comments Ms. Y. Teacher evaluation is only done sporadically, not in the "professional manner" that the teachers expect. Moreover, what is taught in class is not known or understood by the administration. Says an eighth grade teacher: "Once I close the door, no one comes in. I can break rules if I want."

What is important, is the type of talk that typifies the administration. Anything that he/she does (be it the male principal or female vice-principal) is not considered "heavy duty" or "important work." Team meetings are called "trite" and "mundane." What gets talked about in meetings, say teachers, is "busy work," and "public relations," not the "real problems we face everyday." Thus, teachers find team meetings a waste of time and unproductive. Administrators
don't handle discipline problems in what teachers call a "quick" or "effective" manner.

The administrator is typified as "weak" or "soft" in its dealings with problems students. In short, administrators are considered inferior due, in large part, to their inept handling of teacher facilitating tasks. "Swift, sharp, effective" action, as talked about by eighth grade teachers, is not considered to be part of how the administration sees, understands or deals with school problems.

Teacher Work as Ept

It is within the division of teacher work and administrator work that ineptness and inferiority rear their heads. Although the makeup of a schedule or setting up discipline procedures can be hard mental work, according to teachers it is clearly not considered their work. It is mental work that should be completed by the administration at the quick, effective, and workmanlike pace that teachers exhibit in their tasks.

The eighth grade teachers execute different tasks than the administration. They judge these tasks to be not only being more important than administrative tasks, but harder, more laborious, active and not passive. Teacher tasks are more serious and more needed than the tasks executed by the administration. This is in part what defines common sense knowledge for this teacher's group.  

Economically, a teacher may not be considered "working class" in that his/her labor power does not directly produce profit. Yet, culturally another story can be written. Things that teachers do,
such as physically filling the pop machine, carrying computer handouts, volunteering for more work in the form of extracurricular activities such as the organization of intramural sports (which ultimately involves one teacher that I followed taking care of fifty students wanting to play basketball in grades six, seven and eight with only one basketball court to play on), physically moving bleachers so as to obtain a few square feet of playing space, storing candy sale boxes one on top of the other for the school dance, having one's class move physically from one end of the school to the other because of the lack of a classroom on a regular basis (a first year eighth grade teacher) all take on physical qualities.

Other activities, such as taking over scheduling, the designation of incoming students to different eighth grade classes, replacing other teachers who take their classes on a field trip, and the organization and execution of field trips, are what help define ept teacher work. These activities are officially not teacher tasks. Still, teachers take on these tasks over and above their own in order to do them right. Thus, they distinguish between ept and inept work. Teachers complete both their tasks and some administration tasks in the manner that has been described as ept. This involves hard work, be in manual or mental, and it is part of what the teachers do as members of the group and to get on good terms with the administration (accommodation).10

Hard mental or manual tasks, well executed, help define the teachers' status and role in the school. This leads to another limitation. On the whole, teachers at Hillview teach in order to
enrich students' lives. They realize that many students come from broken homes and working class backgrounds, and the home life of these students is not conducive to education. At the practical level, teachers teach in the hope that students will rise above all the predetermined, failing aspects of their lives. The hope is that eighth grade students will attain enough formal education to go on to high school, and who knows, maybe even beyond that. Unintentionally, however, this lofty ideal backfires on teachers. Ultimately, it is the notion that "basically we are here to help the children" that limits penetrations even further. Mr. X's insistence that he wants to instill "responsibility" in his students, Ms. W's overtime work during the candy sale, thus promoting the school dance, Ms. Y's devotion to her students and willingness to spend hours of extra time with them, and Ms. A's caring, motherly approach and friendly disposition to students all suggest that even though there is obvious tension between teachers and administrators at Hillview, students are the first priority. It is in great part because of the devotion to students that there is a limitation to teachers' penetrations. Ultimately, there exists an accommodation by teachers to structures of schooling, precisely because of the willingness of teachers to remain at Hillview for the students' sake.

Summary--Ept and Inept Work--Repercussions

Within the distinction of ept and inept work then, lies the dichotomy of the formal and informal components of the school day. For various reasons, as seen in the data, the informal takes on three
general dimensions. One of these is the resistance by teachers to formal and official routines of the school. Another is an accommodation to the official realm, which will presently be elaborated on in greater detail. The third is a combination of the two. For the moment though, eptness as a teacher work phenomenon, is separate and different from perceived inept administrative duties. With this in mind, the counter-culture of four teachers—in their mental and physical work, in their resistance and accommodation to formal and official routines helps form and nurture a teacher counter-culture. This group is viewed by the administration as dysfunctional to the official routines of schooling. The principal says:

I have a group of eighth grade teachers who simply resist my authority . . . there is a perceived ineptness on my part . . . rules are broken.

The recognition of a distinct teacher counter-culture is confirmed. This is based on the eighth grade team's judgements of various perceived inept acts on the part of the administration. This judgement of a weak administration results in poor communication between administration and teacher, and certain contradictions (what one administrator, be it principal/vice-principal says, the other doesn't know about or acts in accordance with). This situation helps define for teachers a weak, inept, shallow, and inferior administration. Thus, the resistant teacher grup takes shape, agreeing that rules will be broken: "We all arrive late to team meetings." Oppositional talk is always apparent: "The administration stinks."
Teachers then, justify assuming control over their time and space in school. They define how they will do their tasks: "We run the school," comments one eighth grade teacher. To control one's day is a major objective of the "team." It is then, that an apparent victory of sorts is celebrated. In their opposition, and valuing of their ept physical and mental actions, teachers differentiate how "we" and "us" exist and are distinct in a very clear and definite anti-structural way from "they" and "them"—the structural, formal, official and administrative routines of the day. As a result, resistant acts by the group members or counter-culture are culturally productive, rather than reproductive.11

**Accommodation**

The informal member group must also be explained in terms of the logic of accommodation.12 Giroux (1983) points out that in schools "there is a mixture of accommodating and resistant practices" (p. 248). On the one hand teachers are resistant to official routines of the school institution. On the other hand, there is also teacher accommodation to official aspects of schooling. This has been suggested through the inversion of the ept and inept qualities. Resistance by teachers is due in part to perceived inept administrative activity. Importantly though, the inversion of these typified administration inept tasks in the teacher's day/life damns teachers to more elaborate giving of accommodation.

Teachers accommodate when they perform administrative tasks (i.e., scheduling). This involves a concentrated team effort and hours of
extra time. Teachers, additionally, must take care of their own classroom problems, counsel students, and organize field trips. Teachers, then, take on the tasks of the administration in the school and complete these in an effective or ept manner. Concurrently, and most importantly, teacher exploitation is experienced through the teachers' taking over of administration functions. Consequently, the inept aspects of work, become teacher duties, are inverted, and take on ept qualities.

These tasks, along with others, become the accommodative aspects of teachers. In executing administrative tasks, teachers adhere to oppositional tendencies. They believe that "we run the school." This affirms or legitimates their resistances. Ironically, perhaps sadly, these acts are accommodative to the structural aspects of schooling.

Teachers in this study, it seems, will always adhere to certain aspects of structure (the official guidelines), but in the process, will resist total accommodation through resistant acts. Interestingly, there is both the creation and breakdown of teacher opposition which is needed for structural harmony. These breakdowns will be further elaborated in the discussion of dislocations.

Dislocations

A dislocation is what stops, impedes and limits penetrations. Willis (1977) refers to dislocating tendencies as "characteristically unintended." (p. 163) In the case of the "lads," penetrations into the structure of schooling got suppressed, resulting in partial penetrations. An example Willis (1977) gives is the notion of "career
teaching that stresses the real differentiation of job opportunities and their capacity to satisfy the range of human aspirations and hopes." (p. 163) According to Willis, the "lads," reject this and believe countrawise, that "all jobs are basically the same." (p. 163) This belief in job sameness inhibits the "lad's" penetrations. What they celebrate as a victory over career teaching actually dams them to menial job opportunities: "a job is a job." Put differently, exposing weak links (false beliefs) in schooling ironically works to limit penetrations. In short then, dislocations "suppress cultural penetrations." (p. 164)

**Accommodation as a Dislocation**

One dislocating tendency is for teachers not to know that in their fight for control and autonomy, resistance to authority, and breaking rules, they also are led to accommodative behavior. This filters down through certain rewards. If work is well done, eptly performed, a letter of recommendation may be forthcoming or even a choice teaching assignment. Teachers, it seems are induced to eventually "buy into" the official routines of schooling. After all, says Ms. Y, "there's a limit to how far we can rock the boat." Thus, accommodation dislocates further resistance. Ironically, in the fight for autonomy, teachers are damning themselves to a life of subordinated mental and physical labor, when at the same time trying to overcome domination by acts of resistance.
One major dislocation affecting group solidarity has to do with the notion of "zoned decision making." (Lortie, 1970) Zoned decision making presupposes that teachers are free and independent workers in the confines of their own classrooms. In these confines, teachers are separated from each other, thus limiting time spent together as a group. The ultimate dislocating factor remains: teachers are alienated from their group for most of the day. They stand alone in class. Only occasionally do they visit each others' class. They teach different subjects and have different personal interests.

Pratte and Rury (1986) delineate the above notion of zoned decision making:

It is precisely this sense of individual autonomy that makes bearable for teachers employment in the bureaucracy. It is held that the content of one's teaching is one's right to determine however defined the curriculum . . . (p. 4)

This point, I believe, is well taken. Furthermore, they claim, this sense of autonomy really "mystifies or obscures" a teacher's constraint as teachers are "indirectly controlled" through school and district wide educational objectives.

In addition to the above issues, teachers are bogged down completing individual assignments. As Willis (1977) and Harris (1982) have noted, personal and professional differences hinder group formation. Thus, the notion of the isolated individual in his/her many forms is a dislocating factor to further penetrations.
Principal Knowledge as a Dislocation of Group Logic

Another dislocation tendency restricting teacher penetrations is the teachers' ignorance of the principal's knowledge of their actions. It is obvious that school management knows and understands the motivations behind the actions of individual teachers. This works to suppress the penetrations that individual teachers make. Comments the principal on his past work:

I had a couple of teachers who'd find out procedures they would follow to suspend a kid from school. They would maneuver kids into being suspended. I'm finding it interesting that the same kind of thing still exists.

The fact is that the principal admits that teachers in his school have a "private philosophy in a public sector." This indicates that he is not naive about the goings on of his teaching staff:

I think there has been an avoidance of team meetings to avoid discussing issues that need to be dealt with . . . I have a teacher who is supposed to work on data processing, but uses it as a way to avoid team meetings . . . teachers in eighth grade use the intramural type thing as an excuse to avoid a team meeting.

Thus, administrative knowledge works in ways to help dislocate teacher resistance. The principal "knows what's coming down." This helps him designate to teachers certain administrative tasks (that teachers complete eptly) and helps him better understand how teacher resistance works. With this in mind, the principal "allows" certain rules to be broken, when this works to this advantage. Added to this, the principal is aware of the contested terrain to his authority, aware that sometimes teachers "look busy" in class, that S.O.A.R. is a "SORE" subject, signifying that the principal is also aware of the
member group's language. The principal knows "some of these folks need some good strokes to get them going," and even when rules, like not having parties gets broken, the principal comments that:

Sometimes it's easier to have the rule broken with some of the positive things that come down.

Interestingly, teachers perceive the breaking of these rules as a defiance to both the principal's authority and the structure of the school. But while teachers defy, the principal allows it to continue by "looking the other way," aware that it is at a boiling level. Maybe this is why "there is a perceived ineptness on my part," muses the principal.

Related to the above, a dislocation of teacher group penetrations occurs when realizing that opposition is apparent, especially "when we don't have our act together," the principal and other administrators and his administration are able to "show a different way of handling things." Thus, getting one's act together, like having orderly assemblies, is another way of dislocating group opposition.

Control as a Dislocation to Group Logic

The notion of control acts as a dislocating force. With an added ninth class to the eighth grade team for the present year, teachers were asked to perform scheduling tasks. The control of scheduling was handed over to the eighth grade team, but was taken away from them in the middle of this study. Unlike all the team meetings to date where the principal sat at the table with teachers, in this particular meeting he stood by the side of the table, two fists placed firmly on
the table. At other times, his leg was elevated on another chair, and
the one fist remained on the table as he forcefully acknowledged that
"from now on, I will do all the changes, and the scheduling has been
taken away from you completely." The principal explained this
action as follows:

I observed that instead of trying to schedule kids, their attitude was to get me, stick it to me, to
the point that I had to take that scheduling away from them.

Therefore, even though teachers find ways to manipulate the day to
their own satisfaction, there are points where these efforts get
checked. This is indicated by the administrative recovery of control
of scheduling. "Some good comes out of all this," replies the
principal when I questioned him on the giving and taking away of
teacher autonomy. With this in mind, dislocations disallow an
overthrow of the administration, and resistance of the group is
managed.

Dislocation of Penetrations Into Official
Components of Schooling Content

A dislocation of penetrations into official components of
schooling lies in the content teachers teach. Items in the hidden
curriculum typifying the official and unofficial areas of study are
important. Exercises within the limits of everyday curriculum fall
under the official curriculum. However, the data suggest that
teachers place an emphasis on capitalistic items in the class as part
of their content—part of the hidden curriculum. For instance,
teachers reflect and transmit capitalistic values by talking about
commodities. They talk about the 1) completion of tasks on time, 2) value of a working class attitude of enjoying "work, work, work," 3) selling of candy for profit that will involve a trip to spend excess profit, 4) idea of rewards as repayment for a job well done, 5) importance of cars and their value, and 6) value of competition. In countless ways, teachers suggest that capitalism is mere common sense. Moreover, in teachers' hard, ept work, they clearly show or exhibit the above values, thus damming themselves to a life of subordinate work and denying themselves other forms of cultural expression.

Ironically the "lads" cannot see how their penetrations are necessary for capitalism to thrive. With their victory over the school, they not only damn but entrap themselves to more elaborate amounts of labor power. The irony works differently in teachers' lives, but nevertheless works in ways that are needed for capitalism. The fact that teachers penetrate official components of the curriculum is offset when in the process they damn and entrap themselves as overworked. While a victory is celebrated in both the "lad's" and in the teachers' case, it can only be short-lived if other forms of cultural expression are negated.

Summary

Teacher Power

Importantly, head-on confrontation with administration is a routine activity at Hillview, and represents a rejection of the teacher-administrator exchange. Says Mr. X: "He's got a power
struggle here." Individually, Mr. X realizes this. As a group, the strategic acts or what could also be termed informal acts, are used to counter administrative control.\footnote{This suggests an understanding that teachers who hold certain powers act to better their own class.} Foucault (1980) on the notion of power:

>Certainly everyone doesn't occupy the same position; certain positions preponderate and permit an effect of supremacy to be produced. This is so much the case that class domination can be exercised just to the extent that power is dissociated from the individual might. (p. 156)

Important here is the power the group of teachers have as defined by their resistant acts. To understand group solidarity and to utilize it to the group's advantage is a form of 1) power, 2) a production of supremacy, and 3) a form of teacher class domination. To engage in acts of resistance would be to partake in a struggle which has both strategy and tactics, is reflective, creative and emancipatory. It has potential for consciousness raising.

**What a Full Penetration May Look Like**

A full penetration on the teachers' part would not be only to realize hidden curriculum values, but also to act through the hidden curriculum so as to lead students to a better understanding of capitalistic values. This would guide students to act in certain ways, to possibly change a predetermined life with knowledge gained. To know that some students are predetermined to fail is simply not enough. This is to only view an immediate problem. The longer term problem is to understand how teachers use items in the hidden
curriculum to reinforce capitalism, and act on this. Put differently, and in Bowles' and Gintis' (1976) terms, teachers in a contemporary capitalistic society are bound to goals of education that are fundamentally contradictory. In other words, striving for student personal growth is offset with preparing a student to a damned, or as one teacher put it, "predetermined" social, occupational and political order. To raise students' consciousness to their teachers' labelled view of them, to aspects of ept and inept labor, are all important to the students' cultural awareness. This is part of the hidden curriculum. Similar claims could be said of teachers. Raising their consciousness about the above issues is also part of the battleplan—to penetrate the official uses of the curriculum and understand its hidden, manipulative forces.

A full penetration would involve teacher group action that would in the final outcome change the curriculum and school board policies. A full penetration then, would involve teachers being in control of the school day. This would involve teachers having control of decision making out of class as well as in class.

The full penetration will not eventuate if the celebration of an apparent victory of teacher time and space is not seen as short lived and teachers do not realize ways that they are manipulated. Ultimately, a fetishized wage packet is limiting. Says Mr. X: "I'm here for the 22,000." With this factor also in mind, resistance is thwarted and an accommodation to structural components becomes inevitable. Ultimately, it is the "they" in the "we" and the "them" in the "us" that defines the intermingling of the formal and informal,
and ept and inept work habits which keep teachers within the boundaries of structural components of the school.

Penetrations, limitations, divisions, dislocations help form the tension between upper level management (principal, vice-principal and counselor) of a school and its workers, the teachers. Resistant acts make it bearable to live in the tension that teachers are surrounded by everyday. Group cohesion, the at times non-adherence to the teacher-administrator exchange and the move from the official to pragmatic routines of school helps consolidate the counter-culture.

The tension between the economic and the cultural is also portrayed. One cannot determine a structural set-up only in economic terms. This tells only part of the story. The real battle is also on the cultural side. To look at a teacher's life only in economic terms would damn this study to a deterministic viewpoint, which in all seriousness, misses the whole point. To see how penetrations are made, and what limits and dislocates them, better helps understand the role of teacher culture in school settings.
Footnotes


2 Divisions refer to what impedes a fuller penetration. These divisions will be further elaborated on in the ensuing sections of this chapter.

3 Cultural Capital refers to knowledge, skills, values and attitudes that are passed between teachers and students.

4 This is the notion of counter-hegemony expressed in Jean Anyon (1980), "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work." *Journal of Education*, 162, No. 2: pp. 67-92 and Jean Anyon (1981), "Social Class and School Knowledge." *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11, No. 1: pp. 3-42. Here, working class values in a working class school are taught as opposed to teaching higher level thinking values in a working class school.

5 Items, as noted in Chapter 3 footnotes have to do with parts of a school day, i.e., time, space, etc., which may provide information about their relationship with teachers to the wider community.

6 "Emancipation" is a concept used by critical theorists and is summarized by Thomas McCarthy (1979): "Emancipation is understood as the overcoming of dogmatism, especially in the forms of an objectivist blindness to the subjective conditions of knowledge . . . 'the will of reason' that is inherent in reason is the formal interest in theoretical enlightenment, in a rigorous pursuit of the ultimate conditions of knowledge and action . . . the implication is that emancipatory interest aims not simply at the pursuit of knowledge and reflection as such, but at practical change of established conditions, a partnership guided by critical insight into specific structures of power and ideology." (p. 97) In Thomas McCarthy (1979), *The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas*. (London: M.I.T. Press), p. 97.

7 The concept of reflection is many-pronged and at best has a dubious meaning. McCarthy, on Habermas' notion of reflection: "self reflection means reflection on the subjective conditions of knowledge, on the 'a priori constitution' of the facts with which the objectifying deal, on the 'synthetic achievements of the knowing subject.'" Self-reflection for Habermas would be an "attempt to develop the idea of critique of ideology that aims at freeing the subject from his dependence on 'hypostasized powers' concealed in the structures of speech and action . . . self reflection and liberation from dogmatic dependence . . . It is both a reflection on the conditions of knowledge and critical-reflective dissolution of dogmatic life forms." McCarthy, op. cit., pp. 94-96.
8The concept of typifications can be related to that way tasks are viewed. This concept derives from Alfred Shutz. Typifications are the stock of knowledge at hand, including types of expected behavior patterns. Further discussion, see Kenneth Leiter (1980), A Primer on Ethnomethodology. (New York: Oxford University Press), pp. 4-9. A distinction must also be made between first order and second order typifications. First order typifications would be a teacher's subjective view of administrative actions typified as inept. Second order typifications would be a teacher's subjective view of administrative would be my construction of analysis to reconstruct reality as I, the researcher see this reality.

9Common sense knowledge can be connected to the natural attitude of everyday life, something that is simply taken for granted. See Kenneth Leiter (1980), op. cit., pp. 4-9.

10Accomodation refers to aspects in a teacher's day at the school that focuses on adherence to structural components of the day, i.e., curriculum, rules, duties, etc.

11For an elaboration of a member's sense of social structure, Kenneth Leiter (1980), op. cit., p. 68. Important here is that by viewing a distinction between "us" and "we" and "they" and "them," teachers structure their own meaning of a social situation.

12For further discussion on this, see chapter two in Henry Giroux (1983), Theory and Resistance in Education. (Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers), pp. 42-71.

13One could describe these completed tasks as done eptly.

14Willis (1977) uses the term decentering as the "suppression of cultural penetrations." Willis, op. cit., p. 164. Tasks undertaken by teachers in this study decenter the penetrations that they make, as these tasks, while taking on resistant qualities, also provide accommodative aspects to the structure of schooling.

15For a discussion on dislocations on the cultural level, refer to Paul Willis (1977), op. cit., pp. 163-166. Here, Willis talks about dislocations as a major component in the shaping of inequalities of society. They are also looked upon as "the calm acceptance of the system." (p. 165)

16Interestingly, in order to regain some semblance of control/power, the principal recovers some authoritative qualities. This suppresses further remarks by teachers at this meeting.

17Strategic action involves intersubjective validity of the rules of a game. Strategic actions would bind group together to understand certain action as having particular meaning. For more on strategic acts, see McCarthy (1979), op. cit., pp. 25.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

If there is a conclusion that this study points to, it is that teachers do resist administrator authority and certain structural aspects of the school. Resistance is a necessary part of teachers accomplishing their work. Yet, in the long run, this results in the accommodation by teachers to structural components of the school day, such as doing required work in a particular time period, even though school rules are broken in the process.

Through teacher pragmatic routines we see a fundamental tension. There is the creation of an informal teacher counter-culture group on the one hand, and the adherence to the individualistic logic and other official school routines on the other hand. Thus, teachers, in striving for their own autonomy, are alienated from each other into separate classes, have a separate official curriculum, and express different views about issues in school. This weakens group solidarity.

Change in this particular setting is not consciously looked upon as a "class" or group solidarity issue by teachers or administrators. It is here that I tried to discover through a cultural analysis of a group of teachers, to see if there is what Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) adhere to as a display of a sense of critical agency and empowerment,
if there were "workable alternatives to the current forms of schooling" (p. 161), where critical educators identify and interrogate relations of culture and power. I also tried to discover if in this middle school there existed socially constructed sites of contestation that involved culturally produced lived experiences of teachers.

In one sense, there are semblances of a teacher "cultural agency." There are, for example, instances when the "team" acts together on issues, suggesting forms of solidarity. But there are limits to the "team's" penetrations due to dislocating factors, especially the acceptance of an individualistic logic, resulting in the alienation of teachers from other teachers. When Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) argue that what is lacking in educational fields today is an expression of a group's (in my case, teachers) struggle to constitute its social identity, what they do not seem to recognize are the structural factors existing within this struggle, which, in the long run, militate against group identity. This study suggests just that.

What also is clear in this study, is the tension between administrators and teachers. Teachers are under stress much of the school day. They are caught in the immediacy of resisting authority and control by breaking rules, for example. They do not come together after school hours or at break time at school to discuss how their struggle can be furthered on an ideological level, or how they can improve their status in and out of the school. Importantly, Harris (1982) notes:
The avenue as yet not generally available for teachers is one whose primary concern is with the politics and ideology of schooling, and which is open to all affected by schooling—teachers, students, pupils and parents alike. An organization of this type could have a large beneficial effect to the work being done in unions. (p. 150)

It is precisely because teachers are alienated that forming some sort of group solidarity is so difficult. Harris (1982) is helpful here:

Teaching is a solitary, isolated, individualistic job. Classroom teaching is carried out alone, and most of the problems that arise there tend to be seen as the teacher's individual problems rather than as things shared by all teachers or even many teachers. (p. 148)

Therefore, teachers are left with no option but to rely on themselves, individually. Clearly, the lack of what Harris (1982) calls a "disposition towards collective action" (p. 150) is a serious impediment for teachers to overcome.

In short, while there is an eighth-grade "team" on the one hand, there is the solitary teacher individual on the other, who desperately needs to control his/her life in school, at least part of the time.

A question must be asked at this point: What best defines the teacher situation at Hillview? Michel Foucault (1980) helps answer this question. Foucault talks about a relational theory of power:

One doesn't have a power which is wholly in the hands of one person who can exercise it alone and totally over others. It's a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised ... power is no longer substantially identified with an individual who posses it by right of birth; it becomes a machinery that no one owns. (p. 156)
Foucault's point seems well taken. Another way of saying this, is to say that power resides not only in the hands of the supervisors (principal, state department, etc.), or in the hands of the teachers who belong to the counter-culture. But in one system, power can be relational. It is a circular process to be distributed among many individuals.

Through the creation of the teacher counter-culture, the eighth grade team possess certain powers. These can be seen through their penetrations into the individualistic logic, the administrator-teacher exchange, and the official routines of schooling. If power is relational as Foucault argues, then power also resides in those dislocations (principal acts, state acts, etc.) that limit teacher solidarity.

Ultimately a powerful irony remains so poignant to this study. In the celebration of their penetrations, teachers damn themselves in particular and their students in general to a life of subordinate work. A grasp of this irony is fundamental to understanding the role of the teacher in this social order.

What to Do on Monday Morning

Despite the gloom and doom of the foregoing, we can take heart that there does exist a struggle of sorts. While there is an unflagging adherence to pervasive individualistic logic on the one hand, there still exists a culturally productive teacher "team" on the other hand. Finally, however, the team's apparent function is to succumb to the demands of the State. This capitulation is barely
recognized by individuals, even less so on a group basis. If the mind set of the individualistic logic, and ignorance of dominating forces be the cause of this situation, then it is here that teachers must begin.

What should teachers do on Monday morning? There is no simple answer. However, at the university, in teacher education departments is a good beginning. If teachers are to achieve autonomy, a higher social status, be freed from administrative constraints, etc., they must be taught how and why these constraints are in place and who is responsible for them. Put differently, teacher educators must know that a high degree of social and economic inequality exists and persists in their lives as well as in their students' lives. To achieve this would entail a radical form of teacher education: being highly self-critical and reflective. But not to do this would rob teacher educators of the ability to elaborate on what they have been taught. Says Giroux (1980):

In many respects, teacher education programs have simply not given teachers the conceptual tools they need in order to view knowledge as problematic, as a historically conditioned, socially constructed phenomena. (p. 19)

Self reflection and the acquiring of a disposition for a critical spirit or critical attitude are necessary tools for teacher educators as well as teachers.

Next comes the question of change. One hopes, that the ability to critically analyze and reflect on injustices, ironies, etc., may engender social action for teachers on a group level. This could be begun only if university educators are critical themselves, thus not
damning the cause of change on an ideological level. Giroux's (1980) passionate words are convincing:

Teacher-education programs are caught in a deceptive paradox. Charged with the public responsibility to educate teachers to enable future generations to learn the knowledge and skills necessary to guild a principled and democratic society, they represent a significant agency for the reproduction and legitimation of a society characterized by a high degree of social and economic inequality. (p. 5)

It is only when the teachers of teacher educators, and then teachers themselves are educated for empowerment and their work in school is understood, that injustices may be mitigated. I am afraid that without this enlightenment, teachers in the public arena will be damned forever to buying into an unjust situation.

With the above caveats in mind, what can be offered for Monday morning? One teacher I followed said after the study, "What can I do to improve myself?" Surely this is a fundamental question if what she meant is, what can I do to improve my "class" situation? My reply to her was to "obtain an M.A., and at the same time, do something about controlling your life at school." This remark, of course, needs further elaboration.

How is one to control one's life when penetrations are inconspicuously dislocated? In order to become emancipated, one must come to understand the hows and whys of domination. It is not enough just to be a good teacher and change the curriculum to suit your class' needs. This mystifies or obscures who really controls and legitimates the knowledge of the "handed down" curriculum. Teachers need to conceptualize, execute and evaluate the curriculum, not only
individually, but as a group. Control of the dissemination of knowledge is at stake here. The same can be said about school board policy, rules, and other official routines at the school. What the data suggest is that teachers only barely understand the forces that dominate their and their superior's lives. More knowledge of who is in control of school decisions, including rules, policies and the like, may engender forms of resistance that would lead to teachers controlling their day. My hope is that comments like that of Mr. X—"The principal's hands are tied by the people downtown"—represent a penetration that can be built upon. With this in mind, critical reflection in praxis is a necessary condition for an awareness of the forces of domination. "Change" can only come about through penetrations which have the seeds of this sort of critical awareness.

Thus, to control one's day by having a hardcore student discipline problem removed from one's classroom may not be the important issue. The people who decide why and where a child should be placed, is. On Monday morning then, teachers must make long term decisions that have real effect on school board policy.

What does Monday morning mean to the student? While teachers in this study nurture their students, it seems that these students are also victims of a power struggle between teachers and administrators. If teachers cannot understand their own role in the social order, i.e., penetrations, dislocations, limitations and divisions, then I find it difficult to believe that they comprehend their students' role in society as well. Ironically, it is teacher ignorance of not
comprehending the type of curricula content taught and particular values transmitted (hidden curriculum) that in the end dislocates not only teacher penetrations, but also dislocates student consciousness raising. It is to this understanding that teachers must be enlightened about for any change of significance to occur.

If one were to build for, or hope to achieve an authentic emancipatory program, teacher educators, and in turn, teachers and students, would have to understand the force of irony in their lives. Concurrently, group solidarity over issues of domination and subordination must be attained for a battle on the cultural plain to be meaningful in the long term. To succeed in a battle of this sort would have far reaching effects for change to eventuate.

This study succeeds in pointing to resistant acts. There is a battleground. There also exists accommodation to structural aspects of schooling. What is suggested is teacher cultural movement. This is due in large part to the tension, questioning and probing into one's existence. For my liking however, there is not enough of it. It is as if teachers reach a confrontation of not only the administration, but administration's superiors, as well as their own existence, and then slowly withdraw into their shell yet another time. This is due in large part to the limitations and dislocations of their penetrations.
Immediate Teacher Strategies

There is no specific order of importance of these suggestions.

Teachers must focus their attention on forces of power that exist in both their lives and their students' lives. For example, if a competitive ethos is promoted in a teacher's class, which denotes the power of the individualistic logic, understanding why these values are promoted in the ideologic sense may help promulgate teachers to disseminate different forms of knowledge.

View teacher cooperative activities as oppositional to the competitive ethos in a capitalistic society. Promote it among teacher peers and in class.

The school is an arena for penetrations. Rocking the school boat for further autonomy and control will only come about because of these penetrations. They must be exploited to their fullest potential for change to occur.

Penetrations of relationships, say the administration-teacher relationship must be further exposed so as to achieve not only more autonomy on an individual and group basis, but a better life for students in the school as well.

The curriculum used will be a major source of penetrations. Exposing the present ideology through the curriculum is vital if teachers are to succeed at transforming their own culture, as well as students'. Use your curriculum in all subject areas to penetrate the social order. Exercises can be geared to do this, especially exercises involving group work on issues of controversy, i.e. prejudice, economic inequality, etc.

Be honest about your (teacher) role in the social order. This may help make students more aware of their role as well.

Be honest about students' role. Let them in on how they are dominated both in and out of the school setting.

Be critical to students and administrators about your role in the social order. Question, expose and probe it to its maximum.
Treat other teachers, students and administrators with respect. In a teacher's case, this may help override individual differences and help form group cohesion that may allow for eventual collective action, group solidarity.

Don't discriminate against each other. This only promotes a competitive ethos amongst teachers that would end up dislocating penetrations. Each teacher should be treated as an equal, with the goal of promoting a better society. Individual differences and confrontations hinder this.

Take note of administrative weaknesses. Expose them so as to better help your struggle. Let the administration know of their weaknesses through direct confrontation.

Take a political stance. Go to union meetings. Take note of forces of domination. Work to expose them, individually and cooperatively.

Be careful not to rock the boat too much. This will help dislocate the penetrations made quicker. A penetration is a subtle outlet that promotes change. Don't abuse it by getting yourself fired.

Encourage the community you teach in access to your enlightened knowledge on what the real function of the school and its components (administrators, teachers, custodians, time, space, curriculum) are.

Directions for Further Study

More work needs to be completed in the area of teacher routines. This study suggests that teachers do not only follow official guidelines to do their work. The creation of the informal teacher counter-culture group is an example of a group of teachers who defy authority by breaking rules, etc., so they can control their day and have more autonomy. The implications of informal groups of teachers have further potential for study and elaboration, especially the penetrations that exhibit emancipatory interests.
This study also suggests a form of teacher consciousness (teacher thinking traits). More work in this area is needed to understand why teachers succumb, at times so blindly to the State, and why group action is only sought minimally. To study other forms of penetrations, dislocations, limitations and divisions is vital to understanding how teachers think, and how this reflects on their relationships to the structure of schooling.

On another tack, studies need to be conducted on student actions during teacher resistant acts. In other words, how do teacher actions change, influence, hinder or promote student action in and out of class? Serious work needs to be completed in this area if teachers are to understand more of their role and their students' role in the social order. Ideally, it would be nice to know what Willis' "lads" think about a lad-like teacher. Here, there could be room for cooperation by teachers and students in furthering penetrations.

Studies on administrator--principal, vice-principal, counselor, superintendent and area supervisor routines needs elaboration in order to achieve a fuller picture of how resistance and accommodation on a higher authority level exists and how this may relate to teacher lives. Also, how teacher resistance effects administrator authority and decision making (barely looked at in this study) is a vital point and in need of greater clarity.

At higher level institutions, probing into hidden curriculum values of teacher education programs, its teachers and curriculum usage, would aid researchers in the understanding of how values are transferred through teachers to the schools. Clarity is needed on
the way teacher education programs are run—power, authority, and control relations of teacher educators and their superiors. In short, how penetrations of facets of higher institutions exist needs further elaboration.

Finally, a more interactionist perspective by researchers would aid in understanding behavior not only as a microscopic event in history, but as part of a larger whole. Thus, the subjective interpretation of actors must be viewed as part of a more objective, if need be, theoretical framework.

The above directions are really the tip of the iceberg for understanding the school and the social order, in which teachers are such a major force. I take heart that there may be a few researchers who will continue to build the stepping stone for further elaboration into the areas mentioned above.
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