

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

GENDER RELATIONS AND TEACHER-PUPIL
INTERACTION IN FOUR NORTHERN
PRIMARY SCHOOLS

being a Thesis submitted for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Hull

by

Katherine Mary Clarricoates, B.A.

September 1984

CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	iv
Chapter I An Appraisal of Existing Sociological Perspectives on Education	1
Chapter II Methodology and Fieldwork	48
Chapter III The Catchment Areas	103
Chapter IV Suburban Village, Council Estate and Farming Community	149
Chapter V An Overview of the Schools	247
Chapter VI Teachers' Ideologies and Expectations	331
Chapter VII Gender Differentiation in the Organisation and Management of the Classroom	371
Chapter VIII Gender Differentiation in Relation to the Organisation of Knowledge and the Evaluation of Achievement	434
Chapter IX Gender Relations and Peer Group Behaviour	489
Chapter X Conclusions	555
Appendix	589
Bibliography	592

ABSTRACT

The thesis examines the way in which the classroom practices of teachers use gender as a means of categorisation, organisation and control and help to create and/or perpetuate particular perceptions and expectations of gender behaviour and relations in children.

Within this context, the thesis will explore the extent to which classroom practices reflect (or differ from) the more general attitudes that teachers hold about gender relations and about the appropriate education of girls and boys.

It will also investigate the constraints upon teachers' practices which stem from the school situation; the social background, training and attitudes of the teachers; the structure of the lives of married women (as wives/mothers/teachers); the children themselves, who come into school with certain attitudes already formed, and who continue to participate in a culture wider than the school.

It will study the effect of different catchment areas upon the practices of teachers and upon the interaction between teachers and pupils. This aspect of the thesis is based upon the assumptions that:

- i] children's experiences in family and community will vary between catchment areas.
- ii] teachers will view each catchment area differently and that their aims, ambitions and educational practices will be influenced by the nature of the catchment area and by their view of it
- iii] the outlook of the headteachers is a crucial variable since they are key figures in defining the policies of the school and the nature of the relationship of the school to its catchment area.

Through the comparison of catchment areas the thesis will incorporate the variable of class, and study the interaction of class and gender in specific settings. As a subsidiary theme, the urban-rural variable will

also be considered.

While the main emphasis will be on the routine practices of teachers, some attention will be paid to less common forms of interaction such as the treatment of children who 'deviate' from expected forms of gender behaviour.

As well as the interaction between teachers and pupils, the thesis will examine the nature of interaction between children themselves as this relates to gender relations.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I must acknowledge those who form the subject of the research. These include the teachers and pupils of Dock Side, Long Meadow, Applegate and Lintonbray. and the women in the catchment areas who gave me so much of their time and told me so much about, what they thought, were their 'ordinary' lives.

My appreciation must also go to the (then) East Riding Education Committee who gave me a complete list of schools from which to choose my area of study.

Special thanks must go to my supervisor Colin Creighton for his scholastic perfection and endurance which enabled me to finally complete the thesis. Thanks must also go to Dr. Peter Forster for his guidance during my fieldwork and to Dr. Michelle Barrett who provided the encouragement to commence the work. My thanks also to Dr. Norman O'Neill for his advice and the constant use of his own thesis, and who, despite my somewhat lengthy 'sojourn' in the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, kept chiding me to complete.

My remaining debts are to Jo Sutton, Scarlet Pollock and Judy Lown for their theoretical discussions and without whose support I would have long since 'given up the ghost' of the project; my political sisters within the Women's Liberation Movement who are too many to name here; and to Graham, Graham-John, Christopher and Julie Clarricoats who never stopped believing in me. Last, but certainly not the least, to Stella Rhind for stepping in at the last minute to type up the huge manuscript with great patience and never-failing humour.

The responsibility for what eventually emerged is entirely my own.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is based on intensive, qualitative research carried out over a period of eighteen months in four primary schools, in and around a Northern, dockland city. The purpose of the study is to explore certain aspects of the ways in which schools handle gender differences and incorporate the category of gender into routine classroom practices of categorisation, organisation and control. This will, it is hoped, throw greater light upon the contribution of schools to the perpetuation of gender hierarchies in society.

The emergence of the Women's Movement has initiated considerable and much-needed debate within sociology, which had traditionally marginalised women's issues. This thesis is meant to be a contribution to this debate within one specific area of sociology, the sociology of education. The issue of gender has, until very recently, been grossly neglected within theoretical work in educational sociology while empirical work is sparse, often overly descriptive and lacking connection with broader theoretical debates. Very little of the empirical work that has been carried out examines gender relations within the context of classroom interaction. Moreover, most work hitherto relates almost exclusively to secondary schools; the primary sector is ignored thus allowing misleading generalisations about it to flourish.

A further flaw in existing work in the sociology of education is the tendency to examine gender and class in isolation from each other.

This study will attempt to explore the interaction between the two by comparing teaching practices in schools sited in four socially contrasting catchment areas.

In the introduction I would like to clarify my underlying theoretical position and to declare my own values and commitments in relation to the subject matter of the thesis. I write as a feminist, essentially to challenge the oppression of women by men, and regard this study as a form of political praxis.

Involvement in feminist scholarship necessitates reflection upon the debates concerning the theorisation of gender relations. I intend to make use of the concept of patriarchy in exploring the power relationships between males and females in schools and to demonstrate how some of the features of the structural relationship between the sexes within the wider community impinge upon the teaching situation and other social processes within the school. Patriarchy is still a controversial concept within sociology and I therefore propose to examine some of the arguments which surround it.

The concept of patriarchy has been at the centre of a prolonged and heated debate during the last decade. Much of the debate has taken the form of an interchange between Marxist writers on the one side and Radical and Revolutionary Feminists on the other. The concept of patriarchy emerged from the latter wing of the feminist movement in the attempt to develop an analysis which could confront the oppression of women by men in a direct fashion and not treat it as a product of other antagonisms.

Marxist writers, in response, have argued that radical feminist theory is ahistorical and asocial. Barrett (1980) has written that it is "redolent of a universal and transhistorical oppression" (p.11). The

major argument against radical feminist theory is that it 'fails' to explain the origins of patriarchy and thus presumably that the analysis founders on its 'inability' to locate the historical conditions which caused men to exploit women (Beechey, 1979; Barrett, 1980). One form that the argument of ahistoricity takes is to say that patriarchy cannot be applied to modern capitalist society and that the term should only encompass those particular relations involving dominance of fathers and husbands over wives and children and of older men over younger men (Young and Harris, 1976; Edholm et al., 1977; Cockburn, 1981; Fox-Genovese, 1982).

Marxist feminists do not accept the primacy which radical feminists attribute to patriarchy because of their acceptance of a Marxist framework for an analysis of women's oppression (Beechey, 1979; Barrett, 1980), although they do accept that traditional Marxist writings on the position of women are crude and economistic both in analysis and solution (Barrett, 1980). They continue to assume, however, that adequate theorising is possible only within a Marxist framework.¹ A central element of this approach is the attempt to locate the historical origins of male dominance, which stems from the supposition that once the origins are traced, a fundamental link will be established between the (predefined) system of class relations and the persistence of the domination of men over women. Marxist writers have failed, however, to find the origins of male supremacy and indeed the project is fundamentally flawed since the

1. Christine Delphy (1977) discussed such a problem arguing it was holding back the theoretical developments of the Women's Liberation Movement, see *The Main Enemy*, Women's Research and Resources Centre, Explorations in Feminism No. 3, London (first published in France, 1970).

lines on which they conduct such a search tends to place the source of male dominance outside of the social relations between men and women themselves (Friedman, 1982). Marxists sever the connection between the subordination of women and the "sexual division of labour" by taking the latter as given. This is especially significant since the "sexual division of labour" is for most Marxist feminists the key concept used to link patriarchy with economic class relations. But sexual division and conflict are not ultimately explained by the concepts derived from labour and economic class relations. As a descriptive tool the sexual division of labour can be very useful but it is limited because it does not explain why labour should divide by sex and why status and reward remain sex-specific even when changes are brought about in such a division of labour.

As previously indicated, one widespread failing within Marxism is economic reductionism. This leads, in the case of women, to a tendency to conflate class and gender and to treat women as merely another type of worker contributing to the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production. Attempts to avoid this frequently run into dualism, as in the case of analyses which equate patriarchy with production. Sheila Rowbotham regards patriarchy as a pre-capitalist form of control and capitalism based upon control of labour-power rather than control of the person (Rowbotham, 1973). Such analyses recognise that the two forms of control are incompatible with each other in some ways and yet support each other in other ways, yet the arguments over the relation between the two rage back and forth with no satisfactory conclusion, but often with the result of subordinating patriarchy to capitalism (Rowbotham, 1973; Middleton, 1974; Kirvan and Suringer, 1977).

Those Marxist-feminists who try to incorporate patriarchy in their analysis do not necessarily move away from locating women's oppression at the economic level (McDonagh & Harrison, 1978; O'Brien, 1981). Nor is it helpful to analyse the form of the family under capitalism as the result of the production/consumption split which the capitalist system imposes. Altogether, analysis of patriarchal structures has been restricted by the nature of the Marxist paradigm (Friedman, 1982). Juliet Mitchell is one who does, however, attempt to move away from locating women's oppression at the economic level (Mitchell, 1971; 1974). She does this by calling for greater analysis of the ideology of the family and of the processes which reproduce this ideology, and by placing Freudian psychoanalysis at the heart of the analysis of women's oppression. Yet this approach only intensifies the dualism which results from the 'separating out' of patriarchy and capitalism as 'co-existing systems'.

This problem is also found in a variety of theoretical schema for the analysis of gender and class which posit patriarchy and capitalism as mutual coinciding structures (Hartmann, 1976, 1981; Eisenstein, 1979), or which deploy such concepts as 'sex-gender system', 'gender hierarchy' and 'andrarchy' (Rubin, 1975; Cockburn, 1981).

In opposition to such theoretical schema and the Marxist paradigm, Scarlet Friedman has put forward an important defence of radical feminist theory and the contribution that it can make to the understanding of dominant/subordinate relations between the sexes. Friedman points out that it is important to make a clear distinction between the

theoretical views of Shulamith Firestone (1971) and Kate Millett (1971)¹ despite the fact that their common use of the term 'patriarchy' usually leads them to being 'lumped together'. Firestone argues that the man/woman antagonism is the primary division, and claims that the origins of women's oppression were determined by biology i.e. women were originally dependent on men due to factors of human biology, vulnerability during pregnancy, long gestation and nurturing. Millett is similar to Firestone in that she gives primacy to patriarchal rather than capitalist relations, but there all similarity ends. Millett, in fact, broadens the definition of politics² to refer to:

"... power structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another".

Millett, 1971: p.22

She defines patriarchy as: the domination of female by male and of younger males by older males.

Rejecting biological reductionism as an explanatory basis of patriarchy, for this grants the male dominant/woman subordinate relationship a logical as well as historical origin, Millett places stress on patriarchy as a social and political form and insists we look outside nature for its origins. It is true that Millett does not attempt to

-
1. Scarlet Friedman (1982) notes that both Firestone and Millett are seen as 'mothers of radical feminism' (p.1), see her theoretical paper: The Marxist Paradigm: Radical Theorists Compared, paper presented to the B.S.A. Conference, Manchester, April.
 2. Kate Millett's kind of analysis of power is similar to that which Steven Lukes (1974) puts forward in Power, a radical view, Macmillan, London. This involves not just seeing power exercised where the powerful group can win in conflicts of interest, not just in manipulation of what issues emerge as conflicts, but also may be seen to exist by the way the powerful may actually influence and shape the way the less powerful perceive what are their interests and wants.

explain the origin of this system but instead explores key features within patriarchy which are central to its maintenance and perpetuation: these are economic, educational and familial, with 'consent', being obtained through the socialisation of children into the patriarchal system. Friedman (1982) notes that Millett's theoretical standpoint does provide a theory of social change in that:

"Awareness of the historical as well as the contemporary character of the relationship between the sexes is necessary for the change and overthrow of patriarchal structures".

Friedman, 1982: p.5

The analytical identification of the economic and the familial spheres with the split between production and consumption is a result of the pre-occupation with causation. Radical feminists take the position that such an obsession is futile, as the search for origins is empirically insoluble (Millett, 1971; Rich, 1977; Friedman, 1982; Lown, 1983). The accusation from marxist feminists that the term patriarchy is transhistorical is unfounded as radical feminists have insisted upon the historical development of different patriarchal forms. If it is logical to analyse historical and cultural variations of 'economic class', then it is also tenable to search for the differing forms of political relationships between men and women. Essentially, to use the conceptual tool of patriarchy is to explore the power relationship between men and women, and is thus central to feminist analysis (Barry, 1979; Dworkin, 1981).¹

Patriarchal relations are not just a facet of one particular historical

1. See also 'Interview with Andrea Dworkin' in Feminist Review, Summer, 1982.

formation but a pivotal organising principle of society, and as Delphy (1977) suggests, cut across class relations. It is important that feminists explore the material conditions of women's lives in order to analyse our oppression (Delphy, 1977). In exploring these material conditions we can understand the changing nature of patriarchal relations. Judy Lown (1983) has identified some of the historically changing circumstances in relations of domination and subordination between men and women, avoiding the production/consumption split. Lown firmly indicates that in studying patriarchy:

"... the need to conceptually distinguish between 'the economy' on the one hand, and 'the family' on the other, becomes irrelevant".

Lown, 1983: p.29

She justifies this by stating:

"... my use of the term patriarchy is posited on the possibility of economic and familial relations being a single process with no causal variable lying beyond the privileges and advantages accruing to those who benefit from such a process".

Lown, 1983: p.29

In doing so there is nothing to prevent us from examining the variations in patriarchy in different social and historical settings or the specific forms that it takes in each social class.

In this thesis, the researcher intends to explore the manner in which educational institutions help to reproduce and perpetuate patriarchal power relations and the specific forms that these patriarchal relations take in particular social classes.

The researcher was also concerned with the adequacy of some of the

concepts commonly employed in the analysis of gender. Concepts such as 'sex-role', 'sex differences', and 'sex stereotypes' have frequently been used loosely and as alternatives to each other to avoid repetition. Barrie Thorne (1978) has stressed the need for better conceptualisation and has suggested that the various terms in use are tied to alternative conceptualisations of gender. She argues that the 'sex difference' approach and the conceptualisation of gender as a 'role' are both less than useful. The first rests on the assumption that gender is an attribute lodged within the individual: "a result of biology, social learning, or some interaction of the two" (Thorne, 1978: p.5). The major flaw of this approach is that limited bits of behaviour i.e. aggression, shyness etc., are extracted from their social context and then juxtaposed with sex. The second approach has brought more confusion than clarity because it implies that one's gender is a 'role' like any other whereas we really need to know more about how and why gender has come to infuse our conceptions of more specific roles.

Thorne states:

"... it is more meaningful to study the phenomenon of gender to differential power and status: as a system of relationships."

Thorne, 1978: p. 8

If we regard gender as a power relation it becomes easier to examine social institutions for the function they play in defining and reinforcing patriarchy. The researcher's main concern is directly with the ways gender infuses the daily world of primary school children: their friendships; their patterns of talk and play; the way they are sorted into 'groups' for academic work, to eat lunch or to head for home after school; in short the patterning of children's common-sense view

of reality itself.

It is important also to take account of the structural as well as the interactional aspects of social life, i.e. the ways in which the form and development of gender power relations are influenced by the larger patterns of power and control. Confining one's research to just observation of classroom interaction would negate the constraints of the social and political situation in the outside world. The very categories and distinctions used by parents, teachers, pupils and researchers, e.g. home and school, learning and play, 'able' and 'stupid', 'masculine' and 'feminine', are socially constructed. What is more, some groups are in a strong position to impose their constructions or meanings on others.

I have outlined the main themes and theoretical concepts which will inform the work. They will be presented in the following way.

Chapter I will consider theoretical developments in the sociology of education and examine their adequacies and shortcomings in relation to the exploration of gender.

Chapter II will provide a description of the methodological techniques employed and the problems encountered in pursuing the study.

Chapters III and IV will deal at length with community values and attitudes to the 'world's' of women and men in order to assess the nature of patriarchal relations in the home and in the community within the catchment areas of the schools under study.

Chapter V concentrates upon the ethos of the schools, the material provisions within them and the social organisation of gender and class.

Chapter VI provides an analysis of the teaching perspectives in the

four schools by assessing the ideologies and expectations of the teachers through extensive interviews with them. The experience of being a female teacher will also be considered and the effect this has on their substantive practice in the teaching situation.

Chapters VII and VIII comprise the greater part of the fieldwork carried out in the schools, describing and analysing the teacher-and-pupil relationship in accordance with gender and class.

Chapter IX attempts to interpret the everyday 'social reality' of the pupils themselves and some of the ways they make sense of their world in school.

Emphasis will be given to the status relationships that exist within the peer group and the way gender and class impinge upon such relationships. Conclusions will be drawn as to the overall function of the educational institution in reproducing patriarchal relations and the variations in pattern which result from socio-economic class differences.

Essentially the analysis is exploratory but it is hoped that the final results will be directly relevant to the advance of both feminist practice and general sociological theory.

CHAPTER I

An Appraisal of Existing Sociological Perspectives on Education

There can be no doubt that as yet, despite a decade of existing research which focusses upon gender, mainstream sociology of education remains untransformed by feminist thinking,¹ a situation which applies to sociology in general.² This crucial limitation in the field of educational theory and research gives rise to an emphasis on the male experience, in that any examination of the inequalities of the educational system usually deals with those inequalities which exist between men.

The researcher shall proceed to map out the main trends and development over the past two or three decades within the sociology of education, with this in mind. In addition, I will make reference to the relation of the macroscopic and microscopic levels of study, an issue which is of central importance to the sociological enterprise as a whole and one which has come to have particular salience in recent years in the sociology of education (Eggleston, 1974; Karabel & Halsey, 1977).

Functionalism

Functionalist analysis, with its biologicistic assumptions and emphases on consensus and equilibrium in society has been generally criticised for these characteristics and for its exaggeration of the role of technology

-
1. See Acker, Sandra. 1981: "No Woman's-Land: British Sociology of Education" in Sociological Review, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 77-104, for an up-to-date account.
 2. See the collection of papers in Roberts, Helen (Ed.) 1980: Doing Feminist Research, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

and for the inadequacies of its analysis of conflict and ideology.¹ More specifically, in relation to social inequalities, it can be said that functionalist theory treats the various forms of ascriptions, i.e. sex, race, class, as categories; remnants from a less advanced period or features of the shortcomings of the functional mechanism of stratification which is seen as a 'fixed set' of positions, whose various requirements the labour force must satisfy.² The concentration upon "social integration", which is implicit in this, contains certain methodological weaknesses as Floud and Halsey³ have pointed out:

"The structural functionalist is preoccupied with social integration based on shared values - that is, with consensus - and he conducts his analysis solely in terms of the motivated actions of individuals".

Floud & Halsey, 1958: p.171

-
1. According to Randall Collins (1977) the technical-function theories of education is not adequate, and its inadequacies derive from a more basic source: its approach to stratification. See his paper: "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification" in J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (Eds.) Power and Ideology in Education, Oxford University Press, previously published in American Sociological Review, Vol. 36, pp. 1002-1019. See also Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert, 1972: "I.Q. in the U.S. Class Structure", Social Policy, Vol. 3, pp. 65-96, for a similar critique.
 2. For a number of studies deriving from one form of functionalism or another see: Parsons, Talcott, 1959: "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 29, pp. 297-318; Clark, Burton R., 1960: "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 65, pp. 569-576; Turner, Ralph, 1960: "Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System", American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, pp. 855-867; Trow, Martin, 1961: "The Secondary Transformation of American Secondary Education", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Vol. 2, pp. 144-166.
 3. Floud, J. and Halsey, A.H., 1958: "The Sociology of Education: A Trend Report and Bibliography" in Current Sociology, Vol. VII, No. 3, pp. 165-235.

MISSING

PRINT

Thus education is seen as a means of motivating individuals to conform in order that society may maintain a state of equilibrium. But as Floud and Halsey (1958) point out, this hypothesis is difficult to utilise in relation to highly industrialised societies.

A major neglect within structural functionalism's treatment of education is the omission of a serious analysis of class and gender. Functional analysis too readily serves as a vindication for whatever power structure exists, but why and under what conditions this power structure is formed is never explored.¹

Cultural Deprivation

With the spread of more 'egalitarian' ideals, particularly since World War Two, there came a popular demand for equal educational opportunity. Research showed that social class handicaps children from very early on, and the many variables associated with this came under scrutiny.²

Streaming, helpful parents, material conditions of family life (i.e. number of children in the home, sanitary and living conditions), teachers' expectations, neighbourhood and the sub-culture were all examined for their effect upon a child's school career.

One of the shortcomings of these studies is that they concentrate over-

-
1. However, it should be pointed out that one of the founders of functionalism, Emile Durkheim did try to demonstrate how the larger patterns of power and control penetrate the process of schooling and the structure of educational knowledge, and thus to move towards a unified analysis of the structure and process of educational transmission (microcosm) with that of the wider implications of power and control in society (macrocosm). An excellent summary of Durkheim's work in this field can be found in Karabel & Halsey (Eds.), op.cit.
 2. Westergaard, J. and Little, A. 1964: "The Trend of Class Differentials in Educational Opportunity in England and Wales", British Journal of Sociology Vol.15, pp.301-316; Halsey, A.H., (Ed) 1961: Ability and Educational Opportunity, O.E.C.D.; Douglas, J.W.B. 1964: The Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London; Floud, J., Halsey, A.H. & Martin, F.M. 1956, Social Class and Educational Opportunity, Heinemann, London; Mays, J.B. 1962: Education and the Urban Child, Liverpool University Press; Jackson, Brian, 1964: Streaming: An Education System in Miniature, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London

whelmingly upon the class dimensions of inequality and said very little about gender inequalities. Another drawback is that they generally failed to investigate the workings of the educational process, that is, to study what actually goes on within schools and the contribution that this makes to the observed inequalities of 'achievement'.

Some of this research focussed on the individual pupil and her/his environment, rather than upon the educational system as a whole. This tendency received its sharpest expression in the theory of 'cultural deprivation' which postulates that children who are assumed to be 'deprived' come from homes that are less than adequate and that this explains their relatively poor academic performance in school. The pupils' 'failure' and 'underachievement' are suitably accounted for by the alleged deficiencies of themselves, their families and their social background. The theory has been heavily criticised for its inadequacies in explaining class inequalities in educational achievement.¹ It is even less appropriate to the study of gender differences, since girls are brought up in the same social setting as boys, but gender is a theme ignored by this tradition of research.²

-
1. See Banks, Olive, 1971: Sociology of Education, B.T. Batsford, London; the collection of articles in Keddie, Nell, (Ed.), 1973: Tinker, Tailor ... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation, Penguin, Harmondsworth, and the introduction to Karabel & Halsey (Eds.), op.cit.
 2. A prime example of such a study in the '60's is Douglas, 1964: op.cit. He fails to follow up the point he made that girls in primary school, on average, do much better than boys, particularly in reading, English and spelling, by not analysing why such 'discrepancies' or differentiation occurs.

Weberian Conflict Theory

In stark contrast to the absence of conflict in functionalist theory, Weber and his disciples see conflicting interests rather than systemic needs as shaping the educational system.¹ The Weberian emphasis is on the power of dominant groups to shape the school arbitrarily to their own purposes. Conflict is seen in the fact that the groups who have power and control endeavour to appropriate positions of status and privilege, and the powerless groups struggle to gain access to them. In an explicit attack on the functionalist theory of educational stratification Randall Collins² argues:

"The main activity of schools is to teach particular status cultures, both in and outside the classroom".

Collins, 1971: p.1010

For the most part Weberians have relied on research data from already existing work such as the cultural deprivationists and functionalism, and have radically re-interpreted this work. Their strength lies in their recognition of 'status cultures' and the ensuing conflict for prestige. However, Collins for one analyses status-based conflicts predominantly in terms of the labour market and the school's function

-
1. For discussions of Weberian Conflict Theory see Collins, Randall, 1975: Conflict Sociology: Toward an Explanatory Science, Academic Press Inc., New York. Also on the sociology of Max Weber see Gerth, H. and Mill, C. Wright, (Eds.) 1970: From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, Oxford University Press, New York, and Eldridge, E.T. (Ed.) 1971: Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality, Thos. Nelson & Sons, Ltd., London.
 2. Collins' concept of status groups is derived from Max Weber's classical essay: "Class, Status and Party", see Max Weber, 1968: Economy and Society, Bedminster Press, New York.

of allocating people to jobs which carry varying rewards.¹ Applying this perspective to gender, however, is complicated by the fact that girls are not prepared for the labour market in the same way that boys are. Moreover, the analysis must examine not only the formal operations of schools, and the behaviour of teachers, but must also take into account the dynamics of the informal status groups created by the boys and girls and their contribution to the creation of dominant/subordinate relations between men and women. It is obviously important to identify the character of these cultures and the processes by which they are transmitted, but this requires direct empirical evidence on the internal working of the school.

The Deschoolers and Freeschoolers (The Hidden Curriculum)

An alternative approach to the issue of social inequality in education has been provided by those who have called for deschooling and free-schooling.² Recognising that education is socially divisive, they trace much of the problem to the fact that certification has little relevance to the nature of the occupations that people enter, even though this is the 'basis of success' on the job market. Once again, the analysis concentrates on class divisions to the exclusion of gender,

-
1. Studies of the power struggle between men and women in the field of paid employment suggests that the Weberian approach may have something to offer. See for example: Hartmann, Heidi, 1976: "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex", Signs, Spring, Vol. 1, No. 3, and Cockburn, C., 1981: "The Material of Male Power", Feminist Review, No. 9, pp. 41-58.
 2. Among the best known advocates of deschooling and freeschooling are Illich, Ivan, 1971: Deschooling Society, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Holt, John, 1974: The Underachieving School, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Goodman, Paul, 1971: Compulsory Miseducation, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Kohl, Herbert, 1968: 36 Children, Gollancz, London.

but it has indirectly made an important contribution to the study of the latter through developing the concept of the 'hidden curriculum'.

We know that the official curriculum entails what should be taught to pupils, i.e. the skills the pupil is supposed to be learning, and the avowed aims of the school and the education system of which it is a part. The term 'hidden curriculum' is used to describe a variety of other things a pupil learns in addition to succeeding or failing at academic skills. Davies and Meighan¹ state:

"The hidden curriculum is a term used to refer to those aspects of learning in schools that are unofficial or unintentional, or undeclared consequences of the way in which teachers organise and execute teaching and learning".

Davies and Meighan, 1975: p.171

The concept of the 'hidden' curriculum has been used by other writers (apart from Illich) and in varying ways, and is therefore open to inconsistencies. Phil Jackson² argues that it communicates similar messages to all children. They all have to learn to comply with three 'Rs': Rules, Routine and Regulations, in order to cope with school. However, Frazier and Sadker³ argue that the 'hidden' curriculum is not the same for all children, in that it is sex-differentiated and that one of the messages communicated to pupils is what behaviours, attitudes

-
1. Davies, Lynn and Meighan, Roland, 1975: "A Review of Schooling and Sex Roles, with particular reference to the experience of girls in secondary schools", Educational Review, Vol. 27 (3), pp. 165-178.
 2. Jackson, Phil, 1968: Life in Classrooms, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
 3. Frazier, Nancy, and Sadker, Myra, 1973: Sexism in School and Society, Harper & Row, New York.

and prestige are appropriate for either sex. It is necessary to expand the investigation of the 'hidden' curriculum more systematically in relation to gender, but the concept does appear to have the potential of providing important insights into the construction and management of gender identities and relations within schools.

Freeschoolers, much more than deschoolers, make life in the classroom the focal point of their analysis. Unfortunately, though they recognise that the classroom cannot be treated as if in a vacuum, their analysis of the wider educational system is always secondary to their examination of the structure of teacher-pupil relationships. Although they have advanced our knowledge of the problems of teaching and learning, the freeschoolers, like the deschoolers, look for change within the school rather than in society as a whole.

The analysis of the wider educational system is central to the more recent work of Roger Dale¹ and Andy Hargreaves.² In their work both have shown how teachers themselves operate under external constraints, both structural and organisational, within particular schools.³ Their research highlights many important questions including why the teacher organises and evaluates pupil learning and behaviour in one way rather than another. They also show that the tactics that teachers adopt are indicative of the every-day limitations, difficulties and contradictions

-
1. Dale, Roger, 1977: "The Implications of the Rediscovery of the Hidden Curriculum for the Sociology of Teaching", in Dennis Gleeson (Ed.) Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education, Nafferton Books, Driffield.
 2. Hargreaves, Andy, 1978: "The Significance of Classroom Coping Strategies" in Len Barton and Roland Meighan (Eds.) Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal, Nafferton, Books, Driffield.
 3. Sharp, Rachel, and Green, Anthony (1975) have captured a very real grasp of the constraints teachers undergo, see their study: Education and Social Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

that they experience. Hargreaves states:

"Teachers construct the world of the classroom through the employment of different teaching styles but that this process of construction occurs perhaps in situations not of their own choosing and that there are a set of constraints in play which require some sort of resolution through the decisions that teachers are daily and repeatedly called upon to make".

Hargreaves, 1978: p.75

Dale's research would tend to support Hargreaves hypothesis since he shows that the structural aspects of teaching, i.e. number of pupils in a given class, material conditions and facilities of classroom (including size) and the type of school, do have an effect upon the style and content of teaching, and that the presence of a "hierarchy" within their profession requires that teachers conform. Dale reports:

"... behind the immediate presence of the teacher is a continuing hierarchy of educational officials which attunes certain pupils to being in lowly positions in a hierarchy ... and that the 'streaming', whether formal or informal within the school prepares pupils for the 'streaming' in the world at large."

Dale, 1977: p.47

Dale and Hargreaves have extended our understanding of the conflict between the official and 'hidden' curriculum, and they have both made a systematic attempt, along with Sharp and Green (1975), to socially situate the classroom and intra-classroom processes within the wider structure of social relationships, which the 'deschoolers' and 'free-schoolers' failed to do adequately. Like the latter writers, however, they have not taken gender into account and have thus failed to locate the individual in the specific context of patriarchal social relationships or to consider the opportunities which they make available and the constraints which they impose.

Let us take the 'hidden' curriculum as an example. Dale (1977) discusses the 'hierarchy' and 'streaming' in relation to class and the "socio-technical division of labour" (as he terms it), but fails to recognise that the process of this 'hidden' curriculum involves the internalisation of values relating to adult male and female power relations and that it is thus an integral part of patriarchy. Again, both Hargreaves (1978) and Sharp and Green (1975) have ignored the position of women within the teaching context, and the ways in which this relates to their position within society at large. Yet, when studying teachers' practices or "coping strategies" as Hargreaves calls them, we must include the category of gender for it is relevant to the structure of expectations, to the activities of teachers (e.g. the 'double shift' for women), to the ideological and social context in which teachers work and to their own orientation towards this.

Marxist Perspectives

In this section I shall confine myself to some brief general comments as some of the relevant issues will be dealt with more fully, later in the chapter, as part of the discussion of Marxist-feminist work on gender and education.

Marxist perspectives in education have made significant contributions to our understanding of the form of schooling by providing a theoretical analysis of the mode in which the 'work force' is reproduced. Such theory looks first to the character of the 'forces and social relations of production' for the key to the analysis of educational systems. The approach has been developed in various ways. Bowles & Gintis¹ for

1. Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert, 1976: Schooling in Capitalist America, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

instance focus upon the reproduction of the socio-economic division of labour whereas Althusser¹ concentrates upon class domination.²

One point in common, however, is that they ignore hierarchies based upon gender.

The theoretical work of Bowles & Gintis (1976) has been criticised for its crude economic determinism in that they see the essential function of education as meeting the needs of the wage labour system. They neglected to point out that girls are ostensibly geared to the home and not a 'paying' job. Meanwhile, Althusser (1971) fails to recognise that the 'learning of skills' (the 'know-how' as he calls it) and the 'rules of respect' within schools are very different for girls than for boys. The weaknesses of Althusser's treatment of ideology have been highlighted³ for his mechanistic and deterministic approach, in that he does not pinpoint any contradictions and thus fails to locate the possibilities for change.

Though they differ radically from the functionalist theory of education in that they explain⁴ why certain relations exist and how they change over time, Marxist theoreticians for the most part share with functionalism the assumption that a social system is able to produce the

-
1. Althusser, Louis, 1971: Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays, New Left Books, London.
 2. Most established writers refer to this as "capitalist hegemony", Althusser, ibid.; Bowles & Gintis, 1976: op.cit.; Karabel & Halsey, 1977: op.cit.
 3. See Erben, Michael, and Gleeson, Denis, 1976: "A critical examination of some aspects of the work of Louis Althusser" in G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds) Society, State and Schooling, Falmer Press, Sussex.
 4. According to Karabel & Halsey, 1977: op.cit., functionalists tend to describe the relations existing between the educational system and other social institutions rather than explain. Both Althusser and Bowles & Gintis have been accused of a Marxist version of Functionalism.

institutions and attitudes that it requires for its maintenance. Likewise, they tend to "stay away" from the "classroom scene", concentrating on theory and generally relying on the same empirical sources as functionalism. Thus like functionalists they do not question what is seen as educational knowledge.¹

This neglect of the processes that go on in the classroom makes it even more difficult to examine the part that the school plays in preparing children for the patriarchal relations of our society than to investigate its preparations for the hierarchies of the occupational structure.

Most Marxist analyses have refrained from a direct study of the social processes that take place within schools and have thus been unable to demonstrate how the wider processes that they discuss actually operate within the educational institutions, or to show the ways in which power is negotiated in interpersonal encounters. But a few Marxist explanations of education have provided detailed interpretations of classroom life.² At the same time, and converging with this, ethnographic and small scale studies of the construction of 'social reality' have increasingly recognised the implications of class and race in determining

1. See Young, Michael F.D., 1971: Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education, Macmillan, London. Young did not specifically refer to Marxist theoreticians but to sociologists in the field of education.

2. The most notable of these is Sharp & Green (1975) op.cit., in their study of three primary school classrooms. Marxist-feminist research will be discussed in a later section.

social processes and structures.¹ So we have numerous accounts of the ways in which class permeates every dimension of social life from thought and language patterns to life chances. Nevertheless, the authors have not grappled with the 'special' problems associated with girls in the patriarchal institution of education.

For instance Sharp and Green's (1975) study demonstrates some of the subtle ways in which wider structural 'forces' impinge upon or influence teaching and other social processes at the level of the classroom and the school. By doing so their study offers an insight to the internal workings of the school which, if it had included girls' experience and teacher-pupil interactions which differ according to gender, would have provided a unique investigation of the power relations and conflict associated with gender as well as with class. Similarly, the ethnographic studies of Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970) tended to rely on what Llewellyn² calls the "neutralised and neutered categories" of teacher as teacher and pupil as pupil.

Because we know so little of the workings of patriarchy we do not yet

-
1. See for example: Jackson, Brian, and Marsden, Dennis, 1962: Education and the Working Class, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Hargreaves, David, 1967: Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Rist, Ray C., 1970: "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40; Lacey, Colin, 1970: Hightown Grammar, Manchester University Press; Willis, Paul, 1977: Learning to Labour, Saxon House, Farnborough; Corrigan, Paul, 1979: Schooling the Smash Street Kids, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 2. See Llewellyn, Mandy, 1980: "Studying Girls in School: The Implications of Confusion", in Rosemary Deem (Ed.) Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

know how it creates the dominant/subordinate relationship of men over women within specific institutions. We know that capitalist development creates places for a hierarchy of workers but neither traditional nor Marxist categories tell us who fills the empty places (Hartmann, 1981).

Marxism and functionalism have dealt predominantly with macro issues. In contrast, interpretative and ethnomethodological research directs its attention more to micro level processes than to larger social structures.

Symbolic Interaction, Ethnomethodology and Phenomenology

The study of face-to-face relations has increased our knowledge of ongoing situations and dynamics within the classroom.¹ But the failure of such studies to place their research within the wider social context has led Karabel and Halsey to state that they could be accused of avoiding:

"... direct confrontation with the status quo".

Karabel and Halsey, 1977: p.49

while others accuse them of indulging in the 'cult of the exotic' whereby:

"... ethnography deteriorated into a proliferation of unique case studies".

Hargreaves, 1978: p.9

1. The various ethnomethodological and phenomenological approaches filtering through the sociology of education during the '70's have been most noticeable in the classroom interaction studies. See Delamont, Sara, 1976: Interaction in the Classroom, Methuen, London, and Woods, Peter, and Hammersley, Martin, 1976: School Experience, Croom Helm, London.

Certainly, there has been an artificial separation between the school and the community due possibly to the fact that there was more concern with the accuracy of the common-sense view of reality¹ itself rather than with the legitimacy of existing social and political institutions. As Sharp and Green (1975) point out "the concepts of structure and power are important elements that a sociological analysis must take into account" (p.21).

Such interpretative perspectives² should have given some scope to the recognition of the gender of the actor engaged in constructing her or his own reality. But classroom interaction studies have focussed on the pupil as pupil and teacher as teacher and so negate such specific categories as male/female, middle class/working class, black/white, young/old (Llewellyn, 1980). Likewise the ethnographic studies of Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970)³ take gender as self-explanatory and unproblematic rather than something to be understood. Small scale studies have also explored the working class male youth's experience of secondary education and have ignored the experience of adolescent girls. Willis (1977) defends the focus upon white male youths by saying that he avoided "other ethnic and gender variants" for the "sake of clarity and incision" (p.2). Corrigan (1979) recognises "the different

-
1. See Berger, Peter and Luckman, Thomas, 1967: The Social Construction of Reality, Allen Lane, Harmondsworth.
 2. For further readings of this type of interpretative perspective see Eggleston, S.J. (Ed.) 1974: Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education, Methuen, London and also Stubbs, Michael and Delamont, Sara, (Eds.) 1976: Explorations in the Classroom, Wiley and Son, London.
 3. Both Hargreaves, 1967: op.cit., and Lacey, 1970: op.cit., show that interest in pupil-interaction predates the emergence of the interpretative school.

problems of adolescent behaviour experienced by girls" (pp.13-14) but does not take this insight any further. The researcher suggests that the inclusion of girls may well have led to Corrigan and Willis' research being written up in a wholly different way.

Willis' work is exceptional, however, in that he reveals the widespread influence of a form of patriarchal domination and sexism within working class male culture and explores the manifestations of this in some detail in his study of the twelve 'lads'. He effectively brings out the connections between the 'counter-school culture' and shopfloor culture with its "distinctive complex of chauvinism, toughness and machismo ..." (p.53). Willis and Corrigan have the further merit of attempting to integrate the structural and interactional modes of analysis.

The Control of Knowledge

The interpretative paradigm is deeply influenced by the 'sociology of knowledge'¹ which drew especial attention to some of the deficiencies of the conventional sociology of education, with its concentration upon class determinants of educability. The new approach focussed instead upon studying the curriculum and the nature of classroom interaction in order to demonstrate the ways in which knowledge and education are socially constructed, produced, legitimated and diffused. In this, Young (1971) stressed that sociologists must not treat the dominant legitimising categories of educationalists as absolute, but as constructed realities set in specific institutional contexts. He goes on to explain

1. See the collection of articles in Young (Ed.) 1971: op.cit.

that certain phenomena: 'able', 'bright', 'dull', 'stupid', etc., should not be treated as educators' problems but seen as constructed socially and particularly by those who have power to impose such labels on others.

Keddie's (1971) study is an excellent example of the phenomenological school, and she shows that certain types of 'knowledge' are made available to different pupils on the basis of 'ability' which corresponds to their class or social origins.¹ A major flaw in this work² is that control of educational 'knowledge' and those who have access to it has been analysed from a 'male perspective', but the approach could usefully be extended to explore the relationship between the control of knowledge and differentiation and stratification by gender.

Cultural Reproduction and Cultural Hegemony

Bernstein³ has attempted to combine the analysis of educational transmission with that of power and control. His work emphasises the importance of the culture of the curriculum and the social and moral order of the school. Unlike traditional Marxists who have stressed the economic determinist argument he lays emphasis on the mediation of the family between class origin and school as the critical source

-
1. Keddie goes on to point out that the establishment of educational qualifications is used as a screening device which functions to confine large numbers of people to low skills and no-opportunity jobs, see Keddie, Nell, 1971: "Classroom Knowledge", in Young (Ed.) ibid.
 2. Gerald Bernbaum (1977) has suggested that Young fails to apply his general argument concerning the nature of the social organisation of knowledge in educational institutions to the sociology of education itself nor does he exhibit sufficient concern for the 'historical and situationally specific' features of the subject with which he is concerned (p.16-17) in Knowledge and Ideology in the Sociology of Education MacMillan Press, London.
 3. See Bernstein, Basil, 1975: Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

of cultural inequality. He deals with the inheritance of symbolic property¹ and such 'educational currency' as certificates, diplomas, etc., and how the pupils are categorised, the school organised and the knowledge evaluated in such a way that middle class children gain substantial advantages in acquiring 'Cultural Capital'. Pierre Bourdieu², in a similar vein, shows that the making of social hierarchies and their reproduction is based upon the hierarchy of "gifts", "merits", thus legitimising the 'social order'.

Both Bernstein (1975) and Bourdieu (1971, 1977) show that the dominant class has a monopoly of the dominant culture.³ Although neither specifically addresses his hypothesis to gender their conceptual tools of analysis are useful in that we can use them to assess how the boundaries marking gender "differentiated" activities, interests and expectations of future life are maintained and how girls are evaluated and (as a result) excluded, and denied a say or a place in the dominant culture.

This aspect, from the class point of view, is extensively elaborated, though in a very special way, in the work of Paulo Freire.⁴ His work

1. Symbolic property meaning: language, cultural tastes and manners.

2. See Bourdieu, Pierre, 1971: "Systems of Education and Systems of Thought" in Young (Ed.) op.cit. and 1977: "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction" in Karabel & Halsey (Eds.) op.cit.

3. Antonio Gramsci (1971) discusses how the children of certain families from the "intellectual strata" have within their family life: "a preparation, a prolongation and a completion of school life" thus giving them enormous advantages. He further discusses the category of "intellectual" and such an elite hold a monopoly over the important agencies: ecclesiastical, religious, philosophical, scientific etc., who accumulated intellectual wealth. See his Selections from Prison Notebooks, Lawrence and Wishart, London.

4. Freire, Paulo, 1972: Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

is about education and alienation and the 'cultural hegemony' imposed on the working classes who are thus prevented from thinking for themselves, a line of thought developed earlier by Antonio Gramsci.¹ Freire's central theme is that the workers' education, organised and controlled by those in power, both suppresses and nullifies the creative faculties, and that the oppressors care neither to have the 'real' world revealed nor to see it transformed. His view is that children are adjusted to a 'reality' which must remain untouched and above all appears to be natural.

Though sensitive in his political analysis to the use and control of education Freire's work lacks the empirical evidence which would have added so much weight to an otherwise outstanding book. However Freire's work, like traditional Marxism, is functionalist in outlook in that he sees a perfect 'fit' between education and society. He also assumes that 'reality' is, in essence, dictated from above (by those in authority) and never gives credence to individuals' ability to construct their own reality. Indeed, his hypothesis is one of 'brainwashing' with no alternative in existence. Moreover we are left with the presumption that his 'cultural hegemony' thesis only affects men. Perhaps the fact that they are "workers" renders them more vulnerable to such a process than women? (sic).

1. The Italian Marxist's primary concern was with the role of the intellectuals and cultural hegemony, see Gramsci, 1971: op.cit. The idea of hegemony is developed around the theory that it is the means by which the cohesion of society is maintained and 'spontaneous' consent is gained from the masses for the existing social order. And it was in this that Gramsci saw the role of intellectuals as very important.

Just as Gramsci (1971) envisaged that a 'working class' hegemony could be built up and used to break the hold of the ruling classes, by analogy there appears to be a similar role for feminists in countering 'male hegemony'. Without the enlightenment of feminist thinking and analysis the working class movement has nothing to offer women since it will have no realisation of women's specific oppression.

Summary

Structural functionalism, for long the dominant paradigm in the sociology of education, as in sociology generally, places undue emphasis upon consensus and equilibrium in society. Marxism has stressed the reality of class and the centrality of conflict but has frequently retained a functionalist mode of argument and has placed too much stress on the primacy of the class structure in shaping social conflict. Both approaches have failed to analyse the internal life of schools, a task which has been taken up by ethnographic studies, but many of these confine themselves to the microscopic realities while the theoretical perspectives with which such studies tend to be linked have intrinsic difficulty in placing the internal processes of the schools in relation to the wider social structure. All approaches fail as we have seen to provide a satisfactory framework for the analysis of the relationship of gender and educational structures, although some of them provide certain concepts which appear to be potentially useful in this task.

It is mindful of the inadequacies of previous frameworks for understanding the contribution of education to the social and cultural reproduction of gender-power relationships that I will be examining in depth, later in this chapter, previous educational research carried out from a feminist

perspective. But the next section will deal with the analyses of primary school, as this is the area of research which forms the basis of the thesis.

Contemporary Analyses of Primary Schools

Most 'significant' work on the primary school, when dealing with social inequality and educational opportunity, has used the neutral and neutered categories of pupils and teachers. The Plowden Report¹ can be taken as an example here. Even though it did point to the fact that a gender-based curriculum was at odds with the egalitarian principles of equal education for all, and called for an elimination of such a process, for the main part its emphasis was upon making recommendations for assistance towards what was defined as Educational Priority Areas (E.P.A.). Its official ideology is essentially one of 'child-centredness', a set of assumptions about the nature of the child which have been enshrined in primary school practice for several decades.² Thus Plowden states;

"At the heart of the education process lies the child. No advance in policy, no acquisitions of new equipment have their desired effect unless they are in harmony with the nature of the child, unless they are fundamentally acceptable to him".

Plowden, 1967: p.7

This views the child somewhat like a 'hot-house flower', to be nurtured

-
1. The Central Advisory Committee, 1967: Children and their Primary Schools, H.M.S.O., London (2 Vols.).
 2. See for example: Selleck, Richard, Joseph, Wheeler, 1968: The New Education: 1870-1914, Pitman, London; ----- 1972; English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939; Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Nan Whitbread, 1972, Evolution of the Nursery-Infant School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; King, Ronald, 1978, All Things Bright and Beautiful, John Wiley & Son, London.

and cared for in each 'stage' of its behavioural, emotional and intellectual development. It ignores an important aspect of experience of pupils in classrooms: their adaptations and resistance to the power relationships within the school. It also under-emphasises the significance of gender categorisation in shaping the development and experience of young children.

A number of critics of Plowden¹ have noted that the Report fails to come to terms with the basic issues of class:

"'Stages' figure in explanation to the exclusion of sub-cultural differences. There is a lack of a sufficient grasp of the varieties in family background".

Bernstein and Davies, 1969: p.58

and also that it fails to recognise the social significance of gender:

"Plowden also ignores the cultural shaping and expression of biological sex-differences".

Bernstein and Davies, 1969: p.59

Blyth's (1965) work on primary schools notes that the cultural expression of 'sex-differences' in behaviour in middle childhood cuts across class differences, while he suggests that peer group relationships exhibit interesting differences between classes. In general he concludes:

"... that the cultural component in the characteristic behaviour of children in the middle years is much greater than has often been realised".

Blyth, 1965, Vol. II, pp.11-12

1. See the collection of articles in Peters, Richard, S. (Ed.) 1969: Perspectives on Plowden, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Most studies hitherto have failed to show that the evaluation and categorisation of the young with respect to the power structures based on gender in our society is as significant as in relation to social class divisions.

Earlier work stressed the significance of social class as a differentiating feature in the evaluation of the primary school child (i.e. Jackson, 1964). The late '60's and the '70's brought forth an increasing array of classroom studies,¹ both in this country and America, which was of significance in recognising that such differentiation along gender lines took place. Phil Jackson (1968) provided a very readable account of life in classrooms and touched upon the fact that distinctions were made according to gender. His earlier paper, written jointly with Henriette Lahaderne,² gave even greater emphasis to this phenomenon pointing out there was a marked sex-difference in teacher-pupil contact and that:

"... the experience of going to school
is clearly different for boys than girls".

Jackson and Lahaderne, 1967: p.210

But the implications of that difference were never spelt out. More recent work has still tended to view social class as the most important differentiating variable, with the sex of the child given low-key relevance (Brandis & Bernstein, 1974), if any at all (Bennett & Jordan, 1975).

-
1. See Jackson, 1968: op.cit.; and Bennett, S.N. and Jordan, Joyce, 1975: "A Typology of Teaching Styles in Primary Schools", in British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 45, pp. 20-28.
 2. This was a study of four sixth grade classrooms in America, see Jackson, Phil. W. and Lahaderne, Henriette, 1967: "Inequalities of teacher-pupil contacts" in Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 4, pp. 204-211.

Bernstein's (1975a) work on the cultural and social transmission of knowledge within the educational system contains, however, one discussion which is of interest and relevance to the analysis of gender. He argues that one of the ways in which social order is maintained within schools is through "differentiating rituals". These are:

"... concerned to mark off groups within the school from each other, usually in terms of age, sex, age relation or social function. The differentiating rituals deepen local attachment behaviour to, and detachment from, specific groups; they also deepen respect behaviour to those in various positions of authority, and create order in time".

Bernstein, 1975b: pp.55-56

Since gender, as Bernstein points out, is one type of differentiating ritual, the study of this form of practice could throw considerable light upon some of the ways in which gender divisions are both managed and constructed in the primary school and how this process contributes to the demarcation of women and men's overall position within society.

In another of his papers Bernstein¹ discusses the move to what he calls a "more complex division of labour" among the teaching staff in schools and an attendant sharper delineation in specific subjects. This segregation in school knowledge and teaching staff, which has a gender dimension, can reveal how power is maintained by men over women within a specific institution (i.e. education) and replicated (or reproduced) in patriarchal society as a whole. Particularly relevant to the primary school is Bernstein's (1975b) distinction between 'personalised' and

1. See Bernstein, Basil, 1975(c): "Open Schools - Open Society?" in his collection of essays, op.cit.

'positional' authority. The former can relate specifically to primary school teachers as they are mostly women and can represent a 'mother figure' (and are at the 'lowest' base of the teaching profession), whilst the latter can represent the paternal figure of university teachers who are mainly men (and at the 'highest' pinnacle of the teaching profession).

What Bernstein was able to show was that the categorisation of pupils by age, sex and social class lies embedded in the structuring of knowledge, and also in the form of teaching, the spatial organisation of the school and the evaluation criteria. A major purpose of this study will be to examine the existence of boundaries within schools and the pattern, or "coding" (as Bernstein calls it) these boundaries take. Do they dictate discrete areas of activities, interest and subjects for males and females? If so, how are they maintained and what are the relations and conflicts that ensue from such a circumscribed 'coding'?

The significance of gender categorisations within primary education has been addressed more directly by studies which have investigated teachers' ratings of pupils. In their study of teachers in four Scottish primary schools (of differing social class i.e. middle class, mixed social class, suburban working class, urban working class) McIntyre et al. (1966) found that teachers appeared to make a more complete assessment in terms of one or two dimensions of girls than they do of boys, and they vary much less in the qualities which they look for in girls. In particular

"... the 'ideal girl' is much the same whatever the social class background, while the 'ideal boy' appears to vary according to the apparent possibilities and limitations of the environment".



this kind of analysis needs to be extended in order to explain why teachers make such distinctions in assessment and what influence it has on the respective pupils.

Schooling reflects the patriarchal society we live in and perpetuates the deep and dividing schisms, particularly along the line of gender. Teachers are products of that system and much of their teaching will reflect the ideological structures within our society. This is not to imply that teachers consciously discriminate, but studies suggest that they do rate their male and female pupils differently. Kellmer-Pringle (1966) reported that teachers stated that the girls "settled down" better in school than boys, a factor which has been reported in other studies¹ along with the evidence that teachers see boys as "less hard-working".² Boys were rated as more hostile to adults³ and school. However, there appears to be class differences when it comes to rating the boys. Manual boys received much lower ratings than their non-manual counterparts,⁴ which would tend to support the study by Brandis and Bernstein (1974) who found that infant teachers distinguished between middle class and working class area schools in their ratings. Davie et. al. (1972), meanwhile, found that even manual girls had higher scores on the dimensions of "hostility", "restlessness" and "depression" in their first month at school, than non-manual boys which conflicts

-
1. See The Plowden Report, 1967: op.cit. and Davie, R., Butler, N. and Goldstein, H. 1972: From Birth to Seven (Report of the National Child Development Study), Longman, London.
 2. Douglas, 1964: op.cit.
 3. Davie et. al. 1972: op.cit.
 4. See Davie et. al. ibid. and Brandis, Walter and Bernstein, Basil, 1974: Selection and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

with McIntyre et.al. (1966) and their supposition about the 'ideal girl'. One possible explanation for this difference is that the procedures of the researcher(s) in some of these studies may effect the outcome of such ratings. David Hartley (1977) reports that usually the rating scales have been derived from researcher definitions rather than teachers' first order constructs.

Specific problems emerge from these enquiries into the variable ratings of girls and boys. The main issue is not necessarily how teachers rate their pupils but the very fact that they do, and what consequences this has for the pupils. It has been reported that girls and boys may even be aware that their teachers are defining them differently.¹ We need more information on this and also on the neglected issue of how children make sense of their world through this differential rating.

Two major works to appear in the last decade have attempted to fill such gaps. Ronald King (1978) in his study of three primary schools not only raised the issue of social class but also the issue of gender. He states:

"... sex differences cannot be ignored
in comparing children from different
backgrounds".

King, 1978: p.112

King judged through his observations of primary classrooms, that children were to be brought to a closer definition of what the teachers defined a child should be, and that these definitions were assessed on the basis

1. See Meyer, W.J. and Thompson, G. 1956: "Sex Differences in the Distribution of Teacher Approval and Disapproval among Sixth-Grade Children", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 47, No. 7, pp.385-396; Davis, O.L. and Slobodian, J., 1967: "Teacher Behaviour toward Boys and Girls During First Grade Reading Instruction"., American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 4, May, pp. 261-269.

of gender as well as of social class. The ironic consequences of such definitions, he reported, were that these were attempts to reduce individuality and thus were in contradiction to the 'child-centred ideology' which the teachers presumably accepted. (This was clear at least in two of the schools he studied).

Another important aspect of King's work is his expansion of Bernstein's theory on how the 'middle class' mother provides a 'model' for the infants' teacher. He points out that Bernstein omits to explain how this occurs and then proceeds to show the similarity between being an infants' teacher and being a 'traditional housewife' in that they tended to do basic chores such as tidying and cleaning as well as caring for small children. He concluded, on the basis of his research:

"... that in terms of teacher-child relationships, models of behaviour and forms of knowledge, infant education has a closer affinity to their equivalents in the families of the middle classes than those of the working classes".

King, 1978: p.147

His study throws light on the ideologies of infant education as human products, the acceptance of which constrained teachers and through them the children they taught.

The study of educational ideologies enables us to connect social life at the small-scale level of the classroom and the school with historical events and large-scale elements of the wider social structure. But King (1978) fails to make the connection between the social position of women in the patriarchal family and their position in the patriarchal school. This can be seen in his discussion of what he sees as the "peculiar contradiction" that girls, as a group, were more favourably

assessed by teachers. King goes on to ask:

"How does this early sex differentiation relate to eventual occupational placement where women are disfavoured in opportunities".

King, 1978: p.130

King can pose the question in this way because he does not understand the nature of patriarchy and merely sites inequality within the occupational structure rather than society as a whole, thus ignoring the role of the family and education system. In short he does not understand the nature of gender-power relationships.

David Hartley (1977) followed up King's work in a thesis¹ designed to explore "the definitions held by teachers of the pupils in each of the sex/social class categories, and if these definitions had consequences for the ways in which teachers treated their pupils in the classroom" (p.2). Studying two infant schools Hartley also attempted to see how children made sense of their classroom world by analysing how they evaluated the classroom behaviour of their 'fellow' pupils. In this way he hoped to explore the link between the way in which teachers defined and treated their pupils and the latter's interpretation of such definitions. Unfortunately, like King, he failed to situate this within the broader context of patriarchal relations.

Hartley (1977) stated that all teachers in all schools share a common definition of the "good pupil". Both King and Hartley observed that the "good pupil" role was generally filled by girls, but they ultimately

1. Hartley, David, 1977: Some Consequences of Teachers' Definitions of Boys and Girls in Two Infant Schools, unpublished Ph.D., University of Exeter.

misunderstood why. Moreover, Hartley's valuable analysis of the nature of the definitions of the "good pupil" role has certain weaknesses. He argued that the organisational practices decreed from above, and not negotiated within classrooms, were part of the process of social control. While the emphasis is broadly correct it is somewhat deterministic and overlooks the opportunities for negotiation within the classroom. Again, he saw the practices as procedural rather than instructional, yet following Bernstein's analysis we can see them as instructional in the sense that the sex-specific organisational practices instruct the children into sex/age relations and their associated social functions, as well as enabling teachers to cope with classroom management.

Hartley focussed attention on the head teachers, seeing them as key figures since they are able to control the professional practice of the teachers in their school and examined how such constraints affected the method those same teachers used in the classroom to control their pupils, whether female or male.

Recent years have seen a considerable advance in research on the gender and social class categorisation of pupils within the primary schools, with gender being recognised as a discrete category (i.e. Hartley, 1977; King, 1978) and the classroom and intra-classroom processes being situated within a wider, albeit still limited, social structure of class relationships. Yet this work still suffers from a neglect of the wider patriarchal structures in our society and their pervasive influence in every area of life.

Feminist Analyses: Main trends and development in the study of gender within the educational process.

The process of subordinating and differentiating women on grounds of sex within the educational process has been analysed, on more than one level, over the past fifteen years. The two concepts frequently used in such analyses: "sexism" and "sex-stereotyping" are typical of the ways that previous researchers attempt to understand the manner in which girls are socialised and excluded within and from particular aspects of the educational experience. Sexism can best be understood as a process by which certain kinds of phenomena and behaviour are attributed to a particular sex.¹ The notion of sex-stereotyping is related to the concept of sexism and refers to a process whereby individuals are socialised into thinking that they have to act and think in a way appropriate to their sex.

"Sexism" and "sex-stereotyping" have been found to be evident in the school curriculum,² in the way pupils interact with each other³ and with teachers,⁴ in reading schemes and textbooks,⁵ in the allocation and distribution of resources,⁶ in games and play facilities,⁷ in uniform and in many other aspects of education.⁸ Whilst such studies have examined in detail, on an empirical level, the ways in which girls are

-
1. See Frazier & Sadker, 1973: op.cit. and Belotti, Elena G., 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London, for examples.
 2. Byrne, Eileen, 1978: Women and Education, Tavistock Publications, London.
 3. Frazier and Sadker, 1973: op.cit. Belotti, 1975: op.cit.
 4. Belotti, 1975: ibid.
 5. Lobban, Glenys, 1977: "Sexist Bias in Reading Schemes" in M. Holes (Ed.) The Politics of Literacy, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
 6. Byrne, Eileen, 1975: "Inequality in Education - Discriminal Resource - Allocation in Schools?": Educational Review, Vol. 27, No.3, pp. 179-191.
 7. Byrne, 1978: op.cit.
 8. Wolpe, Anne-Marie, 1977: Some Processes in Sexist Education, Women's Research and Resource Centre, London.

discriminated against in schools (e.g. Byrne, 1978), most have not explained the reasons for these inequalities nor connected them adequately with the wider pattern of structural inequality within society. Thus the analysis of power at the theoretical, structural and interactional levels remained unexplored in these accounts.

However, parallel to these accounts the feminist paradigm has attempted to analyse educational issues at a theoretical level frequently drawing upon Marxist perspectives in doing so.¹ Within the 'traditional' Marxist perspective, much has been written on the "reproduction of the conditions of production" (Althusser, 1971: p.123) and this concept has been particularly significant for a number of recent approaches to education and the part it is assumed to play in the reproduction of the relevant social relationships. Althusser attempts to simplify the concept by assuming:

"... that every social formation arises
from a dominant mode of production".

Althusser, 1971: p.124

and goes on to say:

"that the process of production sets to
work the existing productive forces in
and under definite relations of production".

Althusser, 1971: p.124

The older concept of "socialisation"² takes on a new meaning with Marxists

-
1. See Wolpe, 1977: ibid; David, Miriam, 1980: The State, the Family and Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; and MacDonald, Madeleine, 1980: "Socio-cultural reproduction and women's education", Deem (Ed.) op.cit.
 2. Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales (1956) use this concept in a 'neutral' fashion seeing it as a preparation of the young into the values and roles of adults in their culture: Socialisation and the Interaction Process, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

and becomes synonymous with "the reproduction of social relations".¹ Within this conceptual framework, Marxist philosophers and sociologists have discussed the contribution that education makes to the technical division of labour through 'offering skills' or 'know how', as Althusser termed it, for the labour market (Althusser, 1971; Bowles and Gintis, 1976).² Althusser assumes that a dominant ideology is necessary to effect the control and direction of the young in order for those in power to renew their control. He regards the family-education couple as the key institutions contributing to this process. The vital function of the family and school, according to him, is the socialisation of the young into the society's prescribed ideology towards the categories of role, temperament and status.

Although Althusser did not address himself to the social relations of gender, a number of Marxist-feminist writers have attempted to apply his conceptual framework to the conditions of women's lives. The work of Madeleine MacDonald (1980) provides one example. She has sought to "develop an analysis of women's education which relates the form and content of schooling to women's position in capitalist society" (p.13). Exploring the education system from an Althusserian conception of social

-
1. Althusser takes this to mean 'the subjection of subordinate classes to the ideological hegemony of the bourgeoisie', Althusser, 1971: op.cit.
 2. It is not my intention to view these theoreticians as identical as they do differ in certain areas of their theory. Althusser includes both the technical and ideological functioning of education whereas Bowles and Gintis, 1976: op.cit. point out that school does not necessarily give one the technical skills as most learning is done on the job. Bowles and Gintis also differ in that they see schooling as a psychological preparation of pupils into the labour market with its existing hierarchies.

reproduction, MacDonald states:

"... that the emphasis of such an analysis should be upon the way in which schooling produces both class and gender categories upon pupils who are to take their place in a social division of labour structured by the dual, yet often contradictory forces of class and gender relations".

MacDonald, 1980: p.13

Using existing conceptual tools she shows how the educational structures act as differentiating and allocating devices to reproduce certain inequalities and also to reproduce specific elements within the structure of male-female dominance relations. Basing her theory on the existence of the 'dual forms of control' found within women's specific work locations, MacDonald hypothesises that:

"... the sexual division of labour in school knowledge and amongst teaching staff is perhaps one of the ways in which women become assimilated ..."

MacDonald, 1980: p.20

to such forms of control.

The researcher would not disagree with MacDonald's analysis of the ways in which women experience oppression as women in paid employment and how this oppression has become an essential component of, what she calls: "capitalist work structures". The advances that MacDonald, and researchers like her, make is to look for the links between women's oppression and capitalist society - a very necessary venture. However, Marxist analyses (including feminist) implicitly turn women (especially working class women) into merely another type of worker exploited under capitalism thereby justifying the denial of validity to certain ideas of the Women's Liberation Movement, particularly those of radical feminists and their use of 'patriarchy' as a conceptual tool of analysis.

In their analyses of education, Marxist-feminists invariably use the concepts of the sexual and socio-technical division of labour and continue to divide the 'public' (i.e. work place) from the 'private' domain (i.e. the home). One example of this is Anne-Marie Wolpe's (1977) rather mechanistic analysis of the education system in relation to the sexual division of labour¹ which leads essentially to a dualistic formulation in that she makes a distinction between economic hierarchies (the mode of production) and gender hierarchies, the latter being shaped in the sphere of the family and reproductive relations. Such a separation of the 'economic' and the 'familial' is precisely what we have criticised earlier (see Introduction). Moreover, Wolpe's focus on the way in which the education system operates to satisfy "the requirements of both the familial and occupational divisions of labour" (p.2) is no less functional than traditional Marxism, while her tendency to regard education as basically a process of indoctrination makes no allowance for the ways in which pupils make sense of their world and does not question whether pupils do necessarily become what the educational system prescribes.

To avoid the limitations of Marxism we need to utilise the concept of patriarchy as an analytical means:

"... with which to identify the nature of political relations between men and women".

Lown, 1983: p.29

and as a way of studying the different aspects of these relations as part of a single process. While they dispute this approach, Marxist-feminists

1. See Wolpe, Anne-Marie, 1977: "Education: The Road to Dependency", in op.cit.

have increasingly attempted to incorporate the concept of 'patriarchy' into their analyses and to explore its relationships to class and the mode of production.¹ Thus Madeleine MacDonald (1980) recognises the existence of patriarchy and is able to itemise specific processes within education through which men maintain their domination over women.² She shows in a general way how the 'fragmentation of knowledge' in the form of 'masculine' and 'feminine' subjects and skills is used to deny particular groups of students, i.e. girls, certain forms of understanding or specific types of knowledge, thus giving males an obvious advantage, not only in the area of paid employment but through reinforcing the ideology that females are 'naturally' skilled in the domestic and familial sphere.

Anne-Marie Wolpe (1977) likewise shows how the education system functions to reinforce such cultural norms by the transmission of ideologies and the learning of particular skills,³ thus reproducing the rigidly-defined 'division of labour' between men and women whereby the former are presumed to be the 'breadwinners' and provide for the 'family' whilst the latter are expected to stay home and provide services for the immediate members of such groups. Wolpe states:

-
1. See Bland, Lucy, Brunsdon, Charlotte, Hobson, Dorothy and Winship, Janice, 1978: "Women 'inside and outside' the relations of production" in Women's Studies Group, C.C.C.S. Women Take Issue, Hutchinson, London.
 2. MacDonald, 1980: op.cit.
 3. See also her previous and later publications: Wolpe, Anne-Marie, 1974: "The official ideology of education for girls", in M. Flude and J. Ahier (Eds.) Educability, Schools and Ideology, Croom Helm, London; ---- 1978a: "Education and the Sexual Division of Labour", in A. Kuhn and A.M. Wolpe (Eds.), Feminism and Materialism, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, and ---- 1978b: "Girls and Economic Survival", British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 26, No. 2, June, pp. 150-162.

"... women not only believe that they must rely on their husband who contribute the major portion of the family income, they are also unable to increase their earning capacities, due to lack of qualifications and the structural aspects ... Thus the dominant role of men, within the labour market and within the confines of the family is ensured. Equally women are in a subordinate dependent state".

Wolpe, 1977: p.2

This analysis goes beyond the position of the early participants in the 'domestic labour debate'¹ since it recognises that there is much more to the family than the merely 'economic' relationship between husband and wife, yet Wolpe, in a similar way to Althusser (1971) does not overcome the problem of functionalism. She does not explore the potential of human beings to define reality for themselves and does not indicate the contradictions which would lead to change. MacDonald (1980) is more successful in avoiding this problem as a result of the way in which she appropriates Althusser's concepts of 'dominance' and 'subordinacy'. The importance of her work lies in her ability to pinpoint the contradictions, inherent in ideology and in society in general, between women's 'cultural role' and women in paid employment.

A more extended explanation of the relationship between women's schooling and their position within the family and in production has been carried

1. This debate was an attempt to apply the theory of value to work carried on in the home. One of the main analytical problems here is that it proved impossible to discuss domestic labour as a form of abstract human labour. Some of the main contributions to this debate have been Benston, Margaret, 1969: "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation", Monthly Review, 21 (4); Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and James, Selma 1972: The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community, Falling Wall Press; Seccombe, Wally, 1974: "The housewife and her labour under capitalism", New Left Review, No. 83; Himmelweit, S. and Mohun, S. 1977: "Domestic Labour and Capital", Cambridge Journal of Economics, Vol. 1; Gardiner, J., Himmelweit, S. and Mackintosh, M., 1980: "Women's Domestic Labour" in E. Malos, The Politics of Housework, London. An important Marxist critique of the debate is Molyneux, M. 1979: "Beyond the domestic labour debate", New Left Review, No. 116.

out by Miriam David (1980). She has attempted to analyse the way in which the educational system reproduced both the social and gender relations of production. David points out that Althusser fails to do this and that it is essential that we take gender into account when discussing the integration of children into adult life.¹ The major focus of her work is on the role

"... the State plays in regulating family activities with respect to children and especially the relationships between men and women as parents, or rather as mothers and fathers".

David, 1980: p.4

This regulation extends, according to David, not only to parental activities with regard to their children's schooling but also:

"... to the ways in which children, within schools, learn about parenting".

David, 1980: p.4

Such learning occurs through the form, rather than the content of schooling, which involves implicit processes and the way that education is organised. David's work is valuable given that she explores the interconnections between family and education and demonstrates how both class and sex have been critical factors in the organisation of schooling (in its initial stages). But whilst recognising that patriarchal authority is exercised within schools on a structural level (i.e. curricula differences and staff distribution) she fails to show how such authority is mediated at an interpersonal level both within the school and the family. Instead she all too frequently places emphasis on the 'social' and 'sexual division of labour' without conceptualising the nature of patriarchy. Her analysis still leaves one with the

1. David, 1980: op.cit.

impression that particular kinds of 'reproduction' take place tidily in discrete kinds of institutions. We need to know more about the complicated processes involved in the reproduction of social and political relations between men and women in all areas of life and in all forms of social interaction, including the rituals involved in social control, e.g. paternalism, sexuality, violence, rather than focussing solely on the structural and organisational features of selected institutions.

Apart from MacDonald's work there is little recognition of the contradictions that exist in the educational process. Miriam David (1980) for example, discusses the prototype for the primary teacher/pupil relation as being the mother-child bond which embodies a particular strategy of control. But she overlooks the contradictions that exist in the image of the 'ideal' woman and the 'ideal' mother, and the ways in which these are extended into the training and work of the 'ideal' teacher.¹ There exists a contradiction within the primary teacher's role between 'maternal love' and regimented authority. In addition there is a further contradiction between the numerical dominance of women in primary teaching and their under-representation in leadership.² Through these contradictions one can see there is a need to determine the combination of capitalist and patriarchal interests in the actions of the State.

1. See Grumet, Madeleine, 1981: "Pedagogy for Patriarchy: The Feminisation of Teaching", Interchange, Vol. 12, Nos. 2/3, pp. 165-184.

2. See the analysis of Byrne, 1978: op.cit. who provides statistics of the ratio of men to women in positions of authority and leadership within the teaching profession.

Analyses of gender in schools, other than Marxist-feminist, have also yet to provide a theoretical and empirical perspective that deals with the reproduction of social and political relations between men and women in the overall context of schooling. A further limitation of this work is its concentration upon the secondary school and its neglect of the primary sector. Jennifer Shaw justifies her emphasis upon the secondary school by arguing that "the arena where sex is most evident as a principle of organisation" is within this sphere since it is "the sector most responsive to the demands of the labour market" (Shaw, 1976: p.146). Germaine Greer (1971) even states that the primary school educates the girl as a person, making no distinction between the girl and boy.¹ Jennifer Shaw (1976) concludes that sexism has virtually disappeared as an issue in primary education believing the 'problem' to be five or ten years away. Rosemary Deem (1978) echoes their assumptions by stating:

"Sexism in learning is much more apparent in secondary schooling than in primary schooling ... This of course, does not preclude elements of sexism in the basic subjects like history, but because the range of subjects is smaller, than in the secondary school, and because many primary schools place a strong emphasis on individual rather than class learning, the extent of such sexism is probably much less than in the secondary school."

Deem, 1978: p.45

It is noticeable that these assumptions and generalisations are not based upon empirical study of primary schools and have yet to be tested by such research.

1. Greer does however state that this phenomenon of 'equality' only exists within the early years, see Greer, Germaine, 1971: The Female Eunuch, Paladin, London.

The few feminist studies on primary schooling that do exist have been carried out abroad.¹ Frazier and Sadker (1973) give a good descriptive account of 'sexism' in school and in American society, but fail to place the phenomenon of gender in the social context of power. Belotti's (1975) study of Italian schools, though acclaimed in its time, is seriously flawed in that she locates sexism as something 'in the head' so to speak and does not relate it to the overall power relations in society. Like Bernstein's (1961) 'deficit' model of the working class,² Belotti has a 'deficit' model of the young girls and their mothers, posing what they think, believe and do to be what is at fault rather than society as a whole. Indeed, Belotti is caustic in her comments on both girls and women:

"By the time they are six and entering primary school, most little girls have lost their creativity. Few of them retain even a feeble trace of it ..."

Belotti, 1975: p.147

and she accuses female primary teachers of being:

"... timid creatures who have chosen a profession which shelters them from many things in life which might be traumatic as well as stimulating and exciting".

Belotti, 1975: p.127

Such an analysis can be of no use to those who are experiencing patriarchy on its various levels, because the sense that Belotti makes of their world

1. See for example Frazier and Sadker, 1973: op.cit. ; and Belotti, 1975: op.cit. The former in America and the latter in Italy.

2. See Bernstein, Basil, 1961: "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning" in A.H. Halsey et. al. (Eds.), Education, Economy and Society, Free Press, New York.

is qualitatively different from the way in which the girls and their teachers make sense of it.

Before concluding this section on feminist theory I will discuss two fairly recent works: Eileen Byrne (1978) Women and Education, and Rosemary Deem (1978) Women and Schooling. Though drawing together much research and a variety of analyses, both fail to come to terms with the relationship of gender and class, and the experience and formation of gender power relationships. Byrne's quantified, rather diagnostic treatise on girls' education describes their inequality as 'under-achievement' and says that there must be remedial intervention for the 'average' and 'less able' girl. She fails to see that the categories of average and less able, and the interaction involved, is in part a product of the dominant defining categories which are taken for granted, not only by the teachers, but by those who construct 'knowledge' per se and that the social evaluations implicit in such are seen to be fixed and absolute. As Nell Keddie states:

"It is important that researchers cast as problematic what are held to be knowledge and ability in schools rather than taking either as given".

Keddie, 1971: p.13

Deem (1978) fares no better and like Byrne never comes to grips with the need to understand the relationship between the social distribution of power and the distribution of knowledge, in order to understand the generation of categorisations of pupils and categories of organisation of curriculum knowledge in the school situation. She even goes so far as to conclude that women must achieve 'equality' by competing at every level within education rather than questioning the existence of the

relation between those who have and those who do not have power:

"The more women there are in higher education at every level, the greater will be the possibility of the male cultural hegemony being overthrown, and the less will be the extent to which institutions of higher education reproduce the ideological supports of the sexual division of labour in the social relations of reproduction".

Deem, 1978: p.106

The mutual interrelationships of the variables of gender and class are very complex. Greater analysis of this issue is needed and, as Tessa Blackstone (1976) perceptively recognises, there is a need for longitudinal study of how and where gender differences are introduced.

Gender and Class: What is the relationship?

Much of this chapter has centred on the fact that many studies of education have not included gender in their analyses. Likewise feminist studies have frequently failed to grapple with the variable of class. To use gender or class separately is clearly too blunt an approach but at present we are far from overcoming the theoretical problems of integrating them¹ and we are lacking sufficient information on even such basic issues as the ways in which gender demarcation varies according to social class or type of area.

A few attempts have been made to link gender and class and to explore the nature of the interrelation of the two categories. For instance,

1. The most successful so far has been Lown, Judy, 1983: "Not so much a Factory, More a Form of Patriarchy: Gender and Class during Industrialisation", Eva Gamarnikov, David Morgan, June Purvis and Daphne Taylorson (Eds.), Gender, Class and Work, Heinemann, London.

Mandy Llewellyn (1980), in her study of girls' sub-culture, found that the criteria for 'appropriate feminine' behaviour was class-based and that "friendship groupings were not determined primarily or even very significantly by academic and school based factors" (p.45).

Llewellyn states:

"... that there are always distinct 'female' and 'male' experiences of any situation, as well as shared levels of meaning through being working class or successful within the classroom".

Llewellyn, 1980: p.45

Her research recognised that intra-class differences are 'crucial referents' when discussing appropriate forms of behaviour.

Another contribution in this area is the work of Paul Willis (1977) who recognises the elements of patriarchy within the 'lads' anti-school culture which reflect the wider working-class culture. He shows how manual labour is associated with the 'social superiority' of 'masculinity', and mental labour with the 'social inferiority' of 'femininity':

"Gender and mental/manual difference provide the atavistic divisions to be worked up into contemporary concrete cultural forms and relationships, but it is only the learning that division is not always and automatically to its own disadvantage which prevents sectors of the working class from seeing division as oppression. For the 'lads', a division in which they take themselves to be favoured (the sexual) overlies, becomes part of, and finally partially changes the valency of a division in which they are disadvantaged (mental/manual labour power)".

Willis, 1977: p.148

In relation to the oppression of women, however, class is a very complex phenomenon. For instance, McRobbie and Garber (1976) stress that whatever their social class, girls' culture is more 'homecentred', due

in part to the social and physical constraints placed upon females.¹

This may suggest that in some situations the experience of being female is much more relevant than the material experience of belonging to a particular social class. Unfortunately there is, as yet, limited information on the elements of patriarchy in middle-class culture and on the form that it takes.

Diana Leonard (1982) has objected vigorously to the common tendency to analyse women in terms of their class position. She inveighs particularly against one form of this, which is the suggestion that "while all women are 'oppressed', working class women are also exploited" (p. 166); in other words "what women suffer as women is secondary to what is suffered by the working class" (p.166)(of both sexes). Leonard, quite rightly, states that this is just a "refined insult" and goes on to make clear the fragility of the class nature of women's lives:

"Women think that we share the class of our fathers and husbands, when in fact very few daughters end up earning as much, or in as statusful occupations, as their fathers (or brothers); and very, very few indeed end up owning and controlling capital or in senior management or politics (i.e. becoming upper or middle class or bourgeois in their own right".)

Leonard, 1982: p.167

However Leonard does not overlook the fact that women:

"... may sometimes have privileges and class protection, but this is almost invariably due to our husband's (or father's) position: we get it as dependents on men".

Leonard, 1982: p.168

1. Sharpe, Sue, 1976: Just Like a Girl, Penguin, Harmondsworth, discusses the 'social control policies' exercised by the parents of girls in that they have a limited freedom compared to that of boys. Fremlin points out that in London something like 40% of women may never go out alone after dark, see Fremlin, C., 1979: "Walking in London at night", New Society, April.

The essential tenet of Leonard's argument is that while women are not a 'homogeneous group' and while we must clearly make distinctions between women, these must not simply be ones relevant to men, e.g. we must "distinguish between women in working class jobs¹ and the wives of working class men". She concludes that gender cuts across race and class, and that all men (i.e. men of all classes and races) treat or feel they ought to be able to treat, all women as inferiors in this society. Leonard stresses clearly:

"When I say that gender cuts across class, I do not mean that gender is not differently constituted in different classes, rather, that structurally patriarchal power is common throughout society".

Leonard, 1982: p.173

Part of this thesis will attempt to explain and describe the different patriarchal constituents in different classes in relation to schooling and the community.

Summary

In attempting to analyse patriarchy as a distinct force, it is important to explore its origins and workings on both a theoretical and empirical level, so that we can validly add to our understanding of women's oppression in contemporary society. To do this we have to know which are the key institutions through which men maintain their domination of women.

Schooling, as a major area of socialisation, is an essential institution in training future generations to accept the hierarchies of sex, race

1. Who would essentially earn much less than men and experience patriarchal authority in the workplace.

and class within our society, together with their variations and contradictions. In examining four different schools the researcher hopes to identify a number of differences relating to the reproduction of gender relations between these institutions - differences that involve school organisation, school knowledge, pedagogic style and forms of pupil resistance, all of which contribute to the relations of dominance by men. In attempting to formulate an empirical understanding of the mechanisms by which curricula and classrooms actually contribute to the production and reproduction of distinctions and relations of gender we may be able to locate a sequential relation between the class position and gender situation. However, institutions cannot be studied as isolated units and of necessity it will be important to see whether similar basic structural properties of male domination within the schools are apparent in the immediate communities. We will then be able to ascertain how gender is constructed via both social class differences and the structural elements of patriarchy common to society as a whole.

CHAPTER II

Methodology and Fieldwork

An Outline of Fieldwork

My research is a comparative ethnographic case-study of schooling in four primary schools, all within twenty five miles of each other in the North of England. I also undertook fieldwork in the catchment areas of each of the schools.

The particular dimension of the schooling experience receiving attention is the "socialisation" of children into modes of conduct considered "appropriate" in relation to their gender. A major concern within this is the school-specific variations in pupils' gender socialisation and the way that the culture of the community impinges upon their schooling.

Various hypotheses have been advanced with regard to variations in the quality of the education 'received' by members of different social groupings (Mays, 1962; Floud et al., 1957; Jackson, 1964; Eggleston, 1977; Sieber, 1976). Even within, as well as between schools, the sorting of the pupils for differential recruitment has been observed to reproduce pre-existing class and ethnic boundaries (Bowles & Gintis) 1976; Jackson & Marsden, 1962; Douglas, 1964; Rist, 1970). Does such a process exist to reproduce pre-existing gender boundaries? Given that it exists in secondary schools (Wolpe, 1977; Davies, 1974; Deem, 1978, 1980) what form does it take in primary school? Does social class composition affect gender boundaries and behaviour? If so how?

I initially started to explore these questions in a pilot study lasting six months. I studied two schools, one situated in an urban 'slum',¹ the other in a middle-class suburb. The purpose of the pilot study was to note whether gender relations in primary school existed on such a level as to be considered a contributor to already existing boundaries and whether a significant contrast in such gender relations was apparent in different schools and what the basis of that difference was. The pilot study helped to clarify certain questions particularly in relation to gender and class, but also in the way that pupils and their teachers do not necessarily hold similar values and attitudes with regards 'gender appropriate behaviour' and that there may be some form of power exerted by the peer group upon their teachers thus indicating that the reproducing of gender boundaries is not a one-way process.

The pilot study also indicated that there were considerable differences between the two schools, with regard to gender-appropriate behaviour as well as important similarities. The differences posed the problem of explanation. Here I turned to families and homes which do, of necessity, influence life at school (Sharp & Green, 1975; Sieber, 1976; King, 1978). Without knowledge of the home, information on influence of the school is incomplete.² The pilot study also prompted the question as to whether further differences would emerge from other settings.

1. According to the Inland Revenue's Assessment of Rateable Value: less than £30 per annum.

2. See J.W.B. Douglas, 1964: The Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London, who states: "No firm conclusions on the influence of any one aspect of the environment should be reached until all have been considered together". (p.65).

Differences in patterns of gender relationships and socialisation is by no means a new theme in feminist scholarship. Pauline Marks has commented on the class-specific notions of 'femininity' which underlie the existing educational model:

"... it is fascinating to discover that their (girls') 'femininity', that supposedly biological and absolute characteristic, is dependent on the viewpoint of the observer; different social origins and intellectual abilities alter the meaning of 'femininity' which is thus not a fixed concept in educational thinking".

Marks, 1976: p.180

With this in mind I decided to extend the design of the research project itself, by incorporating two more schools. The sample thus consisted of a predominantly working-class inner city school, a middle-class school in a "commuter" village, a school on a council estate and a very small rural village school.¹

While I wished to explain how structural differences and class position set in motion varying levels of social aspirations, and differing patterns of gender expectations, I also felt that other factors could impinge upon gender behaviour. So teaching methods and educational provisions (material) were studied to see if they differed between the schools. I

1. Belotti states:

"Those who have had the opportunity to make comparisons because they have taught in schools encompassing different social groupings, admit that this (masculinity and femininity) phenomenon is much more pronounced in village or small-town schools where masculine and feminine stereotypes are more rigidly differentiated".

Belotti, 1975: p.126

See Belotti, E.G., 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.

also felt it was very important to study the ethos and the informal structure of the school and the influence of the head-teacher upon the nature of the school.

Another important aspect of investigation was the way the children's background presented or did not present 'problems' for teachers and the head; and the sort of relationship each school had with parents and how much they involved them with the school's activities. The way the boys and girls were expected to behave towards their teachers, towards the school and towards each other was studied, and the extent to which expectations and behaviour were influenced by the congruence or incongruence between the culture of the school and of the catchment area. It was this concern that made me look more closely at the actual neighbourhood the school was in and ask further questions. What was the nature of gender relations within the particular catchment areas? Does the sexual division of labour differ according to class composition and catchment area? If so, how? Does occupation affect patriarchal relations? And in what way does this influence the children?

By studying the 'appropriate' behaviour applicable to the girls and boys in the four locations, and the norms which controlled and regulated the speech, activity and general behaviour of the two groups according to notions of "gender appropriateness", I hoped to determine the particular nature of typical and atypical gender social relationships in each of the schools I observed and to analyse the extent of divergence within any one school.

On the whole, the secondary school is seen as a more suitable location

for sociological research because it is felt that the pupils are more articulate in speech and in writing, than are primary school children (Hargreaves, 1967). In addition, academic achievement as it relates to sex differences is underlined at secondary level, so researchers argue that this is the 'arena' which is crucial in forming gender-typed behaviour (Shaw, 1976; Davies, 1974). Previous research into primary schooling suggests that gender-typing has a cumulative effect on children (Frazier & Sadker, 1973; Lobban, 1975, 1978; Belotti, 1975). I do want to stress however, that this thesis is not about whether primary or secondary school has the more crucial part to play in gender stereotyping, but about the particular dimensions of the schooling experience within four different primary schools.

In order to take account of age differences among the pupils and to see whether infant teachers differed from junior teachers in their assessment of gender behaviour I found it necessary to observe classes encompassing various age-groups.¹

OBSERVATION OF CLASSES

<u>School</u>	<u>Started With</u>	<u>Age-Range</u>	<u>Methods</u>
Inner City	Reception = 4½ - 5	6-7, 7-8, 8-9	Observation & Participation
Suburban	Reception = 4½ - 5	6-7, 7-8, 8-9, 9-10, 10-11	"
Council Estate	Nursery = 3 - 5	4½-5, 6-7, 7-8 8-9	"
Rural Village	Infants = 4½ - 7	7-9, 9-11	"

1. Only in the rural village school (because of its size) did I observe all the classes.

I observed eighteen classes in all, avoiding those which had student teachers or part-time staff. The latter category, however, could not be avoided in the suburban school as the 9-10 year olds' class had two part-time teachers.

Once I had decided upon the four schools I hoped to study (I also had another four schools selected in case of rejection), my supervisor and I contacted each one via a letter to the headperson stating that I wished to include the school in a research project and would like permission to carry out participant-observation for a length of time. I received positive replies immediately from all the schools except Lintonbray, which refused me entry for various reasons¹ before finally agreeing to my presence, and proceeded with the fieldwork.

Before discussing some of the methodological issues pertaining to my fieldwork in the schools, I should like to describe my research in the catchment areas. This had two elements. One was the collection of background information on the areas and their residents. This was obtained from the 1971 Census tabulations for the appropriate catchment areas. The other was the participant observation that I carried out to gain more information on the specific nature of gender relations in each of the neighbourhoods. This section of the fieldwork was necessarily much more haphazard than that carried out in the schools, although I spent six weeks in each neighbourhood. I went to places where the women

1. These various reasons included 'not long established teachers'; an inability to accommodate the researcher due to lack of space; too busy etc. Insistence upon the fact that I would actively help out and not 'take up their time' finally received a positive reply.

of each specific neighbourhood appeared to congregate. In the Empsall Road (the catchment area for Dock Side) I went to jumble sales and hung around the school gates, and likewise in Long Meadow; in Applegate I went along to the National Housewives' Register Meetings and in Lintonbray I was introduced to some of the women in the Women's Institute by the wife of the headperson.

Because I wanted to gauge the nature of patriarchal relations I talked to the women about their lives, specifically about their work (paid or unpaid), leisure, decision-making and their aspirations for their children. In all, I had joint discussions (which were taped) with forty three women:

NUMBER OF WOMEN INTERVIEWED AND THEIR LOCATION

<u>Area</u>	<u>No.</u>
Empsall Road (Dock Side)	7
Applegate	15
Long Meadow	10
Lintonbray	11
TOTAL	<u>43</u>

Many of the women gave me a great deal of information about their lives and views, much of which I was unable to use due to the overwhelming amount of data.

Essentially, through these discussions and participant observation (the results of which will be outlined in the next two chapters) I was able to gain considerable insight, in spite of certain gaps, into the nature

of male/female relationships and the elements of domination and subordination contained within them.

For the investigation of the internal life of the schools I chose to do fieldwork on an all-day, everyday basis for a complete year. I joined the children for assembly in the morning, had lunch with them (sometimes with the teachers and sometimes with the children) and left as the school bell rang for hometime. The main body of my research consisted of observation in the classroom. I supplemented this, however, with structured interviews with the teachers in order to gain information on their attitudes to teaching and to issues of gender and class and to enable me to compare these with their actual behaviour in the classroom. I also had many informal discussions with the older groups of children.

As I wished to gather data on interaction within the classroom, it was clear that the major method of fieldwork was to be observation. The manner in which observation was to be carried out, however, demanded that I make several choices. Was I to teach, to observe passively, or pursue a path between the two? Was I to try to produce quantifiable data from my observations or rely upon qualitative data?

Given that I actually hoped to participate within the classroom and become involved in the leisure and associational activity, participant observation was opted for, as I felt rigid distances between the observer and observed can only be maintained in certain circumstances (Stubbs & Delamont, 1976). Also I sought to gain a 'teacher perspective' whilst avoiding the actual teacher role¹ and hence the 'authority' that is

1. A method which has been used by other researchers into classroom interaction, in particular: Hargreaves, David, 1967: Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

involved in such a position. I wanted to observe from the teachers' point of view, the demands of teaching primary school children of varying backgrounds in order to assess their work day. But because I did not teach¹ it is possible that I could not fully appreciate the strains of such a role. On the whole there were two main advantages to the fact that I did not explicitly take on a teacher perspective. It meant I was free from the responsibilities of classroom control which I hoped would lead to a relaxed relationship with the children, as well as with the teachers themselves.

To carry out the fieldwork as a passive observer would have meant not taking part in the day-to-day activities within the classroom. I essentially wanted to play an active role as participant observer rather than just sitting unobtrusively in a corner taking notes, and in that way I felt I gained a great deal more, though being exhausting, both in data and in relating to all members of school, whether negatively or positively. But neither did I wish to determine the outcome of my study.

It has been noted that researchers have a particular effect upon the situation being observed. Ronald King (1978) in his study of infant classrooms, opted for non-participant observation² in an attempt to reduce the effect he may have had upon the events he was trying to observe.

1. The researcher is not a qualified teacher.

2. See Gold, Raymond, L., 1958: "Roles in Sociological Field Observations", *Social Forces*, Vol. 36, March, pp. 217-223, for his interpretation of four fieldwork roles: 1] complete participant; 2] participant-as-observer; 3] observer-as-participant and 4] complete observer.

But King surely makes an error similar to that of Garner.¹ A dynamic interplay must occur between observer and observed (Delamont & Hamilton, 1976; Delamont, 1976), however passive the former is, unless the observed are totally unaware of the observer's existence.

In the end I pursued a path between the two (teaching and observing) using a variety of methodological techniques,² including some non-participant observation, and some formal and informal interviews, in an effort to gain as much qualitative data as possible. Which brings me to the point of whether or not to produce quantifiable data from my observations. This approach has been 'successful' for those undertaking such an analysis.³ However, it was not the amount of interaction between teacher and pupil that interested me but what those forms of interaction meant - the very nature of such interaction. I was interested in the qualitative nature of events in classrooms rather than quantifying them, and I felt much of the quality of such interaction would have been negated by doing so.

So, to pursue qualitative data through participant observation was my goal. The general nature of participant observation has been well

-
1. In an observational study of English infant classrooms Garner devotes no discussion to the impact of the observer, despite the fact that such a dynamic does (or could) exist, Garner, J., 1972: "Some Aspects of Behaviour in Infant School Classrooms", Research in Education, Vol. 7, pp. 28-47.
 2. Delamont and Hamilton make a plea for a more eclectic approach to the study of the classroom. See Delamont, Sara & Hamilton, David, 1976: "Classroom Research: A critique and a new approach" in Michael Stubbs & Sara Delamont (Eds.) Explorations in Classroom Observation, John Wiley & Sons, London.
 3. See for example Hartley, David, 1977: Some Consequences of Teachers' Definitions of Boys and Girls in Two Infant Schools. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Exeter.

described by Howard Becker:¹

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

Becker, 1958: p.652

The implementation of this involves a number of problems. Some of them are specific to schools, particularly in relation to classroom research. Where does one stand in the role of researcher, having decided to avoid both observing as a 'teacher' and the 'fly-on-the-wall' technique (unobtrusive observer)? Because classroom research is still relatively new (only some fifteen years old) and that the 'roles' in school are quite distinct, there appears to be few alternatives for research. Bud Khlíf² has pointed out that the school setting

"... lacks avenues for participation"

Khlíf, 1974: p.391

and that the anthropologist:

"remains more of a stranger than a friend".

Khlíf, 1974: p.391

However, some participant observers within the school setting do not seem

-
1. See the classic study of 'boys becoming medical men': Becker, Howard S., Geer, Blanche, Hughes, Everett C., and Strauss, Anselm L., 1961: Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School, University of Chicago Press. For a general description of this method see Whyte, William Foote, 1951: "Observational Fieldwork Methods" in Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch & Stuart W. Cook (Eds.) Research Methods in Social Relations, II, New York Dryden Press, and also his 1955 study: Street Corner Society, (enlarged edition), University of Chicago Press. See also Gold, 1958: op.cit., for a useful classification of the various procedures that go by this name.
 2. See Khlíf, Bud B., 1974: "Issues in Anthropological Fieldwork in the Schools", in George Spindler (Ed.) Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.

to have experienced such a problem, indeed quite the opposite.¹ Barrie Thorne (1980) did fieldwork among 4th and 5th grade school children, and although she found it difficult to communicate to the children what she was doing due to "gaps in misunderstanding" created by "different experiential worlds", nevertheless she points out:

"... fieldworkers may become good friends
with those they are observing."

Thorne, 1980: p.290

The more specific problems involved in classroom research will be discussed in the sections on the responses of teachers and of children to the observer.

In the interests of 'objectivity', many interaction analysis² research studies feel compelled to survey large numbers of classrooms. But such studies may fail to take into account the influence of the local area with its particular traditions and cultural milieu, which surely must impinge on the school itself.³ Thus an in-depth study of a small number of schools does not have to assume that the particular classrooms studied are typical of any wider sample (Delamont & Hamilton, 1976; Torode, 1976; Nash, 1976; Delamont, 1976). Anthropological classroom research, like interaction analysis, begins with description. But interaction analysis

1. For examples see Hargreaves, 1967: op.cit., and Lacey, Colin, 1970: Hightown Grammar, Manchester University Press.

2. Delamont & Hamilton, 1976: op.cit., outline both the strength and weaknesses of interaction analysis.

3. See Gottlieb, David, 1963: "Regional differences as a variable in sociological research", Social Problems, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 251-256, whereby he attempts to examine the impact of a single variable - region of origin - on the processes by which individuals form friendships.

is often concerned with generating normative data, i.e. in "extrapolating from sample to population" (Delamont & Hamilton, 1976: p.13). My work is intended to be relevant and useful, not to be normative, but to illuminate specific gender categories and power relationships. One can easily argue against anthropological studies that their results cannot be generalised to other settings. This criticism refers only to statistical generalisations. It is important to point out that despite their diversity individual classrooms share many characteristics. Through the detailed study of one particular context it is still possible to clarify relationships, pinpoint critical processes and identify common phenomena (Hargreaves, 1967; Lacey, 1970; Delamont, 1976; Wolpe, 1977; Llewellyn, 1980). Likewise small in-depth studies are not necessarily restricted in scope and unlike interaction analysis¹ they can acknowledge both the particulars and the universals of classroom life. But suffice it to say, neither should classroom research be treated as a substitute for studies which look at the broader social aspects of education.

Qualitative research by its very nature, besets the researcher with specific problems. One that has been given a great deal of coverage, is the continuing debate between 'objectivity' as opposed to 'subjectivity' (Rose, 1945; Madge, 1953; Leach, 1961; Gouldner, 1962; Lacey, 1976) and the problem of escaping from ethnocentric bias.² Arnold Rose (1945) has argued that emphasis on objectivity has seriously restricted

1. Delamont & Hamilton, 1976: op.cit., point out that interaction analysis focusses on the average classroom whilst anthropological/ethnographical studies focus on the individual classroom (p.14).

2. Edmund Leach (1961) tries to avoid this by the use of algebraic equations, see Rethinking Anthropology, The Athlone Press.

information which social scientists have been able to obtain, particularly from interviews (p.143), and appeals for conscious honesty on the part of the social scientist rather than abiding by restrictive, mechanical rules. Gouldner goes even further by seeing "the value-free doctrine as a tranquiliser for the social science sector's political intelligence" (Gouldner, 1962: p.202) and he also makes a plea for "an expression of one's values as open and honest as it can be" rather than succumb "to the vain ritual of moral neutrality" (p.212). In his demand for the right to be critical of tradition he concludes:

"If we could teach students how science is made, really made rather than as publicly reported, we cannot fail to expose them to the whole scientist by whom it is made, with all his gifts and blindresses, with all his methods and his values as well. To do otherwise is to usher in an era of spiritless technicians who will be no less lacking in understanding than they are in passion, and who will be useful only because they can be used".

Gouldner, 1962: p.212

My research itself, with its feminist perspective must come to terms with this continuing debate, given that it involves a criticism of specific social institutions. It must be borne in mind, on the one hand, that commitment can be a source of insight and that research itself is a form of praxis (Althusser, 1971), but it is also imperative to take heed of warnings such as the following:

"While personal commitments are of fundamental importance, they cannot substitute for theory or method".

Delamont, 1978: p.65

Emotive and ill-defined criticisms used for the purpose of "propaganda" discredit both research and 'cause'.

The next section will deal with the schools. This will provide a framework within which to raise further methodological issues and to spell out some factors which may have affected the research, in particular the different responses from the head and teaching staff of each school. It will also serve the purpose of introducing the reader to each school, and the contrasting ways I fitted into each environment.

THE SCHOOLS

Dock Side - First Impressions June - November 1977.

Making my way towards the entrance of the school I am merely a face in the crowd. Streets of regimented terraced houses, the majority having no gardens, form the setting. The noise and fumes of traffic fill the air; people go about their daily work, shopping or seeking somewhere cheap and substantial for lunch among the small cafes, Chinese take-aways and traditional fish-and-chip shops. Ice cream vans regularly rend the air with their high-pitched music box 'calls' to buy. The 'tatter's' horse clip-clops by with its owner shouting the indistinguishable "any ol' rags and bones". Mothers screech for their offspring to "comine in, off t'road". Children, cats and dogs are seen everywhere.

The school, like its surrounds, is deficient in grass, space and playing fields; the surrounding walls, spiked railings, are covered in graffiti announcing the ever-youthful optimism of the local football team (this despite its struggle in the lower half of the Second Division). I walk through the gateway into what seems a 'honeycomb' of tunnels and numerous playgrounds, and enter the precincts of the school. I am shown into the headperson's office where I am given a brief history of the school and give Mrs. Bosworth (the head) an outline of my research.

Whilst being shown round the school Mrs. Bosworth informs me:

"You mustn't mind these children if they don't behave themselves in front of you. Their lack of seemliness is due to their poor upbringing".

I somehow believe that her statement is a reaction to the answer I gave when she asked "What is the purpose of your study?". I had told her I

regarded myself as an anthropologist and was very interested in the behaviour of young children within the primary school, i.e. their social development; particularly the behaviour of, and the differential assessment of girls and boys, and how they acquired certain attitudes towards each other. In short I wished to investigate the role of the primary school in their acquisition of these attitudes and to see whether girls or boys effected the learning process in any way.¹

I found it necessary to be rather vague about the specific nature of my work since I wished to underplay the attention which was to be paid to pupil-teacher interaction, to teachers' behaviour in structuring the classroom situation, because I felt that to alert their attention to this aspect of the study could well influence their actions in ways the researcher would find difficult to assess. Previously, in the pilot study, two schools had refused me entry upon determining the precise nature of the research, the headpersons interpreting it as alleging that their schools were inculcating prejudices towards girls. One of these hotly denied the existence of such behaviour (it must be remembered that I had not implied this), and stated:

"There's too much of this women's lib going on!"

and adamantly refused me admission to his school. The other, who had previously accepted the idea, suddenly declared (after the initial discussions) that the school was closing down within the year² and that too many of her staff were students doing 'teaching practice'.

1. I had learned to avoid the use of the term "sex-role stereotypes" not only because of its theoretical inadequacy, but also because the concept was misunderstood.

2. The school, in fact, stayed open for another two years.

As a researcher I am aware of the ethical questions involved in obtaining 'informed consent'.¹ Such questions enter into recurring debates over the ethics of disguised research (Davis, 1960; Roth, 1962; Erikson, 1967; Humphreys, 1970; von Hoffman, et.al. 1970) and over initial promises of confidentiality and eventual decisions about what to publish (Fichter & Colb, 1953; Becker, 1971; Colvard, 1967; Rainwater & Pittman, 1967).

Researchers are in positions of power, particularly in relation to some groups of subjects who are powerless to freely choose whether they should be studied: I refer to children, mental patients and prisoners, among others. As Herbert C. Kelman (1972) persuasively argues, ethical problems arise "because of the fact that, and to the extent that, the individuals, groups and communities that provide data for social research are deficient in power relative to the other participants in the research process" (p.989). In order to gain access to the school, I had to gain formal consent from the heads and teaching staff, but not (necessarily) from the children.² Observing in a primary school, I first approached the head, who asked knowledgeable questions about my background, purpose and method, and who set 'conditions': I was not to disrupt classroom activities, I was to help out where I could and not to take up the teachers' time. I had similar pre-entry discussions with classroom teachers. The teacher of each class then introduced me to the children simply by name and it never occurred to me to provide an initial explanation

-
1. See Thorne, Barrie, 1980: "You Still Takin' Notes?: Fieldwork and Problems of Informed Consent", Social Problems, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 284-297, for a discussion on the requirement that researchers must obtain 'legally effective informed consent' from those they study.
 2. I will deal more with this aspect in a later chapter.

of my presence to the children, nor to ask them if they would consent to being observed. As Barrie Thorne points out:

"The doctrine of informed consent does not take account of ethical dimensions of the knowledge a researcher may seek. Informed consent applies to individuals, each of whom is to be treated the same, and ignores social structure and deep-seated differences of power".

Thorne, 1980: p.293

My vagueness about the purpose of my research could be justified in that I feel I have an obligation to generate information about a major institution which affects our lives. In doing so I do not put forward a framework which blames the teachers or their teaching standards which may affect policy and reinforce existing inequalities. Although teachers do have power over their pupils - in primary schools in particular - I do not see them as oppressive agents of the State.¹ To a certain extent they too are a powerless group. I end the discussion with Barrie Thorne's plea for responsibility:

"While the doctrine of informed consent is central, it is not exhaustive, and we should not let it blind us to important questions about the responsibilities of social scientists and the ethical uses of knowledge in contemporary society".

Thorne, 1980: p.295

It was with relief that I discovered Mrs. Bosworth was very delighted that I should be interested in "her school" and before she took me on a guided tour insisted I sign the 'visitors' book' which (she told me) she kept for 'important people'.² The headperson escorted me round with a

1. See Chapter VI for a further analysis of teachers' position within the primary school.

2. On the same page as I signed my name was the local constable, a visitor from the "Sally Army", and somebody from the Fire Service who gave a talk on 'Your Local Fire Service'.

demeanour reminiscent of that of a monarch feudalistically surveying her domain.

For me, nostalgia returned, having been educated in a 'traditional'¹ school similar to this. Upon opening the classroom doors I am introduced and greeted by each teacher in turn with a statement from Mrs. Bosworth: "Ms. Clarricoates is here to study our school and I feel sure we are going to help her in any way we can". Each teacher assures us of her co-operation immediately and in a deferential manner.²

Everything in the school has a worn, old look about it: books are dogeared, pencils chewed down and desks are scored with graffiti. There is a new informality which contrasts with my own schooldays: desks are arranged in groups instead of in straight lines facing the front of the class. After the guided tour I am assured of every help and given permission to come and go as I please and to observe all the activities and lessons of the classes I had designated for study.

As I was leaving the school on that first day Mrs. Bosworth stated:

"Now I hope you're not going to write anything bad about my teachers; after all they are letting you come in and observe their classrooms".

A discussion quickly followed where I asked her "Don't you think schools are in need of change?" She certainly agreed with me but at the end of the discussion we both realised that we had radically different ideas about "change" and "bad" which neither of us were able to resolve. But I left

1. A school built before the expansion of education in the 1960's.

2. This manner was more for Mrs. Bosworth's sake than mine. One wonders if, given the chance, they would have said "No" to being observed.

with her assuring me "See you tomorrow".

Applegate Primary School November 1977 - February 1978.

The gales of November have sent the few passers-by scurrying off the streets in this small picturesque (if its to your liking) village, situated halfway between a well-known and historical University city and a small minster town. It lies in open, flat landscape which is stripped of its seasonal colours of autumn, green grass and golden corn, and has a bleak and muddy-brown appearance, with nothing to give it the distinctiveness of the Dales of Yorkshire or the Lakes of Cumbria. There is nothing 'breathtaking' or 'spectacular', everything is 'much of a sameness'.

The village of Applegate might have very well gone the same way but the 'hand of the resident' has left its mark. Anything old, a hint of being 'historic' or 'picturesque', seems to have been carefully nurtured into new life: the old village hand pump; the duck pond; the 'old' village hall; the village pub. The rural flavour, with just a dash of history, is the order of the day. But overall the modern era has won hands down with new bungalows and 'brilliant white' ranch-style fencing almost smothering the village. The cultivated surrounds are in stark contrast to Dock Side, along with the quiet, unhurried atmosphere of the 'rural-commuter' village, which only comes alive between the hours of eight and nine in the morning, and five and six o'clock in the evening as the cars and their owners make their way to and from the offices and other places of work in the nearby town and the city beyond.

I arrive at the appointed time and the secretary opens the door, states

my name, ushers me into the office of the head and then removes herself from our presence. Mr. Seaton (the head) introduces himself, and although displaying none of the 'delight' evinced by Mrs. Bosworth, at being 'chosen' to be observed, he is respectful of my university status and even acquiesces to the invitation to be interviewed. Again I ask for a general history of the school and he informs me that the school was opened in 1967, during which time he has been the headperson.

Mr. Seaton states that Applegate has very few 'social' problems indicating that this is because the children come from backgrounds similar to that of the school. I tell him the basic nature of my research and he comments on the fact that he would like to know the final results of the study. We proceed through the school where I am cordially introduced to the teachers in each of their classrooms.

I emerge to a babble of activity: children building bricks in a corner, others hunched up over written work, their faces creased with frowns and signs of faraway looks as they solve some mathematical or other written problems. Some children are reading aloud to a teacher; huddled in a group each tries to outdo the other in reading the quickest and loudest. As the teacher moves forward in recognition of Mr. Seaton and myself the 'building' ceases, shoulders become unhunched and for a brief moment there is silence. Heads are turned, necks are craned, eyes directed towards the 'object' who has suddenly caused this distraction (to some welcome, to others annoying) in their orderly lives. The moment is over, they return just as quickly to their activities each taking on the air as if they had never been so rudely pulled out of their concern.

Everything is 'bright' and 'new': from the apparatus, the very pencils the children write with, to the building blocks with which they patiently construct vast, high edifices only to see them tumble with monotonous regularity. With this newness, it seemed somehow anomalous that the top three junior classes were organised in rigid lines facing the front and not in groups.¹ The facilities of the school extend to pottery making and ceramics with all the costly equipment of an electrical kiln and numerous materials such as clay, glazes and moulds.

The headperson, reverentially referred to as 'Sir' by all pupils and staff, proceeds to give me information as to what bus to catch out of the village (no buses run during the day, only mornings and evenings). Realising I was in for a long wait, I hitched the fifteen miles home.

Arriving early the next morning, Mr. Seaton is quite surprised by my presence. Seeing I was minus a car he asked "How did you get here so promptly?" My spontaneous reply, later gave me cause for regret:

"I was lucky this morning, I got a lift within a few minutes of hitching".

I bite my tongue, his smile freezes on his face and my "respectability" slips. My status within this school did in fact falter many times, evidence for which I shall provide later in the chapter.

Long Meadow Estate Primary School February - April 1978

The council estate is like any other on a mid-day morning - devoid of the bustle and noise of the Dock Side area (Empsall Road). I have been

1. This was due to lack of space and overcrowding - so a teacher informed me.

wondering around trying to find the school: asking a passer-by she tells me to go through the 'snicket' between two rows of houses then "you can't miss it luv'". Having entered the nursery section by mistake I am directed to the headperson's offices; Mrs. Hartley warmly greets me. Again I ask for and am given a brief history of the school. Long Meadow was opened in 1960 while Mrs. Hartley has been headperson for fourteen years. In 1970 the nursery school was transferred from Hallam Hall, some six miles away, to these premises.

There are 246 children in the main school plus 30¹ (under fives) in the nursery unit. Along with twelve full-time members of the teaching staff (10 female and 2 male), there is a part-time remedial teacher, two nursery assistants, a school clerk and a full-time welfare assistant (all female). The pupil teacher ratio is 22.4-1, but again this varies: from between 14-16 in the reception class to 35 in the second year juniors. Most of the children go on to Junior High School at nine years old.

In contrast to the cool politeness of the suburban village school the teachers are very friendly to me. Instead of the guided tour of the school (which comes later) I am taken to the restroom at recreation time to meet the teachers during their coffee break. The headperson usually joins them for most 'breaks' (except when her presence is demanded in other parts of the school).² There is an eagerness to make me feel

1. This number varies as emergencies arise.

2. In the two previous schools the headperson tended to keep themselves apart from their staff.

welcome and I duly inform and discuss with them the purpose of my study. One of the teachers asked me "Do you think then that schooling has a part to play in the fact that girls and boys have certain attitudes to each other?" I told her that this had already been proved within secondary schooling and it would be interesting to find out if it does in primary schooling. This teacher went on to ask if I had obtained 'proof' from any of the schools¹ I have previously studied. I said that I couldn't be sure given that I hadn't analysed my fieldwork thoroughly and really didn't want to 'jump the gun'. She nodded agreeably and we proceeded to discuss things of a general nature.

Waiting in the hall for Mrs. Hartley to finalise some reports on her desk, I find the most marked feature of the school is its space - the equipment may not be all that new, nor can they boast a pottery and ceramic workshop - but space in this school is plentiful. Two large halls are intersected by a dining room (this was the only school I observed whose dining area did not double as an assembly hall). The physical education apparatus is modern and extensive: from the huge ropes hanging from the ceiling to the equipment which reminds one of an army assault course. Pictures of such leading gymnasts as Olga Korbut, Nadia Comaneci, Nellie Kim and Ludmilla Turischeva along with B.A.G.A.² instructions and charts on how to attain gymnastic grades are on the walls, reflecting the school's enthusiasm for women's gymnastics.

Mrs. Hartley takes me on a leisurely tour round the school. It is not an 'open-plan' school as I had thought,³ and although it has a great deal of

1. I did not divulge the names of the other schools to any of the pupils, staff and heads that I observed.

2. British Amateur Gymnastics Association.

3. In 'open-plan' schools there has been an emphasis of not building walls between adjoining classrooms and few or no doors.

space and is reasonably modern, the door to every classroom is firmly closed - each teacher having their 'own class' so to speak. In every class (except for the older juniors) I am scrutinised by certain pupils more than others; calls come of "Hello Miss, have you come to teach?" and one or two children dash forward to show me the work they have just completed. I am smiled at, waved at, touched and talked to by children, who with their spontaneity, allow themselves the privilege of addressing strangers in as friendly a manner as if they've known me all their lives. The head informs me that a lot of these children are very 'deprived', which she explains means they come from one-parent families, and they are so glad to get attention they will seek it in the most obvious ways.

On our way back to the main entrance Mrs. Hartley is met by a group of children. I quickly ascertain that the children to the right of the door have been sent to her, by their teachers, for praise. These children eagerly clutch their exercise books opened at the precise page warranting such an accolade, whereas the ones to the left of the door are those who are to receive some form of admonishment from her for some misdemeanour in the classroom. The headperson and I make our farewells, with the understanding that I shall return the next day to resume my fieldwork.

Lintonbray Primary School April - June 1978

It was rather ironic that this school initially refused me entry and then treated me like 'one of the family' when I did gain admittance. It was agreed that I should observe during the period just before and after Easter 1978.

Lintonbray village not only seems to be, but is: 'out in the wilds'; it has hardly any bus-service or other means of public transport, except a coach that runs into 'town' (the city) on Saturday lunch-time and returns Saturday evening. So once again I am forced to hitch across country the fifteen miles to the village. The scenery is pleasant enough but not remarkable, and as one would expect of a country village the area is quiet, with only the odd landrover, van or livestock truck to disturb the tranquility. Walking through the playground towards the main building I pass a bicycle shed, a climbing frame and a flower and shrubbery border. The school itself is not very big in size, and is shaped rather like a nissen hut, only, built in stone.

The three classes that make up the whole of the school are involved in lessons so I wait for the inevitable 'playtime'. I am seen by the teacher of the 'middle' class of 7 to 9 yr. olds who promptly ushers me into the class where the head is teaching.¹ There is a flurry of books being put away as it nears 10.30 a.m. I am introduced and the headperson, Mr. Wharten, and I shake hands. I tell him:

"Please don't let me disturb your lesson".

"No I won't, and you're not" comes the brusque reply.

There is the necessary eyeing each other 'up and down' to assess superficially what the other is about, and he leads the way to the infant classroom which doubles as a 'restroom'.² I am introduced to the other teachers: Mrs. Stebbings and Miss Lucas, and a mug of coffee is put into my hands. Again I am 'inspected' and there are polite questions as to

1. The headperson in this school is also the teacher for the top junior class of 9 to 11 year olds.

2. Probably because it's the only room with an open fire.

what my research is about. I reply, giving a similar account to the ones provided in the previous schools. At my answer the head mumbles: "I wish someone would pay me to do that". They start to feel at ease and they question me with interest, but lack of knowledge, about the work of an anthropologist. I assure them that I'm interested in "small-scale" societies, communities or social groups, hence my research into the primary school. They are not impressed but neither are they hostile for I am invited to stay and proceed with my participant observation immediately if I so wished. I accept and become absorbed into the social milieu of the school.

Mr. Wharten informs me that 'public' schooling began in 1867 and the existing school was opened in 1914 to replace the previous one which was too small. All the children move to the senior comprehensive school in Heathton at 11 years old.¹ In all there are 54 pupils, three teachers (2 female and 1 male) which includes the headperson; 1 part-time secretary (also female) and the 'cleaning woman'. The pupil-teacher ratio is very small: 18 to 1, although the head informs me that there are 22 in his class.

Facilities and equipment are scarce - a policy of 'making do' is in operation, with much of the children's creative work upon the walls, and with constant sharing of equipment to make up for the lack of materials. 'Official' posters are not visible. Mostly hand-made material by the children, done on a massive scale, bedecks the walls. With Easter almost

1. Lintonbray is in an area which operates the two-tier education system, i.e. pupils leave primary school at 11 to attend some form of secondary schooling.

upon us Mr. Wharten at the morning assembly, decides that preparations should be made for everyone to enjoy an afternoon 'tea party' before the end of term. The children are encouraged to make Easter Bonnets and hats, and also to decorate Easter Eggs. I am officially welcomed and invited to judge the Easter Egg competition. Feeling that it would be rude to say 'No' and that it can do no harm, I consent to do so.¹ There is a yell of agreement from the children, but this is due more to the head's statement:

"... afterwards, if you're good, we'll have a disco to round off the day before you go home for the holidays".

I now find myself in the strange position of being a 'celebrity' in the space of a few hours. I am greeted by all and sundry as if they've known me for years. I am offered a lift home by Miss Lucas who is 'going my way', which I immediately accept.

Summary

The contrasts between the four schools were obvious and sometimes even dramatic, not least in relation to the reception I had from each of them. The nature of my reception was the result of a combination of many things: my university status, the social class of the school, my style of dress and manner, the fact that I am female, and finally my feminist beliefs² which were a potential source of conflict between myself and those whom

1. I now feel that this was unwise and I should have refused.

2. See the collection of articles in Roberts, Helen (Ed.), 1981, Doing Feminist Research, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, for discussions of this 'problem' in fieldwork.

I was studying (this was particularly marked in Applegate school and the Empsall Road area).

Throughout this chapter and in others (Chapters on Catchment Areas and the Schools) I will attempt to grapple with the methodological issues connected with this and will illustrate the strategies I adopted to deal with these problems with fieldwork material. The next two sections deal with the experience and problems of participant observation within the classroom.

The Teachers' Response Towards the Observer

Having been accepted by the headperson of each school for the purpose of observing classroom interaction, the teachers in turn (some less than others) tolerated me and all my questions. I noticed that, just as I was observing, I in turn was being observed. Within each school the differences in attitudes were quite tremendous and I believe it is important to clarify those differences in order to reveal their effects on my fieldwork. Howard S. Becker states:

"In assessing the values of items of evidence we must also take into account the observer's role in the group. For the way the subjects of his study define that role affects what they will tell him or let him see".

Becker, 1958: p.655

The majority of the teachers treated me amicably, particularly in Long Meadow Estate and Lintonbray, whereas some teachers in the two other schools had more reservations. Favourable acceptance in the initial stages minimised the necessity of detailed explanations of the project. I also found it expedient, in my initial discussions with the headperson,

to compromise by not insisting on school records. All the heads stressed that no 'behavioural records' existed except specific cards relating to the children's 'academic achievement' and these, I was told, 'were confidential'. Certainly, favourable acceptance was far preferable to strained tolerance, as to a certain extent I was dependent upon the teacher for the quantity and quality of data.¹

My decision not to engage in teaching led to a good deal of trust from teachers in that they realised I was not there to judge their teaching 'standards'.² I had been completely unaware of this last issue until it was brought to my notice during my fieldwork for the pilot study. In one particular class I was observing in another 'dockland' school, the teacher Mrs. Veldon, kept referring to me frequently about her teaching style and methods. After certain instructions to the children during a lesson she would then turn to me and say:

"Is that right?"

or

"Am I doing it correctly?"

It was only after discussions in the restroom that it was revealed I was not a teacher and in no way an 'expert' on teaching methods. This knowledge was greeted by all those present with great relief.

Refraining from the teacher role, I nevertheless accepted a range of

-
1. See Colin Lacey's (1976) article for a similar discussion: "Problems of Sociological Fieldwork: a review of the methodology of 'Hightown Grammar'" in Martyn Hammersly & Peter Woods (Eds.) The Process of Schooling, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 2. See Nash, Roy, 1973: Classrooms Observed, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, where teachers in his study thought he wanted to be instructed in teaching methods.

small duties in the classroom such as assisting in various forms of ubiquitous "clean ups", helping children with their work and "reading with" individual children, accompanying classes on excursions and "looked after" classes when teachers were absent. During such times there were more than a dozen instances where teachers attempted to press me into service in the disciplining of children, which I avoided, since I saw these as ethically questionable assignments.

The problem of the nature of the relationship between myself and the teachers, and myself and the children,¹ arose many times, and sometimes I found it a perilous one. One has to recognise that the relationship between the teacher and pupils is indeed a unique one and that classroom life has its own impetus and dynamics, based on teacher and pupils sharing certain cultural assumptions about teaching and learning (Delamont, 1976; Jackson, 1968; Lacey, 1976). Power is in the hands of the teacher, and children expect and accept this. A teacher can rebuke or praise with just a word or a look. Into this environment emerges a 'foreign body'; somebody who, though unwittingly, nevertheless disturbs this unique relationship - the pattern of movement from pupil to teacher and vice-versa. There now emerges a new pattern of movement viz. from pupils to observer and sometimes even from teachers to observer. Another relationship is formed, that between children and observer.

It was this situation that I found problematic. Any movement away from

1. See other classroom studies: Sieber, Robert, 1976: Schooling in the Bureaucratic Classroom: Socialisation and Social Reproduction in Chestnut Heights, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.: see also Lacey, 1970: op.cit., and Hargreaves, 1967: op.cit.

the teacher to the observer by the children may be seen as a threat to the teacher's autonomy¹ and in certain cases was met with a swift reaction. The exception to this was when there was a reasonably acceptable relationship between teacher and observer. My presence, to some extent disturbed what I was observing:

In Dock Side on my first day of observation in the classroom Katie approached me:
"Hey, that's good", directing her remarks towards my scribbles.
A small boy advances:
"This is a rocket" he says showing me a large plastic brick construction:
"We can make it into a gun - watch!"
He proceeds to alter the construction and then states:
"See!"

I glanced at the teacher, and she smiled approvingly. My status was, in fact, quite high in this school not only because of my connection with university, but also because the headperson had shown a certain amount of deference towards me and the majority of the teachers were in dread of her.

But the situation in Applegate was, in some instances, quite different:

Jenny came to show me her Paddington Bear.
She tells me of the books she has read and we discuss the various exploits of this character.
"Jenny, shouldn't you be doing some work?" comes the sharp command.
Jenny grabs the toy out of my hand and rushes to the safety of her seat.

I was, after this, anxious not to repeat the same mistake by imposing my time and project at the expense of the teachers' work. What also had to be considered at the time was the fact that the teacher did not want me

1. For a discussion of teachers' autonomy see Delamont, Sara, 1976: Interaction in the Classroom, Methuen, London.

to think she let her pupils 'mess about' and not get on with their work. In the same school, but in a different class, another incident made me aware of my position within the classroom:

Ruth approached me and asked:

"What's a 'Huh' Miss?"

She was seeking the outline of an 'h'.

I tentatively asked her what she wanted it for and she replied:

"I want to write 'her'".

I proceeded to jot it down on the front of my note-pad. Suddenly the teacher stated loudly:

"The children are supposed to find it out for themselves; that is the object of the whole exercise".

My presence was not so acceptable within this school. A couple of the teachers were quite happy when I observed their classes but the rest were distant as if they resented my presence. One even told me in the restroom:

"There's no problems in this school; you want to be observing working class schools. Now there they do have problems".

Their distance was so great I felt the need to remove myself from Applegate staffroom at 'strategic' times so that they could talk out their suspicions and disapproval of me. There was a tendency to 'close ranks' at this school and it is my feeling that this group of teachers became closer than they had ever been before - due to my presence - so I probably did more good than harm.

I do not wish to overemphasise the aspect of my status as a participant observer, but I do feel that it affected the process of data collection. Yet, other researchers have not necessarily experienced similar problems in classroom research. Roy Nash (1973) for instance remarks:

"One's very lack of status as a mere student greatly relaxes teachers who might well be threatened by a research psychologist".

In contrast to this, other studies have contended that participant observation is subject to various strains and limitations (Lacey, 1976; Hargreaves, 1967; Entwistle & Nisbet, 1972). Hargreaves in particular mentions the misunderstanding and suspicion directed against him by the teachers whilst doing his research in Lumley. Lacey, in his study of 'Hightown Grammar' relates a specific instance whereby a teacher was constantly worried by the researcher's presence and:

"... conveyed such a strong sense of discomfort that I felt I could not impose myself".

Lacey, 1976: p.59

Certainly some Applegate teachers seemed disturbed by my presence and by my attitudes towards a number of educational issues.

On the question of the status of the observer and teachers' responses, there might be a difference between primary and secondary schools as teachers in the former are less highly qualified than secondary school teachers. On the other hand it was only those teachers in Applegate who were worried by my presence.

In this school, more than the others, my views were frequently sought¹ despite the fact that I tried to keep quiet, and on one or two occasions I found myself in the middle of a debate as to the merits of "equal opportunity" for girls and boys. These discussions did help to remove the suspicion that I was some sort of 'spy' from the Education Authority, but some of the teachers then transferred their concern from my presence

1. See Hargreaves, 1967: op.cit., for a similar discussion.

to my "irresponsible views" and even referred to my informal garb (of denim jeans and jacket), which did not meet with their wholesale approval.

The effects of this upon my fieldwork took several forms. No teacher actually refused to allow me to observe their lessons, and in only one case was the lack of co-operation made clear. Mrs. Smithson made it particularly difficult for me to enter into a relationship with the children. She insisted I did not take part in classroom activities and if one of the pupils ventured to show me their work she would quickly admonish them for doing so. On several occasions she was blatantly rude to me and refused to acknowledge my presence in the staffroom over the statutory cup of coffee. For some time I avoided going into her lessons, and attempted to find some common ground and a more personal relationship with her. Eventually my presence was tolerated, but it was made perfectly obvious that I was in her class 'under sufferance'. With other teachers the effects took more subtle forms. Mrs. Harris constantly chatted to me, informed me of the various problems of teaching small children and generally appeared to seek approval. I hinted, without offending her, that this was not the reason for my presence and I did manage to achieve a creditable amount of data. Mrs. Clark never refused to allow me to observe her class but directed work to the children or read them a story which resulted in her pupils playing a passive and silent role. But as the weeks passed most teachers came to accept me and the effect of my presence passed from a strained tolerance to one of reasonable acceptance.

The contrast between Dock Side and Applegate was striking. The teachers at the former school saw my "unusual" behaviour as part of the 'university

image' and afforded me every assistance. Indeed they expected me to behave and dress 'way out' and were more than surprised to find me quite "normal". My fieldwork was gained without too much disturbance and most of the teachers were quite keen to have me in their classrooms with one in fact asking me:

"When is it my turn to have my class observed?"

Many of them appeared to behave quite naturally and act as if I was not in the room at all, and so it is difficult to assess the effect of my presence. Sometimes, however, I gained clues from the children themselves. In one class I was told:

"It's nice in class when you're there Miss."

"Why?" I asked.

"Well, sir calls us by our first names and doesn't throw things at us".

But such attempts at deception were usually thwarted as my continued presence in each class made it difficult for them to maintain such uncharacteristic behaviour.

Acceptance overall was good, and many of the teachers imparted gossip to me and tried to draw me in when one of their colleagues was under fire by the rest. This, despite the fact that I was a researcher, and there to report all I 'heard and saw', constantly happened. David Hargreaves (1967) came across similar problems:

"When I behaved naturally to the teachers, they treated me as an individual person, be it as colleague or friend, and appeared to assume, at least for the moment, that I was not a social psychologist studying the school".

Hargreaves, 1967: p.198

The ethical issues raised by such problems are incapable of simple

resolution according to Hargreaves, but neither does he think that:

"... the difficulties encountered make it necessary to rule out all forms of participant observation as unethical".

Hargreaves, 1967: p.198

He concludes that the moral question is one of the uses made of the material so obtained and that certain information such as specific teacher-teacher relations must be regarded as confidential. I will follow Hargreaves' advice.

Long Meadow school was similar to Dock Side in that fairly good relations existed between myself and the staff. I was called on to 'look after' certain classes for brief interludes and allowed free access to the children in that they were very rarely reprimanded when they came to talk to me or show me their work. Sometimes the teachers went out of their way to tell me how they thought a class ought to be conducted and some went out of their way to discuss what they thought were progressive methods of education:

Mr. Whiting informed me: "It's not good gearing these kids to examinations ... I mean, what's it all for anyway. We'd be better off giving them an 'all round' education".

When I asked him what he meant by an "all round education", he informed me that it was a waste of time teaching academic subjects and that they should be taught more 'practical' subjects like woodwork or metalwork, and also more on "what life is about in the big wide world". Mortgages, running a home, parenthood and dealing with the bureaucracy in everyday life were some of his ideas. He detected my cynicism when I answered:

"Yes, I suppose they'll need to know how to fill in forms for the dole queue and deal with the Social Security people".

His response was to shrug it off and tell me:

"I can't change the system, can I?"

But this is not to detract from the richness of the fieldwork material obtained in this school, and in fact I was tempted to stay longer than I meant to.

My degree of acceptability in Lintonbray could be summed up in the way that I was treated as some form of 'celebrity' and asked to judge the 'Easter Egg' competition. Having certain negative views towards competition, I wasn't very keen to do so, but I was also wary of offending the headperson and his school given that he had publicly announced his intention to 'invite' me to be the 'judge'. At the time I felt I could resolve the two problems: one of competition and the other of offending, by making sure all the children should have a prize. I collected beads, candles, sweets and packets of chalk, and duly presented myself on the appropriate afternoon where all the prizes were given out. I now realise that in resolving the first two problems I created a more severe ethical one for myself. Looking back I feel that I had in effect, although unintentionally, influenced the 'favourable reception' I received in this school.

Having made sure that all the children won a prize I duly helped with and joined in the disco. The headperson ended the day with an informal speech thanking me for judging the competition, and on behalf of the children he thanked me also for the prizes. He ended with:

"I'm sure you would agree that we all hope
that Ms. Clarricoates will stay on longer
with us, as we feel that she has become one of us".

There was a yell of agreement from the children and a promise was extracted from me to return after Easter. I wonder now would things have

been different if I had not participated in judging at all.

Finally in regard to teachers' responses towards me I noticed that the male teachers, in all but one school,¹ kept a distance from me and seemed particularly sensitive to my views and my presence in their classes. There were however, two exceptions: Mr. Taggert in Dock Side, afforded me every assistance whilst I was observing his class and relayed various pieces of information to me on the backgrounds of his pupils. The second was so familiar to me that his behaviour assumed flirtatious proportions which involved me (at first) keeping him at a distance. Upon realising the fact that I was there to do serious research he refrained from such behaviour and I was on reasonable terms with him throughout the length of my stay at the school.

The Children's Response to The Observer

The children's initial reaction to me in school was one of curiosity and interest, whilst to many of them my presence was also a welcome distraction from the tedium of the day. They displayed a delight in showing me their reading books and their 'neatest' work and pointed out their drawings displayed on the surrounding walls. Having no reason or authority to scold them or drive them to complete their work, they eagerly sought my attention. I would first like to focus on the problems arising from this.

As a social anthropologist, I was inevitably something of an intruder in the school. It is difficult to define in detail the content of this role,

1. This was also the case in the study of three schools for my undergraduate dissertation and the two schools in my pilot study - a problem I was never able to overcome.

but it is clear that it is a role which is external to the system, and will thus create some tension.¹ I had hoped that the manner in which I had planned to behave, moving from observer to participant (as and when situations or needs arose) would make me just another person in a busy environment.

When I first arrived at each school the children inevitably ascribed some form of teacher-role to me or other adult role such as inspector or student teacher when I sat at the back of the class and took notes or helped generally within the classroom. I realise now that this was not as confusing or ambiguous to the children as I had previously thought and I will take this up later in the section.

Having ascribed to me some 'official' role, some of the children tried to spend ("waste" as some teachers called it) as much of their precious time with me as possible in order to avoid the 'exacting' tasks the teacher had set them. This initial response from the children gradually modified with the various cues and responses communicated by their teachers as they became aware to what degree my presence was tolerated. In Dock Side, Long Meadow and Lintonbray the younger children made a habit of spending as much time as possible with me.² Most of the teachers in these three schools actually encouraged the children to show their work to me. Although at the beginning this took up a great deal of my

1. David Hargreaves, 1967: op.cit., also found it a problem but managed to alleviate some of the suspicion by accepting a teacher-role and becoming absorbed into the community of teachers.

2. A situation which Ronald King, 1978: op.cit., prevented by avoiding all eye contact or encouragement with the children.

time I did want to relate to the children and get to know them and felt more could be gained by such activity. In time this initial reaction became dissipated and the children accepted my presence within the class, but imparted a great deal of information to me that would have otherwise been lost if I had taken on the full teacher role.

At Applegate however, I encountered a different situation. Some of the teachers did allow the children to engage in conversation but there were certain restrictions to this:

Emma, in the second year infants' class, during a 'choose-what-you-like' period involved me in a game of 'cat's cradle' with her. Using the opportunity to talk to her, ten minutes had elapsed when the teacher remarked:
"It is not a game for the classroom Emma".
The child put the length of twine away and went back to her seat.

In the top infants' class, there was a teacher who actually preferred that I talked more to the children than 'observe her', as she told me it made her very 'nervous'. We compromised - I told her I would still take notes but be unobtrusive about it, and in fact I became involved with a lot of activities in this class.

In the junior classes of all the schools the pupils behaved towards me in a much more formal manner than did the infants, although in Lintonbray the girls in the junior class sought my company and asked me to join them "on their table", which I did. Throughout my fieldwork in all four schools I made consistent and conscious efforts not to personally sanction 'misbehaviour', nor to be enlisted by the teacher in sanctioning pupil 'misbehaviour', which, whilst not always endearing me to the teachers, did allow me to become relatively accepted by the children. Since I

never betrayed their 'misbehaviour' children behaved with a great deal of freedom in my presence, allowing me to observe their actions closely. During my term at Applegate, however, my relations with the children were strained due to the fact that some teachers barely tolerated my presence. I had obtained an agreement within all schools that I would engage the children in conversation when possible, i.e. when it was not to the detriment of classroom routine, but on a number of occasions some of the teachers in Applegate made this difficult. I used the activities in the 'play areas' and 'utility rooms' to take the opportunity to talk with the children and assist them in obtaining their materials. Twice, during such episodes, a teacher came in and unceremoniously hustled the children away from me. I can only assume it was due to my presence and nothing the children had done that caused this.

My main concern was to strike a favourable balance, in time and attention, between teacher and pupils and to avoid excessive conflict but this was difficult as each teacher varied as to what irked them, and the problems here were not totally overcome. They seem to be inherent in the situation and to have tried to avoid them by taking on a teacher's role would only have led to greater difficulties. Lacey (1970) and Hargreaves (1967) had to abandon their roles as 'teachers' in order to improve relationships with the boys they were observing.

My constant juggling with neither teacher nor pupil role left me somewhat powerless in one or two situations. In particular the teacher could make it very difficult for the children to maintain their trust in me as a researcher, e.g. a situation occurred when, during my attempts at participation, I was involved in helping one boy, Jamie, make tissue flowers to

glue on to a branch. I had watched him for over half-an-hour attempting the project with great difficulty, and being with the same group of children I eventually turned my attention to him. The effect was that with my help he produced a reasonably acceptable 'branch' and off he went to the teacher to display his proud effort. The outcome was very unexpected for both Jamie and I. The teacher who had taken a very antagonistic attitude towards me, loudly told him to return to his place and complete one on his own, as the one he had offered her had been done "by that woman" and therefore was unacceptable. The rest of the children were quick to realise that any contact with the 'outsider' could mean the same would happen to them and henceforth avoided all further contact with me. This teacher in fact conveyed such a strong sense of unease that I felt it impossible to renew my fieldwork in her class. It was incidents like these which made it apparent that the observer role made me more sympathetic to the pupil perspective than the teacher perspective.

.

But my relationship with the children themselves was not without its problems. I noted that there was active manipulation of the situation by the children - whether this was to see how far they could go before I withdrew from them or informed the teacher, one can only surmise. The following example from a Dock Side junior class illustrates the attempt of children to play one adult off against the other:

The children were doing fractions that day which entailed numerous trips to the multiplication charts up on the wall. If the teacher would not give them the right answer to a particular sum they were told to find it out for themselves on the appropriate solving apparatus. Some of them immediately proceeded to try and gain the information from me, seeing me as an easy route to solving their 'problems'.

Although not wishing to be aloof I did not comply with their immediate requests but assisted them in locating the correct answer.

Another example of children manipulating events is the way some tried to gain my attention. One such occurrence involved a boy named Justin, a particularly aggressive child in the reception class at Dock Side. He frequently sought my attention in any way he could find and constantly brought leggo-constructed toys for my inspection. Another pupil, Lisa, constructed an object and came forward to display it to me. Justin's reaction was to forcibly knock it out of her hand. He then proceeded to stop Lisa or any of the other girls from coming to see me or talk to me. I left the class and returned only when I thought it expedient to do so.

There were (in all the schools) children who were very shy and never approached me. I found that if I positioned myself in a certain area of the class these children would avoid it or get their classmates to retrieve a piece of equipment they needed for specific projects. Some children even changed their pattern of movement in order not to come into contact with me. Even the observer's choice of where to sit is an important decision and I learned to select a place which was not a strategic position in the 'lanes of movement' within the classroom.

To the children, my place within the school was inevitably a mystery, but it was a mystery they seemed to accept uncritically. Part friend and ally, a person with a 'funny name' (I told them many times I was an anthropologist) they seemed to accept me as part of the system.

The next section deals with the formal interviews and informal discussions with both teachers and children.

Questionnaire and Interviews

The essential subjectivity of participant observation is both its main strength and an important weakness. In participating I tried to prevent artificial influences on the situation, but involvement carries with it the danger of prejudice and error in interpretation. Used solely on its own participant observation may have limited validity in research. But used in conjunction with other instruments of data collection it can lead to a clearer understanding of social behaviour.

Part of my study consisted of formal interviews with teachers (of which the questionnaire appears in the Appendix). The interviewing was used to clarify what the teachers say they do in the classroom, whilst observation provided extensive field notes of what they actually did. I gained many invaluable insights into the prevalence and distribution of teachers' attitudes as to "appropriate gender behaviour", conducting interviews with them in a formal fashion using an interview schedule containing up to 36 questions.¹ I hoped to explore two distinct areas through these interviews:

- 1] To gauge teachers' beliefs and expectation towards gender behaviour among their pupils
- 2] To obtain information on occupational attitudes, feelings of satisfaction and of disappointment accompanying 'success' or 'failure' as teachers.

One of the reasons for including the second set of questions was to try to ascertain whether the teachers' assessment of children in relation to class and gender was at all related to their own occupational attitudes.

1. The number varied according to whether they were married and/or had children.

Teachers are fundamental figures in children's adjustment to life and the social order, so it was important to make them a major part of my study. I wanted to know what kept these teachers, year after year, coming back to the classroom. What was the extent of emotional investment in their work, and what did they perceive as their educational objectives? The demands made upon primary school teachers are continuous and insistent; their contact with their pupils is more intensive than in other professions; and physical fatigue and mental strain are considerable. Such strain may well be greater for married women and since little evidence exists on this issue¹ I included questions on the broad problems of living, as well as on specific problems related to teaching, as one seems likely to affect the other.

Interviewing, despite all the textbook guidance, is admittedly "not easy" (Denzin, 1970: p.186). The various texts on methodology inform us of the need² and dangers³ of "rapport" between the interviewer and interviewee. However, Ann Oakley's account of interviewing women⁴ is more to the point when she states:

"... interviewing necessitates the manipulation of interviewees as objects of study/sources of data ..."

Oakley, 1981: p.33

-
1. One of the few studies is Gabriel, John, 1957: An Analysis of the Emotional Problems of the Teacher in the Classroom, Cheshire, Melbourne.
 2. See Goode, W.J. & Hatt, P.K. 1952: Methods in Social Research, McGraw Hill, New York, who discuss methods of 'maintaining rapport' whilst 'maintaining professional competence'. Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M. & Cook, S.W. 1965: Research Methods in Social Relations, Methuen, London, are more explicit about the "interviewer's manner", in that it should be "friendly, courteous, conversational and unbiased". (p.576).
 3. C.A. Moser (1958) warns against getting too "emotionally involved with the respondent and his problems" (p.195) see Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Heinemann, London.
 4. Oakley, Ann, 1981: "Interviewing Women" in Helen Roberts (Ed.) op.cit.

I myself was aware of such ethical problems in interviewing and made attempts to nullify manipulation. When asking the teachers' permission to record the interview, I stated categorically that no-one but me would ever listen to the tapes, and if publication ever arose I would change the names and personal details and send copies of such publications.

Whilst seeking significant information about teachers' lives, I refused to venture into the 'pretence of neutrality',¹ and felt that I related to their problems and particularly to the dual work load that most of the female teachers experienced. In fact, the women teachers saw me as not too far removed from themselves as I openly discussed my own circumstances, with respect to work and domestic situation. They questioned me about my life as I questioned them about theirs and found we had many similar 'problems': coping with children, balancing domesticity with a heavy work load and dealing with those conflicting emotions that beset so many other women in our situation. Ann Oakley suggests:

"Where both share the same gender socialisation and critical life-experiences, social distance can be minimal".

Oakley, 1981: p.55

It must be pointed out that though I found the interviewing both rewarding and successful, it was not without its problems. Where a relationship of mutual trust did not exist, the individual response was extremely dismal; one teacher felt so hostile to me, she promptly refused an interview

1. Dexter, L.A. 1956: "Role Relationships and Conceptions of Neutrality in Interviewing", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXIV, pp.153-7, states that such a stance is "counterproductive" and that "participation demands alignment" (p.156).

and expressed her views openly to the other teachers. But foremost it was a mutually rewarding discussion (both with women and men) about their lives and work as teachers.

Initial reactions to being interviewed did vary, from those who were keen to talk about their lives to those who felt intimidated by the prospect of being 'formally interviewed' with a tape-recorder. I did, however, interview all the teachers (except for one) whose classes I observed and all of the other teachers in the schools who agreed to be interviewed. I waited until my period of observation was drawing to a close and then I asked teachers in each school if they would take part in an interview. Most readily agreed. One of the 'problems' (especially with female married teachers) was finding the time. I had to compete with playground duties, lunchtime dashes to the shops, staff meetings, concert rehearsals and sports practice. So, interviews were tape-recorded and conducted during lunchtimes and after school hours, and lasted from twenty minutes to over one hour. I assured all the interviewees that the information recorded would be treated confidentially and would be used in a way that would offer no identification of particular individuals.

I interviewed seven male teachers and they were by far the most talkative. Only the male teacher in Applegate was abrupt and to the point. The female teachers varied considerably - some were quite daunted by the prospect, whilst others assumed they had nothing to say and thought their 'life story' was boring. If some were particularly suspicious about the interviews, long discussions with them tended to alleviate any fears they may have had. I was faced with one teacher who

emphatically refused to be interviewed, and I also had to contend with her justifying her refusal to other teachers who were ambivalent about the process. Fearing that they would follow suit I interviewed them almost immediately. Despite some attendant problems, response to interviewing was very good. I interviewed 31 teachers - 24 female and 7 male. I did not interview part-time teachers (except where unavoidable), one teacher who refused and three headpersons.

Because I chose to do participant observation on a continuous and full-time daily basis I found I quickly became absorbed into the school routine with its assemblies, playtimes and lessons. I took the opportunity to incorporate into my study, informal discussions with the children. I had attempted to hold such discussions in my pilot study but had found difficulties because of the very young age of some of the children. I also found that using a tape-recorder caused them to exaggerate their attitudes and expressed opinions. So I chose quite deliberately to have these discussions only with the Top Junior Class of each school. These informal discussions came in three stages - with the whole class together; with the boys on their own and then the girls on their own with each stage lasting approximately an hour. I usually opened the discussion with "Do you think women and men should do the same job?", and let the children control it from then on. The effect was quite startling, and indeed very fruitful, as the children revealed their attitudes towards each other with regard to gender.

Conclusions: Successes and Inadequacies of the Study

The limitations and advantages of my participant observation are too easily enumerated. One was the question of my 'identity' for the children, who sometimes took me to be a teacher's aide, or dinner and playground supervisor. I tried to make it clear that I had no formal role of authority in the school mainly because I wanted to encourage the children to talk and act freely in my presence. When I tried to explain to the children what I was up to with my constant roaming and busy scribbling, I often felt frustrated. For a while I told them I was:

"... interested in understanding the way children behave to one another".

But a number of them asked me:

"Am I being good, Miss?"

So I realised the disciplinary connotations of the word "behaviour" and instead explained my interest in groups and in patterns of relationships. But most of the children would inevitably utter a short and bored "Oh", and run off.

But my explanations however, did not include a reminder that they could decline being party of my study. Were they told they had such a right, I think a few of them might have exercised it. One child in particular, in Applegate, avoided me at all costs informing others that I was a 'spy'.¹ Other children were full of questions and eager to participate, volunteering

1. Gans reports that such activity (participant observation) is "psychologically a form of espionage" (p.34). See Gans, J., 1968: "The participant observer as a human being: Observations on the personal aspects of fieldwork", in H.S. Becker et al. (Eds.) Institutions and the Person, Aldine, Chicago.

information and demonstrating skills on the sports apparatus. Still others seemed uninterested in the fact of my research. As I stated previously I was never able to bridge the gap caused by differences in experience.¹

As for the teachers, I suspect that I made more impact on them as an individual than as a researcher. Undeniably different discoveries would be made, different aspects emphasised, different interpretations elaborated, even though the central analysis might be the same, by another researcher, (even more if the researcher was male). This is inevitable since a researcher does influence the situation by the role she or he adopts. I personally have to admit that I was very conscious of my own behaviour, which was the product of my own beliefs and personality as well as of my profession as a researcher.

Fieldworkers often have what Chrisman (1976) calls: "multiple identities". In addition to my identity as a researcher, I took on a work role. Also, because I am a woman and (was) a wife, I shared interests with the majority of the teachers I studied (as women and wives) which (I think) essentially made the relationship less hierarchical, and encouraged to include in the thesis the women's (and men's) subjective experiences, not only as teachers, but as people. I became quite friendly with some of the teachers and pupils and this posed certain ambiguities. I did not consciously manipulate friendships in order to obtain data, but the trust

1. Barrie Thorne (1980) states "gaps in understanding due to different experiential worlds may hamper a researcher's ability to provide informed consent" (p.288) op.cit. She also found it difficult to explain to the children what she was doing.

and acceptance felt good and information was more readily forthcoming.¹ Becoming friends with someone you are observing is very complicated and can cause ethical problems.

A major problem with interpretative analysis of face-to-face relations within classrooms is that until quite recently much of it has focussed on pupil as pupil and teacher as teacher: neutralised and neutered categories. Given my status (university) and the fact that I am an adult I felt particularly confused by the actions and behaviour of the girls (and boys) around me. How could I understand the real nature of their relations with each other (girl to girl, boy to boy and girl to boy) and with their teachers, the relationship of school based activities and behaviour to the wider social context of estate life, suburbia, tight cramped streets and the home and family setting? Partly this is explained by the complexity of social reality. But also one cannot ignore the very important variable of gender, with all its complexities. What happens to the children is determined within certain boundaries by the very fact of their being girls or boys, and not only by their being pupils or working class or academically 'successful'. These latter dimensions are crucially interrelated with the very complex concepts of 'being female' or 'being male'. Given that my main interest was essentially to do with girls, I wanted to understand the distinct 'female' experience of primary schooling which involves complex articulations between male and female experiences of gender and of cross-cutting

1. Fieldworkers often report experiencing guilt when they 'deliberately' befriended someone or manipulated a pre-existing friendship in order to get data. See for examples: Harrell-Bond, Barbara, 1976: "Studying elites: Some special problems", in Michael H. Rynkiewicz & James P. Spradley (Eds.) Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork, John Wiley & Sons, New York; and Glazer, Myron, 1972: The Research Adventure: Promise and Problems of Fieldwork, Random House, New York.

dimensions such as class and age. I personally feel a lot has been missed simply because it was impossible for me to enter the field as 'one of the girls'.¹ Although I have tried to record accurately and analyse classroom life as a researcher, I feel it is a poor second in that I could not experience what was actually happening to the girls and how they felt at the time.

Whilst doing participant observation I was always aware of the danger of solely providing data which corroborates specific arguments and interpretations. John Madge (1953) stresses that observation studies are prone to bias due to the fact that the observer only sees what she/he wants to see. It would be very easy to avoid the problem of bias by other methods, i.e. an extensive questionnaire. But I found in the interviews, that teachers who gave replies to questions contradicted themselves by their actions within the classroom which suggests that research based on questionnaire responses alone is irrelevant as an exploration of behaviour.

The catchment areas chosen were satisfactory in that they provided contrasting comparative material, although they were not pure 'ideal types', e.g. not all pupils in Applegate were 'exactly' middle class children.

The technical problems of tape-recording interviews and typing transcripts were few but sometimes exasperating.² In the old schools (Dock Side and

1. See Llewellyn, Mandy, 1980: "Studying girls at school: The implications of confusion", in Rosemary Deem (Ed.) Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, who was able to accomplish such participation in secondary schools.

2. Not least when I went to transcribe two interviews on a tape, only to discover that my sons had taped these over with the 'loud ramblings of Status Quo' (a rock musician group). Hence in the figures in Chapter 6, only 29 teachers appear instead of 31.

Lintonbray) it was difficult to locate a suitable electrical point and then finding one with the right type of plug. I also had to be very firm when one or two of the teachers wanted to sit in on each other's interviews.

Analysis of the data¹ involves the recognition of patterns in the behaviour observed. Participant observation as a research methodology is a way of getting at the assumptions which influence and subtly control the environment in schools. It is a means of probing the non-conscious aspects of institutional life, of searching out the patterns, being sensitive to motivations, watching for the unexpected as well as the expected results of an action, looking at side effects, listening for meanings as well as noticing the words. Yet the failure to make explicit the limitations and difficulties of participant observation would be an evasion of the problems involved in this method of social investigation.

The next two chapters will deal extensively with the catchment areas of all four schools. An attempt will be made to identify the factors involved in creating the social relations between the sexes in each social setting.

1. A general discussion of problems of analysis of fieldwork data appears in Becker, Howard S. 1958: "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation", American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, Dec. pp. 652-660. For a thorough analysis of observational data see Walker, Rob, and Adelman, Clem, 1975: A Guide to Classroom Observation, Methuen, London.

CHAPTER III

The Catchment Areas

Introduction

We cannot examine the school as if it existed in a vacuum. Educationalists and researchers recognise that schools have a close relationship to their neighbourhoods (Eggleston, 1977), and this is particularly true of primary schools (Blyth, 1965; King, 1978). But it is not as simple as it would seem to discuss and describe the actual catchment areas. The meaning of certain sociological concepts frequently used in this context, such as 'community' and 'locality' is highly problematic.

Colin Bell and Howard Newby¹ have pointed out that there is no satisfactory definition of 'community' and put forward the term 'locality' as a reasonable replacement (Bell & Newby, 1974). Stacey² prefers the term "a local social system" of which certain conditions are required:

- "a] The majority of the local population should have been present together in the locality for some period of time.
- b] The longer is this period the more likely is there to be a local social system present.
- c] Where the majority of the population have been born and bred in the locality it is highly likely that there will be some sort of local social system present".

Stacey, 1974: p.20

1. See the introduction to Bell, Colin & Newby, Howard (Eds.) 1974: The Sociology of Community, Frank Cass & Co., London.

2. Stacey, Margaret, 1974: "The Myth of Community Studies" in Bell & Newby (Eds.) ibid.

Stacey cites Old Banbury¹ as an example of a "local social system".

Elias and Scotson² state that:

"Communities are essentially organisations of home-makers, residential units such as urban neighbourhoods, villages, hamlets, compounds or groups of tents".

Elias & Scotson, 1974: p.27

Their definition of community is a much wider one than that of the classical tradition of Tönnies³ and Durkheim.⁴

Given that the nature of the thesis concentrates on patriarchal ideology and practices in school, some attention must be paid to the 'types' of patriarchal power and attitudes that are most pervasive in the various catchment areas. Such practices and attitudes will be linked to the occupational structure, social relations and value structure of the community.

In choosing four catchment areas diverse in relation to social class, size and occupational structure, the researcher has tried to meet the criteria for local social systems put forward by Stacey (1974). Each neighbourhood has been in existence long enough to develop similar values.

1. See Margaret Stacey's now classic study of 1960: Tradition and Change: A study of Banbury, Oxford University Press.

2. Elias, Norbert and Scotson, J.L., 1974: "Cohesion, Conflict and Community Character", Bell & Newby (Eds.) op.cit.

3. The German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies introduced the concepts 'Gemeinschaft' and 'Gesellschaft' into sociological literature. The former represented life in a 'community' which is 'warm, homely and affectionate' while the latter was in stark contrast to this and represented a social life which is cold, impersonal and fragmented. See Tönnies, Ferdinand, 1955: Community and Association, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

4. Emile Durkheim's dichotomy 'mechanical solidarity' and 'organic solidarity' like Tönnies, reduced the continuous long-term process of social change to these two static types. See La Capra, Dominick, 1972: Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Philosopher, Cornell University Press, also Nisbet, Roberts, 1966: The Sociological Tradition, Heinemann, London.

There is also a physical continuity or even a 'boundary' with each having their own 'territoriality' complete with school, church, club, association etc., whereas larger institutions such as a hospital are located elsewhere.

It is the researcher's intention to explore the values and attitudes towards gender differentiation within each catchment area and to attempt to assess those attitudes that the children carry with them into their schools. Gender evaluations within each primary school will be bound up with the ecology of the neighbourhood, each with its own traditions and specific relationship with the larger social system. The researcher will be asking whether the values of the home, the school and the peer group, with regard to gender, reinforce each other, or whether, at certain points, tensions exist between them.

The assumptions mentioned earlier about the close relationship of primary schools to neighbourhoods requires some demonstration, as it is relevant to the way in which the behaviour of the teachers in the individual schools is affected by their perceptions of the neighbourhood. Discrepancies between what the children are and what they 'should be' are inevitably related to the family-home background,¹ hence a descriptive analysis of the nature of the catchment area is essential to 'set the scene'.

Four main types of primary school environment are considered and in the following order:

1. See the work of King, Ronald, 1978: All Things Bright and Beautiful? John Wiley & Sons Ltd., London and also Sharp, Rachel, & Green, Anthony, 1975: Education and Social Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

- 1] Traditional urban - inner city working-class district.
- 2] Rural/suburban middle-class village.
- 3] Corporation estate.
- 4] Rural village.

It is important to make clear that because it was not possible to do an in-depth survey of each neighbourhood, firsthand fieldwork material and observational data is rather brief and hence the chapter relies a great deal on other people's research. At the same time, I did spend six weeks in each neighbourhood engaged in observation, informal discussion and semi-structured interviewing and the data presented is only a small proportion of the total material that I was able to collect.

The researcher will focus upon the immediate environment whilst attempting to assess the nature of relationships between women and men. Domestic activity, leisure, and decision-making within the family will be discussed, as well as the world of childhood, the hopes and aspirations of the parents and above all the lives of women in general.

As well as a rich source of material on community studies in Britain, stretching back three decades, the researcher has also been able to draw upon earlier empirical studies of two of the actual areas; in particular Jeremy Tunstall's The Fishermen (1962 Edition); Norman O'Neill's (1973) doctoral thesis, which compared dockers with printers in relation to social class consciousness; and the earlier work of Horobin from the '50's.¹ First, however, it is important to give a brief outline of the city and its industry which will set in context the four communities.

1. Horobin, G.W., 1957: "Community and Occupation in the Hull fishing industry", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 343-356.

The City, the Port and Industry

Hull has the reputation of being essentially a low wage, unskilled and 'backward' industrial area, and in comparison to the rest of the country the city and its surrounding area has high unemployment. One of the major areas of employment - the docks - has been going through great changes¹ and suffered a considerable demise:

In 1970: The Dock Labour Force was 7,000

In 1980: " " " " 2,200

One of the major docks - Victoria - has closed. Fishing too, has experienced a dramatic decline. But for the main Hull is a 'commuter city', with people travelling in from as far as 20 miles to commercial, professional and industrial occupations. The professional, scientific and managerial employees mostly live in the more prosperous areas around Beverley and Haltemprice, a good distance from the decaying inner-city areas like Empsall Road. But the city is trying to attract residents to return to new, comfortable dwellings in the inner city with specially designed 'cobbled streets' and interlaced with art and craft shops. Not surprisingly these new dwellings are situated well away from 'the Road', and are located in the 'old' part of the city which is currently undergoing considerable redevelopment.

The general occupational structure of Hull and its surrounding area is as follows:

1. The researcher refers to containerisation and the ensuing fall in the need for manual labour.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

Area	Prof /Man	Non-Manual	Skilled/ Manual	Semi- Unskilled
Dock Side/ Empsall Road ¹	3.2%	14.8%	19.2%	47.8%
Beverley	10.4%	27.8%	22.3%	29.6%
Haltemprice	21.8%	34.8%	16.2%	16.7%
Hull	6.5%	23.7%	23%	33.9%

(1971 Census Material)

Like all major industrial areas the city has been hit by unemployment, particularly in the 'lower skilled' section. Fishermen in particular have been increasingly affected by a number of factors. Factory trawling - quick freezing its catch at sea - has enabled such trawlers to stay at sea for lengthy periods and to go far afield looking for fish; cheap imports of fish into Britain create a further pressure upon the fishing industry - particularly along the East Coast. But

- Problems arose in connection with the delineation of the actual catchment areas for Dock Side and Long Meadow. With 25 and 26 enumeration districts respectively to each of the two areas - Empsall Road and Moonfleet - the researcher made some attempt to isolate the particular catchment areas of the schools. This was done by pinpointing the enumeration district within the immediate vicinity of the school. But this was found to be unsatisfactory as the ensuing figures show:

Population Statistics

Area	School	Children aged 0-4	Children aged 5-14
Empsall Road	Dock Side	11.3	13.4
Moonfleet	Long Meadow	7.3	23.3

one of the most dramatic impacts upon the industry in Hull was the Cod War¹ which severely limited trawling in traditionally plentiful areas. High unemployment coupled with a lack of re-investment has meant the demise of the port in terms of its tradition of fishing.²

It is not only those directly employed but also other workers who are affected, notably railway workers who carry fish inland, those employed in the construction and servicing of trawlers, and workers in service trades who cater to fishermen (Tunstall, 1962). It must be appreciated that the demise has not been gradual, but indeed quite rapid in its development.

However, it should be remembered that those involved in fishing have never comprised more than 7% or 8% of the city's labour force.³ The people of Hull would probably be offended by the image of fish, fishermen and dockers, and see their city as more than just a port and fish dock. In fact Hull is one of the biggest paint manufacturers in Britain, and the largest single area of employment is engineering with approximately 23,000.⁴

The 'intensely local' quality, previously mentioned, of Empsall Road⁵ can be ascertained by the home-work schedule:

-
1. Iceland decided to place a 50 mile limit around its coastline in order to protect the fish in the waters and its own industry. Hull trawlers had built up a tradition of fishing in such waters and the ensuing 'War' forced them to go further afield.
 2. The research was carried out in this area in 1977-78.
 3. In 1972 - 11,000 people were employed in fishing.
In 1977 - 8,100 " " " " "
Figures from Manpower Services, Register of Fisheries.
 4. Other major areas of employment include Food Processing, Wood and Cork Manufacturing and the Chemical Complex.
 5. To avoid confusion the researcher must point out that Dock Side is the name of the school (street name) whilst Empsall Road is the actual catchment area and community in which the school is situated.

PERSONS TRAVELLING TO WORK (FORMS OF TRANSPORT)

Area	Car	Bus	Pedal Cycle	On Foot
Empsall Road	11.5%	27.2%	13.5%	36.1%
Long Meadow	18.4%	38.8%	22.1%	10.8%
Applegate	64.7%	5.8%	16.6%	11.7%
Linton Bray	25.0%	12.5%	4.1%	25.0%

The highest number of commuters by car come from the area of Applegate whilst the highest number of those who travel to work on foot come from the Dock Side and Empsall Road area.

The Inner-City

Dock Side

It is not difficult to imagine streets of regimented terraced housing - tunnels to backs, with no gardens - except for one or two large tree-lined avenues of once-prosperous merchant houses long needing a face-lift and rapidly falling into disrepair. This community of streets and alleys locked in by the fishing docks to the South and the main Empsall Road to the North has an almost self-contained quality. Work, home, school and pub are all within close proximity of each other, making the area intensely local, each aspect of life reinforcing the other.

In a sense this immediate landscape calls forth the stereotyped view of "mean streets", violence, sexual aggression and ignorance, small narrow lives; or alternatively the picture of the cosy gregariousness of slum dwellers with which sociologists, as well as playwrights, have fed the

public.¹ But neither view can be any longer offered as a realistic account of such areas (Jackson, 1968: O'Neill, 1973, 1982).

Though the people in the community appear united by a common culture and aims, in reality life is much more complex. 'Officially' the Empsall Road is typical of what is commonly known as a Northern Industrial 'Slum'.² Segmented off a busy main road, like branches of a huge tree, it consists of a maze of streets with corner-shops - as well as the mile-long parade of shops and pubs - which sell anything from moth balls to creosoted fire-lighters, from 'best' butter to the tray of one penny 'goodies' for the kids who have managed to obtain a coin from their overworked parents. In accordance with the custom of the district, regular customers are obliged with goods 'on tick'.³

Pubs, bingo halls and local discos merge well into the noisy, and sometimes malodorous area whose smells are exacerbated by the local fish meal plant situated on the docks nearby. Despite extensive clearance in the face of re-development the place can certainly still be called a 'community'. The area has been associated with the fishing industry, and its by-products, since the middle of the 19th century (Tunstall, 1962) and the employees have tended to be concentrated in this particular part of the city (Horobin, 1957) although not all the inhabitants of the Empsall Road are

1. The researcher is mainly thinking of the plays and literature that were a vogue of the past three decades: Barstow, Stan, 1962: A Kind of Loving, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Sillitoe, Alan, 1970: Saturday Night and Sunday Morning, Signet Books, London; Young, Michael and Wilmott, Peter, 1957: Family and Kinship in East London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Wilmott, Peter and Young, Michael, 1960: Family and Class in a London Suburb, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Hoggart, Richard, 1957: Uses of Literacy, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
2. According to the Inland Revenue's Assessment of Rateable Value which was then £30 per annum.
3. A term given to the custom of acquiring goods and paying for them at the 'end of the week' when pay day arrives.

connected with the industry.¹

The threat of imminent demolition hangs over what is left of the community. Of those whose houses are demolished most accept a council house or flat on one of the large 'overspill' estates situated on the outskirts of the city. The shuttered, rat-infested empty houses on 'the Road' are the obvious signs of a decaying area. Each street or terrace is cleared of people and left to the rats, whilst children clamber through the derelict houses or play in rusty old wrecks of cars which are regularly dumped on cleared demolition sites.

This is the kind of area that, it is assumed, people never like to move far from² - where parents went to the same school that their offspring now attend. But changes are already apparent in the evershrinking district, with the presence of new council flats and others partly constructed.

There are other factors besides geographical mobility and rehousing involved in the change and deterioration of the community one of which is the fact that the area was built around the fishing industry which is now being severely undermined by foreign competition.

Life in and around Dock Side (Empsall Road)

It was June 1978 when I first decided to try and get some sense of how

-
1. According to Tunstall, 1962: op.cit., Empsall Road was mostly built up between 1890-1914.
 2. For similar findings of community studies see: Young & Wilmott, 1957: op.cit., Wilmott & Young, 1960: op.cit. See also Gans, Herbert, 1962: The Urban Villagers, The Free Press, New York.

people actually went about their daily lives in the respective catchment areas in order to discover the nature of the relationships between females and males and of the sexual division of labour. In the dockland area of Dock Side school 'prosperity' is tenuous, if it ever arrived. The landscape and surrounds reflect a history of scarcity - William Booth House¹ 'crowns' the Road like an ugly coronet and within a few yards of this stands the derelict remains of the old Wash House. Here the women could bring their kids and laundry and for less than 50p. could wash and dry both.

The working-class family has few financial assets, if any, with relatively limited resources of income compared to a middle-class group (Jackson, 1968; Tunstall, 1962; Dennis et al, 1969).² The occupants in this area live in, for the most part, poorly maintained, unfurnished accommodation rented from absentee landlords who expect a high return for little input.

.
HOUSING CONDITIONS.

Owner Occupied	30.2%	Households sharing or	71.3%
Rented from Council	5.6%	lacking a bath	
Rented Unfurnished	62.3%	Households with no	74.9%
Rented Furnished	2.0%	inside w.c.	

(1971 Census - Small Area Statistics)

Despite the hardship and poverty and the break-up of the community, traditions are still strong and the environment is adaptable to change.

-
1. William Booth House is a hostel for single men most of whom are homeless and jobless. It is also a rehabilitation centre for alcoholics (male).
 2. In their studies they discuss the working-class family's 'insecurity of income' with no alternative other than the D.H.S.S. when faced with unemployment or sickness.

Saturday shopping is still the event of the week when 'the Road' comes alive whilst people, mostly women, shop for the week's provisions. Sunday lunch is still looked forward to with the 'weekly joint', whilst the weekly trips to the cinemas, which were once dotted all over the area, have become a trip to the bingo session, especially for women. For the young there are pubs and ear-screaching discos with coloured lights and fast talking D.J. presenters; a far cry from the weekly 'bop' at the local church hall of two decades ago. Every year, in early October, one of the country's largest fairs gathers in the park nearby and brings a kind of escape for eight days, invading the senses with its flashing lights, loud 'juke-box' music and smells of 'hot-dogs' with onions, and candy floss.

The 'Sally Army' still makes its rounds in search of souls. Perhaps they still see the area as a place in need of saving! Some customs have gone: bonfires in the street on November 5th are few and far now, along with the brass bands in the park on Sundays and 'Whit walks'.¹ Saturday afternoon matinees with Flash Gordon and Batman at the local cinemas have long since been replaced with television (and for most, colour) in every home and the local cinemas have either been 'knocked down' or turned into yet another branch of 'Wooleys' (Woolworths) or a bingo hall.

Though the large super-markets selling food and cheap 'trendy' clothes do a thriving business, they have not altogether replaced the small corner

1. The ritual of 'walking' through the district or town on Whitsuntide Sunday, see Hoggart, 1957: op.cit.

shop which can still do what the supermarkets cannot - give 'tick' to reliable customers. However, the uneasy alliance between the two may well be ended by the bulldozer. But in June 1978, that problem is still three or four years away for a majority of the inhabitants.

Aspects of Gender Relations in the Community

I make my way to the 'local' pub which is nearest to the Dock Side school, and carrying my sandwiches I go to the bar and order half a cider. I sit down at a seat near the far wall which is in a good position to view the bar and main door. A few minutes later a crowd of young women in white overalls and headscarves¹ enter and make for the bar. One of the few men standing at the bar turns round and states familiarly:

"Hello girls, skiving as usual"

"Cheeky sod!" states one,
"We're on our lunch hour. Anyway it
might do you a bit of good if you did
some work now and then."

The man mumbles something but says no more. Perhaps he felt outnumbered, or perhaps her 'quip' which got quite a few laughs, touched a raw spot. Having got their drinks the women move to the other side of the room and sit together. The men at the bar give them a few glances but don't acknowledge their presence anymore, unless one or two of the women go up to the bar to re-order drinks, where there is the 'chat up':

"Where've you been all my life darlin'?"

"Avoiding you that's for sure" comes the quick reply.

1. They are all employees of one of the many frozen food factories that are situated in this area.

"Now you don't mean that do yer".

"Yeah I do," already tiring of this conversation.

He doesn't take the hint or doesn't wish to.

"What's yer boyfriend got that I haven't".

An edge has come into her voice as she replies:

"The list would be too long to tell yer!".

He glares at her and she moves off with her friend, having now got the drinks that they ordered.

The pub has by now become quite busy. Meanwhile I unobtrusively continue to take notes. Except for the few couples (female and male) that come in, the people for the most part tend to group themselves by sex. Workmen come in from the local engineering factory, wearing blue overalls daubed with oil and grease, whilst some dockers come in, down a few pints and are off again. Suddenly I am aware that my presence has been noticed. A young man comes forward to my table asking (in fact, stating):

"All on yer own luv'?"

I neither look at him nor speak to him. He returns to his mates mouthing the audible insult:

"Stuck up bitch!"

In the next few weeks I was to visit this same pub many times and in fact my presence was tolerated, because it was a large place serving a wide clientele, they were used to many strangers coming and going.

Such observations and experiences in fieldwork provide a useful illustration of the nature of Empsall Road as an overtly patriarchal community¹

1. Dennis et al. imply that a masculine rigidity permeates those communities where the occupation is particularly 'extreme' as in coalmining, see Dennis, Norman, Henriques, Fernando & Slaughter, Clifford, 1969: Coal is our Life, Tavistock, London. O'Neill notes the sharp demarcation between men and women in social relations on the Empsall Rd probably reflecting the sharp demarcation between work and leisure, see O'Neill, Norman, 1973: Class and Social Consciousness: Variations in the Social Perspectives of Industrial Workers, unpublished Ph.D., University of Hull, published in 1982: Fascism and the Working Class, Shakti Publications, Southall, Middx.

(this is not to say that middle-class communities are not), whose norms are interpreted through the masculine-feminine polarisation which is characteristic of working-class communities (Dennis et al., 1969; O'Neill, 1982). The worlds of men and women are still highly segregated, despite the belief of many sociologists that this is no longer the case. The leisure time of women and men, is for instance, generally spent separately. Indeed, the polarisation of what is 'masculine' and what is 'feminine' underlies all aspects of existence within the community. It is a land of 'Men Only' bars, and a place where male values of 'toughness', and a central focus upon manual work as the mark of a 'real man', permeates the lives of all those who reside in such an area.¹

The nature of distant water trawling, dock work and other forms of manual labour carried out by men in this area may be particularly conducive to specific kinds of patriarchal relations between men and women. Tunstall (1962) has shown in his study that deep-water trawling has a very high death rate,² appalling working conditions and low pay.³ The vast majority of male workers on the Empsall Road, will probably experience conditions, in their work, which are noisy, dirty and even dangerous. The fact that men have to spend most of their waking hours at work, and base their identity on work activity means they are defined by others essentially through their relations to work (Willis, 1975). Women in contrast are defined essentially as 'wives and mothers' (even though they may not be either) and not in relation to 'real work', and this means that

1. See O'Neill, 1973: ibid, 1982: op.cit. I will be presenting further evidence of segregation later in the chapter.

2. Trawler fishing has a markedly higher occupational death rate than coal mining (since 1952).

3. Horobin, 1957: op.cit. states that fishermen have average incomes quite appreciably higher than the group of shore workers but their earnings per hour are relatively low.

they will not be seen as 'workers' whatever the nature of her domestic duties or/and paid work outside the home.

Men's work, whatever its nature will be seen as 'real' work and will usually lay the basis for what Willis calls 'shop floor culture' (Willis, 1975, 1977), with its group-based private practices, language and social habits. The variations in 'sheer strength' and 'brute skill' in the manual tasks the men perform will provide for them a sense of meaning, purpose and above all 'power'. And although, as Paul Willis points out, that 'power' does not over-rule the power of the bosses and is unpolitical, it provides them with a 'crude sense of pride' and 'a masculine reputation' (Willis, 1975: pp.7-8). But above all it provides them with power over women - the 'masculine' over the 'feminine'.

Just as men see their work in terms of a rigid polarity to the work of women, so they pursue their leisure. One of the main areas of leisure - drinking - reflects such a pattern. Pubs and clubs are in abundance and serve similar functions, except that club membership is mainly open to men, with women only admitted on the premises as 'guests' of their men-folk and then only on specific days. Dennis et al states:

"The exclusion of women from the clubs except on rare occasions results in the women having an ambivalent attitude towards them".

Dennis et al., 1969: p.146

Keen to find out what sort of situation exists in the Empsall Road I push open the swing doors of one of the main working men's clubs and head for the bar. The place is large but cluttered; there are pool tables, a place for darts and some elderly men in a corner playing dominoes. There

are a few other men of varying ages dispersed around: one putting coins into a machine, a few sitting at the tables, while the rest 'prop up' the bar. There is a strong smell of stale beer and cigarettes which helps to make the place oppressive. For the moment I have the advantage of surprise; they all turn and stare, nobody moves having been stunned by such an effrontery. I actually make it to the bar and order a pint (I don't get it) before somebody says something:

- M¹ : "Sorry luv', no women are allowed in here".
R : "Why?"
M : "It's not allowed, besides you're not a member".
R : "If I were a member would you allow me in then"
M : "No! Women aren't allowed to be members"
R : "Sounds a boring place", says I.
For a moment he's speechless.
M : "Well they can come in at the weekend when
there's a concert on"
R : "But aren't women allowed in during the week?
What's wrong with them?"

The ensuing conversation delays my departure for a further half hour and some of the men communicate to me their reasons for keeping women out:

- M : "You're not from round here are yer?"
R : "No" I answered truthfully.
M : "Well, we don't want women in here" says one
M : "We come to get away from 'em"² says another
R : "Why?"
M : "They're always scheming, and you can't tell what
they're thinking", says the first
M : "How to fleece us, no doubt", informs the second
M : "This place is for workmen, not for women"
R : "Don't women work then?"
M : "They say they do, but not like us".

1. M: - means male respondent whilst R: means researcher.

2. At this point the men were treating me as neutered, until they remembered that I am one of 'them' (women).

The conversation continues in the same vein until I am 'shown the door' - I have by then stretched their tolerance to the limit. What the conversation did reflect was the extent of polarisation between the two groups (of men and women). The splitting off of women and men into separate worlds (like the 'them and us' - bosses and workers) with its attendant antagonisms is part and parcel of the life of this community.

The World of Women: Home and Family

In the evening following the incident at the working men's club I went to a jumble sale at one of the many church halls on the Empsall Road. Women jostled each other in search of 'bargains' and many quickly filled their plastic carrier bags and headed for home. Whilst I was there one small boy, in the company of his mother, pointed me out as the 'woman from university' whose "writing about us at school". Liz Jefferson (his mother) came over and we started chatting. I told her about the episode in the working men's club and she fell about laughing:

"That'd have stirred 'em up, the silly buggars ... they think we don't know what they go for. It's just so's they can drink and get away without doing anything. They think we were born yesterday. Mind you it's best when they're out of the way - they're neither use nor bloody ornament".

She told me she was married to a fisherman and that she had two young boys. She was also heavily pregnant with a third. I was invited to her house for a cup of tea, an invitation which I promptly accepted. I was able to go into several places and hold discussions and interviews with the help of Liz and she gladly took me to bingo sessions and introduced me to other women. With this group I had many meetings: in their homes, in the pub, bingo sessions and even in the working men's clubs. Consequently I was able to gather a certain amount of material, though not in

depth, about women's lives in general.

The basic features of family structure and family life derive their character from the framework of the social relations on the Empsall Road. Men and their workplace are seen as distinct from women, whose 'workplace' is seen as the home, where there is a strongly demarcated, 'sexual division of labour'. Wage packets come in weekly and go out weekly. There are no stocks, bonds, shares, securities, trade assets and very little property. Money is put by, by the women: weekly clubs for Christmas presents and 'little extras', along with the tins on the mantelpiece which hold the holiday money, gas, electricity or catalogue payments which are inevitably borrowed from to pay for immediate crises.¹

During the many meetings we had in individual houses I asked the women many questions. "Why did you get married?" was one of the first questions I asked:

Jenny: "Well everybody gets married don't they
... I mean it's a daft question to ask".

Liz: "I think it meant a kind of freedom to me".

Researcher: "In what way?"

Liz: "You don't have your dad breathing down
your neck all 'time .. you know".

Kath: "I remember thinking it were great ...
I mean you could decide what food to
buy and where you could go".

Vera: "You became 'somebody' when you got
married, it was like going up in the
world"

1. See Hoggart, 1957: op.cit. for an account of working-class 'weekly' living. See also Roberts, Robert, 1977: The Classic Slum, Penguin, Harmondsworth, and also his 1978: A Ragged Schooling, Fontana/Collins.

(-) "Sort of like becoming a real adult ..."

Researcher: "Are you saying it gave you prestige when you married? ... let me put it another way you felt you were looked up to?"

Debbie: "Yeah, you could say that. The thing was you could come and go as you like ... I mean right up until I was nineteen I had to be in at a certain time and God help me if I wasn't ... me dad would give me a right belting and me mum would go on about it. The thing that used to get me so mad ... our Kevin (her brother) was allowed to stay out as long as he liked ... nobody ever said a word. They always said it was different for girls ... all I know is it wasn't bloody fair ... I couldn't wait to get away".

To these women marriage represented a kind of freedom at first, away from parental authority, in particular their fathers'. I went on to ask about relationships with parents since they got married. Out of the seven women there, only one said she never saw her mother because the family had been split up when she was a child. But most of them saw their mothers regularly: .

Liz: "I see me Mam about three times a week and we always have Sunday dinner with her or she comes to us. She helps me a lot with the kids ... you know ... She's real good like, she babysits for us, has the boys the odd weekend and she looks after them ... well when I go in to have the baby ... at the hospital like ... well I know they'll be alright 'cos she'll come and stay and look after them".

Debbie: "I get on much better with my mother now that I'm married ... I mean we've got a lot more in common now ... and I see her a lot. Mind you, she only lives down the street".

Four of the women mentioned the fact that their mothers lived within the vicinity of Empsall Road.¹ Jeremy Tunstall (1962), in an earlier study,

1. This has been found to be a common feature in traditional working-class areas and that young married women see their mothers a lot. See Komarovsky, Mirra, 1962: Blue Collar Marriage, Random House, Inc.: Jackson, Brian, 1968: Working Class Community, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; and Young and Wilmott, 1957: op.cit.

discovered extremely elaborate networks of kin in this area. But this is certainly not the case for everybody - there is a very wide range of experience and fortune:

Kath: "I never see my parents, we just never got on. When I got married I didn't feel any 'pangs' ... you know sad about leaving the area (her parents live in Lancashire). I was just glad to get away".

Asked how they see their marriages now after a few years¹ most agreed that they had settled into what they called a reasonable routine and hinted at the changes from when they first married:

Liz: "I suppose the 'rosiness' soon wears a bit thin. The kids come along and you have to cope with the nitty, gritty ... like three square meals a day ..."

Debbie: "When Jim and I first married, we went everywhere together ... you know ... pictures, the pub an' that but once Samantha (her daughter) came along I suppose things changed ... well for one thing you can't afford to go out as much and you're so busy coping with the kid an' all ... well he has his life and I have mine".

Kath: "You don't think kids change your life but they do ... I hardly ever go out now ... not that I mind being in the house ... he (her husband) has his mates and goes out a lot but if I had the chance I wouldn't go with him ... you know ... I haven't got much in common with em..."

(-) "He probably wouldn't want you to anyway..."

Kath: "Yeah ... too true ..." (laughter)

Vera: "I've got two kids but I have a part-time job in Bird's Eye. Me Mum sees to the bairns 'til I get home at 4.30 ... you know when they leave school and she also gives them their dinner".

1. Of this small group of women I interviewed all had been married for more than three years and less than ten years, with the number of children they had ranging from one to three.

Liz: "I suppose really we (the women) see more of each other than we do our own husbands. Bob, that's my husband, he's on trawlers so I only get to see him once every three weeks".

Komarovsky (1962) points out that women tend to 'stick together' whilst Frankenberg (1966) agrees that women can call upon their female kinfolk when the need arises or when some emergency occurs, and states:

"Marriage may bind a daughter more closely to her mother than she had been bound while single".

Frankenberg, 1966: p.188

It would seem that women in such communities do seek each other's company (especially kinfolk if they are nearby and if they have good relations with them) for support and self-identity,¹ although this is not to deny that there are antagonisms and certain standards among the women themselves:

Vera: "I lent Jenny a quarter of tea some months ago and she still hasn't returned it. I won't lend her 'owt again".

Kath: "There's a woman across the way whose kids are filthy ... you know ... she lets them wander round in rags ... I know there's not much money going in as her ol' man's unemployed but you'd think she'd keep 'em clean ... after all soap n' water doesn't cost much".

Liz: "They're up to their eyes in debt you know. There's always parcels coming from some catalogue club or other and she never pays for 'em. They had their telly re-posessed for not keeping up with 'payments".

1. Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit., indicates that "for working-class couples parental families emerged as the major agent of socialisation in the early years of marriage where they go for advice, knowledge and information" (p.36.)

Houses are small, bedrooms few and domestic facilities inadequate which increases the tensions that already exist, such as the dread of falling into debt or the inability to keep up with the H.P. payments, which for many is the only avenue open to them to gain what could be called a 'liveable home'.

Division of Labour in the Home

Given that men are often out of the house (be it in the form of work or leisure) it is usually the woman who has the ultimate responsibility for caring for the children and the home. Upon her shoulders falls the daily running of the household, despite the fact that she herself may have a full-time job. The energy and skill imparted to both forms of work may vary from woman to woman, but her capacity to contend with the ups and downs of, what can be, an erratic income and expedient spending would send her middle-class counterpart into a state of shock. For the working-class wife and mother living on 'the Road', a great deal of time, energy and housekeeping money is used up in her attempts to maintain reasonable standards in her home in conditions frequently below par. Whilst coping with the inevitable dampness of such hastily-built and badly-maintained property, the woman may not even have the basic amenities of a bath nor inside toilet.¹ (See figures on housing conditions in earlier part of the chapter).

When asked about husbands' involvement in household tasks, for various reasons all the women replied in the negative:

1. Komarovsky, 1962: ibid., points out that there is a greater poverty among working-class housewives (p.52).

- Jenny: "He doesn't do any washing-up if that's what you mean, in fact he does very little ... well he might make a cup of tea. But there again I don't expect him to".
- Vera: "Well my husband does do the odd repairs around the house, but he wouldn't offer to wash up or cook or anything like that. He doesn't mind looking after the kids now and again so long as it's not often and for more than a few hours".
- Kath: "He doesn't offer and I don't ask... I don't suppose it's right for a man to help in the house, I mean he brings home the wage, you can't expect him to run the house as well!"
- Liz: "Being away nigh on three weeks at a time all he wants to do when he gets home is relax and go out with his mates. So the last thing he expects is a list of jobs waiting for him; mind you there are times when I really could do with the help, but as I said me Mam helps a lot. It's just now ... you know .. being seven months gone and my two lads play up now and again".
- Debbie: "Jim does help a bit but I don't expect him to ... mm ... it's when he might not be doing anything at the time..."
- (-)
- "Do any of 'em do anything ... it seems like all the time they're not doing anything".
- (Laughter)
- Vera: "If they really did anything they'd make a balls-up of it anyway ... ha ha ... hey Liz do you remember when your Bob burnt those boiled eggs? (Laughter). I've never known anybody burn eggs while they're boiling - by Christ we didn't half pull his leg when we saw him in the street later on ..."
- Liz: "Hey, it wa'n't funny ... he got real mad at you for laughing at him 'cos he knew then I'd told you ..."
- Vera: "Serves him right the silly sod. Trust men! They're worse than bloody useless".
- Jenny: "I must admit they get under your feet when you're trying to get on".

Vera: "Yeah, and they expect you to stop in the middle of what you're doing just to get them a cup of tea".

There was a general discussion of the lack of competence among men to do the 'basic' things and Vera, who was the most vociferous among them, summed it up:

"You just let them get off to 'pub out o'road".

In general, they agreed that the husbands' involvement in household tasks was negligible, though "he might 'set to' now and again if help's really needed" or "give a hand if I ask", but then neither did they expect him to participate despite the fact that one or two of the women expressed some resentment:

Jenny: "Sometimes I'm so tired I ache you know ... especially if the kids have been playing me up. I mean ... Bill comes home and just flops into a chair ... I mean ... I suppose it's taken for granted he's done a day's work and he wants his tea. I reckon he would fall through the chair if I asked him to help me".

Vera: "My ol' man ... he does buggar all ... you know ... I've done a day's work as well as him and he still expects me to do everything. Well I don't! His tea's not ready for him when he gets home ... he should give me a hand then he would get it quicker..."

When asked about husband's participation in childcare their replies were much more positive:

Kath: "He likes to take the kids out now and again ... he's good when it comes to playing with 'em".

Researcher: "Would he change a nappy?"

Kath: "You must be joking! What ... him!
(laughter)
He'd run a mile".

Liz: "When Bob comes home he likes to take the lads out ... you know".

Vera: "Oh yeah ... Dave likes the kids, but not for long ... He soon loses his rag if he has to look after them for more than an hour".

These replies fit in with the picture that previous researchers have drawn as to the low level of participation in housework and child-care by working-class husbands, especially unskilled workers and those in 'traditional communities'.¹ Even though six out of seven of the husbands played with their children and were involved with them, they took very little responsibility in the caring and 'servicing' of them.

Decision-making

When asked about the spending of the weekly income all of the women except for one (Vera) gave me similar replies:

Kath: "He just hands his wage over and takes so much for 'pocket money' for fags and drink like ..."

Jenny: "Same here".

Debbie: "He's good that way ... he does give me the money he gets and the rest is up to me ..."

It is the case in many communities that working-class husbands hand over their wages (keeping so much for themselves) to their wives and that their responsibility ends with this. Ann Oakley (1974) found this a "dominant pattern" in her research. Generally all bills, letters and the everyday business of 'getting by' is seen to be by the wife. As Oakley reports, this situation is not necessarily to the advantage of women (p.144):

Liz: "When he gets home from one of his trips he hands over the money ... I don't know if you know 'owt about fishing ... but his wages vary so much ... I mean one month it's quite high and then another it's quite low

1. Oakley in her research on housewives of both working-class and middle-class found that the overall level of masculine domesticity was lower than that found by other researchers, see Oakley, Ann, 1974: The Sociology of Housework, Martin Robertson, London; Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit. found that wives do not normally expect assistance from their husbands reflecting the traditional segregation of 'masculine' and 'feminine' tasks. See also Dennis et al, 1969, op.cit. Tunstall, 1962: op.cit. O'Neill, 1973 & 1982: op.cit. and also Newson, John & Newson, Elizabeth, 1965: Patterns of Infant Care, George Allen & Unwin, London.

and he never explains to me why it's up or down ..."

Kath: "I'm always short, you know the money just goes nowhere and he's always asking me for a 'sub' and when I can't give it to him he says 'what do you do with it all'".

Debbie: "They haven't much idea of what it costs to live and pay all' bills".

In fact six out of the seven women didn't know how much their husbands earn - correction: they had known some years previously but did not know now what the precise earnings were because of wage increases over time.

The one woman in the group who had a part-time job, Vera, seemed to have a lot more autonomy as she herself was earning, even though her husband's wages paid most of the bills (i.e. gas, electricity, rent):

Vera: "I see to the housekeeping ... you know ... food n't that. I mean I only get just over £20 a week but it means I can mek' do ... and I don't have to ask him for anymore. I used to hate asking him".

As to the decisions about how the 'surplus' was spent, i.e. holidays, car etc., they all looked at me as if I'd gone mad, so no information could be gained on this aspect.

Despite some resentment towards their husbands and the general agreement as to the incompetency of men, all concurred that they had 'good husbands' in that they brought the wage home and didn't 'slap you around'.¹

Leisure

The way that leisure is structured among the women and men of the Empsall

1. See Oakley's 1974: op.cit., research and Komarovsky, 1962, op.cit., for more extensive and thorough evidence.

Road is indicative of the extent of gender-segregation. Most of the women generally go out together, either to the bingo session or to the pub, events to which I was invited to tag along. It was clear that Vera and Liz were the 'life and soul of the party' and the undisputed leaders. They kept up a steady stream of banter either between themselves, or to outsiders, which kept the rest of the group amused and entertained for hours. The bingo session was looked forward to by all the women and for various reasons: some hoped to win some money but most went for the company.

The atmosphere at the 'Mecca Bingo' is full of excitement and talk and only calms down for a session of number calling from the rostrum. Most of the people who attend are women and many of them come in groups, although some do come along on their own or with their husbands.

Visits to the pub, however, were made on a more infrequent basis. Most of the women informed me:

Vera: "We only go to a local just round the corner .. a few of us like ..."

Liz: "I would never go on my own, but always in a group".

Debbie: "If you go on your own or with just one or two others ... everybody knows you're just going for 'fellas'".

Jenny: "You wouldn't catch me going in on me own ... you'd soon get a bad name ..."

One Friday evening at a pre-arranged meeting place, six of us met and made our way to the 'Bell Inn' on 'the Road'. The place was fumey and noisy, and we only just managed to obtain seats where we could all sit together. I noticed men coming into the bar on their own, order a pint

and nod to one or two of the others propping up the bar:

Researcher: "Men come in on their own so why don't you?"

Vera: "But that's different ... they come for 'drink not company. I mean to say would you come in here if you were a fella looking for company? I mean just look at 'em..."

Liz: "Most of 'em come in here 'cos they can't stand their own company anyway. You wouldn't exactly say that they're the best conversationalists".

Kath: "Aye an' that's true of all men ... you take my word for it. I'm lucky if I get so much as a word out of our Jack".

Debbie: "Jim n' I never talk about things as we used to do".

Vera: "I suppose it's what happens ... you know you soon run out of things to talk about when you get married. Their lives (men's) are just different that's all".

The tendency of women to express more dissatisfaction with marriage has been noted in a number of studies,¹ and the younger wives specifically are "by far the more dissatisfied sex and want interaction" (Komarovsky, 1962: p.149).

Most of the evenings are spent watching T.V. together, or else the husband may go and join his mates at the local pub. The main interests of the men outside work are likely to be in betting, drinking and sport (watching rather than participating). There are fewer breaks for the women. There might be a concert at the weekend (and even then the women sit together) at the local working men's club, where they are entertained by a couple of 'up and coming' young hopeful singers and an ageing comedian.

1. See Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit., and Oakley, 1974: op.cit.

Through observing this small group of women, I found that their leisure was generally limited due to the scarcity of time and money within the working-class family. Also, many of their leisure activities or hobbies were associated with specifically 'feminine' tasks and housekeeping. For instance Vera was consistently knitting jumpers for her children. Debbie loved sewing and was in the middle of making curtains as she couldn't afford to buy new ones; whilst Kath was making a patchwork eiderdown for her bed.

Summary

Previous studies have provided extensive information about female/male relationship - social, sexual and economic - in traditional working-class areas and about the attributes which reinforce such relationships (Tunstall, 1962; Komarovsky, 1962; Dennis et al., 1969), and which are linked to the strict sexual division of labour existing within the home. However other studies report a marked change within the working-class family itself to a situation where the division between the sexes is no longer rigidly defined and where decisions are made on a consultative basis (Young and Wilmott, 1957). Apparently greater 'egalitarianism' exists now between husband and wife, partly initiated by the move from the old inner-city areas to places where the pressure to conform to the masculine/feminine polarisation is moderated in the new-found 'home-centredness' (O'Neill, 1982). Are we to conclude that patriarchy is now an anachronism? In its relation to new housing estates, this issue will be discussed in the next chapter; here we are concerned with the question of whether patriarchal relationships continue to exist in an area such as the Empsall Road.

As Ann Oakley (1974) points out, comparable data on housework participation is difficult to find, much less so are empirical studies dealing with patriarchal relations. In Dock Side it would seem that women and men have little in common, each holding to their own distinct groups with both accepting and preferring this situation. This appears to be linked with, or to lead to, antagonism and suspicion between the sexes.

Jeremy Tunstall states that:

".... the menfolk assume that all women are out for what they can get, especially in the way of sexual experience".

Tunstall, 1962: p.138

and

"Some men quickly come to regard their wives merely as providers of sexual and cooking services, in return for a weekly wage".

Tunstall, 1962: p.163

O'Neill further discloses the rigid male/female dichotomy with its ensuing oppression towards women and overtones of their "inferiority":

"A bloke who goes home instead of to the pub at mid-day is thought 'tight-fisted' and at worse effeminate; while the non-drinker is said to be positively queer".

O'Neill, 1982: p.42

and

"To be seen with women would undermine a man's 'maleness'".

O'Neill, 1973: p.179

It is the women, too, who cope with the 'cycle of poverty'; they who try to make 'ends meet'. It is not surprising that they stick to the well-worn and tried traditions together with the warmth and identification with the other women in the same situation. There are frequent trips

to the Jumble Sales and secondhand shops which have almost replaced the pawn shop which nevertheless still exists in the neighbourhood. There are certain attempts to cope with the meagre standard of living which bring the husband and wife into outright confrontation:

Vera: "Dave and I had a real 'set to' the other day ... it was all over nowt really. But I know what lies behind it all ... It's 'cos I've got this job ... you know ... I've told you about it before haven't I? Well, he hates me working ... he does ... and I won't give it up. Not that it's a great job. I work on preparing vegetables for freezing like and the pay's not much cop, but I like it. You know the hours are just right and the pay just gives me that little bit of independence and helps to pay the bills. Dave's allus going on about it ... wanting his tea on the table. Daft buggar ... he never had it ready for 'im even when I wa'n't working".

Two more of the women Liz and Kath, have implied that 'as soon as they get straight' they'll go searching for paid work themselves, despite their husbands' negative attitude towards them doing so.¹ The reasons put forward for seeking paid work were: a greater sense of independence and the fact that they would like to get out of the house as housework "was boring" and they were "fed up" being at home all day.

Along the Empsall Road are a number of large factories dealing in food preserving and 'uniquely fitted' to women's labour.² A large proportion of married women with children (as well as single women) seek employment

-
1. This 'negative attitude' is probably due to the fact that earning a living and supporting a family is equated with 'masculinity'. See Holter, H., 1970: Sex Roles and the Social Structure, Universitet-Forlaget, Oslo.
 2. Extensive material exists to show that women who enter the labour market are treated differently from men. See Hunt, Audrey, 1968: A Survey of Women's Employment, Government Social Survey, H.M.S.O. Vol. II, London, and Mackie, Lindsay and Patullo, Polly, 1977: Women at Work, Tavistock Publications, London, where women are located in low paid, unskilled and un-unionised paid employment.

here and there has been a long tradition of women working on the Empsall Road.¹ Within easy walking distance it is seen as the first viable alternative to unpaid housework for many women. Because of high unemployment, in some of the families the husband may be completely dependent upon the wife. However, I myself did not come across a specific situation although since completion of the research Liz's husband Bob, has lost his job on the trawlers and is now unemployed.

It is only recently that community studies with the earlier exception of Dennis et al's (1969) study of Ashton, have perceived gender as a major variable.² But the theoreticians of the domestic labour debate³ leave us in no doubt that the division of labour between men and women is not just a 'logical allocation of tasks', but as Heidi Hartmann (1981) points out, it is a division that places men in a dominant, and women in a subordinate, position.

The World of Childhood and Adolescence

Children are reared in an environment where the male/female dichotomy is

1. See O'Neill, 1973: op.cit.

2. See for example Whitehead, Ann, 1976: "Sexual Antagonism in Herefordshire" in Diana Leonard Barker and Sheila Allen (Eds.) Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, Longman, London.

3. See Benston, Margaret, 1969: "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation", Monthly Review, 21 (4); Gardiner, Jean, 1976: "Political Economy of Domestic Labour in Capitalist Society" in Diana Leonard Barker and Sheila Allen (Eds.) op.cit.; Secombe, Wally, 1974: "Housework Under Capitalism", New Left Review, Jan-Feb.; Himmelweit, S., and Mohun, S., 1977: "Domestic Labour and Capital", Cambridge Journal of Economics, Vol. I, pp.15-31; Hartmann, Heidi, 1981: "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more progressive union", in L. Sargent (Ed.) The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism, Pluto Press, London.

part of their whole experience, and the "training" into the separate sex categories - so essential to the continuity of patriarchal culture - is part and parcel of their "socialisation". In this section the researcher will focus on the 'world' of children in Dock Side, relying again, to a certain extent, on secondary sources.

According to innumerable studies of urban traditional neighbourhoods (Jackson, 1968; Klein, 1965; Gans, 1962) children are raised "impulsively", with relatively little of the self-consciousness, purposive child-rearing that is found among the middle-class.¹ According to Gans:

"Parents tell their children how they want them to act without much concern about how they receive their messages".

Gans, 1962: p.59

Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter report that:

"Discipline is administered not with an eye to the development of the child but to the immediate needs of the parents and the household routine".

Dennis et al, 1969: p.235

and that parental behaviour

"... does not manifest itself in a serious and detailed consideration of the development and problems of each child and in a plan of action to bring up the child".

Dennis et al, 1969: p.235

Josephine Klein (1965) in her discussion on child-rearing practices states that among the traditional working-class:

1. For accounts of working-class childhood see the social "autobiographies" of Hoggart, 1957: op.cit., Roberts, 1978: op.cit., and Wilmott, Phyllis, 1979: Growing up in a London Village, Peter Owen, London.

"With regards to parental discipline and the control of behaviour, the formation of a child's character may be causal and unplanned by the parent".

Klein, Vol. II, 1965: p.475

and

"... verging on indulgence with regards the behaviour of their young".

Klein, Vol. II, 1965: p.465

Certainly, children in the Dock Side neighbourhood are brought up with much less supervision and have different parent-child relationships than the children of suburban middle-class parents. The researcher believes that we must be wary of the condescending attitudes displayed by some sociologists in their search for benevolent excuses for the working-class parents "mishandling" of their children. For instance Klein (1965) informs us:

"... in households where there are 'standards' - good behaviour is considered important and positive efforts will be made to train the child to behave well".

Klein, Vol. II, 1965: p.475

Klein's analysis of child-rearing practices is laden with evaluative overtones, i.e. 'good' behaviour, 'positive' efforts and behave 'well'. Jackson (1968) is much less critical when he views working-class parental behaviour as being:

"Misunderstood by middle-class professionals as neglectful when it is perfectly typical".

Jackson, 1968: p.157

The imputation of 'normal' attributes to parents (especially) by middle-class 'experts' does not provide an objective picture of these parents. Either it is the case that in certain areas of family life lower middle-class 'experts' and working-class parents maintain conflicting definitions

of the same situation.

We are not informed of the capricious nature of child-care ideology and of its exponents or of the need and use of such ideology to secure the social control of women. Neither is emphasis given to the poor amenities, low living standards and limited resources with which many parents struggle by virtue of their class 'and not, as we are led to believe, because of any 'innate deficiencies' . The acute financial circumstances of some of these parents was relayed to me by the head of the school. Out of the 223 pupils in the school 57 come from one-parent families, with 53 of them living with their mothers. Some of these mothers were working but most were on supplementary benefit. Only 20 of the children stayed for free dinners as a substantial few were able to go to 'Grans' or other relatives in the vicinity for their lunches. Many fathers in the (heterosexual) two-parent families were unemployed - 33 in all - and consequently were 'on the dole'.

With such variation in family circumstances were variations in methods of bringing-up children. Some of the Dock Side mothers' methods are certainly comparable to the Newsons' (1965) picture of working-class behaviour. For instance, they tended to smack their children more and demanded that they remain clean and tidy despite the small child's long hours of play. Some of the mothers informed me that they did not feel it important to put their child/ren to bed at a specific time, but only when they were tired. Vera and Liz even informed me:

"They keep you company when your husband's out with his mates or away on a trip".

It is understandable that mothers hardpressed for time, energy and money

do not tend to behave self-consciously towards their children and that there will be few situations in which they try to see things from their perspective.

Different expectations exist for girls and boys. For the most part children are brought up in households where, as we have seen, the polarisation of what is 'masculine' and what is 'feminine' underlies all aspects of existence. Patterns of gender demarcation become more polarised as children get older. Groups of younger children are put in charge of the older girls (sisters) in their substitute-mum capacity, with the boys eventually breaking away from these groups and becoming part of the younger street 'gangs'. This escape of boys from child-minding obligations and the reinforcement of this 'duty' for girls is one of the basic ways in which the sexual division of labour is perpetuated for the next generation. One consequence of this is that boys dominate the physical space of the street and continue a certain kind of tradition (Gans, 1962; Greer, 1971). Meanwhile girls are made to stay home or be within calling distance in the street. Helping the women in the house is deemed as a 'sissy' occupation and boys are encouraged to go off with their friends to play football and are given the freedom to roam, and in that sense are treated just like their fathers (Gans, 1962; Frankenberg, 1966; Dennis et al., 1969).

When girls reach the age of seven or eight, they start assisting the mother and become 'miniature mothers'. It is through this that girls learn to subvert male authority in the form of placating the menfolk in order to get what they want (which like the male shop floor culture is

unpolitical):¹

Vera: "You let them think they rule the roost, but they don't".

Liz: "I mean ... some men think they own you but they don't. The trick is to let them think they do whilst getting what you can out of them".

Getting their own way without challenging the men's illusion of supremacy is highly regarded. This can be equated, in some form, with the working men's shop-floor culture.

Home chores done, the young girls gather together at some accepted place in the street - under a lamp or by a wall or corner. Certain unwritten rules exist. The choice and order of the games are usually decided upon by the eldest girl present, infants being excluded, while all the boys about the age of seven or eight and above, and all the girls who have left school or have become involved in the 'feminine' youth culture exclude themselves. You can see them playing rounders on the avenue or street, playing 'block' (hide and seek) and 'tig off the ground' seeking "safety" on neighbouring doorsteps in order not to get caught. They band together singing games and chanting rhymes which will eventually give way to the inevitable pop songs and their involvement in 'teeny bopper' culture (pre-teens) which has been brought about in the '70's with 'Osmondmania' and the Bay City Rollers. But still independent of the boys they will hang around together.

During the week-ends and holidays I came across many small groups of eight and nine year old girls holding their own kind of 'jumble sales' on grass

1. Gans, Herbert J. 1962: op.cit. discusses this aspect of women learning "how to get round the men" (p.48). Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit., also discusses the "successful manipulation of husbands" (p.227).

verges and street corners. A book of Norse tales, next to a handbag which has seen better days lie on the pavement or grass with 2p. marked on them, along with the rest of the bric-a-brac which they have 'borrowed' from their parents or scrounged from neighbours. Amongst these small groups of serious-faced girls the researcher has often noticed a girl bigger than most of them situated well in the forefront. She is usually a 'big' sister or friend, but the importance of her presence can be seen when a boy, or group of boys, emitting scorn and ridicule, will attempt to 'take off' with the few coins they have 'earned' or a precious item which is for sale. The big sister or friend soon discourages the boys and at the same time protects the smaller members of the group. If she is 'walking the dog' at the same time this is even more beneficial to the group.

The boys have their own games. Chopper bikes and skate-boards have replaced the marbles, yo-yo and conkers. Their need to be seen to be apart and distinct from the girls appears at times to be obsessive. Their form of violence, sometime vicious and purposeless (as when the researcher witnessed some boys ridiculing two girls who were out with their dolls and pram, and then upturning the pram and kicking the dolls to the other end of the street as in a game of football) seems to have its roots in a determined wish to establish 'superiority' over the girls. It seems that the one easy way to obtain status among the boys is to be seen disrupting the girls' games, and ridiculing and hitting them.¹

1. The researcher is mainly talking about boys of a specific age, i.e. approximately 7/8 to 11/12 year olds, who are excluded from other areas of 'masculine' culture.

The mutual exclusiveness of the sexes is irrefutable and is totally opposed to any flexibility or 'blurring' of roles. The concentration of children together, in particular of boys, increases the vulnerability of boys to group pressure. As O'Neill states:

"Social deviance of any form in a pervasive working class community is likely to meet firm resistance and be finally suppressed".

O'Neill, 1973: p.87

As both sexes 'come of age' they will both attend the same form of leisure centre but still be segregated. Females and males go to discos looking for new faces, new 'talent', to break from the restricted social network of street and neighbourhood.

The young people slip into the mainstream of the locally-dominant youth sub-culture which has emerged since the 1950's. But sex segregation still exists without question. Girls define their leisure interests, according to Angela McRobbie (1978), in terms of consumer goods clothes, make-up, magazines and cigarettes. She also states that they have a "marked lack of interest in organised leisure activities" and have a "preference for dancing" (McRobbie, 1978: p.7). The young males, however, do not care for dancing and many (depending on their sub-culture) will prefer the rock music and live bands, which is more suitable for listening (Robins & Cohen, 1978). The girls' apparent lack of enthusiasm for the latter may partly be explained in the fact that such attributes of male youth culture they may find threatening - particularly the Rockers (Greabos, headbangers) - with their 'heavy metal' music identified in the form of a 'macho' pose and an aggressive male sexuality, which is also exemplified by the 'Skinheads' who are identified with 'working classness' and 'manliness' whilst exuding sexist and racist

overtones (Pearson & Mungham, 1976).¹

Go to any disco and the scene is invariably the same - groups of girls dancing together on the dance floor whilst the young males lean against the walls (or prop up the bar if there happens to be one). They only form 'couples' towards the end of the disco/dance when a male offers to take a female 'home'. This situation is invariably to the advantage of boys as the girls are subject to male sexual labelling (McRobbie & Garber, 1976). The latter have to cope with the pattern of avoiding the 'slag' and 'drag' categories. Robins and Cohen (1978) have shown how the boys classify girls into two distinct divisions: the 'slag' who would go with anyone and everyone, and the 'drag' who did not but whom the lads might one day think about going steady with.² The girls are caught between the two: they regard themselves as too young to start going steady and would prefer some freedom, but yet they don't want to attract the 'slag' label either.³

Most of the young males and females will enter unskilled jobs upon leaving school or face indefinite unemployment, but again there is an essential difference. Work, according to Geoff Mungham (1976), for working class girls is seen as a kind of limbo state (a time-filler) with their main orientations being towards marriage. There is not much of a 'place'

-
1. For accounts of youth cultures see: Clarke, John, 1973: "The Skinheads and the study of youth culture", CCCS Occasional Papers, 23, Birmingham University; Pearson, Geoff, and Mungham, Geoff (Eds.), 1976: Working-Class Youth Culture, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Hall, Stuart, & Jefferson, Tony, (Eds.) 1976: Resistance through Rituals, Hutchinson in association with CCCS, University of Birmingham.
 2. Paul Willis (1977) noted the same double standard and hypocrisy among his 'lads' in Learning to Labour, Saxon House, Farnborough.
 3. McRobbie, Angela, and Garber, Jenny, 1976: "Girls and Subcultures" in Hall & Jefferson (Eds.) op.cit. discuss how girls are judged and labelled sexually.

for a single working-class woman in society. Diana Leonard Barker states:

"Most women cannot earn enough to keep themselves at the same standard of living as they can enjoy as the wife of a man from the same class background as themselves, since women earn roughly half as much as men in the working-class ..."

Leonard Barker, 1978: p.241

With dead-end jobs or unemployment, most of the girls will see marriage or motherhood as a 'release' and escape from the monotony of low-paid drudgery and become wives and mothers.

Aspirations

Previous studies have indicated that there are differences between the social classes in terms of their expectations for the education and ensuing occupations of their children.¹ Moreover, expectations are likely to be lower for daughters than for sons. There is some evidence, however, to suggest that within the working-class, mothers want their children to have more education than do their fathers.²

I asked the small group of women what were their aspirations for their children and whether they differed according to the gender of the children:

Vera: "Well I'd like 'em to have a better chance than I had that's for sure".

Researcher: "What about your daughter?".

Vera: "Oh yeah, I'd like her to do well and not end up in Bird's Eye like me. But I suppose most people regard Boys' schooling ... their education ... much more important given that they'll have families to keep".

1. See Pahl, J.M. and Pahl, R.E., 1971: Managers and their Wives, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit. Gans, 1962: op.cit.

2. Gans, 1962: ibid.

- Liz: "I know for one thing I don't want none of my lads to go on trawlers ... like their Dad. I mean one of 'em's real bright you know and both of 'em deserve better".
- Debbie: "It's all a bit too far away to think about that sort of thing. But it'd be good if the lad got himself an apprenticeship like".
- Vera: "I suppose by the time our lasses grow up there'll be a lot more opportunities for 'em what with this Sex Discrimination Act and Women's Lib. Are you one of 'em?"
- Kath: "Course she is ... look at her clothes ..."
- Researcher: "Hang on, what do you mean 'look at her clothes'?"
- Vera: "Well it's your jeans and that ... you know all this university lark. You've got time for it ... time to sit and think it out and work at the answers. When you've got a couple of kids who want feeding and you're trying to make ends meet and keep going ... it doesn't leave you much time for owt else. Mind you lass, not that I'm blaming you ... you give 'em (men) what for ... keep 'em on their toes. By God I'd love to be in't front line with you ... (laughter) I'd give 'em a run for their money".
- Researcher: "What makes you think that you're not in the front line?"

Despite the meagre fieldwork on parental aspirations, the limited data collected provides a basis for exploratory discussion into what one means by the aspirations and motivations of parents. 'Successful' parents in our society are seen as those who are 'interested' in helping their child to 'succeed' at school. However, such an analysis denies, not only the differential experience of parents, but that the measurement of 'success' may also differ between the school and the parents.¹ Though some of the

1. See Sharp & Green, 1975: op.cit. for a more thorough analysis of this aspect.

parents wanted their children (especially their sons) to be 'successful' they did not see the child's schooling as closely related to the child's subsequent success:

Liz: "Our Alan's just like his dad ...
he'll leave school straight away
... well ... as soon as he can like
and be off making money. Mind you
the youngest one's real bright ...
he'll get on".

This last remark is borne out by the fact that Liz's youngest son is looked upon favourably by his teacher and is in fact in the 'Top Sets' for reading and maths.

Among the women there seemed to be a general ambivalence with regard to their children's schooling. They recognised the examination system as a way to some sort of 'success' but also realised its limitations and irrelevances as a result of their own experiences, in particular with respect to their daughters:

Vera: "When I was a lass I passed the scholarship
... y'know the 11+ ... I bet you can't
believe that? I never forgave my Dad for not
letting me go ... he said we couldn't afford it.
Mind you it wouldn't have made that much
difference ... what is there for a lass I mean..."

Kath: "As far as I see it ... it's a waste of time for
a girl to work n' get her exams. What's gonna
be in it for her? I mean yer can't get decent
jobs round here can yer?"

However, though some of the women did reflect such an ambivalence towards schooling as a whole, they did assert that they would like all their children to do well in acquiring particular skills such as reading, arithmetic, writing and 'how to behave well':

"I hope he's doing well in his reading".

"I'd like her to read and write well... and
her tables ... you know they neglect these
nowadays".

"I'm glad kids don't have to do the ll+
anymore it gives 'em more of a chance
doesn't it?"

The previous few pages have shown that (some) parents' aspirations are not greater than those of their own parents. But it would also seem that the teachers' beliefs about Dock Side parents (see Chapters V and VI) are not necessarily correct.

Summary

The principal aim of this chapter (and the next) is to show the degree of sex segregation within the catchment area of each of the schools studied. Though, in some places, the fieldwork material is sparse and weight has been given to secondary sources, it can be stated with a fair degree of confidence that segregated 'roles' - which is an aspect of patriarchy - in Dock Side still exist in most (if not all) aspects of life: in the home, at work, during leisure and through childhood. This gives women and men little in common. The economic dependence of women helps to perpetuate the unequal power relations between the sexes which are also upheld by the normative structure of the locality. Men hold women in contempt (Komarovsky, 1962) and this tends to be reciprocated (at least in this neighbourhood) as illustrated by the remarks of a number of women about the incompetence of men.

What is of particular interest to the researcher is how the experience of the local environment, suffused with 'masculinity' and 'femininity' in both general and symbolic ways, permeates the experience of schooling and hence consciously and unconsciously influences the child's educational career. How effectively does school life blur the distinctions between

male and female or do the distinctions take on other symbolic meanings and become the basis for institutionally-organised groupings? In what ways does the school reinforce gender social boundaries? These questions will be taken up in later chapters.

CHAPTER IV

Suburban Village, Council Estate and Farming Community

Introduction

Having surveyed the relations between women and men in a decaying inner city, the researcher will compare them with those of a middle-class 'commuter' village.

Applegate

Imagine walking along neat rows of detached houses and bungalows with 'manicured' lawns and 'fly-over' door garages; past farms and cottages, with roses at the door. Applegate is what is known as a 'highly desirable' residential area:

"Three bedroomed bungalow for sale, situated in a highly desirable residential area three miles outside B....., with bathroom, utility room, lounge and an exceptionally well-fitted kitchen. Has large, manageable gardens, to the front, side and rear, a garage for two cars, with attractive views over the North Wolds countryside".

An advertisement in Houses for
Sale column in the Local Paper, 1977.

Applegate has to 'offer' everything the Empsall Road has not: light, space, green fields and high aspirations.

It is a village of mostly settled, prosperous, home-owning, technical and managerial staff. The village, though physically rural, would be described by Pahl (1965) as "mentally urban" and is within easy commuting distance of the small minster town and of the city. The central focus of

the economy is no longer agricultural, although there are a few agricultural workers but these mostly live in Watton and Newby Grange¹ on what used to be, and is still referred to as "Lord Carlton's Estate" - situated one and a half miles from Applegate and consisting of scattered houses and cottages² with a pub, church and village hall, and little or none of the 'new development' that has made Applegate what it is today.

What is also notable about the catchment area of Applegate is its relative diversity in class composition, which is the result of the widespread tendency for the professional/managerial group to move out of the town to neighbouring villages. In the '60's and '70's rapid housing development and relative prosperity made it possible, not only for the professional elite but also white collar workers of the lower middle-class to live in such 'picturesque' villages and rural environment. What has happened in Applegate, and other 'commuter' villages, is that a different 'class' of people, who make their living elsewhere, have settled alongside the older inhabitants and made the place 'their own'. Pahl (1965) describes the inhabitants of such a 'commuter' village as "urban, mobile and supposedly outward looking" and "living in a wider regional sphere of action" (p.16). It is a place of coffee mornings, social dinners and the Women's Institute with people enjoying the 'idyllic' euphoria of village life without the inconvenience of the isolation (thanks to their

-
1. The researcher includes Watton and Newby Grange in her discussion as they are part of the catchment area of Applegate school.
 2. Some were tied cottages but now no longer exist as such, as they are against the law.

ownership of a car) which is experienced by the people of Watton and Newby Grange:

"Part of the basis of the local village community was the sharing of the limited world of the families within the village and sharing of the deprivations due to isolation of country life".

Pahl, 1965: p.18

For the most part, the people of Watton and Newby Grange keep to their own villages¹ socially, e.g. drinking in their own pub. They are, for the most part, manual workers with many of the women seeking seasonal employment on the market gardens which are within close proximity of the village. The people of these two small villages are connected to the land and the area by way of previous settlement of past generations of families.

DIFFERENCES IN OCCUPATIONAL AND HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE

Census District	Housing %		Prof/ Man	Occupation %		
	Owner Occupied	Rent Unfurnished		Other Non- Manual	Skilled	Semi/ Unskilled
Applegate	80.4	11.8	34	25	9	9
Watton	29.3	47.5	12.5	18.7	6.2	43.7
Newby Grange	3.4	94.3	0	12.5	25.0	56.2
Empsall Road	30.2	62.3	3.2	14.8	19.2	47.8

(1971: Census Small Area Statistics)

1. Nalson (1968) warns of errors of simplification - categorising of people by one simple occupational description (p.18) and in some rural communities there is a strong dependence on urban areas for economic opportunities, social interaction and cultural values. See Nalson, J.S. 1968: Mobility of Farm Families, Manchester University Press.

Statistically, with regards to housing and occupation, Watton and Newby Grange have much more in common with the Empsall Road than with Applegate, although the 'northern street culture' would differ socially and aesthetically from the small rural hinterland.

For the most part the researcher will confine her discussion to Applegate, but will also deal with the contradictions that exist when children of two sub-cultures attend the same school.

In general, the majority of people in Applegate¹ live some distance from their place of work and this is one of the ways in which they differ from those living on the Empsall Road. The managing directors, doctors, solicitors, and various managers rub shoulders with the clerks, school-teachers, lower civil servants and artisans (fitters, mechanical engineers) who are buying their 'suburban semis' on mortgage. They all have a great deal in common - they 'aspire to do well'. Though on different rungs, they see themselves as all on the 'same ladder'.

HOUSING CONDITIONS

Owner Occupied	80.4%	Households sharing or lacking a bath	3.0%
Rented from Council	7.8%		
Rented unfurnished	11.8%	Households with no inside w.c.	3.0%
Rented furnished	.3%		

(Figures from 1971 Census - Small Area Statistics)

1. This refers mainly to men as the researcher will discuss later in this chapter.

A certain style of house in a certain sort of district, with the likelihood of finding other people of a "similar sort" are assumed to be essential ingredients in this 'valued' style of life (Pahl & Pahl, 1971). But not all residents in the village seek a 'middle-class style' of life despite their respectable jobs. Two of the old farmhouses in the precincts of the village are rented (furnished and unfurnished respectively), one by a college lecturer (female) living with an industrial chemist, and the other by a couple who are both civil servants and they, to all intents and purposes have no intention of 'owning their own home'. Moreover, some couples are quite happy to stay in Applegate rather than accept promotion and move on:

"We're quite happy to settle here and put down roots...."

Young married woman,
civil servant currently
bringing up two children.

"Alice and I have decided we'd like to stay put
and if promotion comes along we'll just say
'thanks very much, but no thanks'".

A married man, senior civil
servant with three children

Unlike the Dock Side community kinship ties are not so observedly an important aspect in the organisation of daily life.¹ This is due to

1. According to studies of working-class communities e.g. Young, Michael and Wilmott, Peter, 1957: Family and Kinship in East London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, and Komarovsky, Mirra, 1962: Blue Collar Marriage, Random Inc., New York, close ties with kin are important especially for the women. But according to Bell, Colin, 1968: Middle Class Families, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, kinship ties for the middle class are still important even though they may not see relations as often as their working-class counterparts. Other forms of communication are used besides visiting i.e. telephoning, and help is offered in the form of assistance with mortgages.

the fact that professional and managerial employees are more likely to move to where a job is "suitable" and prospects are good. This is in contrast to the working-class in general who consider jobs in only one locality¹ where:

"Moves are more from compulsion rather than choice".

Jackson, 1968: p.41

Unlike the people of the Empsall Road who 'choose' or are forced to, through social and economic circumstances, the middle-class workers do not want to live particularly near their place of work² (Pahl & Pahl, 1971).

In contrast to the 'shop-floor' culture of working class (male) occupations, the middle-class pattern of work reflects concepts of 'career', 'staff', 'job satisfaction', 'self-improvement' and 'job-status', and hence a relative weakness of the informal, group-based structure which is an ingredient of the former.³

Life In and Around Applegate

To understand the present sociological characteristics of this type of village it is necessary to realise how it has developed. It arose from

-
1. Studies have shown that compared with the working-class as a whole many people in middle-class occupations are highly mobile, Bell, 1968: ibid. and in particular the professional/managerial group, Pahl, J.M. and Pahl, R.E., 1971: Managers and their Wives, Penguin, Harmondsworth. For a further discussion of mobility and movement to different areas in pursuit of promotion see: Musgrove, F., 1963: The Migratory Elite, Heinemann, London.
 2. Margaret Stacey (1960) has shown that many of Banbury's really 'well off' choose to live in the villages rather than in the town itself, see her study: Tradition and Change: A Study of Banbury, Oxford University Press.
 3. See Willis, Paul, 1975: "Human Experience and Material Production: The Culture of the Shop Floor", Working Series in Cultural Studies, No. 33, Spring, CCCS, University of Birmingham, for a discussion of the contrasts between 'shop floor' culture and middle-class occupations.

from an old village centre with its own church and school, around which the other social features such as the small council estate and semi- and detached bungalows and houses have accumulated.

The village itself had only three small shops, where prices were high and stock limited, thus many of the couples spent a good day shopping in Heathton or as far away as the city. But the small post office did a thriving trade whilst the general grocer's and hardware shop did a more modest one. There was little public transport to the village with only one bus a week for residents to make shopping trips or visits to the nearby market town, so most would have to rely on private transport.

The surrounding countryside was quite picturesque and the village was keen on maintaining its 'rural flavour'. The researcher was informed by an active member of the Ratepayers' Association:

"We keep an eye on what's going on in the area. Proper amenities, road workings proposed, new housing developments ... you know. We like to think we're safeguarding the village ... keeping it attractive".

Because there were few places to 'socialise' within Applegate, and access for the women was more limited, I did not spend as much time gaining fieldwork material as I did on the Empsall Road. There were no bingo sessions or working men's clubs. Neither were there offers of cups of tea or a quick half in the 'local' with a group of women. The occasional jumble sale existed more as a 'charitable' affair rather than as a means of 'making ends meet' although some of the women took great pains to be 'first in the queue', taking up their position a good half hour before it opened.

I spent continuous lunch times¹ and evenings in the 'Brace of Pheasant' - the 'local' in Applegate. At first my behaviour was viewed as rather odd: I came in, ordered half a lager, sat down at a table in the corner and 'scribbled away' into a notebook. Young farmers, salesmen, professional men came and went. As the owner and clientele got used to me and words were exchanged they began to talk much more about the village and its people:

"It's not like it used to be" said one elderly man.

"Why?" said I,

"Well things are different, it's gone all posh like".

"It's these newcomers, you know, from the city, Their ideas are different".

Within the pub itself there was definitely a 'Them' and 'Us' division. The landlord had recently 'done up' the lounge "all posh like" - which possibly reflects the division in the village itself.

Certainly the 'newcomers' had made their presence felt for the village had become dominated by the middle-class 'city folk' along with their values. One young couple with children at the primary school encapsulated the aura of Applegate by informing me:

"It's a nice place to bring children up in".

Gender Relations in the Community

It would seem on first sight that this is not a "male culture", certainly not like the Empsall Road. Whereas the working men's club dominated part of the social life in the traditional urban neighbourhood, along with the local darts and football teams, in this area there tended to be

1. I eventually dropped the lunch-time visits as for the most part it remained empty so I felt it a waste of my time.

more formal social organisation of a wider variety.

The 'character' and 'privacy' of the middle class home together with living in a 'nice' area goes hand in hand with the assumed "co-operation" and "understanding" between husband and wife (Pahl & Pahl, 1971) which is altogether absent among the Dock Side couples; both appear to have a number of common external interests and participate regularly in activities and organisations.¹ In addition, separate organisations existed for the women.

The wives of the white-collar workers tended to be part of the Women's Institute or the National Housewives' Register - the latter seeing themselves as more progressive (and younger) than the former. These two organisations ran the Jumble Sales, the bring-and-buy sales, the Flower Show and the Summer Bazaar (or fete) and there was healthy rivalry between the two as to putting on a 'good show'. It was only on rare (and then acceptable) occasions that men were involved in the structure - such as running the local Boy Scouts or Cub Groups. The participation of the women in such organisation and activities reflects their position and status as wives of the professional/managerial/clerical workers. Although the village did not appear to express the extreme polarisation, so apparent along the Empsall Road, between male and female 'culture', one gradually became aware that a significant differentiation did exist.

My 'status' as a university person made it possible for me to go to meetings

1. See Bott's concept of the 'jointness' of role relationship, Bott, Elizabeth, 1971 (Revised edition) Family and Social Network, Tavistock Publications, London.

of the National Housewives' Register and the Residents' (Ratepayers') Association. The contrast between the two was remarkable. The former held their activities mainly in the village hall in the form of fortnightly meetings along with any events that they organised. Their activities tended to reinforce the image of women as being 'feminine' although they broke from the traditional cake-decorating demonstrations, 'leaving that to the W.I.' as 'their sort of thing'. Talks given by the Samaritans¹ and a woman police officer, which I attended, emphasised the specific "nature and caring capacities" of women. During the break for tea and coffee I managed to have discussions with some of the women about their own personal lives (which I will discuss later), and the relationship with their husbands.² Most of them were married to teachers and managerial/clerical workers and hope eventually to get some form of job but recognised that the opportunities within and around Applegate were few and far between.

The Residents' Association was a different matter. Here, the meetings were well attended, the majority being men.³ In fact men dominated the whole structure i.e. the Chairperson, Treasurer and Secretary were all men. Important decisions about the Parish were usually made here and

-
1. An organisation run by Chad Vara which helps people on the brink of suicide - by 'giving them hope and telling them that life is worth living'.
 2. It was obvious that I was not able to collect a great deal of material with such limited access hence it is even more sparse than Dock Side, but still worth discussing.
 3. The National Housewives' Register was held on every other Tuesday afternoon and evenings when women were able to take their small children. The Residents' Association held their meetings every third Wednesday in the evening and for a lot of women it was difficult to attend as they had no creche facilities to call upon, unlike the Housewives' Register. So for men it was easier.

referred to the Parish Council.¹ The new Minster By-Pass was their priority at that time and due to their articulateness and knowledge of bureaucracy their presence was felt even as far away as the Town Council itself. There was one striking incident at one of these meetings which particularly raised the issue of power between women and men. The group was deciding whether to appeal for a more regular bus-service. One woman delivered a concise and adequate report of "the needs of young mothers with children" who are virtually "held captive in the village" simply because of the lack of a cheap and regular bus-service. This woman, however, was not popular with the men due to her 'outspokenness' over certain previous issues.² When it actually came to a vote, because the majority were men (and mobile - most of them having cars) the appeal was put aside "until a later date", despite the fact that the women there were in favour of it.³

It was also noticeable that very few of the local women drank in the pub on their own, and the wives of middle-class men do not drink by themselves in the pub (I will be discussing this later in the chapter).

-
1. Among the many things they had pressured for were: better street lighting, a new playground, and a public footpath to the school to avoid dangerous road crossings and junctions.
 2. In fact this particular person had revealed to the Association that a certain 'dirt-track' (which one of the members had applied to council to have concreted) had actually led to the applicant's own drive and nowhere else hence the application was denied.
 3. Ann Whitehead showed in her study of a rural village, that mobility for a wife was seen as a great threat as it increases independence. See Whitehead, Ann, 1976: "Sexual Antagonisms in Herefordshire" in Diana Leonard Barker and Sheila Allen (Eds.), Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage. Longman, New York.

The World of Women: Home and Family

Because of the difficulty I had in gaining access to women within the village and because I was able to attend only four meetings of the National Housewives' Register my material here is brief. From the few hours of discussions I had with the women I am able to give only an exploratory analysis of the kind of life that young women with middle-class husbands have in Applegate.

For most of the fifteen women I met, running a home and caring for husband and children is a full-time occupation. All of them had children (three had one child, ten had two children, two had three children) who ranged from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 years of age. All of the women have been living in Applegate for more than two years, some even longer, whilst two are 'local girls' (they come from the surrounding area). But all have one thing in common - occupational promotion, a newer and better job (their husband's of course) or a larger and/or new house were the reasons for coming to the area. Four of the women are teachers (though not now teaching), five are clerical workers, two librarians, one nurse, one hairdresser, and the other two, shop assistants - all hope to return to work sometime in the future, though three of them are seeking work and as yet have not been successful. Three are married to teachers, two to junior managers, one to a physiotherapist, four to civil servants and the rest to technicians of various sorts.

Men and their workplaces are distinct and distant from women and the home, but the majority of these women have more knowledge than women in Dock Side, about their husband's work - its nature, extent and expertise, as well as its remuneration (all of them insisted they knew how much their

husbands earned). The teachers, the clerical assistants (all lower civil servants) and the nurse in particular, knew a great deal about their husband's work as most of them had met each other 'on the job' as it were or at college.

The threat of 'real' poverty was far from the minds of these women as they had little real experience of it in their own lives, although some had to manage a 'tight budget' according to the extent of the H.P. payments they made. All agreed that they had the 'now taken-for-granted' domestic goods that go with the fairly new 'semi' or 'detached' house in a desirable area.

Except for two of the women, their husband's pay was in the form of a monthly salary paid through their bank. A reasonably secure income, which was as consistent as it was adequate. The teachers and the civil servants had travelling expenses paid to them and most of them were paying into a substantial pension (superannuation index-linked) scheme which would ensure security in retirement. All expected to have at least a few days away for their annual holidays if not the obligatory 10 or 14 days abroad.

In answer to my question "Why did you get married?" there was an air of amused embarrassment:

Lynn: "I suppose it sounds old-fashioned to talk about love. But really I had just finished university and he'd got a teaching job in Leicester so we decided to get married and I followed him and managed to get a teaching post there ..."

Frankie: "Ian and I were living together for sometime before we got married ... I mean I was 26 so I thought I might as well get married as I wanted children. Besides which he's got promotion to junior manager of a printing firm up here so it made sense to marry and settle up here".

Jayne: "Well I was a nurse in the same hospital where Tony worked and we'd been going out together, and when he got the chance to be physiotherapist in the large hospital in H..... we got married and moved up here".

None of the women mentioned marriage as an escape although one, Claire, got married to "spite my Dad" because "we never got on and I knew it would make him angry". To them marriage had been the 'sensible thing to do' as most were well into their 'careers' and were still able to carry on their jobs until the children came.

Asking about the level of satisfaction of their lives some of the women tended to be more guarded:

Jill: "I suppose things are reasonably good ... I mean I love the kids but I would like to get back to my teaching. But it's impossible at the moment. Stephen keeps going on about the 'latch-key syndrome' and that he doesn't want Sara and Tim suffering from that ... whatever it is. I mean I can't see why he's fussing so much 'cos there's no chance of my getting a job as yet. I mean I'd have to get a teaching post somewhere near in order to get back for the kids but nothing's come up yet. It's this area ... there's not much opportunity and Stephen needs the car so ..."

Steph: "I get a bit fed up sometimes ... being stuck in the house drives me mad so I try and get out for long walks. I get involved with the children and make plans with them. You see my husband's away a lot - being a junior executive and all that entails. He has to travel, he can't really refuse as it's his career. There are days and sometimes weeks when we never see him so I suppose I get a bit lonely".

Despite their 'guarded' answers the women in this group in general reflected dissatisfaction with certain aspects of their lives. They found domestic work boring and many expressed loneliness but qualified this by saying "it's this area". Certainly the area offered little opportunity to find work and as all of the women had young children it would be difficult to go further afield without alternative child-care facilities. Two of the women saw their parents regularly (at least once a week) whilst those whose parents lived within a 'reasonable distance' (i.e. the North) were able to see them once every month or two months. Five of the women only saw their parents two or three times a year, having moved away for job purposes. The lack of mobility and few social amenities increased the women's isolation:

Lillian: "I used to run a car of my own when I first married ... with two incomes coming in it was easy. But what with the children and the house we can just about afford one car, never mind two".

Gwen: "There's so little to do here and there's no bus-service, well none that you could speak of. I mean if it wasn't for these meetings, at least there's a chance to get involved in something".

When asked about 'the local' they were all in agreement: "you wouldn't catch me going in there" or "your name would be notorious if you went there, especially on your own". Indeed when it came to their Annual Christmas 'Do' for the National Housewives' Register, they preferred to go out of the village in order to have their celebration.¹

Division of Labour in the Home

In Applegate the 'choice' of being a full-time housewife is influenced by the fact that women are tied to their families due to a combination of

1. Whitehead, 1976: op.cit. noted also in her study that the women went out of the area in order to socialise or drink.

factors such as lack of kinship ties, i.e. no (or very few) grandparents to care for the young children; no state nurseries;¹ and the shortage of what could be called "suitable" work.² Two of the women had had seasonal jobs on the nearby market gardens whilst another had advertised her clerical and typing skills but had found little remunerative reward in it and had given it up. So even when gaining employment it had not radically altered their domestic lives.³

Another crucial factor which may affect the women in gaining employment or pursuing a 'career' is "residential mobility". Evaluating success as they do, in terms of a career, white collar workers are expected to be highly mobile if and when promotion appears with its increasing responsibility and prestige, particularly among the higher echelons⁴ where the career (for the man) is the be and end all.⁵

-
1. There does exist, however, a private playschool within the village where mothers bring their children for only three hours a day and for a fee, and only those children who are three or above may attend.
 2. The fact that middle-class wives are full-time housewives, according to the Pahl's, does not necessarily mean they see it or prefer it as a full-time 'occupation', see Pahl & Pahl, 1971: op.cit.
 3. Stacey, 1960, op.cit. found that when the women obtained work, in her study, it was very often in clerical or teaching - jobs in which they remain in the traditional 'female role'. Hilary Wainwright (1978) found that the distinctive character of female employment in no way threatened her traditional domestic role; see her article "Women and the Division of Labour", in P. Abrams (Ed.) Work, Urbanism and Inequality, Weidenfield & Nicolson, London.
 4. Watson (1964) makes the point that most middle-class people "enter into life-careers of an almost identical pattern, whatever the nature of their work and despite the considerable variation in salaries" (pp.144-5) see: Watson, W., 1964: "Social Mobility and Social Class in Industrial Communities" in M. Gluckman (Ed.) Closed Systems and Open Minds, Oliver and Boyd, London. He includes in this pattern the 'ladder of promotion' with its higher salaries and prestige. See also Pahl & Pahl, 1971, op.cit.
 5. Bell, 1968: op.cit. stresses the "centrality of the career in the middle-class life style" and that "the career provides the reference group and gives continuity to personal life experience" (p.14). For the blue-collar worker this does not exist; he does not see his job as part of a career combined with social and residential mobility that goes with it, see Chinoy, Ely, 1955: Automobile Workers and the American Dream, Doubleday, New York.

It is generally assumed that middle-class marriages are characterised by "role desegregation and equality".¹ But because of the nature and structure of the family and the labour market,² it cannot be denied that roles are highly segregated with the husband out of the house all day, working.³ In order to assess who has the major responsibility for running the home and for child care I asked them about 'who' did 'what' tasks:

Vinnie: "I suppose basically the house is my responsibility ... well John's out of the house all day so it stands to reason that I do most of the housework. But he will help during the weekend ... you know ... when I cook he'll wash up; that sort of thing".

Jill: "Stephen's really good that way, when he comes home he'll set to and do those things that I haven't had time to do ... like Hoover or help prepare a meal".

It did appear that the majority of the husbands were quite willing to 'help' their wives, and any 'help' received was considered a favour and not an obligation. However, some of the women expressed a dissatisfaction with those husbands who did not help at all:

-
1. For examples see: Fletcher, Ronald, 1966: The Family and Marriage, Penguin, Harmondsworth, and Young, Michael, & Willmott, Peter, 1973: The Symmetrical Family, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 2. See Barker, Diana Leonard, 1978: "The Regulation of Marriage: Repressive Benevolence", in Gary Littlejohn, Barry Smart, John Wakeford and Nira Yuval-Davis (Eds.) Power and the State, Croom Helm, London. Leonard Barker points out that women are discriminated against in middle-class occupations, whilst Barron & Norris say that women form the bulk of (what is controversially called) 'the secondary labour market', see Barron, R.D. & Norris, G.M., 1976: "Sexual divisions and the dual labour market" in Leonard Barker & Allen (Eds.) op.cit.
 3. Edgell (1980) notes in his study of middle-class couples that the husband's involvement with 'work' invariably meant little involvement with the home (p.29) see Edgell, Stephen, 1980: Middle Class Couples: A Study of Segregation, Domination and Inequality in Marriage, George Allen & Unwin, London. Also Cohen (1977) found that the career pressures on husbands caused them to be absent from the home frequently, see Cohen, G., 1977: "Absentee husbands in spiralist families", Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 39, pp.595-604.

Frankie: "I know he's got his job to do but he never does anything and neither does he offer. I've got to the stage where I actually ask him to do something but somehow or other he always manages to get out of it by saying he has an 'appointment'. That's a laugh, I bet he's in the pub with the rest of the 'young execs'. He doesn't even do the lawn or the garden - you'd at least think he'd do that".

Steph: "My husband's away a lot of the time so consequently the running of the home is my complete responsibility. I wonder sometimes why he got married - he was the one that wanted to, not me. And I know for a fact he doesn't have to accept all those trips he makes".

Like the wives of working class men, the women in this group agreed that the greater responsibility for housework fell on their shoulders and like the previous group they accepted this situation, although with some objections. However, it did seem that the majority of the men were prepared to get involved with a number of household tasks unlike the working class husbands who mainly avoided doing anything within the home.¹

Again in discussions about the husband's involvement in child care there was a similar pattern, i.e. due to the husband's involvement in paid work most of the women were responsible during the major part of the day, for the care of children. However, there are important differences between this and the group in Dock Side, in that the middle-class husbands were much more involved in child care.²

1. Oakley (1974) makes an interesting distinction between what husbands actually do and what they might be prepared to do, see Oakley, Ann, 1974: The Sociology of Housework, Martin Robertson, London. Previous research had overlooked this aspect, for example, Gavron, Hannah, 1966: The Captive Wife, Penguin, Harmondsworth. Edgell, 1980: op.cit., recognises that "egalitarian norms are easier to define than egalitarian behaviour is to locate" (p.31).

2. See Oakley, 1974: op.cit. for an assessment of previous studies of husband's participation in child-care. See also Edgell, 1980, op.cit. who notes that husbands are more involved in child care tasks rather than household tasks.

Lynn: "Even though he's away at school most of the day Alan likes to be involved with the children. He takes being a father very seriously and looks forward to the school holidays when he can be with them more often".

Researcher: "Would he change a nappy?"

Lynn: "Yes he did - the children are passed the nappy stage. And even now he comes home and he baths the children and gets them ready for bed whilst I prepare the evening meal".

This is echoed by some of the other women who also stress that their husbands demand a say in their children's upbringing. This includes 'monitoring' the children's progress. Jill's husband, Stephen, likes to keep an eye on his children:

Jill: "Stephen's worse than me sometimes ... he worries so much as if they sneeze, assumes they've got pneumonia ... He likes to see how they're getting on at school you know ... he listens to them reading and helps them with their numberwork".

Certainly this couple's involvement with the upbringing of their children is a 'parental ideal' to which the teachers in Applegate point. As many of the fathers, as of the mothers, attempt to turn up for 'open evenings', sports days and the annual school concert, an uncommon sight at Dock Side School (see Chapter V). However, the opposite situation does exist as in the case of Steph., who bitterly complains of having to be both 'father' and mother to the children:

Steph: "The children hardly ever see him ... he comes home when they're in bed. I bet they wouldn't know him. I find it difficult being both parents all the time, but I put a lot into taking them out - I know that's limited; but I'll take them for a 'long walk' and we'll

finish off with an ice-cream or some little treat like that. Last month I took them into Heathton for the day ... we were all exhausted but they really enjoyed it".

The middle class father's assumed involvement with his children can create a point of conflict when it comes to the wife seeking a job. In a previous interview extract, one husband had called upon the concept of the 'latch key' syndrome in order to obstruct or caution his wife from seeking employment;¹ but although there were a few guarded replies most of the women did hope to return to some form of paid work.²

The division of labour is both a reflection of and a strong influence on the distribution of power between the sexes. It is to this issue that we must now turn.

Decision Making

Among this group, it is the husband who brings to the family a comfortable income and a 'good social' status. However, more often than not studies show that the management of money is a 'joint' area in middle class households.³ I asked the women "who deals with the financial arrangements?" and "are decisions made together or separately?":

Margaret: "My husband's salary is paid through the bank on a monthly basis ... as the bills come in we pay them by order of priority and I draw so much out for the food".

Researcher: "Is it a joint account?"

Margaret: "Oh definitely!"

-
1. Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit. states that the wife of a middle class man, who is also a mother and goes to work is 'attacked' on the basis of the 'expert opinion' which the husband employs, i.e. the implication of "maternal deprivation" which increases the sense of guilt (p.52).
 2. Many of the women expressed disapproval of women with pre-school children going to work; they saw it as 'fit and proper' for the mother to stay home and look after them.
 3. See Bott, 1971: op.cit.

All the women agreed that the household budget was managed equally by both them and their husbands. Certain (or "natural" as the women defined them) distinctions did arise such as: the women tended to be solely responsible for food and clothes buying whilst the men decided what kind of car and what make to buy.¹

Jill: "After all, he drives it more than I do so he should know more than I do about cars ... men do, don't they?"

Vinnie: "The car's more his concern than mine, he needs it for work".

But a couple of the women had insisted on a say in the car buying. Lillian informed me it was "my car at first" and "as mine was more economical we decided to get rid of his as we couldn't afford two". Gwen had had to put her foot down as to what kind of car to buy:

Gwen: "He wanted a sports car - still thinks he's young and single - where the hell are you going to put two young kiddies and all that goes with them. I told him straight - it had to be a saloon or estate car or nothing. We got an estate!"

In general "decisions" were made together: type of furniture, where to go for holidays and where to live. But a fine distinction has to be made between decisions made and the discussions in reaching those decisions. Although the husband and wife may jointly share in the organising of the household budget, holidays and moving house, the final major decisions are often made by the husbands. The emphasis on 'task sharing' and 'role segregation and desegregation' blurs the wider issues - that of power dynamics within the family. Recent studies provide little or no evidence to support the view that marriages today involve an equalisation of power

1. Edgell, 1980, op.cit. has previously reported a similar division.

(Barker & Allen, 1976a, 1976b; Oakley, 1974; Edgell, 1980). It is not who makes the decision or whether the decisions are jointly agreed on, but the very fact of who has the ultimate choice of making that decision.

The Pahls inform us:

"Looked at in terms of relative power and in terms of the contribution which each makes to the marriage it is clear that most of our couples are husband dominated".

Pahl & Pahl, 1971: p.202

The 'contribution' that they speak of is in the form of the husbands holding:

"... relatively high-status jobs and earning good incomes, which are in most cases the family's only source of financial support".

Pahl & Pahl, 1971: p.202

Yet when looking at the women's 'contribution' to the marriage it is clear that they contribute more in the form of labour, time and energy.¹ But in terms of power (sanctioned by society) the wife of a middle class man is in the same relationship to the husband as the working class woman: they are both dependent.

Leisure

The patterns of leisure among the middle class couples differed, both materially and personally, from the women in Dock Side, but with some interesting similarities. Although trips to the cinema and theatre were few, as babysitters were always needed, many of the women stated that they did things together with their husbands:

1. Marriage is seen as more 'important for a woman', see Pahl & Pahl, 1971: op.cit., and Komarovsky, 1962, op.cit. However Diana Leonard Barker interprets marriage as an economic necessity for all women, see Leonard Barker, 1978: op.cit. (p.241).

Lynn: "On Sundays we always go for a walk ... all of us ... unless the weather's really bad. We always try to do things together and once a month we go out on our own and have a meal".

On the other extreme of the spectrum Steph. and Glynn hardly ever go out together as he is too involved with activities that she is unable to attend such as a game of golf or business lunches with young executives like himself.¹

Some of the women mentioned that their husbands were involved in organisations in which they themselves either could not participate - such as the Freemasons and the Squash Club - or did not want to - such as the local political party branch which was dominated by men.² The women themselves very rarely went out on their own except during the day, e.g. to the shops and to the N.H.R. meetings. The main exception, in the evenings, were the night school sessions held at the large comprehensive in the Minster town some miles away. To reach these they had to have access to a car. It was significant that they either relied on each other or asked their husbands for the "loan of the car". Night school, N.H.R.

1. See Pahl & Pahl, 1971: op.cit.

2. The communal affairs of the parish are run by a number of organisations which have largely segregated gender participation. This would seem to be a common feature in most types of villages see: Williams, W.M., 1963: A West Country Village: Ashworthy, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Frankenberg, Ronald, 1957: Village on the Border, Cohen & West, London; Nalson, 1968: op.cit.; Whitehead, 1976: op.cit. In contrast to this Ruth Durant (1939) points out that in her study women are the most prominent members of local associations see her study: Watling: A Social Survey, P.S. King & Son Ltd., Stacey, 1960: op.cit. was much more thorough and specific in her study. She counted 110 voluntary recreational associations in Banbury of which 71 did not have direct religious or political content. Grouping them into eight categories: sport, hobbies, cultural, social, social service, charity, mutual aid and occupational associations, she found the common factor of membership and leadership were male, middle aged and had higher than average occupational class status. Stacey also found that 39 out of 71 were run by men only and six by women only.

meetings, coffee mornings are all regarded as 'leisure' and very much looked forward to. Six of the women go to night-school: two are doing 'O' and 'A' levels whilst the others are doing basketwork, pottery and a variety of crafts, with one taking car maintenance and woodwork, much to the amusement of her friends and the disapproval of her husband.

Drinking in the 'local' is taboo - there you are recognised, which is "not fair to your husband". The researcher asked: "but surely there's a lady's darts night - don't you join in that?" I am looked at with a mixture of horror and disbelief and drop the subject of the 'local'. Jill and Lynn discussed entertainment consisting of small informal gatherings or dinner parties where one could "spend a pleasant evening among friends". I caught Vinnie and Claire giving each other an 'exasperated look' (signified by a rolling of the eyes) and afterwards I asked them what they meant by it:

Claire: "Some of them really get on my nerves ... you know ... they're so bloody pretentious. 'Pleasant evening dinners' my eye - they just try and outdo each other in the best meals, the cleanest, plushiest houses, etc. etc. ..."

Vinnie: "You can guess we don't get invited - Claire's a bit of a rebel".

Claire: "I wouldn't want to be seen doing that. A packet of fish and chips and a bottle of coke ... that's more my line".

Despite the apparent affluence of the area certain conflicts simmered just below the surface which reflected tensions among the women. This may well have been due to the isolation of many of the women and what Edgell (1980) has called the greater repression of self-interest by wives of the middle class than wives of the working class.

The white-collar workers' stereotyping of 'femininity' will be bound up with occupational status and prestige. It is still infinitely more desirable and prestigious for them to earn enough to keep their wives at home. The role of wife takes on another meaning for the middle class, other than the domestic and sexual services that they provide. A wife is expected to be an asset, a support to the husband as he strives for promotion and her domestic services will be extended to that of 'hostess' in that she will entertain in the form of dinner parties which tend to be part and parcel of the set-up for particular occupational groupings.¹

Altogether then, we can see that in spite of the greater help given by middle class husbands and their greater involvement with the children, despite joint bank accounts and discussion before decisions are reached, and even though spouses spend more of their leisure time together, the wives of the middle class are nonetheless less powerful than their husbands and are structurally both dependent upon them and subordinated to them:

"Many wives are in an ambiguous position, in that the relationship which is most salient to them is one in which they are the less powerful partner, and one in which their roles as wives are dependent on and determined by their husbands".

Pahl & Pahl, 1971: p.236

1. Pahl & Pahl, 1971: op.cit.

The World of Childhood and Adolescence

Unlike the children of Dock Side, the childhood of the middle class in Applegate is spent in relatively desirable and scenic circumstances. The culture of the streets, in which children from Dock Side grow up, is in marked contrast to the private secluded gardens (some quite small) with their herbaceous borders and roses. There is no sign of grimey factories nor is there the permanent pall of cooking fish meal, which seeps through the packed houses of the traditional urban area.

Sociologists have built up a well-known picture of parents' behaviour in areas like Applegate. Many parents, both male and female, tend to approach child-rearing differently from the working class, and raise their children according to certain principles and not in response to a succession of impulses.¹ Relative affluence and security enables them to follow a determined policy towards the upbringing of their children with all the advantages that flow from this. Higher expectations of their children are reported for middle class mothers who lay stress on the happiness, considerateness and self-control of their offspring. The interpretative dimensions of 'permissiveness' and 'restrictiveness', as well as fathers' participation, among this group of parents are well known to differ from parents in areas such as Dock Side.² With their longer

-
1. This is indicative of middle class parents in general, see Pahl & Pahl, 1971, op.cit.; Klein, Josephine, 1965: Samples from English Cultures, Vols. I & II, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth, 1965: Patterns of Infant Care, George Allen & Unwin, London.
 2. Substantial evidence exists to show that there are considerable differences between the child-rearing practices of different social classes, see Newson & Newson, 1965, ibid., and Klein, 1965: op.cit.

term perspective parents closely supervise their children, giving a special emphasis to understanding and self-discipline. Certain kinds of behaviour are more tolerated by them than by working class parents who demand that the child obey immediately and without explanation.

Children in this area certainly came closer to the definition of what the teachers believe a child 'should be'. But it was interesting to note that one or two of the teachers at Applegate school disapproved of the 'permissiveness' of some of the children.

"Some of these children won't take 'no' for an answer; they want to know the 'whys' and 'wherefores' which makes teaching that much harder".

"I blame the parents. It's alright if you've got the time to give long explanations ... but there's too much of this permissiveness going on. The children just won't obey and you have to spend so long on insisting that they do".

It can be seen that certain elements of middle class ideals are at variance with the teachers' ideals: that the child is to act appropriately, not because an adult tells them to, but because they want to. This non-conformity to authority, with emphasis given to inner control, may work against teachers' needs for silence and order in class.

Certain character traits, such as self-discipline, will be more encouraged within the middle class in order to create adults who will be 'successful' in occupational life. However a distinction is made between adult women and adult men. Certain qualities which are part of the value structure of the occupational world may not necessarily be desirable in females:

Jill: "I wouldn't want Sara to be aggressive ... you know all this Women's Lib ... I think it's bad for us. Not that I want Tim to be aggressive either, but they are different aren't they ... boys and girls".

Lynn: "It stands to reason that they are different ... I certainly wouldn't expect my daughter to behave exactly like my son. I suppose I keep an eye on her more ... you know ... manners and that ... well you do don't you?"

In a very early work Aberle & Naegele (1952) recognised the definition that middle class fathers had of the ideal-typical successful adult male, who should be:

"... responsible, show initiative, be competent, be aggressive, be capable of meeting competition. He should be emotionally stable and capable of self-restraint".

Aberle & Naegele, 1952: p.373

Such qualities are part and parcel of the occupational world in which they hope their sons achieve success. However the qualities which they itemise are not seen as necessary for the ideal-typical successful female whose main concern (presumably) is to be married. Most of the women I talked to agreed on the differences between their sons and daughters although they did not consider that they differed materially in their upbringing.

Wherever possible parents show their children the 'cultural' world as well as the 'material' world. Books are available in the home,¹ text-books as well as fiction, whilst trips are made to the theatre (to see the pantomime or the touring ballet) and to the cinema, during the school holidays, to see the latest children's (Disney) epic. Leisure activities in the form

1. See Klein, 1965: ibid.

of judo and gymnastics are made available and during the summer season some of the families (parents and children) attend swimming sessions regularly in the small town nearby. Ballet lessons, horse-riding and, for some, private music lessons are frequently provided for the younger girls. Cossetting and protection is an expression of status amongst this bourgeois group, as well as part of the dynamics of power between women and men. The consumption patterns of the male professional workers will include the life-styles of their wives and daughters.

Certain activities are sanctioned:

Jayne: "I only allow my children to watch so much television - after that I switch it off".

Margaret: "We don't just haphazardly leave the television on and let them watch anything - I encourage them to become involved in something more creative".

Just as certain activities are restricted, so who their children play with, come under scrutiny:¹

Janet: "I like to know who my children are playing with".

Jill: "Tim came home one day and his language was unbelievable. Anyway we found out he had picked it up from a child in his class, so we told him not to have anything to do with him".

Sex-segregated games are played: girls generally play together in the garden of their home. The garden soon gets too small for the children's games, furthermore some parents take a pride in it and do not want herds

1. See Newson & Newson, 1965: op.cit., for a similar pattern.

of children trampling their flower-beds, and so the cul-de-sac or playground nearby becomes a welcome change from the restriction and restraint of the 'home-ground'. Groups of boys can be seen going off on their expensive bikes ('choppers' and 'racers'), with warnings "not to go too far" or to "keep away from the busy main road". All offspring are given specific instructions to return home at a given time.

The demands made upon the girls in Dock Side, in the form of household duties and caring for younger children are not so excessive in Applegate, thus extending their childhood longer, although they are expected to keep their rooms tidy and help their mothers in a way that their brothers are not:

Jill: "We expect high standards of responsibility from Sara, more so than we do Tim. I mean I just give up with Tim ... he's just impossible when it comes to doing anything within the home".

Steph.: "I try to make both of them do something while their father's away but James seems to opt out completely - so I tend not to push it".

Such differentiation in the demands of females and males will probably extend into adolescence when daughters are kept on a tighter rein of control than the sons. For parties and discos, three things come under scrutiny: who the daughter is going with, what form of transport has been arranged and what time she will be coming home. When all three are discussed and arranged then she may go. A combination of a concern for the daughter's safety, an avoidance of the sexual labelling (which girls from the working class area also undergo) and greater aspirations for her future are (perhaps) the reasons for the greater stringency on the female offspring's actions.

Aspirations

The difference between the two neighbourhoods become more distinct when analysing the aspirations of parents for their children. In general the middle class have high aspirations for all their children's education and they are expected to do better at school (Newson & Newson, 1965; Musgrove, 1963; Pahl & Pahl, 1971) and to stay there longer.

Pahl (1963) found that of his middle class sample:

"... 82% wanted their children to stay on till 18 or over as against 15% of working class".

Pahl, 1963: p.242

To the working class, extra schooling is seen as a training of some sort whereas the middle class see it as a means of preparing their children to go to university.¹ There is also a significant differentiation in regard to sons and daughters. Pahl (1963) in his research into middle class 'commuter' villages, shows that parents tend to discriminate in favour of their sons in regard to university education when they have to pay for it, with the consequence that the education of daughters could well be made to suffer. Justification for this lies in the 'belief' that daughters are not clever enough to study for a degree.²

When I asked the women in Applegate about their hopes for their children, like the reports on previous studies of the middle class they were high:

Jill: "I should like them to do well. Tim's got a real head for figures. I should think he'll study Maths at university".

-
1. Aberle, David F., and Naegele, Kaspar D., 1952: "Middle Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes toward Children", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 22, April, pp.366-378; they remark that skilled waged work is seen as a drastic limitation and completely anomalous for fathers of male offspring in this group.
 2. In Aberle & Naegele, 1952: ibid, just over half of the fathers they interviewed accepted the possibility of a career for their daughters and only two wanted them to know how to earn a living, most preferring or expecting them to marry.

Lynn: "I'd like them to stay on at school and get as far as they can".

Vinnie: "It would be great if they became famous ... oh no ... I mean I'd like them to do well and be happy".

As for their daughters:

Janet: "Oh yes, that goes without saying. I mean it's important that women are educated now. It'll be something she can fall back on".

Jill: "I'd certainly like Sara to get to university if she's got the potential. Her father would but I must admit he's more keen to see Timothy do well".

Lynn: "I think that's only natural ... you know Dads get more involved with their sons. Alan's interested in both their welfares but when it comes to Robert ... well ... anything he does at school he wants to know, particularly if he's done well ... whether it's his written work or some sporting activity".

It can be seen that though fathers tended to be more concerned about their sons' educational career, the women in particular were concerned that their daughters should also further their education in order to obtain 'better' jobs, before and after marriage. In general the women had much the same aspirations for girls as for boys but with certain qualifications, and they accepted that fathers placed their special priority on their sons.

Traditional attitudes are hard to change. Girls' education is viewed as 'cultural' schooling as much as 'occupational', for it is important that she should be seen as an asset for her husband and he be proud of her.

Summary

Although in the middle class 'commuter' village the rigid polarisation predominant in Dock Side does not exist, nevertheless power and prestige do reside with the male and the traditional 'sexual division of labour' within marriage does exist. Care of home and children rests ultimately with the woman, and as Oakley (1974) and Edgell (1980) suggest, only a minority of husbands give the kind of 'help' that assertions of equality in modern marriage indicate.

Like the women of Dock Side, these women find domestic work boring and recognise it as having low social esteem. They are aware of their economic dependence and unlike the women in Dock Side, they express a lack of fulfilment, but 'accept' the situation that they are wives and mothers whilst their husbands are the 'breadwinners' because no other alternative exists.

Similarities between Dock Side and Applegate do exist particularly in the sphere of leisure: there is the same social unacceptability of women in public places, particularly in pubs and clubs and many of the associations were gender segregated. However there was a certain sphere of influence for females in Applegate since their associations created a circle of activity within the village which gave them a limited amount of power. As in Dock Side, the economic dependence of women is an important influence upon the power relation within marriage, but in Applegate more attempt is made to discuss matters before decisions are taken.

But the major distinction between Dock Side and Applegate is the nature of girls' upbringing and its relevance to their schooling. For the former,

childhood is short-lived as they are thrust into adult responsibilities long before the onset of adolescence; moreover the rigid polarisation between the 'masculine' and 'feminine' in their early years will probably set most girls on the same course as their mothers: gender-segregated childhood, adolescence and an unskilled, low-paying job and eventual marriage. For girls of Applegate certain features of this gender polarisation will be blurred by the material provision and aspirations made possible by the social class of their fathers, yet ultimately their lives will also be characterised by segregation and relative lack of power. Their very upbringing, though 'materially secure', may well reflect their future schooling with its protection, educational encouragement, cultural and other pursuits, themes which will be explored in further chapters.

The researcher will now turn her attention to a Corporation Housing Estate. The eventual choice of Long Meadow council estate was made for two reasons. In the first place, some writers have suggested that rehousing and rising living standards lead to increasing home-centredness, some alternations in gender power relationships and greater ambitions for children. This could, if true, be expected to have some influence upon the process of schooling. Secondly, a previous study¹ has suggested that many of these changes have been taking place in Long Meadow. As the study progressed doubts about both propositions emerged.

1. See O'Neill, 1973: Class and Social Consciousness: Variations in the Social Perspectives among Industrial Workers, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Hull, published in 1982: Fascism and the Working Class, Shakti Publications, Southall, Middx.

Long Meadow Corporation Housing Estate

The Corporation bus stops in the middle of a lane of council houses which are typical of pre- and post-war estates used to rehouse families from decaying industrial areas of the city. In contrast to Dock Side, the housing is spacious and semi-detached with few signs of the shops, pubs and social centres which pervade the Empsall Road. Cinemas, the 'flash' disco and places of entertainment are all located in the city, four or five miles away, thus there are few people on the streets and the place has a 'Sunday atmosphere'.

According to various studies, relatives - particularly parents - are left behind in the old districts¹ (here it would be the Seedon and Empsall Roads) and life takes on a 'familiar pattern' of initial loneliness - home-centred with social life oriented to small groups unlike that of the Empsall Road.² One distinctive similarity between the two areas (Dock Side and Long Meadow) is that both are peopled almost exclusively by manual workers, but there is also an important difference which is captured by Brian Jackson:

"Council house estates are one-class districts without the depth and complexity of the older working class communities".

Jackson, 1968: p.163

However the researcher questions the idea that the people who live on such estates see the houses as looking all the same or that the sense of

-
1. See Young & Willmott, 1957: op.cit., and Willmott, Peter and Young, Michael, 1960: Family and Kinship in East London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 2. See Mogey, J.M., 1956: Family and Neighbourhood, Oxford University Press, Willmott, Peter, 1963: The Evolution of a Community, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; and O'Neill, 1973: op.cit.

work-place and of class are, for them no longer so intimately tied together (Jackson, 1968; O'Neill, 1973; Robins & Cohen, 1978). Also to be questioned is the notion that the different layers of respectability which help in part to provide the 'richness and texture' in the old urban districts, are non-existent (see p.186 for a table comparing class composition).

The impressions drawn from previous inquiries lack a sense of historical development. Peter Willmott (1963) in a study of a housing estate 40 years in existence, has been able to show that despite the uniformity and lack of amenities, many of the residents have not only stayed but recreated some of the familiar local and established patterns which were an integral part of the old 'traditional' working class communities. The estate of Long Meadow was built before and after the Second World War, and the people have had time (over 30 years) to evolve social patterns.

Situated on the outskirts of the city, the estate has the effect of being 'out in the wilds' despite its close proximity to the nearby town. Yet even though the move is away from an industrial landscape, there is no sense of being 'in the country', although at the eastern boundary of the estate and beyond the open drain, there lies stretches of farmland and bleak marshland. The feeling of monotony is due largely to the expanse of housing, which was built in the same era, at the same price and roughly in the same style. Every corner one turns offers the same view¹ - semi or terraced council houses supplied with gardens and gates as opposed to

1. This is reminiscent of most large housing estates (corporation), see Willmott, 1963: op.cit.

the paving-stones and back-yards that pervade Dock Side. There is no denying that qualitatively, these houses are much better in both value and space than those on Dock Side. The temptation to move to a spacious and 'desirable' council house is obviously too great for people to ignore when considering the inadequate and (for some) sub-standard living conditions in Empsall Road which rapidly consume any 'surplus' income in the residents' attempt to achieve a comfortable existence in the old terraces.

A COMPARISON IN HOUSING AMENITIES

	Dock Side %	Long Meadow %
Households with no inside w.c.	74.9	2.4
Households sharing or lacking bath	71.3	.2
Households with exclusive use of all amenities	17.1	97.2

(Figures from 1971 census - Small Area Statistics)

There are none of the corner-shops that give Dock Side its distinctive pattern. But there are some basic amenities: a large parade of shops, four schools, and a pub are dispersed throughout the complex as if planners were playing a hide-and-seek game of "find the amenities". A church known as St. Stephen's doubles as the Community Centre which has its round of bingo sessions and 'small scale' discos. There is no cinema. Shopping is more expensive here, so it requires a bus-trip of four to five miles to obtain the general groceries in town.

Life in and around Long Meadow

By and large, council tenants do not choose where they live.¹ Through 'slum' clearance or through the shortage of housing, people are forced to live wherever there is a council house available, provided they are 'eligible'. And since council rents are often high compared with the rents for the housing from which tenants come (thus preventing the very poor from accepting tenancies) as Frankenberg² has pointed out, there is a sense in which tenants, despite their council house, "are fundamentally and patently insecure" (pp.198-199).

The estate inhabitants are nearly all manual workers, whether female or male. Semi-skilled workers and labourers make up well over a third of all residents with over 8% unemployed:

OCCUPATIONAL CLASS (OF MEN) IN CONTRAST TO
DOCK SIDE AND APPLGATE

	Dock Side%	Applegate %	Long Meadow %
Professional/Managerial ¹	3.2	34.0	2.8
Other Non-Manual ²	14.8	25.0	18.4
Skilled Manual ³	19.2	9.0	24.1
Semi-skilled/Unskilled ⁴	47.8	9.0	38.6
Persons Unemployed	12.6	5.5	8.3

-
1. Seg. 1,2,3,4,13
2. Seg. 5,6,
3. Seg. 8,9,
4. Seg. 7,10,11,15.

-
1. Hence they do not choose their 'class' of neighbour.
2. See Frankenberg, Ronald, 1966: Communities in Britain, Penguin, Harmondsworth. See also Durant, 1939: op.cit., who also discusses the financial precariousness of the tenants of a housing estate.

The figures in the previous table are from the 1971 Census - Small Area Statistics¹.

Just under half of the residents are slightly better off as skilled, transport and clerical workers and prison officers. Many of the males work at the large Oil Complex, located a few miles away, in a wide variety of manual jobs - from general labouring to skilled machine-minding - but no industry dominates the estate.

There are no major industries which provide "women's" jobs in the area, unlike the food processing factories along the Empsall Road, and women who seek employment have to travel a good number of miles into the city (or further). However, there are the 'usual' type of jobs available within the vicinity: canteen assistants, cleaners and cooks for the nearby schools and offices, and shop assistants. So, Long Meadow people, on the whole, do not 'work' on the estate except those women who are housewives but do not receive any wage. Most have to travel to work, but this is not by choice as it is for the residents of Applegate. This, added to the weekly budget (cost of fares and dinners) may place greater strain on the limited income:

1. Women's occupational class is not considered in statistics nor in many studies, particularly married women, see Acker, Joan, 1973: "Women and social stratification: a case of intellectual sexism", American Journal of Sociology, Vol.78, pp.936-945, and Delphy, Christine, 1981: "Women in stratification studies" in Helen Roberts (Ed.) Doing Feminist Research Routledge & Kegan Paul, London. Acker notes that the status of women is assumed to be equal to that of their husbands given that the family is a unit of equivalent evaluation (p.937) and goes on to point out that the women are not equal to men in many ways is irrelevant to the structure of stratification systems. Christine Delphy however, makes an important statement in that taking married women's "occupation into account resolves nothing" (p.123). The same goes for comparisons between husband and wife because as Delphy, quite rightly, states this only serves to distort "the comparison between the social class position of husband and wife" (p.123). In short the presence or absence of economic independence is obscured.

MODE OF TRANSPORT TO WORK IN CONTRAST TO
APPLEGATE AND DOCK SIDE

Type of Transport	Dock Side %	Applegate %	Long Meadow %
Persons travelling to work by car	11.5	64.7	18.4
Persons travelling to work by bus	27.2	5.8	38.4
Persons travelling to work by bike	13.5	16.6	22.1
Persons travelling to work on foot	36.1	11.7	10.8

(Figures from 1971 Census - Small Area Statistics).

Just as Dock Side reflected different strata of 'prosperity' and 'respectability' so does Long Meadow. Some of the houses were kept spick and span (outside and as well as in), their gardens were neat - with the lawns well cut and the fencing freshly painted. Others had paint peeling off the wooden door and window frames with the garden appearing like a jungle. People appeared in suits and dresses as well as the denim which is a constant reminder of the popular 'jean' culture we live in. Certain families were viewed with disdain which reflected an attitude that poverty does not have to lead to 'dirt' and criminality: 'that one should at least have standards'. The MacDonalds, who live at No. 39, Lilac Grove, have the dubious honour of being No. 1 'Problem family' in the area - a long

Delphy proceeds to expose the Parsonian functionalist argument that affirms class parity between husband and wife:

"The relations within the couple, and particularly the relations of economic dependence, are always treated secondary since they share social status - seen as more general and therefore carrying more weight in determining an individual's situation - is supposed to override internal disparities. Unfortunately, this 'parity of status' is based necessarily and exclusively on women's dependence".

line of social workers and other officials of the Welfare State regularly pay calls on them which warrant comments such as this:

"The probation officer's allus' there, it's a wonder he doe'n't tek a room and lodge there. It'd save 'im a lot'a petrol for' car".

The said family numbered eight in all, with the 'children' ranging from nineteen to three years in age. The father, known to be a 'ne'er-do-well', is out of work constantly, and when he wasn't, he was in prison:

"You can allus' tell when he gets out ... she (his wife) gets pregnant then he's back 'in-side' again. Christ, some folk never learn ... And ' kids are just as bad as ol' man ... that Darren's regularly on probation - the next time round he'll 'go down', I tell yer ..."

Meanwhile the mother of this 'troubled brood' has managed to hold down a job consistently as a cook in the school canteen, despite her constant pregnancies, providing a regular income and keeping a home together which the father seems incapable of doing.

Frankenberg's (1966) hypothesis of council house tenants being "patently insecure" is consistent with this area. Apart from the ups and downs of the working class wage, there is always unemployment around the corner. Rents are high with rumours that both rent and rates will take a sharp increase. With the lack of opportunities for women to take jobs there are few additional sources of income (no matter how low) and then there is the inevitable Social Security to negotiate with in the attempt to extract a 'reasonable' income to live on. Somehow the word 'reasonable' is not seen exactly the same way between client and State:

"They don't tek yer h.p. into account... I mean there's the telly, the suite an' all that. But they won't pay ..."

The idea of affluence is questionable in relation to Long Meadow at least

in the 70's and 80's.¹ Real deprivation is ever present. As the head of the school informed me, over 70 of the children 'qualify' for and receive free school dinners:

"... there are probably more but either their parents won't or don't know how to apply ..."

There are many without cars, a commodity which Applegate residents view as a necessity:

CAR OWNERSHIP IN CONTRAST TO
APPLEGATE

	Long Meadow %	Applegate %
Households with no car PH	72.9	12.8
Households with two or more cars PH	1.5	25.0

(Figures from 1971 Census - Small Area Statistics).

Undeniably, there is a sharp contrast between life on Long Meadow and in Dock Side. Previous studies of housing estates² have noted that this is especially so for women as the studies repeatedly concentrate on the 'loneliness' of their lives, whereas in the older areas:

"... family is linked to relatives, neighbours and friends in a web of intimate relationships".

Frankenberg, 1966: p.227

We must avoid exaggerating this difference, however, for while lives do become rearranged by rehousing it does not necessarily mean that the

1. O'Neill, 1973: op.cit.

2. Young & Willmott, 1957: op.cit.; Mogey, 1956: op.cit.; Willmott & Young, 1960: op.cit.; O'Neill, 1982: op.cit.

extended family has ceased to exist. Long Meadow can no longer be classified as a 'new housing estate' and has established a fairly stable population:

STABILITY OF RESIDENTIAL POPULATION PP.

	Long Meadow	Dock Side	Applegate
Persons migrant last year within Local Area	4.3%	10.8%	2.0%
Persons migrant last year into Local Area	.2%	1.7%	19.1%
Persons migrant last five years within Local Area	24.8%	23.7%	9.0%
Persons migrant last five years into Local Area	1.6%	5.6%	46.4%

(Figures from 1971 Census - Small Area Statistics).

Like the area around Dock Side and Empsall Road the population is fairly settled unlike the 'up and coming', promotion-seeking middle-classes of Applegate. 'Grans' are still looked to for support in the caring of children. Among the group of women I met and spoke to their replies reflected a 'settled' way of life:

Margaret: "I was born and raised round here, just over the western end. My Mum and Dad still live here, about a quarter of an hour's walk ... it's a big estate this".

Lil': "I can remember when we moved up here ... I wa'r only a kid then ... the house seemed huge, it were like coming to a different country. I like the estate and I'm glad I was able to get a house not far from where I used to live".

Trudy: "I've lived here ten years now. We allus talk about buying our own house but well, I like living round here, mind you sometimes I get fed up, but then most folks do".

By and large, of the ten women I had discussions with, seven of them had

their immediate families living within twenty miles. Four had parents (some widowed) living on the estate itself, whilst the rest have families scattered in the various districts within reach of the city. One woman had moved from Leeds whilst two others had no contact with their families at all.

Gender Relations in the Community

Long Meadow, though dissimilar in many respects to Dock Side, is similar in its class make-up and family patterns. But what of the social arrangements between women and men and the domination of spheres of influence within the locality?

What is obvious on first sight is the apparent absence of the 'local' and the working men's club, which are an integral part of the Empsall Road. However some of the women did point out the public house which represented the 'local', whilst stressing at the same time that "it's a dreadful place" and that "it has no atmosphere". One has to admit that it certainly was different from on 'the Road'. There was a huge sprawling bar and the large cavernous room was packed with formica 'cafeteria type' chairs and tables. The floor was dirty and carpetless, and worst of all the beer, that was served to me, was flat. The clientele were mostly men except for a few elderly women who sat about near the bar on their own.¹

1. Evidence suggests that fewer people go to pubs on the estates, even compared to middle class suburbs such as Woodford or Applegate, see Willmott & Young, 1960: op.cit. Evidence also suggests that this may partly be due to the reasons explained above, see Willmott, 1963: op.cit. Dennis et al., make a similar observation about older women in pubs and suggest that they are more acceptable than younger ones, perhaps because they are not seen as a threat. See Dennis, Norman, Henriques, Fernando & Slaughter, Clifford, 1969: Coal is our Life, Harper & Row, New York.

The World of Women: Home and the Family

The young women (mothers of school-age children) tended to gather outside the school gates chatting to one another about the latest crisis, be it national or local, before making their way home. One woman who had moved here from the Empsall Road told me of some of the problems with regard to social amenities:

"It's different here, although I do like it what with the house n' everything. But when you went shopping on 'Road you could be sure of meeting somebody you knew ... besides having a look-round or finding the odd bargain".

There are the odd jumble sales which are well attended by the women and are usually held at St. Stephen's - the multi-purpose church hall. In order to 'assist' the community and give it an interest in a wide range of activities, a Project Officer is employed by the council to help organise on-going events. The young male who was taken on, rapidly got things going, organising Saturday evening discos, Friday night bingo sessions and the usual activities one finds in an urban community and supposedly 'suited' to the residents.

One of the women I met outside the school gates took me along to St. Stephen's. Inside it was like any other functional village hall although on a much grander scale. Tables are set around and the place is fairly buzzing with activity. Attempts have been made to fill the place to 'bursting point' as there are so many chairs it is difficult to get by without asking people to move. Around the walls of the Centre are posters advertising such offerings as Karate classes, Judo, Fencing and Gymnastics. I turn towards Margaret, impressed with them:

"I should take no notice of them luv'. They've all been and gone ... none of them last for long".

She went on to explain:

"It's the expense you see ... Oh yeah it looks grand all these classes being set up but folk just can't afford it. I mean take karate, judo or such like. After a few weeks if the kids are keen they want one of them white suits like ... and they cost the earth and then there's the license and the cost of the classes. Do you know it cost £7.50 for a six weeks' course. Personally that's a helluv'a lot out of the housekeeping".

Her friend Lil' chipped in:

"You hear all these tales about vandalism 'round here and classes just pack up and go. It's got nowt to do with it. People haven't got the money to afford it. Same with gymnastics - where the hell are the folk round here gonna buy that sort of equipment".

The local comprehensive schools on the estate run thriving vocational and educational evening classes and courses, which because of easy access and short travelling, are well attended by women.

There were very few associations or social amenities in comparison to Dock Side and the Empsall Road, hence sex-segregation is not so observable in Long Meadow as in the latter area. Therefore it is important to examine the structure of peoples' lives within the home.

Community studies of housing estates, have generally stressed the development of a more 'participatory' relationship¹ between husband and

1. Willmott, 1963: op.cit.; Willmott & Young, 1960: op.cit.

wife, even an egalitarian one,¹ because of the lack of kinship ties and a loosening of the older, close social networks. Norman O'Neill (1973) sees this as resulting from a reduction in the pressure to conform in the sharp demarcation between male and female, thus producing a situation in which:

"... the inhabitants question the existing norms of polarisation of masculine/feminine"

O'Neill, 1973: p.97

that exist within the traditional working class areas like the Empsall Road.

There are indeed changes, but to suggest that a more 'egalitarian relationship' is the result could be an over-simplification. For example some writers have questioned conceptually and empirically the identification of the dimensions of power and of segregation within the home and family.² In order to obtain more information on this point I asked the group of women, whom I had met outside the school gates, questions about their lives and relationships with their husband, about their work experiences both inside and outside the home, their leisure, and aspirations for their children.

Meeting in three different houses on four separate occasions I was able to contact ten women, all of whom had been married - two were single-parents and had children under the ages of eleven years old. Six of the women had no paid work outside the home, though four of them were actively seeking work; two others had jobs as canteen assistants in

1. O'Neill, 1973: op.cit.

2. See for example: Edgell, 1980: op.cit. and Oakley, 1974: op.cit.

nearby schools (thus the hours suited the unpaid work they had to do in the home) whilst the other two had part-time paid jobs as cleaners.

All of them spoke about their homes and families, and agreed that the ultimate responsibility for both these spheres were theirs, as the men's responsibility for earning the 'major' wage took them out of the home for most of the day or night.

The Division of Labour within the Home

When asking for their reasons for marrying, many of the women expressed similar views to those expressed in Dock Side:

Lil': "I had a lousy job in the food factory and on days when I was packing fish I just couldn't get rid of the smell and you were always on yer feet ... never hardly a chance to sit down".

Trudy: "My dad wa'n't half strict with me ... he's never let me nor our Jen' out of his sight. It we're just impossible to have any kind of freedom with 'im around. So when Ken asked me to marry him I was off like a shot I can tell you".

Freedom from strict parents (specifically the father) and boredom with monotonous jobs were 'sound' reasons to these women for marrying. Most of the women had settled routines and accepted the hard work and the 'making do' that tends to accompany the arrival of children within the working class family. However, few of the women regretted the kids and spoke of the pleasure that was to be had from them despite the fact:

"that they get under yer feet sometimes ..."

Two of the women were 'separated' from their husbands and this had caused more than a few problems for both of them:

Anne: "I'm not able to get a job and have to get money from the Social Security in order to cope".

Pat: "Aye, but they're allus out there (she pointed vaguely to the road) ... snooping ... spying on yer to see whether you've got a feller in with you or not".

When asked would they form a lasting relationship with another man Pat stated with cynical realism:

"I don't know ... The money's not up to much but at least it comes in on time. That's more than what could be said for Alec (her husband) when he was around".

It is the accepted and valued norm that men should be the 'provider', failure to do so is looked down upon.¹

When asking about the involvement of husbands within the home the women's replies were much more varied than in Dock Side:

Margaret: "Well he potters about the garden now and then ... you know he keeps it nice. He does lots of little repairs about the house ... he's good at that. He does the odd washing up but on the whole he's not that keen".

However one or two of the husbands could be classified as being highly involved with the level of participation they give to their marriages:

Audrey: "Jack's allus been good like that ... ever since we got married. You know he'll come home and set to, he doe'n't think twice about it. He's a real treasure".

(-) "Lucky you" ...

Audrey: "Yeah, and I know it ..."

Linda: "Mark thinks nothing of being in the kitchen cooking and washing up. He does a good share of the housework".

1. See Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit., and also her 1946 article: "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 52 (3), Nov., pp.184-189.

For these two women the help they get from their husbands is a very important feature of their marriage and likewise they recognise the fact that they are 'fortunate' in having such husbands.¹ For most of the other women the basic everyday services are their sphere:

Mary: "I do most of the things in the house
Peter wouldn't think of doing anything".

Val: "We row about him not doing owt".

Joy: "It's just not worth arguing about. I
gave up long ago asking Mike to give us
a hand".

Among the women there was an acceptance that their menfolk were under no obligation to 'help' in the home and for some who asked for that 'help' it was only to fall on deaf ears. However, what was obviously different to the situation in Dock Side was the fact that the women reported that their husbands were involved in some way in the house whether it was in the form of "doing the garden" or "carrying out odd repairs" in a way that Dock Side men were not. But this could hardly be classed as the "task sharing" that O'Neill² reports, although it may support his stress on "home-centredness". But it would appear that this has less significance for the dynamics of power existing between men and women than earlier writers have suggested.

When questioning the women about childcare, again their answers varied:

Trudy: "Well, he likes seeing to the kids ... I
mean he's real proud of them like. He
teks 'em out an' that ... But I suppose
he doesn't really do for 'em in the way
that I do".

-
1. Leonard Barker, 1978, op.cit., points out that it is not who does the tasks, but what is specific is, the relations of production: "Husband or wife may cut the lawn or cook a meal, but the wife does it as a dependent - gratuitously, for the head of the household" (p.242).
 2. O'Neill, 1973, op.cit. (1982, op.cit.).

Lil': "He'll mind 'em an' that ... he loves to take 'em out ... especially when we're all together".

Researcher: "Would he change a nappy?"

Lil': "No, an' I wouldn't ask him either ... he just wouldn't be able to do it".

Essentially the men seemed to be involved in the 'positive' aspects of childcare - those tasks which are most rewarding:

Val: "He'll keep an eye on 'em while I'm doing something else".

Joy: Mike'll play with them but he wouldn't think to bath 'em and put 'em to bed".

Only two of the women (Audrey and Linda) seemed to have an 'equal' arrangement when it came to childcare:

Audrey: "Jack would get ever so upset if he found the kids already in bed; he loves to come home and see to 'em like. He reads to them, clears up after them, in fact he's allus been like that. He says "they're my kids as well" and he mucks in and has allus done so".

Linda: "I can remember when Mark changed our Sharon's nappy ... Oh Christ, I thought he'd die but after that he were O.K. you know ... and has done every thing since. I mean he's allus there with the kids when he's finished work ... cleaning for 'em, dressing 'em ... and the thing I look forward to is the weekend. He always gets up with 'em, so it gives me a lie in".

As Ann Oakley points out: "a willing husband lightens the burden of domesticity and paves the way for a more relaxed approach to the tasks of childcare" (p.151).¹ There was obviously a clear difference between the satisfaction of those wives whose husbands only engaged partially

1. However Oakley also points out that the alternative explanation is that women who are satisfied with child-care put pressure on their husbands to share housework; See Oakley, 1974: op.cit.

(or even not at all) in task sharing and child-care and those who participated fully in the home.

Decision-Making

As can be seen there is a traditional division of labour between women and men in Long Meadow. The man has a job and thus brings home the resources (a wage) to be converted into goods and services for family consumption. Domestic activities are usually the sphere of the women and for most men they are ready to accept this situation by their apparently low level of participation in the services and cleaning carried out by the wife.

Those husbands and fathers who are 'satisfactory breadwinners' for their families they are considered 'good husbands' by the women. For those men who 'fail' there are certain methods of bringing them into line:

Margaret: "When Terry n' I first got married, he wasn't one for sticking to his work - in n' out of jobs like a yo-yo I can tell yer. When me Mam got wind of it she was round like a bat out a' hell. He sticks to his job now though, he's been fairly regular at t' oil works".

Trudy: "If a fella doe'n't bring a wage in regular like, it can make your life twice as hard. That's not getting at you Pat ..."

Pat: "I know luv' don't be daft. And yer right n' all. The best thing is to get shut of him as well if yer know you've got a bad 'un, 'cos while you're working and worrying yerself sick trying to make ends meet, they're boozing or smoking it and then get nasty when yer tackle 'em. They're best 'gone ... 'cos all you've got is another mouth to feed and n' extra to look after. Yer best on security even tho' it's rotten".

What Pat and Anne did like was the fact that the decisions involved in spending their 'income' (wisely or misguidedly) were theirs with no come-backs from any menfolk when short.¹

Anne: "Mind you I hate being on' Sup.Ben. (supplementary benefit). Folks round here look down on yer and if a fella comes to the door even so much as to read 'meter, by Christ yer a 'fallen woman'".

Decisions about the spending of the wage again varied among the women. It is often she rather than her husband who is in charge of rent payments, bills and other household budgeting:

Lil': "Our Frank's allus handed 'money over. His dad used to do it before like. I suppose habits die hard like don't they. Anyway it's me that pays bills".

Val: "My ol' man's got no head for figures. I do it all ... he finds it easier just letting me get on with it".

Margaret: "Lucky ol' them I'd like to sit back and let somebody else get on with worrying where the next meal's coming from and how to keep 'wolf from 'door'".

However, some men did not just 'leave it all' to their wives:

Joy: "I suppose we have like a kitty you know ... we take out for what we need like rent, food, gas and electricity. If there's owt left (this is greeted by laughter all round) ... I'm not saying there is mind you; then we go out and buy something ..."

Audrey: "We work out what we've got and then decide between us what needs paying".

1. Hannerz, Ulf, 1969, remarks that the American Welfare System of Aid to Families with Dependent Children provides the woman with an independent source of income. See Soulside: Inquiries into ghetto culture and community, Columbia University Press.

I asked about the various decisions made about holidays and moving house:

- Val: "I'm not quite sure. We go where the kids would enjoy it ... sun, sand and sea ... the usual. I'm not sure who decides".
- Joy: "If I had my way it'd be a villa in' Greek Isles ... eeh all that sun ..."
- Lil: "Gerraway with yer, it'd burn yer to a frazzle".
- Margaret: "My husband won't go abroad. He ses' it's all that foreign food ... 'muck' he calls it. Not that he knows owt about it; the most he's ever tasted is a Chinese take-away n' that wa' with chips n' all".
- (-) "Aye, men are afraid of trying owt new".

Certain questions remained unanswered with statements such as "never thought about it" or "not much bothered". Despite the brevity of such material there are indications that not only do men, in Long Meadow, have a low participation in task-sharing and child-care, but that they can also 'choose' whether to be highly involved or not at all, both in household tasks and in decision-making.¹

When discussing the general merits of the estate one of the women put it in a nut-shell:

- Margaret: "It's like everywhere else you go ... there's some good and bad, you gain some things whilst you lose others. You have rows with your neighbours and be in and out of each other's houses whilst some just keep themselves to themselves. It's all 'same and all different wherever you go ... just different house, n' different packaging".

1. For further analyses of marital dominance see Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit., Friedan, Betty, 1963: The Feminine Mystique, Victor Gollancz; and Gillespie, D. 1972: "Who has the Power? The Marital Struggle" in H.P. Dreitzel (Ed.) Family, Marriage and the Struggle of the Sexes, Collier-MacMillan, London.

That 'different packaging' becomes obvious when viewing and discussing leisure and the provided amenities.

Leisure

Like other estate dwellers, Long Meadow residents have to bear with a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the authorities to finishing the estate to the satisfaction of the inhabitants. It is common to assume that those who 'plan' corporation estates do not tend to live there nor are they planned with the needs of women in mind.¹

On Long Meadow there are the usual bingo sessions and discos at the local community centre, but for the most part, women with small children spend their evenings watching telly or on rare occasions will travel to the city for their entertainment. Some of the women actually join evening classes or attend meetings at one of the large comprehensives on the estate, which provide classes for adults ranging from basket weaving to 'A' level Psychology. What is striking about this particular feature of leisure-cum-extra education is the fact that women tend to take up this facility more than the men in Long Meadow.²

However, many of the women informed me that there was very little time and money for leisure activities, particularly if they involved going into town:

1. See Inglis, Kate, 1974: House Form, Family Structure and the Agents of Housing Provision: A Perspective, B.A. Dissertation, University of Hull. Inglis informs us "the modern Western housing experience is marked by a disconnection between the 'provider' and the 'users'; expressing in its form both class and sexual inequalities".
2. Durant, 1939: op.cit. points out that in her study women are the most prominent members of local associations. She suggests that there are two reasons as to why women are prominent in local associations and Workers' Education: "being at Watling or in its neighbourhood all day long, even if they work, they are not hampered in their free hours by fatigue from long train journeys" (p.60). Coupled with this is the isolation and loneliness that most women experience. op.cit.

Margaret: "Sometimes it's more bother than its worth going to town of an evening. During the winter I very rarely go out ... Terry goes out for the odd evening but most of the time I watch telly or slip over 'road to see our Trudy or Lil'".

Trudy: "It's not much cop' round here ... you know not many places to go like. And I don't fancy traipsing to town in weather like this".

I asked them about joint leisure activities and how often they went out with their husbands:

Val: "Oh, we go out together if there's a party on 'estate".

Lil: "We don't have anywhere to go together ... it's allus been like that. I mean I've got nothing in common with his mates ... they're allus on about sport all the time".

Pat: "Fellas are so caught up with 'emselves, you're lucky to get a word in edgeways".

There was general agreement that leisure did tend to be sex-segregated:

Joy: "I go to evening classes up the road and at the end of the course we arrange to have a 'do' you know ... a meal in town. It's mostly just women together".

Mary: "When I go out in the evening ... I go up to night school, Peter won't babysit for me you know ... he just refuses so Maggie comes in and looks after 'bairns for me. He just ses "it's not my job, you see to 'em' n' that's it".

Taking leisure pursuits separately was more of an accepted way of life than just due to the difficulty of finding babysitters. In all three areas: the division of labour, decision-making and leisure there existed a sharp demarcation and that among these few respondents their lives reflected an ostensibly segregated existence. Such sex-linked interests, together with the exclusion of the wives from their husbands' world of work and the differential upbringing of children all contribute to the separation of the sexes.

The World of Childhood and Adolescence

Children on Long Meadow are like children everywhere: they play, eat, sleep, quarrel, fall in and out of friendships - sometimes at the drop of a hat - and generally manage to attain adolescence without too much physical and mental damage. On the way they will absorb the social patterns, attitudes and values which are strongest within their environment. But this does not necessarily mean that children are reared in a similar way to each other.¹

On the whole the mother is mainly responsible for the care of the children,² as the father's job is likely to affect not only the amount of time he is able to spend with his family, but also the extent to which he is prepared to participate in the children's care; indeed the whole pattern of family living is determined by the father's hours of work.³ This is particularly so in a neighbourhood such as Long Meadow, where men in certain occupations - dockers, factory employees, lorry drivers, workers at the Oil Complex and officers in the prison service, - work alternating shifts. But in some ways this is no different from Dock Side or Applegate. As shown previously, fishermen spend several weeks at a time away from home⁴ and the up-and-coming executive, the teacher or the doctor in Applegate may often work late in the evenings doing accounts, preparing lessons or being constantly on call.⁵ But night shift work is

1. Newson & Newson, 1965: op.cit. revealed a range of patterns and behaviour, even within a similar socio-economic class.

2. Oakley, 1974: op.cit.; Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit.

3. Pahl & Pahl, 1971: op.cit.; Newson & Newson, 1965: op.cit.

4. Tunstall, Jeremy, 1962: The Fishermen, MacGibbon & Kee, London.

5. Pahl & Pahl, 1971: op.cit.

almost exclusively restricted to manual workers.¹ Despite the uneven hours, the woman adapts to a routine of caring for the home and children, whether they are pre-school or attend one of the primary or comprehensive schools on the estate and whether they themselves are or are not involved in a (paid) job outside the home.

Accounts of child-rearing practices and the differences between socio-economic classes² are numerous and if to be believed, the middle-class perspective is one of temperance and restraint, of controlling the self-indulgent childish whims of today for the more firm and concrete demands of tomorrow. Middle-class parents emphasise the qualities of self-control, intellectual exercise and consistent emotion, all of which are said to be lacking (or at least minimally present) in child-rearing patterns of the working class.³ However the Newsons do point out that the social class differences are not absolute.⁴ Cutting through most of the controversy on the material and technical aspects of childcare Oakley,⁵ quite wisely, states that these aspects should be "interpreted as a response to the situation in which women find themselves" (p.179).

As in Dock Side and Applegate, early infancy is negotiated in the sex

-
1. Oakley, 1974: op.cit. makes the point that certain aspects of working class husband's job are demanding - in particular the long hours.
 2. Klein, 1965: op.cit. See also J.W.B. Douglas, 1964: The Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London; Newson & Newson, 1965: op.cit.
 3. Klein, 1965: op.cit.
 4. Newson & Newson, 1965: op.cit.
 5. Oakley, 1974: op.cit.

segregated world of their parents, although children at this age play together irrespective of sex. The estate is dotted with playgrounds which mothers of young children frequent, on fine days, with their toddlers, to keep a wary eye on them and to chat to women in a similar situation. Small children go round to a close neighbour and play in the garden (an amenity not common in Dock Side), whilst their mums discuss over cups of tea their everyday happenings and problems. Although the children may see men intermittently and for some, quite frequently (since some of their fathers are shift workers or are unemployed) - it is a world of women that they first move about in; that protects them, feeds them and sees to most of their needs. And through this division of labour they will come to understand that there is a world of 'women's work' and 'men's work', with its attributes of privilege, status and social standing within the family and neighbourhood.¹

Though childhood experiences differ somewhat from Dock Side (since gardens and playgrounds provide alternatives to the street) traditions are continued (though changed) in the estate environment. Bonfires are still held on November 5th but not haphazardly in a street. A large vacant site is selected and the bonfires and fireworks are held under close supervision. Despite the signs NO BALL GAMES, on most evenings groups of children improvise games on the courtyards and bare patches of grass.

As in Dock Side and Applegate, a street culture does exist here also, and with the same unwritten rule of sex-segregation - especially beyond

1. Dennis et al. 1969: op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1966: op.cit. and also Jackson, Brian, 1968: Working Class Community, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

the years of seven or eight. Boys play together - on bikes, with a football or heading for the local pond to fish for tadpoles. Girls are still to be heard chanting their rhymes and games. And the children invariably 'mark out' their territory, creating short cuts and ginnels for themselves. The boys seek status within their peer group and fight to maintain it.¹ Girls meanwhile, are excluded from these groups unless there is a stalwart Boadiccea among them who tenaciously hangs on to the group outdoing, outrunning and taking on all comers within it.

Empirical studies of housing estates suggest that such an environment is difficult for youth to grow up in.² Educational and recreational facilities for adolescents are almost non-existent on Long Meadow, partly creating the ever present void and area of conflict between the young and the old:

"Them kids are always hanging around ...
up to no good".

Frequently there is a crowd of (male) adolescents hanging around outside the off-licence and chip shop in the late evenings, drawn by the lights and the appearance of warmth. Sometimes there are one or two girls on the fringe but on the whole the street-corner and the places to 'hang around' are the territory of the males.

The young lads (ranging from 13/14 years of age to 18) have 'outgrown'

-
1. See examples of the work on male youth cultures: Hargreaves, David, 1967: Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; and Willis, Paul, 1977: Learning to Labour, Saxon House, Farnborough and Corrigan, Paul, 1979: Schooling The Smash Street Kids, MacMillan Press, London.
 2. See Durant, 1939: op.cit.; Wilson, R., 1963: Difficult Housing Estates, Tavistock Publications, London.

the community centre, although they do attend the odd dance and play billiards. Their involvement in activities which are adult-regulated,¹ such as school-based leisure activities, youth club etc., is minimal, perhaps because such statutory services attempt to modify the young people's attitudes and behaviour, and control the way they dress. One of the consistent complaints made to me by young people (both female and male) is the way that the club tries to control, as well as organise them:

"They started to tell us we couldn't wear leather jackets like ..."

(17 year old male)

"I was told I couldn't come in punk gear any longer ... so sod 'em ... I aren't going again".

(16 year old female)

"They're allus tryn'a tell yer what to do ... you get fed up".

(15 year old male)

Consequently the community centre fails to compete with similar attractions in the city, which do not attempt to control youth to the same degree. However, such activity is expensive and the only alternative is the streets.

A tighter rein is kept on young girls than on the boys, with parents justifying this on the ground that the former are more at risk. If they do walk the streets of the estate they inevitably encounter a group of young males and meet with a barrage of ritual jokes heavy with

1. Corrigan, 1979: op.cit. gives an account of male youth culture and attempts to explain why there is such low involvement in structured leisure activities.

sexual innuendo. For the mid-teen girls they are more likely to attend the discos on the estate as they are not allowed to go to the city:

"Me dad ses I can't go to 'discos in town 'til I'm seventeen".

"You get stuck in this place with 'little lads'¹ tryna' get off with yer ..."

But even if they get to the city most places will be excluded to them as they are licensed premises and the girls will only be allowed in if they are (or look) eighteen.

Like many children of blue-collar workers, the young are reared in a way that seems unsystematic to middle class experts. At times they are indulged and at others they are virtually ignored. For most of these children, their schooling and their environment will guide them into blind-alley jobs and the majority of the girls will 'choose' marriage as an alternative to their mundane employment, if they are lucky to acquire a job at all.

Aspirations

Aspirations of parents for their children in Long Meadow vary considerably as they do in Dock Side. For sons to obtain a skill or trade is considered highly desirable:

Margaret: "Truth is I haven't really thought about it yet, but I'd like 'em to get an apprenticeship. But I don't know yet ... I mean it's what they want that's important".

Val: "Well I know I'd want them to have some form of training ... you know ... a trade, something like that".

1. 'Little lads' are those up to 13 or 14 years of age, although there are some who are older.

Anne wanted the same for her daughter:

Anne: "I know for sure I'd get our lass a training, then she wouldn't have to rely on no fella to support her ..."

Her statement is the product of her own experience and the failure of her expectations of marriage. She has had to struggle in order to survive with two young children whilst existing on Supplementary Benefit. Margaret, however, seems to imply that she doesn't want to impose her own needs on her children, something^{to} which middle class parents are considered prone under the guise of encouragement and aspirations.

Previous evidence suggests that parents have greater aspirations for their children on housing estates and that children tend to do better at school than children from an inner-city area,¹ and also that wives of working class husbands have higher aspirations for their children (girls and boys) than working class fathers.² My fieldwork however, does not allow me to either support or contradict those assertions.

Summary

In comparing Long Meadow with Dock Side it can be seen that there are many similarities. Working class resources are low and often precarious. Though their social networks are not as wide as in Dock Side nevertheless some women do have families close to them and also form friendship groupings. There is also a low rate of participation by husbands in task-sharing and child-care although there is some evidence to suggest

1. See Douglas, 1964: op.cit.

2. See Gans, Herbert, J. 1962: The Urban Villagers, The Free Press, New York.

that a minority could be classed as 'high' in terms of their involvement within the home. The sexual division of labour, together with masculine privilege and authority is still fundamental. Throughout all forms of relationships sex-segregation abounds and decides the future of those within the area. However, the fact that a minority of menfolk were not only prepared to 'help' in the home but actually did so denotes an important variation between Long Meadow and Dock Side.

Nevertheless analysis of the division of labour between the sexes must include the notion of 'option' and 'choice'. The 'homecentredness' of the husband was not obligatory, and in some cases it may well have been the lesser of two evils, i.e. either that or being bored. Long Meadow lacked the places where men in Dock Side so often spent their leisure time, such as the pubs and clubs, and in addition it was more expensive living on the estate as rent was higher and travel costs greater which may be an added incentive to stay and 'help' in the home. Such is the basis of O'Neill's analysis.¹ What he and other writers fail to do is to stress that while the man's participation in the home is a choice on his part, the woman's participation is far from optional. A domesticated husband is highly valued but it must also be recognised that wives are grateful for such 'help'. This 'help', essentially, can be withdrawn anytime the man chooses; whether he does or does not is not the whole story, for equally important is the fact that he has a choice and she does not.

Though the extent of participation by men within the home is higher in Long Meadow than in Dock Side this does little to change the sexual

1. O'Neill, 1973: op.cit. and 1982: op.cit.

division of labour or extend 'equality' to women. The polarisation between women and men still exists; what are deemed as 'feminine' or 'masculine' tasks remain much the same and this segregation is passed on to the children during their pre-school socialisation. Moreover, the aspirations of parents for their children are still largely based upon notions of gender as well as upon class, which leads to the conclusion that the overall beliefs about gender relations are still broadly the same.

The final catchment area is geographically and physically different from the rest and it is to this that the researcher now turns her attention.

Lintonbray - A Village on the Wolds

This village, like many of its kind is, at a brief, cursory glance, attractive, quiet and reminiscent of the urban dweller's dream of rural retreat. Lintonbray is in many ways a characteristic rural village "community". While the concept of the urban-rural continuum is a highly problematic one,¹ nevertheless, it can safely be called a 'rural' village, given that it is predominantly agricultural, is of a sufficiently remote location, has few visitors and that its landscape has none of the amenities which attract the tourist or holiday-maker.

Today the visual focal points are still as they were in the Middle Ages, the church and the green. From the village green radiate the streets, as they did in the medieval period, revealing their historical origins

1. See Lowe, George D. & Peek, Charles W., 1974: "Location and Lifestyle: The Comparative Explanatory Ability of Urbanism and Rurality" in Rural Sociology, Vol. 39, pp. 392-420.

by such names as Burgate and Galegate.¹ House types vary from the country stone cottage and red-bricked farmhouses to the row of newly developed 'ranch style' bungalows of the 1970's. Arable farming is the main activity, but there is also some livestock, chiefly sheep, pigs and poultry. At one time, employment could be had in the stone quarries² and water mills, as well as on the land, until the effects of land enclosure and the decline in prosperity hit the agricultural community in the later 19th and early 20th century. The village never benefitted from a railway station and from the 19th century there began a period of comparative isolation that still continues today. However, Lintonbray was then largely self-sufficient in craft, trade³ and even religion.⁴ The move from the countryside to the towns from the 1860's onwards was accompanied by a decrease in the number of houses and a deterioration of the fabric of many of the remaining buildings, a feature still evident today. It was also one of the worst hit by the depression of the 1920's and '30's, and the poverty and unemployment of that time are still fresh in local memory:

Annie Sellars is 48 and recalls parts of her childhood in the Depression:

"I remember there were eight of us and me dad
had just lost his job on' land ... he was a
labourer working for 'big house' ... you couldn't

-
1. The term 'gate' signifying street and not bar or gateway as is sometimes stated.
 2. Most of the cottages are built in the local stone.
 3. There were once eleven joiners/wheelwrights, ten grocers and drapers, eight tailors, five shoemakers, five blacksmiths, five millers, five bricklayers, two carriers, a butcher, a tea vendor, a coal dealer and fourteen dressmakers. It is not known how many women or how many men participated in these occupations.
 4. Of the four non-conformist chapels, three remain, namely Wesleyan Methodist, built 1806; Primitive Methodist, 1878; and Baptist, 1867.

get anything else in them days. And me mam she'd go cleaning anywhere just to get a few bob so's we could eat. We'd go out with her on days like, picking plants and herbs for 'stewpot' 'cos all you got from 'parish was nowt but a few bob. We'd walk for miles ... never thought owt on it. Me mam was marvellous, I don't know how she did it but she managed ... but only just".

The situation has now changed, but the legacy of the poverty of the village in the earlier twentieth century is still present in the 1970's.

The basic economics of the village are no longer totally agrarian yet 'family' farms still dominate the area, and the family remains the unit of production. Williams, in his study of Gosforth,¹ noted that the most desirable farm is a "family holding"; that is one that can be worked without the help of hired labour. However, Nalson² went a step further and itemised four distinct types of farm families:

- "1] Full-time farmers wholly dependent on their farm for earned income, and who have no family members working off the farm.
- 2] Farmers who have a full-time job off the farm - with some other family members who also work off the farm.
- 3] Farmer and his wife working full-time at home, but has other family members working off the property usually as a matter of necessity.
- 4] Farmers who are self-employed in two occupations one of which is farming". (pp.34-35)

In Lintonbray it is the first type of farm family that is most numerous within the community.

1. Williams, W.M., 1956: The Sociology of an English Village: Gosforth, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
2. Nalson, 1968: op.cit.

Life In and Around the Village

With its poor facilities and sparse building development over the past two decades, Lintonbray has acquired an 'unspoilt nature'. Only a small number of commuters have built property, so this group has made little impact on the social and occupational structure of this traditional village.

A social survey carried out in 1969 with additional material collected early in 1974 reveals that Lintonbray population is still locally derived, based and oriented. From this survey the stability of the population was thus:

24% of the adults came from further afield
47% of the adults questioned had been borne in the parish
29% had come from local parishes

73% of the households have been resident in the ¹
village for more than 15 years
75% of the households were related to at least
one other household.

Of the working population in 1974:

72% worked in or were based in the village
28% travelled out of the village to work

8.5% travelled to the large aircraft factory ²
some miles away
8% travelled to the city and dock area
2.5% had jobs in the Minster town and the
nearby town of Heathton.
9% had jobs further afield

The high proportion of Lintonbray-based workers reflects the occupational pattern:

OCCUPATIONAL PATTERN OF LINTONBRAY³

Agriculture/Market Gardening	36%
Transport Industries	15%
Agriculture/Mfg. Farm Buildings	8.5%
Building Trades	4.5%
<i>Other Trades</i>	<i>36%</i>

1. A rate double the national average.
2. In transport arranged by the employers.
3. These figures were obtained from the Headperson of the village primary school.

For the men the village is fortunate in having a large number of trades and industries connected with agriculture. However for the women it is a different tale. The two largest employers: agricultural engineers and farm produce processors (both with work forces of 70-80) only employ 12 and 14 residents respectively thus giving local women little chance of full-time consistent paid work. The farm produce processors operate a shift basis during October to January relying on casual workers¹ from as far afield as Doncaster.

Many of the industries and small haulage firms are small family concerns. Lack of adequate transport encourage^s such a growth of industries, but the situation has improved little for those without private transport. The Minster town and city port are the principal shopping centres and the three village general shops and the fish and chip shop are well patronised, but more out of necessity than desire. Food in the village is expensive and the lack of transport means that few women have the financial advantage of shopping at a market or a supermarket. A travelling butcher and fishmonger make regular calls every week, whilst the travelling library visits once a fortnight.

The need for a new village hall and an improved bus service were considered the most pressing requirements of the community, though the young people express a dissatisfaction at the paucity of entertainment in the village. It is evident that improvement of amenities is wanted, but not increased

1. For a discussion on Casual Workers see: Robertson, J.A.S. & Briggs, J.M., 1979: "Part time working in Great Britain", Unit for Manpower Studies, Department of Employment Gazette, July, p.671; "Working Women in the '80's" Labour Research, March, 1982, pp.60-71; Joshi, Heather, 1978: Government Service Working Paper on Casual Work, Women's Employment Intermediate Work; Hurstfield, J. 1978: The Part Time Trap, London, Low Pay Unit; for accounts of the conditions of work and the lack of rights of women in part-time and casual work.

population or new housing estates.

The usual organisations exist, the British Legion and Women's Institute being two of the most active bodies along with the Young Farmers.

Despite there being only sporadic development within the village, some amongst the small influx of newcomers have attempted to involve themselves in village life by joining societies and pressing for amenities.

Conflicts have arisen here which intertwine with elements of both gender and class, to which the researcher will refer later.

Gender Relations in the Community

Beliefs about the traditional 'roles' of women and men and the sexual division of labour are strong within Lintonbray. Such beliefs are strong in part because farming dominates the area. Williams¹ reports:

"On farms the tie between father and son is particularly strong ..."

Williams, 1963: p.149

Nalson's study² would tend to support this as he found that sons are more valued than daughters (probably because men are the mainstay of farming).

Farming is deemed a man's job; no women are 'employed' (for money) on the farms, except as casual and seasonal workers. Those women and men who work together are household and family members. Women are seen as incapable of performing everyday tasks³ despite the fact that women are involved in jobs (varying on the kind of farm) such as harvesting

1. Williams, 1963: op.cit.

2. Nalson, 1968: op.cit.

3. Williams, 1963: op.cit.

potato cropping poultry and livestock rearing.¹

With agriculture being the major source of work, employment choices for women are minimal. Of course there is always the housework and rearing of children, but this is not considered a 'choice' but a 'natural destiny' and is not, therefore, recognised as 'real work'. Many of the farmers are too small to employ extra labour on a regular basis and many young women 'choose' not to work on the land. Seasonal work: such as potato picking and market gardening is sought after by the older women, many of whom are married with young families, as a way of augmenting the family income and for some they are a social event despite the difficult working conditions.²

The paid work the women do is still done by hand³ despite the changeover to technical farming machinery; as Mary Chamberlain reports for rural Cambridgeshire:

"... little has changed basically - only details, not fundamentals. Particularly for women".

Chamberlain, 1975: p.23

Obviously newer norms have appeared - such as norms concerning appearance among the young with the capitalist consumer market geared to clothes and music, just as in the urban areas. Some of the younger women are no longer disposed to put up with the 'inadequacies' of domesticity

-
1. Nalson, unlike Williams does not accept the 'incompetence' of women. Referring to his study: 4 of the single farmers are women, whilst another 4 (widows) also ran farms (p.39). He goes on to report that "there is a bias towards descent in the direct male line" (p.62). Nalson, 1968: op.cit. which suggests that it is more an ascriptive role rather than a matter of incompetence on behalf of the women.
 2. Many of the women work 'under glass' (in the hothouses) where temperatures make working conditions 'uncomfortable'. For others it is the extreme opposite: potato picking (including sorting and grading) is done in the open where they are vulnerable to the vagaries of the weather and it is dirty and 'back-breaking' work.
 3. Chamberlain, Mary, 1975: Fenwomen: A Portrait of Women in an English Village Virago, reports this in her account of women in a village.

usually associated with rural life and seek the basic commodities of a washing machine (twin-tub rather than automatic) and refrigerator to improve their lot.¹

For the most part all forms of work (whether paid or unpaid) are highly segregated within the village.² Such an emphasis on the division of labour is bound to penetrate the cultural consciousness of the people in the community. Certain kinds of leisure such as pub-going are not traditional among women, the 'local' is essentially an all-male preserve,³ whereas the village dances, whist drives and the Women's Institute are attended by the wives and daughters. In short the values and norms in Lintonbray are very much expressed through a male/female dichotomy. Even in non-farming jobs men as timber workers, lorry drivers, labourers and so on, work in exclusively male groups and rarely in organisations employing women in other tasks. Ann Whitehead in her study of a Herefordshire village states:

"... the involvement of women in the workforce at any stage in the life-cycle was very limited".

Whitehead, 1976: p.183

Her work revealed the depth of the antagonisms that exist between the women and men, and what she describes is linked in part to the almost total barrier to women entering the workforce as well as to the nature of their husbands' work, i.e. its exclusivity and isolation from women. Frankenberg's study of rural life⁴ earlier came to a similar conclusion

-
1. See Curtin, Chris, 1978: Family and Land in the West of Ireland, unpublished Ph.D. thesis University of Hull, who also refers to the awareness, amongst women in a rural area, of material and household goods.
 2. See the accounts of Williams, 1956: op.cit. and also Arensberg, C.M., 1939: The Irish Countryman: An Anthropological Study, MacMillan, New York, for the sex-segregation of tasks within and outside the home.
 3. See Whitehead, 1976: op.cit., Williams, 1963: op.cit., for similar findings.
 4. Ronald Frankenberg's 1957 study: Village on the Border, quoted and summarised in Frankenberg, 1966: op.cit.

when he noted that the very nature of men's work (i.e. its exclusivity as regards women):

"... tends to intensify the segregation of roles between men and women outside the home".

Frankenberg, 1966: p.92

This led him to suggest that:

"... except for a brief period of courtship and early marriage, there seems to be two villages, one of men and one of women which rarely mingle".

Frankenberg, 1966: p.92

The World of Women: Home and the Family

Numerous studies have remarked on the importance of the 'role' of women in farming communities,¹ particularly economically, and on the way in which such tasks and activities are simultaneously marginalised.² It is only recently (within the last decade) that studies have concentrated on women and placed their experiences in a valid context.³ Being a wife and mother in Lintonbray entails a similar work-load and pattern of duties to that of women in Dock Side, Applegate and Long Meadow. 'Duties' pertaining to the house and child-care are women's domain, for like other men who will have (paid) work the men of Lintonbray will be out of the house all day; even the work of the farmer, though situated nearer to home, will demand his absence from the house for most of the day. However being a 'farmer's wife' entails differing types of labour

1. Williams, 1956: op.cit., Nalson, 1968: op.cit.

2. Arensberg, 1939: op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1966: op.cit.

3. Chamberlain, 1975: op.cit.; Whitehead, 1976: op.cit.; Kitteringham, Jennie, 1973: Country Girls in 19th Century England, History Workshop Pamphlets, No.II.

from the conventional form of 'housewife'.

Despite the changes, modernisation and innovation in technology, which have mechanised certain arduous tasks (both in 'female' and 'male' types of farmwork) and redefined the position of the wife to a more 'domestic' level,¹ little has changed for the farmer's wife. The task load for many of the farmers' wives in Lintonbray remains the same, having been relatively unaffected by technology nor incorporated into the 'masculine' tasks.² The preparation of animal foodstuffs, for whatever livestock is on the farm, is usually prepared by women. Poultry is an important sideline on many farms and women are in sole charge of the egg production (its collection, grading and marketing); even in many non-farming homes a small fraction of the garden is taken up with hens. It is a source of independence for women given that they retain the profits.

Of the eleven women with whom I had discussions, four were married to farmers and were full-time 'housewives'. Three others were married to agricultural workers, two to lorry drivers, one to a postman and the final to an unemployed agricultural engineer. Three of the women had permanent (paid) jobs on a part-time basis in shops and offices in the nearby town of Heathton, but had to rely on 'lifts' from neighbours for their journeys to and from their place of work. Another three had

-
1. 'Domestic level' meaning duties tied more to the home and children rather than participating in the farm production, i.e. dairy work - buttermaking, cheese and cream etc.
 2. Because of mechanisation, certain forms of farm work (throughout the country) have been 'transferred' from 'feminine tasks' to 'masculine tasks'. A good example of this is milking.

seasonal jobs working in the market gardens or picking potatoes on neighbouring farms, whilst another was the 'relief postie'.

The one essential difference between this group of women and those in the three other catchment areas was the age ratio which ranged from a nineteen year old mother of a two year old to a sixty seven year old woman who has seven grandchildren; thus giving a greater depth of experience across a number of years.

The Division of Labour within the Home

For the women of Lintonbray marriage is a 'necessity'. Not a matter of 'if' but 'when'. Not to be married - especially for a woman - invites questions, scorn and even sympathy. So to ask for reasons for marrying was like asking 'Why does the sun come up in a morning?'.

May: Dennis, 67, is a farmer's wife. She has two adult sons who have both married farmers' daughters, and her daughter has married an agricultural advisor ('sommat to do with agricultural college as any' road'):

"I got married when I was seventeen. I'd been in service 'afore then and I wa' glad to get out of it I can tell yer. I wa' working all hours God send - up at half 'five every morning to light fires and get breakfast ready. Young uns don't know how well off they are these days ..."

"Here she goes again ..."

The interruption comes from Angela, a young woman with two children, who is a seasonal worker:

"... up to her neck in muck n' bullets ... 'yer don't know how lucky you are...."

May: "Well yer don't ..."

The discussion becomes heated, a contest between young and old:

Angela: "I know, I know it were bad but why try n' make us feel guilty 'bout it? Them days is gone but it doesn't mean that we're having it easy ... we've got our struggles only the're different. I mean look at me ... I got married 'cos I had to ... n' don't think I didn't know 'bout everybody gossiping 'bout my being in 'family way ... I knew ... more fool me. 'Kid were coming so I went n' married 'father. I don't parti'cly like him but it were either get wed or mek do on' State.¹ Where could I go in this village? I didn't have any friends outside. It were marriage or nowt".

May: "Aye ... some things never change".

There was a general nod of agreement from the women and tea-cups were re-filled. Certain traditions among the women still remain. All of them bake at least once a week and some of the farmers' wives, every day. There is no bakery in the village so bread, pastries and similar confectionery is made for home consumption individually by the women. Jam-making, fruit bottling, and sauces and chutneys were still made to tried and tested recipes. Husbands expected home-made produce as part of the services they receive from their wives:

"If I don't bake or something happens ... I never hear the end of it ... it's as if I've committed a sin ..."

When asked about the husband's participation in the home there were a number of reactions: May nearly choked on the scone she was eating, Angela gave a dry laugh, whilst others smiled sympathetically at me in a way one does at a stranger who has been rather gauche:

May: "I never expected my man to do owt in the house and I wouldn't want him to neither ..."

Angela: "He wouldn't anyway even if you asked him. Men round here don't believe in that sort

1. The Social Security.

'a work... y'know ... 'women's work'.
Aye they come home put their feet up
whilst muggins does for 'em. I wish
somebody would get my tea when I come
home from work. I'm fair wacked when
I get home but then I've got to set to
and get his tea for 'im when he comes in".

May: "You shouldn't go out to work then ..."

Angela: "You what! We'd starve on what he brings home."

Carol: "My husband's good 'round 'house when he's
home. He allus helps me".

Alice: "My 'ol man wouldn't know where to start ...
he'd mek a mess of things. Oh no I
wouldn't want 'im to do owt ..."

Apart from the situation of Carol, the level of masculine participation in domestic tasks reflected a similar pattern to that found in Dock Side: very low.¹ However, without wishing to justify the level of sex-segregation it must be pointed out that for many of the male workers there appeared to be a longer work schedule, especially for those working on the land, although this pattern changes according to the seasons. The two largest firms in the village have a work-day from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. (But it must also be remembered that these companies do not draw the majority of their labour force from the immediate locality).

The pattern of non-participation repeated itself in many aspects of childcare. Going through the list of tasks involving parenting, the response seemed negative. 'Does your husband help with the following (or has he ever helped?): nappy-changing, bathing the child/ren, feeding,

1. Chamberlain, 1975: op.cit. reports - that the women in the village of her study more or less insist that "their man and his needs must take precedence over all else" (p.71).

getting up in the middle of the night'. I become aware of complete silence, glance round and reel off the list again, adding that I wish to know how regular such participation is. By now Angela has collapsed into uncontrollable laughter, May is pursing her lips which gives her a severe look whilst Carol and Maureen sit back and close their eyes:

Alice: "Look, I must admit that my bloke doesn't really 'involve' - is that the word - hissen' with anything like that. Are you sure this is not a piss-take?"

Angela, again collapses into fits of laughter causing some of the other women to comment:

"Aw shirrup Angela, for Christ's sake ... lass is only tryna' do her job ..."

Angela makes a supreme effort and the only indication of her amusement is the occasional heaving of her shoulders. To all intents and purposes many of the men do not share in the physical aspects of child-care, especially in the early stages:

Carol: "I think Alan was always afraid he's drop the baby or something ... you know. He just left the looking after the kids up to me ... mind you I'm quite happy with that situation".

May: "Women are there to see to 'bairns not fellas. If we left 'em to it they'd probably half kill 'em wi' not knowing what to do for 'em".

Angela: "Yer probably right May. I'm sorry for laughing but I can just see our Jim changing nappies, that would be a sight for sore eyes".

It is obvious, that not only is masculine participation low in the area of child-care but also that the women do not care for the men's involvement either. This seems to support earlier rural studies which note a pattern of separation between what women do and what men do¹ which may

1. See Frankenberg, 1966: op.cit.; Williams, 1963: op.cit.; Whitehead, 1976: op.cit.; also Gluckman, M., 1955: Custom and Conflict in Africa, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

be bound up with village culture.

Decision-making

The discussion turned to decisions, and arrangements for dealing with income brought into the home. Here, many of the women regarded themselves as 'independent' as they managed to earn from seasonal work. Two of the farmers' wives reared poultry and kept the profits (though the latter varied) which allow them some autonomy of decision making in terms of buying clothes for their children and the 'odd luxury' for their home:

Alice: "I tek' a real pride in' poultry ... none o' yer battery hens neither ... free-range all o' them ... they lay far better n' a damn sight more of 'em. The eggs gives me a nice little income n' I can spend it how I like".

Carol: "We of'en go to 'market together and sell the 'best' eggs there ... then there's allus 'locals like, who come round for the odd dozen or so. It may not be a grand total but it does mek a difference 'aving money of yer own".

Many of the other women were involved in seasonal or some form of temporary work which afforded them a limited form of independence; however, the work is sporadic and consistent only to those women with school-age children or with some form of alternative childcare. Such work did not include any of the benefits paid in full-time occupations such as holiday pay. And they had to agree that in large part they were dependent upon the income brought in by the menfolk:

Angela: "Jim's good with what money he brings in we sort out what needs paying n' go on from there".

Carol: "Alan keeps an eye out for 'bills n'that ... he's dead careful what with wanting

to extend 'farm n' that. In fact he does the books including the bills for 'house ... electricity, gas ..."

Angela: "Yer, he's a real tight sod!"

Carol: "Aw c'mon he wants 'farm to do well. I do alright with 'eggs n' he doesn't interfere wi' that".

Alice: "With Ted he leaves all that up to me ... paying bills n'that. With farming, money's up n'down like ... not a regular wage like ordinary work. I do the accounts for 'farm and you find you have good years n' bad years y'know".

Angela: "Oh aye, I can just see yer cryin' into yer gold lined beer mugs ... don't talk about poor farmers to me".

As in the three other catchment areas the extent of decision-making between men and women varied a great deal from couple to couple. Some of the men dealt with the bills, allotting so much for the housekeeping (food buying) to the women, whilst others brought home the pay and kept so much for themselves and handed the rest over to their wives. Ann Oakley¹ has pointed out the negative aspects of both forms of arrangements which is ultimately linked to the fact that the majority of women are basically dependent on the income of the men. But some of the women were quick to point out certain areas of independence and the contribution that they themselves make to the household budget:

Angela: "If it weren't for my working we'd never ever get a holiday nor make ends meet. I buy all 'kids clothes ... well most o'them ... the coats they'll need for 'winter, and shoes".

1. Oakley, 1974: op.cit.

Alice: "I've managed to pay for all 'essential things for 'house ... the basics mind ... not yer cocktail cabinets or owt like that ... all replacements for 'crockery, cutlery and the general stuff ... I pay for it all".

Indeed the financial contribution that the women make to the household budget is quite important, but like the physical and durational aspects of housework, which remain invisible as "women's work", so the financial is reduced to "pin-money".

Leisure

Rural communities are assumed to be divided into separate groups of men and women as regards leisure activities,¹ but as Whitehead points out:

"Sexual apartheid is not total"

Whitehead, 1976: p.170

In Lintonbray, there are activities and events in which both sexes participate: discos, whist drives, bingo and the pub. But even then couples do not necessarily go together.²

The two local pubs: "The Old Tavern" and "The Lion" are essentially dominated by men with the former drawing most of its customers from the immediate locality. It was very rare for women to be seen drinking alone:

May: "It's not nice to see a woman drinking in the pub on her own ... it's just not respectable".

Angela: "Heaven help any woman who does ... it's round 'village before she's even finished her first drink ... you've been in there a lot recently doing some writing haven't yer?"

Researcher: "Yeah, it's part of my research to see what goes on in the local pub. Mind you it's not a bad pint either."

Angela: (Laughing) "You fair set a cat among the pigeons I can tell yer .. mind you you're from 'university' so they think it's alright ..."

1. Gluckman, 1955: op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1957: op.cit.

2. A similar situation is found in urban studies see in particular Willmott & Young, 1960: op.cit.

Researcher: "What do you mean?"

Angela: "Well ... university folk are a bit strange aren't they ... so it's expected you'd do some strange things".

Researcher: "But if a university guy was sitting in the pub on his own you wouldn't find that strange would you?"

May: "Don't suppose so ... I expect it's cos you're a woman".

The fact that in Lintonbray 'everybody knows everybody else' and what will people say and what they will think and do when a person behaves in an 'unexpected' way is a very potent social force. This is especially intense as one's life is spent in the village - people shop at the same places, there is only one school, one disco, one village hall etc. - and there is no way to 'disappear'. What one does and/or says usually comes under the scrutiny of all, particularly if you happen to be a woman. Sex-segregated activities were both expected and encouraged - to be seen too often in the company of the opposite sex initiated gossip, with some hints being 'dropped' to the 'transgressor'. Discos and bingo sessions held at the village hall meant there was a relative relaxation of sex-segregation, but even then certain aspects of one's behaviour still came under scrutiny:

May: "That young lass of Seldon's been seen with Pete Hawkin's son ... someone should tell 'em".

Angela: "Tell 'em what, for God's sake? Let 'em alone, there's precious little to do in village ... let 'em be".

May: "But they're seen everywhere together ... people'll talk".

Angela: "Like what you're doing ... they're doing no harm".

It seemed that leisure among the women was limited, with few venues

offering facilities. Apart from the barn dance organised by the Young Farmers once every six months, there seemed little to do:

Alice: "Ted and I hardly ever go out ... I mean there's so much to do on' farm. Now and then we go to "the Lion" but he's not of'en keen. He likes going hunting with his mates ... there's not much else".

Angela: "I mostly stay in on an evening, apart from the odd whist drive which Jim doesn't like. We go to 'barn dance together but Jim goes more to drink and chat with other fellas rather than dance".

May: "I can remember when we had lots of things going on in 'village ... there were garden parties, village fetes regular - n' not to mention Hound n' Hunts Ball - we'd all go, all village folk ... not just gentry like. There were allus sommat to do or somewhere to go".

Carol: "There is the disco but that's mainly for the young folk. There is the W.I. and some other groups you can join ..."

Angela gives a snort of disapproval:

May: "You can say what you like but the W.I. did get the village hall finished".

The communal affairs of the parish are run by organisations which invariably exist on a sex-segregated basis.¹ The Parish Council, The Young Farmers, and the Women's Institute are the central associations within the village, along with the British Legion. The first two are dominated by men whilst the third (obviously) by women. Most of the social events are organised by these groups, i.e. barn dances, football matches, the local flower and fruit show and any sales - come 'jumble' or 'bring and buy'.

1. For similar studies but with greater detail see Williams, 1956: op.cit.; 1963; op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1957: op.cit.; Nalson, 1968: op.cit. Whitehead, 1976: op.cit.

By being introduced to the headperson's wife, who was a 'leading light' in the W.I., I was able to attend two meetings. This was particularly interesting, as a great deal of enthusiasm had been injected into the organisation by some of the newcomers who had joined a year previously and had managed to make their presence felt over decisions about the new village hall. This particular situation had sparked off antagonisms among certain villagers which incorporated both class and gender categories.

The area of conflict which I was able to observe arose in connection with the new village hall - where plans had been made sometime ago to have a new one built. For a combination of reasons work on the building had become static (no money, bad weather etc.), thus creating an impasse whereby people agreed amongst themselves that it would never be finished. But the 'new women' members of the W.I. took it upon themselves to organise events and social activities - working with other groups, i.e. Boy Scouts, the school and the Church - in order to raise money and have the hall completed.

Because of their activity the members of the W.I. had insisted on some say about the finished product and this had created bad feeling among some of the villagers. These feelings were particularly expressed among the men who frequented the "Old Tavern" and who were also members of the British Legion. They felt slighted by the influence of these strangers; as long-living members of the locality they felt justified in asserting their authority. As one of them put it:

"... unless you've been born and bred around here you have no right to speak about how the area should be run".

Such criticism was exacerbated by the fact that it was directed against women, and the men viewed the W.I. as a community association

"... dominated by crabby old ladies with their hairdos, handbags and big mouths".

With the influence they had managed to gain through the completion of the village hall, the members of the W.I. are able to manipulate the running of it, deciding what events should be held and when, leaving the out-manoeuvred British Legion 'in the cold' so to speak:

"They think they can come here with their money and start throwing their weight around".

"In my day women knew their place; they wouldn't 'ave taken it 'pon themselves to start bossing you around and organising things".

The disparaging remarks are accompanied by a ritual of non-recognition whenever the W.I. members are seen in the vicinity.

Apart from the W.I. and the occasional event held in the village, there are few social activities that women can engage in. The isolation of the village and the unofficial policy of sex-segregation are double obstacles to women's involvement in leisure on a wider scale within Lintonbray. However, in some ways the women appeared more independent and assertive than in Dock Side or Long Meadow as witnessed by their involvement with the village hall. This may also, in some way, be explained by the limited independence that they are able to obtain through seasonal work and the profits from rearing poultry.

The World of Childhood and Adolescence

The village is by no means the sentimentalised dream of urban dwellers who have visions of the maypole, the sound of leather on willow (cricket)

followed by strawberries and cream. It is a working village with all the attendant problems of earning a living off the land or finding jobs in an area with too few opportunities. Gone are the days when children had to work (for pay); work no longer exists for them and no longer do they need to work. But as is apparent in the other catchment areas, they are reared in an environment where the sexual division of labour is in evidence. In Lintonbray, however, the sexual division of labour is even more differentiated, partly in response to (and not as a 'natural concomitant' of) the occupational structure of the village.

Such a division will probably be less rigid when, as small children, they will be confined to the house (but even then within the home there is a clear demarcation of labour between the mother and the father). But the daughters and sons of farmers are soon allotted tasks when they are of an age to carry them out, as in most farming communities.¹ Unlike Dock Side, Applegate and Long Meadow, the father's work is not something mysterious, carried on away from home - a farmer's work is a familiar part of children's everyday lives.² Despite the fact that child labour is no longer bought and sold, sons and daughters in farming families are required to help with the animals and field work.³ Through summer and winter both are expected to carry out their chores, and for some this means seeing to animals before they themselves get fed:

-
1. See Arensberg, 1939: op.cit.; Rees, 1950: op.cit.; Williams, 1956: op.cit.; 1963: op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1957: op.cit.; Nalson, 1968: op.cit. Chamberlain, 1975: op.cit.; Kitteringham, 1973: op.cit.
 2. Nalson reports that "the children's home is also their father's workplace ..." (p.173) op.cit.
 3. See Blythe, Ronald, 1969: Akenfield, Portrait of an English Village, Penguin, Harmondsworth and Thompson, Flora, 1979 (first published 1945): Lark Rise to Candleford, Oxford University Press; for accounts of rural childhood and when child labour was needed.

Alice: "Our Helen hates getting up in the morning to feed the animals ... you should hear her ... she'd not make a farmer's wife. Heaven knows what she'd say if we 'ad a dairy farm ... I can remember having to get up at the crack o'dawn for the milking ... mind you it's all done by machines now".

Young boys take up with their fathers and at thirteen they are already young men, expected to help in the fields with the heavy tractor work. Girls help around the farm too, particularly in the care of poultry and, if they're old enough, with the accounts of the farm.¹ During the harvest when everyone is expected to give a hand, daughters help their mothers in the preparation of the large meals that are served to the harvest workers and are generally expected to help a great deal more in the housework during this period. So from very early on children of both sexes are involved in the adult work, but predominantly in different spheres.

But like children in other areas, they are also involved in the world of children's games. There are bikes, skate-boards and skipping ropes along with the 'conkers', hide-and-seek and fruit picking in the late summer and autumn. The 'policy' of child rearing in Lintonbray, may again leave much to be desired by middle class 'authorities', but the 'rearing' is well-tried and tested and borne out of 'making do', and governed partially by the demands of the land. The harsh poverty has gone now; the children are clean, healthy and exuberant, but their horizons are still narrow. As Mary Chamberlain states:

"Childhood for girls has not changed. It still ends early".

Chamberlain, 1975: p.26

1. Alwyn Rees, 1950: op.cit. in his study of a Welsh parish describes the segregated tasks noting that women are for the most part confined to jobs in the house and yard.

Visits to town are few and far between as money is scarce¹ and there is little real prosperity among the people except for the large land-owners and highly paid professional workers who live in the village.

Gender segregation is very significant among the children of Lintonbray, but this is hardly surprising given the nature of the division of labour between women and men, which leads to a segregation of interests.²

Groups of about seven or eight boys gather on the green during the holidays or on early summer evenings to organise games for themselves.

Girls gather in smaller groups around the communal swings. Sex-segregation is both accepted and expected from the adults and only when courtship arrives is the sight of the young couple together taken for granted.

There is little in the late evenings to attract young children out so most spend winter nights at home.

Adolescence brings with it a sense of restlessness borne out of young people being enticed by the teenage consumer market which has become part of village life, though not necessarily making the same impact it has done in urban areas. Pop music and trendy clothes are part of the village scene however, but there are few places to express such a 'foreign import' except the infrequent Saturday night discos held in the village hall. Most young people have to head for the town of Heathton and beyond in order to get to the 'real' discos and other 'scenes' of entertainment.

1. Nalson states that there is an income disparity between agriculture and other occupations (p.2) Nalson, 1968: op.cit.

2. See Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit.; Dennis et al, 1969: op.cit.; Whitehead, 1976: op.cit.

The similarities that can be drawn between the youths of this and of other areas are easily observable. Groups of young males hang around outside the local fish-shop discussing motor-bikes or whatever one member of their group has been up to. There is little to do and nowhere to go unless one has a means of conveyance and for a young person, either female or male, with little resources, this is out of reach for many of them. Youth is brief, with little chance of extending their childhood by university education, for all but a few.

Aspirations

When focussing upon aspirations in such a rural neighbourhood, the whole issue impinges upon the type of industry and opportunities for full scale employment for both females and males. Sons of farmers are expected to follow their fathers 'to the land'. It is quite common for farmer's sons to marry farmer's daughters thus taking the strain off the ownership of land for families who have more than one son,¹ and relatively few acres. Some of the daughters of farmers have created important sidelines for themselves and in that way have secured a 'career' for themselves:

May: "My granddaughter Sally set up office in her own home and does the books of all the local farmers".

Alice: "My sister went and opened some stables of her own. She was always daft on horses".

There is still the emphasis on patriarchal descent on the land; sons are seen as more valuable than daughters. Nalson² and Williams³ argue that

1. Nalson points out that in an 'all daughter' family of a full time farmer, a daughter will tend to take the place of a son and work on the farm and may also succeed to farms (p.62) see Nalson, 1968: op.cit.

2. Nalson: ibid:

3. Williams, 1956: op.cit., 1963: op.cit.

this is because sons are seen as available for longer periods than are daughters who appear to marry at an earlier age. Such an analysis, however, fails to realise that for most women there is no other alternative.

In non-farming families, daughters and sons do have difficulty in obtaining jobs. However, it is easier for young men to find a job within the vicinity. Work on the land, or in the small industries in the village or nearby Heathton, or joining their fathers in private enterprise gets them by. There is always a need for an electrician, a plumber, and a 'jobbing' builder. For young women it is not so simple in a community where most of the skills are seen to be 'masculine'. (Paid) employment on a farm is very definitely seen as a 'masculine' occupation despite the fact that women are employed in seasonal land jobs and market gardens. A specific case can be cited as to the stress on patriarchal inheritance. A couple who owned a small market garden in Lintonbray with both putting an equal share of labour into the business¹ expressed disappointment that both their children were girls:

"We'd have liked a boy, so 'he' could take over the business from us".

"Well perhaps the girls will take an interest in the land and run the business ..." the researcher.

"No, from past experience ... and people have told us you know ... girls have no idea of running a business. Besides they don't have any interest in the land".

The girls are aged 2 and 4 respectively.

1. The woman in fact kept the accounts, saw to stock control and generally dealt with the administrative and practical details of the business.

The only jobs open to non-farming women in the vicinity are domestic work or work in a family trading enterprise such as a shop, post office or pub.¹ Inevitably the majority of people (especially women) who do not live on farms and cannot obtain jobs, mainly because of the structure of the labour market and the lack of mobility which further limits girls' and womens' occupational aspirations, must leave the community sooner or later.²

As in other areas daughters are expected to marry, thus 'solving' the problem of having to earn a living.³ Young female school leavers are not keen to work on the land as their mothers do but this may be due more to the structural conditions or the actual type of work, rather than to the lack of interest or ability. Employers prefer the seasonal/temporary workers which married women with or without children so readily 'qualify' to be.⁴

On first sight, educational aspirations appear to be limited, with farmers valuing the labour of their sons more highly than their educational achievements,⁵ particularly as it is to be remembered that farming is an occupation which is largely learnt at home, and not at some university or college many miles away. However, some of the young men are making

1. Nalson noted in his research that "employment in the vicinity of their homes was scarce for women who had been reared in the area but who could not be employed on their parents' farm; they had to seek work either on large farms some distance from home or in the nearest town" (p.62) Nalson, 1968: op.cit.
2. A lower proportion of females in rural populations is a well known phenomenon, see Saville, John, 1957: Rural Depopulation in England and Wales 1851-1951, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
3. In his study of rural women, Fulton, Phillip (1975) found that most of them seek social mobility through marriage rather than through occupational achievement (p.52). See his paper: "Setting of Social Contact and Status Advancement through Marriage: A Study of Rural Women" in Rural Sociology, Vol. 40, No.1, pp.45-54.
4. West (1978) points out these 'qualifications', in that married women's labour power is 'cheap, flexible and disposable', which stems from their actual and assumed position in the family, see West, Jackie, 1978: "Women, Sex and Class" in Annette Kuhn & Ann-Marie Wolfe (Eds.) Feminism and Materialism, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
5. Nalson, 1968: op.cit.

their way to the local Agricultural College, situated beyond Heathton, to learn the basic farming methods, mechanisation and animal husbandry. But many will turn away from the land, drawn by better wages and a 'future', to the towns and cities.¹

Rural girls, compared to their mothers, do tend to have a greater freedom which has presumably increased their occupational mobility.² Since girls generally have to seek work outside the village, educational aspirations among the girls and their mothers is a logical consequence though not necessarily a desired one:

Maureen: "I'd like my daughter to do well ... well both kids come to that ... I mean there's not much round here for 'em. But there's a better chance for Keith to get something. Jenny wants to be a secretary which means she'll have to move somewhere, unless she gets a job in Heathton. I think I'll be upset if she has to go like, but there's nowt else"

Angela: "It would be good for 'em to get away ... you know give 'em a wider look on life. I mean it's too early for me to say what they're gonna be or do. But our Sandra should at least attempt to get some higher education. There's always a job for Sean at his uncle's place providing nowt happens but our Sandra'll need to look further afield".

May: "In my day you had no choice ... you had to stay ... born, live n'die in 'village. Now there's lasses bare turned seventeen n'they're off. And they get married and settle out a 'village".

Angela: "And why not love ... things change ... lasses need work ... a career ... chances that we never 'ad or if we 'ad we threw 'em away".

1. Blythe, 1969: op.cit.

2. Nalson (1968) reports that "proportionately more daughters are engaged in the professions, in shops and offices". (p.62): op.cit.

It would seem that girls are far more dependent upon educational qualifications because the majority have to seek work beyond the boundaries of Lintonbray. This would tend to support Nalson's theory:

"The effect of higher education is to widen the job selectivity area and range for girls, with the possibility of subsequent employment and/or marriage away from their home district".

Nalson, 1968: p.186

Thus the modest expectations for education for young men is understandable whereas girls need greater expectations in order to achieve flight from the village.¹ This would also support Littlejohn's² findings which indicate a contrast between rural boys and girls in their attitudes to social mobility and cultural aspirations. He goes on to report that girls see themselves as part of a wider society in contrast to the local orientations of the boys (Littlejohn, 1963).³

It seems clear that, due to the patriarchal ownership of land, the nature of (the extremely limited) labour market and the sex and marital structure of the neighbourhood, it is extremely difficult for a girl to remain within the area of her kin unless she marries and her husband has a local job. Hence the expectations of a single woman remaining in her home village and being independent are very slight.

-
1. Not all research in rural studies agree. Williams (1956) in his study of Gosforth remarked: "education for girls beyond the elementary level was thought to be a waste of time" (p.61) op.cit. But his research is over twenty years ago and rather limited when it comes to analysing the social mobility and aspirations of daughters in a rural area.
 2. Littlejohn, James, 1963: Westrigg: The Sociology of a Cheviot Parish, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 3. Frankenberg (1957) however, observes the reverse phenomenon in a village where the men move out to work and the women remain at home, op.cit. Unfortunately his study does not include the type of demographic data which would enable interrelationships to be studied between cultural orientation, male and female occupations prior to marriage, and the sex and marital structure of the community, op.cit.

Those who aspire to higher education and perhaps even go on to university to obtain a degree (whether female or male) take up employment elsewhere, having neither the opportunity nor the desire to return.¹ There are few places for those with higher education: there is the headperson of the local village school, the doctor who has his surgery in Heathton, the chemist, the vicar and the very small number of business people and professionals who commute to the city over 20 miles away:

EDUCATION (AS MEASURED BY RECEIPT OF QUALIFICATIONS)

	Dock Side %	Lintonbray %	Long Meadow %	Applegate %
O.N.; 'A' level H.N. or Degree	4.2%	1.9%	1.9%	29.1%

(Figures from 1971 Census - Small Area Statistics)

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter (and the previous one) have attempted to consider the neighbourhoods and their configurations, and their place in the wider community. The researcher has outlined the contrasts and similarities between all four catchment areas. Particular emphasis has been given to the experience of (some of) the residents, particularly women, in each area. Patterns of behaviour - be it in leisure or work (inside or outside the home) - have been briefly surveyed and views of residents sought, in order to consider gender social boundaries and their implications and effects on community life.

It cannot be denied that differences are many and complex, some of which

1. Frankenberg: ibid.

are beyond the scope of this thesis. But of even greater significance are the similarities (with reference to gender organisation) which exist in the four areas. The researcher has attempted to demonstrate that there is in existence a fairly uniform pattern in the allocation of the domestic division of labour and a segregation of work and interests between women and men which must exert an influence upon children.

The existence of male cliques which 'positively' exclude women permeates all levels of our highly advanced industrial society. The husband's involvement in these has been explained, by some, as compensation for the brutalising nature of some men's work under capitalism.¹ This can certainly be understood in relation to Dock Side and Long Meadow, but is no explanation as to why there is such a segregation of interests between women and men in middle class areas such as Applegate.

What is equally striking are the aspirations parents have for their children. Although they vary according to class in respect of sons most parents have lesser expectations for their daughters, except in Lintonbray where circumstances require the girls to look for work beyond the boundaries of the village and hence lead to higher educational aspirations.

Similarities exist in children's play, in that, past the age of seven and eight years, it is for the most part gender-segregated. Girls tend to

1. Tunstall, 1962: op.cit.; Dennis et al, 1969: op.cit.; O'Neill, 1973, op.cit. and Willis, 1975: op.cit.

engage in co-operative activities while boys are more aggressive and competitive in theirs.¹ It is hard to escape the conclusion that the monosexual structure of the peer group reinforces the gender cultural differences which exist in each neighbourhood.²

Despite the recent research which optimistically emphasises the reduction of male authoritarianism within the family³ and the development of more joint marital roles⁴ women are still not in a position to lead an independent life for themselves.⁵ The very nature of the labour market makes it difficult for most, other than a 'fortunate minority' of women, to think in terms of anything but marriage and a home.

According to Ann Whitehead:

"... the content of marital roles may be changing; gender stereotypes and the ideological use of gender differentiation remain ..."

Whitehead, 1976: p.170

What is also interesting is the existence of conflict and antagonism between the gender groupings⁶ which in turn is relayed and replicated within the peer group at school, as the researcher will show in later chapters. Not only do teachers have to contend with the socio-economic

-
1. See Lever, Janet, 1976: "Sex Differences in the Games Children Play", Social Problems, Vol. 23(4) April, pp.478-487; and Lever, Janet, 1978: "Sex Differences in the Complexity of Children's Play and Games", American Sociological Review, Vol. 43, Aug. pp.471-483. See also Opie, Joan and Peter, 1959: The Lore and Language of Schoolchildren, Oxford University Press.
 2. Klein, 1965: op.cit.
 3. Young & Willmott, 1973: op.cit.
 4. Bott, 1971: op.cit.; O'Neill, 1973: op.cit.
 5. Leonard, 1978: op.cit.; Edgell, 1980: op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1966: op.cit.
 6. Frankenberg, 1957: op.cit.; Komarovsky, 1962: op.cit.; Dennis et al, 1969: op.cit.; Whitehead, 1976: op.cit.; Frankenberg, 1976: op.cit.

sub-cultures which take on differing patterns according to the area, but also with the patriarchal relations which permeate the consciousness of the peer groups.

So what exists in all four neighbourhoods is a varying pattern of patriarchy which is determined by a set of social relations existing outside of the family and reflected within the institution itself.

Just as it is important to bring out the similarities of women's experiences in the four areas because of the pervasiveness of patriarchal structures in all of them, it is also crucial to underline the differences between the areas and between the forms that patriarchy takes. In particular it is important to stress the spheres of influence the women have in the neighbourhood.

Some of the women in Lintonbray, for example, had managed to make their presence felt in a way that women in Applegate had not been allowed to do (I refer particularly to the incident in the latter of the unsuccessful appeal for a regular and cheap bus-service). Perhaps in the sphere of 'femininity' there are more rigid constraints upon the women in Applegate which may be reflected in their schooling. However the aspirations of Applegate mothers for their children do reflect the traditional middle-class value of higher education for their offspring although it will be shown that these aspirations are mediated on the basis of gender in that they see their son's education as more important than their daughters.

The boundaries that exist between the 'appropriate' activities, interests

and expectations of future work (be it inside or outside the home) for the two sexes are maintained and transmitted in many and various ways throughout the process of pre-school socialisation within the catchment areas. As we have seen in the last two chapters, the upbringing and peer-group behaviour of boys and girls differs in respect of both catchment areas and gender. The girls' upbringing in Applegate, for instance, differs markedly from the girls in Dock Side, Long Meadow and Lintonbray with regard to the material provision, protection and 'cultural' privileges that the former girls 'receive' because of the class position of their fathers. When we compare the upbringing of their brothers, again the boys in Applegate gain many advantages because of the socio-economic class of their parents. However, what the boys share in their upbringing with their working-class counterparts is their sphere of dominance in relation to females.

In the next chapter attention will be focussed on modal patterns of social organisation in the schools and the associated gender socialisation of pupils within the setting of the classroom. Emphasis will be given to the role of the head teacher and to the teachers' subjective definitions of the catchment areas and of the children in each of the schools; and to the implications of gender-grouping practices for the maintenance of significant sex-class boundaries.

CHAPTER V

An Overview of the Schools

Introduction

In the previous chapter the researcher attempted to depict certain aspects of the way in which children spend the first five years of their lives, before starting school, in families where the basic relationships between parents and children vary by social class and the sex of the child. This chapter will deal with a descriptive analysis of the four schools studied.

Given that the researcher is concerned with important variations in the 'social construction of reality',¹ she will show that the reality of educational provision is experienced in different ways in relation to gender and class. I have shown previously that within the four neighbourhoods each of the social classes was more heavily concentrated in specific kinds of ecological environments, that the 'communities' varied in the predominant or average social class affiliation of their residents and that each community reflected specific cultural and social values regarding the 'worlds' of men and women. Such structural differences and community values set in motion both formal arrangements within the school and informal mechanisms such as modal levels of social aspiration, which are likely to affect the members of the community be they man/woman, girl/boy or working class/middle class.

1. The 'construction of reality' involves an interactive process, a negotiation which involves the use of power. See Berger, P., and Luckmann, T., 1967: The Social Construction of Reality, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Taking each school individually, the researcher will look at the role of education within the community, dealing with custodial, academic and moralistic dimensions, and at what the school personnel think their particular school can do for the children in the community. Since the 'communities' each have their own conceptions of 'gender relations' we must ask - do teachers themselves operate with a similar conception of such 'relations'? Do they conflict or reinforce each other? How do the teachers adjust if a conflict exists between their own and the neighbourhood's perception of class and gender 'appropriate' behaviour?

The chapter will be arranged in the following way:

- a] A general discussion of the school will include the architectural aspects and the surrounds of the school and its symbiotic relationship within the community. General information such as date, size and layout will be given, as well as the philosophy underlying its initial construction - even the architecture and space may reflect certain philosophies.
- b] The second section will focus on the headpersons: their aims and attitudes to the surrounding neighbourhood (the catchment area) and their aspirations for the school and pupils.
- c] The third section will discuss the teachers: their attitude towards the neighbourhood, the children and education, and the way in which they conceive of their 'mission'.
- d] Next will come the physical organisation of the schools which will deal with the detailed and complex ways in which control is exercised on a physical level and includes consideration of the distribution of

facilities and provisions which throughout all school systems provide classic social control devices. The day-to-day life within schools will be discussed - assemblies and the "schedule" of activities which comprise the school day and which are bound up with the segregation of the children according to age, sex and ability. Again architecture and organisation of space will be featured in this section.

e] The penultimate section will deal with the nature of learning.

Descriptive evidence and discussion will be provided as to the 'nature' of education. What and how the children are taught is a very important aspect within education. Does it, for instance, lead to fragmentation of knowledge according to class and gender divisions?

f] Finally the last section will cover class and sex-differences in extra-curricular activities, and the messages that these have for the pupils.

Included in this chapter will be a brief examination of the respective patterns of school-community relations for the four schools and of the social and gender composition of their teaching and administrative staffs, which further demonstrate that the schools are instrumental in reinforcing and giving expression to social and gender boundaries which have their genesis in the wider structure of community life.

There will be a summary for each school and the chapter will end with a general conclusion.

DOCK SIDE

The School

Tucked in among the terraced houses in the traditional urban area, Dock Side school is well-absorbed into the neighbourhood. It is dilapidated and old; like its surroundings it is showing exterior signs of decay.

Built in the late 19th century (the school was opened in 1881) the building has an atmosphere of functionality and austerity, and reflects the Victorian sense of thrift; it lacks playing fields but yet has 'provided' separate playgrounds for different age-groups and for girls and boys.

Walking through the cramped school yards sectioned off by walls and archways, one's nostrils are assailed by the stench of urine, emanating from the clump of lavatories demarcated for boys and girls; outside toilets are only one of the graceless and stark impracticalities so reminiscent of this type of school. The few square yards of each playground (five in all) are, for the majority of the time, under the perpetual shadow cast by the adjacent buildings of terraced houses and by the school itself. Crowning the building is the old air-raid warning bell, still intact, which can be seen just above the words, etched in concrete letters, G - I - R - L - S & I - N - F - A - N - T - S. The 'junior' school is situated five minutes away in the next street - a smaller building which shows it was once kept for B - O - Y - S beyond the age of seven.¹ Despite changes from the Victorian 'morality'

1. This form of spatial organisation of junior girls from junior boys was quite common even to the middle of this century, and this intentionally precluded social contact between the older girls and boys. See the accounts of working class life and schooling: Hoggart, Richard, 1957: The Uses of Literacy, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Roberts, Robert, 1977: The Classic Slum, Penguin, Harmondsworth; and Roberts, Robert, 1978: A Ragged Schooling, Fontana/Collins.

children are subjected by the existing structure to some physical and economic constraints. Authority structures are rooted in physical reality. In the period when "social distance" between the sexes was to be made obvious on moralistic grounds, and beliefs about the respective gender-appropriate behaviour sharply defined, school building form was required to provide 'adequate separate facilities' (playgrounds, toilets, entrances and exits etc.,) for the sexes, as can be seen in any existing Victorian educational edifice.

The school exterior consists of locks, spiked railings and high walls, reflecting a philosophy of containment and control.¹ School building is greatly influenced by the cultural milieu to which it belongs and the form it takes is the consequence of a whole range of social and economic factors seen in their broadest terms. As previously stated a major concern of Victorian primary schools was to contain its 'inmates' whilst keeping the two sexes apart. The specific choices a society makes to meet certain needs reflects a set of beliefs, a scale of values, a view of the 'proper' environment for learning; and in its expression, a social structure.²

The interior of the school belies its exterior, since a certain amount of effort has been expended in keeping it visually attractive. The

1. A comparison can be made with 'total institutions': prisons, asylums, etc., see Jackson, Phil, 1968: Life in Classrooms, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York. For a discussion of 'total institutions' see Goffman, Erving, 1961: Asylums, Anchor, New York.

2. See Lloyd-Wright, Frank, 1941: An Autobiography, Faber and Faber, London, for how building form "is a matter of structure, it must be a matter of government as well as a matter of architecture" (p.332).

wooden floors are highly polished and the school furniture, though old and belonging to an era long gone, is painted in bright colours and kept scrupulously clean and tidy. There is an all-embracing effort to make the environment as pleasant as possible which is evidenced by the highly decorative reception area which faces the headperson's large, spacious office. Coloured carpet squares and well-cared for plants surround the awkward grandiosity of a small, bubbling fountain. A scenic ostentatiousness has been carefully built up - reflecting a pride in the school.

Despite the fact that much effort was put into keeping it visually attractive, the school is besieged by the impracticalities and inadequate facilities common to the old 'Board' schools still standing, such as outside toilets, poor heating and insufficient space. The high church-like windows, which give a view of the surrounding houses let in little light thus accounting for the shadowy light and the sombre effect of the school. In the two buildings which make up Dock Side, the classrooms are grouped round a central hall for easy supervision. The junior's hall is used for lunch-time provision of school meals whilst the infants' hall is used regularly for the thrice-weekly assemblies.¹ Despite its lack of space the school has a 'reasonable' pupil-teacher ratio and provides a modest-sized room in each building specifically for showing television educational programmes.

The Headperson

One of the themes of this chapter will be the headpersons, their authority and the way each headperson characterised the pupils and parents both

1. Each hall doubles for a gym and 'movement to music' period.

factually and evaluatively.

English education requires headpersons to keep a school quiet and orderly so that 'teaching' and 'learning' can be carried out with as least interruption as possible.¹ Headpersons, like teachers, are individuals with certain loyalties, ideas and traditions which will vary according to personal psychology, sex and catchment area; much that goes on in schools - rules, forms and conventions - will be determined by the head.²

Mrs. Bosworth³ emerged from her study, which all about her regard as sacrosanct, to welcome the researcher with an enthusiasm which was at the same time both pleasing and daunting. As in all schools in the study, she was keen to stress that her's was part of the whole community - democratic and altruistic. But it became obvious over the next few months that Mrs. Bosworth was an autocratic head and not inclined to share her authority.

Taking a certain pride in her school and her position within it, Mrs. Bosworth encourages frequent visits and talks from such organisations as the police, the fire-service, the R.S.P.C.A. and the Salvation Army. But she informed me:

-
1. For a discussion of the role of the head see Ellis, Terry, Haddow, Brian, McWhirter, Jackie, and McColgan, Dorothy, 1976: William Tyndale: The Teachers' Story, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
 2. Sharp & Green defined the headperson as: "the most powerful reality definer in the school situation" (p.47), see Sharp, Rachel, & Green, Anthony, 1975: Education and Social Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 3. All names are fictitious in order to maintain anonymity.

"Few parents attended the talks but many more flocked to the 'socials' we arrange".

There are frequent open nights, bingo sessions and an Old Age Pensioner's Club; the special evenings or day events to which parents were invited, were well supported, but the majority of fathers were noticeable by their absence.¹

Mrs. Bosworth's firm belief 'that there is a place for everything' and 'everything in its place' includes people, and her statements on the purpose of education reflected a philosophy of social control and a desire to 'lay the ghosts of past mishandling':

"Discipline is very important in this school; you know these children come from such neglected homes that they don't know the meaning of the word. So I make up for that loss by instilling into them the importance of good behaviour and decent moral standards".

She views children predominantly as unruly little animals that need 'to be tamed', which meant taking 'the kids off the street' and imbueing them with specific values, and within their own limitations turned into 'useful, industrious and respectable citizens'.²

Mrs. Bosworth was a strict disciplinarian to both her pupils and teachers, and kept a strict eye on all facets of classroom life. She organised the teachers' duty rota, ordered school equipment and controlled the curriculum. She regularly monitored the reading progress of all the pupils in school;³ held impromptu table tests without warning in various

-
1. A not uncommon feature according to Mays, J.B. , 1962: Education and the Urban Child, Liverpool University Press, in this 'type' of school.
 2. See Sieber, Robert, 1976: Schooling in the Bureaucratic Classroom: Socialisation and Social Reproduction in Chestnut Heights, University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan, in how the school embodies the values of 'citizenship'.
 3. This however is looked upon as a general duty of all headteachers of schools.

classes, and insisted that the children be instructed by their teachers on the Fletcher Maths System.

Most members of the staff are, if not in awe, ready to agree with her on most points and to avoid her wrath at all costs.¹ As the researcher's presence became more accepted in the staffroom, the teachers openly discussed their "overbearing, monolithic tyrant" in rather abrasive terms in front of me. They pointed out that the headperson's manner tended to be dogmatic and domineering; so much so that she expected each class to be at a particular standard and disallowed any flexibility for the teachers towards those pupils who had 'real learning problems'. Even the caretaker informed the author:

"She's a real tartar!"

The head regularly holds assemblies, and regards them as an important part of school routine, in which she regularly exhorts her small charges to 'good behaviour'. Authority, honesty and obedience are part and parcel of her moralistic didacticism. Woe betide anyone if they step out of line.²

-
1. This may be in part due to the fact that it is the headperson that controls a teacher's promotion prospects and thus has a great deal of power over individual teachers.
 2. On one such occasion the researcher, anxious to obtain further data, burst in upon the assembly being held in the Infants' hall. She collided into the musical instrument trolley which consisted of old tambourines, slymbals and other pieces of equipment which typifies the working class tradition of school music - anything that can be clanged, bashed or shaken to get a noise from - sending a large part of it crashing to the floor. The attempts to prevent the 'disaster' met with an immediate response: the teachers could barely contain themselves, the children didn't. Delighted at the 'thunderous diversion' they fell about laughing, whilst Mrs. Bosworth remained the rigid disciplinarian and soon brought them to silence with one of her noted 'dragon-like' looks which promise the fires of hell if not immediately obeyed. The researcher mouthed an apology and sat down next to one of the teachers who could barely stop shaking with the effort to contain her laughter. Because the researcher had become part of the ethos of the school, Mrs. Bosworth felt the right to admonish her. In her tightlipped fashion she informed the children:

"That is an example of how not to enter a room!"

Row upon row of upturned faces watch and listen with varying degrees of attention, boredom and fatigue, to her admonition to conform to certain standards:

"It is now that you must be trained to do as you are told, to learn to know what is right from wrong. To do that we must pray to God for help and guidance - for without Him we are just small, helpless beings, but with Him, we do not need anybody else".

When broached on the subject that Dock Side was an E.P.A.¹ school, Mrs. Bosworth avoided all discussion of it. She still had great hopes of some children emerging like 'diamonds' among the 'rough stones'. Combined with this were very definite views concerning the 'appropriate' attributes of girls and boys:

"I like the girls to escort themselves in a conduct befitting young ladies, and for the boys to at least make an attempt at being gentlemen".

She had little success in achieving these ideals, however, attributing her 'failure' to the poor quality of the 'material' that she was forced to deal with viz., blaming the home environment. Accepting, to a degree, the lack of academic success (based on quantifiable levels of achievement) and of 'proper behaviour' she contents herself in seeing that all is outwardly proper and correct. Leaving problems involving parents, such

1. The Plowden Committee conceived the idea of the Educational Priority Area where schools with 'problems' were supposed to be most commonly found. The areas, and therefore the schools, were defined in demographic terms including the proportion of children receiving free school dinners; from large or 'incomplete' families; those defined as disturbed or handicapped; from overcrowded homes with low rateable value and whose fathers have semi-skilled or unskilled manual jobs. The E.P.A. category means the teachers receive an extra allowance, a slight increase in the capitation allowance, plus the extra appointment of compensatory teacher.

as free meal applications, financial and health matters to the welfare officer¹ employed on the premises, she restricts herself to the 'educational welfare' of her charges, thus avoiding open conflict with the parents² and the higher authorities.

It was obvious that Mrs. Bosworth exercised great control over the methods and activities of her teachers, demanding weekly reports and termly plans. Having strong views about classroom behaviour, she urged these on the teachers. Considerable direction is given to the projects the children should be engaged upon. At one assembly Mrs. Bosworth informs them and the children:

"Tomorrow we are having a harvest festival service in the local church. I want you afterwards to write about it - something either about the service itself, and I shall tell your teachers to bring them to me by Monday morning".

As to her attitude and actions to the parents of the children who attended the school, they could be seen as consequences of her definition of the catchment area. It was not part of her school policy to mobilise the interest of parents in a 'useful' way: she did not invite them to participate in classroom activities feeling that they would be 'unable' to help and that she must protect her teachers:

-
1. The welfare officer was the main contact with all the external agencies such as health visitors, speech therapists, school clinic and educational psychologist.
 2. King reports that a headperson in a similar school had received abuse, threats and, on two occasions, physical attacks whilst dealing with the 'social welfare' of parents; see King, Ronald, 1978: All Things Bright and Beautiful?, John Wiley & Sons, London.

"Some of these parents ... you wouldn't believe it if you heard their language. Besides they might get violent".

There was no organised P.T.A., Mrs. Bosworth feeling that they wouldn't attend even if there was. Instead she 'preferred' their presence in a way she could control, i.e. organised activities (where the three male teachers were specifically kept behind 'just in case'), an arrangement whereby individual parents could (even though the majority never did) make appointments to discuss their child's progress.

The Teachers¹

The teachers ranged from young to old; from energetic, dedicated ones to the 'couldn't-care-less', let's-get-the-day-over-with teachers, as was the case in all four schools in the study. All the teachers attempted to make the researcher aware of the 'problems' of discipline with children from this 'sort of area':

"Give them an inch and they'll take a mile".

"Most of them have never had discipline in their lives before, I blame it on the parents".

"They're very demanding these type of children. Some of them come from such neglected homes".

"Kids round here tend to be more rebellious".

"We tend to have more behavioural problems because of the area we're in".

Opinion among the teachers in Dock Side was almost unanimous that the general social background of the area imposed severe limitations upon their work:

"You've seen what the children are like",

1. The teachers' role and their ideologies will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

a teacher informed me. Children in Dock Side were defined¹ as making less than expected progress in their learning and not readily compliant with classroom rules, 'especially the boys':

"Some of these kids, especially the lads just won't sit still".

"The lads tend to drive me up the wall".

"I find these children very draining ... you know ... the boys are quite a handful".

"You just can't afford to take your eyes off them ... especially the boys".

Drawing mainly upon their immediate experience of the children in the classroom the teachers assessed their academic 'progress',² their classroom conduct and their behaviour towards other children, as something less than could be hoped for.

In reading, for instance, the teachers defined the pupils as slow in progress for their age and noted that the discrepancy is even greater for boys than for girls,³ with more boys being referred for remedial reading instruction. In mathematics the definition of slow progress in numerical work could not be confirmed, as Fletcher Maths had just been introduced. The teachers felt conflict here as the headperson had 'encouraged' them all to introduce 'Fletcher's' into their curriculum

-
1. The researcher stresses that the teachers' collective definition of the children in no way cancelled out the fact that individually 'some' children, as stated by the teachers were rather 'bright' and 'nicely behaved'.
 2. Mays, 1962: op.cit., reports that "it is an unequivocal fact that many more children are ascertained as being educationally subnormal in the poorer districts than in better off localities" (p.126).
 3. There is growing evidence that suggests quite marked discrepancies between male and female reading performances among young readers, see: Blom, G.E., 1971: "Sex Differences in Reading Disability" quoted in S.G. Zimet, 1976: Print and Prejudice, Hodder and Stoughton, London; Asher, S.R. and Gottman, J.M., 1973: "Sex of Teacher and Student Reading Achievement", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 65, pp.168-171.

but this coexisted with the need to keep up the learning of the traditional multiplication tables with the headperson 'rushing in' and giving impromptu tests. The teachers decided that 'these' children 'were not capable' of 'getting to grips' with Fletcher.

Speech, knowledge of things and concentration were three other issues which the teachers stressed in relation to the children's level of progress in learning. It was not the local accent that worried the teachers but the children's 'inability to express themselves'.¹ In fact the researcher was informed that the girls were better than the boys in expressing themselves:

"That's if the boys will let them have a say ..."

"It does tend to be the boys who throw out answers quicker, but when you get down to it, the girls do tend to grasp the basic concept far more than the boys".

Upon discussing the children's pre-school experience most of the teachers regarded this as being limited. In one class the teacher told the researcher:

"They come into school and they don't know what colours are even".

On another occasion:

"They don't know even what scissors are, or how to use them".

Also, in an infants' class:

"You find you have to repeat yourself over and over again before something sinks in".

In one class there had been an ongoing discussion about the sun and moon and what the basic differences were:

1. Dock Side referred certain children with specific speech defects, i.e. cleft palate, to a speech therapist.

Teacher: Who can tell me what is the difference between the sun and the moon.

Justin: The sun comes out at night.

Jenny: No it doesn't!

Kevin: It keeps you warm.

Teacher: What does?

Kevin: The moon.

Lisa: Silly, that's the sun!

Teacher: That's right.

Justin: But Miss, the sun's shining and it's cold ... look I think it's snowing.

All attention is turned towards the window where Justin has pointed:

Teacher: (now getting exasperated) but we've talked about the seasons and why it's cold and why it's warm.

Kevin: I still say it's the moon.

Teacher: What is?

Kevin: That keeps you warm, 'cos Justin says so. Look outside, the sun's shining and it's cold outside.

Lisa: The moon only comes out at night, and it's got something to do with the sea.

Justin: Next she'll be telling us it dives in.

Tracey: You're just being silly.

Teacher: (who thinks the conversation has gone far enough). I'll tell you once more. It is the sun that shines during the day ... it gives the earth light and warmth. The moon comes out at night. It also controls the tide of the sea.

It is this sort of discourse that the teachers regard as evidence of the children's lack of concentration.

The teachers' judgements of the children's behaviour were made on a number of bases. Although the children could be quiet, non-aggressive and co-operative, their negative behaviour (squabbling, shouting and screaming) was judged as more fundamental, presumably because they have 'poor backgrounds', and thus they were compared unfavourably to their own children:

"My children don't behave like that".

The teachers also compared Dock Side to other schools they had taught in:

"I've taught in better schools than this ... you know in middle class schools. Children were certainly better behaved there".

In a previous school I taught in, under no circumstances would the children have behaved in such a manner ... it just wouldn't have been allowed".

The teachers tended to "compare notes" in the staffroom, sympathising and reinforcing each other's views by recalling similar incidents of boys' hooliganism and girl's bad language.

A cultural gulf exists between the ordinary teacher and the ordinary child in Dock Side. Teachers have a specific ideal of what the 'normal' pupil is, or at least ought to be. The discrepancy between their 'ideal' and 'reality' was blamed upon certain social factors which were said to retard and impede their 'efforts' and neutralise their attempts to improve 'standards'. It was parents, particularly the mothers, and the home background that came in for criticism. The children's 'poor behaviour' and 'slow progress' were due to the conditions and the way they were brought up. Lack of facilities, physical limitations, noise and distraction of the television were all pointed to as factors which cause children to fare so badly at school.

"It's the mothers I blame ... they don't look after their children properly".

"What can you expect in this sort of neighbourhood ... kids are just left to look after themselves".

"The boys especially are allowed to run wild. I wouldn't expect any of my sons to speak to me the way some of these lads do".

In general parents were described in negative terms: fathers frequently 'in and out of work', who 'drank a lot'; mothers who are 'always at bingo'.

These typifications were constructed by the teachers from their own experiences and observations of the children. Some were conspicuously neglected and not exactly 'well cared for'. Their clothes were 'inappropriate' for the type of weather; old clothes - obvious 'hand-me-downs' - were frequently worn; shoes too big or too small, cast-off coats with missing buttons and broken zips, dirty underwear and soiled woollens were regularly seen. Children arrived late for school or were absent simply because there was insufficient food in the house. The male teacher of the top infants' class, a kindly man, passed to the researcher, the inside of an empty packet of cigarettes. On the back were the words:

"Sorry Karl didn't come to school this morning as his dad's sick pay didn't come and I couldn't send him with nothing to eat".

Thank you
Mrs. Lawrence.

Girls especially are kept home to 'mind' either a younger child or the house while the mother goes off to take another child to the clinic; or to wait for the 'clubman' or to pay the rent. Sometimes they are even kept home to do the weekly washing at the local launderette.

Teachers' direct encounters with parents hardly endears either group to one another. On a particular open-day, when as usual only the mothers had arrived, disparaging remarks had been heard in the staff-room afterwards:

"Did you see that Mrs. Black; she was all 'tarted up' and her hair was filthy!"

"They just sit there smoking and the noise they make ... I couldn't hear myself think. They let the toddlers run loose and they get up to all sorts of mischief".

In general the staff and officials complained that parents take little interest in their children and even less in the school.¹ Parents meanwhile, find some teachers 'standoffish', 'make you feel small', and 'some look at you as if you were muck'. Despite the fact that the majority of teachers attempted to make the parents welcome it was obvious that a wide social distance existed between school staff and parents.² But the implications of this social distance were mediated through the fact that the school and its staff had a detrimental view of parents' "incompetence and irresponsibility". In discussions and interviews with the teachers they categorised the sort of 'problems' that existed in terms such as these:

Absent parent	- father 'run off' or in prison
Accumulated debts	- incurred by overspending with 'clubs', 'catalogues', etc.
Overcrowding	- housing conditions poor, too many kids
Sporadic unemployment	- lack of consistency in obtaining a job
Family instability	- a succession of 'uncles' 3
Absent mother	- dead or 'run off'

Given that the children are inevitably looked upon as 'educational failures' and 'underachievers', the teachers root this in some aspect of the family experience and are thus able to assure themselves that they are doing the 'best job possible' given the very difficult circumstances that they have to work with. They themselves are not to blame, nor are the children to blame, it is the family background.

-
1. Schools are, of course, keyed to the middle class child-centred family in which parents do 'involve themselves' in their children's lives.
 2. See March, L., and Abrams, S., 1966: The Education Shop, Advisory Centre for Education, for an analysis of why schools do not communicate effectively with working class parents.
 3. This category was viewed far more detrimentally than if the father was 'missing'.

The strain which is set up as a result of the difference between their beliefs and ideology¹ as teachers and their actual experiences in Dock Side is relieved because they felt in the final analysis that it was not their fault but the fault of the 'home background'.² Thus collectively the teachers are able to come to terms with the problems in their situation.³

Organisation of the School

'Material and social constraints'⁴ present the teacher with a series of management problems. This section will deal with the ways in which teachers and staff personnel solve such problems, including the device of stratifying pupils' identities, particularly with regard to gender. A teacher will be required to live up to the 'good teaching practice' standards set by the wider community of professional colleagues and, more crucially, by those who are in a position of power over her within the school itself. In addition parents and colleagues will look to her to maintain social order in the classroom and school.⁵

Mrs. Bosworth's definition of the aims of 'her' school places considerable

1. Will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

2. See King, 1978: op.cit.

3. Becker, H.S. et al., 1961: Boys in White, Chicago University Press, suggest that when people find themselves in an organisation facing a common set of problems and where they are in a situation which allows them considerable interaction over time, the participants will develop a group culture, a body of organised perspectives which will support them and aid them in coming to terms with the problems in their situation.

4. These constraints include pupil-teacher ratio, architectural facilities and limitations, classroom layout and other human and non-human resources at the teachers' disposal.

5. For further studies on how social order is maintained see Sharp & Green, 1975: op.cit., and King, 1978: op.cit.

emphasis upon teachers running 'orderly' and 'constructive' classrooms. The way the teachers and headperson 'achieved' such aims was by operating with somewhat inflexible views of many of the children and this served to confirm the staff's categorisation of the home background and gender.

In theory, though the social distance between the sexes, recognised by the physical insignia of old Victorian schools, is not seen as a pervasive philosophy anymore, practices involving the separation of the sexes were still commonplace. Given that a significant portion of the total energy required to operate a classroom is spent in the mundane business of managing the movement of social traffic and of responding to violations of institutional expectations, the majority of teachers used preconceived notions of gender categories to cut down on their 'management' problems.

By organising the children into gender subgroupings the teachers hoped to isolate the disruptive element amongst the boys and thereby halve the 'management' problem. Teachers often exhort the gender groups to better behaviour or performance by comparing them with each other. This was done in the hope that the boys would come 'into line' like the girls:

"Can't you boys do as you've been told.
The girls don't behave like that".

"Why can't you do as the girls do; try
and behave yourselves".

Ironically the very categories used to make the boys conform could be interpreted by the latter as securing status. The categories of 'masculinity' and 'femininity', so pervasive in this area - the worst insult a boy can receive is to be called a 'sissy' or to have his

behaviour regarded as 'feminine' - are strongly reinforced. Slights from the teacher such as:

"Stop wandering around like an old woman Simon,
and find yourself something to do".

"Don't be such a 'great soft girl' John!"

These comments were used to control boys' behaviour. In such a catchment area to have one's 'masculinity' questioned is an insult difficult to live down. In the Empsall Road a display of aggression by working class boys is a concomitant of 'masculinity'¹ and certainly the boys displayed such aggression in school. The teachers saw themselves as a kind of captive target for such social aggression and thus inevitably in the 'firing line':

"What can you do with kids like these. All
the lads want to do is to do manual work
like their dads. As for the girls ... well"

"There was one lad up on the roof of the school,
throwing slates down at us".

The dichotomy in behaviour between the sexes and the general 'poor' background of the children was the foundation of the methods which teachers used in the classroom and throughout the school to control girls and boys. The ultimate sanction of corporal punishment was used in Dock Side school. The teachers' feelings of frustration, combined with the belief that it is necessary to rigidly control the youngsters, intensifies the classroom struggle between teachers and taught.

Because of the polarisation between masculinity and femininity with the

1. Middle class parents regard this as being less the case for their sons, see Klein, Josephine, 1965: Samples from English Cultures, Vols. I & II, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

boys' ensuing attempts to impose their 'masculinity'; because of the 'deficient' background of most of the children and because of the Headperson's overall philosophy of containment and control, Dock Side staff imposed a rigid pattern of organisation upon the school which reflected class and gender categories.

The Nature of Learning

The nature of the learning process retains many similarities with traditional methods of primary education. Regurgitative singing of tables by rote, for instance, is still practised. In the early part of this century, Robert Roberts states:

"... working class school kids were taught the ability to take in facts and reproduce them unchanged when required".

Roberts, 1978: p.12

Richard Hoggart, writing on a period some thirty years later, remarked that there was:

"Little training in their (working class children) education in the handling of ideas or in analysis".

Hoggart, 1957: p.102

and that the children

"... have little idea of an historical or ideological pattern or process".

Hoggart, 1957: p.191

Forty years later in an urban traditional primary classroom, children are still taught that five times nine is forty five; that London is the capital of England; that there are five oceans and seven continents and to know all the relevant names. Why? "Because the teacher says so!" They will not have an inkling of the significance of such knowledge - that is how their parents were taught. A parent will soon begin to

worry if their child is unable to recite the multiplication tables. It is a concrete and immediate sign to them that their child is "learning".¹

The nature of this learning is justified by the belief that the children come from homes which are "culturally deprived" (a term which refers to the complex of variables which is believed to be responsible for retarding the child's progress in school)² and by the conception that the school should aim to compensate the children for their under-privileged backgrounds (Sharp & Green, 1975). This 'type' of child is seen as difficult to teach in the sense of being relatively impervious to the teacher's normal techniques and presentation of materials:

"The children come from such a barren background ... their lives are barren ... their minds are barren".

"It's important to get some facts into them, so at least they'll be able to take some skills with them which will enable them to cope with the outside world".

"Most of these kids are going to end up in semi-skilled or unskilled jobs ... one just has to be realistic".

Hence the teachers' conception of the curriculum in the organisation of their classrooms centres upon children's 'needs' and 'interests'. But such a definition entails teaching children a 'practical' form of knowledge.³

-
1. See Gretton, John & Jackson, Mark, 1976: William Tyndale: Collapse of a School or a System? Allen & Unwin, London, Chap. 4, pp.47-48, for an enlightening comparison of the nature of learning and how parents evaluate knowledge.
 2. See Keddie, Nell, (Ed.) 1973: Tinker, Tailor ... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation, Penguin, Harmondsworth, for discussion on how this is used to explain failure at school among children of various ethnic and social class groups.
 3. See Young, Michael, F.D. (Ed.) 1971: Knowledge and Control, MacMillan, London, for criticisms of existing assumptions and perspectives that are counted as 'legitimate knowledge'.

Moreover, within this 'knowledge' lies a sexual division (which will be discussed in a later chapter) pertaining to 'masculine' and 'feminine' attributes of personality and skills. Thus the content and nature of learning necessitates hierarchical differentiation of the pupils by gender as well as class, in order that the teachers may solve the problems they are confronted with and provide some legitimation for the allocation of their time and energy.

When we view curricula materials for the primary classroom we thus find two basic divisions: class and gender; a world which specifically reflects certain class values but also gender values. The books that children learn to read from reveal that the sky is blue, the fields are green and that all children live in nice, neat little houses with a garden, play with expensive-looking toys and are looked after by a faceless, selfless woman, who never goes out to work at Bird's Eye¹ or ever looks tired (Northern Women's Education Study Group, 1972). Neil Postman states that an important function:

"... of the teaching of reading is to make students accessible to political and historical myth".

Postman, 1973: p.89

Being minimally literate means for the majority of children that they will become accessible to standard, brand beliefs that encompass class and gender. Teaching kids in a 'mental pawnshop'² fashion means the contents of the school-book world will go unchallenged.

1. A food processing factory where a percentage of the pupils' mothers are employed.

2. A term coined by Roberts, 1978: op.cit.

Most children's books deny the "reality" of the working class child (and even more so the working class girl), by leaving out all manner of significant experiences, for example working mothers, unemployment and single parent families.¹ School books purport to be 'real' and researchers have consistently reported that not only do they teach children to read, but that they also mirror the non-school world and put a seal of approval on patterns of behaviour.²

The researcher examined most of the books being used in all classes of the four schools. The major infant readers were the ever-faithful 'Janet and John' books, Ladybird and Breakthrough to Literacy. Again recent research has analysed all these series and there is little point in replicating their knowledgeable and competent findings, but it is essential to stress that they do play an integral part in the purveying of false images and myths encompassing class and gender.

Extra-Curricular Activities

Extra-curricular activities such as sport, visits, excursions and clubs are all seen in terms of their capacity to extend children's experiences both within and outside the school.³ But to a certain extent this was limited by the lack of such resources as finance and time. In Dock Side

-
1. See Lobban, Glenys, 1977: "Sexist Bias in Reading Schemes", Michael Hoyles (Ed.), The Politics of Literacy, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London; and Moon, C., 1974: Sex-role stereotyping in books for young children, unpublished Dip.Ed. Thesis, Bristol University.
 2. See Northern Women's Education Study Group, 1972: "Sex-role learning: a study of infants readers" in Michelene Wandor (Ed.) The Body Politic, Stage One, London; Children's Rights Workshop, 1976: Sexism in Children's Books: Facts, Figures and Guidelines, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London; and Byrne, Eileen, 1978: Women and Education, Tavistock, London.
 3. See King, 1978: op.cit.; and Mays, 1962: op.cit.

very few educational visits were arranged because it was found difficult to get the parents to pay for them, either because they were unable or unwilling:

"We have tried to organise trips to museums and once we arranged a day on a farm, but the parents weren't eager to pay for them".

"It's difficult when money's short ... mind you some parents can't see the 'sense' in organising such trips".

There was also the 'problem' of the behaviour of the Dock Side children:

"Some of these kids would run wild in a museum ... I can just see it now ... it'd be like letting a dog off its lead".

"Schools on this 'road' haven't exactly got a 'good reputation' ... a lot of places aren't keen to have the pupils 'tramping' over their premises".

One of the teachers had attempted to form 'cub' and 'brownie' troupes - but with a uniform that costs well over a few pounds, thus biting deep into the already over-stretched household budget, there were not many recruits.

However in the junior section of the school efforts to put together a football team and to inject enthusiasm into it have been successful, and the teachers involved were feeling quite pleased with themselves when they told the researcher:

"Getting the boys involved in the football team is one way of harnessing all that aggression and energy and at the same time letting them do something for the school ... you know, giving something back".

Getting 'involved', especially for the boys, was seen to be particularly important - providing them with a way of being 'successful' and proving their 'masculinity'. There were, however, no such team games arranged

for the girls. Although they played rounders and netball, the school did not arrange for visiting teams to come and compete or arrange 'away' games¹ as they did for the boys. But one girl was allowed to play in the football team during practice games, but this was sporadic and she was subject to a good deal of harrassment from the boys themselves, which probably enforced her decision to stop playing after a while.

So we have a situation in which the 'children in this school', and especially the boys, are defined as poor in behaviour - and where activities and visits were rarely arranged but where the major activity - football - was to the advantage of the boys, whose extreme forms of behaviour - appropriately categorised as 'masculine' - were seen as needing to be harnessed and contained. This approach was also reflected in the organisation of the spatial areas. The yards surrounding the school buildings are divided by walls and doorways for the various age-groups and sexes. The largest area is kept specifically for football as there are no houses on that side of the school and this area is dominated by the boys. The researcher was informed by a teacher on playground duty:

"Separate play areas were kept in force so that boys could play football without impeding the girls. It seems a bit silly to get rid of the walls between the playgrounds as they are quite useful in certain ways".

When it was pointed out that the largest space was given entirely over to boys for their use the teachers explained that this was not as unfair as it seemed:

1. The boys particularly enjoyed 'away' games as it meant a long interval away from school and a journey to a different part of the city.

"After all boys have much more energy to expend than girls so therefore it's only natural that they should require more space in order to do so".

The yard for the girls was adequate but not large enough for playing any organised games. When asked if girls wanted to play football as well, teachers merely shrugged and said the problem never arose.

Summary of Dock Side

The children in Dock Side are seen by the staff as the products of largely 'unstable' and 'uncultured' backgrounds, with parents who are "irresponsible, incompetent, uninterested and unappreciative of education"; they are thus regarded as 'slow in their academic ability' and rather 'rough hewn in their behaviour'. Such definitions have consequences for the organisation and policies of the school and for the actions of the teachers in the classroom.

To counteract such previous 'mishandling' the overall ethos of the school stressed obedience and docility. The children have to learn that obedience and respect for authority are important 'virtues' that they should submit to. Throughout all this the 'spectre' of gender differences dominates their learning and experience in school, as it does in the home, only in a much more regulated and hierarchical form.¹ The school, in its efforts to control the children, reinforces the already existing polarisation between girls and boys by using the category of gender in both discipline and spatial organisation.

1. Sara Delamont (1980) reports this in her book: Sex Roles and the School, Methuen, London.

Mrs. Bosworth's views about the girls and boys, and about the nature of education and classroom practices were urged upon the teachers, and she exercised a strong influence over teaching methods and activities. Rigid control and classroom management, though at variance with teachers' 'child-centred' ideologies,¹ meant the head and the school staff in general are able to hold onto their professional standards for children's behaviour. But in order to produce what they saw as 'reasonable' standards of behaviour and work, they 'relied' upon fairly rigid gender stereotypes.

APPLEGATE

The School

Entering Applegate, one cannot help but notice the stark contrast to Dock Side in terms of both the school and the neighbourhood. 'Typical' of a 'commuter village' (Pahl, 1965), in one sense villages like Applegate are genuine cross-sections of England, linking the old villages with the new technological society and spanning the extremes of any scale of socio-economic status; but in another sense they are relatively privileged, for they know nothing either of the blight of entrenched industrialism or of the slow demise of the agricultural village.

There is the obvious sign of affluence, not apparent in Dock Side, with mothers bringing their offspring in cars to the gates of the school. On

1. For a more thorough discussion see King, 1978: op.cit., and Sharp & Green, 1975: op.cit.

the whole, residents of the village live in owner-occupied housing and have, mainly, white-collar jobs. Physically, the school reflects the area it is situated in:¹ plate glass, space and green lawns. Although not a large school and somewhat overcrowded it represented the 'vogue' of the '60's for open-planned schools.

The original building is single storey with four classrooms leading off the main hall which doubles as the dining and assembly hall. Two extensions have been added to the school since it was opened in 1966. One is built onto the actual building itself, and causes problems for teacher and pupils of the Top Infants' class since the teachers and pupils of the 1st and 2nd year junior classes have to go through to get to their own rooms. The other extension, built eighteen months previously, is situated twenty yards or so from the main building and 'houses' the two top junior classes.² Despite the overcrowding, amenities and equipment were very good and up-to-date. There are two playgrounds situated on each side of the school, the larger one for the juniors and the smaller for the infants. Skirting the playground and surrounding the whole school are large playing fields with football posts in permanent position. It could be called an 'idyllic' setting: light, bright classrooms set in green fields and shrubberies, and surrounded by owner-occupied ranch-style housing.

-
1. This is not meant to imply that school buildings are necessarily homogeneous with socio-economic class of the catchment area.
 2. The headperson suggests that the reason for such 'modular' building is the fact that the planners have not allowed for the increasing housing development which has created an upsurge in numbers of children attending.

Certainly the feeling of being 'hemmed in', did not exist in this school. Even the playgrounds were different from Dock Side. Whereas in the latter they consisted of 'ginnels' and covered ways, Applegate had no covered playing space and was open to the vagaries of the wind and rain. This situation was exacerbated by the fact that the school was situated out in the open, flat eastern landscape. Facilities were not sharply demarcated between the sexes as they were in Dock Side; girls and boys shared the same toilets, cloakroom and playground. It was only in the two top junior classes that it was 'seen fit' for the sexes to have their own separate toilets.

Certainly, within this school there is a different aura, which could reflect the 'liberal' philosophy of the '60's: light, space and that school should be seen as a place to enjoy, despite its compulsory nature.

The Headperson

The headperson is male and the local Church Warden and reveals a pride in his position as head for eleven years. On her first visit to the school the researcher was informed:

"... that people of the same sort live here".

He regards himself as an 'old established Christian' and went on to say that all his members of staff were 'good Christians'. A concern for the moral and religious education of the pupils came high on his list of what makes a 'good' teacher.

When discussing what he referred to as "social problems" he stated:

"... only four children are given free dinners.
and they're from one-parent families".

He extended this 'lack of social problems' perspective by stating that during the 'Head Lice Survey' carried out that year, the results of his school "we're negative". Both these aspects he gave as good indicators of the area.

There is no friendly banter between the head and staff - he knows his place and they know their's. Teachers call him 'Sir' when addressing him and even when discussing him in his absence. Mr. Seaton fosters a high level of academic attainment within Applegate and is at pains to provide evidence of this. Sporadic tests, taken in the form of 'formal examinations', according to him, not only reveal the strength and weaknesses of individual pupils but also prepare them for the inevitable system of individual competition and examinations that most of them will confront later:

"It gives them a good solid grounding for their academic careers. Most of them will know what to expect by the time they come up to 'O' and 'A' levels".

Through the use of these 'tests' he was able to keep a strict record of children's academic progress:

"I like to make sure no child is falling behind. You never know, some of our pupils may have slipped through the net and be experiencing learning difficulties. If we spotlight the weaknesses we can work on those areas."

The children were exhorted to individual initiative and to prepare for a career,² and were imbued with aspirations of success and materialism. It was expected that they would behave 'well' and in general the children's

1. C.S.E.'s (the 'lower-grade' examinations) were never mentioned.
2. Klein, 1965: op.cit., states that middle class children were more concerned than working class children with how well they did at school (p.611).

behaviour was not defined as a 'problem' although there were some who were more boisterous than the generally-permitted level. But in all Mr. Seaton expected 'high standards' in both behaviour and attainment and in general his expectations were met. He maintained a sense of purpose and this was exemplified strongly in his attitude towards girls and boys. They should be aware of the "niceties" involved in interaction with each other and behave with due propriety toward the opposite sex. Mr. Seaton stated that above all:

"I cannot stand rude boys and noisy girls".

Mr. Seaton's policy in relation to parents was consistent with his definition of them as 'interested, informed and ambitious' for their children.¹ Most of these parents were seen as needing little advice from the school on educational topics, and as well able to select the sorts of secondary schools they desired for their children:

"They knew what they wanted when the children entered school at five years of age".

Home-school relations were fostered to meet the parents' expectations, as Mr. Seaton perceived them, of good progress in work and good levels of behaviour. His school had no formal association for its parents and depended entirely upon establishing personal contact when and if

1. Davis and Havighurst inform us that not only what the children did at school, but what they did at home and in their leisure time, was more closely supervised by middle class parents, see Davis, A., and Havighurst, R.J., 1946: "Social class and colour differences in child rearing", American Sociological Review, Vol. 11, pp.698-710. Also some writers have found higher-educated parents more interested in their children's schooling, with more frequent visits to school to discuss education with their child's teacher, see Floud, J., Halsey, A.H. and Martin, F.M., 1956: Social Class and Educational Opportunity, Heinemann, London.

the opportunity occurred. In addition to the usual Nativity Play there was a hand-picked school choir and recorder group which performed for parents and competed successfully in local competitions.¹ Sports Days and Open Evenings were regularly attended and in addition parents were free to visit whenever they wished to consult the headteacher on matters concerning their children's schooling. Applegate parents were always regular attenders at their children's school medical examination.²

Just as Mrs. Bosworth was keen to see her school as part of the neighbourhood so too was Mr. Seaton. He extended an invitation asking if any parents would be willing to help with jobs in school. As can be expected the response was from mothers who came on a regular basis to carry out light duties in helping teachers prepare lessons and generally providing immediate assistance in the education of their children. Because most of the fathers were at work all day it was seen as not possible for them to participate, but some helped out regularly on Saturdays with the school's junior football team, providing transport to 'away' matches and helping with coaching the team.

Mr. Seaton however insisted that the school was not without its 'problems' and recounted situations where some of the boys had behaved like a 'rougher element':

"... certainly not what you'd expect in this school".

Apparently one of these boys had stolen some articles and money from

-
1. Applegate were fortunate in acquiring a graduate in music employed as a part-time teacher and whose husband was the principal conductor of the local area orchestra.
 2. In Dock Side it was taken as given that the parents wouldn't come, hence, they were not invited.

pupils and teachers, and Mr. Seaton had been put into a situation of having to 'suspend' the boy, which meant it was also hard for the parents; after all the boy came from a 'very good home'.¹ He also reported some conflict between the owner-occupiers of Applegate and the council tenants and the few parents that came from Watton and Newby Grange. The former were sometimes 'stand-offish' and wouldn't talk to the others:

"Most of the parents who come from Watton and Newby Grange are agricultural workers; their families have been here for many years. I suppose they resent the 'newer' parents as it seems they only stay for a few years and then they move on".

The head informed me that probably the parents in Watton and Newby Grange felt isolated:

"They never really get involved with the school, but they are a few miles away and there isn't any public transport".

But despite this 'distance' from certain parents the head felt that in general the school and its pupils were fairly compatible. This may well imply that the ethos of the school was so strong, and the working class pupils so few in number, that they could be absorbed by it.

The Teachers

The teachers echoed the headperson's hopes and beliefs for the pupils:

"Most of these children will be quite successful".

"It's not often you find a below average child in this school".

"I would say most of these children are going to enter professional careers ... well the boys are!"

1. Apparently the boy lived in a large detached house and both his parents were teachers.

"Quite a lot are capable of going to college and university".

Their overall ability was viewed as 'above average' and in general the children were seen as able to get on with their work:

"They don't need to be told over and over again".

"They come into class and they know what's expected of them, and they get on with it".

The behaviour of the children in the classrooms at Applegate was not defined as a problem. There was not the overt aggression that some of the Dock Side boys exhibited. Good social manners were required from girls and boys whereas in Dock Side they were only hoped for, but it was expected as a matter of course that girls would be more mannerly than the boys. Indeed, girls' behaviour was held up as an example for boys to follow:¹

"You boys, that is not nice, you don't find the girls doing that".

"Will the girls show the boys how nicely they form a line by the door".

But although the conduct of boys was regarded as inferior to that of the girls they were not regarded as being the special nuisances of the class. Some teachers even wished they 'had a bit more about them' and would act 'like real boys'.

There was little discussion about the children's 'background' and none of the children were seen as having 'problem parents'. The teachers had vague but favourable conceptions of the children's homes and seldom

1. King, 1978: op.cit., noted in the three schools he studied that in the records there was a strong tendency for girls to receive more favourable assessments of behaviour.

discussed them, unlike the teachers at Dock Side. When work progress, behaviour or relations with other children were not satisfactory, this was attributed to unusual (and generally transitory) developments at home. One boy was having 'problems' because his father had recently died, whilst two sisters whose behaviour was below par were seen as like that because their mother was going through a rather 'sticky divorce'.

Virtually all the children wore 'sensible' and 'good quality' clothes and generally 'looked prosperous' compared to the children of Dock Side. Some children entered the 'reception' class, even able to read. "Not parrot-fashion neither but aware of the concepts"; which seemed to be seen as another sign of interested and knowledgeable parents.

'Parental interest' was also demonstrated for the teachers by the good response they had when they asked children to bring them things from home:

"Nothing 'garish' either ... you know, sensible things".

The 'sensible things' were books on mythology, the 'Mr' stories and Beatrix Potter animal stories. The parents were also very generous with 'gifts' of food and money for various activities such as trips, 'school fund' (euphemistically called), the harvest festival and Christmas gifts for the old-age pensioners within the immediate vicinity of Applegate.

Tidiness was not a problem within the class¹ and the children were

1. This was probably due to the fact that classrooms had more storage space (built-in cupboards) and were better designed.

exhorted to be helpful and considerate in keeping their surroundings 'nice'. Within this context of classroom orderliness and its management there exists a sexual division, where girls (from very early on) and boys are assigned tasks which reflect ideals of 'femininity' and 'masculinity': boys are expected to bring in and carry out the milk crate, empty the bins etc., whilst girls are expected to tidy up, keep the blackboard clean and run errands. These tasks were assigned as privileges for good behaviour and high standards of work and there was no shortage of volunteers. These 'privileges' were seen as part of the fact that these children could be 'trusted' and were 'efficient' at carrying them out.

The pupils in general were looked upon as 'normal' children with appreciative parents who showed great interest¹ in their children's upbringing and schooling. When they first entered school it was remarked upon that they were able to paint and crayon, they knew colours, traditional rhymes and stories. A further indication of the continuity between home and school was shown by the presence of parent helpers (mainly mothers) in the classroom and this was heightened since some of the mothers were themselves teacher-trained and so looked and behaved in a manner becoming a teacher when supervising play, reading stories and preparing craft materials.

Mr. Seaton attempted to exercise a tight control on the activities of his teachers, justifying this as 'keeping up high standards'. He expected

1. The child of well-educated parents has inestimable advantage, see Mays, 1962: op.cit., and Douglas, J.W.B., 1964: Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London.

them to have his expectations of high levels of success and standards of behaviour, urging them to 'stretch the children'. The teachers used a great deal of headperson reference control with the children.

"'Sir' wouldn't like that you know".

All in all the children in Applegate were, and were seen to be, much more 'articulate', 'bright' and in general above par, in comparison to the pupils of Dock Side. Relationships were good with parents on the whole, although some teachers were seen to bristle when particular parents came into talk about their child's progress. These parents lacked the deference which some teachers thought was due them.¹ They even on occasions questioned the teacher's competency, which all teachers regard as a slight.

Parents' educational practices at home could meet objections. One pupil was being consistently taught her 'tables' by her mother, and indeed the child was fairly knowledgeable to the point that she only stumbled over the 8 times and 9 times. The teacher insisted on 'having a word' with this particular parent, asking her to refrain from 'teaching' in such a manner. Another child whose parent was teaching him to 'real write'² had a letter sent home to her via her son, explaining why children of his age had not got to that stage yet. Such 'interference' was regarded by the teacher as an insult. Even more upsetting to them was the way some parents regarded them:

"They think we're not fit to teach their children".

"Her mother's really pushy ... she thinks we're all a bunch of cretins".

1. See King, 1978: op.cit., and Sharp & Green, 1975: op.cit.
2. Writing with 'joined up' letters and not 'block' ones.

"These 'high professional people', they think we're not competent enough to teach. One even has extra lessons for his son privately.

But in general there was equanimity between the teachers and parents of Applegate.

Organisation of the School

The tendency to impose control over movement in the working class school was not apparent in Applegate. Instead greater self-regulation¹ was expected. Forming lines at the door, waiting in queues and general classroom behaviour was expected without the need for continual supervision and repeated instructions.

The light, spacious classrooms swayed with movement, kept up by constant toing and froing and chattering. Facilities and equipment were good enabling the children to choose from a large range of toys, books and project equipment. Children appeared and disappeared as they moved from the reading room, the project area and back to the main classroom.

Architecturally and spatially the school seemed more amorphous than Dock Side and was not built to keep the two sexes apart. Except in the Top two junior classes, there was no sex-segregation in the use of toilets and cloakrooms; girls and boys shared the same cloakroom and also the same playground (although there were separate playgrounds for the juniors and for the infants "as juniors tended to be a bit rougher at that age" - as the researcher was informed by a teacher).

Expectations of behaviour from the girls and boys, however, reflected the

1. See Pahl, J.M. & Pahl, R.E., 1971: Managers and their Wives, Penguin, Harmondsworth, who discuss the socialisation of the middle class child both at home, and more briefly in school.

general ethos of the school. Mr. Seaton expected a certain "chivalry" from the boys and a "seemliness" from the girls. Extreme 'masculine' behaviour was frowned upon although (as the researcher will later show) a certain degree of aggression and boisterous activity from the boys was seen as 'natural'. Despite the lack of architectural sex-segregation, various aspects of supervision and activity based themselves upon gender differentiation. Lining up, queueing and assembling reflected gender demarcation, but far less than in Dock Side, nor was this seen as enabling teachers to maintain control over the boys in particular, as high standards were also expected of them. This practice could be due to the middle class expectations of girls and boys¹ which have been described as consisting of an adherence to:

"... two sets of rigid standards, those of ladylike behaviour at all times and those of the dominant male culture and educational system".

Delamont, 1978: p.140

This means that to some extent, girls are seen as being different from boys and steps are to be taken to incorporate the values of 'femininity' and 'masculinity' in their schooling.

In all aspects of life, Mr. Seaton saw a dichotomy existing which was both 'natural' and taken-for-granted:

During a Christmas Carol rehearsal he was duly admonishing his pupils:
"If there is talking between carols, you will write them over and over again. Silence is something we must all learn as well as other things".

1. See Delamont, Sara, 1978: "The Double Conformity Trap: The Contradiction in Ladies' Education", in Sara Delamont & Lorna Duffin (Eds.), The Nineteenth Century Woman, Her Cultural and Physical World, Croom Helm, London.

There is a pause as the children settle into silence.

"Right we are going to learn 'While Shepherds Watch Their Flocks by Night', girls you're going to sing verse two. Boys you be looking at verse three ... you'll be singing that".

Whilst the children shuffled and stretched, trying to get comfortable in their cramped cross-legged positions on the floor, a teacher reads out the verse ...

"Fear not said he ..." "Actually it would be better and more appropriate if the boys sang it" the headteacher interrupts.

More significant were the ways in which behaviour was sanctioned by teachers in this school. Although rigid control and strict sex-segregation did not exist in Applegate, there was an underlying philosophy of gender expectations which affected the range of the repertoire of sanctions used by the teachers, and this had a bearing upon pupil behaviour. As stated before, pupil behaviour in general was not seen as a major problem, hence it was possible to 'isolate' the few who deviated from the 'standard norms'. But underlying these 'norms' were certain assumptions about gender.

As in all schools, the researcher observed classes according to age, starting with the 'reception' class, and finishing with the top juniors. It was aimed, as far as possible to begin the period of observation at the beginning of a term, so that the researcher could record the process of how 'new' pupils¹ were incorporated into the school's overlying routine and philosophy (discipline and achievement). Most of the new

1. By 'new' pupils, the researcher means those children just beginning their school 'career'.

children acknowledged the authority of the teacher from the outset.¹ This propensity is reinforced, ignorance is dispelled and ambiguities clarified² as they watch the other children and imitate them.³ If a child transgressed any of the expected norms of good behaviour, they were soon informed of the specific norms required. These were often specified by genders:

"Sara, in this school we don't expect such behaviour from little girls, kindly remember that".

"That is not the way little girls come into a room Emma; Tina go and show her how young ladies enter the room".

"Simon, I know you're excited with it being your first day at school, but we expect our boys to act like young gentlemen".

In general all of the children were directed towards high standards of behaviour, but this guidance incorporated certain aspects of gender categories. Girls and boys in fact were subjected to rather different exposure to the norms governing classroom and pupil life.⁴

The classes of older children, the girls and boys needed little reminding of the behaviour that was expected from them or of the tasks which they had been allocated. When class was dismissed they all stood up and quietly made two lines - one of girls, one of boys. Their behaviour,

1. The research by Jean Jones and Basil Bernstein showed that mothers do prepare their children for the prospect of school and this may include defining the teacher as a person with authority; see Jones, Jean and Bernstein, Basil, 1974: "The preparation of the infant-school child" in W. Brandis and B. Bernstein, Selection and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

2. This could also be because of the exposure of middle class children to playschools and kindergartens.

3. See King, 1978: op.cit.

4. The researcher will go into greater detail in Chapter IX of this thesis.

for the most part, conformed to the teachers' and staff's expectations of their social class - and of their gender. If the boys - individually or collectively - behaved in a way likely to cause concern, they were exhorted to adhere to the behaviour expected from and assumed to be provided by the girls:

"You boys are being silly today. Take a 'leaf out of the girls' book' and try and behave".

"David, if I placed you with the girls perhaps you'd follow their example of being quiet and considerate".

In Applegate there was little cultural gulf between teachers and children, who were recognised as coming from 'good quality' homes. Nevertheless, the physical organisation, although distinctively less ritualised than Dock Side, did reflect beliefs and attitudes according to class and gender.

The Nature of Learning

Unlike Dock Side, Applegate favours a more "progressive" approach to schooling, priding itself on the non-streaming arrangements of all classes. But like other schools they require children to learn and provide evidence of that 'learning'. Regurgitative singing of knowledge was rarely apparent; the active seeking out of knowledge involving field excursions to the 'outer world' was encouraged - from a walk to the duck-pond which is situated 200 yards away, in the village, to an overseas trip to St. Malo to improve their French.

Particularly in the infant classes, there was considerable evidence of

informality and learning 'through play',¹ as well as the 'skills' periods used to achieve literacy and numeracy. Certainly, lessons appeared to be more flexible in their nature in that there was a greater degree of individualised, as opposed to standardised instruction and assignments. Teachers in general "respected the individuality" of the child more than was the case in Dock Side. More time was spent on such matters as individualised work of a personally "creative" nature, such as arts and crafts, "creative writing", and individualised "research" by the pupils on topics of their choosing. In addition, as a mechanism for instituting the more individualised curriculum, a greater degree of pupil choice was seen as necessary. A range of alternative assignments were commonly presented to the pupils in the class to choose from in light of their own "capabilities", "desires" or "interests". The children were, by and large, taught concepts and processes rather than just facts and figures. The boundary between 'work' and 'play'² was in some ways not clearly marked; yet these categories were clearly in the minds of the teachers; for instance if children brought 'toys' deemed to be 'inappropriate' they were soon informed of this and the toys inevitably confiscated:

"Darran you know you're not allowed guns in the classroom - those sort of toys are not nice".

-
1. Bernstein states that in the working class, work and play are "very strongly classified and framed" whilst for certain sub-groups of the middle class, work and play are "weakly classified and weakly framed" and that no strict line may be drawn "between work and play" (p.51), see Bernstein, Basil, 1975a: "Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible", in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. III, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London. Whereas King, 1978: op.cit., suggests that play was seen as a prelude to work when applied to young children (pp.20-21).
 2. See King, 1978: ibid, for a thorough discussion of how teachers define what is work and play.

"Playing games" also had to meet with the teachers' approval. Board games, word games and even threading a string of beads were acceptable as they were seen as 'educational'. But the inappropriateness of games like 'cat's cradle' and 'blow football' were soon brought to the children's attention:

"That is not a game for the classroom, Emma".

"John you can play with that in the playground but not in the classroom".

The purpose of work and play was to extend the children, whereas in Dock Side it was seen to 'occupy' them.

In mathematics, Applegate children were seen as capable of grasping the concepts of Fletcher Maths¹ despite its apparent 'esoterism'. The children were also encouraged to write stories but there was inevitable guidance by the teachers as to suitable content.

Although work and play may have had little distinction in the infant section of Applegate, this was by no means the case in the junior section of the school.² A high academic standard was expected from all the junior pupils with Mr. Seaton keeping a strict eye on their progress. School work became more individualised, with the word 'cheating' taking on a certain significance. Here pupils learn that 'co-operation' is 'cheating'.³ It can be seen that junior pupils are steadily prepared

-
1. In King's (1978) ibid., study he states that teachers' acceptance of the Fletcher books was partly an acknowledgement of their implicit acceptance of the 'expert authority' of the authors (p.32).
 2. Blyth (1965) reports that "some teachers and some parents, and therefore some children, still tend to regard this transition as basically one from play to work". (p.59). See Blyth, W.A.L., 1965: English Primary Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 3. See Spender, Dale, 1980b: "Educational Institutions: Where Co-operation is called cheating", in Dale Spender & Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, Women's Press, London.

for the academic careers within secondary schools which it is assumed they will take.

The notion that the children have 'individual propensities' for learning, was qualified by the acceptance of the relevance of gender. During a project where the pupils were using card sections to make up items and then write about them, there was a 'tustle' between a girl and a boy over the card sections which make up a train. The teacher came over:

"Jenny, let Gareth have it; boys like trains.
Why don't you find something else. Look!
There's one of a house, and there's a caterpillar here".

Jenny shrugs her shoulders and picks one of the other card sections up and proceeds to put it together. The fact that boys and girls were defined by their teachers as having different interests was confirmed in their written and creative work. Teachers encouraged differentiations from very early on. In the reception class the children practised their writing skills by tracing or copying the words the teacher had pencilled in. But the children never had complete autonomy in their writing as the teachers' conveyed what they considered 'appropriate' for their class or for their gender:

Timothy had written:
"I had a fight with my friend and I beat him, and I was happy".
The teacher remarked that it was no way for friends to behave and:
"I don't expect boys in my class to fight.
Go and write about something else".

Emma's story was about football:
"I wish for some football boots so that I can play games".
The teacher read it stating:
"Perhaps something different than football boots would be appropriate, Emma. How about slippers, or ballet shoes?"
Emma vigorously shook her head in a way that showed she did not endorse the teacher's views.

When studying the curriculum materials the researcher found the early readers portrayed an idealised middle class family life which in point of fact possibly only the Applegate children 'fit'. The Ladybird books, however, had been brought 'up to date'. Jane was depicted as an energetic small person like her brother 'Peter'. Garbed out in shirt and jeans she took on the 'tomboy' role.

In the vein of 'white-collar' schools Applegate seemed more aware of stereotypical roles, and also had more money to buy the new books, whereas schools such as Dock Side put up with old material. But some books were still retained which displayed stereotypical images. In "Sounds for Reading" women were depicted as mums, nuns, nurses and witches whereas men were depicted as sailors, guardsmen, kings, umpires and Indians.

Text-books within Applegate also depicted stereotyped images, particularly in maths and history, a feature which other research has shown to be widespread.¹ 'Fletcher' maths, the system in general use in the classrooms throughout the country, as well as in Applegate, revealed mathematical sequences showing girls gathering flowers, boys playing marbles, girls buying umbrellas, handbags, games and dolls, and boys buying trumpets, aeroplanes and trucks (Fletcher Maths - Level II, Bk.1).

Extra-Curricular Activities

Schools in this type of catchment area are much more likely to provide extra-

1. See Spender, Dale, 1980a: "Education or Indoctrination" in Spender & Sarah (Eds.), op.cit., and Scott, Marion, 1980: "Teacher Her a Lesson: Sexist Curriculum in Patriarchal Education" in Spender & Sarah (Eds.) ibid.

curricular activities in the form of clubs and outings.¹ Football, music and chess came high on the list of clubs, whilst numerous educational visits were made to farms, factories, museums and 'other interesting places'. Mr. Seaton informed the researcher of the trips organised to France for his juniors to improve their French.

Chess and music was open to both girls and boys, but football 'belonged' specifically to the boys who gained extra privileges as a result of being part of the team (see Chapter IX). The researcher found in traditional areas like sport that there was still an overt tendency to 'value' male pursuits over 'female' pursuits and high priority was given to 'male activities'. The playground and the field were obviously marked out for the game of football, usually thought of as a male sport, whilst netball had to adapt to this pitch. The netball posts had to be brought out of storage for each game and replaced in the store-room immediately the game was over, while the goal posts for football were permanently fixed. Despite the "choice" open to both sexes in all sports, I never saw the boys playing netball, though it was observed that girls attempted to join the boys in a game of football or even have their own game. Both attempts were frustrated however, due to the fact that teachers stated:

"It causes too much trouble, the lads simply won't play if the girls join in".

"We haven't got the time to train the girls ... it would take too long ... we haven't got the facilities or the time".

1. See King, 1978: op.cit., and Sieber, 1976: op.cit.

Summary of Applegate

Despite their social awareness, they did differentiate on the basis of gender. Perhaps this was not surprising since in Applegate (as in all schools) sex differences between pupils were highly visible, in that a teacher could see that a child being well or badly behaved was a boy or a girl, but differences in social background were relatively invisible.

Mr. Seaton's attitude was a reflection of "reality" within his school. High academic achievement and extended extra-curricular activities were used to 'stretch his charges' and like Mrs. Bosworth in Dock Side, he scrutinised the proceedings and routines in his school closely. Similarly, he was also rather authoritarian in his expectations of behaviour from the pupils; expectations which incorporated a male/female dichotomy. Where he differed from Mrs. Bosworth over this, was in the fact that he expected middle class conceptions of femininity to be observed by the girls and less aggressive behaviour from the boys.

Applegate teaching staff revealed more favourable attitudes towards parents than those at Dock Side, whose staff saw parents as incompetent and having no right to opinions about the education of their children. Certainly Mr. Seaton and his staff welcomed the presence of parents and had a small number of mothers in on various days to assist in the preparation of materials, and help with day-trips whilst fathers helped with sports events, thus reproducing familial relations within school.¹

1. Ellis et al., 1976: op.cit., have argued that working class parents are more intimidated in their relations to the school whereas their middle class counterparts have a greater influence upon the school. This substantiates the Plowden Report's hypothesis that a minority of articulate middle class people have more say in the running of schools than the larger 'less articulate' group, see the Central Advisory Committee, 1967: Children and their Primary Schools, H.M.S.O., London.

Although segregation of the sexes did not occur as much in Applegate as it did in Dock Side, nevertheless a clear 'social distance' was still maintained between girls and boys. The school practices of structuring what was 'femininity' and 'masculinity' were inevitably patterned through rituals and functions of physical and spatial ordering of classroom life.

LONG MEADOW ESTATE

The School

Situated on the edge of a sprawling housing estate the school overlooks Neat Marsh - a flat wasteland and farming area. The school is large and modern, with excellent facilities, but even so primary schools on Corporation Estates are seen as inferior to those in predominantly middle class suburbs.¹ Long Meadow primary school is an imposing two-storey building housing twelve large classrooms and a spacious nursery section. It has two large halls and a dining room.² It is set in a large, grassy area surrounded by streets and terraces of council houses. Though built in the '60's "closed" classrooms³ were maintained within

-
1. See Kemp, L.C.D., 1955: "Environmental and other characteristics determining attainment in primary schools", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp.67-77. Also Floud et al., 1956: op.cit., have shown that the bestowal of lavish facilities on newly-built primary schools in rehousing areas is in itself inadequate to bring them abreast of middle class suburban schools either in attainment or in general "reputation"; while Musgrove, F., 1961: "Parents' expectations of the junior school", Sociological Review, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 167-180, also indicates how parental aspirations may differ in the two types of school.
 2. It was the only school whose hall did not 'double' as a dining room.
 3. See Kate Evans (1974) for a discussion of 'open' and 'closed' classrooms in her paper "The Spatial Organisation of Infant Schools", in Journal of Architecture, Research and Teaching, Vol. 3, pp.26-33.

the school. What was immediately visible were the corridors, interspersed with cloakrooms. Space, light and facilities were plentiful, with two large playgrounds (one for juniors and one for infants). Entering the plate-glass doors, two offices 'stand guard': the headperson's and the school secretary's. Immediately to the left of these were the main halls; the first revealed sporting apparatus, huge ropes hanging from the ceiling and a large stage that would create envy in any headperson. Passing through the door one came to the dining room, where meals were cooked on the premises, then beyond that lay the next hall, which, though lacking the sports equipment of the first hall, provided facilities for movement-to-music and for the infants to stage their plays. It was this network of halls which sectioned off the juniors from the infants and nursery.

The school is permeated with a sense of orderly tranquility; children went by in two files to their prospective classrooms, the walls were decked with murals, examples of children's artwork and 'creative' writings; the floors of the halls, warm and brown with polish, added to the smells that permeate a large primary school. Here, there was no sense of being hemmed in.

In addition to the classrooms there was a staffroom, a 'projects' room fitted with small cooking ovens, and a room which was kept for music and to give extra instruction for those with 'learning problems'.

All in all the school reflects a painless, albeit compulsory, atmosphere of education for young children.

The Headperson

The researcher was shown into the office of the headperson who is female, a Quaker and an avid supporter of comprehensive education. Mrs. Hartley informed the observer that the area was one of low incomes, with many social problems. Out of the 246 children in the school 70 have free dinners. The school also provided nursery facilities for 30 children between the ages of three to five, for which there was a long waiting list with priority given to those children with 'serious' background problems such as one-parent families, mothers who were battered, fathers imprisoned, and children who have a history of neglect.¹ Priorities were arranged in order of three category lists ranging from 'serious' to 'general', such as 'broken marriages'. The headperson also informed the researcher that she takes in an equal amount of 'normal' children to set standards for the 'poorer' children.²

Mrs. Hartley reflected strength, warmth and competence in her position as head of a large council estate primary school with all its attendant 'problems'. She encouraged children from 'good' homes to co-operate with

1. In the past nursery education has been unmistakably linked with economic and social 'deprivation', (except perhaps the War Years) a point of view that is closely expressed in the Introduction to a series of Reports on Children under Five Years of Age in Public Elementary Schools by women inspectors, issued by the Board of Education in 1905. Even today, priority is still regularly given to some form of 'social handicap' in deciding which children should be admitted to nursery schools - see National Union of Teachers, 1964: The State of Nursery Education, N.U.T., London (p.13). And since the children are to be 'pitied' in each case, nursery education tends to be associated with misfortune, like National Assistance. It appears that nurseries are to be found predominantly in working class areas, see Blyth, 1965: op.cit.
2. Due to the cutbacks in Education and the Conservative take-over of the Labour-held local council there was a move to decrease the numbers of children attending the nursery, thus requiring less staff. In fact the headperson had been forewarned by the Council to stop admitting the under-fives to the reception class, which again, would mean less staff required.

her view that they should respond warmly to children who were 'neglected' and were assumed to have 'difficulties' at home:

"John, is not as fortunate as the rest of you"
addressing a second year infants class,
"so I want you to be kind to him and look after
him. Will you do that children?"
The children eagerly nod their heads.

Aware of the social problems in her catchment area Mrs. Hartley did her best to relieve them. She exercised official responsibility in relation to medical inspections, milk, school meals and clothing;¹ contacted the external welfare agencies i.e. social workers, speech therapist etc., and generally involved herself with administrative duties.

Because she looks after 'external affairs', her teachers are able to 'get on with their job' without extra worries, and she exercised only light control over their teaching methods and activities, and demanded no reports either weekly or termly. She was sensitive to staff relations and knocked on the staff-room door before entering, ('this is their room') unlike Mrs. Bosworth who burst in upon her teachers as if trying to 'catch them out' in some way. Unlike Mr. Seaton, Mrs. Hartley participated in the 'kitty' for tea and coffee and joined the teachers for break-time. It was only at lunch-time did she leave them to chat. The teachers never grumbled about her (at least when the researcher was there) and considered themselves fortunate in having such a head. She was well-known as a person who came into conflict with 'the authorities' ('she sticks her neck out') by her insistence in keeping the nursery open. Arguments on trade union issues were common in the staffroom with

1. Mays, 1962: op.cit. points out that primary schools nowadays have a specific welfare role as they are the only neighbourhood institutions.

Mrs. Hartley present and she was often seen (locally) as leading her teachers "into battle". She encouraged all her teachers to attend union meetings, both locally and nationally, and regarded herself not as an 'autocratic head' but leader of a 'good team' of teachers. The teachers and staff in return respected and trusted Mrs. Hartley

The headperson's policy towards parents was to encourage them to get involved with their children's education but this was not always easy. She admitted to having no P.T.A., but regarded her school as having close links with the community. Most of the mothers with 'absent-husband' problems were said to come to the school for sympathy and advice,¹ and regarded Mrs. Hartley as a 'far more approachable person than the "social" (security)'. She dealt with any problems involving the parents, helping them to fill in forms, advising on health and financial matters as well as receiving abuse and threats for 'sticking her nose in where it's not wanted'.

In general, the Head felt there were good relations between parents and teachers and she encouraged fathers to help with football, whilst mothers helped with the jumble sales and other fund-raising activities which were then vital due to the 'cuts'. Open Days (held in the afternoons) were well-attended, especially by the mothers. And as with the teachers there was trust and respect for Mrs. Hartley from the majority of parents.

1. Blyth, 1965: op.cit., points out that it is reasonable to assume that a Head has some general competence and even authority to give advice to local people about their pressing personal problems (p.19).

The Teachers

All the teachers were very conscious of social problems in an area of high unemployment and most wanted to give of their best as teachers. But though they recognised that many of the 'social problems' were beyond the control of people in the catchment area nevertheless problems connected with the children and neglect and lack of discipline were firmly "laid at the parents' door" (usually the mother's):

"Kids in this area suffer from social deprivation. I mean there's one child here and she'll sit ... you know we sat on the wall in the sun this morning ... just telling me ... how she got up late this morning and didn't have any breakfast and I said Why?: and she said 'my mother was still in bed' and I learned the older ones had to get themselves off to school and you think just what chance ... what's going to happen there".

"These children tend to come from rather deprived backgrounds. I don't think education is going to hold much for them later".

"I wish parents would discipline the children more in the home... you know mothers just let them do anything".

"So many of them have got such poor backgrounds. I mean they take pictures home that they've done to show Mum, and Mum just says 'Oh another one' and tears it up".

"It's important that they should have the right values and behaviour ... especially today where a lot of children don't get it at home".

"Some parents are good ... but I think it's scarce ... just to be interested in the child and to talk to their children; that's what they lack, nobody talks to them at home ... nobody's interested in them".

The teachers' shared definition was that most of the children were average to below average in their progress in school work, "although there were some who were really quite bright". They did not regard the pupils as "unruly little animals" but implied that it was more that they were full of 'themselves', and 'quite a handful' or 'unable to sit still for five

minutes'. All in all, they could be 'very demanding', especially the boys. The pupils in general were untidy and seen to be careless, although the girls 'tend to be much more sensible than the boys' and can be 'relied upon' to be much more 'orderly and able to get on with their work'.

The children's progress was monitored continuously, but not as obsessively and painstakingly as at Applegate. Mrs. Hartley's approach is better characterised as keeping a 'friendly eye' on her charges. The school did not use one single reading scheme, as Mrs. Bardsley felt that teachers should use the scheme they felt 'happiest with', some teachers used more than one scheme in the class whilst others devised their own reading materials. As in most schools, there was a sex gap in reading,¹ with girls being regarded as reasonably proficient with boys lagging somewhat behind. In the remedial class boys outnumbered girls by six to one throughout the age range.²

Teachers referred to the 'limited lives' of the children - the latter made too many 'references to the telly' for their liking, with pupils singing television jingles.

"And they're allowed to stay up so late to watch some programmes".

Some of the children definitely looked tired upon arrival at school, but in general their demeanour was not 'neglected'. There were few

-
1. See Douglas, 1964, op.cit., and Lee, Anne, 1980: "Together we learn to read and write": Sexism and literacy", in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), op.cit.
 2. A point also noted by King, 1978: op.cit.

obscenities uttered, with few signs of bullying except towards one small boy in the Top Infants class, (a situation I will be discussing later). Many of the children were able to complete tasks such as painting, drawing, writing etc., although the teachers remarked upon the limited content of their work. Sometimes the teachers felt that there was too much 'bustle and hum' in the classroom - 'the hum' was not quiet enough. But the pupils were not too difficult to call to attention when the teacher asked for this.

The main concern of the teachers was that some of the children tended to be 'destructive' (or neglectful) with the classroom materials, leaving contents of their project scattered about, either dropping things and not bothering to pick them up, or stepping on things and still not bothering to pick them up. But in general 'the girls could be relied upon to be more careful' whilst the boys were seen as 'rather silly'. Teachers however, explained that the children were as they were, because of the way their parents had brought them up or that there were 'problems' in the home, i.e. single-parent family, father imprisoned, both parents out to work, bad debtors etc. Some parents were seen to 'spoil' or 'over-indulge' their children with 'whatever they want', and were 'allowed to have their own way'.

Conversation in the restroom revealed further aspects of the teachers' attitudes to the parents of their pupils. Commenting upon a recent and appreciable increase in family allowances (Spring, 1978), one teacher commented:

"Some women who have 10 children are going to receive about £23 a week".

Although her 'sums' were correct it did seem rather an exaggeration as the researcher was later informed by Mrs. Hartley that there was no pupil who attended the school who belonged to such a large family. Other teachers stated (in support of the statement quoted above):

- Teacher 1 "You wonder how women themselves will cope with such an increase".
- Teacher 2 "They'll only spend it on fags or bingo" replied another.
- Teacher 3 "Well I can't see them using it to 'better' themselves".
- Teacher 4 "Neither can I. They'll (mothers) certainly not use it to buy extra food or clothes that kids need".

Sharp criticisms of some parents were made by most teachers in this school, and this was supported by the head who was fairly critical of the 'neglect' that some of the children in this catchment area 'suffered' from their parents.

But even when the children were not 'neglected' some parents still came in for criticism. The 'conventional' standards of physical hygiene and dress varied, and some teachers disapproved of the clothes that some pupils (particularly girls) wore, which were seen as the 'height of fashion' but 'certainly not suitable for school'. Objection was particularly made to some of the shoes the girls wore - their heels were seen as far 'too high' - and to the 'expensive nature' of some of their clothes. Toys, books and other items the children brought to school also came in for criticism: 'High Chaparrel' Albums, mechanised toys such as dolls and transport vehicles were all seen as unsuitable (paraphernalia such as guns and rockets were confiscated, and children after their first year learned not to bring them to school). 'They

don't extend the children or develop any skill' within them. They also complained of parents 'molly-coddling' or 'spoiling' their children which accounted for the children's carelessness and inability to dress themselves properly and do their shoe-laces up. They were seen as lacking in the 'social graces', 'not enough please and thank-you's'. In short, some of the children's behaviour was not as good as the teachers would have liked but the children could not be blamed for this. It was obviously their 'home-background'.

On open days and special occasions parents come under observation. They, like their children, varied considerably from smart to couldn't-care-less. Fathers, though some came, were rarely to be seen. Some parents were not seen as 'neglectful' and even as 'interested' in their children's education but nevertheless were regarded as not knowing how to be of the greatest help.

The family-background theory, as in Dock Side, enabled the teachers to preserve their identities as good teachers. Some did have aspirations for the 'odd one or two' children that might make it':

"I'd like to try to widen the horizon of these children, because as you know, this is an estate school and the children are very, very much estate children and so many of them have very little background and when you talk about words and try and use vocabulary ... they're very limited in their vocabulary. But just now and then there's the child you feel you're getting through to ... hanging on to every word and really spurting ahead and then you feel it's really worth it all ... he just might be the one who'll make it to university or find that there's a whole world out there with opportunities ... waiting for him to grasp".

"You know everytime a child achieves some

success in whatever it is you're trying to teach them, you give him a feeling there's pleasure in learning and there's an end in sight".

Organisation of the School

The children, as we have seen, tended to be defined as lacking adequate parental discipline and control. In response to this, the head and staff consciously stressed tidiness, a respect for property and politeness in their exercise of social control in the classroom. The teachers' overlying concern with discipline and behaviour was reflected in their everyday activity. In the reception class of 4-5 year olds the children are chattering excitedly as they sit on the floor. A command goes out:

"Finger on lips".

Most of the children do it immediately. A girl, Sally-Ann, made no move. The teacher moves forward and whilst placing the girl's finger on her lip she addresses the researcher:

"This one's quite new to the school,
that's why she's not so good at doing
what she's told".

The first day in this class the researcher was pleasantly surprised to find very little sex-segregation. During one interval the children, led by the teacher, made their way through the school for games. A small girl turned to the teacher and said:

"Where's the boys' line Miss?"

The teacher replied:

"Well there are only three boys
here today; certainly not enough
to make a line".

In general a good deal of sex-segregation was in use, but its extent was

not at first obvious. The main purpose of sex segregation was to effect orderly, neat rows and to show the boys good examples of 'appropriate behaviour' by exhibiting the girls' assumed conformity. The fact that the school facilities were sex segregated tended to reinforce sex differentiation.

The outdoor apparatus in the playground, there to 'develop their skills and confidence' was usually dominated by the boys. The larger halls, with their modern and up-to-date 'apparatus', periodically became full of pupils and equipment was commandeered by equal numbers of either girls or boys on a rota basis in order to facilitate easy management.

When discussing the organisation of the school it is important to take into account the composition and distribution of the staff and to see whether this replicates the broad power positions between women and men characteristic of the family and non-family based spheres of social life. Irene Payne for instance, states that the organisation of the school:

"... can show in microcosm the way that society is divided on the basis of gender: it can show the economic relations of gender".

Payne, 1980b: p.35

Extensive research has shown that the senior positions of the professional hierarchy within schools is dominated by men,¹ and that women on the

1. See Byrne, 1978: op.cit., and Lobban, Glenys, 1978: "The Influence of the School on Sex Role Stereotyping", J. Chetwynd & O. Hartnett (Eds.), The Sex-Role System: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Spender & Sara (Eds.), op.cit.

whole, are relegated to the lower ranks within education¹ as teachers, or as ancillary staff, with less pay, insecure conditions and low status. It was symbolic that most of the headpersons allocated male teachers to the Top-Junior classes in each school. The argument here is that this system of allocation reinforces the very ideas of sex-differentiation, i.e. boys need the firm, strong handling of a male teacher at the junior age. This was particularly the philosophy in Dock Side where the headperson saw the pupils as 'problem' children. Men were seen as especially competent to teach and maintain control and this reinforced the public stereotype that male teachers are 'subject-oriented' whilst female teachers are 'child oriented'. Mr. Seaton of Applegate certainly ascribed to this view in placing the one male teacher in the Top Junior class 'in order to prepare them (pupils) for the exacting academic career in front of them'.

In Long Meadow, however, along with one male teacher in top juniors, was a young female teacher.² In Dock Side, as well as two males in the top junior classes, there was a male teaching the top infant class of 6-7 year olds,³ who happened to be also the head of the infant department. Blyth indicates that the male teacher's role is more specific

-
1. Frazier, N. & Sadker, M. 1973, Sexism in School and Society, Harper & Row, New York, find a similar situation in America, as does Belott, E.G. 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London, in Italy and Smith, D.E. 1978: "A Peculiar Eclipsing: Women's Exclusion from Man's Culture", Women Studies International Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 281-295, in Canada.
 2. Upon enquiry and close scrutiny of the interview, the researcher realised that she was the only teacher with a degree (in Psychology) in this school.
 3. This was the youngest group, the researcher found, being taught by a man.

- thus more 'masculine'. He goes on to state:

"As children move from the infant to the junior stage, it is no longer so necessary for them all to be taught by women. An infusion of male blood is apparently considered suitable in boys' schools though only to the extent of two-thirds of the total teaching strength. But in the case of separate girls' schools, there is nothing anomalous in perpetuating the exclusive 'feminine' atmosphere until the age of eleven, interrupted only, it seems, by six brave men".

Blyth, 1965: p.153

Nature of Learning

Learning tables by rote was still practised but a move was being made to a more abstract approach with the use of Fletcher Maths. Very little was formally time-tabled, unlike Dock Side and Applegate, and there was an emphasis on physical activities as well as the basic three R's. In the infant classrooms, where the emphasis was on play and activity methods it was common to see the boys stretching out on their tummies on the floor involved with some form of construction or play; the girls hardly ever did likewise and 'preferred' to keep an orderly space about them. Even in the older classrooms, some of the female teachers encouraged the extensive use of play equipment, seeing it as a problem-solver, since it diminished the amount of fighting and disruption amongst the boys. Despite the fact that the majority of the teachers wanted to give of their 'best', they thought the 'best' way was to 'stream' pupils as early as 6 to 7 in order to distinguish the 'weak' ones from the 'bright'.¹

1. A great deal of research has been conducted in this area. The 'self-fulfilling' prophecy has been offered as an explanatory device by microsociologists who are interested in the understanding of educational achievement and failure and the social construction of educability, see for example: Rist, Ray C., 1970: "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education",

The teachers justified the 'streaming' on the grounds that 'most of these children are not going to go far in the world', but they did have some hope for 'the odd bright child' who might make it'.

Because the children of Long Meadow Estate were defined as 'not very successful academically' it was the headperson's idea to create an alternative success system for them - creative or craft work, which was exhibited, on Open Days and special functions, in the main entrance to the school and in the large sports hall. But these activities were also gender-based. Familiar images of houses, trees and flowers were done by the girls, whilst the boys were encouraged to draw and paint fire-engines, trains, cars etc. Many of the activities that the teachers arranged for the children to do were based upon their imputations of children's interests:

"We must start from the natural interests
of the children".

Teachers made assumptions about children's interest in providing books, reading stories and in starting off projects, proving the original assumptions to be 'real'. Girls were assumed to be interested in animals, flowers, houses, singing and poetry. Boys were assumed to be interested in people's jobs, cars and trains.

Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 411-451; Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, C., 1968: Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils Intellectual Development. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York; Beez, W.V., 1970: "Influence of Biased Psychological Reports on Teacher Behaviour and Pupil Performance", M.B. Miles and W.W. Charters (Eds.), Learning in Social Settings, Allyn & Bacon, Mass.

Extra-Curricular Activities

Extra-curricular activities in the form of clubs were run, as in most schools along with visits, perhaps to the local fire-station or to the minster located in a small market town some 16 to 20 miles way. These trips were arranged specifically to 'extend the children's experiences':

"Some of these children barely know what's beyond the boundaries of the estate".

At news time the request 'Did anyone do anything exciting over the weekend?' was usually met with 'watching this or that programme on telly':

"If you asked any of them who went off the estate at the weekend it would probably be none".

The response from Applegate, in comparison, would be 'a visit to a local museum or park', a ride in the country or even a visit to the theatre. But though local visits were arranged and even day-trips to the nearby coast, it was problematic to arrange more extended excursions over a few days, or even a one-day visit to a 'far off' city (i.e. London). Teachers and Head knew that money was scarce and that for some families it would cause 'real hardship' to ask for a few pounds, and acute disappointment from those pupils whose parents were unable or unwilling to pay.

The clubs, (mainly sports) were organised on the basis of a female/male dichotomy. Football was dominated by boys despite the head's insistence that it was open to both girls and boys:

"It's difficult to fit the girls in because of the lack of time".

After-school hours and Saturday mornings were occupied with team practices

and the playing of fixtures. Fathers (some) helped in what way they could - cars, training etc.

The headperson, Mrs. Hartley, encouraged the formation of the football team, seeing it as a way of gaining success and a sense of achievement, thus making up for the lack of academic attainment in general. Meanwhile, parallel to this, was the gymnastics club; gymnastics having had a 'boost' since the emergence of Olga Korbitt, Nadia Commanechi, Nelli Kim, and Ludmilla Teresheva (all world-famous Eastern European gymnasts). Though mainly attended by the girls, this was open to both sexes - with one boy, on some occasions, availing himself of the opportunity. This club, though taken by a man (as football was), was run during the dinner hour, with no competitions or trips to other areas to pursue the sport (unlike football). Organisation of these clubs in such a fashion may lead to increased isolation and reduced interaction between girls and boys.

Summary of Long Meadow Estate

As at Dock Side, the family-home background theory held fast in Long Meadow Estate, and hence provided a reason for what were seen as the children's 'shortcomings' in behaviour and academic progress. The headperson and teachers expressed disapproval of the children's 'home-life', commenting on the 'limited range of useful experiences', and also expressed concern about the number of one-parent families due to separation and divorce. But unlike Dock Side they aimed to 'compensate' for these problems by what could be seen as a 'social welfare' programme. The head felt it important to keep open the provision of nursery facilities and also sought to instil in her pupils and staff the

attitude that they should make allowances for those children who were more obviously seen as 'neglected' and 'deprived'.

Also to make up for the children's 'limited experiences' the school provided numerous educational visits, which formed the basis of projects and follow-up written and craft work. There were no expectations of significant academic success but teachers' placed emphasis upon 'stretching the children's imagination with painting, craftwork, writing, and even music'.¹ Because of the assumed low status of the school, craftwork, along with the 'prowess in sport', was a way of pursuing an alternative success system. But this provision was permeated with gender-based criteria.

Domestic breakdown or signs of neglect were seen as the inability of the woman to come to terms with her domestic duties, i.e. her 'incompetency'. Some parents however were perceived as interested in their children's education but as not knowing how to be of the greatest help. Mrs. Hartley's home-school policy was to mobilise their interest usefully, in as far as possible.

Exhibitions and the generous provision of materials were part of the headperson's efforts to maintain the morale of the staff, in what could be called 'a difficult teaching situation'. Mrs. Hartley, in turn, was trusted and respected by her staff, and all in all relationship between her, and among the staff seemed good. Most lunched together in a local pub every Friday and there was a Christmas lunch with wine.

1. The remedial teacher also taught music and children learned to play instruments such as recorders.

A blind eye was turned to certain forms of behaviour from the pupils which would not have been tolerated in Applegate. Physical aggression, though discouraged, was 'accepted' by teachers as part of the 'boys will be boys' syndrome, but not expected from the female pupils, even though it was a fairly conspicuous attribute of these estate girls. Overall, sex-segregation was used as a means of social control and to facilitate classroom management as in most schools.

LINTONBRAY VILLAGE SCHOOL

The School

The small stone edifice which houses the school is situated on the far side of the village. It was built in 1914, replacing the former school which was closed down. Lintonbray is a small, grey one-storied building standing on a hill overlooking the whole village. The top junior classroom served many of the purposes needed in the everyday life of schools: i.e. Assembly Hall, Dining Room and General Meeting Room. All three classrooms were light and airy due to the existence of several large windows in each room, and the colourful displays on the walls added to an overall pleasant effect. Surrounding the building was quite a large playground with birch trees, garden borders and bicycle sheds.

The building had a large lobby with pegs for clothes (each class had their own space for a cloakroom), and two toilets which were shared by both boys and girls, and along a narrow corridor were fixed wash-basins. According to Eileen Byrne¹ village schools have always been mixed for

1. See Byrne, 1978: op.cit. For a general description of the adequacies and inadequacies of school buildings in the past see Wise, Marjorie, 1931: English Village Schools, Hogarth Press, London.

obvious reasons. No village could support sex-segregated facilities or departments, indeed it was generally hard to keep a village school open at all.¹

The average attendance was approximately fifty four. Most of the children lived in and around the village while a few others came from cottages and farms dispersed across the rambling countryside. To see them, they are like children everywhere - running, shouting, laughing and quarreling. The rough and tumble of children in everyday life was apparent here as in other schools. Pupils of both sexes dashed about, played games and yelled their way through the school day.

The school itself seemed very much a part of the village² although the opening of the new village hall meant that it was no longer needed for the holding of social occasions such as beetle-drives, country fayres and jumble sales. The high ceilings and old fashioned heating system gave it the feeling of a small-scale version of the urban traditional school of Dock Side.

Although village life is no longer rigidly controlled by the seasons

1. Primary schools are regarded as belonging to the village in a way that secondary schools are not, and in some cases, according to Kempe, the retention of a village school becomes an issue on which the whole village achieves a transient unity of purpose, Kempe, J. 1949: "A Pilot Survey of Much Marcle", Sociological Review, Vol. XLI, No.1, pp.1-35. See also Blyth, 1965: op.cit.

2. Ashby, M.K., (1929) states that "the distinctively rural character is given to a school not by green environs but by the employment of the children's parents in agriculture, by the rural history and of the school as a corporate entity" (p.3), The Country School, Oxford University Press.

and the needs of the land, nevertheless they do play a part in the life of the school.¹ Open fires are made in two of the classrooms to compensate for the inefficiency of the built-in heating system whilst frost and snow make the playground hazardous as the school was built on a steep hill. The day preceding events such as Christmas, Harvest Festival and Easter were an excuse for lessons to come to an immediate halt and for all the children to gather in the hall for a 'disco', short religious service or an impromptu party, activities which, in the other three schools, would have been impossible due to numbers and size. This seasonal aura is heightened by the cluster of trees in the playground and around the school which consist of birch, oak, chestnut and laburnum.

All in all, the school, staff and pupils, have the aura of a large, reasonably happy family.

The Headperson

Mr. Wharten's position as headperson of Lintonbray was unique in comparison to the other three schools in that he was also the teacher of the 'Top' class of nine to eleven year olds. His demeanour was that of a benign patriarch who enjoyed his position as head of the village school.² He did not 'pound out' his authority as Mrs. Bosworth did,

1. This was more so in the past in village schools when older children used to truant in order to help with the harvest. See Goldman, Joan M., 1957: The School in our Village, B.T. Batsford, Ltd., London.
2. In Williams' work on Gosforth (1956) the school is shown as an institution identified in some villagers' eyes with the upper range of the social hierarchy, pp.98-9, Williams, W.M., 1956: The Sociology of an English Village: Gosforth, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

but neither did he relinquish it. His manner was ingenious, and he 'ruled' the school with what could be euphemistically called a 'shepherd's crook' rather than a 'rod of iron'.

He has been in charge of the school for twenty years and seemed to his pupils, and to the village, as much a fixture as the school building. He was, in most people's view, informal, easygoing and quite popular. Mr. Wharten was also astute; where Mrs. Bosworth involved 'her' school in the community for the purpose of prestige, Mr. Wharten did so to alleviate some of the problems endemic in rural schooling.¹ The jobbing gardener, the vicar, local farmers as well as the local bus driver all in some way helped the school to run and to organise its functions. The vicar helped with the various services, and for the past few years has organised and rehearsed the children for the annual Nativity Play. The bus driver, whenever he could, gave over his time and bus free, when the school needed transport to various football fixtures or for day-trips. The bus, like its owner, was somewhat old and the single-decker, 'straight-nosed' vehicle could be heard all the way through the village as it heaved and 'crashed its gears' on its way to another 'expedition'. Both bus and owner were part of the village, a tradition in every respect and if 'put to grass' both would be sorely missed.

Mr. Wharten prides himself on knowing not merely every boy and girl, but

1. See Betts, George Herbert, 1913: New Ideals in Rural Schools, Houghton Mifflin Co.; Ashby, 1929: op.cit. and Richmond, W. Kenneth, 1953: The Rural School: Its Problems and Prospects, Alvin Redman Ltd., London, for accounts of the formation of rural schools and the problems besetting education in villages.

every mother and father as well, although he did not think it necessary to organise a Parent-Teacher Association, but relied more on friendly contacts of an informal character. He was also the chairperson of the Conservation Society (set up to conserve and ward off impending large-scale development projects or anything that was seen as harmful to the village), played cricket and was a regular at the 'real local' (although he lunched now and then at the 'posh place' over the road) the 'New Inn'.¹ He told the researcher that he enjoyed the sense of belonging to the village and its people.

The headperson was aware of the absence of class distinctions within the school, which was mainly because, as Mr. Wharten put it:

"Children of the same sort attend here, the few wealthy parents send their kids to private schools".

The main social distinction he drew was between 'the people who've been here years' and their parents before them who have or once had connections to the land; then there was the large section who mostly earned their living through paid employment, either in the village or in the nearby market town. As stated in the previous chapter the influx of newcomers had been relatively low, and though there were some tensions in the village these never really affected the school. As for his views on education these were neither ultra-conservative nor ultra-radical:

"If you take the 11+, I think clearly it has had to go, and I've said so for a long time before it disappeared from the scene because it was very restrictive in my opinion with particular regard of course to the primary schools. But also I think that by and large the 11+ system did its job ... it may be said that it was a bit of a blunt instrument ... by and large it did the job that they set out to do. So now we've got a comprehensive system ... although

1. Blyth, 1965: op.cit. reports that the village teacher in addition to what he does in school is expected to play a part in village life.

many people argue that in fact you've swapped one lot of change for another because there's selection at any stage of the game even in comprehensive education. Somebody is still going to sort somebody out and label them and put them into groups, but the abolition of the 11+ by and large was a good thing because it was quite clearly not a socially just thing".

While it would be over-sentimentalising it to say that this school was one "big happy family", there was no doubt that relations between staff and pupils were good and friendly. As for standards of attainment; it has been noted that a certain proportion of the pupils, particularly the girls, had high expectations. The headperson was observed to relate more to the boys than to the girls and this he admitted, saying the reasons were 'obvious':

"I share a lot of interests which are similar to the boys in my junior class. Girls tend to have different interests".

The 'masculine' sharing of norms were apparent on such occasions as a lively conversation with 'his boys' about football and Old Trafford.¹ Girls were excluded from this form of companionable relationship by the expectations of the boys and Mr. Wharten that they do not share these kind of interests. The way in which relationships differed according to gender permeated most aspects of school life.

The Teachers

The two teachers employed at the school were both young and female with only three years teaching experience between them - both having

1. Old Trafford is the football ground of Manchester United.

taught a year each in Lintonbray. Both have a passion for Art, Craft and Design having majored in these subjects during their training.

They teach the two younger classes; Miss Lucas teaching the 7 to 9 year olds and Mrs. Stebbings teaching the 4½ to 7 year olds.¹ It was not difficult to understand why the teachers got on so well with their headperson as they, like him, attempted to make the classroom as interesting a place as possible, although Miss Lucas preferred more formal methods than Mrs. Stebbings. It was evident that the latter teacher in particular enjoyed her 'vocation' and even more so enjoyed being with her pupils, fifteen in all ranging from 4½ to 7 years old. On the early Spring chilly mornings it was customary for her and the children to gather round the open fire to warm themselves before school 'officially' began. They chatted, telling her of any special event that had happened since their last meeting; sometimes Mrs. Stebbings opened the day with one of their favourite stories which according to her gave a nice start to the day and equally 'thawed' the children out on exceptionally bitter mornings. Despite the various inadequacies of educational materials and facilities Mrs. Stebbings was both adaptable and innovative. Every inch (almost) of the walls were covered with murals, posters and paintings depicting various projects and all done by the children themselves. She herself painted

1. The teaching of more than one age group has long been a tradition in rural schools due to the amount of pupils and inadequate educational provision, i.e. building. See Wise, 1931: op.cit.
See also autobiographical accounts such as Goldman, 1957: op.cit., Thompson, Flora, 1945 (1980 Edition) Lark Rise to Candleford, Book Club Assoc. with Oxford University Press.

any dull, outdated furniture brightly which gave the room a bright cheerful look. Her pupils appeared healthy and happy and in no way did she see them as having 'poor backgrounds' despite the fact that most of them would have been put in the category of 'working class'.

Mrs. Stebbings was a keen potter and the school had managed to obtain a small electric kiln which she well made use of. Miss Lucas tended to be a little more formal in her classroom expecting certain standards of behaviour and requiring the children to work at more formal tasks, although she herself encouraged Art and Design, signs of which hung all over the wall. Her class was small (in size) and she had seventeen pupils in all; again class distinctions appeared invisible. Mr. Wharten himself, as previously reported, was heavily involved with teaching - his class being the 9 to 11 year olds, with 22 pupils in all. He worked hard at achieving a standard whereby his pupils were on a similar level to other children in city schools, as his main concern was to make sure that they were not 'behind' too much when they entered the comprehensive school at eleven in the nearby market town.

If the teachers saw any problems emanating from this group of children it was that they found them 'deprived' in experience, as well as materially. Their main view was that there was a distinctively rural idiom to the children's personalities, especially the boys. Mr. Wharten told the researcher that in general the pupils interest was not in books, but in life, and especially the life that lay immediately about them, although no obvious compulsion (other than that existed in most schools) was used to make them work. Boys¹ particularly were not enamoured

1. Nalson, 1968: op.cit., in his study of a Cotswold community reveals that "information about the boys and girls attending the country secondary modern school ... confirms the impression gained on the farms: that

of 'book-learning', whilst girls enjoyed it.

"Their experiences are limited, some of these kids have never been further than Heathton".

"I'd like to show them that there's a whole world beyond the village ... you know get them to see that there are other things and places besides Lintonbray".

"I try to widen their horizons, Their limited knowledge and experience is incredible".

But the staff did find their jobs rewarding and felt that due to the low number of pupils they were able to relate to the children. Here again, especially for the two young female teachers, some 'problems' did emerge. Mrs. Stebbings found the boys rigid, even unwilling to take on projects or do anything minutely connected with girls:

"Boys shun away from anything connected with girls, it probably has a lot to do with the fact that it is a very rural working community".

"The boys have this very strong idea about I'm a man ... I do this' and a girl doesn't. The girls have a much freer attitude than the boys, mind you this is a farming community where the attitudes are very well laid down".

"Boys tend to demur from things they think is 'a woman's business', you know ... subjects related to them, even such things as writing, creative things ... I tend to chivvy them along a bit".

boys are less interested in scholastic achievement than girls. Boys do less well at school work and are much poorer attenders than girls, apart from those farmers' daughters who have no brothers" (p.177). He goes on to show the gross differences between girls and boys in A & B classes finding a higher percentage of girls in A. He indicates that the findings could be due to differences in attitudes, application and attendance between the boys and girls in rural areas.

My observations confirmed that gender coding was much more rigid among the children here than in the other schools. This was probably due to the nature and occupational grouping of the community.¹ But the problem is not so simple as might be thought, for though the district is predominantly agricultural, less than 30% of the pupils go to work on the land:² the rest, mainly the boys will seek manual work (skilled or unskilled) either within the village or in nearby Heathton. The girls will seek clerical and shop jobs further beyond the village, and some pursue higher education.

Organisation of the School

The school seemed to lack a rigid organisation and there appeared to be considerable flexibility in rules. This could be accounted for by the fact that it was not a large school, and there were not too many pupils for the building.

Whether wittingly or not, the organisation of the school and Mr. Wharten's influence reinforced gender differentiation. It was not that the formal structure of the school incorporated sex-segregation. There was neither enough rooms, space or facilities for such proprieties. But verbally and socially, a marked dichotomy between the sexes existed. The tendency of the headperson was to favour the boys - and the relationships he made

-
1. Nalson, 1968, ibid, concludes that the difference in employment between sons and daughters accentuates the divisions in outlook between the sexes which develop through childhood and adolescence (p.207.)
 2. Most of the boys the researcher talked to chose occupations similar to their fathers (as they did in other areas), despite the fact that some of them didn't own the land that they worked on. It was obvious farming was thought very highly of.

with them contributed to the sexual division of labour within the school. To the girls, 'Sir' kept up a lively (almost 'flirtatious') banter which the girls reciprocated. Whereas, with the boys he frequently called upon them for help in organising and moving of equipment through the school. If the girls rushed to help, the boys quickly brushed them aside. In no way did they wish the former to encroach on what the boys regarded as their area of privilege. The first sign of 'ritual' segregation was within the assembly and on certain other occasions too the boys did their best to separate themselves off from the girls. By the time they reached the top class of 9-11 year olds they sit at separate tables.

The distinctive quality of Lintonbray was obviously its size and its interrelation with the 'outside' i.e. village life. The latter tended to exert a pressure to conform to the clearly defined gender coding, which was quite dominant in the area.¹ Perhaps the school's size and closeness to the village in general, acts as a brake on change.

The Nature of Learning

Aspirations and academic norms were in no way similar to Applegate. There seemed to be an unhurried, almost leisurely approach to learning. Art, Craft and Design were taught alongside the basic three 'R's'. Formal lessons such as History, Science and Geography were combined with Current

1. Accounts of village life and rural schools clearly reveals the emphasis on gender distinctions. Ashby, 1929: opcit: discusses the 'special need of girls', and Fitzpatrick, Marion G., 1917: The Rural School from Within, J.B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia gives over two chapters, one on 'Managing Girls' whilst another is on 'Managing Boys'. It would seem that more was made of the supposed differential needs of rural girls and boys than of their city counterparts.

Affairs and Social Studies - in the top class, with discussion methods used rather than classroom instruction. Individual pupils were encouraged to display their talents in the assemblies whether the talent be in violin-playing or in making a corn-dolly. Each class takes its turn to present a tableau to the rest of the school at these Friday morning assemblies. In all of the classes, because of the dual age-system streaming was ruled out, with the organisation being flexible enough to cater for individual differences in ability and disability. Thus an exceptionally bright girl in the middle class was taking Maths in the Top class whilst at the same time Simon from the same class, who was having difficulties with his reading, was making up lost ground with the 8 year olds. Traditional methods in teaching were in use with the repetition of multiplication tables and spelling, particularly in the infant and junior I classes.

A great deal of time is also spent on creative activities. These small children were fairly competent in making handbuilt pottery, from functional bowls and other containers to sculptured fish and figurines. From then on they were taught the rudiments and processes involved in firing and glazing pottery. Mrs. Stebbings had arranged some space in the room in order that the children could have a play area. One side of it was fitted out as a confectioner's shop complete with cakes (made by their mums) on sale, the other was fitted up as a post-office with real postage stamps for sale.

At the other end of the school the Top Juniors' room (or part of it) has been converted into a laboratory-cum-reference library. It has a bench and sink for scientific experiments and demonstrations, a wall newspaper

(for Local Studies), a suspended globe, a television set and an extension loudspeaker, all of which are used to the fullest extent. The headperson begs, borrows and acquires any of the desirable extras which 20th Century economics apparently cannot afford relying heavily on local support to make good the need.

Extra-Curricular Activities

Mr. Wharten has made use of a wide range of visiting speakers in connection with his Social Studies schemes. These have included the village policeman, three farmers, the vet, a market gardener, the owner of a small haulage firm and the local baker. In each case the visit has either been preceded or followed by an out-of-school visit. Money was scarce and further trips were difficult to arrange, but some annual trips were made - one to a coastal resort, another to watch 'their' football team play Forbodingly.

The school, as do others, prides itself on having a 'good football reputation'. Considering it was so small, Lintonbray had done 'extremely well' in the football calendar, beating other and much larger schools in the Knock-Out Cup Competition for the whole region. It was significant that one of the girls was allowed to play regularly each year.

-
1. According to Eileen Byrne (1975) resource allocation is discriminatory against girls' schools, rural schools and working-class schools which is why she contends that girls have a triple chance of resource deprivation if they are in rural schools. See "Inequality in Education - Discriminal Resource - Allocation in Schools?", Educational Review, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.179-191.

Due to the lack of boys a fully-fledged male football team was not possible¹ - so the 'token' female was allowed to play. The headperson did not mention this reason when he stated:

"We've set a precedent here and there's a girl here not only playing in the football team but she has won two cup-winners' medals".

The fact that there is invariably only one 'place' available for a girl to play football has the added effect of making girls compete for such a 'prized' position, hence alleviating any solidarity amongst themselves. It was seen as a prized position due to the fact that Mr. Wharten conferred 'privileges' on his successful football team and the pupils were aware of this. (The researcher will show in a later chapter the consequences this has for the peer group).

Conclusions

This chapter has examined the internal structure and dynamics of the four schools, the opportunities they make available and the constraints they impose with regard to class and gender. At the same time it has attempted to relate these features to the social core of the schools.

Although there are many similarities between the schools, on the whole, as Blyth (1965) points out, primary schools have catchment areas small enough and homogeneous enough to make it likely that differences between schools are greater than differences within schools (p.49).

We can see a number of differences between the four schools. Dock Side

1. This was a regular 'problem' in a lot of village schools, see Goldman, 1957: op.cit. and Richmond, 1953: op.cit.

was characterised by inferior social and economic status.¹ As part of a decaying inner urban area it offers its pupils neither the possibilities of high academic attainment nor adequate material provision.² Applegate in contrast enjoys general educational provision of a 'fair and uniform standard', catering for what was seen as a somewhat 'socially superior' type of family. Long Meadow Estate was also seen as lacking the children of 'better' parents but had far better facilities than Dock Side.

Discipline in the schools was inevitably affected by the class and gender patterns of society beyond the walls. However, the nature

SOME ASPECTS OF THE SCHOOLS

School	Free ³ dinners %	Material ⁴ Provision	Pupil/ Teacher Ratio	Teachers' ⁵ Experience in years
Dock Side	20.4	0.5	24.8	9.2
Applegate	1.9	3.0	28.9	7.5
Long Meadow	30.2	4.0	22.4	6.9
Lintonbray	10.8	2.0	18.1	1.5

1. Staffing and the finance of primary education are governed by statute; see Section 24 of the 1944 Education Act.
2. See data table gathered from inside the schools, but these figures should be treated cautiously.
3. Free dinners - caution here: The high percentage in Long Meadow was due to Mrs. Hartley's efforts to obtain free meals for as many children as possible in contrast to Mrs. Bosworth. But in Dock Side most of the children lived within a very short walking distance of the school, while some of the parents were too proud to apply for free meals or did not even know they were eligible for them. The seemingly high percentage for Lintonbray was due to low incomes rather than 'problem' families.
4. One point awarded for each of the following (range 0-4): dining area other than hall, games field on school site, good craft facilities, indoor toilets. Half point for having more than one hall though used for double purposes.
5. Mean of all teachers excluding head teacher.

of the discipline and of the school organisation was also influenced by the perspective of the head-person i.e. contrast the rather over-zealous regime in Dock Side with the 'social welfare' approach applied in Long Meadow, both of which were responses to the 'type' of neighbourhood in which the schools were located.

The organisation of the school and the nature of learning within the four locations does appear to coincide with the class position of the pupils. Compare, for instance, the repetitive rote-learning procedures and the fragmentation of knowledge found in Dock Side, with the more abstract approach to learning of the affluent school of Applegate. Alongside, or interwoven with the class-based organisation of curriculum knowledge were the patriarchal structures, signifying specific forms of social control and an emphasis on distinctive gender behaviour, which cuts through socio-economic class.

In relation to gender, many aspects of the pupils' experiences within school have profound similarities with what they experience in the community, i.e. the polarisation of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' within work, play, knowledge, activities and interests which are consciously (or unconsciously) encouraged within each school and which is effectively sustained by the patriarchal organisation and structure of the educational system. This is done in such a way that even when the position of head is undertaken by a female this does not mean that there is a high degree of matriarchal influence in the same way that female-headed families are not to be viewed as 'matriarchal'.

It is important to note that there is no direct 'fit' or 'correspondence'

between school and catchment area, as many contradictions do arise. For instance Applegate's pupils were not so homogenous (with regards their class) as were Dock Side and Lintonbray and some conflicts did present themselves (these will be broached in ensuing chapters). Where female teachers and mothers of pupils have common experiences of patriarchal control and share conventional notions of motherhood this does not unite them but serves to distance and separate them in many respects. In particular, the notion of the 'ideal mother' or/and the 'ideal family' was particularly widespread among the teachers, and in some cases they saw mothers 'falling short of their duty' in that they 'failed' to duly present their child/ren to school in a 'befitting manner' and 'well prepared' for classroom life. This impression was given in both Dock Side and Long Meadow. So failure to 'achieve' is usually attributed to the family situation and made the responsibility of the mother, particularly if she works,¹ is separated or having any problems.

It is ironic that this same oppressive ideology of 'motherhood' is experienced by the teachers themselves, as many of them were married and have children and were prey to the 'double-shift' which only women experience.

The next chapter will examine the conflicts and the contradictions that the female teachers experience as women and as paid workers, as well as discussing teachers' attitudes to education and to gender differences.

1. Work - meaning paid employment outside the home.

CHAPTER VI

Teachers' Ideologies and Expectations

Introduction

In the previous chapter the researcher investigated the ethos of the schools, their relationship to their respective catchment areas and certain aspects of the social organisation of curricula and pedagogy. The main concern of this chapter is with the general attitudes that teachers bring to their work and in particular with their perception of gender differences and of the implications of the latter for education.

Teachers mediate between the formal educational structure and the actual children, with their varying characteristics and needs, who pass through it. It is important to bear in mind both the restrictions upon teachers and their active relationship to the teaching situation. Gerald Grace suggests that literature:

"... has emphasised features of constraint and control in the teacher's social world and have thus tended toward the production of a 'social puppet' view of the teacher".

Grace, 1978: p.2

However the work of Nell Keddie and of Sharp & Green have been important in going beyond such studies.¹ Keddie states:

"... that teachers have a set of expectations about their 'ideal pupil' ..."

1. Keddie, Nell, 1971: "Classroom Knowledge" in Michael F.D. Young (Ed), Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education, Collier-MacMillan; Sharp, Rachel and Green, Anthony, 1975: Education and Social Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

and:

"... taken for granted notions of appropriate pupil behaviour"

Keddie, 1971: p.135

Sharp & Green emphasise that:

"When looking at teachers' practices we will need to explore the structure of expectations regarding their activities, the ideological and social context in which they work and their own orientations to them".

Sharp & Green, 1975: p.32

The emphasis in this chapter will be to show and attempt to explain the disparity between what Keddie¹ calls the educationalist and teacher contexts; that is, between what teachers say about teaching among themselves and in interviews, and their actions in the classroom. This disparity will be shown to be connected to the 'ideals' of the teacher² in her (or his) expectations towards her pupils in relation to gender and class.

The chapter will be presented in the following way:

- a] The first section will provide background information on the teachers in the sample.
- b] The second section will deal with the aims of the teachers and will explore their hopes and ambitions for their pupils. The tangibility of 'rewards' in relation to teaching will be looked at and how and why this varied among the schools.
- c] The third section will discuss whether teachers regard boys and girls as 'innately' different, whether they consider that girls and boys exhibit

1. Keddie, 1971: ibid.

2. Becker has shown that school teachers experience problems in working with their pupils to the degree that those pupils fail to exhibit in reality the qualities of the image of the 'ideal pupil' which teachers hold: see Becker, H.S., 1952: "Social-class variations in the teacher-pupil relationship", Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 25, No.8, April, pp.451-465.

actual differences in behaviour, how the teachers react to these, and whether their expectations differ for girls and boys.

d] The fourth section will examine some of the pressures placed upon female teachers as a result of their double work-load as teachers and as housewives/mothers and will broach some issues regarding the differences in classroom attitudes and behaviour of men and women teachers.

The General Background of Teachers

The women and men primary school teachers varied in respect of age, teaching experience, position in school, age-group taught and type of school. They had in common, not only the fact that they were all teaching within the five to eleven age range, but also that they are overwhelmingly college trained. Only three (2 women and 1 man) had university degrees.

THE TEACHERS

School	No. of ⁺⁺ Teachers in School	Age Range				Qualification		Position			
		20-29 yrs.	30-39 yrs.	40-49 yrs.	50-59 yrs.	College Cert.	Univ. Degree	Head of Jnrs	Head of Infs	Teacher Jnr	Inf c
Dock Side	8	3	4	-	1	8	-	1M*	1M	3	3
Applegate	6	1	4	1	-	4	2	1M	1F	1	3
Long Meadow	12	4	2	5	1	11	1	1M	1F	4	6
Lintonbray	3	2	-	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	2
TOTALS	29	10	10	6	3	26	3	4	3	8	14

⁺⁺ No. of Teachers in the school which amounts to more than those interviewed.

*M = Male, F = Female.

It was interesting to note that very few of the teachers (both female and male) had travelled far from their birthplace and home.¹ The majority had lived and stayed in and around Hull:

1. The researcher is referring to parents' domicile.

16 were from Hull and North Humberside

5 were from other areas in Yorkshire: Leeds, Sheffield and
Doncaster.

5 were from neighbouring counties: Lancashire, Derbyshire,
Lincolnshire and Teeside.

1 came from Wiltshire

1 came from Solihull

1 came from Iraq (parents had been ex colonials)

All except seven had done their training in and around the North. The remaining seven had trained in far-flung places such as Teeside, Norwich, Loughborough, Manchester, Birmingham and Essex.¹

Each came with their own hopes and aspirations into teaching. Most of the teachers in Applegate and Lintonbray lived in and around the area in which the school was situated. In contrast only one of the teachers lived in the 'depressed' urban area of Dock Side, whilst none resided on the estate.² Thus for those who teach in Dock Side and Long Meadow estate, the grime and 'social deprivation' of these areas were not experienced by the teachers, as they lived in a contrasting social setting to that of their pupils.

All the schools in the study had reasonable staff stability; there were no signs of a high rate of staff turnover even in the so-called problem areas.³ (It must be added that Dock Side was in an Educational Priority Area, where teaching staff were paid more to encourage them to stay on in the schools).

1. There was no discernible sex-ratio.

2. This does not necessarily imply that residence demonstrates attitudes.

3. See Halsey, A.H., Floud, J. & Anderson, C.A. (Eds.), 1961: Education Economy and Society, Free Press: Jackson, Brian and Marsden, Dennis, 1962: Education and the Working Class, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Central Advisory Committee, 1967: Children and their Primary Schools, (Plowden Report), H.M.S.O., London.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT SCHOOLS

School	No.	Age				Teaching Experience (years)					Experience-present school				
		20-29	30-39	40-49	50+	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21+
Dock Side	8	3	4	-	1	-	7	-	-	1	4	4	-	-	-
Applegate	6	1	4	1	-	4	1	-	-	1	5	1	-	-	-
Long Meadow	12	4	2	5	1	5	3	3	1	-	7	5	-	-	-
Lintonbray	3	2	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	1	-
		10	10	6	3	11	11	3	1	3	18	10	-	1	-

Many of the teachers had, in fact, been in their posts from between three and eight years; only four had been less:

Two in Long Meadow)
Two in Lintonbray 1)

All four had recently
qualified.

The researcher is not implying that the stability was necessarily beneficial to the schools but it was clear that the children were not subjected to transient relationships with teachers in any of the schools.

Turning to the social origins of the teachers in the sample, we find that the majority come from working-class backgrounds.² It is clear from the interim report by Halsey, Floud and Anderson³, that manual workers' families are more likely to produce primary school teachers, especially women, than teachers in other 'levels' of education.

The question on reasons for choosing teaching as a career produced some interesting results. Among the female teachers their choice appeared to be child-centred as the following answers illustrate:

1. Both of the young teachers in Lintonbray had filled the places of retired teachers who had been there for a great many years.
2. Taken from the Registrar General's classification of occupational strata.
3. Halsey, et al. 1961: op.cit.

SOCIAL CLASS BACKGROUND OF TEACHERS¹

School	Class I		Class II		Class III				Class IV		Class V	
	F ^A	M ^B	F	M	Non-manual		Manual		F	M	F	M
Dock Side	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	3	1	-	-
Applegate	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	2	-	-	-
Long Meadow	-	-	1	1	1	-	2	-	3	1	2	1
Lintonbray	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-
TOTALS	-	-	3	2	2	2	4	-	9	3	3	1

A - Female

B - Male

"Well I like children. I like working with them, I like discussing things with them".

"I think because I like children. I've always enjoyed explaining things. I think I enjoy being with the children mainly".

"Because I'm very fond of children".

"More job-satisfaction ... I've had a lot of experience with other children as well".

"Well because I enjoy being with children".

"Well I like children and my temperament being what it is, I knew I could be a good teacher, especially with young children".

"I've always liked children and in particular when I was in the sixth form I felt I could do justice to teaching".

Compare these statements with those of the male teachers:

"I don't really know ..."

"I thought about social work at first but then went into teaching".

1. Social class is a problematic issue in that women are always placed in the class of their fathers and husbands.

"It seemed a good idea at the time although I didn't think I'd end up in the primary sector".

It is to be remembered that the majority of primary school teachers are women and it could be that their motives for choosing a career in teaching (specifically in the primary sector) are determined by ideological assumptions concerning the 'nurturant role' of women as mothers and teachers of small children.¹ Certainly, there appeared to be a sex-differentiation in the motivation for choice of career.

At the same time it is worth noting that while most of the male teachers had not chosen teaching specifically because of their 'liking for children' nevertheless, like their female counterparts, this did enter into their appreciation of the job. In answer to a question about the 'positive' aspects of their occupation, sentiments such as "I enjoy ..." and "I like children ..." were voiced by a sizeable minority.

These feelings need to be placed in the context of the knowledge we have from other sources about the outlook of primary teachers. The studies of Ronald King (1978) and Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green (1975) reveal that the idea of "childhood innocence" (or of children being in a specific stage of development) has a special status in the ideology of primary education. Such an ideology serves many purposes. One of them is to insulate teachers in certain ways from the contradictions that they face in their working lives particularly in those schools, such as Dock Side and Long Meadow, where many of the children do not come up to the standard of what is seen as the 'normal' or 'ideal' pupil. By regarding

1. See the collection of papers in Spender, Dale and Sarah, Elizabeth, (Eds.) 1980: Learning to Lose, Women's Press, London.

the children, from the perspective of this ideology, as "innocent" and therefore blameless of their 'shortcomings', especially amongst the working-class pupils, and attributing the fault to the parents and home environment, teachers can go on believing that all children have potential and that the education system is sufficiently egalitarian (at least within the primary sector) to allow that potential to develop.

Aims of the Teachers

Teachers' aims, in my study, fell roughly into three categories. All the teachers claimed they wanted to get to know their pupils in their 'idiosyncrasy and uniqueness' and were aware of the dangers of premature labelling, preferring to retain (so they stated) 'open minds'. The researcher can only surmise that most of the teachers were genuine in their 'idealistic' claims about the aims of education. But in the definition of those aims there was a very wide range and a level of ambiguity was found in the majority of the statements. Replies to the question: "What do you think are the main aims of the Education System?" revealed this:

"I don't know, it changes. You get emphasis on literacy obviously and there's been sort of vogues when the Arts have been in and sometimes there's a call for Science ... But I think I don't necessarily believe that a child should know everything but I think it's our duty at school to teach them how to find things out; where to go, make them aware of possibilities, of what they can do afterwards although I don't think this affects us so much with teaching little children. But basically I think it's to make them aware of where they can find out anything".

"Well the three R's really. Reading, writing ... of course number work. ... from reading, kids will be able to express themselves. A command of basic skills".

"It seems to me they should be social and educational alongside each other. I don't believe they are at the moment. They're much more geared to academic work ... the high flyers of the academic world. But I think there should be a lot more in the social light going on in school so that we ought to be looking towards development ... developing people to take part in the world whatever that might be in whatever way they can. We cast off people very quickly because they can't read properly at eight; so they're going to be useless all their lives ... there's very little provision for them".

"Certainly a good standard of literacy and numeracy I'd say from children at this age. But as well, coupled with this, very much a moral education. To try to persuade children to accept values. To value other people's property as well as their own ... all part and parcel ... especially with teaching children of this age group because they're still very receptive and I think in some cases if you can persuade them to accept standards at this age they'll carry on to do so".

Many of the teachers were inevitably ambivalent about the aims of the education system. Ten of the sample told me they saw a conflict between the State, the public and themselves as to what teachers were expected to do. The views did not vary according to catchment area but the majority of the male teachers were inclined to enunciate more specific aims, i.e.:

"To get through the three R's"..

"Well you've got to have an educational standard ... you know ... literacy, numeracy"

"Teach reading, writing and numeracy. On the whole you should turn out a child who is well balanced in everything ... but I think more emphasis is on the academic side than anything else."

The women, in contrast, tended towards a more diffuse role, and preferred to see an 'all-round' education, recognising the individual pupil and

his/her development:

"A mixture between socialisation of the child and basically keeping them interested".

"I think everything is expected of us besides the three R's ... there's the social need of a teacher ... I mean I find I'm a nurse, social worker, psychologist, psychiatrist ... everything".

"I think this is a puzzle ... one of the worries of a school teacher is what her job really is. It certainly isn't just the three R's... obviously the aims are to make children into the social animal I suppose. Conforming to certain regulations, certain ideas which are acceptable in this country. If the ideas ... and things change then presumably the schools will be angled and they would change as well because I'm only a product of all the pressures on me and I presumably pass that on to the children I teach".

Brian Wilson has discussed the diffuseness of the teacher's role.¹ It is interesting to note that he regards this diffuseness as more typical of 'feminine' than of 'masculine' roles in society. For this reason, perhaps, men in primary schools are often more uneasy in their situation than women. The familistic nature of the formal structure accommodates them less readily. Wilson considers the appropriateness of the three-generation family as a model for the formal structure of a school: the Head figuring as a grandparent, the teacher as parent and the pupils of course as children (Wilson, 1962: p.28). Blyth points out that this model is imperfect, but does recognise its usefulness in that it gives some support to the attitude of affectionate interest shown by teachers in children (Blyth, 1965: p.165). Bernstein suggests that the middle-class mother provides a 'model' for the infants' teacher, but does not

1. See Wilson, Brian, 1962: "The Role of Teacher" in British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 13, No. 1, March, pp.15-32.

explain how this occurs (Bernstein, 1975a). The teachers in the study do, perhaps, semi-consciously take some aspects of this model into the classroom as some of them are "middle-class" mothers. Teachers at Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate schools tended to show explicit disapproval of some working-class mothers whilst at Applegate there was greater approval of middle-class homes and so implicitly the middle-class mothers.

Primary school teachers in this country constitute a social group which has common class characteristics, in Weberian terms (Weber, 1948) in that they occupy a particular position in the economic order in terms of remuneration and conditions of work. But they are also a status group,¹ with shared perspectives and social identities, and a particular social position, which may be related in part to their being mainly women, more than 99% nationally (Byrne, 1978).

From their professional training teachers derived ideals of what they were expected to achieve as teachers and most had an honest faith in the education system, seeing it as a benevolent preparation of pupils for a complicated, technological society:

1. Gerald Grace (1978) in his section on 'Controlling the teachers: the ideology of respectability and professionalism' (Chap. I) sees that 'professionalism' and the social status that goes with it - "serves as a device to separate the teachers from the rest of the working class and from any tendencies to militant unionism by encouraging loyalty in anticipation of greater honour ..." (p.15). Teachers, Ideology and Control: A Study in Urban Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London. Asher Tropp's study is valuable sociological research in that he traces the history and rise of the professional elementary school teachers, 1957: The School Teachers: the Growth of the Teaching Profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day, Heinemann, London.

"Education is there to provide the children with a basis for life. To teach them all the things they need to know and learn".

"We should equip the child for life. With education ... if they've been to school they should have a good background for the world".

"Just to educate the children to live a better life".

"I think primarily educating them to help the child make it in life - to extend his character obviously as well".

"Hopefully to turn out a better society or a good ... working ... capable set of people with as wide a knowledge as possible ... children and young people who have their own abilities and are advanced as they can be".

It must be pointed out, however, that some teachers were aware of alternative viewpoints:

"Some schools set out ... to set kids on the road to careers, other schools set to prepare them for society. I think it entirely depends on the school you're in".

"Well first of all schools classify ... take part in the classification system almost labelling ... I think this is certainly the role of some schools and certainly within a class system. And to come to a major function of the school we transmit traditional or cultural values - we socialise them".

"They should be able to develop every aspect as far as possible, but I don't think it necessarily works out that way".

It is important to obtain a clearer perspective of how teachers see their jobs and the things that annoy or frustrate them. Gerald Grace states:

"Having established notions of the 'normality' of the educational process in ordered, hierarchic, bookish and domesticated contexts which have been largely exclusive in social class and ethnic terms, her/his career as a teacher now locates her/him in a social world which appears to them pathological in its apparent lack of 'order', in its lack of

respect for hierarchy and authority and its apparent resistance to learning, disturbing and threatening in the directness of its relationships, language and behaviour and the unpredictability of its unsocialised intelligence and wit".

Grace, 1978: p.62

Anybody who is a teacher, who has taught sometime in their life, or observed classrooms on a day-to-day basis is well aware of the physical and emotional output of energy required from teachers in the everchanging organisation of our education system. They have to teach, to a limited 'required standard', children who are regarded as covering the whole 'ability range' from the remedial child to the future university candidate, who come from varying social backgrounds, and who bring their individual problems into the school. As well as the steady routine pressures of staff meetings, extra-curricular activities and the necessary preparation of classroom material teachers also have to contend with organisational, structural and curriculum changes that they must adjust to every school year (or term even). The imposition of a host of other duties within the school, besides teaching the children set subjects, i.e. dinner monies, school savings, playground and dinner duties plus other pastoral functions all add to the fatigue and strain of a teachers' role. Married women have additional familial responsibilities on top of this. Most of the teachers were genuinely concerned about the lives and future prospects of their pupils, even of those children (in Dock Side and Long Meadow) who were rarely seen as a source of teacher satisfaction. But having said this, most accepted educational attitudes as they presently stand whilst those who were more aware of basic pressures and expressed a disquiet about the aims of the system acceded in practice to the status quo. In fact, it would be fair to say that most of the interviewees leaned towards

a strong-minded world-view supportive of the existing social structure.

How far did the job meet with their ideals? Their "rewards" were obviously different from those of the secondary school given they did not spur children towards examinations - so quantifiably their standards were not measured in the 'usual numbers game' (external examinations) or through the climactic frenzy of 'all or nothing' which characterised the 11+ exam.

Given that evidence of learning was not as clear-cut as in the secondary school, the "rewards" for teaching would be more abstract, and would also vary between the schools. For Applegate the sources of teacher-satisfaction were clearly apparent: fairly new, though overcrowded premises; sedate respectability ensuring an academic and behavioural 'elite' with regard to State schooling; and pleasant surroundings. Lintonbray, though non-academic, was at least 'blessed' for the teachers by being in a rural area, small and having the semblance of a large contained 'family'. In Long Meadow and even more in Dock Side "rewards" could be seen as minimal and even more intangible. Poor housing, lack of an ordered life and shortcomings in 'discipline in the home' of their pupils, were often the reasons given by teachers when faced with 'low intelligence', behavioural problems and 'social deprivation'.¹

1. A pattern found by Sharp & Green, 1975: op.cit., and King, Ronald, 1978: All Things Bright and Beautiful?, John Wiley & Sons, London.

Teachers' Assessment of their pupils according to class and gender

It is widely acknowledged that discipline is an important (if not the most important) function in a teacher's role and is a yardstick by which teachers and headpersons measure each other's 'ability'. (Gabriel, 1957; Hargreaves, 1967; Jackson, 1968; Grace, 1978). How teachers implement this function will depend to a large extent on the catchment area, and, in addition, attitudes towards gender behaviour, as the researcher hopes to show.

As previously stated, teachers in Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate were conscious of teaching in 'low status' schools, in that their pupils' background has given these children many liabilities which will hold them back. The teachers displayed little desire to blame the pupil for problems of behaviour and lack of achievement in schools. On the other hand, while they observed problems of poverty, overcrowding and unemployment, they largely abstained from wider socio-political criticism:

"Their (pupils') behaviour ... well they just don't know what discipline is. It's the parents' fault, they're so forward and talkative, and take so much time to settle down and listen".

"Some of these children .. their home life is shocking. They come from homes where their parents don't encourage them, don't read to them before they start school, don't make sure that they go to bed at a reasonable time. They come to school tired and dirty, and not ready for a day of work".

"A good number of these children have very little background ..."

"This is not a culturally alive area ... it's a very deprived environment. They're barren ... their minds are barren ... because they come from a barren environment".

"These children are from such poor backgrounds and they have such terrible problems .. You know

... their dad's in prison, or their mum goes to work, so consequently she doesn't have much time for them".

"They've got such problems ... and that's the major battle ... trying to sort out the problems that these kids bring into school".

1

The teachers' replies disclosed a wide variety of attitudes - varying from those who saw it as fatal to relax one's hold on the class to those who maintained a minimal imposition of demands, requesting self-discipline as in Applegate. From the previous chapter we know that in the more prosperous areas the children respond in a more 'culturally positive' way to their schooling than do their working class counterparts and that the teachers preferred this 'class' of pupil. But central to the discussion was the fact that what constitutes desirable behaviour among children was decided not only in relation to class but also in relation to gender, as well as by reference to the specific situation of the school and classroom.

Before they were questioned about behavioural differences among children, all the teachers (except for two)² agreed that the aims of the education system should be the same for girls and boys,³ although many thought that this was not yet the case in practice, despite noticeable improvements:

-
1. An interesting difference (if not significant) was seen between Dock Side and Long Meadow. The former school sought firm discipline for itself whereas the latter justified it in order to solve learning problems.
 2. Significantly both these teachers were much older than the rest (1 female and 1 male). Yet age is not necessarily a variable as another teacher (and headperson of Lintonbray), who was due for retirement, was in agreement with the rest of the teachers.
 3. The question was whether they thought the educational aims should be the same for both girls and boys.

"Yes, I think they should be. It's just as important for the girl to have a career as for boys, especially nowadays, where no-one would think much to it if a man stayed at home and looked after his children and the girl had a better career she could then go out to work to support the family ... But in lots of schools they're not ... I think there's discrimination in quite a few schools".

"I don't think they are, although I think they're obviously a lot nearer that what they used to be ... I mean the opportunities should be there so that they can choose and it certainly isn't at the moment".

"I think they should be but I don't think they are yet but I think things have changed dramatically ... I think we're heading in the right direction".

"I don't think they are ... particularly in the secondary school ... where pressure is put on the boys to do more science and the supposed home-making for the girls ..."

"They should be certainly ... and we are moving towards it but it's more biased towards boys".

Reference was made to the fact that boys will be the ones "most likely to settle for a career" or "support the family" whilst the girls "would opt. to marry and have a family" or "prefer to stay at home". But most were in agreement that equal opportunity should exist within education. However, having noted that the education system, as it operates at present, was not the same for girls and boys, the teachers pin-pointed this discrimination as 'somewhere out there', i.e. they emphasised the secondary school, the role of parents and the labour market as the 'major offenders', and in no way did they see themselves involved, in the process of transmitting inegalitarian ideals within education:

"The kids already have these ideas about what men and women are supposed to do .. I mean it's

the parents ... they hear and see them doing different activities ..."

"It's very difficult trying to treat the girls and boys equally and trying to make them do the same things ... because just look around and we can see such clear differences - you know - the types of jobs men and women do ... their mums and dads encourage them to think they're different".

"Actually I don't think it's the primary school that's to blame ... I mean ... in the secondary school that's where a lot of it starts. Girls and boys doing different subjects and even the teachers ... male teachers and female teacher ... teaching different subjects ... like the men teaching maths and science and the women teaching cookery and needlework. I mean you don't get none of that in primary schools".

"I blame a lot of it on the media ... for instance the television and all the images about what women do and what men do. Trying to educate them equally is an uphill struggle if society's encouraging them to treat each other differently".

In general, the teachers steered clear of the 'biological deterministic' theory of differences between girls and boys. Answers to the question "Do you think there are any inborn personality differences other than physical differences between male and female?" revealed the following:

"No I don't think so really. You get some sort of aggressive girls the same as you get some sort of aggressive boys".

"There aren't really any personality differences between the sexes, at least not at this age, or at least you're not aware of them".

"No, - I don't really, just a straight, forward answer - I don't".

"I don't think that boys are born 'boys' and all that it entails, just as I don't think girls are born 'girls' and come to act as many dads would like to see".

"Looking at the kids I would say not particularly. But that's not to say that I'm sure that if you brought two kids up in exactly the same way that there wouldn't be any individual differences. But it's not necessarily biological sex that determines a difference".

All the teachers insisted that they did not treat the children differently on the basis of them being either girls or boys. However, when questioned about gender differences in behaviour they failed to recognise that the way in which they categorised girls' and boys' behaviour, drawing on their experiences and observations of children, would, in reality, result in a different interaction between themselves and the two gender groups.¹

In the interviews, despite the fact that they thought there was no inherent difference between girls and boys and that they considered that they did not treat them differently, the teachers revealed a greater expectation of good conduct from girls,² whilst expecting and even tolerating the disruptive element amongst the boys':

(In Dock Side)

"The boys are more difficult to settle down to their work, whereas girls get on with it and do it neatly. The boys don't seem to have the same self-discipline .. they're more interested in play".

"Well I generally find that the girls .. and I've noticed this class after class ... the girls are better behaved and more conscientious".

-
1. See Lobban, Glenys, 1978: "The Influence of the School on Sex-Role Stereotyping" in J. Chetwynd & O. Hartnett (Eds.) The Sex-Role System: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, in which she collates research on this issue, for a further analysis.
 2. King, 1978: op.cit. in his research on infant classrooms states that "girls seem to be closer to the definition of how children should be, than boys from the same social background". (p.126).

"The girls are far more mature than boys at this age.¹ Boys are the ones who still get into fights and go mad whilst girls are sensible and tend to get on better with everyone else".

"Boys are much rougher, you have to keep a firm grip on them otherwise there's no stopping them".

In Applegate the accent was not so much on the good or bad conduct of the pupils as on a broader range of behavioural differences between them:

"Girls are very petty, this class in particular. The boys are more straightforward ... seem to have less complications about themselves".

"Girls tend to be rather more responsible at this age than the boys, whereas the boys are still in a very childish stage".

"Generally, boys are less nervous about doing P.E. and the boys are more untidy than the girls".

In Long Meadow and Lintonbray a similar dichotomy in the perception of girls and boys to the one held at Dock Side also existed among the teachers:

"The boys are not as capable as the girls, so they do things which I wouldn't allow the girls to do ... you know you have to allow for certain things ... the lads have to be contained that much more".

"Usually the boys tend to play about more ... where normally one expects and demands more from the girls".

"The boys are more physical in my class certainly ... nine times out of ten it will be the boys that are tearing round the class, not being destructive ... they just get so involved in what they're doing".

1. This teacher was talking about children of the age of seven.

"By and large girls apply themselves and are better at things. Whereas boys seem a little more ready to adopt or undertake masculine attitudes that you know he's a tough guy ... well I won't be bothered with that".

As can be seen, physical aggression and 'disruptive'¹ behaviour was expected and accepted from boys, not only in the urban traditional school but in all of the schools. Teachers expected girls to set a good example in behaviour and in fact they believed that the latter did so, though this could well be a product of their own perceptions which dichotomised the behaviour of girls and boys so that even the same activity may well be evaluated differently according to the sex of the actor (see next chapter for evidence).

TEACHERS' RATINGS OF THE 'CONDUCT' AND 'ATTITUDE TO WORK' OF CHILDREN IN THEIR SCHOOL CLASS

School	Conduct rated more favourably		Attitude to Work rated more favourably	
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
Dock Side	6	2	7	1
Applegate	4	2	4	2
Long Meadow	9	3	10	2
Lintonbray	3	-	2	1
TOTALS	22	7	23	6

When asked what lay behind these 'differences', most teachers agreed it was "conditioning" or "socialisation" within the family and there was general acceptance that parents' expectations were different for girls and boys, (note the family-home background theory again):

1. The researcher uses the term 'disruptive' to imply that the behaviour demanded more attention.

"I think it's conditioning from the parents".

"I think it's the parents ... what they've tended to instil into them".

"It's probably been drilled into them that boys are boys ... I think boys get away with much more at home. The girls are expected to be little mothers and the boys can get away with an awful lot".

"It's mostly acquired I think. The way that the parents bring them up ... you know Daddy's playing football with them and Mummy cooks for the children ... all that sort of thing".

"I think their home background has a lot to do with it especially with the children of this village anyway".

"I wouldn't say their behaviour is inborn, I would definitely say it was acquired from the parental attitudes".

Having conceded that 'socialisation' would affect gender behaviour, the teachers, nevertheless, accepted certain patterns of behaviour as given and assumed they were features that they had to work with, rather than confront or change:

"... The girls seem to be typically feminine whilst the boys seem to be typically male ... you know more aggressive ... the ideal of what males ought to be".

"I think the boys tend to be a little more aggressive and on thinking about it the male is the same in the animal world ... we are animals basically ..."

"It would be nice to treat them all alike on everything but I don't know if you'd be doing the right thing because if you turn out a load of boys who are "nice" and "considerate" and play netball ... I mean they're not going to get very far when they leave us. I mean they'll go off somewhere and it'll have no practical use for them ... they'll be laughed at and ridiculed that's all".

Because of their major concern with group control and classroom management,

and their acceptance that there would be a higher incidence of 'behaviour problems' among the boys, the teachers resorted to strategies which favoured the boys. Faced with the possibility of disruptive boys, and the pressure to keep effective control within their classes, the teachers informed me that (whilst teaching the official curricula) they directed the subject content of lessons in favour of boys:

"The boys are more difficult to settle down to their work ... they don't seem to have the same self-discipline as the girls do, so it is important to direct the subject at them."

"I tend to make the topic as interesting as possible so that the boys won't lose their concentration and start fidgeting".

"It's a bit harder to keep the boys' attention during a lesson ... at least that's what I've found so I gear the subject to them more than I do the girls who are good at paying attention in class".

"I tend to make sure that the lesson's got a lot for the lads".

Perhaps aware that they could be seen as guilty of biased treatment in directing the content of lessons more towards the boys (though the researcher will argue in the following chapters that the teachers were caught in a situation that was not of their making), many teachers proceeded to justify their approach to me:

"Boys seem to want more exciting projects to do than girls, whereas girls will fall in with most things".

"You can choose a subject interesting to the boys; the girls would be interested just as well ... something like transport. But the other way round you often find boys are not very interested if it's not (the lesson) directed at them".

"Girls come in and straight away they'll respond to the subject ... so it makes it that much easier to pick a topic that will interest the boys".

"Some of the lads are getting to that stage where they're not keen on coming to school, so you've got to make life that bit more interesting for them".

"It's easier to pull the girls in than it is to pull the boys in, so you try a topic that's usually got quite a lot for the lads".

"I tend to look at a topic ... and really look for something that you know the lads are going to like. The girls will usually find something in it".

Looking carefully at their replies one can see that the teachers were implying (although they may not have realised it) that they acceded to manipulation from the boys in so far as they were 'forced' to orientate lessons towards this group or risk disruption, which would have made it difficult to teach at all.

There was a lack of consistency in the statements of some of the teachers on this issue. On the one hand they suggest that there is a clear differentiation of interests and that boys and girls have certain 'leanings' towards particular subjects and topics. On the other hand, many suggested that "the girls were interested in most topics" and that it was "easier to pull the girls in".

In answer to the question "do you think boys and girls respond differently to particular subjects?" these were some of the replies:

"Yes I do ... mean it's kind of a standard thing that boys like maths more than girls ... whereas the girls will use expressive writing more than many of the boys will".

"..... personally I like doing things like geography subjects and I do find that this is the area where the lads do come out ... you know they've got the scientific facts, they've got some geography facts, whereas the girls tend to be a bit more woollier in most of the things".

"Girls are better at writing and can write nice stories and they can read quite well, but they haven't got the imagination that most of the lads have got".

"I find you can spark the lads a bit easier than you can the girls'. They've got their own set ideas ... it's always '.. and we went home for tea' and 'Mum and Dad were there and we all lived happily ever after...."

Yet these very same teachers went on to state that "the girls will fall in with most things" and "girls will find something to interest them in any topic". But it must be stressed that some teachers thought there 'was no hard and fast rule' and 'that at this age it doesn't matter'.

Upon further investigation, another justification for gearing classroom life centrally to the boys was put forward, in addition to their need for more control. Teachers classed the boy's as 'needing more attention' due to the fact they were 'behind the girls' in intellectual achievement:¹

"The boys aren't as academic as the girls ..."

"In this school you find that girls tend ... there's simply more girls at the top of the class than boys".

"Girls tend to ... I think in the past five years I've been here ... they've always been my brightest pupils".

"More often, the girls' work is better than the boys ... they tend to settle down to their work better than boys".

"Usually the girls outshine the boys ... in this school anyway".

1. Jenny Shaw (1980) has discussed this in her paper: "Education and the individual: Schooling for girls, or mixed schooling - a mixed blessing?" in Rosemary Deem, (Ed.) Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul. She states that "one consequence of co-educational schooling is not that girls retire gracefully from educational competition but that they are pushed out by being turned into a negative reference group for boys. Boys define themselves as being, whatever else, at least not a girl. This has many consequences, not least of which might be that in certain circumstances it reduces boys' inclination to work hard precisely because of their security". (p.67).

The teachers thus offered three reasons for boys having subjects geared towards them, and hence having more attention paid to them: that the boys 'needed to be pushed'; their own needs, as teachers, to control the class; and that the girls acquiesced in most subjects.

But having stated that girls are ahead in 'achievement' the teachers followed up with statements which seem difficult to reconcile with what they had just said. It appears that they actually see the boys as having the 'real imagination' and 'true creativity'¹ whilst the girls were 'good' at merely "tagging along" and "wanting to please". In short the teachers did not perceive girls as being positively intelligent:

"On the whole you can generally say that the boys are far more capable of learning, nicer to teach".

"Boys are interested in everything are are prepared to take things seriously".

"They (girls) haven't got the imagination that most of the lads have ..."

So the 'good results of the girls' were seen as due to their presumed conformity to the 'good pupil' role.²

-
1. Terry Evans (1979) in his discussion of teachers' perceptions of the creativity of their pupils in early schooling defined 'creativity' as that which may be seen as "the child's ability to provide new or original products of ideas which are valued by the teacher as worthwhile in the particular context" (p.139) See his paper "Creativity, Sex-Role Socialisation and Pupil Teacher Interactions in Early Schooling" in *Sociological Review*, Vol. 27, pp.139-155.
 2. Madeleine MacDonald (1980) notes that "because they are female, their academic failure is legitimated, their success treated as unusual luck or a result of over diligent, hence 'boring' effort" (p.24). See her paper "Socio-Cultural Reproduction and Women's Education" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.) op.cit.

"Boys tend to ask the deeper questions while girls tend to be more superficial about subjects; they ask the 'right' questions simply because it's expected of them."

"The girls' attitude seems to be better with regard to the learning process, and I have a suspicion that this is because they are more ready to please parents or teachers".

The significance of this differential in imputed competency between girls and boys and the effects that it may have upon their overall achievement will be discussed in a later chapter.

Earlier in this chapter the researcher pointed out that teachers saw gender-related behaviour as given, and did not deem it necessary to change or confront it. The interviews also showed that the teachers appreciated the boys more, even though both men and women teachers expected better conduct from girls.¹ The teachers also evaluated the boys' behaviour more positively in another way: "did not 'argue' so much", were seen 'not to take offence' and 'saw reason quicker'. Girls however were seen as bitchy, catty etc.

"I've noticed in particular that the girls tend to be sort of more bitchy towards each other whereas boys are not".

"You get giggley groups of girls and they can be very catty ... the boys are not like that".

It would seem that the interpretation of a pupil's behaviour is (partly)

1. This has also been found by Davies, Lynn, 1979: "Deadlier than the male? Girls Conformity and Deviance in School", Len Barton and Roland Meighan (Eds.) Schools, Pupils and Deviance, Nafferton Books. See also the collection of articles in Spender & Sarah, 1980, op.cit. and Frazier, Nancy & Sadker, Myra, 1973, Sexism in School and Society, Harper and Row, New York.

evaluated on the basis of their sex. Such labelling, by gender, was even used by the female teachers, who formed a majority in all of the primary schools in this study.

Teachers: Pressures and Conflicts

At the broadest level it is necessary to relate gender-appropriate behaviour in school to sexual divisions in society and investigate the contradictions which emerge for the teachers, especially for women who are attempting to satisfy their teaching goals alongside being a wife and/or mother. Teaching, at least at the primary level, can be seen as an extension of women's traditional 'roles'.¹ Previously it was noted that women had a 'leaning' towards the 'protected' occupations, but women are also led into teaching by practical considerations. Few alternatives actually exist for women who wish to enter the professions.² The guarantee of a livelihood to women entering teaching, and one which does not interfere with the presumed 'natural' role of wife and mother, is hardly to be ignored. In addition an element of 'improving' one's class did enter into the issue, besides the stereotype of the profession being a 'protective' occupation for women as it gives them 'always something to fall back on'.

For many of the women teachers who are married, with or without children, their days will be fraught with the physical and emotional problems of

-
1. See Frazier & Sadker, 1973: ibid, Spender & Sarah, 1980: op.cit. and Joll, Carol, 1976: "Teachers' Pay" in Women and Education, No. 10, pp.8-9.
 2. See Sullerot, Evelyne, 1971: Women, Society and Change, World University Library; Rendel, Margherita, 1978: "The Death of Leadership or Educating People to Lead Themselves" in Women's Studies International Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 313-325; Rendel, Margherita, 1980: "How Many Women Academics 1912-1976?" in Deem (Ed.) op.cit.

teaching all day, and going home tired, but tasks in the home place still further demands upon them. Efforts to ease the burden varied from person to person, i.e. some ignored tasks completely; waited for holidays to catch up on specific chores; or, like two of the teachers in Applegate, worked part-time which reflected the values and attitudes of a 'middle-class', respectable area where the needs of children are placed first and where the women should be seen to carry out their 'wifely and motherly' duties. Here is another area where the patriarchal values of the dominant culture impinge upon the primary school teaching role.

For women primary school teachers, the functions of mother and teacher are similar, but the taking on of the two are in direct conflict with each other: competence at one is achieved only at the expense of the other/other things. However, many of these women take on both functions and their anxieties about their competence (mediated through ideological beliefs about 'motherhood') was expressed in their interviews.¹

The married teachers, in particular, remarked how little time they had to themselves, when asked "Do you have much leisure time?"

"Very little at all. I have hobbies but they are the sort that I stay at home and do ... knitting, sewing ... this kind of thing".

"I suppose now I've got more used to teaching and now I know what I'm doing it's become easier. I still do a lot of preparation and so forth, so evenings I tend to work and make up for what hasn't got done in the way of household chores".

1. For further transcripts and analysis of this double work-load see the collection of papers in Spender & Sarah, 1980: op.cit.

The restrictions upon the time of the women teachers who have husbands and families, creates a particular problem in the 'difficult schools'. The strain that these teachers experience contributes to their tendency to blame parents for the difficulties they have with the children in a way that the unmarried female teachers and male teachers do not:

"You know these children here are very demanding, they drain you to the limit".

"I suppose I come from a ... well, a better area, I would hate to sound awfully snobbish but a lot of the parents round here are very easy going with their children ... I mean if you ever heard a parent coming to the school gates and say 'com on Carrie' or whatever and Carrie will turn round and shout 'Aw shurrup, I'm busy ...' I mean my kids wouldn't speak to me like that".

"There's a lot of answering back and having the last word. They won't be told".

"The children here are difficult to teach. You know you're giving a lot and getting nothing from these type of kids".

"The parents of some of these kids must have no idea how to bring them up properly..."

"If any of my children behaved like some of these kids I'd have a fit".

In Applegate and Lintonbray the teachers tended to see their own children in the same light as the children they taught:

"I see them as the same although I would be stricter with my own".

"Mine are not special or different from the children at school."

"From a professional point of view, they're very much alike".

The reason for holding this attitude is probably because they tended to live in the same area and were therefore more personally acquainted with

their pupils' background, home and parents, and because they shared the same values. This situation did not occur in Dock Side and Long Meadow:

"Apart from anything else they're in a different area, very different. I mean our children had a lot more cultural experience before they went to school".

"Although I'm teaching children the same age as my daughter there would be no comparison whatsoever ... I mean I just couldn't prepare material for them which she could cope with".

"The children here have more social problems".

"My Sarah, she's not like these children at all. These children tend to come from rather deprived backgrounds, and she doesn't."

As well as trying to 'cope with' children that they see as 'below par', many of the women teachers have the responsibility of young families (as well as husbands) to see to upon returning home in the evening. The fact that many of the women teachers have these responsibilities does not make them any more sympathetic than the men towards the problems faced by the mothers of the children they teach or more radical in their views on mothers who try to combine paid work and child-rearing, as their views on the pupil's background and on various 'deficiencies' of the parents indicates (see Chapter V). Such a stance may, in part, be regarded as a 'coping strategy' as for them the demands of the school must not be allowed to impinge too much upon their home-life and upon their 'duties' as wives and mothers.

Previous research on gender differences in attitudes to teaching may be relevant here. Gabriel¹ found that women teachers report a greater

1. Gabriel, John, 1957: An Analysis of the Emotional Problems of the Teacher in the Classroom, Cheshire, Melbourne.

degree of worry or strain than men for all of the following items: large classes, noise, difficult child, demands of syllabus, securing obedience, slow progress, criticism from head teacher, maintaining children's interest, and excitability of children.

The overall pressure to be proficient in all aspects of their lives was felt by most of the teachers, who worked out 'patterns' and rigid routines in their attempts to "fit everything in" and "get everything done". Some of the teachers conveyed in their interviews that their husbands felt that the 'quality of home-life' had gone down since they had started or resumed teaching; and instead of questioning this presumption they felt they had to justify themselves and offer excuses as to why they couldn't excel at being both the 'perfect' wife and the 'perfect' teacher.¹ Many felt varying degrees of guilt at their inability to cope with all the demands and to complete domestic chores.

Most of the teachers interviewed would be regarded as 'good' teachers, in that they effect order and social control within their classrooms, and they are also 'successful' wives and mothers. However, some of them expressed doubt about their competence:

"Well, you don't have enough time to do everything you want to do. I suppose my family suffers sometime from the lack of attention".

"You know in some ways I suppose I don't do a complete 100% good job at school because I've got so much to do at home and vice-versa".

1. See Margaret Sandra's (1979) unpublished paper Supermum and Superteacher.

I feel as if I don't spend enough time with my own children... I don't think I let the children down in school but I feel very guilty about my own two children. I just feel as though I ought to be spending more time with them".

"I sometimes feel that I don't give as much time to my own children that I should do".

"Mainly, I think a guilt problem ... I find it very difficult after a full day's work, feeling I can cope adequately with my own kids when I get home".

It is no accident that society assumes that it is men's place to "work" (work means being out of the house and earning money) and pursue careers with single-minded dedication, whereas women experience a double-edged sword of having to divide their time between the responsibilities of teaching and of being 'a woman'.

Other factors such as socialisation and lack of confidence also affect the situation and outlook of women teachers in ways that do not affect the men teachers.¹ It has to be remembered that teaching is seen as complementary to, rather than intervening with women's 'usual and natural' role of wife and mother, whilst males occupy high status posts in British primary schools.²

This situation is prevalent throughout our society and not just in educational institutions. As a result, teachers (whether female or male) accept such cultural beliefs about the sexual division of labour. From the excerpts from interviews with the teachers (both male and female) it was obvious that many expressed a 'traditional' attitude towards the

-
1. See Belott, Elena G., 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
 2. See Byrne, Eileen, 1978: Women and Education, Tavistock, London, for statistics.

ideas of "masculinity" and "femininity". They believe that it is men's place to work and pursue a career with what is assumed to be a single-minded dedication. Other research has indicated¹ that women are taught to accept a sexual identity that is in line with what society deems as 'appropriate' gender behaviour and this does not include challenging for power positions.

Lack of confidence is borne out of achievement-related conflicts in women and, according to Matina Horner (1974)², is a 'motive' to avoid success. Women have to face the reality of a situation where the decision to move upwards is made in a male-centred environment, with little or no support; it is obviously difficult to give up the security and rewards of face-to-face teaching for the doubtful privilege of becoming an authority figure and standing alone.

Ronald King (1978) has pointed out, that the "ideologies of infant education are human products", the "acceptance of which constrained teachers and through them the children they taught" (p.132). In having to deal with the social realities in both Dock Side and Long Meadow it would seem that teachers take on coping strategies, which not only endorse traditional beliefs, but may in fact reinforce certain assumptions that are held with regard to girls' and boys' behaviour.³

1. Fennema, Elizabeth, 1976: "Women and Girls in Public Schools: Defeat or Liberation?" in Joan Roberts (Ed.) Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A new reality, David McKay, New York.

2. Horner, Matina, 1974: "Toward an Understanding of Achievement-related Conflicts in Women" in Judith Stacey, Susan Bereaud and Joan Daniels (Eds.) And Jill Came Tumbling After, Dell, New York.

3. Ricks and Pyke found that teachers believed the two sexes behaved differently. See Ricks, F.A. & Pyke, S.W., 1973: "Teacher perceptions and attitudes that foster or maintain sex-role differences", Interchange, Vol. 4, pp.26-33.

Teachers may frequently interact differently with girls than with boys. Evidence from the interviews supports such a hypothesis. Despite the fact that all the male teachers stated they would not treat the girls and boys differently in any way, they did emphasise that they would react differently when punishing a misdemeanour:

"I would give a swift kick up the boys' backside more than I would the girls".

"On the whole I'm stricter with the boys than with the girls. But then a lot of that is because trouble comes from the boys than from the girls".

"Girls never seem to be mischievous as the boys so I suppose I do overlook the few misdemeanours the odd girl may get up to".

It has to be remembered that the above statements come from male teachers who teach in Dock Side and Long Meadow, where the disruptive element amongst the boys was most noted.¹ But one cannot avoid thinking that the fact that men teachers do not punish their female pupils as readily as boys, reflects traditional attitudes towards females.²

The frustrations and annoyances felt by the teachers towards misbehaviour in the class vary, and are affected by the gender of the child and the catchment area of the school. Essentially, teachers are constrained by the fundamentally contradictory goals of the education system in capitalist society:³ the material resources i.e. pupil-teacher ratio,

-
1. Gabriel, 1957: op.cit. in his study has suggested that this difference in disciplinary procedure between male and female teachers arises out of the fact that "assertive defiance would easily upset feminine sensitivities" (p.92). His hypothesis however, reveals his own beliefs in gender stereotypes rather than the root causes of the problem.
 2. See Davies, 1979: op.cit.
 3. See Hargreaves, Andy, 1978: "The Significance of Classroom Coping Strategies" in Len Barton & Roland Meigham (Eds.) Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal, Nafferton Books Driffeld.

buildings, facilities etc., are at variance with the educational ideology. The pressures on teachers are such that their instructional and ideological goals begin to take second place to a concern with personal 'survival'.¹

At a substantive level many types of dilemma faced in the expediting of teaching processes have been analysed² and conflicts in the teacher role have been a focus of research for many years.³ It has been shown that teachers attempt to establish their authority through an ordered set of routines and procedures which assists them in 'coping' with the large number of children in their classes. Such authority, routines and procedures are negotiated not only on the basis of age and social class of the pupil, but also on the basis of gender, and this reflects attitudes and divisions within society as a whole.

A problem that both teachers and pupils share is that they have to 'cope with'⁴ and accomplish their daily classroom lives. Chapter IX of this thesis deals extensively with the children's relative positions in the official school and the unofficial child social systems, so I shall

-
1. See Woods, Peter, 1977: "Teaching for survival" in P. Woods & M. Hammersley (Eds.) School Experience, Croom Helm, London, and Pollard, Andrew, 1982: "A Model of Classroom Coping Strategies", British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.19-37.
 2. Berlak, H. & Berlak, A., 1976: "Towards a political and social psychological theory of schooling", Interchange, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp.11-22; Berlak, H. & Berlak, A., 1981: The Dilemmas of Schooling, Methuen, London, and Hammersley, Martin, 1979: "Towards a model of teacher activity", John Eggleston (Ed.) Teacher Decision Making in the Classroom, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 3. Wilson, 1962: op.cit.; Westwood, L.J., 1967: "The role of the teacher", Educational Research, Pt. I, Vol. 9, No.2, pp.122-134 and Pt. II, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp.21-37 and Grace, Gerald, 1972: Role Conflict and the Teacher, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
 4. See Hargreaves, 1978, op.cit.; for his definition of 'coping strategies'.

conclude with some reflections on the way in which the specific biographical experiences of teachers (including the influence of family life and other concerns outside the sphere of the school) will impinge upon their goals as teachers. Andrew Pollard (1982) makes an important contribution towards the analysis of 'coping strategies' in demonstrating that by using the concept of 'self', he has identified an important element contributing to the subjective meaning of 'coping' which has hithertobefore been ignored.¹ Extending Hargreaves' analysis² Pollard states that:

"... the consideration of biography must itself draw on an awareness of structural factors".

Pollard, 1982: p.29

G.H. Mead (1934)³ pointed out that the social origin of self would have a specific structural location:

"We are individuals born into a certain nationality, located at a certain spot geographically, with such and such family relations, and such and such political relations. All of these represent a certain situation which constitutes the 'me'".

Mead, 1934: p.182

Given this, it is important to investigate the possible connections between self-conceptions and the positions of individuals in the social structure.

As teachers and as women their self-conceptions will conform with the ideas and conventions of the dominant culture, which they will tend to 'support' in order to confirm their own idealised images of themselves.

1. Pollard, 1982: op.cit.

2. Hargreaves, 1978: op.cit.

3. Mead, George H., 1934: Mind, Self and Society, University of Chicago Press.

In the earlier part of this chapter it was pointed out that most of the teachers accept the 'child-centred ideology' of English primary education, and rather than perceive any 'inadequacies' (either of the school or their pupils) as being the consequences of wider political implications, they laid such inadequacies at 'the door' of the parents and the 'short-comings' of the pupils' home backgrounds.

The particular nature of their self-image (teachers, women and mothers) will be greatly influenced by culturally-mediated definitions of acceptability. Such definitions will emphasise their anxieties over unfavourable assessments of competence as teachers and will be influenced by their own expectations of what constitutes being a 'good' wife or mother. In the case of Dock Side and Long Meadow their anxieties over such competence will be placated by locating the 'fault' with the pupils' parents and home background (Chapters IV and V).

Finally the suggestion that women are relatively more conscientious and that they tend to identify themselves more with the progress and behaviour of children could be due, not only to their previous upbringing as women,¹ but also to their existing experiences as wives and mothers. Such experiences, of necessity, impinge upon their role as teachers, in that there is a strong similarity between their situation as women and mothers and their role as primary school teachers.²

1. Belotti, 1975: op.cit.

2. See Bernstein, Basil, 1975a: "Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible", Class, Codes and Control, Vol. III, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Conclusions

In their attempts to pursue a 'child-centred' approach to primary education teachers faced contradictions (especially in Dock Side and Long Meadow) between their theoretically-derived ideals and the practical difficulties of putting them into operation. It was clear from their interviews that they used 'coping strategies' which reinforced the already existing stratifications in society based on gender and class. This was compounded by their own expectations of an 'ideal' and 'normal' pupil (either girl or boy), of appropriate social and gender behaviour, and of the actual and perceived levels of achievement among the children.

Their expressed practices and views are a function of the constraints, both ideological and material, with which they are faced. Whilst numerous studies have sought to describe and explain these 'ideological and material constraints',¹ many have overlooked that the sense of 'self', by which 'coping' may be subjectively understood by teachers, will be formed by a number of personal elements associated with biography. These "personal elements" are to a large degree related to the fact that many of the primary school teachers are female and therefore have to contend with the constraints of patriarchy and the ideological beliefs and attitudes encompassing the 'ideal' behaviour of mothers, wives and women. They are therefore unwilling victims of a structure that undermines the moral concerns they profess and creates particular contradictions to their own perspective on their activity. So the majority of teachers will, due to their own upbringing and education, the dual work lives of female teachers and the material and

1. See for example: Sharp & Green, 1975: op.cit.; King, 1978; op.cit.; and Hargreaves, 1978: op.cit.

ideological constraints in their teaching situation, use 'coping' strategies which can in no way offer any effective challenge to the gender power relationships which constitute patriarchy.

The next chapter will attempt to observe and explain actual classroom practices and will thus go beyond the perspectives of the individual teachers and explore the tensions which occur between the meanings and the actions, intentions and outcomes, and consciousness and the reality.

CHAPTER VII

Gender Differentiation in the Organisation and Management of the Classroom

Introduction

Although there has been lengthy discussion in the existing literature about sex-segregation and inequality in classroom routine and the carrying out of tasks (Frazier and Sadker, 1973; Lobban, 1978; Weinreich, 1978), further analysis is needed to explore the link between schooling experience and learning 'appropriate' gender behaviour in order to reveal how pupils are equipped with the fundamentals in behaviour that are seen as essential to their future adult lives in the wider society, in relation to class and gender.

Extensive research has shown that, in the routines of school life, children learn to act as members of the formal organisational sub-groupings of ethnicity, race and class (Sharp and Green, 1975; Rist, 1970; Sieber, 1976). The researcher will attempt to fill in an important gap by including gender and revealing the different intricacies involved in the organisation of this latter category in the processes of classroom life.

The chapter will be presented in the following way:

In the previous chapter, the teachers insisted that they treated the girls and boys alike - or think they do. Yet the researcher has shown that teachers have in their 'mind's eye' a roughly constructed ideal type which,

we shall see, is very much related to a child's 'appropriate' gender behaviour. So before any teacher meets her/his new group of children she/he already has specifically defined expectations, attributes and characteristics of what they will perceive from a girl or boy. Indeed notions of 'femininity' and 'masculinity' may loom large within the teachers' perspectives because education is seen as something which is to prepare children for their future 'place' in society.

The emphasis in this chapter will be to explore the extent to which teachers' responses in the classroom differ towards boys and girls. Previous researchers have shown that the 'hidden' curriculum¹ is largely unconsciously taught and learned by teachers and pupils (Lobban, 1978; Scott, 1980; Payne, 1980b). This chapter will examine certain aspects of the hidden curriculum which relate to gender. It will also raise the issue of variations between schools and the extent to which this is influenced by the nature of the school's catchment area.

The first section of the chapter will examine some of the ways in which gender differentiation is used as an organising principle in the classroom, concentrating on elements which are common to all the schools. The second section will explore in more detail the use of gender differentiation in classroom control, and will bring out variations between the schools. The third section will discuss the forms that discipline takes, and the ways in which sanctions differ according to the gender of the

1. See Chapter I for a discussion of the 'hidden' curriculum. It must also be borne in mind that the research merely documents the contents of the 'hidden' curriculum as it relates to gender behaviour.

teacher and of the child, and differences between schools in these respects.

The fourth section will deal with the kinds of behaviour that teachers consider is appropriate to girls and boys respectively and some of the ways in which this is enforced. This will be followed by a section on the standards of dress, etiquette and demeanour demanded of girls and boys. A sixth section is concerned with language behaviour and demarcation according to gender, as well as with adjectives which teachers use to define girls' and boys' behaviour and the way these reflect their perception of gender differences. The chapter will conclude with some reflections on the relationship between gender categorisation and the coping strategies of teachers.

1. Gender as an organising principle in the classroom

All teachers will have notions of what they hope to 'achieve' and these notions will, to a large extent, be influenced by their assumptions about social relationships, including those of class and gender. This chapter attempts to analyse the teachers' practices within the classroom, and to see whether there are significant variations in the processes of gender demarcation between the schools. In this section, however, the researcher's intention will be to explore those elements of gender differentiation and demarcation which were essentially similar in all four settings.

It is useful to repeat what was stated in the previous chapter: namely that all the teachers claimed that in no way did they treat the children differently on the premise of gender (Chapter VI); but it is well-known

that behaviour isn't always in conformity with expressed attitudes.

In all the schools, school loyalties were inculcated through a series of obligatory school rituals and routines. In following these, all children learned to act as members of the formal organisational sub-grouping of gender. Let us take some normal everyday routines in classroom life.

Proper 'line-up' formation in all the schools involved children standing orderly and reasonably at attention in their 'place' in line, and remaining quiet. Permeating this everyday routine were notions of gender: in all of the schools studied it was an everyday occurrence to hear:

"Girls form a line at the door", announces
the teacher of an infants' class.
"Now the boys, go and form a line".

The researcher noted in general that teachers will as a rule "hold" a class up for up to ten minutes until proper line-up behaviour occurs before leaving the classroom for any purpose. This form of organisation was regularly exercised throughout the four schools. Children were lined up to come into school, queued to go into assembly, formed lines to return to class, to go to the gym.¹ In all the schools, by the time the pupils had reached the Top Juniors, they did not need to be reminded to form sex-segregated lines.

1. Apparently this is an everyday occurrence in most schools throughout the country; see Lobban, Glenys, 1975: "Sexism in British Primary Schools", Women Speaking, 4 July. It also exists in other countries where its importance has been assessed: see Seiber, Robert, 1976: Schooling in the Bureaucratic Classroom: Socialisation and Social Reproduction in Chestnut Heights, Ph.D. New York University, Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Belotti, Elena, G., 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.

Not all practices, of course, are as simple as this. There were diverse and often far more complex practices going on in classrooms which had the effect of making children constantly aware of their gender identities. During school assemblies, speeches made by the headperson sometimes included congratulatory remarks to the boys for doing well in football or admonishment in the form of exhorting them to be more sporting when involved in their games. Announcements and presentation of awards were mainly directed in their (the boys') favour. In Lintonbray, the general assembly was being held:

"Our boys have come through their qualifying round successfully and are now through to the final. Let's give them a round of applause".

The boys stand up at the back and beam.¹

Identification of pupils with their gender was also enhanced by various school activities where boys and girls were encouraged to compete with one another for honour and prestige, thus creating a sense of rivalry between them. In all four schools in my research it was not uncommon, especially in the junior classes, to have 'games' of general knowledge to see which group (girls or boys) could get the most marks, and this would lead to that specific group being categorised as the 'cleverest':

In the Dock Side School (Junior 2 class)

"Let's have a game of general knowledge"
announces the teacher.
"Yeah" shouts the boys.
"Oh no" groan the girls.

Having viewed this class consistently for three weeks the researcher was

1. Belotti, 1975: ibid, has noted also that children soon become aware of the relative status of their sex vis-a-vis the opposite sex.

not surprised at the reaction from either girls or boys. Among the boys was one Ian, 'bright', fair and quiet. He was the one who was able to answer what were seen to be the most 'difficult' questions. The girls had 'lost' three times in a row. The boys were thus exultant in their expected 'triumph', whereas for the girls the anticipated loss would be one more blow to their already low status.

In the Applegate School (Top Junior Class)

A game was arranged to while away the time before the 'break-up' for Christmas holidays. Again the 'game' was between girls and boys - and subsequently the girls won. Mutters of insults were heard from the boys, whilst the girls were delighted to have 'proved' themselves in at least one of the few areas of status allowed them.

These games appear to inculcate feelings of rivalry and even of hostility which must have the effect of creating some sense of 'distance' and conflict between girls and boys. A major aspect of the common ritual activities, such as sex-segregated lines, and the encouragement of competitive games between girls and boys is that the identification of pupils with their gender group is accomplished in a much more ritualistic and formal way at school, than at home.

Children in all classes were informed by their teachers that certain behaviour was 'appropriate' according to gender, and the teachers used forms of categorisation to indicate when children were indulging in opposite gender behaviour:

"Jonathan Cowley, stop being girlish".

"Gillian Smith, I will not accept such tomboyish behaviour".

At the same time, teachers took it for granted that children wished to

conform to the norms of gender and used reference to gender quite routinely as a means of control.

In Applegate, Tracey joins a group of boys lining up at the door.

"You're a funny looking boy, Tracey", remarks the teacher.

Tracey hurriedly returns to her place.

At the small village school of Lintonbray, the boys are asked to stay when the class is dismissed. One boy mishears, and makes his way to the door; "I didn't realise you'd changed sex, Simon". Embarrassed with the ensuing laughter the boy quickly returns to the group of boys.

Teachers also exhorted the gender groups to better behaviour or performance by comparing them with each other:

"Which boys have hung their coats on the floor. You wouldn't find the girls doing that".

"The girls have already completed their sums. How about you boys taking a leaf out of their book".

"Right, girls, go and show the boys how well you can make a line by the door without fidgeting or making a noise. Boys I hope you're watching".

Hence behaviour of one gender group was evaluated with reference to the other, with one group held up as being particularly under or over par in relation to the other, which functionally facilitated the learning by the children, in the classroom, of their gender 'appropriate' behaviour.

It was common for gender groups to be the target of both positive and negative sanctions the girls or the boys received reprimands directed at the entire group in the form of punishment or special privileges:

"I'm not going to start till you boys settle down".

"Seeing as the girls have been good, you can have an extra five minutes at playtime".

"You girls have tried my patience to-day, so you can stay behind and help tidy the classroom. Perhaps then you'll learn to control yourselves".

Because of the expectations of teachers (Chapter VI) of the girls' 'trustworthiness' and general good behaviour,¹ the girls were usually reminded by teachers of the 'ideal norms' when their behaviour seriously departed from the expected standards:

"I expect better behaviour from you girls".

"Joanna, little girls do not enter the classroom like that. Go back and come in the proper manner".

The boys were also required to reach certain standards of behaviour, but the assumptions that teachers held about them affected the tactics they adopted to achieve the desired result. It was taken for granted in each of the schools that the boys would be less orderly and that keeping them in check would be more difficult than with the girls. As a result, 'requests' to conform to good behaviour would often be repeated before compliance was insisted upon:

"We're waiting for the talking to stop ... We're still waiting and it seems like the same boys".

"All right you boys I know you're fed up but do stop running around. Just be patient, it'll be home-time soon".

The day is drawing to a close, the teacher states: "put your pencils down and tidy your books away before you get your coats". There is the sound of desk lids slamming, the hurried anticipation of going home which is reminiscent of all schools at 4 o'clock or thereabouts. The teacher asks for five seconds silence before they move off to the cloakroom; at a signal most of the children

1. For further evidence see Belotti, 1975: ibid., Frazier, Nancy and Sadker, Myra, 1973: Sexism in School and Society, Harper & Row, New York, and Lobban, Glenys, 1978: "The Influence of the School on Sex-Role Stereotyping" in Jane Chetwynd and Oonagh Hartnett (eds.), The Sex Role System, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

sit in an erect position with their arms folded. There is a scuffling and shuffling from a group of boys so the teacher announces: "We will all sit here until the boys decide to join us". The class waits for another five minutes and then Mrs. Watson states: "Karen and Tracey have sat for five whole minutes without moving. Well done you girls, I wish you boys would follow their example".

It can be seen that the behaviour expected of children varied according to gender and that a standard assumption was held that boys were "problems" while girls were "responsible" and "good".

We can thus see that teachers in general used gender differentiation in order to simplify their administration of the classroom. And in general it will be seen that the categories which they employed to order the situation actually 'work' for them. This is not only because of the teachers' prior experience, schooling and socialisation where these same categories were used and hence legitimised,¹ but also because this form of everyday stratification (gender differentiation) was similar to the experience of children within their home and community.

So far the researcher has attempted to describe some straightforward mechanisms in the process of gender differentiation to show how the gender identification of the children is reinforced and to specify certain

1. See Sharp, Rachel and Green, Anthony, 1975: Education and Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Hargreaves, Andy, 1978: "The Significance of Classroom Coping Strategies" in Len Barton and Roland Meighan (eds.), Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal, Nafferton Books; and Dale, Roger, 1977: "The Implications of the Rediscovery of the Hidden Curriculum for the Sociology of Teaching" in D. Gleeson (ed.) Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education, Nafferton Books.

patterns of stratification which were basic, and present in all four schools. The next four sections will expand some of these themes and will bring in further aspects of gender differentiation, exploring variations between the schools.

The researcher will sketch out some of the dimensions of variability and suggest ways in which they were socially structured and related to other significant processes, which will be identified.

2. Classroom Control and Management

Classroom structure and organisation are dependent upon the exercise of control by the teachers.¹ Because this requirement is so basic within the education system it is the teachers' central focus. Discipline to them, is an important feature of their role as a teacher;

1. Hargreaves, David, 1967: Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, states: "Teachers have a number of basic problems. The class must be under the firm control of the teacher, the children must learn, and the children must show evidence of their learning" (p.103). Sharp and Green, 1975, op.cit., also remark: "... the following are of importance for the teachers' practice: expectations are placed upon her from professional colleagues and superiors, from parents and others regarding the levels of achievements she is to maintain. Similarly she will be required to live up to certain standards of 'good pedagogical practice' set within the wider community of professional colleagues and more crucially by those who are in a position of power over her within the school itself. In addition parents and colleagues will look to her to maintain social order in the classroom" (p.116). See also Jackson, Phil, 1968: Life in Classrooms, Holt, Rinehart, New York; Sieber, 1976, op.cit., sees "Good Classroom Management" as necessary for formal curricular activities to proceed smoothly.

indeed their very existence as teachers depends upon their 'skill' in keeping order in the class and in coping with the plethora of trivia that surrounds classroom life. This is a yardstick by which teachers and headpersons measure each other (Blyth, 1965; Sharp and Green, 1975). Signs of chaos or disturbance in a classroom soon brings a teacher into disrepute amongst colleagues (King, 1978; Sharp and Green, 1975¹), and teachers are aware that they must maintain order.

In the four schools studied, the researcher noted that the discipline² of the pupils had top priority within the classroom. Robert Sieber states:

"It is necessary to consider 'discipline' as constituting significant pressures on school pupils to learn the modes of behaviour appropriate to life in formal organisations".

(Sieber, 1976, p.32)

But Sieber, and other researchers like him (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Dreeben, 1970, 1973) have failed to take gender into account in their analyses, focussing upon it only marginally, without recognising its significance. Sieber, for instance, writes that when a pupil becomes "disciplined" in the classroom, "it means that not only does he learn to behave in a manner that permits social control in the classroom organisation", but that in so doing the child is able "to learn the basic

-
1. See their empirical chapters for evidence of this.
 2. School discipline plays very important socialisation functions, see Warren, R.L., 1975: "Context and Isolation: The Teaching Experience in an Elementary School", Human Organisation, Vol. 34, No. 2; Mayer, Philip (ed.), 1970, "Introduction" in Socialisation: Approach from Social Anthropology, Tavistock, London. Durkheim, Emile, 1966, Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education, Translated by E.K. Wilson and H. Schnurer, Free Press, New York.

norms and behaviour patterns that will be appropriate in filling his future occupational and other adult "public" 'roles'" (Sieber, 1976, p.32). Repetitious though it may be, the researcher must point out that to "learn the basic norms and behaviour patterns" that will be "appropriate" ... requires an analysis of gender. One must credit Sieber with a clear analysis of the functioning of the 'hidden' curriculum in his observations of patterned subvariations in the school's sorting of its charges for differential recruitment.¹ But little attempt has been made to explore the variations of the "hidden" curriculum in the types of gender conformity transmitted to the children, although these variations have been noted by others.² The researcher will provide extensive empirical material to show the variation in the schooling experience, which though not dramatic, nevertheless was significant.

The researcher has already indicated that the teachers in general, in each of the schools, relied on girls to behave themselves and to do as they were told without question:

-
1. This form of differential recruitment has been observed to reproduce pre-existing class, colour, caste and/or ethnic boundaries see Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., 1976, Schooling in Capitalist America, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; and the collection of papers in Karabel, J. and Halsey, A., (Eds.) 1977: Power and Ideology in Education, Oxford University Press, which have been accomplished through differential provision of educational "services" see Jackson, Brian, 1964: Streaming: An Education System in Miniature, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and Douglas, J.W.B., 1964: Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London.
 2. See Wolpe, Anne-Marie, 1977: Some Processes in Sexist Education, Women's Research and Resources Centre, London; Marks, Pauline, 1976: "Femininity in the Classroom" in Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley (Eds.), The Rights and Wrongs of Women, Penguin, Harmondsworth; Belotti, 1975, op.cit.

Elaine tosses a book to another pupil, causing a slight disturbance. The teacher, with (feigned) horror in her voice checks her immediately:
"I would have expected that from one of the boys, but not from you".
When Elaine attempts to make her excuses she is further rebuked:
"Don't answer me back ... my goodness you're in a funny mood to-day. You know I expect much better behaviour from you girls".
Elaine falls silent.

But while all the schools treated boys and girls differently in the course of establishing control within the classroom, the manner in which this was done varied from school to school.

One of the reasons for this variation may lie in the way the schools perceive and experience differences between boys and girls in terms of maintenance of discipline. Dock Side was seen as having greater discipline problems than most schools:

"We have a real problem with these kids when it comes to discipline, especially with the lads".

"You have to watch yourself here; give 'em an inch and they'll take a mile".

"You have to make allowances for these type of children ... you've got to keep a firm grip on them, otherwise you've had it".

In order to contain the disruptive element among the boys¹, teachers spent a good deal of their attention in attempting to keep them occupied:

"I must admit I direct a lot of my attention to encouraging the lads because I have such tremendous discipline problems with them".

"You know I came into the class after lunch and these kids were just throwing books at one another".

1. The fact that boys were seen as more disruptive (in other studies) has been noted by Belotti, 1975, op.cit. Lobban, 1978, op.cit. and the collection of articles in Spender, Dale, and Sarah, Elizabeth, 1980: Learning to Lose: Sexism in Education, Women's Press, London.

"If you get a group of lads who are beyond reasoning with they can make your life hell".

In general most of the teachers maintained that behavioural problems came from the boys and Dock Side had more than its fair share of 'problems'. However, this same school also tended to have some behavioural problems with the girls:

"Even the girls tend to be a handful ..."

"The girls are generally better than the boys, mind you they can act up a bit if they've a mind to".

The reaction to forms of misbehaviour and to the forms of aggression, by the teachers, was rigid and tended to reflect the general philosophy of this school - severity and austerity:

"I had a lad who came at me with fists flying ... my immediate reaction was to 'cuff him round the ear' and then haul him off to the head for a 'real set to'".

"You can't argue with any of them - they'll give as much back. You have to be stern, let them know what's what".

"One's got to be fair, but you mustn't let them think you're soft, otherwise you're lost".

Long Meadow had similar 'problems' to Dock Side, in that children were seen as in need of discipline, specifically the boys who were much more disruptive than the girls. The teachers perceived the problem in this way:

"You have to be strict with the children, they're from such poor backgrounds. The boys especially are a handful".

"Boys are more difficult to handle".

"They (boys) are more likely to be boisterous and go mad ..."

"Boys tend to be more aggressive definitely ..."

They duly attributed 'the lack of discipline' to the home with its

accompanying 'relative deprivation' but yet 'recognised' that girls were much better behaved than the boys:

"I find girls much less troublesome than the boys".

"Certainly the girls get down to their work much better than the boys".

"Girls are not so aggressive ..."

But as in all schools, boys' 'unruly' behaviour was much more acceptable than girls', despite the fact that teachers spent more of their time reprimanding the misbehaviour of boys.¹ The boys in both schools tended to squabble and fight in groups, arguing over who was doing better than who, or over a rubber or a pencil sharpener, their noise and activity filling the whole classroom. It was only after a while that the teacher was forced to rebuke them (Top Infants in Long Meadow).

"Gareth" exclaims the teachers, "get on with your work, and the rest of you boys be quiet. I want that work finished by the end of the lesson; some of the girls have already finished so pull your socks up".

The boys merely snorted and pulled exaggerated faces at the beaming faces of the girls who smirk their disapproval of the boys.

Whilst the teachers tended to deal directly with the misbehaviour and aggression from the children, especially the boys, they hold a less paternalistic philosophy than Dock Side. The view at Long Meadow was that the children are really not to blame and that their behaviour is the fault of their 'deprived backgrounds':

1. For a similar finding see Spaulding, R.L., 1963, "Achievement, creativity and self-concept correlates of teacher-pupil transactions" quoted in P. Sears and D.H. Feldman, 1974: "Teacher interactions with boys and girls", reprinted in J. Stacey, S. Bereaud and J. Daniels (Eds.), And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education, Dell, New York.

"I had to break up a fight in the playground between these two lads ... y'know it was the usual ... a big crowd egging 'em on. But at the heart of it these kids are crying out for attention".

"A lot of them, especially the boys, have to prove how tough they are and they try it on in the class - showing off in front of everybody. These children have hardly ever had the love and attention they need".

"They can be real so and so's if they put their mind to it but inside they're screaming: 'look at me', 'look at me' ... and that's what it's all about".

The philosophy of the teachers at Long Meadow is reflected in their handling of the situation:

"I appeal to their reason - they do have it. I mean some of these lads will really sit and listen if you give them the chance".

"You have to be firm ... I mean they're growing up in a rough area, well you know what life on the estates is like? They have to be taught or go under.."

"If you give them the chance they'll protect others weaker than themselves, so you turn their attention to others needing more consideration."

Applegate school and its staff also took a dichotomous view towards gender behaviour. But whereas Dock Side and Long Meadow expected serious disciplinary problems, Applegate did not (see Chapter V). Teachers at this school demanded a discipline which was more self-imposed from both girls and boys:

"We expect greater self-control from the children at this school".

"There is a very high standard of behaviour expected from all our pupils".

"Discipline has been well established in most of these children's homes and we expect them to keep to it".

However certain gender categories were applied to their behaviour. Anxious to create an academic atmosphere in the school the headperson and teachers felt the need to establish, as early as possible, an awareness amongst their pupils of being in a 'good' school. 'Chivalry' and sedate behaviour were expected and demanded, and certainly aggressive behaviour in general was discouraged in Applegate but again, more actively in girls than in boys:

"It's not nice to see a young girl fighting".

"You would expect it from boys, although I myself wouldn't condone it, rather than you would expect it from girls".

"I expect a high standard of behaviour from my girls, and fighting and swearing is totally inexcusable".

The expectation of 'chivalric' behaviour, of the boys towards the girls, became apparent on a number of occasions:

There was a rush for the door when the bell rang for playtime. The teacher was heard to comment: "You boys stand back and let the girls through first; come on now be young gentlemen"

On another occasion:

When an argument broke out in class and the teacher interceded one young boy announced: "It was them girls, Miss ..."
"Really Darren that's hardly chivalrous of you ... why don't you be honourable and take the blame ..." stated the teacher.
Darren merely shrugs and looks uncomfortable.

Whilst in the other schools, especially Dock Side and Long Meadow, tensions and antagonisms tended to be expressed between the girls and boys, in Applegate this was suppressed under the guise of chivalry.

The category of 'tomboy' behaviour in Applegate (increasingly reflecting the expectations of turning out 'young ladies') was much less acceptable:

Helle was an active child, keen on sports and in general quite boisterous. Her activity¹ level caused some concern to her teacher.

"Helle don't go dashing about like that, I'd expect it from one of the boys but certainly not from you."

Also, fighting and arguing amongst the pupils was taboo, particularly aggression between the girls and boys (this discussion is developed in a later chapter):

In the lower juniors, two girls and three boys were in the middle of a heated debate as to who should have the abacus. In exasperation Joanne (one of the girls) picked up the apparatus and was about to hurl it at one of the boys. Miss Simons (the teacher) interceded at this point:

"You could have all used the abacus if there'd been a bit more give and take on both sides. As for you boys you could have been a little more gallant about it and Joanne Pearson don't let me dare see you behaving so violently again".

If we turn our attention to the village school of Lintonbray we can see that this school also takes a dichotomous view of the pupils with regard to gender:

"Girls do apply themselves more diligently and more correctly to what it is they're doing".

"Girls are more static in their activities ..."

"Girls do tend to be more conscientious".

The teachers regarded the school as having no great problems concerning discipline since it was such a small school, with only fifty-four pupils.

1. Loo, C. and Wenar, C., 1971, "Activity level and motor inhibition: their relation to intelligence test performance in normal children", Child Development, Vol. 42, pp. 967-971, asked pre-school teachers to rate their girl and boy pupils in terms of how active they were. The teachers rated boys as more active but an objective measure of activity showed no sex differences.

They, as other teachers did, interpreted behaviour according to gender stereotypes, expecting their female pupils to be conscientious, quiet and inactive, whilst expecting their male pupils to be active, boisterous and assertive:

There was a scuffle in the classroom:
"Alright you boys it'll be playtime soon,
then you can release all that energy
in the playground. Kate Thompson if you
don't sit still, you'll not go out at all".

Yet on another occasion, when the boys leapt to the door at the sound of the bell, the teacher merely responded:

"Steady as you make your way to the door".

Forms of classroom control and management thus appear to differ in each of the four schools. In each of the schools, however, the teachers relied upon girls behaving themselves. In Dock Side this reliance may have been an attempt to reduce the disruptive element among the boys. Teachers expected girls to set a good example in their behaviour and directed life to such expectations. Girls were relied upon to helping keep the class in check; assured of their 'conformity' and good behaviour, teachers were able to concentrate on keeping the other half of the class 'in line':

The usual business of registering the pupils and sorting out the dinner money is going on one Monday morning. Some of the boys are beginning to get restless and two start to run round the class. Jenny gets up and joins them. The teacher's response is immediate:
"Alright Jenny, that will do. I expect that sort of behaviour from the boys but not from you".

A couple of the teachers remarked:

"I rely on the girls to be reasonably behaved ... I mean if they start acting up, then it'll be sheer anarchy".

"At least you know half the class is settled ...

is going to get on with the work, and that cuts your problem by half".

It appears that girls are seen to be useful in the attempt to run an orderly class.

Such gender differentiation is also present in Applegate in that girls were held to be more "co-operative" and "responsible". On one occasion a teacher insisted that girls tidy up the classroom before going out to play:

The girls reacted by stating that the boys made most of the mess, so they should clear it up. Seeing the unfairness of it the teacher replied, bolstering their morale: "It's you girls I trust; if the boys did it they would only make a mess of it".

In many situations, in order to facilitate classroom management, the girls were regularly held up as examples of quiet orderly behaviour:

"Could the girls show us in a quiet orderly way how to form a neat line".
The girls do so.
"Now will the boys follow the girls' example and make a line by the door".
The boys grudgingly do so.

The teachers' categorisation of pupils into girls and boys, and the comparisons that followed from this, was used by them to stir the boys into greater conformity in Applegate; whereas in Dock Side differentiation was used to cut down the disruptive element among the boys. In many ways this corresponds to the practices observed in the other schools - Long Meadow and Lintonbray - , but there is also a difference, which derives from the fact that the boys in this particular catchment area accede to the middle class values of education and, like the girls, tended to conform to the teachers' requests and demands for good behaviour and high achievement in class. The reliance of the teachers upon the good behaviour of the girls was more noticeable at Dock Side than in

other schools.

Long Meadow and Lintonbray relied upon the girls behaving themselves, as did Dock Side and Applegate. In Long Meadow some of the teachers informed the researcher:

"The girls are really helpful and I can rely on them to be sensible and get on with their work".

"There are problems with a lot of these kids, especially the lads, so it's a relief to have the girls behaving themselves".

"I've had a hell'uva day with the lads ... it took me all my time to keep control of them. Thank goodness I don't have that problem with the girls".

Similarly in Lintonbray:

"I give far more responsibilities to the girls - you know you can trust them. Mind you I'm not saying we have a problem with discipline and behaviour with all of the lads ... it's that they tend to be the ones that can play you up or be the 'clowns' in the class".

"When you give out instructions ... you know saying to a class what we're going to do, you know you only have to say it just the once with the girls. Now the boys ... that's a different matter altogether".

It would seem that all the schools tended to categorise the behaviour of their pupils according to gender groupings in the teachers' attempts to facilitate classroom management. Various techniques were in operation, utilising gender categorisations, throughout the four schools. Comparisons were frequently made by teachers between the girls and boys. Again more often than not, this occurred when a teacher was trying to gain some semblance of order:

In Dock Side school it was time for milk in the second year infants and there was a general

scurrying around of the children who took advantage of the break from written work. A group: some boys and mostly girls, had already taken up their positions on the floor. In order to try to get the rest of the children settled, the teacher stated: "Why don't you do as you are told like the girls do. Now put away your things and sit down on the floor".

The significance of this goes beyond merely drawing a distinction between girls and boys and using the comparison to get the boys to behave in the desired manner. The categorisation comes to influence the way in which the teacher 'sees' what is taking place within the classroom. In the incident described, some of the boys were behaving well and some of the girls were not. Despite this, the teacher's commands did not simply distinguish 'good' from the 'bad' children but identified the well-behaved children with the girls and the poorly-behaved children with the boys even though this was not factually the case.

Even in Applegate, where 'behavioural problems' were not so extreme as in Dock Side, such comparisons were made:

"Now then girls stand quietly and show the boys how to form a perfect line".

"Girls! We must always remember to behave properly and set a good example to the boys".

"Are you boys watching and taking note of how the girls come into class in an orderly line".

Such categorising, and comparisons, of behaviour according to gender was frequent, despite the fact that, to the observer, there was on many occasions no real difference between the girls or boys. The public evaluation and categorisation of behaviour inevitably reinforces gender stereotyping when many of the assessments that are made of the pupils is determined by the children's 'conformity' to the teachers' gender expectations. These categories tend to be hardened, the fit being more

convincing to their users (the teachers) the more the children continued to feed back the 'appropriate' behavioural cues:

Three boys and a girl start quarrelling over a book:

"Boys, if I have to tell you off once more, I shall send you to Mr. Hardy".

This process of hardening the children's gender identity is obviously related to the degree to which extra-classroom audiences accept and also reinforce this reified definition of the children's appropriate gender. But it may safely be stated that in so sustaining the structure of gender groupings, the teachers see it as pressure taken off them and as a reduction of their management problem. In Long Meadow time and again classroom control was exercised on the basis of a comparison of girls' and boys' behaviour:¹

"Would Graham Clark show us how nicely boys go to the door".

"Now Cecilia would you show how sensibly girls walk to the door".

"Boys, are you watching how nicely they do it, not pushing or shoving".

The examples are endless; despite the fact that some girls were involved in active play and rushed around they were still seen as more static and hence passive than the boys - in fact they were seen to conform to the 'good pupil' role by teachers. Children were frequently rebuked on the basis of behaviour and some girls were difficult to control:

(In Lintonbray):

"All come and sit down here" demands Mrs. Stebbings
Most of the children move forward.

"It seems we have one, two three
four boys who are not in our class".

It escapes her attention that two girls
have not acquiesced to her demand.

1. David Hartley, 1977, noticed a similar dimension in Some Consequences of Teachers' Definitions of Boys and Girls in Two Infant Schools, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Exeter.

As previously noted this suggests that teachers' expectations influence their perceptions, and lead them to respond differently to the same behaviour depending on whether it was a girl or a boy who was involved.¹

The differentiation and comparisons had unfortunate consequences. One was the tendency to create a feeling amongst the boys that 'favouritism' was shown to the girls by the teachers, as we can see in Applegate:

"Will you two girls take the register back to Mr. Seaton".

Some boys volunteer.

"Thank you boys, but I've chosen Sarah and Melissa to go".

The boys sit down, muttering under their breath: "it's not fair".

Two junior girls are selected to serve tea to Mr. Seaton in the mornings.

"You never let us take Sir his tea", protests Anthony..

"I'll find something else for you to do more appropriate" replies the teacher.

"I wouldn't mind serving the tea", continues Anthony. Nods of agreement come from a group of boys.

The process of selecting pupils to carry out certain tasks simply because they were thought more 'suitable', helps to maintain the social distance (which already existed) between the boys and the girls.

To extend this latter point, albeit briefly, it was common in all four schools that everyday 'duties' were assigned by gender: boys were usually requested to carry the milk crates, move furniture, etc., whereas the girls were required to perform the lighter tasks,² this despite the fact

1. See Feschbach, N.D., 1969: "Student Teacher preferences for elementary school pupils varying in personality characteristics", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 60 (2), pp. 126-132.

2. See Belotti's work, 1975, op.cit. and also the collection of articles in J. Stacey et. al. (Eds.), 1974: op.cit., for further evidence, and Byrne, Eileen, 1978: Women and Education, Tavistock, London.

that there was very little physical difference between girls and boys. Thus there exists within the classroom a 'sexual division of labour' which reflects many of the expected norms in adult life, viz. that girls and boys are fitted to 'certain' tasks. It is no accident that girls were expected to carry out certain duties, whilst boys were expected to carry out what are usually regarded as 'masculine' tasks. Allowing pupils the experience of carrying out what are seen as sex-specific tasks necessitates the filling of certain functions and positions in gender-based relationships. Girls are informed that they perform certain tasks and boys perform others in 'adult forms of behaviour'.

Teachers unwittingly created a division between the two groups by their process of selection and this led to an intensification of the girls' commitment to teachers and school. Because of the categorisation of girls' behaviour as 'conformist', they were utilised both in maintaining control of the class and fulfilling specific tasks.¹

It came to the researcher's attention that when comparisons between the girls and boys had no effect on the boys' behaviour, teachers used what the researcher would call a 'second line' in their attempt to gain control:

In Dock Side the teacher of a top junior's class of 8-9 year olds found the boys conspiring together; the teacher who was male, came towards them and said, half in jest and half serious:
"You should hear yourselves, you sound more like a bunch of girls chattering and giggling".

1. See Belotti, 1975: op.cit.; Lobban, 1978: op.cit. for similar observations.

The boys' reaction was to become quiet.¹ As can be seen this was contrary to the previous stereotype of 'manageable, goody-goody' girls. The teacher did not make a comparison between them and a younger class,² but a comparison by gender.

With the knowledge that most of the pupils wished to conform to the norms of gender (especially the boys), this reserve guard of action - whereby boys' behaviour is categorised as being 'feminine' - is used by the teachers in a variety of ways:

In Long Meadow a teacher of the top infants' class informs the boys:
"I'm beginning to think that you are no better than the girls if you continue to behave like that".
There is an uneasy silence and one of the more vociferous amongst the boys vehemently states:
"But we're not girls, Miss!".

Similarly in Lintonbray:

"Simon, if you're going to carry on like that then I'll leave you behind with the girls".

-
1. Perhaps I should say that this reaction is influenced by the sexual division within the catchment area, and the marked polarisation between the 'masculine' and 'feminine' worlds. And possibly the Dock Side boys are more 'afraid' of cross-sexual labels and intolerant of what is assumed 'sex-inappropriate' behaviour and that boys in general appear to be more actively deterred from cross-sex behaviour and traits (especially by their fathers). See Maccoby, E. E. and Jacklin, G.N., 1974: The Psychology of Sex Differences, Oxford University Press; Hartley, Ruth E., 1959: "Sex-Role Pressures and the Socialisation of the Male Child" in Psychology Reports, Vol. 5, pp. 457-468; Biller, H.B. and Borstelmann, J., 1967: "Masculine Development and integrative review", Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Vol. 13, pp. 253-294; Feinman, S., 1974: "Approval of cross-sex role behaviour", Psychology Reports, Vol. 35, pp. 643-648; Fagot, B.I. and Litman, J., 1975: "Stability of sex-role and play interests from pre-school to elementary school", Journal of Psychology, Vol. 89, pp. 285-292.
 2. Sieber, 1976: op.cit. found this a major comparison used in order to gain social control; however Hargreaves (1967) states that 'ability' groups were compared in his study, op.cit.

This tactic was used to bring any disruptive boys 'into line' and in Dock Side in particular, because of the threat to their 'masculinity' it had the immediate effect of quietening the boys down.

Such contradictions also exist in the level of tolerance of girls' and boys' behaviour:¹

In Dock Side a teacher rebuked a girl for being disruptive.
"Stop dashing round the classroom Patricia".
However, Patricia was only one of three children who were dashing round the classroom.
The other two were boys.

The researcher does not wish to argue that girls' misbehaviour was invariably treated more harshly than boys; the relationship is much more complex than this as will be shown later. But I would put forward the suggestion that 'misbehaviour' is judged in relation to what is expected from either sex, rather than according to a universalistic norm. To make this clearer the researcher wishes to provide a further illustration:

Craig, a five year old, spent a good deal of his time in harrassing his classmates. He took a great delight in breaking up their games, bombarding any hapless child, who happened near him with marbles and was a constant source of irritation to the girls whom he maliciously attacked - either verbally or physically - and all this within the confines of the class and to the non-reaction of the teacher.
On the other hand, Sarah was prone to outbursts of temper, either screaming or letting loose a barrage of insults at her 'offender'. The researcher was present at a time when Sarah let fly a quantity of paint at Lynsey, who promptly burst into tears. Sarah's behaviour was met with severe rebuke in public by the teacher:
"Little girls do not do that", and thereafter she was nicknamed the 'paint dauber'.

1. See Brophy, J.E. and Good, T.L., 1970, "Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: some behavioural data", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 61 (5), pp. 365-374; for similar findings.

The teacher, prompted by the researcher's attention to the scene, proceeded to justify her own behaviour by stating that Sarah was a 'problem child', in that she annoyed her classmates and disrupted them from their school work. It seemed to escape her notice that this was the very same behaviour that Craig was allowed to get away with.¹ The implicit message to be read here is that girls and boys are different and merit different treatment.

Not only were different standards of tolerance applied but also similar behaviour was categorised differently depending on the sex of the child. Many times the researcher observed children involved in play, and in many instances became aware of the use of this double standard:

In Long Meadow:

Alan and Edward are involved in a game of plasticine and both are seized with a fit of laughter. They are allowed to carry on. But parallel to this - when two girls were caught up in a similar game and became noisy the teacher classed it as "giggling hysterically" and told the girls to calm down.

And yet in this particular instance there was no real distinction, to the observer, between the girls' or the boys' behaviour. What is becoming apparent is that the pupil's sex seems to be an important variable determining teachers' behaviour, and that there is a subtle interaction between the teachers' reactions and the teachers' beliefs.²

Altogether, it would seem that the schools are alike in ascribing certain forms of behaviour on the basis of gender, with boys being seen as more

-
1. Again see the research of Feschbach, 1969: op.cit. Other evidence exists that teachers are unaware that their behaviour towards boys and girls differs, see Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, op.cit.
 2. The research of Feschbach, 1969: op.cit. suggests that teachers may well respond differently to the same behaviour depending on whether it is coming from a girl or boy.

aggressive and wayward and the girls as quieter and more ready to conform. Teachers make comparisons between the sexes on this basis and such comparisons used as a means of implementing classroom control. In general then, girls are seen as conforming and their behaviour is invariably held up to the boys as such. But when this has no effect then a contradictory position is put forward, with girls' "bad" behaviour being seen as somehow "sissy" and "girlish". Furthermore, the way in which teachers react to the behaviour of individuals and small groups of children appears to be influenced by their assumptions about appropriate gender behaviour. The schools differ, however, in the degree to which they dichotomise between the sexes, in the extent to which girls are used to enforce acceptable behaviour and in the manner in which differential expectations of behaviour are applied.

3. Forms of Discipline and Sanctions: Gender Differentiation

In all the schools, punishment is another way in which the sexes are divided.¹ Punishments in the schools ranged from physical chastisement in the classroom (e.g. what is usually classed as 'a cuff round the ear') to severe admonishment and institutionalised sanctions. In the schools where boys were 'slipperered' or given some form of corporal punishment, be it a rap over the knuckles or a 'box' on the ears, they were sent to the headperson for serious misdemeanours² whilst girls were sent to the

-
1. See Berg, Leila, 1968, Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive, Penguin; Byrne, 1978, op.cit., and also Lynn Davies, 1979, "Deadlier Than the Male? Girls' Conformity and Deviance in School", in Len Barton and Roland Meighan (Eds.) Schools, Pupils and Deviance, Nafferton Books, for further evidence on divisions of punishment between girls and boys.
 2. It must be pointed out that if the headperson happened to be female and physical punishment was to be used, then the boys were sent to the senior male teacher.

senior female teacher. So both the punishment meted out to the two groups is different and also the way in which it is administered.

A group of children, 5 boys and 2 girls, were caught in the school kitchen - which is categorically out of bounds due to an outbreak of petty thefts. In order to make an example of them Mrs. Bosworth insisted that the five boys be 'slipperered' and the two girls to receive six slaps on each bare arm.

Dock Side

The use of arbitrary (physical) punishment was more apparent from the male teachers in this school and was directed more to boys than girls. Only an occasional slap, in very exceptional circumstances, was delivered by female teachers. But the isolation of a 'culprit' was used much more by females:

In the reception class Justin throws a toy to the other side of the classroom. Upon seeing this, the teacher makes him stand alone in a corner. Two other boys who had been playing with him hurriedly put the toys away in case they are admonished also. (Incidentally these two boys were quick to inform on him which questions the concept of boys' solidarity - see Chapter IX).

Girls were not as disruptive or mischievous as the boys (or were not seen to be), and hence much less punishment was meted out to them.

Because of the organisation of staff in this school,¹ boys of the infant section were sent to the head of the infants' department, who was male; whilst boys in the juniors were sent to the head of the junior department

1. Lynn Davies (1974) in her thesis that gender was an important variable in staff distribution and observed the similar implications of such a distribution, The Contribution of the Secondary School to the Sex Typing of Girls, unpublished M.Ed., University of Birmingham.

who was also male. In the latter case, this teacher was feared by all the boys because he was not averse to being 'liberal', not only with the slipper, but also with the 'cane'. As stated above, girls were sent to the female headperson, Mrs. Bosworth, who promptly gave the 'offender' a very severe talking to; and for those who were really vexatious she administered a sharp slap on each arm.

For girls, punishment was meted out for fighting in the classroom or playground, for the isolated case of disruptive behaviour and for persistently not doing as they were told. Boys' 'deviancy' was usually expressed in fighting and swearing, or isolated cases of petty theft. It must be pointed out that the fighting and swearing had to be persistent before it was punished severely as the staff expected and accepted a certain amount of such behaviour from boys, and to a certain extent from girls too.

One of the main variations in punishment practices was that male teachers were lenient to the girls' behaviour and openly admitted this (Chapter VI). This was mainly because they expected 'trouble to come from the boys' than from the girls' and hence 'tended to overlook the few misdemeanours the odd girl may get up to'.

Long Meadow

In this school the traditional attitude towards females was reflected among the two male teachers in the juniors. Rather than use physical punishment they would tend to shout at them. One of the male teachers, Mr. Vincent, informed the researcher:

"You only have to shout at the girls and they'll respond".

And another reason put forward by Mr. Swinton was:

"You realise that girls are not as physically strong as boys although at this age there doesn't seem to be much difference".

The boys were aware of this difference and considered that the girls received what they saw as 'privileges' from the male teachers and from the organisation of the schools:

"Girls never get the slipper".

"Girls get away with more than us".

"Yeah, 'Sir' hits us, but they don't get hit".

The researcher would suggest that as girls are seen as 'getting away with more' than the boys, the division between the two groups becomes wider.

In the organisation of staff at this school again boys were sent to the head male teacher and the girls were sent to the female headperson for some acts of 'misbehaviour'. However Mrs. Hartley was known for her belief in 'non-violence' and encouraged her teachers to deal with overt acts of misbehaviour with understanding and there was very little use of any form of physical punishment. Stern warnings, extra 'unfavourable' duties¹ and the name recorded in the 'disgrace book' were the usual forms of punishment. When glancing through the 'disgrace book' I was surprised to find more girls than boys entered in it. Mrs. Hartley soon explained the situation:

1. If any pupil was seen at the end of the school day collecting litter in the playground it was known that he or she was out of favour with the teacher or head.

"I find the girls tend to react more to this punishment than the boys! The boys are given more duties to perform as we find that soon quietens them down".

If a pupil is constantly being reprimanded and sent to the head then other reasons are looked for as an alternative to incessantly blaming the child:

Mrs. Hartley told me:
"I'm very concerned about Gareth lately.
Usually you find continual bad behaviour
is the result of some unhappiness at home".

Applegate

Arbitrary physical punishment in Applegate was an uncommon sight although other more subtle sanctions were at play to keep the children in check. A symbolic pattern of punishment was in operation. Censure for the 'offending' pupil came in the form of such devices as standing in a corner or, in cases of severe misdemeanors, waiting in the corridor to have an 'audience' with the revered head. It was believed that part of the punishment consisted in the knowledge that everybody else, either in the class or school, knew you were a 'wrong-doer'. Although boys were admonished for aggressive behaviour it became clear that girls were more rigorously punished for any behaviour that 'deviated' from the expected norms. This became apparent in the school's reaction to a group of four girls who were clearly 'inseparable' and seen as a bad influence upon each other:

The four girls: Elizabeth, Sally, Joanne and Dawn, were labelled as quite 'uncontrollable' when together which was often. Using their numbers as a form of strength they resisted any interference from the boys and also intruded upon the games of the latter. On several occasions they were hauled into the school corridor and forcibly separated by being made to stand with their faces to the wall as far

apart from each other as the teachers could possibly do so.

"I do not like 'gang warfare' from my girls" insisted the headperson, "aggression is something I will not tolerate".

On most occasions they were usually classed as "extremely silly and giggly" or "just not sensible".

Several attempts had been made to split them up but to no avail. Even their parents were called in to ask their assistance in "quelling the disruptive element" caused by their close relationship.

Some further explanation is required to put the relationship of these four girls into perspective. Elizabeth and Sally were twin sisters, who lived in a large, new private house within the village boundary. Their parents were fairly 'well off' and were both in the professions. Joanne and Dawn meanwhile were two children (unrelated) from Watton, i.e. their fathers were land-workers living in rented or 'tied' accommodation. So not only was the girls' behaviour at variance with their gender - 'appropriate' behaviour but for two of the girls - Joanne and Dawn - their home-background was also at variance with the school's culture.

When discussing this situation in the rest-room, the teachers attributed Joanne and Dawn's behaviour to their home-background whilst attributing Elizabeth and Sally's to the bad influence of the two former girls, saying that they should 'surely know better'. This incident brings out the further point that the interpretation of behaviour by teachers involves criteria of class, as well as of gender. This gives rise to a particularly complex situation in schools such as Applegate (unlike the other schools in the sample) which are less socially homogeneous.

When a boy and girl were seen disputing heatedly over some article of

school equipment they were both immediately sent to the head. The researcher was present in the head's study on a number of occasions when he was called upon to be arbiter in cases of hotly contested disagreements. The researcher, in such cases, noted that a child was reprimanded on the basis of their sex:

"Paul, I would have expected you to give way to a young girl; and as for you Emma, young ladies do not scream and bellow. You could have had the abaccus after Paul had finished with it. All it needed was a little bit of patience on your part".

The male teacher and headperson within Applegate did not display greater leniency over the misbehaviour of girls, in fact quite the opposite; although there is a distinction to be made between leniency of attitude, i.e. overlooking misbehaviour, as opposed to leniency of punishment:

"I do expect girls to have a greater self-control".

"Certainly you have to allow for the boys a little high spirits; but you somehow see the girls as above that sort of thing ... much more sensible".

Girls in Applegate (as in all of the schools) were expected to set a good example to the boys, so greater demands were made upon them with regard to their gender-appropriate behaviour, and as such 'deviation' in any form was rigorously noted and duly corrected; in consequence girls appeared to receive more punishment than the boys.

Lintonbray

As stated before, discipline in this school was not seen as a great problem, since it was relatively small. I observed that if an individual was particularly disruptive, the teacher called upon the rest of the class to exercise control over the 'deviant'.

At the time of the researcher's observation within this school, some

agitation was felt in the Top class (9-11 year olds) due to the presence of Simon who appeared to be the most disruptive:

Simon was a large, stout eleven year old, who annoyed his classmates, upset the equipment and because of his size was able to bully the odd child he managed to find on their own.

The usual forms of punishment, i.e. caning and 'staying in' after school had had no effect upon the boy, so the headperson (who was also the teacher of this particular class) decided to leave him behind with the girls when it came to the away-matches (football) or when a special outing was arranged just for the boys. In this way, Simon was made to feel particularly isolated and penalised for his behaviour.¹

As a further rejection of Simon, another mode of gender differentiation was used to impose discipline on him:

"Are you behaving like an old woman again Simon?"

"You're like a great soft girl".

It can be noted that this form of gender differentiation was similar to that used in the Dock Side school, where to get the boys to adhere to the teachers' demands their behaviour was compared to the girls in a negative form, which ultimately implies girls' inferiority.

Because of the small numbers of pupils most forms of misdemeanours were dealt with by the individual teachers, and their demands of 'good behaviour' were, in general, similar to those existing in other schools. Girls were expected to behave well and any deviation from this was soon remarked upon:

Miss Lucas, in the 'middle' class, felt that the girls were 'acting up':

1. See Belotti, 1975: op.cit. for further evidence of this mode of social control.

"Come on you girls ... this is not up to your usual standard of behaviour. I shall have to make an example of you if this noise continues".

Because of the smaller numbers of pupils if particular members of gender groups needed to be admonished then the whole group was affected:

"Alright you boys, you can all stay behind after school and tidy up the class ...
Some of the boys are very indignant:
"But it was Tim Clarke, Miss, not us ...
that's not fair".

We have seen, in this chapter, that the belief that teachers hold that girls are more passive and easily managed influences the way in which the former manage the class. This extends to patterns of discipline and punishment, and is true even of those teachers who, in interview, did not fully agree with this dichotomous categorisation, seeing no uniform pattern between the behaviour of boys and girls.

Having shown how teachers (unconsciously) often break their classes into gender groups in order to simplify their administration of the classroom the next section will discuss the ways in which teachers reinforce the statuses and identities of the children in terms of gender.

4. Gender-Appropriate Behaviour and its Reinforcement

Because 'good classroom management' is viewed by the professional hierarchy as the sine-qua-non for effective transmission of the formal curriculum a wide set of routines and procedures have to be developed and implemented in order for teachers to carry out their tasks. Through the establishment of a schedule of activities, a division of labour and a definition of procedure, the teacher established a broad set of norms to govern the

operations involved in classroom life.

These routines and procedures have considerable implications for the social organisation¹ of the classroom - who gets to interact with whom, when and about what, and who gets to learn from whom, when and about what. In short, face-to-face relations help to organise status and identities in the classroom. Not only the level of work engaged in, but also the people interacted with and the kind of feedback received from the teachers all depend upon the gender group to which the child is assigned. The groupings help a teacher to group into accessible units children who are to receive fairly similar messages of relationship from the teacher. What makes this so powerful is that the gender groupings within the school reflect the daily dealings of the children themselves, and similar criteria are used by the children's parents and the rest of their community in their dealings with the children. In short, the teacher handles the children in a way the children are used to being handled.

Discussion of schools as oppressive institutions (Goodman, 1971; Illich,

1. The term "social organisation" is a shorthand term for the organisation of social actions performed by social actors, see: Garfinkel, H., 1956, "Some Sociological Concepts and Methods for Psychiatrists", Psychiatric Research Reports, Vol. 6, pp. 181-196. See also Miller, G., Galanter, E. and Pribram, K., 1960: Plans and the Structure of Behaviour, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York. McDermott, R.P., 1974, "Achieving School Failure: An Anthropological Approach to Illiteracy and Social Stratification" in G.D. Spindler (Ed.), Education and Cultural Process, Toward an Anthropology of Education, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, define 'social organisations' as "daily accomplishments, daily products of actors working out rational ways of dealing with each other", p.88.

1971; Althusser, 1971; Freire, 1972) should not ignore the issue of gender. Forms of oppression do not operate in identical ways for girls and boys. In general the researcher's observations in the four schools leads one to suggest that boys were given much more social consideration¹ and were able to express themselves more freely in boisterous, mischievous play which is seen as part and parcel of the 'boys will be boys' syndrome. Girls were limited in this form of self-expression, with consideration, silence and diligence being the hallmark of their gender grouping.

In the previous sections of this chapter, the emphasis has been on the ways in which gender differentiation is used by teachers to make their task of controlling classroom life much easier. In this section further material will be presented on the ways in which teachers define and reinforce gender-appropriate behaviour. This will, in the researcher's opinion, demonstrate that the practices of teachers in this area are not simply means to the end of good classroom management but embody underlying assumptions about the 'proper' ways for girls and boys to behave. The ways in which girls were guided to gender-'appropriate' behaviour varied (though not considerably) according to the value structure and cultural aspirations of the school.

Teachers encouraged pupils to conform to kinds of behaviour considered appropriate for their gender and discouraged instances of deviation. In this way, teachers worked with the cultural values of the area rather than challenging them. In some ways this is an extension of their use

1. For further evidence see Belotti, 1975: op.cit.; Lobban, 1978: op.cit.

of gender-differentiation as a means of classroom control, as the following example illustrates:

In Dock Side:

In the second year infants' class, children having completed their work return to their favourite pastimes, either playing with the constructive toys or other forms of equipment. Because of the tumultuous noise, the teacher directs the girls to dolls' furniture which most of the children had previously rejected. Meanwhile the boys carry on using the constructive toys such as Leggo, etc., to build rockets and guns which they proceed to 'aim' and 'fire' at each other.

Children are not slow to pick up the teacher's guidelines, as is shown by one child's reaction to the above incident:

Lisa 'conformed' to the 'appropriate' behaviour required by the teacher and initiated disapproval of the boys' noisy activity.

We can also see the ways in which gender expectations find their way into forms of play and use of toys, as well as other lessons and activities. Another example from the same school provides a further illustration of this:

Infant I are preparing for the 'Movement to Music' in the hall.

"Girls, walk quietly to the door", states the teacher,

"Now the boys!"

She turns the knobs on a box high on the wall which emits music. The teach announces,

"The boys are going to march around the girls without touching them". With exaggerated movements and steps, the boys do so.

"Now the girls are going to tiptoe quietly among the boys".

This example may seem trivial to the reader. Of what significance is it if a teacher asks the boys to march and the girls to tiptoe? But this form of social organisation is a further illustration of the division into gender groups, which reinforce the divisions produced in everyday

life. What is more, the teacher conveys the assumption that certain forms of behaviour are expected of boys, e.g. marching, and other forms of girls, e.g. tiptoeing. In such ways, the gender groups are led, in their daily dealings, to classify each other into different groups and then treat each other in accordance with the dictates of their classification. This was apparent in all the schools. In accordance with the ethos of the school in Applegate, the teachers enticed a certain 'fragility' from the girls:

In the gym hall all the children were eagerly clambering over the apparatus. A small girl nimbly made her way to the top of the high climbing frame. A well-meaning teacher exclaimed:

"You're not going to be able to get over the top, Gillian".

Immediately the girl becomes nervous and falters; gingerly she descends the way she had come.

One wonders, was the teacher's warning necessary? It was noticed that she coaxed another child (a boy) over the same apparatus. Unknowingly teachers may create a psychological halter within girls creating a lack of confidence.

If we scrutinise the concept 'fragility' we can see that this is interwoven with the idea of 'lady-like' behaviour apparent in Applegate, where a high concern was displayed for girls' 'sedate' and 'ladylike' behaviour.

On my way through the main hall of the school two small girls ran past shrieking with delight at hearing their voices echoing back to them. They were apprehended by the head of the school who sternly warned them against such 'unladylike' behaviour, and insisted they walk back to their class in a quiet and orderly manner which was more becoming of girls. This they did with exaggerated gesture.

The prevailing attitude at Applegate appeared to be that girls should not behave in the least like boys. In Dock Side it was accepted that

some of the girls were aggressive (but according to the teachers much less so than the boys), although this was not looked upon with favour by the teachers. But the area was seen as rough and deprived (see Chapter III), so their behaviour was put down to that factor.

However, even accepting that girls' behaviour in this school was 'under par' teachers' attitudes to their disruptive and aggressive behaviour was less tolerated than boys:

Two girls joined a group of boys in the class who were being rowdy. The teacher announces: "Seeing as the girls are in a silly mood today, the boys can go out to play first, maybe then the girls will quieten down".

A further point should be emphasised is that while it was predominantly the boys who were being noisy and disruptive, it was against the girls that sanctions were directed. In ways such as this, boys are provided with greater opportunities for unruly behaviour than are the girls.

At Applegate, I observed that 'tomboyish' behaviour was persistently put down as in the case of Hellé and Emma. Hellé has already been discussed by the researcher. Emma, like Hellé, was an active child (as indeed most girls are), but less discreetly so. She consistently sought the activities and games usually confined to the boys and was forever in conflict with her teachers. Being in a Junior class where the level of tolerance was low with regards to 'gender deviation', the boys openly informed on her as intruding into their activities, i.e. Meccano, football, etc. Because the teacher saw Emma's behaviour as disruptive - usually caused by the boys' intolerance and fuss - Emma was isolated, and induced to adopt the proper behaviour befitting a girl:

"It's very worrying" a teacher told the researcher.
"Emma's such a disruptive child and won't leave

the boys to get on with their work, which throws the whole class into turmoil".

To the observer it was not Emma's behaviour that was disruptive but that of the boys' who did not want her to 'invade' their areas of prestige. The teacher's reaction was also an adaptation to a situation which it was difficult for her to control. Unwittingly it is through these many forms of behaviour that teachers help to organise the status and identities of children according to gender, and allow the boys to achieve their needs and wants at the expense of the girls. Thus girls' subordinate relationships with boys are developed early within the classroom.

So far, the main dimensions of gender-related behaviour which our analysis has suggested are reinforced by the practices of the teachers, are unruliness and aggressiveness among the boys and quieter and more co-operative behaviour among the girls. The example above shows that other dimensions enter into teachers' definitions and are reinforced by their practices, and that the differences seem to reflect the ethos of the respective communities.

Polarisation in most schools, as we have seen, was used as a method of simplifying administration of the classroom and general school life. Dock Side did not offer any alternative to the sharply segregated divisions between the two gender groups within the community. Separation within the school begins in early infancy with separate playgrounds, separate toilets, separate lines and even separate lists on the registers. In Applegate sex segregation was not so distinctively a part of the organisation as Dock Side was. It did not seem so important to keep the girls and boys apart, probably because other social forces were in

operation to induce pupils to conform to specific patterns of behaviour. It seemed clear to the researcher that there was more flexibility here, and less of a fixed polarisation between the two groups. But register was called on a sex-segregated basis¹ and sports and activities were defined and organised by gender categories.² When they reach the Juniors the children consistently and spontaneously segregated themselves according to sex. This is not to suggest that the latter phenomenon does not happen at nursery and infant levels, but that the phenomenon is more intense and rigid as the children become older.

The estate primary school of Long Meadow did not appear on first sight to differentiate as systematically between females and males as Dock Side did. This was probably due to the fact that it was a more modern school as well as being spacious. On closer inspection the 'usual' polarisation existed in the register, sports and basic school organisation. Discouragement of joint activities was also a constant factor:

In a junior class a maths project was under way which entailed weighing items and logging the details systematically in exercise books. The teacher decides that the boys will go out into the hall and continue their work out there whilst the girls remain within the confines of the classroom.

Similarly the village school of Lintonbray did not appear to adopt widespread sex-segregated practices, partly because it had neither enough rooms, space or facilities to carry out such 'proprieties', but verbally and socially a marked dichotomy existed. Everyday events were

-
1. This could well be in response to the fact that Education Committees invariably ask for the number of intake of girls and boys and not just children.
 2. This was common in most schools, see Lobban, 1978: op.cit.; see also Belotti, 1975: op.cit.

consistently gender-oriented, with pupils and teachers acquiescing to marked stereotype. This, I would suggest, can be attributed, at least in part, to the culture of the farming community, which defines the worlds of men and women very clearly and reinforces gender differences in a very detailed way.

Within Lintonbray, the first sign of segregation was within assembly and on certain other occasions the boys did their best to separate themselves off from the girls:

The boys (senior) were arguing that they should be the 'last line' in the assembly, as they were 'the biggest' and after all they were 'boys'.
Mr. Wharten complied to their request:
"Alright, if you must make a fuss about it ..."

One of the most effective ways in which teachers reinforce desired behaviour is by mocking children who do not conform. In the top junior class of Dock Side, taught by a male teacher, again children were preparing for a dancing period. Two boys, Stephen and Robert, consistently seek each other's company. The teacher pulls them apart:

Mr. Jameson shouts: "You're not stuck together are you?" The rest of the children laugh.

"Right, girls, find yourself a boy partner", he demands.

"Come on girls, hurry!" as the girls are dilatory in selecting a partner, preferring to stay with each other.

"There's a couple of boys free over there. What's Robert doing? Clinging to Stephen no doubt".

The close relationship of these two boys was consistently viewed by the teacher as 'unhealthy' and they were constantly chided for searching out each other's company:

"You're like a couple of girls" he remarks,
The rest of the class looked on.

The teacher, in this particular instance, was making use of certain attitudes which are held by the children and this manifested itself in the use of ridicule. Such ridicule not only conveyed a clear message about gender-related behaviour, but also implied girls' 'inferiority'.¹

'Deviation' from one's gender was frowned upon. When one girl, Linda, stated she didn't like dancing, Mr. Jameson replied:

"Nonsense, all little girls like dancing".

Linda shrugged and went over to the corner and was forced to join in. Certainly in Dock Side, 'gender deviation' was much less tolerated than in Applegate. In the latter school a pupil, who would have been regarded 'deviant' in another school, was not labelled as such:

Paul, a six year old, does not need a reason to play with or be in the presence of girls. He consistently seeks their company and enjoys being involved in what is usually referred to as 'feminine play' as indeed other boys do, but does not 'cloak' his behaviour like some do (see below). He also withstands the traditional 'insults' which boys direct against each other expressed in female gender terms like 'sissy' or 'puffy'. Paul's status within the class is indeed quite good, his company being sought by both girls and boys.

As indicated, other boys 'cloaked' their enjoyment of feminine play:

Edward and Darren are involved in the Wendy House; Edward was 'ironing' whilst Darren was 'laying the table'. Both were quite happy and oblivious to what was going on around them in the class. The teacher moves towards them and states:

"You boys look busy, what are you playing?"

1. Jennifer Shaw (1977a) states that boys define themselves as being, whatever else, at least not a girl (p.71), see her paper: Sexual Division in the Classroom, presented at Teaching Girls to be Women Conference, Essex, April.

Suddenly Edward and Darren both looked sheepish (as if caught in the act of doing something that they're not supposed to) and glanced at one another.

Edward replies:

"Batman and Robin!"

The teacher smiles and moves away.

In Dock Side a boy who behaved like Paul would have been shunned and derided by the other children as 'deviant'. The apparent flexibility and tolerance of Applegate could partly be explained by the fact that less aggressive behaviour was expected from the boys, although it must be pointed out that this does not preclude polarisation between the sexes (see Chapter III). In fact more subtle avenues were open in Applegate for the gender categorisation of girls and boys especially in academic achievement and aspirations (this will be discussed further in the next chapter).

Long Meadow's reaction to 'gender deviation' can be measured with regard to Michael, a seven year old boy in the Third Year Infants class:

Michael, much to the concern of his teachers, and to the contempt of his peer group, loved to play with dolls. He liked to bake and constantly sought the company of girls. He was constantly admonished by his teacher 'to try and behave properly'.

Similar behaviour was accepted in Applegate. Michael, however, was excluded from his peer group and constantly chided by his teachers. When the researcher spoke to the teacher of the advantages of Michael's behaviour - that he is not a bully, and really an affectionate child - the teacher was quick to correct the writer:

"Oh no! He has all those nasty little ways that girls have".

"What do you mean?" asks the researcher.

"He's every so catty; he bites and scratches and pulls hair".

Michael's behaviour was deemed 'bizarre' by the children, making him the target of much bullying by some girls and most of the boys. The headperson informed the researcher that Michael was confused between 'masculine' and 'feminine' roles and suspects that he has 'feminine genes'. If he was not 'cured' by the time he leaves, it was suggested that the only 'solution' to his 'problem' was for him to enter the 'world' of the Arts, Drama or Music, where 'That kind of behaviour' was much more acceptable. There was more genuine concern for Michael's behaviour, than would have been forthcoming from Dock Side, together with an assumption that 'deviant' behaviour is caused by some personality disorder, i.e. "a biological malfunction". Yet despite the attempt to be understanding, Michael's behaviour was not found acceptable by the school.

Another interesting observation to be made was the fact that male teachers interacted differently with the girls than with the boys.¹ In particular they (male teachers) displayed a more authoritarian attitude towards the boys whilst the girls were able to be more familiar with them:

In Dock Side, in one of the senior classes a girl took her work to be marked. Mr. Thompson showed her how she'd gone wrong on one particular problem; she laughed whilst returning to her place.

1. In their study of secondary classrooms in Canada Ricks and Pyke report that half of the teachers thought that girls and boys expected different treatment. They said that girls expected to be treated in 'a more ladylike, genteel fashion, less sternly with more consideration of their feelings' whilst the boys were described as expecting 'more sternness, setting of limits, authority, having to be told how it is' (p.29); see Ricks, F.A. and Pyke, S.W., 1973: "Teacher perceptions and attitudes that foster or maintain sex-role differences", Interchange, Vol. 4, pp. 26-33.

"I bet you'll go and get it wrong", he tells her.
She grins at him.

"No I won't, Sir!"

Whereas with Patrick he was more brusque:

"You've done it wrong again" and gives him a push
in his exasperation. The boy staggers back
against a chair, hitting his head as he does so:

"It's your own fault" and then laughingly he says:
"Have you hurt the chair?"

There was definitely a tendency to be much kinder with the girls and
to speak in a softer tone - not wanting to appear a gruff man. To give
a further example:

Nigel was made to stand on a chair to recite
his eight times table. Halfway through he
falters. Hurling chalk at him Mr. Jameson
insists he carry on. The boy, confused,
breaks down and cries.

"Look at Nigel Smith, crying like a great soft
girl", an invitation to the class to join in
deriding the unfortunate boy.

This illustration reveals a number of aspects that have already been
mentioned: the difference between the interaction of male teachers
with girls and with boys; an intolerance towards gender 'deviation',
(i.e. Nigel's tears were seen as "girlish" and not "appropriate" for a
boy); the implications that girls' behaviour is inferior.

The tendency of male teachers to act differently towards boys and girls,
noted earlier, is illustrated in Lintonbray by Mr. Wharten, whose
behaviour contributed in a fundamental way to the values of gender
differentiation. To the girls, 'Sir' kept up a lively 'flirtatious'
banter which they duly reciprocated. The masculine sharing of norms
provided the basis of certain kinds of interaction with the boys, as
for instance in a discussion about football and Old Trafford.¹

1. Manchester United's 'home' football ground.

This type of relationship carried on through all aspects of school life since the headperson frequently called upon the boys for help in the organising and moving of equipment through the small school. If girls rushed to help, the boys quickly brushed them aside. In no way did they wish them to intrude on their area of power or privilege. Attempts to sabotage the girls' 'moving in' were frequent and the girls did not receive support from the head.

5. Dress, Manners and Gender

Dress and manners are also affected by conceptions of gender and by the ethos of the school, distinctly ^{more} so in some than in others. In Applegate a fair degree of smartness and cleanliness was demanded from the children of the professional and white-collar workers; but more specifically from girls, for whom the first sign of neglect was unacceptable:

"Joanne, don't you think you should wear a clean frock tomorrow? Tell your mummy when you get home tonight. You've worn it three days already and it's a little grubby."

"Kindly remember, girls, to keep your hair reasonably tidy. We don't want you looking like 'wild cave men' do we?"

A grubby, dishevelled appearance amongst the boys was not seen as so disturbing. Nevertheless, in comparison with the Dock Side or Long Meadow Estate boy, where it was overlooked, it was still viewed with some concern.

In Lintonbray emphasis on dress was not that important but all the children had a 'reasonable standard of dress', despite the fact that many would be categorised as children of the working-class since they were the sons and daughters of farm-workers and lorry-drivers, while the fathers of

some of the others would be small farmers.

In the working class schools there was more variation in standards of dress and care. Disarray was more acceptable, especially for boys, again a little less for girls. The 'extreme' was marked as smelling of 'stale' clothing (urine). Again, if the child had lice then it was definitely shunned and the fact remarked on:

In Long Meadow a teacher announced in the staffroom "Ian Johnson is smelling again, Mrs. Hartley" a teacher informed the headperson in the staffroom. "His mother puts him to bed and she doesn't change his underclothes in the morning. Do you think we could drop a discreet hint to her when she comes to collect him in the evening".

In Dock Side one teacher stated:
"When's the nurse coming? Andy's starting to scratch his head a lot and I think he needs seeing to".

A further point is that in all the schools, girls were allowed the freedom to wear jeans or trousers. Only in Applegate was it sometimes remarked upon:

"It would be nice if some of the girls wore dresses now and then".

"Helle's a strange child. She never wears anything else but jeans. Sometimes I think that's all the clothes she has".

The nature of the emphasis on dress requirements for girls in Applegate can be further elucidated through the following piece of observation from a young infants' class:

The children were getting dressed after games and P.T. Boys went around with buttons unfastened, shirt ends showing, socks missing and shoe laces perilously undone. But one girl who forgot to put her underskirt on was promptly told to go and get dressed properly.

Boys were allowed to be dishevelled in a structured situation whereas girls

were not.

In all the schools whilst preparing for gym, dancing or games the children freely disrobed and changed in front of each other (except for one or two boys in Dock Side). This pattern changed in the Juniors and varied not only by catchment area but also according to the sex of the teacher. Where classes were taught by male teachers, girls were not expected to undress as much as the boys; although leotards and shorts could be worn by them, it was not obligatory.

In the estate school, on one occasion, the children were preparing for P.T.:

For a moment all attention was turned to the teacher as he informs the whole class that:
"Paul Simpson has not brought his shorts, so he'll have to play in his underpants". Giggles go round the class and everybody stares at Paul.
Then two boys cry out:
"Sir, you've let Suzanne off".
This discrimination is witnessed by all and sundry.

In the junior classes with female teachers the boys were allowed to keep their trousers on whilst the girls were expected to disrobe to their underwear..

In Applegate both the sexes were required to have the same gear, i.e. shorts, or leotards (for the girls), running shoes; and if any of the children 'defaulted' by not bringing the required gear they had to be content as onlookers. There was self-consciousness on the part of the older children:

Girls tended to slip shorts on under their skirts and maintain their dignity whereas boys tended to slide into the toilets rather than remove their trousers in public. The teachers' reaction was to pull them bodily from the loo and state:
"You've got nothing different from us to hide".

Because of the limited space and lack of 'free' hall Lintonbray had no set curricular for P.T. Games or Movement to Music. Instead activities such as games were kept strictly apart for male and female, thus close contact during such preparation was avoided.

6. Language and Gender Differentiation

Teachers tend to censure girls more harshly than boys for the use of what they call improper language, thus creating a linguistic double standard¹ which is another part of the 'hidden' curriculum. It is somehow seen as not 'fit' for girls to swear and use rough speech, whereas for their male counterparts it is seen as part of the 'boys will be boys' syndrome, even though they also were admonished for such behaviour.

In Applegate:

When Emma fought to retain a prized book from the school library her self-control faltered; she emitted verbal abuse to the boy who had endeavoured to take it:

"Give me that book back you rotten, lousy ..."

Her words reached the teacher:

"Emma, that is no way for a young girl to speak, go and stand at the back until you decide to improve your language".

In the schools that were observed there did appear a class divergence in expectations; as stated above, middle class suburban school girls were expected to use more 'correct' grammar and pronunciation than boys. In Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate the standards were much less discriminating.²

-
1. See Spender, Dale, 1980: Man Made Language, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, for a further discussion of the linguistic double standard.
 2. Working class language has a 'deprivation' and deficit label attached to it; in short: working class children are seen as having (or suffering from) conceptual and linguistic handicaps due to low social class and its associated life style, see Deutsch, M., 1963: "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process", in A. Passow (Ed.)

"You can't expect anything coming from kids like this".

"They hear it at home ... their parents swear like anything".

"It's expecting too much for these kids to talk nicely".

In general though, this did not prevent the teachers from admonishing girls much more than boys.

The verbal double standard cut across class lines and was not the only area of discrimination in language. The various adjectives that teachers used when admonishing or rewarding their pupils have gender-related qualities. If boys got 'out of hand' they were regarded as 'boisterous', 'rough', 'aggressive', 'assertive', 'rowdy', 'adventurous' etc.; for girls, the adjectives were 'fussy', 'bitchy', 'giggly', 'catty', 'silly' and this despite the fact that to the researcher there was very little to distinguish between the girls' and boys' behaviour:

"I've noticed in particular that the girls tend to be sort of ... more bitchy towards each other".

"The boys are more rough, and they lean to boys' things".

"I think boys are more liable to be aggressive, more adventurous than girls".

"Girls are tidier and quieter ..."

"Girls tend to congregate together gossiping in corners, whilst boys tend to get involved in more energetic play".

"Girls are fussy, boys are louder".

"Girls are very petty, this class in particular are very bitchy towards each other, I've noticed this over the past year".

"Girls can be very catty you know ..."

The common adjectives that teachers use contributes to social categorising, creating a value-laden dichotomy, marking off males from females and ranking them in a superior/inferior stratification. These categories are constructed from what are, in reality, limited aspects of the child's behaviour and which are perceived according to the teachers' gender expectations. This serves to reinforce the 'distance' between girls and boys.

Acts are coloured by the qualities of the person to whom they are ascribed. A quotation from Heider's essay on "Social Perception and Phenomenal Causality" will make this point clear:

"A joke made by a person considered silly will usually seem silly, while the same joke made by a person with the reputation of being witty will arouse laughter".

Heider, 1944: pp. 358-374, my emphasis

7. General Comments

The main emphasis in this thesis is to show the ways in which the primary school positions the future generations according to gender and the variations that occur according to catchment area and social class. This chapter is part of the attempt to show that girls and boys are treated differently by teachers and are thus likely to be guided through their schooling to develop very different views of the world and very different self-concepts.

As pointed out in the contextual chapter (Chapter I), the social relationships

of education replicate the hierarchical division of labour of the wider society (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Sieber, 1976). But what previous researchers have stressed was the division of labour within the capitalist mode of production, i.e. the factory. As Bowles and Gintis point out:

"The differential socialisation patterns of schools attended by pupils of different social classes do not arise by accident".

Bowles and Gintis, 1976: p.132

They went on to add:

"Rather, they reflect the fact that the educational objectives and expectations of administrators, teachers and parents as well as the responsiveness of pupils to various patterns of teaching and control differ for pupils of different social classes".

Bowles and Gintis, 1976: p.132

But in their analysis of schooling there is little recognition of the potential correspondence between patriarchal authority structure and the hierarchy of male over female within the social relations of the school and of the work processes.¹

Educationalists have also argued that the structure of social relations in education not only inures the pupil to the discipline of the work-place, but also develops the types of personal demeanour, modes of self-presentation and self-image appropriate for each social class. What they fail (with the exception of a few feminist writers, i.e. MacDonald,

1. See MacDonald, Madeleine, 1980, "Socio-cultural reproduction and women's education" in Rosemary Deem (ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 13-25, for an analysis of the relationship of capitalism and patriarchy within the educational process.

1980; Deem, 1980; Wolpe, 1977; Spender and Sarah, 1980) to recognise is that gender identification is also involved in this process. At the same time, gender identification varies somewhat from class to class.

With regard to discipline and control, the empirical evidence shows that the predominantly working-class schools of Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate tend to emphasise behavioural control and rule-following, whilst Applegate employed a relatively open system, less direct supervision and generally a value system stressing internalised standards of control. Also, with relation to gender, this process of socialisation corresponds to a comparable process within the family and the labour market.

In Applegate conformity in clothing and speech patterns were part of the process of enforcing a particular set of bourgeois values, based on ideas of respectability, smartness and appearances. Ideas about dress were based on notions of 'nice' girls and 'not so nice' girls, which has both class and sexual connotations. With respect to speech, girls had to learn to 'speak properly', that is like the middle class, and in terms of gender to speak politely, that is talking like 'a lady'. As girls, they have to consider more than class factors; they were expected within Applegate to be refined at all times and therefore such things as loudness of voice were discouraged as raucous and 'unfeminine'. Even in Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate, any form of ostentatious verbal behaviour - shouting, arguing and challenging - was regarded as inappropriate and was often considered a punishable offence.

Submitting to male authority, as well as the hierarchical authority

(of capitalism), is an essential ingredient of girls' education. They (girls) acquire manners, speech and demeanour which are not only more or less socially acceptable and appropriate to their class but also to their 'femininity' as women.¹ Whereas boys become valuable to employers - in ways that are appropriate to their level - girls are valuable to employers and to husbands, legitimising and stabilising the power relations held within society between men and women.

Throughout this chapter it has been shown that girls were treated differently from boys as individuals, as members of a sub-cultural group (class), as recipients of a broad gender division within the school, and then as representatives of sexual divisions in society. Similar behaviour from girls and boys was treated in a different manner; boys in all the schools were not really expected to behave in a manner that did not conform to the 'good pupil' role, if, however, a girl or a group of girls stood their ground, it was seen as a more serious disruption than if a boy or boys did likewise. Perhaps this was because of the fact that girls expressed their disruption (or resistance) in a different manner, i.e. by verbal means.² Davies reports that the initial greater 'conformity' amongst girls at school:

"... can be related to the overall absence of alternative typescript for women in society; and also to the fact that the conforming girl fits into the good pupil script at school".

Davies, 1979: p.69

-
1. See how femininity is perceived differently according to social class (Chapter I).
 2. Davies, 1979, op.cit. expressed that 'verbal confrontations are less valued by teachers in that language represents thought and girls' opposition is seen as more permanent. Boys' physical display can be seen to start and stop, hence girls are seen as less amenable to control (p.69).

She goes on to state:

"The difficulty school has in dealing with disruptive female pupils indicates the lack of appropriate deviant typescripts for them. Boys are expected to be naughty. But for girls the punishment structure is not there, and teachers have to fall back on the wider 'social immorality' typescript".

Davies, 1979: p.69

This chapter has also shown that two contradictory stereotypes were used by teachers to gain control. On the one hand girls' behaviour was set up as an example for boys to follow. Yet in other instances, when the boys misbehaved, a similar comparison was given negative connotations, which do not go unnoticed:

"You sound more like a bunch of girls chattering and giggling ..."

"Fancy you boys behaving like that. I'd have expected it from the girls but not from the boys. I thought you were much more sensible".

It has been shown that praise of 'good behaviour' involves an analogy with behaviour usually attributed to girls. In addition, teachers, in their allowance of a fair degree of 'boyish behaviour' give less encouragement than they might to 'good behaviour'. These two factors, the researcher would suggest, are likely to mean that boys will be reluctant to conform to behaviour which would be seen as 'girlish' (in that it conforms) and which also has implications of inferiority.

However, treating the sexes in an equal way may be made difficult or even impossible as teachers are faced with an immediate¹ problem of 'what

1. See Delamont, Sara, 1976: Interaction in the Classroom, Methuen, London, for a discussion of privacy, immediacy and autonomy.

to do' in the classroom which itself is embedded in a wider structure of material and social relationships.

8. Teachers' Coping Strategies

In the previous chapter the researcher has discussed the expectations placed upon teachers by professional colleagues and superiors, and by parents and others regarding the levels of achievement they are to maintain (Chapter VI). Teachers are required to live up to certain standards of what Sharp and Green (1975) term "good pedagogical practice", with its emphasis on control and social order, and all that it implies¹ (p.116).

Also previously discussed were the physical and material constraints of the teachers' classroom situation, i.e. teacher-pupil ratio, architecture and layout of the classrooms, the 'materials' therein, and other human and non-human resources at the teachers' disposal. Within this situation are generated a series of concepts and categories with which the individual teacher orders the situation and objects in the world of her practice. She operates within systems of available and legitimised categories within the community of her colleagues; and the acceptability of these categories will relate also to the teacher's prior experiences, her history and socialisation in other contexts of relevance. So, just as the

1. See Miriam David's 1977 paper, "The State, Education and the Family: An Exploratory Analysis", presented at the British Sociological Association Annual Conference, University of Sheffield, 30 March - 3 April, for an example of what happens when teachers attempt to teach against the ruling ideology in education.

researcher has shown that the gender categories which are used reflect the pupils' everyday lives, so these categories reflect the teacher's world also.

Teachers see their pupils as being 'good', 'awkward', 'dull', 'silly', etc., but it is essential to understand that these labels were also affected by the category of gender. Primarily the teachers call upon their own experience, not only as teachers, but also as pupils (which they once were) to feed their definitions of the pupils and in so doing tend to reinforce the categorisation they have of them.

Throughout this chapter it has been shown that the gender categorisation of the pupils is related to the problems of control presented to the teacher within the classroom context. Extensive research has documented the image of the 'ideal pupil', viz. one who conforms to the teachers' demands, is 'bright', 'co-operative' etc. (Sharp and Green, 1975; King, 1978; Sieber, 1976). Ironically, quite clearly, in all of the four schools, it was girls who fitted this notion overall. Their ability to get on in school and to be easily integrated into what Sharp and Green (1975) term "the bedrock of busyness" means that teachers tend to divert their time and energy mostly to boys. But this situation was not articulated in terms of the boys' non-conformity to the teachers' personal ideal. It has been suggested by Levitin and Chananie (1972) that despite the nonconformity of the boys (as pupils) to teachers' demands in class, the former were still high in the teachers' esteem as their behaviour 'conformed' to the ideal of normal boys. In effect, what exists are two ideals of pupil conformity; one for girls and one for boys (the researcher will expand this theme later in the thesis).

It has been suggested that the structure of material and social constraints presents the teacher with management problems, the solving of which leads to a stratification of pupils' identities and opportunities (Sharp and Green, 1975; Dale, 1977; Hargreaves, 1978). But integral to this is the gender-based stratification of pupils' identities and opportunities, which serves to widen and accentuate the initial differences between girls and boys, producing consequences latent to the teacher's perspective but which are explained and legitimised in terms consistent with that perspective.

The analysis has been concerned with the variations in social control with reference to the gender and class of pupils. This is related to the amounts and types of interaction which take place between pupil and teacher. Moreover certain pupils, particularly the boys, have more power than others over the teacher and can manipulate themselves into gaining more of her time and energy.

Certain features of gender stratification are common to all the schools within the study, but variations do occur where the categorisations become more subtle and complex. These variations depend on the degree of fluidity within the classroom and within the school. With regard to teachers, the greater their acceptance of gender stereotypes, the less chance the pupils have for breaking away from the gender category. With regard to the school, the potentialities for gender deviance will vary according to the degree of polarisation between the 'feminine' and 'masculine' that is embedded in the school's organisation. The more elaborate the system of gender differentiation - the system of norms and rules which define acceptable 'gender-appropriate' behaviour - the

greater the possibility for pupils to transgress these institutionalised expectations and thus acquire a 'deviant' status.

The next section will deal with further aspects of classroom interaction: the curriculum, lesson content and the rules governing knowledge.

CHAPTER VIII

Gender Differentiation in Relation to the Organisation of Knowledge and the Evaluation of Achievement

Introduction

The researcher implied in the last chapter that pupils are not merely passive 'objects' but will exert some influence on the teachers. Teachers are also constrained not only by material and physical realities but by the role-expectations of themselves as teachers and, for some, as wives and mothers. So far, it has been explained that there exists a system of stratification based on gender, as well as socio-economic class, which has been investigated by exploring classroom management and forms of social control within and between the schools and the factors affecting the dynamics of gender in classroom interaction.

This chapter will attempt to explore further how female and male pupils are perceived differently and what consequences they have for the life chances of pupils. The chapter will be divided up as follows:

a] Lesson Content:

This section will examine aspects of Teacher-Pupil interaction in so far as behaviour of the girls and boys makes different demands upon the teachers. It appears that because of the boys' disruptive behaviour and the girls' 'willingness' to participate in classroom activity and their apparent ease within the learning process, teachers tend to direct the lesson content and classroom life to the advantage of boys. An integral part of this discussion will be the sex-specificity of subjects.

b] Gender division in relation to knowledge and achievement:

The researcher will show how 'ability' and 'achievement' are perceived differently on the basis of gender by the teachers, and what significance this has on the learning process of pupils in all four schools. Girls' 'ability' was seen as 'conformist', part of the feminine stereotype of 'wanting to please', whilst the boys' 'ability' was seen as the real 'creativity' and worthy of note. The relationship between the children's achievement motivation (or its absence) and the prevalence of primary school teachers being female will be explored.

c] Gender Divisions in the Curriculum and Extra-Curricula Activities:

The researcher will show that the organisation of certain activities and curriculum practices is based on gender. In relation to gender-organised activities the researcher will also reveal that 'sex-based' curricula were to the advantage of male pupils and afforded them greater prestige, and was in part seen as a compensatory alternative to low scholastic ability; however, no such alternative existed for the girls. An important part of this section will discuss the reduced interaction between girls and boys because of the nature of the curriculum organisation.

d] Gender Preference of Teachers:

It will be shown how and in what way the teachers justify the process of gender differentiation and their 'personal' and 'professional' values to girls and boys both as 'pupils' and children, and how such gender preference affects on-going social interaction. An important part of the section will be how the value structure of the school in relation to the neighbourhood affects such preferences.

e] General Comments:

This section will sum up the chapter and explore the nature of teachers' behaviour towards girls and boys which expresses a multiplicity of factors. Throughout the chapter evidence will be provided and emphasis will be placed on variations between the four schools and the significance of such variations. The final part, though briefly, will attempt to show how gender is essentially related to the general beliefs held in society as a whole, and how the micro-world of the classroom reflects the macro-structure of the sexual divisions that are in existence, in family life, the labour market and public life.

a] Lesson Content

Treating the sexes in an equal way may be made difficult for the teacher, or even impossible, by the pupils themselves.¹ Because the latter have already learned socially-sanctioned gender-appropriate behaviour,² the classroom behaviour of the two sexes makes different demands upon the teachers. The researcher has shown in her previous chapter that boys tend to be more disruptive in class.

In their interviews, the teachers stated:

"The boys are more difficult to settle down ..."

"It's a bit harder to keep the boys' attention ..."

-
1. See Sarah, Elizabeth, 1980: "Teachers and Students in the Classroom: an examination of Classroom Interaction" in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (eds.), Learning to Lose: Sexism in Education, Women's Press, London, Sharp, Rachel, and Green, Anthony, 1975: Education and Social Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Sarah, Elizabeth, Scott, Marion and Spender, Dale, 1980: "The Education of Feminists: The Case for Single-Sex Schools" in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (eds.) op.cit. have all shown that pupils exert influence on the teachers.
 2. See Chapters III and IV for socialisation within the family and the neighbourhood.

"The lads can really play you up if they're in that frame of mind".

This was evidenced in all four schools studied, and it has a particular bearing on classroom practices. Teachers were 'forced' into situations where they would halt the lesson or delay in starting a lesson:

"We're not going to start until it's perfectly quiet. You boys shut up".

"All right, I'm waiting for some of the boys to settle down ... all of you listen".

"When Michael stops playing the fool, I'll tell you what we're going to do".

"We're waiting for the talking to stop ... We're still waiting and it seems like the same boys".

"John Simpson, will you be quiet. I'll stop the lesson until you do, and I won't start again until there is complete silence".

Faced with the possibility of disruptive boys and the pressure by their colleagues and the educational hierarchy to keep effective control over their classes, how do teachers adapt to the situation and what kind of strategies do they use?

In the estate school, during the Spring Term of 1978, the education media¹ did an extensive television project on dinosaurs for top infant classes (6-7 year olds). Teachers encouraged the children to participate fully in the venture by painting pictures and writing short stories on them, examples of which were hung around the walls of the classroom. The impact of recognising that a project or topic was interpreted as directly appropriate for girls or boys was apparent to pupils and teachers alike. During such a lesson a teacher stated:

"Get your books out on dinosaurs please".
"Oh no", cried the girls. "Not again, we're

1. B.B.C. Television for Schools, March 1978, the programme 'Watch'.

always doing boys' topics, Miss".
"Well perhaps later on in the term we'll do something on houses and flowers", compromises the teacher.
Monosyllabic word and sounds of disgust are emitted from the boys.

It is widely assumed that within the primary school girls and boys learn the same subject.¹ But within the classroom the teacher selects certain projects and activities, some of which are presumed to be 'appropriate' for girls and some of which for boys. We know from various studies that curricular materials have been found wanting in relation to sex, race and class.² The school-book world with its sexist implications reveals the implausible statistical ratio of twice as many boys as girls, and seven times as many men as women, who are also predominantly white and middle class. What has been less emphasised is the extent to which the content of individual lessons is seen as gender-appropriate by both pupils and teachers and the way in which this affects classroom practices.

This has particular relevance in the way lesson content was geared to certain groups of children and was thus effectively used to facilitate classroom management. The label 'it's for boys' was endorsed by many of the teachers in all four schools, and because certain activities,

-
1. See Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967: Children and their Primary Schools, (Plowden Report), H.M.S.O., London.
 2. See Lobban, G., 1977, "Sexist Bias in Reading Schemes", M. Hoyles (ed.), The Politics of Literacy, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London., Moon, C., 1974: Sex-role stereotyping in books for young children, Unpublished Dip.Ed. Thesis, Bristol University. Northern Women's Education Study Group, 1972: "Sex role learning: a study of infant readers" in Michelene Wandor (Ed.), The Body Politic, Stage One, London. Children's Rights Workshop, 1976: Sexism in Children's Books: Facts, Figures and Guidelines, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
Dixon, Bob, 1977: Catching Them Young: Sex, Race and Class in Children's Fiction, 2 Vols. Pluto, London.

projects and subject matter were thought to hold their (boys') attention, discriminating instruction processes became part and parcel of the whole curriculum.

Teachers report that they have more difficulty in teaching boys:

Dock Side

"It's the girls who are the sensible ones ... their work is better and they tend to settle down to work much better than the boys".

"Boys want to be involved in more energetic play".

"Boys are less co-operative than the girls... you have to keep an eye on them that much more..."

"In class you see the girls behaving themselves more".

"The boys are more difficult to settle down to their work ... whereas girls get on with the job".

"The boys don't seem to have the same self-discipline as the girls. They're more interested in play".

Applegate

"Girls tend to be rather more responsible at this age than the boys. Whereas boys are still in a very childish stage".

"Boys are beginning to get a little rougher now ... at least in my class. Girls know how to behave better".

"Boys do tend to be more untidy and lose their concentration easily".

"Girls' attitudes are better than boys' as far as work is concerned".

Long Meadow Estate

"I find that the boys ... you know a boy wants to be one of the boys and tends to try to prove it to his mates ... by trying to disrupt the class".

"The boys are always on the go. It's an effort to get them to settle down to work".

"The girls are more conscientious ... they're cleaner and neater with their work".

"They're (boys) much more easily distracted than the girls ..."

"I think the boys are more likely to be boisterous and go mad".

Lintonbray

"Boys seem a little more ready to adopt or undertake masculine attitudes that ... you know he's a tough guy ... well I won't be bothered with that".

"The boys have this idea about 'I am a man ... I do this, I do that' and a girl doesn't."

"The boys are more boisterous, more physical in my class certainly".

This dichotomy (or the teachers' interpretation of such) is reported for all the social groups. Manipulated by the necessity to maintain control and provide instruction, teachers were drawn into (or acted out) the stereotypes towards gender-oriented subjects and activities:

"It's better if only half the class are involved in the play corner", says the teacher of 2nd year infants' class in Dock Side.

"Would you girls go and play with the projects on the desks".

The boys and girls were being particularly noisy and exuberant; by way of encouraging the girls to engage in a quieter pursuit a tolerable level of noise and activity was reached. But at the expense of the girls.

In the interviews, the researcher asked the teachers "Do you think girls and boys respond differently to your particular subjects?"

"Yes, and this comes from home. We're doing dinosaurs at the moment and the boys are more enthusiastic about it. It tends to be a boys' 'thing' to do. If you had a topic about

housing ... houses ... the girls would immediately begin to sit up and take notice".

"I think it's a standard thing that boys like maths more than girls".

"Certainly anything to do with rockets or transport, even dinosaurs ... you know subjects like that seems to be a boy's type of subject".

"Oh yes, in subjects in general boys seem to want more exciting projects to do than girls, whereas girls will fall in with most things".

Most of the teachers did act upon their beliefs that certain topics were appropriate for boys whilst others were appropriate for girls.

Given that most of the teachers accepted this gender dichotomy as existing in reality, the teachers then used it to justify the need to keep the boys from being disruptive (in the working class schools), or to hold their attention (in the middle class schools):

"I like doing subjects like geography and I do find that this is the area where the lads do come out ... you know ... they've got the scientific facts, they've got some geographical facts whereas the girls tend to be a bit more woollier in most of the things".

"They (girls) haven't got the imagination that most of the lads have got".

"I find you can spark the boys a bit easier than you can the girls ..."

"Girls have got their own set ideas; it's always ... 'and we went home for tea' and 'Mum and Dad were there' and 'we all lived happily ever after ...'. Whereas you can get the boys to write something really interesting and there's nothing like '... and we all went home for tea ...' you know this sort of thing".

"Boys seem to want more exciting projects to do than girls, whereas girls will fall in with most things"

"You can choose a subject interesting to the boys, the girls would be interested just as well ..."

something like transport. But the other way round you often find boys are not very interested if it's not directed at them ..."

"If you are doing a transport type of thing boys will be into it whilst the girls are just tagging along and vice versa".

It was very common for topics to be chosen and taught with a view to evoking the interest of the boys.¹ Various reasons were used for such a distinction:

Dock Side

Female teachers:

"I do tend to try and make the topics as interesting as possible for the boys so that they won't lose their concentration and start fidgeting".

"It's a bit harder to keep the boys' attention during a lesson ... at least that's what I've found".

"Boys do tend to be interested in different subjects than the girls and because they (girls) settle down to work better than the boys I aim the topic at them (boys)".

"The girls come in and straight away they're going to respond to one thing but the boys ... oh ... you know. I try to make the subjects as interesting as possible for all the children but you just can't do it ... try your best. So you gear to the boys to hold their attention. Anyway, the girls enjoy anything, which makes it easier".

1. Lee, Anne, 1980: reports from her own experiences and observations: "it seems that teachers work harder on trying to provide examples and experiences that will hold the boys' attention" (p.125), in "Together we learn to read and write: Sexism and Literacy, Dale Spender & Elizabeth, Sarah (Eds.) op.cit. Marion Scott (1980) supports this analysis in the fact that because of boys' rigidity and unwillingness in class they can "determine the nature of the lessons to an unfair extent" (p.105). "Teach her a Lesson: Sexist Curriculum in Patriarchal Education" in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), ibid.

Male teachers:

"On the whole I do like topics and subjects that the boys like so I tend to choose those kind of topics. But that doesn't mean that the girls don't like them ... they catch on to subjects more quickly than the boys".

"I tend to stick to the basic science subjects which the boys do hang on to more. But we do have sewing for the girls and the boys are interested equally as the girls".

"You saw today where it was about war ... boys tend to respond to it more than the girls. I suppose I do tend to choose some sort of work relating to men, but mainly because most topics are aimed at boys".

Applegate

Female teachers:

"Certain projects go down better with the boys than they do with the girls. Topics ... you know like Junior One were doing this morning about 'People Who Help Us' ... that appeals to all of them. But certain things the girls do, don't stand out as the boys' do ... you know different kinds of topics ..."

"Girls are much more enthusiastic by comparison so I try to create the situation where the boys are going to become interested".

Male teachers:

"I do think it's important to select a topic that's got something for the boys. They've got such active minds ... you've got to hold their attention with something that they could identify with".

Long Meadow Estate

Female teachers:

"It's easier to pull the girls in than it is to pull the boys in, so you try a topic that's usually got quite a lot for the lads".

"I tend to look at a topic ... it's very difficult perhaps because a lot of the topics are very 'girl orientated'. They seem to like a lot better ...

most things ... when you talk about houses and the family ... you know that type of subject".

"If you do something like pirates, then you really look for something that you know the lads are going to like".

"The girls always find something in a topic ... whereas if we do a topic for the girls the lads will just cut out ... 'I'm not doing that sort of thing ...', whereas the girls will usually try to relate to the topic that the lads like".

Male teachers:

"It's very hard to find ... to kind of work out what is there (he touches his temple) and what is kind of ... they're responding to. The girls apply themselves better and hence I choose something that will make the boys 'clam up' and get down to work. You know ... they (boys) become aware that certain things are not kind of 'manly' to do, so I try and be sensitive to this It's all tied in with the culture".

Lintonbray

Female teachers:

"There are subjects that girls like and there are subjects that boys like. But as I've said before ... the boys get so boisterous that I tend to pick a topic that they'll get involved in".

Male teachers:

"Well boys will not do anything highly ... what they construe as 'unboyish' because they've got to face their peers ... afterwards ... ridicule ... they'll want to avoid. So I tend to choose more inventive things ... and also simply because I like teaching those sort of topics".

However not all teachers have such opinions:

"I haven't seen any differences between the kids as far as some subjects go. You just have different likes and dislikes between different children. They're so young, they pick up on anything ... I mean in my subject Art and Crafts ... they'll make a mess of it ... but so long as they're trying it doesn't matter."

This particular teacher taught the 5-7 year class in the Lintonbray

village school, and is an example of a teacher who does not gear lessons to the boys. Her class was small (pupil number) and (as she stated) she thought them far too young to make distinctions based on gender a part of her classroom practice.

However, it would seem that, for the majority of teachers, because of the need to control boys who were seen as more disruptive, and because girls were seen as more "conscientious", "enthusiastic" and "sensible", lesson content was, on the whole, geared to boys at the expense of the girls. The majority of teachers have assumed that there are some topics more befitting boys than girls and vice versa. The former are chosen mainly to 'occupy' the boys.¹

What also begins to emerge here is a tendency to regard the boys as more "inventive", "boisterous" and having the propensity to "stand out more". It is important to develop this theme further to see what teachers regard as "intellectual achievement".

b] Gender Divisions in Relation to Academic Achievement and its Evaluation

A pupil's gender is an important variable in determining teachers' behaviour or interaction, with disruptive boys receiving more attention

1. "Subject specialism" according to Jennifer Shaw (1980) "is operated by boys pupils as much as by teachers, by the curriculum or by the organisational features of schools, and they are possible because the values and attitudes thus expressed are endorsed on a mass scale by the culture in which we live" (p.73), "Education and the individual: Schooling for girls, or mixed schooling - a mixed blessing?" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

from teachers.¹ One of the main reasons put forward by the teachers themselves and confirmed by the researcher's observational data was that boys 'needed' more control.

Given that girls more often than boys leave school with few or no qualifications and also with what has been termed as the 'wrong skills',² it is particularly puzzling to read in previous studies that girls are more 'successful' than boys at primary level in most subjects, particularly in reading, writing, English and spelling.³ There are in existence certain hypotheses which presume to explain how the assumed 'superiority' in Maths, Geography and Science is soon lost to boys in secondary education, which the researcher will discuss later.

In all four schools the girls, according to the teachers, tended to do better in academic terms:

Dock Side

"On the whole girls are better at their work ..."

"Certainly if you were to compare their scholastic ability you'll find girls 'streets' ahead at this age".

Applegate

"The boys aren't as academic as the girls ..."

-
1. See Lobban, Glenys, 1978: "The influence of the school on Sex Role Stereotyping" in J. Chetwynd and O. Hartnett (Eds.), The Sex-Role System: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Weinreich, Helen, 1978: "Sex role socialisation", J. Chetwynd and O. Hartnett (Eds.) ibid.; Good, T.L., Sikes, N.J. and Brophy, J.E., 1973, "Effects of teacher sex and pupil sex on classroom interaction", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 65 (1) pp. 74-87, for similar findings.
 2. See Anne-Marie Wolpe's two papers of 1978, (a) "Education and the sexual division of labour" in Annette Kuhn and Anne-Marie Wolpe (Eds.), Feminism and Materialism, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; and (b) "Girls and Economic Survival", British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 26, No. 2, June, pp. 150-162.
 3. See Douglas, J.W.B., 1964: The Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London. Sharpe, Sue, 1976: Just Like a Girl: How Girls Learn to be Women, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

"Girls tend to be more responsive in their work...."

"They're (boys) much more uptight in their work than girls, who just tend to get on with it".

Long Meadow Estate

"They're (girls) better at reading and writing ... and can write nice stories and they read quite well".

"Most of the boys are in the middle ... bottom ... group; they have greater learning difficulties".

"I think in the five years I've been here the girls have always been my brightest pupils".

"Usually in this primary school you find that girls tend to ... there's simply more girls at the top of the class than boys".

"Certainly in my class most girls are in the top half".

Lintonbray

"Girls, by and large, apply themselves and are better at things ... their attitude seems to be better with regard to the learning process".

"The girls have a freer attitude with regard to most things than the boys ... and in doing well".

Observation confirmed that the girls did tend to 'excel' in class. At Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate - where the existence of 'sets' for Maths and Reading were constantly used to mark off 'brighter' children from the 'less bright' ones - girls outnumbered the boys in all of the 'top sets'.

The teachers' awareness that the performance of the girls is 'superior' to that of the boys leads to a further reason for boys having subjects geared towards them and receiving more attention. This is the need to encourage them more, given that they were 'behind' the girls. Hence teachers further justify the situation of turning their attention to the

boys:

Dock Side

"The boys need handling differently, so you have to encourage them more".

"I think possibly boys respond more if you push them harder..."

Applegate

In this school the teachers favoured high academic achievement, especially for the boys, an attitude which reflected the ethos of the school and the aspirations of the parents, thus mutually reinforcing each other. Middle-class boys were expected to put as much effort into scholastic achievement as the girls were.

Although none of the teachers reported having to 'push' the lads in the way that Dock Side teachers did, they did however inform the researcher that they selected topics in order to gain the boys' attention:

"... it's easier to pull the girls in than it is to pull the boys in, so I try a topic that's usually got quite a lot for the lads".

"The boys' attention is that much more difficult to hold. They tend to lose concentration more easily".

In Long Meadow Estate the teachers reported a different tale:

"Well, I find I have to be much stricter with the boys, and push them that little bit more".

"I'm always on at them to try a bit harder ..."

"I try to pressure them to put a bit more effort into their work".

"You look at your lads in a different way, you've got to push them.

"It's always pushing the lads at the moment ... I don't know why".

And a very significant comment:

"Because you gear to the middle ... and that's where the lads are ... it's obvious you're going to gear to the lads".

Lintonbray

"The boys do tend to drift ... you know ... lack greater concentration than the girls so you tend to encourage them to stick to it more ..."

There is in play here a 'necessity' felt by the teachers to direct the lesson content and classroom life to the boys' advantage, not only to meet the needs of classroom management, but also because it was believed that male pupils were 'backward', in comparison to the girls, and thus needed more encouragement.

When analysing the teachers' perception of achievement, one becomes aware of a significant difference in the way in which the achievement of the two gender groups is evaluated:

"On the whole you can generally say that the boys are far more capable of learning; more nicer to teach"

"Boys are interested in everything and are prepared to take things seriously. They tend to ask deeper questions while girls tend to be more superficial about subjects; they ask the 'right' questions simply because it's expected of them ..."

"Although girls tend to be good at most things, in the end you find it's a boy who's going to be your most brilliant pupil".

"Girls are better at their work, but I have a suspicion that this is because they are more ready to please and wish to do well to please parents or teachers".

"Girls haven't got the imagination that most of the lads have got".

"Sometimes the girls are equally as boisterous and imaginative".

The implications of these statements, which cover all four schools, is

that teachers perceive girls' 'achievement' as being due to conformity to institutional expectations and diligence rather than to academic ability. In short teachers do not perceive girls as being 'positively' intelligent, which reflects societal beliefs regarding women's 'achievement' in general.¹ Despite the evidence that girls are 'brighter' than boys (on average), teachers find boys more interesting and rewarding to teach, thus providing an additional justification for directing their attention to them rather than girls:

" I must admit I find the boys much more inventive than the girls ..."

"I find you can spark the boys a bit easier than you can the girls".

"The boys demand so much from you... but at least in a way it 'stretches' you ... you know ... you attempt things that within yourself you didn't think possible".

"In general the boys have a greater originality in their work than the girls, though they're not as neat and tidy".

"Their (boys) work is much more original ... you know they tend to write about adventures and such like ..."

"The girls' work always tends to be the same ... rather boring, I find".

Societal stereotypes do influence teachers' beliefs about what girls are like. Boys are regarded as "adventurous", "boisterous", "disruptive",

1. "A number of studies show that women are perceived as inferior and less competent than men ... When women do well it is more likely to be attributed to luck or special effort, rather than skill or ability", (p.20), Weinreich, 1978, op.cit. Piacente et al., 1974, set up a situation in which both sexes showed incompetence, and found that females were more likely to be labelled incompetent, see Piacente, B.S., Denner, L.A., Hawkins, H.L. and Cohen, S.L., 1974: "Evaluation of the performance of experimenters as a function of their sex and competence", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, No. 4, pp. 321-9.

"unco-operative" and these qualities are seen as linked to others, such as their supposedly "high creativity" and "imagination",¹ whereas the behaviour of girls ^{as} ~~were~~ interpreted as "conscientious", "sensible", "self-disciplined" and "less distracted in their work", and hence "mediocre" and lacking the "imagination" and "creativity" seen in boys. This was in spite of the fact that on many occasions, the girls, in the eyes of the observer, behaved in similar ways to boys. Previous research points to a similar distinction on the part of teachers.²

-
1. But there is no evidence to suggest high activity is connected with intelligence, see Broverman, D.M., Klaiber, E.L., Kobayashi, V. and Vogel, W., 1968: "Roles of activation and inhibition in sex differences in cognitive abilities", in Psychology Review, Vol. 75, pp. 25-50.
 2. In their study of Canadian teachers, Ricks and Pyke (1973) revealed that teachers preferred teaching boys believing they were more interesting and rewarding, see Ricks, S.A. and Pyke, S.W., 1973: "Teacher perceptions and attitudes that foster or maintain sex-role differences", Interchange, Vol. 4, pp. 26-33. Other research indicates that teachers responded differently to their pupils on the basis of their gender, interacting more with boys, see Brophy, J.E. and Goode, T.L., 1970: "Teacher's communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: some behavioural data", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 61 (5), pp. 365-374; Martin, R., 1972: "Student sex behaviour as determinants of the type and frequency of teacher-student contacts", School Psychology, Vol. 10 (4), pp. 339-347; Meyer, W.J. and Thompson, G.G., 1956: "Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth-grade children", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 47, pp. 385-396; Serbin, L.A., O'Leary, K.D., Kent, R.N. and Tonick, I.J., 1973: "A comparison of teacher response to the pre-academic and problem behaviour of boys and girls", Child Development, Vol. 44, pp. 796-804; and Spaulding, R.L., 1963: "Achievement, creativity and self-concept correlates of teacher-pupil transactions in elementary schools" cited in Sears, P. and Feldman, D.H., 1974: "Teacher interactions with boys and girls" reprinted in J. Stacey, S. Bereaud and J. Daniels (Eds.): And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education, Dell, New York. Spaulding (1963) op.cit., in particular, found that teachers spent more of their time reprimanding the misbehaviour of boys whilst the girls were reprimanded for their lack of knowledge and skill.

In all four schools the researcher noted that girls' real ability was attributed to conformity to institutional expectations, and that the academic achievement of girls in schools was explained in terms of the 'feminine' stereotype.¹

In general, teachers' behaviour towards girls and boys expresses a multiplicity of factors: in attempting to exercise control over the class and/or justify the gearing of lesson content to the boys, teachers operate a form of instruction aimed directly at this group whom they find harder to control, lower in academic abilities than girls but more interesting and rewarding to teach, and place emphasis upon the long-term needs of the boys vis-a-vis their position within the family and the labour market.² All of these factors contributes to the 'marginalisation' of girls' education. Despite the fact that both girls and boys were required to work, more emphasis was placed on achievement and success for boys whilst girls were merely expected to accede to the teachers' desire for less disturbance so that they could concentrate their time and effort on the boys.

-
1. Madeleine MacDonald (1980) stated that "... because of being female their success is treated as unusual, luck or as a result of over-diligent, hence 'boring' effort" (p.24). See her paper "Socio-cultural reproduction and women's education" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), op.cit. Martina Horner (1974) states "... we have a general inability to reconcile competence, ambition, intellectual accomplishment and success with femininity" (p.44), "Towards an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women", J. Stacey et al. (Eds.), op.cit.
 2. Anne-Marie Wolpe (1977), has identified two processes within education: the basic training of pupils and the ideological transmission. The close relationship between these two aspects reveals the dominant beliefs of the 'role' of women, as that of wife and mother, whilst boys are perceived by their occupational roles within the labour market to earn enough money to support their wives and families (p.2), Some Processes within Sexist Education, Women's Research and Resources Centre, London.

There is no doubt that teachers define the general behaviour and the scholastic ability of girls as conformist. Their definitions of the girls' behaviour may well be justified as a result of their experiences within the classroom (as well in terms of the way society interprets female behaviour on a general level) yet the teachers did not try (as they could have) to break what they saw as the girls' conformist routine. In fact teachers actually collude in this conformity and do not prod their female pupils into 'creative' activities, but utilise the girls' behaviour for their own need to maintain control and facilitate classroom management. It is of course true, as Elizabeth Sarah points out:

"The individual teacher's behaviour in the classroom may help to sustain and reinforce the status quo, but the situation is not of the teacher's own making".

Sarah, 1980: p.158

She goes on to say:

"... the patriarchal value system is an established entity before the teacher arrives on the scene ..."

Sarah, 1980: p.159

But this does not excuse the situation in that teachers (as shown) influence segregation patterns in the direction of increased gender differentiation.

The researcher, at this stage, would like to venture into the analysis of why certain groups of boys do not do 'as well as' the girls in primary school. School is a decisive and delicate time in a child's life, in that they will start to acquire a 'universalistic' status identity, whereas previously within the home they had more of a 'particularistic' biography. There will be many facets of this identity

which will differ for girls as opposed to boys.

School success, or the lack of it, will be of paramount importance in the determination of a child's identity and status vis-a-vis the school and society. In these early stages of school, in ways which depend upon the catchment area, children define their relations with their classmates and their teachers. As stated before, there does seem to be a marked differentiation in 'ability' and in the learning situation between girls and boys, especially in schools such as Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate.¹ School success is, for most people, of crucial importance in achieving class status; it plays a major part in allocating people within the stratification system in our society. Yet many children 'fall by the wayside', not because of their 'lack of intelligence', but through the influence of a variety of forces upon them. The contextual chapter has referred to some of the reasons which have been put forward to explain why children 'fail' in school. What the researcher wishes to emphasise here is the fact that school success among working class boys is not a 'masculine' norm. R.P. McDermott points out:

"... the high rates of learning disorder point to learned patterns of selective inattention developed in the politics of everyday life in the classroom".

McDermott, 1974: p.93)

Although he was specifically referring to black children with white teachers, there could be a similar pattern going on among working-class male pupils and female teachers. The identities and statuses offered

1. David Hartley notes in his research that teachers do not rate working-class boys in the same way as more middle-class boys but apparently they rate middle-class and working-class girls in the same way (p.106), 1977, Some Consequences of Teachers' Definitions of Boys and Girls in Two Infant Schools, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Exeter.

by a school system, which is essentially middle-class and which appears to be ordered by females (at least within the primary school) may not be worth seeking or are even worth avoiding, simply because the norms of the community are not only 'opposed' to middle-class values, but also reflect a strong masculine culture, which avoids anything associated with women.

Let us take reading as an example.¹ There is growing evidence that suggests male and female reading performances differ on the basis of competency. In all the four schools there was a greater percentage of male pupils (although Applegate males were lower in number) referred for remedial reading instruction. It could be that reading is an act which apparently aligns the male pupil with the "wrong" gender values and thus alienate him from his peer group. To read and generally do well in school is to accept the authority of the teacher and all the 'status' and 'identity' that goes with this 'success'. To be disruptive and inattentive in school in general is to 'accept' male peer group games along with the accompanying status and identity. In other words it may be that some boys are ambivalent about success in school simply because succeeding in mental skills is seen as 'feminine' and not 'masculine'.² However, when children and teacher share the same perspectives and values, then reading and school success will be eagerly sought after, as it is in Applegate.

We need only refer to Chapter III and IV of this thesis to see the

1. Lee, 1980: op.cit. reports that there is a strong sense of the appropriateness of reading as an activity for girls to participate in (p.126).

2. Paul Willis, (1977) in his, now famous research, illustrates this clearly, in Learning to Labour, Saxon House, Farnborough,

character of relations between men and women, especially in working-class neighbourhoods. Boys learn not to take note of females and to disassociate themselves from the 'feminine' world. When they enter primary school, they meet what may well be seen as a contradiction: they have to accept the authority of the teacher who is usually a woman. But this position is not such a contradiction as it first seems. As a result of the extreme polarisation within the working-class neighbourhoods, whereby two 'separate worlds' of women and men exist boys may shut down their attention skills in response to tasks set by the teacher; they in fact feel ambivalent about school learning and feel they have to act up, and lower performance results from this. The last two chapters have shown how boys were more disruptive and inattentive within the classroom. Reading disabilities and school failure result. The teachers' calls for attention from the boys was far more apparent and seemed to have far less effect than it did on the girls. In essence the boys were attempting to flout the teachers' authority and deny their dominance,¹ not only because they (the teachers) are 'middle-class' but also because they are female. It is ironic then that whilst girls 'succeed' in school, their success is negated because they are female, whilst teachers themselves perceive some relation between 'masculine' identity and lower commitment and performance:²

Dock Side

"The boys somehow seem to avoid doing well in their lessons ..."

"I think the lads think they are seen as 'girlish' if they come out on top in class..."

1. In primate studies, attention pattern has been used to define the social organisation of dominance hierarchies, see Chance, M., 1967: "Attention Structure as the Basis of Primate Rank Orders", Man (n.s.) Vol. 2 (4), pp. 503-518.

2. The researcher recognises that this is much more complex than stated. Consequently it will be covered in greater length in the next chapter.

"Boys would much prefer to be 'one of the lads' who are usually at the bottom in class ... I somehow think that they believe it's 'sissy' to do well".

Long Meadow

"I find that the boys ... you know a boy wants to be one of the boys and tends to try to prove it to his mates ... by trying to disrupt the class and not doing his lessons".

"Lads will just cut out and say 'I'm not doing that sort of thing' ..."

"You know they (boys) become aware that certain things are not kind of 'manly' ... like reading and writing ..."

"A boy can swank around and not do well in his maths ... you know it's accepted".

Lintonbray

"Boys seem a little more ready to adopt or undertake masculine attitudes that ... you know ... he's a tough guy ... 'well I won't be bothered with that".

"The boys have this idea about 'I am a man ... I do this, I do that".

"It's not seen as 'quite right' for boys to do well".

Such an argument can be supported when we look to the situation in Applegate where the difference in achievement between the girls and boys in the primary school appears to be less than at the other schools:

Applegate

"On the whole the boys are quite keen and in certain instances do better than the girls".

"When it matters they'll (boys) pull their socks up, so to speak, and really get down to their work".

"In many instances it is difficult to ascertain who is exactly doing better ... a girl or a boy ... except that the girls' attitude is more responsive and therefore their work is consistently better."

Moreover, in Applegate the tendency for girls to do slightly better in school is rationalised in terms of a maturational hypothesis.¹

"Boys are still in a very childish stage ... not so responsible as the girls".

"Girls tend to be more responsive in their work, whereas boys are still inclined not to bother so much. But eventually they tend to catch up in senior school".

"At this age you find boys a little more lax than the girls with regards their work; but with a little more maturity they will settle down".

c] Gender Divisions in the Curriculum and in Extra-Curricular Activities

In the organisation of certain activities and curriculum practices on a gender basis, polarisation became particularly pronounced. Football, P.E., and other organised games were consistently organised on sex-segregated lines. Certain activities are not only segregated but have their place in a hierarchy of prestige. In all the schools, football had high prestige and was seen as an activity done by males.

Dock Side

This school, though lacking in space and provision of playing fields and hence having few opportunities for outside activity, e.g. inter-school football, nevertheless held firm views about the distinctiveness of the sexes:

"Well I know for a fact they like to play different types of games which probably reflects their abilities ... boys are more physical ... they'll play ball games whereas girls are quite happy going on the apparatus ... quieter games mainly".

1. The 'maturational hypothesis' is a rather ambiguous term and used to suggest that adolescent development affects cognitive abilities differently for girls and boys in that girls depreciate in 'ability' whilst boys 'career' ahead in ability. See Maccoby, E., and Jacklin, C., 1974: The Psychology of Sex Differences, University of Stanford Press, for an analysis.

"Boys definitely want to get involved in more energetic games like playing football. But you have to remember that boys do have an advantage in the fact that they are stronger ... in P.E. ... apparatus work".

Dock Side did not, as mentioned above, participate in football on an inter-school basis (maybe because the head was female and did not seek such prestige in the way a male headperson would), yet the largest area of the four segmented playgrounds was kept specifically for football - thus the boys dominated a large proportion of space.¹ During a games lesson where girls were playing netball and boys playing football, the researcher was informed by the teacher in charge:

"Separate play areas were kept in force so that boys could play football without impeding girls' games. It seems a bit silly to get rid of the walls between the playgrounds as they are quite useful in certain ways".

When the researcher pointed out that the largest space was given entirely over to boys for their use of football, and asked why didn't girls join in, Mr. Thompson explained that this was not as unfair as it seemed:

"After all, boys have much more energy to expend than girls so therefore it's only natural that they should require more space in order to do so".

Asked if girls wanted to play football as well, he stated:

"Oh yes! It's good that the girls play football, providing they play separately. Mind you, sometimes we've had a girl who's been good enough to play for the lads' team".

Dancing and 'movement to music' held in draughty halls were also segregated,

1. See Wolpe, 1977: op.cit.; Thorne, Barrie, 1978: "Gender: How Is It Best Conceptualised?", paper presented at the American Sociological Association San Francisco, California, September.

i.e. girls and boys are often expected to assume different positions:

"Boys make a bow, girls make a curtsy".

By the time they reached the Juniors, girls and boys automatically segregated themselves during many aspects of classroom life. When selecting a team for games, the boys automatically chose each other and none of the girls - the girls did likewise. Whilst preparing for games and P.T. the two groups tended to take up opposite ends of the room whilst donning their P.T. gear. When called to line-up at the door, without any instruction to do so, they immediately made two separate lines: one for girls and one for boys.

Applegate

Inter-school competition in Applegate was extolled and sought to increase the school's prestige.¹ Football, chess and music were all high status activities and, due to an abundance of the right facilities, all three were pursued and encouraged with vigour. Mr. Seaton, the headperson, informed me:

"Our Mr. Braithwaite regularly gives up his Saturday mornings to help run the football team; and we're not doing too badly in that area considering we are only a small school".

The researcher's reply was:

"What about the girls - is football only for boys?"

His comment was:

"Well, the girls are not so keen as the boys. But they do participate in music".

1. Read David Hargreaves' account of pupils' involvement with school activities and the high status accorded to such involvement, 1967, Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

During organised games, if by chance it happened to be raining, then football was 'called off' the field, for fear of doing damage to the turf in the wet conditions. The girls were moved on to the infants' playground in order to let the boys have the greater space for their game.

It was obvious that the teachers in this school placed great emphasis on the visual arts and crafts (in the junior section there was a well-stocked pottery workshop), and subjects like music:

"Girls are more likely to take up playing an instrument than boys".

"It's a question of trying to get the boys to play ... we're always trying to get the boys".

"More girls are interested in music ... and as far as our school is concerned there are more girls who are better at it".

"You find six girls who are very good and one boy who's just about bright enough".

"It's later when the boys develop that they get back".

"Well I find that you start a lot of girls off and they're very keen. You see they're more conscientious, they do the work. But if you do manage to get a boy to go through the hard work the chances are that in the end he'll do better than the girls for some reason.

A contradiction is revealed:

"The girls will work by themselves and be conscientious and not always want to give up; but the boys always want to go and join the football teams or play out, especially in the summer when the days are longer, then they're very difficult to keep, but they're much more talented".

"When it comes to music, girls have much more staying power, particularly now when they're quite young. But you find that the really brilliant ones are usually boys. By the time they get to seventeen they're really the top

ones ... oh you may get your one-off ...
Jacqueline Du Pre, for example, but all you've
got to do is look around you at most of the
orchestras ... they're usually all men
musicians, with the odd woman here and there".

These comments are taken from a discussion among teachers about extra-curricular activities. It was interesting to note that even when it was the girls' 'appropriate activity' (i.e. music), boys were more encouraged and looked upon as the ones 'who are really going to succeed'. No mention was made of the possibility that the smaller number of really 'eminent' women within the field of music might be due to the fact that it was dominated by men and as such it may be quite difficult for women to achieve such 'eminence'. Also, when certain skills or activities are designated as the preserve of one sex, "then the other sex may feel tentative about participating, which may well influence pupils and contribute to their performance in schools" (Lee, 1980, p.127). Again, this school emphasised the 'maturational hypothesis' as a rationale for the differentiation in activities undertaken by girls and/or boys:

"Girls get rebellious ... you know like girls do when they grow up, whereas the boys are a bit more frank ... easier to deal with".

"It applies particularly to music because they're (girls) very often put on a spot where they've got to play something in front of a lot of people and that's when there is a lot of pressure on them. And then they decide to throw up about the boyfriend chucking them".

In the encouragement of certain activities and subjects defined on a gender basis the teachers in Applegate, however, were positive in encouraging cross-sex activities which were usually designated as a 'girls' thing', the motivation behind this was chiefly to extend the boys. For instance, the boys were allowed to do sewing and cookery and the teachers encouraged such activities, but the girls were refused the

choice of woodwork. The girls did not always accept this situation passively. On one occasion during my fieldwork the girls of the Top Juniors put together a petition, signed it and duly presented it to the Headperson. Although he accepted their petition, Mr. Seaton made no move towards changing the situation to meet the request of the girls. In fact, no reply or reaction was ever forthcoming.¹

Long Meadow Estate

Extra-curricular activities in the estate school were organised on a gender basis, as in most of the schools. Football was dominated by the boys, despite the head's insistence that it was open to both girls and boys:

"It's difficult though to fit the girls in because of the lack of time".

But plenty of time was made available after school hours and on Saturdays for the boys to pursue their activity.

Parallel to football as an extra-curricular activity (as well as part of the school curriculum) was the gymnastic club; gymnastics having had a 'boost' since the emergence of Korbut, Commaneci, Kim and Tourischeva² in the Seventies. Though mainly attended by the girls, it was, in theory, open to both boys and girls - with one boy on some occasions availing himself of the activity. Organised by a male teacher (as football was) the club was run during the dinner hour, with no inter-school competitions or trips to other areas to pursue the sport in contrast to football.

-
1. During the pilot study, in East Port Road (a school similar to Dock Side) the two teachers (both female) of the Top Junior classes were instrumental in encouraging 'cross-sex' activities. They encouraged the girls and boys to do woodwork, as well as cookery and soft-toy making. And it was noticeable that all enjoyed the activities, although the boys did need a certain amount of 'chivvyng' along in the beginning.
 2. They are all well-known East European women gymnasts who have done exceptionally well in the Olympics and other major sports events.

It was particularly noticeable that in this school football was used as a compensatory activity for boys with low 'academic' status:

"Soccer is what boys hang themselves on to ... and in a way ... it's good in some ways because it means somebody with very low or poor scholastic ability can achieve some kind of 'fame' or some kind of 'greatness' in some other area. Because he's good at soccer and he's bad in class he can at least achieve some respect from his peers".

(Male teacher)

For the girls, however, no such compensatory alternative exists. Another teacher pointed out:

"I think competition for the boys is a good thing ... It gives them something to achieve, especially if they're in a poor group ..."

"Football tends to be completely for boys, and it's something they look forward to ... it's certainly a way of using all that energy ... you know what boys usually have".

Lintonbray

The village school prided itself on providing/maintaining a "good football reputation". Considering that it was so small and that the team was picked from the twelve oldest male pupils, Lintonbray had done "extremely well" in the football calendar, beating other and much larger schools in the Knock-out Cup Competition. It was notable that a girl regularly played each year due most probably to the fact that there were not enough 'good' male pupils¹ to choose from, although the headperson (who took charge of training), did not own up to such a reason:

1. An important fact to be noted was that of the twelve oldest male pupils - two were totally 'unsuitable' candidates for the team; one was large and had a weight 'problem', whilst the other limped badly.

"We've set a precedent here and there's a girl who not only played for the school team, but she ended up with two cup-winners' medals".

When the team were playing an away game, the rest of the girls were 'allowed' to run their own gymnastics class during the absence of Mr. Wharten and the 'boys' (and one girl).

All the schools tended to display little interest in organising clubs and teams specifically for girls. Either the clubs or activities which girls made their own were given low status¹ (Long Meadow and Lintonbray) or otherwise attempts were made to entice the boys into taking it up (Applegate). The most prestigious of all activities, football, was kept for boys.

In response to the different attitudes of the girls and boys towards traditionally viewed gender-typed subjects such as cookery, woodwork, sewing etc., reactions among the teachers varied within as well as between the schools:

Dock Side

"So long as you take the attitude we are all going to sew then the lads accept it ... of course rather grudgingly".

"After the first few moans and groans the lads tend to settle down to it ... you know sewing and that ... although I do think they'd prefer hammering nails into something ... this lot would anyway".

1. Eileen Byrne notes that the prestige gained from football within society as a whole is not comparable to any of the girls' activities or sport. See Byrne, Eileen, 1978, Women and Education, Tavistock, London.

"I think as long as they know what's expected of them ... you know I tell them to just get on with it and they'll do it".

"Most of the boys will have a go at sewing but in most handicrafts you find girls tend to get more involved in it".

"If the boys want to sew, if the girls want to knit, then let them have a go".

These teachers' attitudes towards the breaking-down of sex-based subjects seemed more authoritarian - in that they did not put forward a positive attitude in the encouragement of such subjects. They stated: 'this is how it's going to be, because I said so', without giving logical reasons or pointing out the advantages of learning such skills. However one or two teachers appeared to express a more 'positive attitude':

"At the moment I'm doing sewing in the class and the boys will readily accept it as the girls. I'm happy to say that there's a move towards both sexes covering topics like metalwork and sewing. I feel myself that it is an essential part of their education that they should have a go at both of them".

"It's quite nice to get the boys doing sewing as well as the girls ... to do different subjects. I was always frustrated at school ... I had to do sewing every week and I loathed it because I was a proper little tomboy and I would have much rather got on with the woodwork. So my class do the whole lot ... boys do the sewing and girls do the woodwork and they all thoroughly enjoy it".

Applegate

"I make a point of not making boys do woodwork and girls do needlework. Actually they both get involved very much in the arts and crafts, especially ceramics and pottery".

"I try to encourage the boys a great deal in baking and sewing. Although girls want to attempt to do more intricate things with material ... sewing, whilst the boys are interested in models, manual type and physical type things".

"I think we should stretch the talents of each child and discover what they're good at. I mean if a boy is good at baking who knows ..."

Long Meadow

"The idea that boys do cookery and girls do metalwork and so on is very good, but a lot of it is token. Obviously there will always be a lot of girls who will always opt out ... or more girls than boys will opt out.¹ Given the fact that men can get employment, generally opt for employment outside the home whereas there'll always be a big percentage of girls who opt for staying in the home and working as a housewife and this is fair enough I suppose".

"Boys can ... and do sewing and knitting in this kind of school without suffering any ridicule at all. It is just taken for granted that they'll do baking, sewing and knitting. If woodwork does take place with the girls ... it doesn't usually because a lot of the tools they use are very dangerous for children to use".

It was true of most of the teachers that they actively encouraged the children to participate in 'cross-sex' activities. Between the ages of five to eight the children indeed regarded these as fairly routine. This attitude of the teachers towards cross-sex activities qualifies the earlier contention that the school intensifies the gender separation of the home. But it was also noticeable that by the age of nine years the preoccupations and hobbies of the two sexes had drawn apart.² It may have been that in structured situations such as exist in classrooms the children, especially the boys, felt in no way inhibited or threatened by having to do activities usually perceived in a sex-stereotyped way,³

1. This teacher is referring to the labour market.

2. In their extensive studies on child-upbringing John Newson and Elizabeth Newson noticed the sharp polarisation in hobbies and preoccupations of the two sexes by the age of seven and even more by the age of eleven, which would suggest age is an important variable. See Newson, J. and Newson, E., 1965, Infant Care in an Urban Community; 1968, Four Years Old in an Urban Community; 1976, Seven Years Old in the Home Environment; 1977, Perspectives on School at Seven Years Old, all published by Allen & Unwin, London.

3. But it may be that out of school activities would not be so flexible given the influence of the peer group. See Newson, J., Newson, E., Richardson, Diane, and Scaife, Joyce, 1978, "Perspectives in Sex-Role Stereotyping: Sex-roles in adolescence and pre-adolescence" in Jane Chetwynd and Oonagh Hartnett (Eds.), op.cit.

and even look forward to doing them, as most of them will have been deterred from such pastimes out of school (particularly by their fathers) and enjoy the newness of it all:

"When we do sewing and this sort of thing usually it's the boys that always want to do it. Maybe because they don't ever do it at home. And baking, there again, the boys like to do it more than the girls".

"In this school most boys do cookery".

"Typical sex aims like sewing and that sort of thing ... you find that goes down well with the lads".

Lintonbray

"Well here we encourage all the children to get involved in Art and Craft ... I suppose you've seen the displays on the walls in the hall ... those tiles and clay models".

"You'll find that in fact a lot of boys enjoy cooking and really want to have a go at it".

"The boys in my class don't like to be seen sewing and enjoying it ... but I'm sure they do. So they tend to do such things that are seen as boyish, like models, whilst the girls do the usual things like knitting and sewing".

What seems to have been happening in the process of 'de-sexing' specialised curricula is that the boys have received particular consideration in that they are allowed to participate in what were usually termed 'girls' subjects', like sewing, knitting and cooking. The girls, on the other hand, very rarely were able to participate in what were termed 'boys' subjects' like metalwork, woodwork or sport. Various excuses and reasons were given for this discrimination: "not enough time", "the lack of a teacher" and also the lack of facilities and space given over to these curricula activities. Applegate, despite its 'positive' attitude towards the reduction of sex-based subjects did not allow the girls to

participate in 'boys' topics' such as woodwork, regardless of the frequent demands made from the girls in the Top Junior section.

Of additional interest is that a number of teachers extolled the 'achievements' of boys in the subjects which were normally seen as 'feminine' skills; this was either to encourage the boys who feared ridicule or to compensate for their first initial endeavours (which, for some, were disastrous):

"I've had this complete baking session this year and the boys have done just as well as the girls".

"When you do baking there's no difference at all and the boys will produce stuff just as nicely as the girls".

"In sewing, most of the lads turn out by far the best work, because they'll be more meticulous than some of the girls who just want to finish quickly. This is their attitude ... you know ... I'm the best, I'm the quickest, ... whereas you don't get that with the boys. They're more interested in actually what they're doing rather than what the rest of the class is doing".

"Some of these boys really make some quite nice things ... soft toys ..."

"It's group activities that the lads don't like particularly. But yet in 'movement to music' so long as they can do 'Movement' with another lad they're all right, and some of them are quite creative in fact and they really enjoy that".

"Singing is the worst thing .. they (boys) really don't like it so I do try to compensate ... I give them an instrument".

The organisation of the school time-table, and the encouragement of boys to extend their experience and skills in previously 'tabooed' topics was

1. The next chapter will show that there is a contradiction here.

essentially at the girls' expense as no alternative was made for them to do likewise. They ultimately remain secondary in all their needs and skills.

d] Gender Preferences of Teachers

In a previous section of this chapter it was pointed out that some teachers thought the boys more 'creative' and found teaching them 'more rewarding' than teaching the girls. This was given as one reason for gearing classroom activity and lessons to the boys:

Dock Side

"Even though the boys can be difficult they can be so responsive when they decide to be".

"Give me a lad to teach any day ... they're so positive you know. I mean ... take the other day for instance; there was this argument going on in the class and I had to call it to a halt. The boy involved, Robert Simpson, took it much better than the girl, Karen Dawson ... I mean he shrugged his shoulders and got on with whatever he was doing while she sulked for at least a good hour ... I mean I can't be doing with it"

"In general I prefer to teach the boys ... to talk to them ... they've got such a wide range of dreams and they tell you such things... Whereas the girls are so insular ... so limited in so many respects".

Previous research¹ has shown that there are conflicting views as to teachers' preferences for pupils. Levitin and Chananie (1972) imply that achievement behaviour was the most approved behaviour regardless of sex, and that teachers like dependent girls better than dependent boys

1. See Nash, Roy, 1973: Classrooms Observed, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London; Hartley, 1977: op.cit.

(Levitin and Chananie, 1972). Feschbach's study of student teachers and their preferences for pupils would tend to support this, indicating that teachers have preferences for those children with graded and 'acceptable' gender-typed behaviour:

"In general, it appears that student teachers perceive most positively the rigid conforming girl and secondly the rigid conforming boy. The third position in the preference order is occupied by the dependent passive girl who is closely followed by her male counterpart. The flexible boy is fifth in the ordering while the flexible girl and the independent boy vie for sixth and seventh positions. The lowest ratings are given to the independent, assertive girl".

Feschbach, 1969: p.130

What is interesting in these gradings and Feschbach's study is the fact that once the categorisation of gender behaviour changes for the girl, (i.e. from dependent, conforming, etc. to flexible and independent) she not only moves down the 'list' but is also replaced (or overtaken) by her male counterpart.

But one must probe the meaning of 'liking' and 'preference'. True, most teachers do prefer to have rigidly conforming girls in order to 'facilitate' classroom management.¹ The words 'prefer' and 'like' however are not necessarily synonymous. Teachers, in the two studies being discussed, had a high regard for boys who displayed gender-appropriate behaviour, even though this exacerbated problems of control, whereas the girls were despised or ignored for what teachers saw as their conformity.²

-
1. It has been noted by Nash, 1973, op.cit. that both female and male teachers perceive girls more favourably than boys. David Hartley, 1977; op.cit. also reports in his study that, on the whole, it was the boys who had the most unfavourable ratings.
 2. Hartley, 1977; ibid, recognised that some teachers preferred to teach boys despite their unfavourable rating attributed to boys (p.103). But he was unable to analyse fully why and attributed it to those female teachers who had only girl-children of their own.

A major reason for the difference between the author's findings and those of earlier studies may lie in methodology.¹ Levitin and Chananie's study was on responses rather than actual classroom behaviour, whilst Feschbach interviewed student teachers whose initial doubts and fears could affect their responses.

The preferences and likes of teachers must also be related to the type of school. Feschbach's gradings of acceptable gender-typed behaviour could well be spurious as the variable of class manifests itself when we come to analyse gender and the criteria for gender appropriate behaviour. Feschbach has not taken class into account whilst Levitin and Chananie's study (1972) was based on a white middle class sample only. But the value of their work lies in the analysis of the conflict between the teachers' professional values about how children ought to behave, and the teachers' personal values about how each sex ought to behave. As they suggest, it is not difficult to ascertain that noisy, active and aggressive girls would be least liked as they violate both sets of values, whereas boys with similar behaviour only violate one set of values.² Aggressive behaviour is seen as 'appropriate' gender behaviour for males whilst it is the reverse for females; thus, as Levitin and Chananie (1972) point out, there is a significant sex-and-behaviour interaction effect between teachers and pupils.

-
1. Feschbach, N.D., 1969: "Student teacher preferences for elementary school pupils varying in personality characteristics", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 60 (2), pp. 126-132, and Levitin, T.E. and Chananie, J.D. 1972: "Responses of female primary school teachers to sex-typed behaviours in male and female children", Child Development, Vol. 43, pp. 1309-1316, - all recognised the shortcomings of their studies.
 2. Hartley, 1977, op.cit.; noted that although some teachers did not like the boys as "pupils", nevertheless they liked them as "boys" (p.203).

But despite the research too many generalisations persist. Preference and liking to 'gender appropriate' behaviour must be seen in the light of a class analysis, and how such behaviour varies between the schools. The researcher will attempt to fill in the gaps left by previous analyses by examining the factors which influence the preferences within each school.

Dock Side

Though achievement-oriented behaviour and conformity would have been preferred from all pupils (professional values of the teachers), it was accepted that these children did come from a rather "poor area" where "discipline" in the home was lax, and parents tended to "neglect their duties" in not encouraging their offspring to aspire to "good behaviour" and "academic achievement" (see Chapters IV and V). So teachers did expect their hopes to fall short given that they were forced to deal with "material" which was too recalcitrant to allow them to reach the goals they aspire to as teachers. But nevertheless, the personal values of the teachers (about how girls and boys ought to behave) did become apparent. They expected the girls to 'conform' to proper, orderly behaviour and on many occasions believed that they got such behaviour - though in reality it was not always forthcoming.¹

"I don't know what gets into the girls sometimes ... there's just no controlling them".

"It's bad enough when the lads get out of hand, but if the girls decide to have an 'off-day' then your work's really cut out in keeping the peace".

1. The setting up and transmission of sex-stereotypes as a form of social control does not necessarily imply that individuals become what the stereotype demands. See Fuller, Mary, 1980, "Black girls in a London comprehensive school" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), op.cit. She shows how girls walk a tight-rope between conformity to school discipline and conformity to the racial and sexual stereotypes.

"I don't mind if the boys are a bit boisterous but the girls ... I mean they just won't settle down sometimes. I mean you can get a day when it's really noticeable that the girls are playing you up. I don't know what it is ... the weather or what ... but oh they can be exhausting".

The teachers perceived the boys as "rough and ready", and their unwillingness to accept authority as part of the 'boys will be boys' syndrome. Given the fact that boys were fairly noisy and disruptive, the teachers required the girls to be orderly and "good at getting on with their work" - though having to accept certain facets of the girls' behaviour, i.e. swearing and a tendency to fight more than the 'feminine' stereotype prescribes, because they were hardly in a 'desirable area'. Not only did the teachers require orderly behaviour, they demanded it.

Although boys' behaviour is created and accepted by socialisation in the home, and by society at large, teachers (unwittingly) by attributing behaviour to gender and seeing 'misbehaviour' as an attribute lodged within the male ('naturally' or learned) transfer a 'toleration message' to the boys that their noise and disruption was acceptable. This operates through, and is intensified by, the insistence that the girls accede to the teachers' expectations of the 'feminine stereotype'. These expectations reinforce the tendency of boys' behaviour and provide them with the leeway to express that behaviour further.

Applegate

In this school, academic requirement and behaviour 'becoming of white-collar workers' children' was expected from all the pupils (despite the fact that a minority came from working class backgrounds). The status which resulted from this varied according to gender. The boy who

achieved well scholastically and was also involved in the football team was given high status (since this behaviour was what the value structure of the school approved) and generally preferred by all the teachers:

"When a boy's doing well they have so much to offer ... I mean they also develop in their personality. There's Peter Jenkins ... he's bright but confident and outgoing with it.. but take one of the girls who's doing just as well and they're different ... They do it just to please ... you know ... they're introvert .. oh I don't know ... the personality's just not there like you get with the boys".

"You know that when a boy's doing well he's going to take it with him through his school career and even afterwards. For girls it's just the here and now ... for a particular moment in time".

"All the girls concentrate on is doing well, whereas boys are much more balanced. The lads'll do well but still be involved in outside things like sport and games. Girls tend to be so static, concentrating only on one thing".

It can be seen that teachers gave the girls only highly-qualified status and preference for fulfilling all that was required of them, i.e. good behaviour and high scholastic achievement.

'High spirits' was accepted from the boys as this was seen to be part of their 'natural exuberance' but the 'sedate' behaviour that was expected from the girls, and their acquiescence to this meant, that they were less liked since such behaviour was seen as part of the 'feminine stereotype'.¹

1. See Delamont, Sara, 1978: "The Double Conformity Trap" in Delamont, Sara and Duffin, Lorna (Eds.), The Nineteenth Century Woman: Her Cultural and Physical World, Croom Helm, London, for an analysis of this double-bind,. Lobban, 1978: op.cit., notes in her overview of the 'hidden curriculum' that girls were criticised for their academic failure whilst being ignored if they were academically successful.

In the urban school of Dock Side, the active, noisy girl was more acceptable than in Applegate. In the latter the 'tomboy' image amongst the girls was frowned upon as the girls were expected to comply more to 'ladylike' behaviour than those in Dock Side. In fact, in Applegate, girls 'misbehaviour' was looked upon as a character defect, whilst boys' 'misbehaviour' was viewed as a desire to assert themselves:

"If the boys are acting up at a particular time you feel it's just high spirits and they soon quieten down. But the girls tend to take it to the extreme ... you know even when you've asked them to settle down they'll carry on whispering and giggling amongst themselves. And they know what's expected of them ... there's just no excuse for it".

"The boys are just asserting themselves ... well you know what lads are, but you know that they'll soon quieten down and get back to their work. But the girls ... it's just the odd bunch, but they get out of all control. If you ask me it's in their nature ... something lacking in character, because we expect a high standard of behaviour here at this school".

Long Meadow

Though 'sedate' behaviour was no more expected from girls in this school than in Dock Side, nevertheless distinct differences existed between the sexes with regard to teachers' expectations and preference. A girl is expected and encouraged to learn her lessons well, speak appropriately, be considerate in all she does and be no bother to the teacher whilst the boys are expected to be disruptive. This is despite the fact that all come from similar backgrounds where life on the estate is not easy and many social problems exist.

Even when a girl does meet with all that is expected of her teachers still prefer the boys:

"Give me a lad to teach anyday. They don't go off in a fit of sulks ... they're much more open and prepared to listen to reason. With the girls you never quite know where you are with them".

"I was trying to reason with Hayley Emmett the other morning and you could see the defiance on her face. No way was she prepared to give and take".

"You feel the girls' good behaviour has always something lurking behind it. And you're worrying what's going to come next".

While the girls frequently meet the professional expectations of the teacher, overshadowing the latter's judgement is the personal preference they have for the boys. This reflects the values of society in general where 'masculine' traits are seen to be more positive than 'feminine'. And ironically this attitude comes from female as well as male teachers.

Lintonbray

Preference from teachers, in this school, was channelled to those children who achieved academically and conformed to institutional expectations, but this preference, and the status that went with it, was mostly directed towards the boys. One has to look at the alternatives that exist for the boys to achieve and gain status in order to find at least part of the answer to this contradiction.

If a boy does not succeed scholastically his status is in no way threatened; indeed it is enhanced, among his peer group especially, if he plays for the school football team:

At assembly in the village school, before the gathered crowd of children and the other two teachers, the head gave a long running commentary on the victories in the Knock-Out Cup for football with great emphasis being placed on the boys for having won. A round of applause was called for 'our young heroes'.

The headperson informed the researcher:

"A boy can swank around not being very good at his maths or being in trouble".

If the particular boy was good at sports then he accrued status for himself and in no way damaged the preference teachers had for boys as a group in general, because he met both the personal and professional expectations, even when he was in 'trouble'. So we can see that boys have an alternative to academic success.

For a girl (except for Sharon in Lintonbray who had a place in the football team although only because there were not enough boys) no such alternative exists because they are subjected to exclusive and restrictive forces imposed upon them within the school and in society in general. These forces are made up of a set of ideas and stereotypes which push individuals towards acceptable masculine and feminine forms of behaviour. The availability of an alternative for boys was re-echoed in Long Meadow:

"Soccer is what the boys hang themselves on and it's good in some ways because it means somebody with very low or very poor scholastic ability can achieve some kind of greatness or some kind of fame in some other area".

"Because he's good at soccer and he's bad in class he can at least achieve some respect from his peers".

It seems plausible to draw the conclusion that girls who are regarded as a nuisance, by teachers in classroom, do in fact become more of a 'problem' than the unruly boy.¹ The researcher's hypothesis rests mainly

1. The author has previously referred to Lynn Davies' paper "Deadlier than the Male? Girls' Conformity and Deviance in School", 1979, Len Barton and Roland Meighan (Eds.), Schools, Pupils and Deviance, Nafferton Books, who has cited the difficulty school has in dealing with disruptive female pupils which indicates the lack of appropriate deviant typescripts for them (p.69).

on the fact that, because the subject content of lessons, and school life in general, is centrally directed towards boys, the 'troublesome' girl becomes more of a problem because her interests, far from being catered for, are virtually ignored,¹ with teachers expecting her to 'tag along' with material which the girls know is directed towards the boys.

e] General Comments

The author has attempted in the last two chapters to explore and analyse the differences in teachers' attitudes towards female and male pupils, and how these attitudes are translated into the way the teachers plan what they do, how they 'handle' the girls, and the way they are directed in their work. The discussion has led to the way that 'interest based' activities and educational objectives are pre-empted and prescribed on the basis of gender differentiation. The planning (mostly unconscious) of a 'hidden' curriculum, which is subtly and pervasively different for girls due to the teachers' expectations and professional and personal values,² revealed itself in all aspects of classroom practice and in the perception of children's achievement.

Though many aspects were similar in all four schools, there were also significant differences in attitudes towards gender behaviour. By studying the appropriate behaviour required from the girls and boys within each school, the researcher was able to make some assessment of the value structure of 'femininity' and 'masculinity' within each of them

1. Shaw, 1980, op.cit. states that mixed schools are essentially boys' schools in so far as they are dominated by boys' interests (p.73).
2. Levitin and Chananie's concept, 1972: op.cit.

and about its relationship to the specific catchment area. The data and ensuing analysis leads one to believe that models presented to the children, with their demarcation between 'masculine' and 'feminine' are based on ecological factors, which implies that the term 'class' - specifically working class - is oversimplified and misleading. The interaction of the community and the value structure of the school would seem to be important factors when discussing and analysing gender and social groupings.

Seen from the perspective of gender and the composition of groups and encounters, the daily round of activities and interaction within the school indicated a relationship between the occupational structure and social consciousness of specific groups. The professional managerial, as would be expected, tended towards a normative framework of future aspirations and high scholastic achievement.¹ There is also evidence to suggest that pre-school socialisation into gender identification (usually termed as "sex-role socialisation") is somewhat less in the middle class² (Chapter III), whereas the blue-collar workers are noted for their traditional, even authoritarian attitudes towards gender

-
1. See Hyman, H.H., 1954: "The Value-System of Different Classes" in Bendix, R. and Lipset, S. (Eds.), Class, Status and Power, Routledge & Kegan Paul; Sewell, W.H., Haller, A.O. and Strauss, M.A., 1957, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspirations", American Sociological Review, Vol. 22; Sewell, W.H. and Shah, V.P., 1968, "Social Class, Parental Encouragement and Educational Aspirations", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 73. Strodbeck's study of child-rearing techniques is however one of the most interesting: Strodbeck, F.L., "Family Integration, Values and Achievement" in A.H. Halsey, J. Floud and C.A. Anderson (Eds.), 1961, Education, Economy and Society, Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.
 2. See Newson, J. and Newson, E., 1968, Four Years Old in an Urban Community, and 1976, Seven Years Old in the Home Environment, both by Allen & Unwin. Talcott Parsons suggests less sex-differentiation will be made in middle-class urban families, 1954 (Ed.), Essays in Sociological Theory, The Free Press, New York.

divisions (Chapter IV). However, recent research suggests a much more conservative attitude towards gender within the middle class, which reveals a definite 'class and gender ideology' with regard to girls' upbringing (Payne, 1980a; Delamont, 1978). So we have, facing girls from a different backgrounds, varying mechanisms of capitalist patriarchy. Within the middle-class, 'ostentatious' verbal or physical behaviour from girls is frowned upon as 'unladylike' both within the home and the school, yet these girls benefit materially through the class positions of their fathers and their higher educational aspirations. Girls from the working class neighbourhood are not only affected by their family's material position, but also by the patriarchal attitudes of their fathers and of society in general (Payne, 1980a, p.12).

Thus examining the value system of the school in relation to the value system of the neighbourhood helps us to understand why gender was more prominent in some school situations than in others. The researcher has attempted to make clear what is general in all four schools with regard to gender, and what is specific to each school. It was evidenced in all four schools that boys tended to be more disruptive in class (although this varied between the schools), and this had a particular bearing on classroom practices. There existed sex-specificity, not only within organisational practices, but also on an instructional level in that lesson content and subject matter was geared to the boys and ultimately this took place at the expense of girls. But the way (and the frequency) gender was invoked or brought into play varied considerably both according to social class, and within social class (contrast Dock Side and Long Meadow Estate). The fact that gender was more prominent in some schools than in others can partly be explained by the relationship

between the occupational structure and social consciousness of specific groups (Chapters III and IV), and the demands made by the children upon the teachers.

Applegate held a relatively idealised notion of 'femininity' and demanded a 'ladylike' behaviour from girls which befits the class image of women from prosperous, professional and home-owning parents. Segregation may not have been as strict as in other schools but restrictions upon girls' behaviour was more defined. Dock Side enforced stricter taboos against cross-sex touch and activity, but this was also because the boys manipulated classroom activities by their demands on teachers and ensured it was their interests which were given priority in the classroom. The researcher has also suggested that a large portion of working class boys - specifically in Dock Side - shut down their attention skills partly because the teachers are mainly female, and that they (boys) are 'preparing' themselves to become what Hargreaves called the 'anti-school' male youth culture (Hargreaves, 1967), with their aversion to mental skill which is seen as 'feminine' and 'womanly' (Willis, 1977).

Most of the teachers within each of the schools made gender relevant to most procedural and instructional situations and, as shown, the Junior years of the primary school revealed a spontaneous segregation between the girls and boys.

A number of factors thus seem to combine to increase the differentiation and separation of boys and girls. Even the reward system enters into this since marks are frequently allocated for behaviour and achievements which are gender-specific, e.g. the boys may gain them for doing well

in the football team and for scoring goals, while girls may gain them for 'best poetry', for 'good behaviour' and for 'setting an example' to the boys. The researcher would suggest, furthermore, that these processes not only separate boys and girls but encourage hostility between them since the two groups are placed in competition with each other for the attention, praise and regard of the teacher, and for status within the school. An additional consequence is that the girls' confidence and ability to succeed are restricted in certain areas and are encouraged particularly in what are seen as feminine skills, which must have consequences for the confidence and ambitions in later life and which has the corollary that their 'achievement' in the primary school is perceived as part of the feminine stereotype.

The boys thus seemed to gain greater status and power within the school. They were able to dominate space, classroom life and the content of lessons, and had more freedom of physical and verbal expression. This reflects the patterns of male dominance and female subordination found within the wider society and teachers, often unknowingly, sanctioned this inequality.

The organisation of the school time-table worked to the detriment of the girls in varying ways and for various reasons in each school. This discrimination did not take place throughout the curriculum but was emphasised in certain subject areas, especially in regard to woodwork (particularly in Applegate) and in extra-curricular activities, and was rationalised on the basis that boys do football etc. whilst girls do netball. Convertly, the whole curriculum was ultimately (and in many ways directly) to the advantage of boys. In particular, certain skills

8

and activities were designated as the preserve of one sex implying that there are skills inherent in being female or male. And so just as academic subjects are divided from practical subjects (implying an intellectual [class] dichotomy) (Keddie, 1971; Young, 1971) so 'masculine' skills are separated from 'feminine' skills reflecting and reinforcing the differentiation of the workplace and public life from the family. Madeleine MacDonald states:

"Fragmentation of knowledge is fundamental in reproducing hierarchy of male over female with particular school subjects and disciplines classed as 'masculine', which contribute to the acceptance of students of the sexual divisions within the labour force".

MacDonald, 1980: p.20

Teachers, in general, hold a commonsense definition of their role, formed not only through their 'teacher training' but through their own experiences as pupils. Teachers develop status or interaction skills in accordance with the definition of themselves as persons to be listened to and learned from at all costs. Faced with disruptive boys - specifically in the working class school - they gear classroom life centrally to the boys. However, working class boys develop their status and identity through the alternative reasons provided by their peer group, which professes 'masculine qualities' (see Chapter IX), and hence they shut down their learning skills.

It was no mere coincidence that in all the schools men were given the top classes to teach.¹ In the schools, discipline was important and

1. It must be pointed out that in the 'estate' school there was a young woman, a graduate in Psychology, teaching a top class.

was seen as a very necessary focal point of class routine, and the behaviour of the boys was a major area of concern:

"The girls I can trust to work on their own but I wouldn't leave the boys ... I'd keep them with me".

stated a teacher in Dock Side. Because men are seen to have more authority (Smith, 1978; Shaw, 1976), the need for stricter discipline leads to the allocation of mainly male teachers to the Top Junior classes:

"I think as boys get older, they need firm handling ..."

"Boys tend to get wilder as they near the top end of the school so it's good to have a man that they know they can't push around".

"They (boys) certainly relate to men more as they get older".

The female primary school teacher is personified as the 'mother figure', whilst the males are imbued with paternal authority. The inverse relation between status level and proportion of women is found in schools as in most walks of life, and has ramifications for power and leadership.¹ Madeline MacDonald notes that:

"The control of women workers by male managers is a reflection of the sexual hierarchy of the school's division of labour marked by male head and inspector with a female teaching force".

MacDonald, 1980: p.20

In fact it is assumed that a dichotomy exists in that female teachers are 'pupil-oriented', whilst male teachers are 'subject-oriented' and hence 'better' teachers.

In the interaction between the teacher and pupils, the gender of the teacher and the age of the pupils became an important variable. The male

1. See Basil Bernstein's (1975c) distinction between personalised and positional authority in "Open Schools - open society", in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

teachers in all the schools tended to encourage solidarity between the boys and themselves. They interacted with the boys on the basis of shared 'masculine' understandings. This form of 'solidarity' marginalises the girls - it excludes them from sharing in what are seen as certain prestigious areas. This 'group' formation reinforces the divisions between the girls and boys that already exist. It is not that sex differences abound but that gender is made a salient feature in the intervening nature of groups and situations.

There are, within the teachers' situation, certain influences which enhance the process of gender categorisation. Favourable or unfavourable verbal reports were bandied about readily in the staffroom - which can be seen as a 'fruitful place' where reputations of certain children are first formed for prospective teachers. In Dock Side it was the last day of term and teachers were discussing amongst themselves their up-and-coming classes for the next school year. They were in the process of informing and warning each other what to expect from their next 'batch' of pupils. It was significant that gender was used as a category during this process of informing each other with regard to the imagery and dynamics of the pupils:

"The boys are a real boisterous lot, you'll have to keep a tight rein on them".

"They're a smashing group of girls - real helpful and quick... mind you one or two of them tend to act up a little".

"There's a small group of boys who are real trouble-makers ... it's that Tommy Franklin who tends to be the one that starts it all off".

In the estate school agitation was felt by the teachers about girls whom they interpreted as being particularly 'difficult':

"That Lynsey Collins is an absolute nuisance, she's such a fidget and incessantly disrupts the class. I don't know what I'm going to do about her".

This child's behaviour becomes a major concern because it is from a girl. Because classroom life is geared to boys and teachers fail to inspire and motivate girls, then a girl's misbehaviour causes problems, for without the girls' co-operation, the structure and organisation of the classroom would break down. 'Disruptive' girls violate both the teachers' professional and personal values with their 'misbehaviour' being seen as a character defect, whilst for boys it is viewed as a desire to assert themselves. Teachers were in fact manipulated by the boys' behaviour, and women teachers were forced to translate lessons against common understandings that they and the girls share as females. This works to divide them against each other and possibly force both to retard themselves by orienting to the boys' demands.

What was particularly disquieting was the way girls' achievement was discounted by the teachers. Their 'ability to achieve' was seen as 'wanting to please', 'asking the right questions'. This influence may eventually make girls decide to shut down their attentive skills (this aspect will be discussed in the next chapter) and lower their achievement and aspirations.¹

The next chapter will deal with peer group interaction and the competition

1. Research has shown that girls have a lower estimate of their ability than boys of equal ability; see Wylie, R.C., 1963, "Children's estimates of their school-work ability, as a function of sex, race and socio-economic level", Journal of Personality, Vol. 31, pp. 203-224; Torrance, E.P., 1963, "Changing reactions of pre-adolescent girls to tasks requiring creative scientific thinking", Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 102, pp. 217-223; Sears and Feldman, 1974, op.cit.

for status and power. A teacher does not have to be sexist to produce a classroom rigidly divided between female and male groups. Rather, the social dynamics of gender are worked out in every classroom, every day, not only by every teacher, but by all children in their own peculiar ways. It is essential to analyse children's positions in both the official school and the unofficial child social systems. This is necessary because in addition to such official practices and structures the children's own social system also develops hierarchies, identities and group perspectives. We therefore need to know the child's position in each of these social structures in addition to their home background, in order to understand the nature of gender power relationships more fully.

CHAPTER IX

Gender Relations and Peer Group Behaviour

Introduction

The researcher has concentrated in the previous two chapters mainly on teacher-pupil interaction in the classroom and depicted the various ways in which the teachers divide girls and boys, for organisational purposes into distinct gender-based categories and groups and encourage behaviour 'appropriate' to each gender. I will now explore the ways in which girls and boys behave towards each other and examine how far this behaviour is in conformity with the classifications utilised by the school.

The acquisition of gender behaviour patterns is a very complex process rooted in everyday life. Children's pre-school socialisation has already inculcated a conventional polarisation of interests and attitudes as a function of sex (Chapters III and IV) even though there are variations between the communities. The boys, whatever their socio-economic class, were unequivocally the 'outdoor children' and allowed freedom to wander, whereas the girls (again of whatever class) experienced more adult surveillance and were invariably required to be within calling distance.¹ As the girls and boys develop separate interests, and

1. Newson, John, Newson, Elizabeth, Richardson, Diane and Scaife, Joyce, 1978: "Perspectives in Sex-Role Stereotyping" in Jane Chetwynd and Oonagh Hartnett (Eds.), The Sex Role System, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, state that 'chaperonage' reflects the desire of parents to protect girls, in particular, from contacts with strangers of the opposite sex (p.34).

social relationships which are mutually sustaining, they are likely to become less satisfying playmates to each other as they negotiate the power relationship of patriarchy.

In all of the schools friendship choices were highly sex-bound, and only in exceptional circumstances do friendship choices extend to the other sex. Gender was a category which defined behaviour as 'appropriate' or unacceptable to the members of a group, and which contributed to a pupils' acceptance or rejection by the peer group. The variables affecting conformity or deviation, such as age, catchment area and social class will be considered in the discussion. Where possible, fieldwork material will be provided as evidence.

The researcher would like to make another important point concerning this chapter. The interpretations offered are rather tentative as there is scant material in existence on peer groups within the primary school. There is some analysis of girls' peer-group relationships in the secondary school, concentrating on the definition and development of femininity.¹ In examining the primary school, however, there are particular methodological problems, since peer groups here are more fluid than they become later on, and it is thus difficult, in certain situations, to explain what keeps a particular friendship going within the peer group. However, despite the fluidity and high-degree of 'turn-over' amongst friendship

1. Wolpe, Anne-Marie, 1977: Some Processes in Sexist Education, Women's Research and Resource Centre, London; Delamont, Sara, 1976: Interaction in the Classroom, Methuen, London; both have made extensive observations of girls in secondary schools. The effects of peer groups and group expectations have been investigated by Llewellyn, Mandy, 1980: "Studying Girls in School: The Implications of Confusion" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London and McRobbie, Angela and Garber, Jenny, 1976: "Girls and Subcultures" in Stuart Hall & Tony Jefferson (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals, Hutchison and CCCS, University of Birmingham.

groupings the overall distinctions of peer group status are clear.

The chapter will be arranged in the following way:

The first section examines the nature of status amongst girls and boys and the 'qualities' that provide status. The researcher will discuss the expectations regarding gender 'appropriate' behaviour which centre on three main aspects:

- a] Academic or non-academic prowess
- b] Behaviour and prowess at games.
- c] Dress and hygiene, which though a subsidiary factor, nevertheless deserves attention.

By examining those children at the extremes, viz. those with high and low status within the peer group, one should be able to specify the behaviour and attributes which influence the behaviour of others.

The interaction between girls and between boys will be contrasted, as well as the leadership qualities of the genders. The different schools will be compared, but because of the similarities between Dock Side, Long Meadow Estate and Lintonbray, these schools will often be merged in the discussion and compared with Applegate which contrasted significantly with the other three.

The next section will concentrate on the struggle for dominance between the girls and boys. The researcher will also examine intra-group rivalry and the ways in which individuals compete against each other. Alongside struggles for dominance the researcher will analyse certain features of solidarity and dissent, and the ways in which these were called into play.

The third section will contrast the aspirations of the girls and boys and the significance of class differences.

The final section will place the chapter in a wider setting, and show how the various aspects covered reflect the politics of everyday life within those power structures which order relations between the sexes on specific lines.

Status and Gender-Appropriate Behaviour

Most of the children from Dock Side, Long Meadow Estate and even Lintonbray will probably enter working-class occupations: the girls to the jobs defined as stereotypically 'feminine', i.e. textiles, food processing, health and other service industries, whilst the boys to those that are seen as 'masculine': heavy labouring jobs whether indoor or outdoor; the shop-floor; or one of the primary industries (coal, fishing, farming and timber). The aspirations of their parents and teachers are low, and by and large their parents' place in the class structure usually determines the child's performance in the classroom.¹

This situation affects the attitudes of the children towards schooling and the nature of the informal system of status amongst pupils. Hargreaves² has argued that peer-group status in the secondary school is related (in different ways for different forms within each year) to the value

-
1. Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth, 1977: Perspectives on School at Seven Years Old, George Allen & Unwin, London.
 2. Hargreaves, David, 1967: Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

structure of the school. In the four primary schools under study, however, the position is rather different. One source of variation is connected with gender.

Academic norms were not high in Dock Side, Long Meadow and Lintonbray but this broad statement conceals the complexity of the situation. The girls sought scholastic achievement for a number of reasons. Some work hard and seek academic achievement as individuals:

Wendy is a Top Junior pupil at Dock Side; she is quiet, easygoing and 'forever has her nose in a book' (so to speak). She doesn't have many friends except the one or two girls she is constantly seen with. Although the girls call forth Wendy's name whenever their status as a group is brought into question by the boys, Wendy does not appear to do well for the sake of status being neither competitive nor boastful of her supposedly high scholastic position in class.

Researcher: "Do you like school, Wendy?"

Wendy: "Yes, I do".

Researcher: "What do you like about it most of all?"

Wendy: "Well I can read all sorts o'things like stories about gods and goddesses (mythology). And I like maths and story-writing"

Researcher: "Would you like to do well at school?"

Wendy: "Yeah, I like anything to do with books n'that".

This is reinforced by group attitudes since many girls accord peer group status to academic achievement:

In a conversation with a group of girls at Dock Side they discussed who (them or the boys) was better and at what: The girls generally agreed that they were much brighter than the boys: "We're much better at maths and things ... y'know like writing and lessons. We always

beat the lads every year ... I mean us lasses are always at the top of the class".

And again in Long Meadow:

A spelling test was being given in a top class at the estate school. After the fifteenth word some of the boys have lost their concentration and start shuffling and talking amongst themselves. The teacher stops the chanting of words and refuses to go on. One of the girls - Jane - turns round and loudly exclaims: "It's only 'cos us girls get the most right that they're messing about Miss!". The reply was heard. "See if we care".

Another major reason why girls aim to do well comes from their aspirations for their future, which was particularly surprising given their socio-economic class. Some of the girls in Lintonbray expressed a wish to do well and even acquire further education:

"My mum wants me to do well and get a good job ... 'cos you know there's nowt in our village ..."

"I'm gonna be a nurse and me mum wants me to as well ... but I'll have to go away for the training".

During conversations which were conducted with all female, with all male and with mixed gender groups for the purpose of collecting data,¹ the researcher was able to ascertain the opinions of various groups towards academic achievement and towards those pupils who deviated from the forms of behaviour: which were considered 'appropriate' or who ranked highly within the peer group.

Dock Side Girls

"Boys always make a noise and try to stop you working ... I like doing sums. ..."

"I got three stars to-day ... teacher says I'm improving all the time".

1. The researcher chose to talk to the Top Junior classes in each school.

"They (boys) don't do their writing properly like we do".

"See that girl there, Wendy Hagan ... she's the best in the class".

Dock Side Boys

"Girls always try to answer the questions first".

"Yeah they think they're a bunch of clever clogs".

"We don't have to do anything 'cos the girls will answer the teacher's questions first".

These quotations illustrate that distinctive attitudes towards academic endeavour and peer group status are held by boys and girls and that this leads them to express mutual scorn for each other. The researcher will proceed to examine the complexities of this process.

I have already suggested that lack of scholastic success among the boys is part of their peer group status (Chapter VIII), in other words it represents more of an 'achievement' than a disability. But the story is not as simple as this. Some boys were actually quite good at their work and were keen to achieve, whilst some girls had many problems trying to get to grips with their work. Again, in Dock Side:

The girls

"Some lads are good at their work especially Ian Johnson".

"Yeah some of the lads aren't bad".

"Ian Johnson's O.K. but that Andrew Davis he's thick ... a dunce ... he needs to go to 'daft' school".

The boys

"The girls are soft, they're not good at football".

"They're such goody goodies with the teachers..."

"I'm glad I'm a boy and that I can play football".

Whereas the girls did recognise, verbally, that some boys were 'good' academically, the boys, for the most part, profess an unconditional antipathy to whatever the girls did. But it may be assumed, that what young children articulate does not necessarily mirror their actual behaviour. This leads one to suggest that their expressed attitudes may stem from the need to be accepted or to be seen as conforming to the group's dominant values.

In the previous chapter it has been shown that the teachers encouraged competitiveness between the girls and boys. In the Top Junior class of Dock Side the boys saw themselves fortunate in having Ian Johnson (already mentioned) on their side.

The boys invariably won, with the help of Ian, the general knowledge quizzes between girls and boys. They gather round Ian in an exaggerated show of camaraderie, slapping his back and grinning triumphantly, whilst making sly comments to the girls.

It was interesting to see how the boys accepted one of their kind with high academic achievement when it was of particular use to them; for the most part Ian does not usually 'conform' to the dominant values of the boys in this type of school, in that he likes his lessons, doesn't fight, and though he can hold his own, if called upon to play football, he was by no means 'gifted' at the sport. He transcends his 'deviation' by helping his peer group beat the girls, which is the boys' major occupation in their prize for dominance as the 'superior' gender. Ian, who was not high up on the 'Cowboy and Indian, football' stakes, can be categorised as a 'loner', and for greater clarification, is to be compared with an 'outcast'.

Danny (aged eight and a half), is very shy, afraid of females and males who approach him aggressively. Awkward and timorous in games, he is inevitably overlooked as a potential playmate to either girls or boys.

Possessing none of the status-conferring attributes he was constantly put down by both teachers and pupils. He is open to abuse from the other pupils, girls as well as boys (whereas abuse was not handed out to Ian):

Boys

"Danny's a flea-bag".¹

"Yeah he smells and he's always crying"

"Not always surely?" asks the researcher

"Well ... you only have to shout at him and he starts crying, and he's hopeless at football".

"But not everybody likes football" states the researcher.

"Mebbe but fancy a lad not liking football, ... he's like a great soft girl".

"He sits with 'em you know ..."

Girls

"Danny's awful at football an' he can't read".

"You should see him try'na run".

"He's hopeless, even I dare walk up to him and hit him ... you know ... he won't fight back".

"Does it matter very much if he won't fight?" asks the researcher.

"Well a lad should stick up for himself".

"He sits at our dinner-table ... he won't sit with the other boys .. mind you he stinks".

"Yeah, phew ... you should smell him Miss".

1. A category used by the peer group for dirty, neglected children.

They all laugh in agreement whilst the unfortunate Danny shrinks away.

It was also noticed in Long Meadow Estate, that high academic behaviour and articulateness among the boys is fairly irrelevant. 'Sissy' behaviour is the main thing that brings low prestige which is earmarked by fear of aggressive encounters and low ability in football:

Boys

"Michael's like a great fairy ... he goes around with the girls".

"He can't fight ... he's always goin' on about how he makes buns and things".

"When Miss Mackeson asked him what he wanted to be when he grew up he said he wanted to be a butterfly. He's just a great sissy".

"He's scared of having a fight, anybody can beat him".

Laughter from all the children.

"We never pick him for the team (football), he's ever so soft".

"Yeah if you hit him he'd run home to his Mum".

"He does that all the time ... you know when we get him in the playground. He cries when you hit him".

"Wouldn't you cry if you were hit by a gang?" asks the researcher.

"Well ... no I'd fight back. Besides I'm a better fighter than Michael Stephenson".

Girls

"You should see how Michael prances around, he's ever so soppy".

"He's always following us around asking if he can play".

"Why don't you let him?" the researcher asks.

"It's not right for boys to play skipping an' all that".

"Why?..." the researcher.

"Well you know Miss ... boys play football".

"Michael's ever so weedy ... he doesn't like fighting".

"But he's good in his schoolwork isn't he?"

"So what! Tracey Everson's better than him anyway".

In the village school of Lintonbray the most unpopular person in the Top Junior class was Simon; a large, awkward boy possessing none of the skills of football and presumed slow at his work:

Girls

"Simon's lousy at Maths, he can't count you know".

"He's too fat ... he can't run fast enough in football".

"'Sir's' always telling him off. He makes him stay behind when the team's on 'away' matches and we have to put up with him".

"He's a nuisance, he's always messing up our gymnastics".

"And he can hardly read, he's hopeless".

Boys

"Simon Thompson's an idiot, he's always in trouble".

"'Sir' won't allow him to come on football matches with us, anyway he can't play".

"Yeah he's fat, and he has to stay with the girls".

As can be seen, in varying ways Danny, Michael and Simon all have low status. Danny's work is poor, he is timid and has the added problem of being neglected. But only very rarely was physical hygiene and dress used as a status symbol and when it was it was usually associated with

further aspects of 'deviant' behaviour.¹ It was Danny's timidity, which reflected his 'non-masculine' behaviour, which seemed to be the main cause of his low status. When speaking of Michael it is obvious that the boy's conformity to the school's values does not afford him any prestige within his peer group. Despite Michael's high academic achievement and articulateness, his 'lack' of 'masculine' qualities would give him little status. The examples of Michael and Simon also illustrate that the girls 'accept' not only gender differentiation but the appropriateness of gender-based criteria for judging boys. What was also interesting is that the girls felt that these two boys were encroaching upon their games which may have increased their dislike of them. Both Michael and Danny are outcasts, despite the fact that one of them is a high achiever. Although Simon may at first seem to be an outcast, given that he lacks status because of his weight and inability to play football, he was however disruptive and aggressive, to the point of being a bully, which is seen as 'boyish' and hence 'masculine' behaviour; so Simon could better be called an outsider.

It was noted in all three schools, that on some occasions, teachers colluded with the pupils' teasing of the outsider or outcast, which reveals that teachers values and peer group values sometimes overlap:

Dockside

"Danny shouldn't you be getting on with your work instead of laughing and talking" announces

1. Hargreaves, 1967, op.cit. found clothes and 'trend-setters' an important area of status in his study. However, within the primary school, apart from the odd item of clothing that came in for admiration, no observable form of consistent status through dress was apparent.

the teacher.

Danny had merely turned round in his eagerness to be accepted by a group on his table who were participating in some intrigue.

"If you spent as much time concentrating on what you should be doing and less on talking, your reading might improve".

The boy puts his hand to his head and leans forward to his work. But he is not to escape yet.

"By the way you can wash your hands before you take that reading book home. I don't want it to smell when you bring it back".

The teacher has highlighted Danny's problem in reading and hinted also at his 'neglected state'.

In Long Meadow, pressure from teachers to conform to specific behaviour played a part in the rejection or acceptance of particular children by the peer group:

Michael, the sensitive boy, mostly travels in the female space; he loves 'Movement to Music' which most of the boys regard as 'sissy' and is terrified of anything that includes aggressive encounters, which involves football. Due to the fact that the school is situated in what is regarded as a 'rough' area teachers did expect boys to conform to a certain pattern i.e. displaying rigid masculine behaviour along with its taboos against cross-sex interaction and cross-sex behaviour.

"Michael shouldn't you be in the boys' line?" asks Mrs. Mackeson. Michael merely shrugs. It is not that he's adamant about being in either line but displays a lack of interest for the obsessiveness of being in either one. "Wouldn't you like to join the rest of the boys in being a "soldier" rather than being a "pixie"? urges the teacher.

The rest of the pupils start to giggle as Michael becomes confused.

Again, in Lintonbray, the teachers' awareness and collusion with the peer group's rejection of a particular pupil was apparent:

Simon is consistently chided by Mr. Wharten, having the labels of 'fat', 'loud' and 'awkward' he was constantly the butt of the teachers admonishments and jokes:

"For heaven's sake Simon Thompson stop fussing around, you're like a great fairy" shouts Mr. Wharten. Laughter erupts from the rest of the class.

On the whole, most of the teachers rated the girls more highly for good, 'conformist' behaviour¹ (see Chapters VI, VII and VIII). Certainly, the boys in all four schools were reprimanded much more often,² and were praised more often. Most of the teachers implicitly believed that girls just got on with their work and were 'dull' and 'boring'. But the picture was much more complex than this, which will show that many questionable assumptions have previously been made, not only by the teachers, but also by the researchers. A number of writers (i.e. Byrne, 1978; Belotti, 1975) have started from the premise that girls are 'scholastically' more competent than boys and displayed 'good' behaviour. But they have said nothing of those girls who do not display such qualities and in fact are seen to deviate from their gender-'appropriate' behaviour with regard to teachers' expectations.

An example from Dock Side will show how teachers particularly frowned upon girls who were not scholastically bright and also seen as disruptive. It will also show how peer group status and academic performance could diverge amongst the girls:

-
1. Ingleby and Cooper provide evidence that girls get rated more highly for good behaviour and personality by teachers; see Ingleby, J.D. and Cooper, E., 1974: "How teachers perceive first year schoolchildren", Sociology, Vol. 8, (3), pp.463-73.
 2. Jackson and Lahaderne provide evidence that boys get far more disciplinary contacts with teachers than girls do, see Jackson, P.W. and Lahaderne, H., 1967, "Inequalities of teacher-pupil contacts", in M.B. Miles and W.W. Charters (eds.) Learning in Social Settings, Allyn & Bacon, Boston.

Kerry, a nine year old girl in Dock Side is rather poor in her lessons but actively involved during the games and P.T. Her prowess at gymnastics was quite incredible despite the fact that there was no club for her to aspire to. She did manage to attain a reasonable status from the pupils both female and male. However the teachers sometimes found her behaviour alarming, to say the least:

"Kerry, if I see you doing that once more I shall make you stand in the hall", states the teacher having seen her push the boy, Andrew from his seat for the third time that day.

Kerry was allowed in the "male space" in that she sometimes played football with the boys and shared the same dinner-table. She was a muscular child for her age (due to long practice at gymnastics in the street and at school) and was not afraid of aggressive encounters with either female or male. For this reason she was able to make inroads for other girls into those areas and activities which the boys usually dominated, and into which they normally would never have gained a foothold if it had not been for her leadership. For this, Kerry was well rewarded: with sweets, licks of lollies, the first bite of an apple and the odd packed lunch (that the owner did not want). Her status was assured during the games lesson when she was always one of the first to be picked by either the female or male teams for the various mixed game efforts. She thus had fairly high status among both female and male pupils (the latter did not use as much abuse towards her as they did other girls).

Physical aggression was a respected quality within the peer group and the staff accorded it a fair degree of tolerance. The teachers, accordingly, allowed a certain amount of disruptive behaviour from Kerry but were concerned for her lack of "academic" ability:

"Kerry's good at games especially gymnastics and she's not afraid to stick up for herself. I'll give her that. But I mean where's gymnastics going to get her for heaven's sake" states her teacher.

The other teachers in the staffroom nod their heads in agreement:

"She was always a problem child ... I can remember when she was in my class" replies an infant teacher.

"Mind you she's one of the best goalies this school's ever had".

Kerry was defined as 'noisy' and 'raucous' and had previous 'form' in that the other teachers had found her a 'problem' as she passed through their classes. However, this situation also worked, in certain ways, to Kerry's advantage. The observer noted how Kerry tended to push in and shout out to the teacher and in this way interacted with the teacher much more than the other girls did, although it was on a negative basis. The fact that she deviated from what Levitin and Chananie call the teacher's "professional and personal values"¹ of what was expected from a female pupil, was tempered by the former's interpretation of the situation:

"Well what can you expect from an area like this".

It is important to point out that the term 'deviant' is used in two senses by the researcher: deviant from teachers' values and deviant from peer group values. Where it is necessary the researcher will define which meaning is being used.

So, we can see that some girls cued into the correct sequential routes to furthering their 'advance' at school and perceived how not to displease the teacher. Girls, however, were still involved in behaviour,

1. Levitin, T.E. and Chananie, J.D., 1972: "Responses of female primary school teachers to sex-typed behaviours in male and female children", Child Development, Vol. 43, pp. 1309-1316.

which transgressed the teachers' values but under the guise of 'conformity' they were more able to get away with it. For instance the researcher noted the many occasions when girls swapped sweets (which were banned in class) under their desks or helped themselves now and then to crisps and other eatables. They poured scorn on the boy or boys who were caught in their acts of deviancy (from the teachers' professional values) and who even bragged about it:

"Boys are silly, they show off about getting the slipper".

"They (boys) always get found out when they're naughty".

"That Martin Smith is always in trouble"...

"The boys are just silly and lazy".

The girls, in fact reported that the boys seemed to want "to get into trouble". And certainly the hard core of the non-scholastic boys indulged in deviant behaviour (as the girls did) but in a way that suggested that they wanted to be observed and admonished by the teachers.

By comparison with the girls, the boys tended to pay more attention to their peer group and were more interested in gaining status within it.

McDermott in his study of 'Achieving School Failure'¹ notes:

"To attend to a teacher is to give the teacher a leadership role in the classroom: to attend to the peer-group is to subvert the teacher's role".

McDermott, 1974: p.99

We must however not jump to any premature conclusion about girls' presumed 'conformity' and 'lack of peer group norms' before further

1. See McDermott, R.P., 1974: "Achieving School Failure: An Anthropological Approach to Illiteracy and Social Stratification", G.D. Spindler (Ed.), Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.

examination of the actual situation. Before doing this, the researcher must point out a factor which complicates the investigation: although the girls formed the majority of the core elite of the class whilst the boys formed the most deviant group, the composition of the various (gendered) peer groups was constantly changing and friendship and loyalty links were fairly diverse, which contrast strongly with the male peer group culture of the secondary school.¹ However there was already apparent among the boys the hard core of the 'anti-school elite' who had high status in the eyes of the other boys and considerable power to define proceedings both within the classroom and the playground. Their antics constituted light relief and amusement, they threw books at one another, played football together and generally dominated the rest of the pupils, within their own class (situated in the junior section of the school).

The girls, in general, did not go along with the boys' definition of situations and appropriate behaviour, of which gender specificity was a crucial component. Male-appropriate behaviour can already been seen at this stage of their schooling, whilst female-appropriate behaviour was much more complex simply because the majority of the girls (because of their age) did not seek status via their relationships with boys: they did not wear make-up nor seek to make themselves attractive to boys. What is more, in many cases the girls were inclined to interpret the boys' behaviour as evidence of their inability to be competent either

1. See Hargreaves, 1967, op.cit. Also Lacey, Colin, 1970: Hightown Grammar, Manchester University Press, and Willis, Paul, 1977: Learning to Labour Saxon House, Farnborough, for studies of boys at school, their academic performance, involvement in and commitment to school and their friendship groupings.

scholastically or in their behaviour. However, certain qualities and forms of behaviour which are seen as 'appropriate' to the girls do become manifested e.g. their capacity to be more attentive in class, that they form the majority of the 'academic elite' and their tendency to stay together merely to avoid the aggressive overtures of some of the boys.

Disruption is invariably initiated by the boys, this disruption for a time halts further work advancement and the girls react by expressing resentment against the boys. They regarded the boys as 'silly', 'lazy', and 'thick'.¹ One way of controlling the boys' who were disrupting their chances of getting on with their work was to call upon the teacher to disapprove of the offending boy. Because boys deviate (more than girls) from the teachers' professional² values the girls call their attention to some default:

"Aw Miss, Michael Billings is throwing the pencils around". The teacher may not intercede but it has the required effect of curtailing the boy's action .

So far the picture that is drawn seems to be that of girls as archetypal 'good pupils'. But as indicated earlier, girls actually indulged in non-conformist behaviour much more than their teachers realised. In fact they considered themselves 'clever' in not being found out whilst being involved in such acts. Also, some girls were openly involved in

-
1. See Fuller, Mary, 1980: "Black Girls in a London Comprehensive School" in Deem (ed.) op.cit. Fuller noted that "... the discrepancy in the demands made on girls and boys seemed to provide one of the bases of the girls' greater confidence in their ability" (p.56).
 2. See Levitin & Chananie, 1972: op.cit.

disruptive behaviour which invariably brought them into serious conflict with their teachers. Some of these girls were not necessarily the scholastic non-achievers, but were quite 'able' (in the school's terms). What they tended to do was test how far they would be allowed to go by the teacher. This sort of behaviour was neither meek and passive, nor aggressive and did cause tension with the teachers. But because there is no behavioural typescript for deviant behaviour for girls¹ they were categorised as 'silly' by teachers who found their behaviour puzzling. The girls seemed to be less influenced by each other, (which some may regard as proof of a 'lack of solidarity') than the boys who tended to prove to each other that they were part of the 'in-group'. The girls did not automatically define teachers as adversaries, and had many common understandings with them which may have been assisted by the sex of the teachers.² It certainly is too easy to assume that academic striving and achieving are synonymous with 'conformity'.

As a comparison with these three schools, the researcher would like to discuss the middle-class rural-suburban school of:

Applegate

The values of the high status members of this suburban school were in marked contrast to those of Dock Side, Long Meadow or Lintonbray especially for the boys. Academic aspirations were part and parcel of the value structure of both school and home. That was the central concern. Most

-
1. See Davies, Lynn, 1979: "Deadlier than the male? Girls' conformity and Deviance in School", Len Barton & Roland Meighan (Eds.), Schools, Pupils and Deviance, Nafferton, Driffield.
 2. The researcher realises this is speculative and that far more research needs to be done in this area.

of the children were highly attuned to these values and duly placed considerable efforts into achieving them. Whereas most of the Dock Side pupils would seek to end their schooling as soon as they reached the statutory age, most of these children would aim (as their teachers and parents hoped) to remain at school so as to further their education.¹

Independence among the children was expected by the teachers as well as encouraged by their parents.² It was noticeable at this school that the majority of the teachers agreed that the children were socially prepared for school as a result of the efforts of the parents. With regard to the personal attire of pupils (especially of the girls) teachers expected high standards and, for the most part, got them: shoe-laces were tied, coats buttoned up and the children were able to attend to the toilet by themselves.

Most of the children revealed considerable diligence in their written work through all the age levels of the school. This was particularly obvious in Top Junior classes. Again in conversation with the girls, with the boys, and with the mixed groups this was ascertained from them:

Girls

"I really like writing compositions ... I'd like to do well. My mum wants me to go to college".

-
1. See Pahl, R.E., 1963: "Education and Social Class in Commuter Villages", Sociological Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 241-246.
 2. See Newson, John, and Newson, Elizabeth, 1968: Four Years Old in an Urban Community, George Allen & Unwin, London. Also Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth, 1976: Seven Years Old in the Home Environment, George Allen & Unwin, London, for class patterns of child-care in relation to independence and self-reliance.

"'Sir' says this is the best school in the area, much better than in Bentonly even; and he wants us to do well when we go to the senior school".

"Sometimes Peter Jenkinson's top of the class and sometimes Carol Thornham is ... aren't you Carol?"

"Yes. I'm better at Maths though but he's good at poetry and writing".

Boys

"I'd like to get on in school and get some qualifications. My Dad says it's important you do well at school".

"The girls usually win in the general knowledge quizzes but we're not far behind".

"I'm top of the class ... well, Carol Thornham is but I'm better than her at writing and poetry".

Both girls and boys regarded scholastic ability as an indicator of high status in contrast to Dock Side where scholastic ability conferred status among the boys only when it was used to the collective advantage, to score one against the girls. At Applegate, the boys each sought scholastic achievement for the sake of their own individual status.

Disruptive behaviour was frowned on by most of the pupils, and they adamantly insisted that others conform to the appropriate behaviour which was in accordance with the teachers' professional values.¹

The top infant class are preparing for a Fletcher maths lesson.

Timothy however, is continuously being disruptive, demanding the attention from the teacher. Mrs. Jameson resorts to public humiliation while the whole class remains quiet and looks on.

"Timothy Wilson, the rest of us would like to get on with our project. If you don't wish to join us then I suggest you leave the class".

1. See Levitin and Chananie, 1972: op.cit.

Some of the children nod their heads
in approval at the boy's reprimand.

Fighting and swearing was also looked down on by the peer group even among the boys. As daughters and sons of "good, respectable" professional/managerial families they were expected to comply to the behaviour becoming to such parents:

Robert was loud, aggressive and prone to consistent swearing. There was little love lost between him, his peer group and the school authorities, in that he deviated from the basic values of both the group and the school. He did however manage to attain a certain core group around him who accorded him status for his behaviour. His work was poor and he appeared rough in his manner and attire.

Thus Robert was ostracised, because he was 'failing' and discredited on almost every dimension that seemed important to the pupils. In relation to school, Robert was an academically failing boy and also a non-conformist to the norms of the majority of the classroom pupils. The fact that he came from the working class area of Watton (his father was a labourer), was not necessarily against him, but intra-class differences were also crucial referents, and Robert and his family were seen as rough and inadequate in relation to the norms of working-class respectability. And in as much as he and his family deviated from working-class respectability Robert also 'failed' on another important dimension, he deviated from the middle-class variation of 'masculinity', where heavy 'machoism' was not approved of:

Girls

"Robert Smith is always fighting. He's a proper bully and you should hear him swear".

"If 'Sir' catches him swearing he's for it".

"He's really rough and he never does his work in class. Miss Jacobs is always on at him".

"He's friends with that Stephen James and Mark Hallet ... mind you they're just as bad".

Boys

"He's always using swear words. He thinks he's real clever, but he's not".

"My mum thinks it's unnecessary to use such bad language".

"He's absolutely stupid .. he's always in trouble with the teachers but he's good at football, I suppose".

"He hits girls even, and I don't think you should do that".

"Why?" the researcher asks.

"Well girls are weaker than boys and 'Sir' doesn't like you hitting girls, it's not nice".

Robert was considered a problem by the staff, a troublemaker, coming from a 'difficult' home background. Further, his parents didn't support the school's attempts to contain him, so within the classroom Robert had considerable power to define proceedings. As such, he was a threat to the rest of the girls and boys in the challenge he represented to their widely and firmly held norms about class location and educational performance. He also deviated from the accepted definitions (within the school) of appropriate 'masculine' behaviour, in that he was rude to girls and was not adverse to hitting them.

Similar opinions were expressed by those in power and authority:

"Robert Smith, in this school we do not hit each other, let alone girls. My goodness a fine young man you'll make if you go around hitting girls".

(Top Junior teacher breaking up a fracas in the playground where Robert had attempted to run off with a girl's netball and had been caught up by her and lashed out when she had retrieved it).

"You in trouble again Robert Smith (booms the headmaster). "You're hardly going to turn out a pillar of society with your manners".

Fighting and swearing in Applegate amongst the boys implies rejection of both peer group and school values, given that they come from a 'respectable' area. For girls such behaviour was unheard of, whereas in Dock Side, girls who were seen to be aggressive and moved within the "male" space (although restrictedly) were to a certain extent accepted, which suggests that in certain respects a more rigid regime of 'femininity' was imposed upon the girls at the middle-class schools.

As stated earlier in this thesis (Chapter V and VII) sex-segregation was not so distinctively a part of Applegate's organisation, although in the Juniors most things were done on a gender basis: e.g. mobility through the school, registers, sports. "Male" and "female" space were not clearly demarcated in the earlier years of this school, thus there was relatively flexible movement between girls and boys. Reference has already been made to Paul who was sought as a playmate by both girls and boys and who had reasonable status (Chapter VII) despite his apparent preference for "female space". It is, however, to be remembered that the playground was still dominated by the boys' movement and games.

It is important to ask how and when gender enters into group formation? Who and what makes gender relevant in a given situation? To state that Applegate infant groups did not use gender as a basic core of identity would be an exaggeration. Careful observation revealed that children were well aware of gender norms of 'masculinity' and 'femininity', and were embarrassed about breaking those norms. To recall an instance

from Chapter VII when the two boys, Edward and Darren, were playing in the Wendy House - ironing make-believe clothes and setting the table, upon being observed by the teacher they informed her that they were playing 'Batman and Robin', rather than admit to what they were really doing. In order to cloak any behaviour that might be construed as 'feminine' and hence be met with derision the boys falsified their activity, giving it a masculine name.

Another incident illustrates that even though space and activities may have had flexible boundaries with regard to gender categories, 'extremes' are not tolerated:

Andy approached the researcher, wearing a long, tatty gold lame dress, a woollen beret pulled down over his ears and carrying an old handbag. It was obvious he had been in the 'dressing up' corner. He stumbled towards me, the long dress causing him to trip up with every few steps he took.

"I'm a policeman" he declares.

During our ensuing conversation another boy dashes past and yells:

"Sissy!".

Surprisingly Andy is slightly confused, and asks his friend:

"What's a sissy?"

"Someone who dresses up in women's clothes" comes the reply.

He hurriedly removes the now offensive clothing and retreats to the other side of the classroom with a hostile look in the researcher's direction. One can easily assume he will never don 'women's' clothing again.

It can be seen that the peer group's attempt to control and ridicule a member who has 'stepped out of line' can be quite powerful. One must also remember that the teacher, in allowing the incident to pass without a reaction from her, informed the class that it was acceptable for Andy to be checked for his 'deviant' behaviour from 'masculine' norms. Just as the teacher's interaction with the children (or a particular child)

could be perceived as enticing the child to engage or not engage in certain behaviour, so the non-reaction could be construed in a similar fashion.

Referring back to the chapters on classroom interaction (Chapters VII and VIII) we can recall that not all the girls were seen to conform to the 'good-pupil' role. Sarah for instance was seen as a 'problem' child by both teachers and her peer group; Sarah's parents were seen as rather odd in that the teachers regarded them as having 'funny ideas'. (Sarah's mother was a designer, whilst her father was a college lecturer).

"Her parents let her run wild, they're very odd you know".

"Sarah gets up to all sorts of mischief".

She was very isolated both at school and outside it, unlike her male counterpart who reigned supreme with an admiring group of lads in tow. The other pupils in her class found her rather disturbing to say the least, particularly the boys:

"She yells at you, she thinks she knows it all".

"She tries to stick her nose into our games ... well Miss won't let her".

"We give her what for ..."

Even the girls found her difficult:

"It's hard to get to know her, she's not like us ..."

"In what way?" the researcher

"Well she shouts at the lads and barges into their games".

"It's not that she's thick, she's real good at Maths and general knowledge but it's the way she behaves ... do you know she fights with the lads!"

Sarah represented an unenviable picture, which reminded the other pupils and reinforced their notions of what constituted 'female' appropriate behaviour, irrespective of class location and educational performance.

The 'problem' with Sarah was possibly that she did not forge any allies amongst the girls and consequently was isolated. We can compare her situation to that of the four reigning 'Boadiceas': Elizabeth, Sally, Joanne and Dawn. These four girls came from varying backgrounds i.e. two came from relatively comfortable middle-class homes whilst the other two came from working-class (albeit respectable) homes. Their educational performance also differed, though not greatly¹ and they were inseparable from each other. They exasperated the staff in that they neither courted a 'good' reputation among teachers nor seemed to want to be seen as 'serious' by the staff or other pupils. They were a source of amusement and diversion to the other girls who admired them for daring to challenge the boys on their own 'territory' and despite the fact that many attempts were made to separate them these were never successful. To a certain extent the four were a 'rallying' point for the other girls, especially in the playground where the boys always dominated the play apparatus and the space.

The boys on the other hand deeply resented their 'interference' and saw them as a threat:

1. This may point to the fact that girls' choice of friends underlines the importance of their sex in the girls' identity, rather than to other academically inclined pupils. Fuller, 1980: op.cit. points to this fact as well as ethnicity in her study. Mandy Llewellyn in her study of middle and working class adolescent girls found that the criteria for friendship groupings were not determined primarily or even very significantly by academic and school based factors see Llewellyn, 1980: op.cit.

"Who do they think they are, tryn a' take our ball".

"We always play football here, why should they suddenly decide they want to play."

"We'll tell 'Sir' if they try to overstep the mark; he'll soon see to 'em".

Their behaviour brought them into serious conflict with the boys rather than being a direct challenge to the teachers' authority. But because the boys were more threatened, it was they that indulged in grossly disruptive behaviour. This led the teachers to admonish the girls. It must be remembered that teachers were tied to the demands of the maintenance of social order in the classroom which were thus ultimately related to the social structuring of the pupils' identities.

Summary

It was apparent in most of the classes that there was a fair degree of impermanence in the composition of groups; however relations between and within the peer groups were stable enough to demarcate areas of privilege and status. Such areas of privilege and status are, to a large extent based on gender criteria. But it is also important to point out the variations among those pupils who had considerable power to define proceedings, thus making the situation more complex.

Whilst Danny (from Dock Side) and Michael (from Long Meadow) were both outcasts from the peer group by virtue of their gender deviant behaviour i.e. they were both afraid of aggressive encounters and 'lacked' the gender behaviour usually related to 'masculinity', Simon (from Lintonbray)

was an outsider because he deviated from school-appropriate behaviour in a way that was disruptive to both his teachers and his peer-group which suggests that at certain times and in particular situations gender-appropriate and school-appropriate behaviour overlap. This can be seen in the particular case of Ian, a loner, who is scholastically bright but not necessarily high on gender-based criteria of 'masculinity' yet who gives support to his peer group by 'beating the girls'. This is to be contrasted with the case of Robert (from Applegate) who deviates broadly from school-appropriate behaviour and, in many instances, gender-based criteria (according to the class and ecology of the area). However Robert is able to maintain a small core of admiring members of his peer group around him despite his deviancy from school-based values. This may in part be due to the fact that Applegate was not entirely populated by an indigenous middle-class but still retained a small core of working-class residents.

A similarly complex picture appears when discussing 'deviancy' and status amongst the girls. Kerry (from Dock Side) and Elizabeth, Sally, Joanne and Dawn (from Applegate) deviate from school-appropriate behaviour in varying degrees and yet have the support and status of their peer group which may suggest, after all, that girls are not wholeheartedly compliant with school-based values (at this age) and may be forming peer-group values all of their own, distinct and apart from their school and its environs. Sarah (from Applegate) and Simon (from Lintonbray) are both 'outsiders', but it is important to point out the essential differences between them. She is an outsider in a different way from him for she transgresses gender-appropriate behaviour. Yet she is not an 'outcast' like Michael or Danny, perhaps because it is the behavioural

patterns of the dominant sex that she adopts. Nor is she like Kerry, for Sarah has no allies among the girls.

The teachers' collusion with the peer group may also have different inferences in different situations. For example Michale was a high scholastic achiever, as also was Sarah, but both had low prestige, apparently because they deviated from the teachers' personal values¹ as to what was to be expected from girls and boys. However, the situation of Kerry offers a contrast to this. Some of the teachers respected her for being able "to stand up for herself" and for her prowess at sports whilst Sarah did not have high prestige amongst the teachers in her school. This suggests strongly that class has an important bearing upon the relation between gender-appropriate behaviour (and its transgressions) and prestige.

Despite the complexities of the situation it is meaningful to speak of a "girls' world" and a "boys' world" within each school. The next section will deal with spatial and verbal dominance both within and outside the school.

Spatial and Verbal Dominance

As a result of the separation of the worlds of girls and boys, which is reinforced by the social structure and organisation of the primary school, the children develop amongst themselves relationships of status and power based on gender,² the analysis of which interrelates crucially

1. See Levitin and Chananie, 1972: op.cit.

2. Barrie Thorne's ethnomethodological analysis of an elementary school in America, deals with the concept of gender in relation to differential

with the wider institutional features, thus differentially structuring opportunity, resources and power.

Domination of space within schools operates as an expression and mechanism of social control.¹ This is not only imposed by the teachers, but also by other 'dominant' groups - specifically by males upon females.

Within the School Building

In Dock Side, space and who dominated it was an important issue, and one of the underlying reasons for this was the lack of it (see Chapter V). Within the classroom, despite limited space, there was some attempt to provide a 'play area'. Specific 'corners' were marked out in each infants' class² which varied according to the size of the room and the number of children present. It became apparent that it was mainly boys who tended to occupy this space with girls restricted to their desks and the surrounding area. The researcher assumed that there would be some interchange in regard to the utilisation of space, but as the days turned to weeks and months the pattern became consistent; the boys dominated the area, expecting first choice of toys and going to great lengths to keep at bay either the girls or another group of boys. Girls

power and status see the theoretical chapters for a greater discussion on Barrie Thorne's work: 1978: "Gender: How is it best conceptualised?" Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, California, September.

1. The structural features of spatial dominance in the wider society can be evidenced by the fact that in London something like 40% of women may never go out alone after dark. See Fremlin, C., 1979: "Walking in London at night". New Society, April.
2. In the junior classes this became a 'reading area'.

only ventured into the play area when it was vacant or to pick up some piece of equipment:

Lisa was the only one to dare to venture into this space when the boys were playing. She was on particularly 'good' speaking terms with the rest of the boys along with her best friend Katy, confident of the fact that the boys would not force them to vacate the space.

The researcher was soon to find out why:

During a brief scuffle with the boys in her class Lisa threatens violence not only from herself (by way of aggressively displaying a fist and pointing her finger at her 'defaulter') but also from her 'big' brother who happens to be in the 2nd year Juniors and is not loathe to beating up little boys in the infants.

Long Meadow provides a strong physical contrast with Dock Side. It was the largest and most spacious of the four schools and sex-segregated toilets and roomy areas of circulation (corridors) made available the exclusivity, by sex, of facilities. Here, too, the infant classes laid an emphasis on play and activity. It was common to see the boys stretching out on their tummies on the floor involved with some form of construction or play; the girls however tended to keep to themselves, wrapped up in their own worlds of activity and play. Even in the older classrooms some of the teachers encouraged the extensive use of play equipment, seeing it as a problem solver, since it diminished the amount of disruptive behaviour amongst the boys, who generated more energy and more activity and hence were able to dominate more space.

1. It is a well-known fact that brothers are assumed to 'protect' younger sisters from the would be bullies, this is an accepted part of 'masculine street culture'. However one can surmise that this is for the brothers' own honour rather than the sisters' protection.

In Applegate and Lintonbray, as in Dock Side, space tended to be an overriding problem, with what appeared too many children competing for the too little space. In the 'middle' (7-9 year olds) and 'senior' (9-11 year olds) classes of Lintonbray there was no space set aside for play areas. Only in the infants' (5-7 year olds) class was there an attempt to accord space for play. There were the usual constructive toys and books occupying makeshift shelves in this space. The infants' teacher, Mrs. Stebbings, ensured that most of the children were involved in some form of activity or/and project and in this way there appeared to be 'equality' in the use of the play space between the boys and girls. However, observations revealed some interesting aspects of behaviour among the boys during their occupation of such space.

Before the end of the school day Mrs. Stebbings invariably read to the children a story chosen by one of them. There was the usual rush for places in the playspace for such occasions, with most of the boys usually seated on the low-lying book-cases whilst the rest ~~were~~ sat on the chairs and the floor. Apparently, occupying a place on the book-cases was seen as a high status thing among the boys:

On a number of occasions some girls attempted to occupy such places but were invariably pushed off by the dominant groups of boys: "Get off there, that's our place" yells a red-faced six year old boy. One of the girls retorts "You're always sitting there, it's not fair..." "It's only for us boys ..." and with that he shoves her away with his feet (if not exactly a kick). Mrs. Stebbings rebukes the boy for his behaviour.

It is important to note that the teacher in this case rebuked the boy for his harsh behaviour and not for insisting on occupying such an 'exalted position' in the playspace. She was, to all intents and purposes,

unaware of the aspects of power being acted out in this form of spatial dominance.

In Applegate such forms of dominance were also being acted out in the 'recreation' spaces provided. This was particularly apparent in the 'middle' juniors where there was quite a fair size room adjoining the classroom for activities 'of a less serious nature'. Harsh, physical behaviour from the boys towards the girls was frowned upon, in accordance to the ethos of the school, but that did not pre-empt certain forms of spatial dominance from not being carried out. Ridicule was used as a means of control (I shall also discuss this in a later section) by some of the boys:

Two girls were attempting to retrieve an abacus from one of the many equipment cupboards. Five boys were already esconced in a project and resented their intrusion: "I suppose you'll need that seeing as you can't count" states one. The other boys start to laugh. "Shut up Carl Haymers, you're hardly one to talk seeing as you got nought out of ten for your mental arithmetic test" comes back the reply. There is a unison of jeering remarks and the girls feeling outnumbered leave the space to the boys. "Good, now we can get on with what we're doing..."

Cross-group and intra-group rivalry was apparent in all the schools. Boys in particular make a great show of who was 'top dog' amongst themselves and also banded together in order to express their collective dominance as a group. It is interesting to note that when an individual boy seeks to dominate a girl in some respect, he calls on other boys for support, and in certain cases even the teacher:

It is 11.30 a.m. and the children in the Top Infants at Long Meadow have resigned themselves

to their work books. A group compare each other's work amongst themselves. Paul states: "I've done more than you!" "No you haven't" replies one indignant girl. Paul turns for support from Stephen and Neil. "I've done more than her haven't I?" "Yeah, you have, so there", comes the reply. The girl retreats into her seat and avoids further aggressive encounters, being easily outnumbered.

"I've passed your page" says Stephen jabbing a finger at Nicola's work. Nicola brushes his hand aside and carries on; he interprets this as her not recognising his 'dominance' and screeches in her ear "I'm past you!" "Stop being silly" stated Nicola no longer unable to ignore him. She looks to Linda who has just been subdued by Paul, Stephen and Neil. Linda supports her by compromising: "But we've got more difficult sums to do". Stephen is not to be outdone: "Miss, Miss I've passed her page haven't I?" he says pointing at Nicola agitatedly. The harassed teacher who was marking books and hearing children read at the same time, wants an end to the disturbance caused by Stephen's agitation: "Yes, you're passed Nicola, now please get on with your work". "See!" says Stephen.

The boys appeared to have a constant fear of being beaten by the girls. A teacher unthinkingly informed a games class in Dock Side, who were clambering over makeshift apparatus, that the girls were 'beating' the boys in climbing up the rope. Almost immediately the boys went into paroxysms of activity in order to prove that they were better. The boys instilled with the 'quality' of competitiveness seek to outrun, outclimb, outdo each other and the girls. In their tenacious efforts to do so they manipulate as much space as possible, for to them it was important not only for them to 'beat' their counterparts, it was also necessary that they should be seen doing so.

The concept of solidarity is frequently associated with male groupings.¹

1. For example Jules Henry, in describing the American teenage experience,

The researcher would like to qualify this, at least as it manifested itself among this age-group in the schools under study. Certainly, boys concentrated together to reinforce mutual orientations towards gender norms. However, upon observing and analysing the phenomenon of 'masculine solidarity' what became clear that this was interlaced with an intense competitiveness. In general most of the boys competed against each other, in ways which might appear trivial to the outsider but which to them were very important:

"I can beat you"

"I've got the biggest pencil"

"I've won!"

were often heard in the classrooms.

It has already been shown that boys call on each other when competing collectively as a group against the girls, but sub-divisions did exist and certain children were hallmarked for isolation for a variety of reasons. One particular example was Danny, whilst another was Andrew:

Andrew has a speech defect, is timid of aggressive encounters and usually involves himself in solitary games. He sometimes joins Kerry playing with the Leggo. His interaction with the girl involves no aggressiveness and in that way he survives. Justin, the dominant aggressive boy leads a group into the reading area. Andrew is

points out that boys are dependent on masculine solidarity
see Jules Henry, 1973: Culture Against Man, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

excluded from this group and gives way if they happen to be in the same area. Only in the final instance is he called upon and 'included' in the boys' group when they need to keep the girls 'out' and to beat them in some game.

The researcher wishes to point out that the term 'solidarity' has specific implications of consistent co-operation combined with feelings of mutual companionship. What happens among and between the boys is in many ways quite contrary to 'solidarity' and in some cases borders on open antagonism. The term is misused in a variety of ways since what is really happening is wily opportunism. In addition to opportunism, that is in play, what keeps the boys together is the desire to exclude and dominate women.

Within the classroom any sign of co-operation or acceptance between male and female was quickly put down, usually by the ritual of ridicule:

In Long Meadow Peter rushes to help the teacher with her chores:
"Thank you Peter that's very kind of you", she tells him. He is derided later by three boys.
"Fancy washing-up"
"You're a teacher's pet".
"A sissy ..."
Peter is extremely offended by their remarks and it is noticeable that he does not offer help again when the situation occurs.

In this type of area, as in Dock Side, anything connected with the girls was of low prestige to the boys so it was obvious that in no way should they conform to behaviour similar to that of the girls.

Girls condemn boys for being rough and aggressive whilst boys condemn girls for appearing to be the 'good pupils', since it is through the display of reverse qualities of what girls do that boys gain and reward

status.

A further way in which the boys were able to dominate classroom life was in being able to gain the teacher's attention much more often.¹

On many occasions when a girl made attempts to show her work to the teacher she was unable to gain her attention. Some degree of forcefulness was necessary to divert the teacher away from whatever she was doing, but to a certain extent the majority of the girls lacked the confidence to do this.

However, one of the most often used means of dominance was teasing and joking.² Weaker children are the most exposed; commonly this means younger children, but in our culture it also includes girls.³ These jokes depend upon shared assumptions, which encompasses the idea that women are the object of derision, the sexual prowess of men, and the willingness of the audience to ratify these attributes by laughing.

The use of ridicule was used as an effective weapon against the females:

In a class of eight year olds in Dock Side craftwork was being prepared. The children were laying out old newspapers to protect the desk from paint. A boy came across a picture of a semi-nude woman in bold graphics:

-
1. It is generally agreed that girls receive less attention in class and that boys manipulate the attention for themselves. See the collections of articles in Stacey, J., Bereaud, S. and Daniels, J. (Eds.), 1974: And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education, Dell, New York and Spender, Dale and Sarah, Elizabeth, 1980: Learning to Lose: Sexism in Education, Women's Press, London.
 2. All children are liable to be ridiculed and abused in this way.
 3. Ann Whitehead's work has shown that sexual innuendo is the common basis of a large number of jokes in our culture (as in many others). See Whitehead, Anne, 1976: "Sexual Antagonism in rural Herefordshire" in Diana Leonard-Barker & Sheila Allen (Eds.), Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, Longman's, London.

"This is what you'll look like Tracey when you grow up" he says sneeringly
"No, I won't will I Miss?" replies Tracey confused, turning to the teacher.
The teacher looks on but not impassively. The ridicule has also affected her; she feels she has to justify herself and tells me:
"I don't take any notice of these silly little incidents. After all they mean nothing".

This form of ridicule was used to lay claim to a specific space. It was not employed only in the working class schools:

In the first year juniors of Applegate Oliver was playing with clay in the project area. He proceeded to mock a certain area of the female body by affixing clay points to his chest:
"Hey, this is what you'll have when you get big", to the girl present.
The other two boys with him collapsed about laughing, while Claire fled the area humiliated.

Upon hearing so much noise the teacher came to investigate. Claire stated that the boys were being "naughty"; she could not express her confusion or the form of insult aimed at her despite her articulateness. The middle class norms she is instilled with do not allow her to mention sexuality or bodies. Jennifer Shaw states:

"... the observation that girls, as a category, are laughable and become ever more so as they get mature, especially sexually, may go some way towards explaining the increasing polarisation and 'voluntary' segregation of girls from boys that characterises the later years of schooling".

Shaw, 1980: p.73

She goes on to say:

"As boys of the same age are easing themselves into their futures by adopting styles and manners of the shop floor, girls similarly have little option but to withdraw from the danger zones where their presence simply invites abuse".

Shaw, 1980: p.73

Displays of overt violence from the pupils were not acceptable and were met with responses ranging from disapproval in three of the schools to severe admonishment in Applegate. However this does not mean that the peer group refrained from violence because of the presence of sanctions. When a struggle ensued amongst two or more boys over the possession of an item or other event they were quick to use their physical strength (this depended on knowing whether or not each particular boy could win if forced to fight). Once past the verbal threats of violence among the boys in Dock Side (likewise in Long Meadow and Lintonbray) it was the boy who was prepared to use the most aggression (and not necessarily the strongest) in front of the teacher and get away with it who invariably dominated classroom squabbles.

Amongst the girls there were the usual arguments and displays of anger common amongst all children. The girls, however, were observed, on specific occasions, to call on someone to 'arbitrate' in an argument (usually a best friend, but in some situations a teacher), rather than resort to violence. Between the girls and boys, violence usually reflected a common practice of dominance or, in the boys' case, a reaffirmation of their dominance over the girls:

A call comes from the teacher of a Junior classroom in Dock Side for the pupils to make 'their lines' at the door. There is an immediate rush for the door. The boys clamber over one another in their haste to get to the front of the queue, using many indiscreet kicks and elbows to subdue allcomers. The three girls who had managed to be fairly nimble and make it to the front of the queue were literally set upon by a dominant group of boys:
"Get to the back, we're always first" ranted one of the red-faced boys.
"We will not!" screams back one of the girls as they cling together for support in their efforts to stand their ground. However, they were

eventually outnumbered and rudely pushed to the back where the rest of the girls were lining up. For a moment there is a chorus of victorious squeals from the boys and the teacher has to silence them before they proceed out of the classroom.

Applegate, despite its particular brand of liberalism, was witness to scenes of covert violence. Besides the use of ridicule, where possible the boys still used the threat of violence, despite the prevailing norms of chivalry and good manners:

In the infant classes the 'Wendy House' filled one corner and it was there that girls did not often have to fight for space. On occasions it was accepted that boys made use of it, becoming involved with the paraphernalia. However there were occasions when they used it as a "machine-gun post" or "army tank" much to the disgust of the girls:

"You're not playing war", states Louise

"Yes I am" says the boy as he clambers over the roof of the house, "I like to fight best of all".

"We won't let you, so there" Carol siding with Louise.

"Then I'll hit you" hisses the boy.

"You're not allowed to", Louise says vehemently

"Try me!" he says threateningly.

The two girls hover, waiting for a chance to 'occupy' their 'territory' but the boy continues to thrash about making gun and explosion noises. They tactically wait till he has exhausted himself, and become tired of the game, and then move in to take over the now empty space. There is a sense of relief by the girls that the 'siege' is over.

As in other schools, the boys attempted to dominate existing material, space and equipment.

Compared to Dock Side however, Applegate differed with respect to scholastic achievement which conferred high status upon individual pupils within both the peer group and the school. Academic competition was vigorous amongst the girls and boys with both vying for the high status that went with high school marks. It was also noticeable that the boys were anxious

to prove themselves intellectually superior during the 'quiz-games' when girls were pitted against the boys in a duel of general knowledge. Individually the boys were concerned as to who had finished a book first, who had the highest marks and most number of stars. Comparing Applegate and Dock Side, it appears that in the former the boys saw their scholastic ability more in terms of individual success whereas in the latter the boys used success as another form of dominance over the girls. The girls at Dock Side were very much aware of this and they distinctly saw their academic achievement as an area of power against the boys:

"We're cleverer than the lads".

"Girls are better at their work than boys".

"The lads are thick, we're always top of the class".

and made sure that the boys did not copy from them although certain situations proved that this was difficult as some boys were not loathe to hitting the girls outright in order to obtain the right answer.

Referring back to the existence of the girls grouped into what could be classed as the 'elite' and 'dull', it was observed that usually a girl who was a high scholastic achiever had quite high status within her peer-group, as opposed to a girl who was struggling at the 'bottom of the class'. This appeared to be the case in all the schools. However, there were some exceptions - particularly Kerry in Dock Side and Sarah in Applegate. Kerry was not scholastically bright, according to her teachers but held very high status within her peer group mainly because of her assertive personality towards the boys. She was also an extremely physical child and very able in sporting activities. On the whole her popularity within the class was due to her courage to stand up to the boys and her outgoing and generous character. Sarah, on the other hand, was 'bright' and not

very popular despite her many stands against the boys. She found it difficult, as has been already shown, to form close relationships with the others. Here perhaps, the variable of the community maybe quite strong, as Sarah deviated quite distinctly from the middle-class notions of 'femininity' within both the school and her peer-group whereas Kerry came from a tougher area and the 'refinements' of 'femininity' were not so emphasised.

When we examine the boys' reaction towards the 'bright' and the 'dull' girls, interesting differences emerge. In the working class schools the 'dull' girls were ignored by the male peer group unless they somehow made their presence felt. In relation to the 'elite' core of girls the boys' behaviour was fairly ambivalent: at one level they were quite scornful of 'high achievers' seeing them as 'goody-goody' and therefore irrelevant. On another level, however, the boys did recognise that these same girls had the teachers' respect and were accorded privileges and rewards (although few) which afforded them some power. The boys pretended to treat them with indifference but their joy on the occasions when they beat the girls academically and their fierce concern to win competitions and quizzes suggested to the researcher that this indifference was feigned. The boys in Applegate, however, did recognise and grudgingly respect those girls who formed the core of the 'elite', since they pursued the same goal as the girls, i.e. scholastic achievement. But this had the effect of reinforcing the sense of deep rivalry between the two groups which is encouraged by the teachers and organisation of the school (see previous chapters) and so perpetuates the 'distancing' between the girls and boys.

Another way in which the boys exerted power was through the tasks that they were asked to carry out. This was particularly noticeable in Lintonbray where the headperson maintained a lively, companionable relationship with 'his senior boys'. Requests were often made of the boys, by the headperson, to help in various ways, including the regular movement of furniture, equipment and other school paraphernalia. The girls were excluded from taking part in such activity and thereby excluded from partaking in the 'privileges' that were gained from carrying out such functions.

In ascertaining that boys negotiate space for themselves the researcher in no way denies that girls attempt to do likewise - although the structure and negotiation is different. This was particularly apparent with regard to their relationship with male teachers,¹ who maintained a 'protective' and 'affectionate' attitude towards their female pupils. Girls tended to congregate more at male teachers' desks and stay longer than the boys:

In one particular instance the girls were standing around Mr. Vincent's desk. The girls were laughing at the remarks he was making. A boy emerges and ventures forward: "Go and sit down" states Mr. Vincent. He remains where he is. At this a girl retorts: "Go and sit down; are you deaf or something?" in support of the teacher. Mr. Vincent says nothing and the boy moves away. The teacher's silence is seen as a furtherance of power and thus allowed the girl to 'admonish' the boy.

Girls were often given the task of handing out classroom material. This gave them a temporary position of power, and one which they sometimes used to extend their influence further.

1. The researcher is speaking specifically of Junior girls.

Joanna moves about the class handing out small strips of paper for a word test, whilst Sheila hands out the books for the T.V. project: 'Sleepers on the Hill'. A boy gets up and walks towards her demanding a book.
"Go and sit down! I'll give you one when I come to your table" states Sheila.
"I want one now" demands the boy.
The girl turns to the teacher for support.
"What are you doing out of your place", he shouts "only the person who is giving out the books should be standing up".
The boy mouths an insult at Sheila and returns to his place.

However, this particular type of power is double-edged, in that the duties in question can be seen as mirroring the 'service' role that women play in the outside world.

Verbal dominance was also exercised by the boys within the schools. In the early part of this chapter one of the research techniques employed in the study was outlined, viz. that of carrying out unstructured interviews with the two top classes¹ to discuss their relationships. I encouraged discussions in order to supplement my own observations i.e. I had pinpointed certain "deviants" (within the peer group), i.e. 'leaders', 'loners' and 'outcasts' and wanted to substantiate my identification. I asked some basic questions as to who (girl or boy) was the most popular pupil in class and why. From these questions I moved to more general ones: "Do you think women and men should be allowed to do the same job? Why? ".

Contrary to the prevailing myths that females talk more and usually about 'nothing', in the mixed gender discussion groups the boys talked more,

1. In Lintonbray this was only one but encompassing the two top age ranges.

were the loudest and were able to select topics more than the girls. It was particularly noticeable that on certain points, (not all), the girls were shouted down and that some of the boys made rather crude and irrelevant suggestions to them whilst doing so (most of which were anatomically impossible). If by chance any of the boys agreed with the girls (which one or two did) they were also shouted down and quickly 'brought into line' by less than subtle statements such as:

"We'll bash him in the playground".

"Trust Johnson to go and say sommat daft like that".

"Aw shaddup Smith, you know it's not true".

and so forth.

This form of verbal dominance/subordination was distinguishable in classrooms too but less dramatically so. It was observed that female pupils talked less often than male pupils in their classes,¹ although there were some girls who talked as much, especially Helen in Long Meadow and Elizabeth, Sally, Joanne and Dawn in Applegate. For the most part the girls were the more ardent listeners. But if we look back to the previous chapters some reasonable explanation can be offered. The boys become quite proficient at gaining attention and having classroom life and lesson content geared to them, with their disruptive behaviour (Chapters VII and VIII). Given that subject matter and lesson content is geared mainly to boys' interests this in essence encourages them to participate more in the lessons:²

-
1. Spender, Dale, 1980: Man Made Language, R.K.P. supports such a finding as does Thorne, Barrie, 1979: Claiming Verbal Space: Women, Speech and Language in College Classrooms, paper presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and the Undergraduate Woman, Wellesley College, September 13-15.
 2. Parker, 1973 also reports that boys are permitted to talk more and encouraged to challenge and question more. See Parker, Angela, 1973: Sex Differences in Classroom Intellectual Argumentation, unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Pennsylvania State University.

In the Dock Side school Junior Three pupils have just watched a programme on Vikings. Questions are asked and ideas for projects encouraged:

"Come on you boys, I should think that this sort of topic would be right up your street" says Mr. Jacobs.

If the girls made attempts to suggest some ideas there is an immediate contemptuous tut-tutting, followed by audible groans from the boys:

"Ugh just listen to her"

"Yeah she doesn't know what she's talking about".

"Trust the lasses to say a daft thing like that".

In such situations girls get the strong sense that certain topics are not appropriate to them,¹ especially when they are ridiculed or put down when they try to make a contribution.

Outside the Classroom

As a result of their own overt aggressive behaviour and the overall structural organisation of each school, boys were able to dominate, not only lesson content and classroom life in general, but also space and verbal interaction outside the school building.² The boys' endless games of 'Batman' and 'Lone Ranger' can keep the whole playground in a state of tension and excitement as they 'charge' and 'whoop' their way through the ranks of girls, who feel excluded and very threatened by the boys' capacity to dominate space.

Differences of power and status are closely tied to gender differences in both verbal and non-verbal behaviour. Previous studies have shown that

-
1. Dale Spender's hypothesis that "talking for girls can be discouraged by the material they are required to talk about" (p.150), see Spender, Dale, 1980c. "Talking in Class" in Spender & Sarah (Eds.) op.cit.
 2. A pattern also found by other researchers, see Wolpe, 1977: op.cit. Lever, Janet, 1976: "Sex Differences in the Games Children Play", Social Problems, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 478-487; Thorne, 1978: op.cit.

boys' games take up more space¹ and that in their home environment they play outside the home more than girls.² The fact that such a difference between the leisure activities of boys and girls exists is generally attributed to the socialisation process, whereby girls and boys develop a so-called 'preference' for such a distinction in activities. It may be that socialisation does play a significant part, but only recently have the material and structural supports of such differences been taken into account.³

In all four schools, sports activities were carried out on a sex-segregated basis with boys taking up the greater amount of space for football and with girls mainly playing netball. In the modern world the two sports cannot be compared in terms of the cultural prestige afforded to them. The school is no exception. Far greater facilities and privileges are given to football and those who play it.

The boys dominated the available space in most forms of play in the playground, whilst the girls kept together in small pockets (although in Dock Side, playgrounds were separate). If by chance the girls wandered into what was seen as the space of the boys, they were viewed as intruders who do not know 'their place' and try to take that which is not theirs.

In theory, all sports are open to both sexes but very rarely did the

1. See Evans, Kate, 1974: "The Spatial Organisation of Infant Schools", Journal of Architecture, Research and Teaching, Vol. 3, pp. 26-33.

2. See Lever, 1976: op.cit.

3. Thorne, 1978: op.cit.; Spender & Sarah, 1980: op.cit.

boys play netball, and the girls were not included in the structured sports periods of football. However they did attempt to join the lads' game during playtime, or instead, have their own game of football. But usually both forms of attempt were frustrated due to the fact in the former case the lads refused to let them join in and in the latter they obstructed the girls' game by appropriating as much space as possible for themselves. When asked individually, why they wouldn't let the girls play the boys' immediate reaction is:

"Because girls haven't got football boots".

or

"They don't know how to play".

The privileges afforded to the participants in the high status game of football were indeed quite obvious on some occasions, and 'understandably' the boys did not wish the girls to encroach on their area of privilege and power. For instance in the Lintonbray village school, the children were not unaware of these privileges:

"We go to football tournaments and we also go on trips. We came first in a knockout competition and we was the smallest school so 'Sir' took us on a trip to the sea-side as a reward like, for doing well".

(James, 11 years old)

"I wish I were a boy then I could play for the football team. 'Sir' takes them (boys) on trips and gives them bars of chocolate. I wish I could go to the seaside".

(Kate, 10 years old)

"He (Mr. Wharten) let's one of us play when they're a boy short. I practise all the time hoping he'll pick me. But Sharon's better at playing football. She's better than the boys, she always scores a goal. I think it's great but the lads don't like it. I wish I was better than Sharon playing football".

(Susan, 11 years old)

"Mark (my brother) always gets a place in the football team, but he's not as good as me. It's because there's never enough boys so that's when I get to play for the team. It's smashing, 'Sir' takes us out and buys us an ice-cream".

Sharon, 11 years old

In the Applegate school, expectations of chivalry from the boys to the girls impeded any outright hostility between the two group, although it did exist. This became evident when the girls' petition presented to Mr. Seaton, (see Chapter VIII), received no reply. The boys of Junior I and II jeered at them for their 'failure' and one or two boys were even to be heard calling the girls 'Commies'.¹

The girls in the schools were aware to varying degrees that things were perhaps more than a little unfair. When trying to share in the privileges allotted to the boys in relation to sports and games, most of the girls voiced their complaints on an individual basis or jointly in a disorganised and spontaneous fashion:

The Junior Three teacher announces that the boys are to be taken to the park so that they can practise their football expertise. The girls protest!
"That's not fair Sir, why can't we go?"
"Because you aren't in the football team" replies Mr. Jacobs.
"But why aren't we allowed?"
"That's quite enough. The boys are going to the park, you're staying in the playground"
The girls groan and give up.

There were some girls who consistently got together and posed quite a problem for the boys. The example has previously been discussed of the four girls in Applegate - Elizabeth, Sally, Joanne and Dawn - who were

1. A term used for Communists.

classed as disruptive by their teachers. Together they formed a 'force' which the boys felt quite incapable of taking on:

Elizabeth and Sally proceeded at morning playtime to move into a boys' game of football, having had their own game spoiled by this same group the previous day. The boys became angry and one, Gavin made a move towards Sally. But Joanne took Gavin by surprise and made a counter-attack and promptly the boy took to his heels.

A similar situation exists in the infant section of Long Meadow:

Helen, a very solid child, tends to be the noisiest and most boisterous child in the class. She eagerly clambers over the apparatus when and where she feels like it. It became apparent that the boys were reluctant to engage in physical confrontation with her, by virtue of the fact that she calls upon the other girls for support against their intended domination.

It can be seen that numbers and age are also factors to be considered, when discussing the dominant/subordinate relationship between girls and boys. However girls do use a variety of subtle means, rather than engaging in aggressive encounters, when the odds are against them to win.

In general, then, boys claim more physical and verbal space.¹ Particularly in playgrounds it was the boys that mainly dominated what space there was. Barrie Thorne suggests that there are ritualised ways of challenging and reacting, advancing and retreating (Thorne, 1978) which express and provide evidence of the power relationship between males and females. In the Dock Side playground, where children hide in the nooks

1. See Henley, Nancy, 1977: Body Politics: Power, Sex and Non-verbal Communication, Prentice-Hall, N.J. This has also been observed by Thorne, 1979: op.cit. in seating arrangements, movement and gestures in classrooms. See also Evans, 1974: op.cit.

and crannies of the old urban traditional school, some of the boys were indulging in social and sexual gestures modelled on the sexual power relationships of the adult world:

The 'usual game' of the boys is to drag an unsuspecting girl into the boys' toilets where the hapless girl suffers one of two abuses. The ultimate aim is to get down her knickers. This requires two or more boys to participate in this act, (two to hold her down whilst the other to remove her garment - this is by no means easy as the girl constantly screams and struggles). The other abuse is: again one or two boys holds the girl whilst another boy undoes his trousers and exposes himself. In both forms of abuse there is always the attendant group - usually the followers not the leaders of the boys - to give verbal support to the protagonists and ridicule the girl at the same time.

This form of physical and sexual aggression was the most basic display of the boys' dominance over the girls. Girls learn that boys "do" things and that they resist or run away.¹

However, the story does not end here. The junior girls obviously resent this form of activity but are at pains not to inform a member of the staff for one of two reasons. There is an unfortunate system of status among the girls whereby if it gets known that one particular girl has been 'got' by the boys then she goes through yet another process of ridicule within her own group. For example ... it became known that one girl, Tracey, had recently been 'got' by the boys and that they had been 'fortunate' to go as far as getting her knickers down to her knees:

1. See Stevi Jackson (1982) for an analysis of the ideology surrounding the differences concerned with the process of how women and men come to express their sexuality: "Femininity, Masculinity and Sexuality" in Scarlet Friedman and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), The Problem of Men, Women's Press, London.

One of the girls in Tracey's class
yelled out in the playground:
"Fancy, letting the boys 'get you'".

If, however the boys were to overstep the mark in that they were discovered by an adult member of staff, they were ritually punished. Nevertheless the screams of the unfortunate girl were seen as self-indulgent cries of "more".

One male teacher told me, the researcher,
"I don't like this sort of thing myself
but the girls do tend to encourage the
boys. All I'm glad about it is, that it
is a harmless bit of fun".

The researcher posits that this statement is rather naive and that this form of behaviour is not to be seen as "a harmless bit of fun", but an expression of the power relationship between males and females. The girls' and teachers' reaction to a girl being 'got' by the boys can also be seen as part of the moral and sexual regulation of females.¹

This isolated form of behaviour was by no means restricted to Dock Side, but existed to a lesser degree in Applegate:

On one occasion I was observing playground
behaviour when I was literally bowled over
by a terrified girl who took up a position
behind me in order to protect herself from
a boy who was in hot pursuit:
"Miss, he's trying to lift my dress up"
she yelled.
"I'm only playing" came back his giggled reply.

For the most part girls inevitably attempt to avoid direct confrontation with the boys and confined themselves to bridled indignation, especially when the boys have a way of making them 'run the gauntlet' to the toilets in Dock Side. But towards the end of the researcher's period of

1. See Jackson, 1982: op.cit.

observation in Dock Side the boys had been checked in this behaviour outside the toilets. This was mainly due to Kerry, whom the researcher has mentioned previously:

Kerry has low academic status but this is offset by her ability in gymnastics and games in general. Athletic and wiry she is a match to any of the boys and is able to inspire the girls to follow her example. It was she who had the idea of posting look-outs in strategic parts of the playground not only to have a clear run to the girls' toilets but to avoid any girls being 'got' by the boys.

What was interesting in this situation was the boys' apparent reluctance to have an all-out confrontation with Kerry. Fighting amongst the boys was an important part of the informal status system in all the schools even, to an extent, in Applegate. Those boys who feared aggressive encounters and avoided fights even when insulted or picked on, such as Danny (Dock Side) or Michael (Long Meadow) were despised even by the girls. To 'perform' badly in a fight was also looked down upon. But it seemed that 'bullying' was a different thing altogether. Simon (Lintonbray) was a school 'bully' and although there were few boys who would take him on because of his size and weight he mostly fought with much younger and smaller boys and was therefore disliked.¹ The boys in Dock Side, however, avoided fights with Kerry, as it was rumoured that she had once bloodied the nose of a boy who was considered to be a 'fair fighter' in the pecking order. It was bad enough to refuse to fight but to be publicly beaten by a girl was the worst loss of status for a boy, no matter how many fights he had had and won with members of his own peer

1. Hargreaves (1967) and Willis (1977) both point out similar findings in their studies, op.cit.

group. It would have been disastrous for his 'masculine' reputation. It was also difficult for the boys to 'gang up' on Kerry and take her to task, whether within or outside the school, as this would also have meant taking her as a serious adversary, and would have shown that it needed a group of boys to put down one lone girl. The issue was best avoided. Violence (or the formal aspect of fighting) is the most important basis of the boys' power amongst each other, and in fact was used to show off in front of girls, and to give them their own sense of superiority.¹ Fighting with girls in a formal setting means treating them as equals. Girls and boys may dispute, or even struggle over some item in class or exert pressure to dominate some space, which may even come to blows, but a formally-organised fight which is arranged either in a secluded corner of the playground or in the street on the way home, is kept strictly for the boys.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the sexes also differed in terms of the way in which games were approached. The girls' games (e.g. skipping in groups with a rope, and playing ball against the wall) were based more upon turn-taking and had less of the competitive and dominance-seeking character of the boys' games.²

Aspirations According to Gender³

In Chapters III and IV the researcher discussed the subcultures of

1. Willis, 1977: op.cit. has shown that among 'the lads' "there is a traditional conflict in their view of women: they are both sexual objects and domestic comforters" (p.43). This may also be why the boys cannot see them as equal contenders in a fight. But the researcher is not implying that males do not use overt physical violence towards females: i.e. wife battering and rape. See Friedland & Sarah, (Eds.), op.cit.

2. See Janet Lever, 1976: op.cit.

3. This section is based on extracts from discussions with pupils in all the schools - taking each class separately, with girls and boys on their own and then finally 'mixing' the two groups. All the children with whom the discussions were carried out, were from the age of seven upwards.

'masculinity' and 'femininity' within the respective catchment areas. Pupils' aspirations for their future would be, the researcher anticipated, strongly connected to their environment, family and peer group. The data showed in general that this was the case, allowing for slight variations and the age of the children.

Within Dock Side and Long Meadow aspirations were obviously connected with parents' occupation - along with what was seen as 'masculine' or 'feminine'. The following questions were put to them:

"What sort of job does your mother do?"

"What sort of job does your father do?"

"What would you like to be when you grow up?"

"Would you like to do the same job as your mother?"

"Would you like to do the same job as your father?"

Although some of the children couldn't give the formal name of their parents' occupation their answers were clear enough and fairly consistent.

"My Mum works at Bird's Eye".

My Dad's a docker".

"She works in a shop".

"Dad's a trawlerman - he fishes".

"He's a painter".

"He works in a factory".

"My Mum doesn't work".

"My Dad drives lorries".

"He's a digger".

"Dad works in a factory".

"She cleans for another lady".

are some of the examples.

As to the children's aspirations, these again were fairly predictable. The boys chose a "wider" variety of occupations but this may have been due to the fact that some of the job choices bordered on the 'fantasy' rather than reality:

"I'd like to be a fisherman like my Dad".

"A lorry driver".

"Work on a forge".

"I'm going to be a policeman".

"A fire-engine driver".

"Be a worker".

"I'm gonna be a cowboy and fight Indians".

"Don't be silly" yells Carrie "there aren't any Indians left, they've all been killed off".

Fisherman along with factory worker came high on the list, along with 'fantasy jobs', i.e. cowboy, or Indian, but most wanted to be a 'worker'! The girls meanwhile had more realistic aspirations and hence a narrower range of occupations, however this limitation was also due to their choice of jobs being stereotyped with regard to gender:

"I want to be a nurse".

"I want to work in a sweetshop then I can eat all the sweets".

"A schoolteacher, I'm good at Maths".

"I wouldn't mind being a worker".

"Work in an office".

"I want to look after people".

"I suppose I'll just work at Bird's Eye like my Mum and be home in time for my kids when they come home from school".

Teacher, nurse and typist far outnumbered the rest, whilst working in a shop and being a 'Mum' came next.

The aspirations of Applegate pupils, as might be expected, were higher

than those of Dock Side pupils. However, this contrast in aspirations existed more strongly among the boys than the girls. Many of the children were able to specify their parents' occupations:

"My Dad's in Local Government but my mum doesn't work".

"An Airline Pilot; my mum stays in the house".

"My Mum doesn't have a job, but my dad teaches at the university".

"My Dad builds caravans and my mum's a part-time teacher".

"My father's a Managing Director, my Mum was a nurse but she gave it up when she was pregnant".

Compared with Dock Side and Long Meadow schools, of the 100 children the researcher interviewed in each, 54 of the Applegate mothers were reported as staying at home as 'housewives', whilst in Dock Side it was 27 and Long Meadow 38, revealing a considerable difference between the groups.

When comparing the aspirations of Applegate girls with those of the former two schools, although some difference does exist, they are actually more similar than might be expected:

"I want to be a nurse".

"I'd like to be on aeroplanes and be an air hostess".

"I'd like to go to college and be a teacher".

"I'd go on the stage if I could ... you know be an actress".

"I'd like to be a good gymnast".

"Work in an office".

Teacher and nurse far outnumbered the other 'choices' of occupation, although only one girl wanted to be a secretary. In the main the girls recognised a much narrower range of 'job choice' and also appeared more

realistic than the boys; who said:

"I'd like to be an inventor and invent the 'transmat' beam".

"I'm going to be a doctor, like my dad".

"I'm going to be a farmer and have lots of fields to plough".

"I want to be a dustman, so I can get dirty".

"An engine-driver".

Ten of the boys wanted to be in the police force whilst another eight wanted to join the forces, and here it would be difficult to draw the line between fantasy and reality. As for the rest they wanted to be firemen, farmers, doctors and scientists. There were the usual 'choices' reminiscent of nine and ten year olds, when they believe they can be anything they want to be: cowboys and artists, an astronaut and a lumberjack were mixed in with the vets and lorry drivers.

What is significant about the three schools and their pupils' aspirations is the similarity in the choice of occupations by girls, despite the difference in socio-economic class. In the little school of Lintonbray choice of occupation was again gender demarcated:

The boys

"I'm going to drive a tractor".

"Be a footballer".

"Be a farmer"

The girls

"I'd like to work in a shop".

"Train horses".

"I'm going to be a nurse".

Overall, we can see that the selection of occupations by these young pupils is related to the socio-economic division of labour. But running through this 'selection' procedure is also the notion of gender. With regard to work vis-a-vis the labour market many (if not all) of the children were aware of the differences in prestige that accrued to men and women through their jobs. When asked if they would like to enter either of their parents' occupation most gave prestige to their father's work rather than their mother's:

Danny: "I'm gonna work on the roads like my Dad; he's ever so strong".

Michael: "I'm going to be a fisherman like my dad".

Jamie : "My father's a music conductor; it would mean taking lots of exams but I'd like to try and be one".

Timmy: "My dad's a vet, but he wants me to be a doctor; I don't mind which one, either'll do".

If they did not mention the status attached to their fathers' occupations, they recognised that they had the real earning potential:

"My dad earns money so we can buy things".

"He makes lots of money, my Mum doesn't - she spends it all".

"My Mum doesn't work. She doesn't have a job".

Mother being in the house is not an indication of work; it is their father who goes out and does the work:

"Mummy's not a farmer,¹ she works inside".

"My Mum just does the cooking, and she cleans the rabbit hutches".

"Mummy doesn't have a job, she just stays in the house a lot".

"She doesn't do a job, she plays badminton".

"I don't know what my mother does, she doesn't have a job".

1. This despite the fact that women do participate in a great deal of the labour involved on a farm (see Chapter IV).

Just as the boys stated that they would not like to do the same job as their mothers, the girls, in general, were not keen on the 'work' their mothers do. Instead they preferred to identify with the jobs that their fathers had:

"My father's a civil servant; I wouldn't mind doing that".

"Dad works on the trawlers ... I wish girls could be a fisherman, then I'd be one".

"I'd like to be a worker like my Dad - my Mum just works in the house".

"Well I can't say that I'd like to do the work my mummy does because she hasn't got a job".

"My mum doesn't earn money, but my Dad does. He earns money to buy things".

Only one girl told me she would like to do, what her mother does:

"I want to be a nurse 'cos my Mummy's a nurse".

But for the rest, the girls admired their father's work but also know they cannot aspire to it.

It is interesting to note that the very jobs that the bulk of the working class male pupils 'choose' are reminiscent of those arduous physical occupations admired by Willis' 'lads' and which underlie the attitudes and values through which the 'masculinity' which permeates shopfloor culture and the ethos of 'male work' comes to substitute for the lack of cultural and economic power in an essentially middle-class world.

General Comments

Throughout this chapter the writer has endeavoured to show that in all

the schools there existed a dominant/subordinate power relationship between the male and female pupils and has attempted to itemise the differing mechanisms of that power relationship.

It was noted that gender was a category which defined behaviour as 'appropriate' or 'inappropriate' to the members of groups, and that this contributed to a pupils' acceptance or rejection by the peer group. Conformity and deviation varied within the school (or group) as it did between the schools, with social class being an important factor behind these variations.

The chapter has also concentrated on the structural and material realities which girls confront in their daily lives at school in the power struggle with the boys. Some previous feminist studies¹ have tended to concentrate on the aspect of 'socialisation' whereby women and girls (as mothers, daughters and pupils) actually 'collude' in their 'inferiority, give way' on all counts and accept their subordinate position. But one is forced² into a subordinate position, and it is not something which is willingly taken on, e.g. master/slave.

The focus of attention has been upon exclusion of girls by boys from those areas that represent status and 'power', the forms of exclusion used and the ways in which the girls 'adapted' to these, together with the status that an individual or a group manages to acquire. 'Silly'

-
1. See Belotti, Elena G., 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
 2. Perhaps the use of the word is too strong - the researcher includes in this ideological, cultural and economic processes.

and 'thick' though the low-academic and disruptive boys may seem to the girls, nevertheless the boys' 'gang' is 'the club' and the main route to power. At the same time the girls recognise that being girls, they are excluded from "success" (even in Applegate) despite their so-called 'academic prowess'. Girls are excluded, are encouraged to grow up taking other people's needs and wishes into account, to service others. The tasks that girls were given within the class and which they saw as a way of gaining some form of dominance, were usually connected with servicing others (i.e. handing out materials and text books). They are excluded from male association - whether it be in the form of games, play and 'masculine' rituals in Dock Side or 'academic success', cultural and symbolic power in Applegate - which enhance male domination.

Girls may be subordinated but this does not mean that they are necessarily passive. In some ways, in fact, they are more active than the boys in that they have to work out:¹

a] What is going on.

b] How to redirect their ambitions.

and c] How to deal with the boys.

Through this process of organising statuses and identities on a gender basis, certain forces are at play. Particularly in the working class schools the bulk of male pupils are already beginning to shun school learning, as this is not where their own cultural form of status and achievement lies. Eventually this shunning will lead to school 'failure' but will be seen, later in their school lives, as an 'achievement',

1. I am grateful to Scarlet Pollock for pointing this out to me.

rather than disability.¹ This school failure is positively condemned by our middle-class society and will ensure for most of these boys, working class jobs (or unemployment). But through their distinctive form of language and intimidatory behaviour towards females they are entering the world of 'real men' with their oppressive form of masculine chauvinism which will guarantee for them a meaningful framework - one which will give them power over women - within a male-dominated society. In this form, it can be seen that working-class 'masculinity' appears almost as achieved. The middle-class boys in Applegate do not seek to 'achieve' this extreme, for they have already cultural, symbolic and economic power by the virtue of their class.

In contrast, one could say that the position of the girls is ascribed rather than achieved (whatever their social class). Socially and culturally, both within the school and in the neighbourhood, they have been required to learn what has to be known in order to act in a culturally or subculturally gender-'appropriate' way in specific social situations. The gender boundaries, within which the 'appropriate' activities, interests and expectations are constructed, are more rigidly fixed for girls. However, the daughters of middle-class fathers may have more resources to move beyond those boundaries in later life (Sharpe, 1976). The boys, whatever their social class, have learned to mark themselves off from the girls, and construct a status hierarchy from which they exclude the girls by various means, depending on social class. This status hierarchy has greater credence than anything that the girls create as an alternative, because that status hierarchy both

1. See Willis, 1977, op.cit. and Hargreaves, 1967, op.cit.

functions within the school (through its organisation, the curriculum and subject specialism) and is expressed and authenticated by the macro-structure of the culture in which we exist. But we can also see that just as the boys are segregating themselves off from the girls, so the reverse is happening. Aware of the confrontation and ridicule that they have to contend with (especially sexually), the girls reciprocate the polarisation between the two existing groups.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS

The major emphasis of the thesis centres upon the analysis of the ways in which primary schools produce and reproduce gender categories, within and across class boundaries. The analysis is based upon data collected during periods of participant observation within four schools. The classroom practices of teachers were examined in order to assess how they use gender as a means of categorisation, organisation and control, thus enabling the researcher to examine the perceptions and expectations of gender behaviour held by the teachers themselves and how they communicate these to their pupils. This, it is hoped, will throw further light upon the role that schools play in the reproduction and perpetuation of the patriarchal power relations of the wider society.

A further aim was to examine the behaviour of the children themselves in order to see how they make sense of their 'gender world' and utilise gender-based categories in their interaction with each other.

The dimension of the schooling experience receiving particular attention is the "socialisation" of children into modes of conduct considered "appropriate" in relation to their gender. Another major concern within this is the school-specific variations in pupils' gender socialisation and the way that the culture of the local community impinges upon their schooling.

The research methods used for this comparative ethnographic study were participant observation along with structured and semi-structured interviews. Ethnography, with its essential component of participant observation, has many limitations of which the researcher is well aware. However, it can and does give access to crucial dimensions of experience in a way that other research methods do not. For this reason the researcher decided to collect qualitative data through the role, not of observer or of teacher, but of active participant observer.

In almost all of the schools, I interviewed both the teachers (using a structured technique) and the pupils (using an unstructured technique) and in the catchment areas I interviewed young women, again using an unstructured technique. All interviews were handled by myself. The focus throughout was on elucidating the connections between class relations and gender relations - an interaction whose importance and complexity became increasingly obvious as the researcher got deeper into the analysis. Finally, while fictitious names of places, schools and the people involved have been used, every incident and process recorded is real.

Attitudes and Practices of the Teachers

Interviews with the teachers (both female and male) disclosed that they accepted the prevailing cultural beliefs about gender differentiation, although many denied that they treated boys and girls differently in the classroom. In relation to the macro-culture the teachers certainly expressed standard, even traditional, assumptions about the sexual demarcation in occupations, and about "masculinity" and "femininity". They believed that it is men's place 'to work' and pursue a career with what is assumed to be single-minded dedication.

With regard to their attitudes towards gender in schooling the majority of the teachers steered clear of the 'biological deterministic' theory of differences between girls and boys. However, when questioned about gender differences in respect of their own teaching experience they failed to recognise that the ways in which they actually categorised girls' and boys' behaviour might result in a different interaction between themselves and the two gender groups.

Many of the teachers revealed, in their interviews, a greater expectation of good conduct from the girls, whilst expecting and even tolerating the disruptive element amongst the boys, not only in the urban traditional school but in all of the schools. Because of these expectations, in their actual classroom practice the teachers dichotomised the behaviour of girls and boys so that even the same activity may well be evaluated differently according to the sex of the actor. Most of the teachers rated both the conduct and attitude to work more favourably for girls than for boys.

Having dismissed 'inherent differences' between the girls and boys and noted the gender inequalities within the education system the teachers pin-pointed this discrimination as 'somewhere out there' e.g. 'socialisation' within the family, the secondary school, and the labour market were all blamed. The teachers did not see themselves as implicated in the process of transmitting inegalitarian ideals but accepted certain patterns of behaviour as given and assumed they were features that they had to work with rather than confront or change. "Femininity" and "masculinity" thus became, despite their previous statements, attributes lodged within the girls and boys respectively and as such were to be treated accordingly.

The teachers' perceptions of these attributes, however, were based on their own interpretations and actual experiences of life within their own classrooms and as such gender differentiation, according to their statements, was used to organise and control their pupils. Many of the teachers told me that they directed the subject content of lessons in favour of boys and admitted that they thought the girls would 'tag along' with any topic. With this in mind they consciously chose topics which would 'suit the boys'. Such statements again reveal particular contradictions in their beliefs e.g. on the one hand they suggest that there is a clear differentiation of interests and that boys and girls have certain 'leanings' towards particular subjects and topics, whilst on the other many of the teachers suggested that the girls were interested in most topics. Turning to my observations of the behaviour of teachers in the classroom, it can be said that in all the schools there were similar elements of gender differentiation and demarcation which the teachers employed in order to simplify their administration of the classroom. No matter which philosophy was dominant, within each school gender was a central category in the overall organisation of the school. Such practices as 'lining up', and the ubiquity of sex-segregation in the structure and dynamics of each institution, all helped children to learn to act as members of the formal organisational subgrouping of gender. Teachers consistently divided up the class on lines of gender to facilitate classroom management. A competitive philosophy was encouraged between the girls and boys in all the schools in the form of quizzes, games, behaviour and extra-curricular activities as it appeared simpler for the teachers to divide the class by this category rather than any other and in order to minimise management problems generally.

Teachers in all the schools exhorted the gender groups to better behaviour

or performance by comparing them with each other thus hoping to make the boys conform in the way that they (the teachers) thought the girls did. If this failed a 'second line' of social control was used, that of comparing the boys with the girls in ways that could be interpreted as depicting girls as inferior. It can thus be seen that gender was used as a means of social control either in attempts to isolate the disruptive elements amongst the boys (as in Dock Side or Long Meadow) or securing greater conformity by the boys to the ideals of the school (as in Applegate) or in compensating the boys for lack of amenities.

It was also noted that in all four schools lesson content was interpreted through a 'masculine/feminine' dichotomy and was geared essentially to boys, with girls expected to 'tag along' in order:

- a] to contain the boys and
- b] to give them more assistance in that they were
'academically' less able than the girls.

Such reasons were also interwoven with the dominant ideas and values of 'appropriate' gender behaviour, in that boys were seen as the future 'breadwinners' so their needs must be met. In addition, the values related to 'masculinity' appeared the more positive and rewarding.

Punishment and discipline is another way in which girls and boys were divided. More physical punishment was meted out to the boys whereas the girls were heir to ritual forms of discipline, such as being 'told off' more or made to stand in a corridor or corner.

Teachers seem to have been influenced by their own evaluations of masculinity and femininity as well as by the desire to impose order and

discipline. This is best illustrated by the teachers' interpretations of the academic performance of boys and girls. Despite the fact that there was abundant evidence to show that girls, on the whole, were 'successful' and more 'able' in academic attainment according to the school's formal criteria (e.g. they completed set tasks more readily than the boys; girls tended to gain higher marks in tests; their ability to grasp the elements of reading was greater than the boys - in all the schools boys greatly outnumbered the girls in their attendance of the class for those with reading difficulties - as their reading age (on average) was higher than the boys; and they predominated in the higher-ability sets in those schools which organised particular lessons according to graded levels of ability) teachers preferred to teach the boys, seeing them as having greater capabilities than the girls. In this way, the teachers came to enhance, rather than to challenge, the attitudes of the wider society which interprets the dominance of men in art, culture and science as evidence of a link between 'masculinity' and creativity.

Such beliefs are also apparent when it comes to the teachers' beliefs about gender-appropriate behaviour and their reaction to particular acts of gender deviation. As previously pointed out the girls were expected to acquiesce more to teachers' demands and to school rules than the boys, no matter which school. Teachers informed the children if they were 'indulging' in what they thought was 'opposite gender behaviour' by comparing the gender groups' behaviour with each other. Again it was common for gender groups to be the target of both positive and negative sanctions in the form of punishment or special privileges - even though the whole group may not have been indulging or acquiescing in the deviant or required gender behaviour. Essentially teachers take a general

concept of gender behaviour as a datum and act upon this.

Two points are worth emphasising here. Firstly, the identification of pupils with their gender group is accomplished in a much more ritualistic and formal way at school, than at home. Secondly the encouragement of gender-appropriate behaviour does not simply dichotomise girls and boys but involves a greater level of tolerance for boys' 'high spirits' and general boisterousness and a greater repression for the girls through the insistence that they conform.

Variations between the schools

The schools have one basic feature in common, which is that they differentiate on the basis of gender, but there are also considerable variations in their internal structures and classroom practices. There are also variations from classroom to classroom within each school, as one would expect to find anywhere, but the researcher can say firmly that there did appear to be a dominant pattern constructed within each school and distinctive enough to describe.

Thus, though many aspects were similar in all four schools, there were also significant differences. The nature of learning and work activity provides an example. In Dock Side and Long Meadow the emphasis was placed upon repetitive rote procedures and mechanical activity such as copying teachers' notes from the blackboard. Questions were asked to ascertain whether children had done the assigned work rather than to invite reflection or sustained creative thought. Similarly school knowledge was fragmented, in that what was presented was not so much bodies of ideas or connected generalisations but fragmented fact and figures. Pupils

were taught the "basics" rather than "concepts" because, as one teacher put it, "their minds are barren". In Lintonbray, too, the construction of knowledge and the work patterns were similar to this because of the "limited horizons" of these children. Yet if we turn to Applegate we can clearly see that this school gave higher priority to activities that aimed to foster creativity, independent thought and personal development. A common goal expressed by teachers was to help the pupils "meet their potential" and "prepare them for the rigorous examination system" which no doubt many of these pupils would undergo. School knowledge in Applegate was more abundant, difficult, analytical and conceptual than the knowledge in the other three schools.

The manner in which gender differentiation was handled also varied from school to school. One of the reasons for this variation may lie in the way the schools perceive and experience differences between boys and girls in terms of the maintenance of discipline. Dock Side was seen as having greater discipline problems than most schools particularly in regard to the boys, although there were some behavioural problems from the girls. Practices relating to gender differentiation were particularly marked in this school and reactions to gender deviation were severe and rigid. 'Gender-appropriate' behaviour had fixed parameters within this school and there was an inflexible attitude towards anything deviating from what was seen as 'appropriate'. Routine gender differentiation was more widespread than in the other schools, and so were explicit comparisons between the sexes, the girls' behaviour continually held up as above or below par in accordance with their gender. Competition was frequently used as the boys were pitted against the girls in tests of general knowledge, sport and other activities. More physical punishment

was in use in this school than in the other three and was particularly directed towards the boys. In essence gender was invoked constantly to offset any classroom management problems faced by the teachers. Finally, while it was hoped that 'ladylike' behaviour would be forthcoming from the girls, this could not be guaranteed, consequently there was a degree of tolerance of 'tomboy' behaviour.

In Long Meadow and Lintonbray gender was similarly frequently invoked in the organisation and daily life of the school and classroom. The practice was not as rigid as in Dock Side, but there was frequent sex-segregation and gender differentiation in routine procedures. Discipline was still a problem in Long Meadow but harsh physical punishment for the boys was frowned upon and instead 'appeals were made to the better side of their nature'. However, exhortations to good behaviour involved continuous comparison between the two groups and this was used as a basic form of control.

In Dock Side, Long Meadow and Lintonbray more responsibilities were given to the girls as it was felt that they would accomplish them more conscientiously than the boys. Among the latter this did not go unnoticed. The responsibilities in question corresponded to the stereotyped forms that exist in the outside world with girls servicing others and seeing to general domestic things, tidying up, returning the register, carrying messages whilst boys carry the milk-crates and help to move equipment.

Applegate did not appear to be as rigid in gender demarcation and differentiation and I did indeed observe a greater degree of flexibility. One example of this was the acceptance of boys being involved in

activities in the Wendy House as well as actually being involved in play with the girls. Certainly there seemed to be a tolerance shown towards boys who engage in "girls'" behaviour and activities. But even here certain kinds of 'gender-appropriate' behaviour were frequently demanded. 'Genteel' behaviour was expected from the girls whilst 'chivalrous' behaviour was expected from the boys. Greater emphasis in this school was placed upon self-control and upon being aware of the correct way to behave. This led to a different form of rigidity than that found in the other schools - a firmer insistence upon 'feminine' behaviour and consequently a greater disapproval of 'tomboyishness'. Although little physical (corporal) punishment was in use, negative sanctions and continual exhortations were continually directed against those who deviated from what was regarded as 'gender-appropriate' behaviour. Conformity to school rules and competency in academic performance was expected from both boys and girls, but it appeared that deviation from appropriate behaviour was dealt with more swiftly by the teacher when it concerned the girls, than the boys - consider the example of Joanne, Sally, Elizabeth and Dawn and also of Sarah.

With regard to 'deviance' from the boys, the case of Robert suggests that the school is more anxious about continual aggressiveness than it is about manifestations of 'girlish' behaviour.

Differences between the schools are particularly apparent in relation to reactions to 'gender deviation'. Compare, for instance, the cases of Michael at Long Meadow and Paul at Applegate, or of Kerry at Dock Side and Sarah at Applegate.

An interesting feature of reactions to 'gender deviation' is that there seems to be a high degree of conformity between the attitudes of the school and the perceptions of the pupils within the school, e.g. Danny at Dock Side and again Sarah at Applegate. It may well be that one reinforces the other.

Gender differentiation is thus a pervasive influence in all of the schools and affects many dimensions of school life. Gender is an important device for organising classroom activity; lesson content tends to be geared toward the boys, who also receive more attention in an effort to maintain their interest and curb disruptive behaviour; and important aspects of behaviour are defined in terms of gender, with infractions of these often treated as a very serious matter.

Throughout, gender differences are interwoven with class differences. At times they reinforce each other; at times they cut across each other. Thus in the working class schools the mechanical routine work procedures which dominated activity within the classroom develop capacities and skills appropriate for forms of adult wage labour demanding submission to routine and provide little conceptual or critical understanding of the world or of the pupils' place within it. Both sexes are affected by this.

At Applegate, in contrast, both boys and girls were expected to perform well and to aim for college and university. At the same time, the purpose was defined differently for the two sexes. Boys were expected to be 'highfliers' and go on to good careers. Higher education for the girls was seen more as a 'finishing' process than as a gateway to a career or independence - they would marry executive and professional workers rather

than become them (although many would go on to enter lower middle-class professions themselves - teaching, nursing). The knowledge that the girls acquire at school is thus thoroughly imbued with masculine definitions since it is intended to be used in ways which reproduce the hierarchical order of 'masculine' and 'feminine' within our society.

The ubiquity of gender stratification in the schools is evidence of the patriarchal structures that exist in society as a whole. The school reflects those structures. But these "structures" do not simply work by themselves, independent of the head, teachers and pupils within them. They are constructed within the school by these very same people and are worked out in endless negotiation although we must recognise that in this process some groups have more power than others. But this is not to deny that patriarchy structures relationships within the school in definite ways. Why, then, are there differences in the structuring of these relationships between the four schools in the study?

The most important single factor is the nature of the catchment area. The schools are located in areas which are relatively (although not totally) homogenous in their social composition. The schools are thus presented with pupils whose parents occupy a particular set of positions in the social and technical division of labour and who live in communities whose norms, hopes, expectations and ways of behaving are heavily conditioned by this fact. The schools, by and large, take the constraints and opportunities provided by the catchment areas as given and work within them. The aims of the school, and the forms of organisation chosen to achieve them, are thus worked out in terms of the nature of the catchment area in which they are situated.

This does not mean that there is a straightforward, one-to-one relationship between the 'ethos' of the school and the catchment area. There is scope for the school to interpret its role in a variety of ways, but there are definite limits upon how far this can be carried. Within these limits, the most important influence upon the policies of the school is likely to be the headperson. This can be seen if we compare Applegate, with its emphasis on self-control and chivalry, and with Lintonbray's 'family' based ethos. Again, contrast the rather over-zealous regime in Dock Side with the 'social welfare' approach of Long Meadow, both of which were responses to the 'type' of neighbourhood in which the schools were located. The difference between the schools can thus be explained largely in terms of the processes of interaction that take place between the school and the catchment area. At this point we can briefly summarise the relationship between the two for the schools under study.

The researcher can define Dock Side's "catchment" as families who come from and are established in a traditional working class area of the inner city, now in decline and going through massive redevelopment. The social norms of the area are imbued with assumptions of a masculine/feminine polarisation whereby relations between men and women are sharply demarcated, as the interviews of the women from Dock Side illustrate. In relation to gender, many aspects of the pupils' experiences within school have profound similarities with what they experience in the community. There was rigid sex-segregation within the school-organisationally, architecturally and socially - and the headperson and teachers conformed strictly to 'gender-appropriate' behaviour and expected the pupils to do likewise. The classroom practices of the teachers confirm this.

Similarly the "catchment" of Long Meadow was working class, coming from families living in, for the most part, council houses on a large corporation estate, where problems such as unemployment, low wages and little prospect of security for the future are endemic. The 'worlds' of women and men were sharply demarcated and although the harsh illustrations of it are less obvious than they are in Dock Side with its Working Men's Clubs and Men Only Bars, the sexual antagonisms were just as apparent.

At Long Meadow, despite the difference in age and architecture of the school, the staff and headperson held a similar philosophy with regard to the 'gender-appropriate' behaviour of their pupils, although the rigid sex-segregation prevalent in Dock Side, appeared at times to be 'blurred' in Long Meadow due to the spacious surroundings and to the 'caring' atmosphere created by its head. Mrs. Hartley, the headperson of Long Meadow, differed markedly from Mrs. Bosworth, the head of Dock Side. The latter showed no qualms about her feelings towards her pupils who were, to her mind, "unruly little animals" who needed to be "disciplined and civilised" as they came from parents who were seen as "irresponsible and incompetent" with regard to the needs of their children. For Mrs. Hartley, her charges were "deprived" and thus needed "care and understanding". Both heads and staff of the two schools had different expectations of their pupils (both male and female) which was reflected in the school organisation and classroom practices.

Applegate's "catchment" came from families with fathers mainly in the professional/managerial income bracket marked by high occupational status and financial security, and resident in private and reasonably expensive

accommodation. The affluent salary and security of income of the middle-class father meant a comfortable life-style for the wife and children, at least on a materialistic level. But nevertheless, it was a lifestyle suffused with gender divisions with regard to the care of the family, decision-making, leisure and even future expectations for offspring.

The principal of Applegate, Mr. Seaton, finds himself talking to parents as one 'equal' to another; they understand each other's aims and requirements. He and the staff see the parents as competent and keen for their progeny to do well.

Mr. Seaton desires to give a Christian education based on sound moral and social principles. These incorporate notions of correct gender behaviour which impose firm control upon the girls. The school also offers an academic emphasis with strong cultural, social and sporting activities. Essentially, even though it is a state school Applegate offers an exclusiveness and a sense of social superiority which is so strong and pervasive that it even absorbs many of the working class children who make up a small percentage of the school's intake.

Lintonbray differed markedly from the other three schools in that its catchment area was rural and distinctly agricultural even though there were workers in the village who earned their wage other than off the land. Small farmers, lorry drivers and agricultural workers and mechanics of various kinds (plant operators, engineers etc.) dominated the occupational structure, so for the most part it was working class. Due to the nature of relations and ties to the land, along with the occupational structure,

there was a sharp demarcation between the lives of the men and women, with labour, leisure, and interests polarised between 'masculine' and 'feminine'. Power, economic and social, was held by the men as it was in the other three areas, and similarly, as was the case in Dock Side, Long Meadow and Applegate, there were few opportunities for women to work and become independent. What was interesting was that the women here attempted (in no matter how limited a fashion) to retain some form of economic independence and indeed succeeded in doing so, whilst women in Applegate appeared to be more encapsulated within the boundaries of the village, with no jobs and very little chance of mobility, despite the middle class notions of 'egalitarianism'. This may be part of the explanation of why women in Lintonbray appeared to have greater expectations for their daughters; another is the geographical isolation of the village and limited opportunities within it.

Mr. Wharten exuded the demeanour of the warmhearted and friendly patriarch, ruling and controlling the school as if all its participants were members of a large family. With his senior boys he had good relationships which expressed a reaffirmation of masculine values through sporting activities and men-only groups working co-operatively together. Such relations exclude the girls and thus help to create different social worlds for male and female pupils.

The academic expectations in all the schools, apart from Applegate, were not high and likewise Lintonbray expected no hidden 'genius' to emerge within its enclave. A practical, no-nonsense education was provided

with a certain emphasis on Art and Crafts.

Previous research has provided substantial documentation of the influence of the class composition of catchment areas upon the practices of schools. I hope to have shown that the nature of catchment areas must also be taken into consideration in studying the practices of schools in relation to gender.

The relative congruity that exists between the school and its catchment area should not be taken to mean that differences, and possibly contradictions, do not exist between the experience of the child within the family and community and its experience at school. There is no deterministic fit between school and home and children do not necessarily become what either school or home demand. A good example of this is Ian of Dock Side ('fair, quiet and bright') and Sarah of Applegate (loud, defiant and intelligent) both of whom represent the opposite of the expected 'gender-appropriate' behaviour.

Interaction in the Peer Group

Whilst the school and the educational system have the greatest say in determining what is produced in classrooms, this does not preclude pupils themselves influencing what takes place.

It was evident in all the schools that the girls and the boys had very different perceptions of themselves and that these self-perceptions helped to structure the power relations between the groups in any one school. Evidence has been presented that the pre-school 'socialisation' to which the pupils were subjected had sex-segregation as one of its central

organising principles, even within the middle class catchment area of Applegate and despite the middle class ideology of "equal opportunity".

Within each school, notions of 'femininity', even a 'style' of 'femininity', was an important part of the cultural repertoire, and it was these notions that helped (in part) to construct the differing positions between the male and female pupils. In the case of the working class pupils, the interaction of class and gender categories takes a particular form, as evidenced within Dock Side and Long Meadow, and even within Lintonbray. Particularly in Dock Side the boys celebrated their 'masculinity' against the girls who were seen to be the docile, conforming and diligent pupils. The boys were pugnacious and physical in expressing their 'masculinity' and manifested this in their general behaviour, inside and outside the school itself, by dominating verbal and physical space whenever and wherever possible. They confirm their respect for their 'hard' masculine identity even within their own peer group as evidenced by their behaviour towards 'outcasts' such as Danny and Andrew.

Within Long Meadow and Lintonbray, the displays of masculinity were less 'brutish', because of the overall ethos of the school (the 'social welfare' ethos of Long Meadow and the 'family based' ethos of Lintonbray), nevertheless the power struggle was no less blurred, as the boys dominated the physical and spatial arrangements within their locale. Again within their own peer group they evinced antagonistic behaviour towards those who were unable to come up to the accepted standard of masculinity imposed by the dominant group; see the cases of Michael in Long Meadow and Simon in Lintonbray.

Essentially the peer groups sorted themselves into oppositional groupings

which both represented and contradicted class categorisations. The boys set themselves up against both teachers and the female pupils by resisting the school norms of achievement in lessons and conformity to regulations. Such resistance took the form of both group and individual behaviour characterised by fighting, fussing, not paying attention, oppositional language (directed against the girls) and the incessant harrassment and teasing of the girls and each other. In this way it can be seen that the boys' resistance was ultimately reproductive of their gender and class positions within society, in that they saw mental work, or academic achievement as 'soppy' and 'feminine' and in the main veered away from those skills which may have given them access to lower-middle or middle class male occupations and opted instead for what they saw as their 'successful' power position within both the 'immediate' environment (i.e. in the classroom and school) and their class-related lives overall, exemplified in the desire of most boys to follow their father's (and their class occupation).

The girls, themselves, were aware of their 'success' in academic performance; knew they were "cleverer than the lads" and attempted to resist the boys in the overt displays of 'masculinity' which degraded and oppressed the girls. The 'core elite' of the girls did this by 'achieving well' seeing this as an expression of their own power and a way of escaping the coercive methods of the boys. However this in no way amounted to a questioning of their own positions as females. We can see that the staff expected the girls to conform to school regulations and to surpass the boys in lesson performance. This was part and parcel of the gender stereotype of 'femininity' which was apparent in all the schools. In contradiction to this the 'superior' performance of the girls did not

enhance the teachers respect for them. Rather, the teachers preferred to teach the boys since they saw them as the product of their most rewarding efforts.

Within Applegate the disruptive tactics associated with boys in working-class schools were not in evidence, as both girls and boys both acceded to the school norms of conformity and academic requirements, yet nevertheless a gender power relationship did exist between male and female pupils. Verbal and physical space was dominated by the boys both within and outside the school confines. Both groups battled for 'academic supremacy' and on many occasions were pitted against each other in the form of quizzes and other competitions.

Even though most of the pupils acquiesced in the school norms and the girls achieved academically, this in no way usurped the power relation existing between the males and females. Applegate was suffused with rigid notions of 'femininity' which exacted greater 'gender-appropriate' behaviour from the girls than did the other schools, as we can see from the school's reaction to Elizabeth, Sally, Joanne and Dawn who were not compliant with school-based values and 'deviated' from the gender norms.

The girls, despite the 'middle-class' atmosphere, were subject to a good deal of sexual ridicule, as in all the schools. although it took less brutal forms than at Dock Side. Such displays of dominance by the boys (in whatever school), whether sexual or non-sexual, always have undercurrents of violence which the girls have to counter with whatever strategy is at hand. For most, all they can do is withdraw from such animosity as there are few ways acceptable to the school in which they can openly

take on the boys. However, some girls did manage to survive and make inroads into the areas of boys' power i.e. Kerry in Dock Side and the group of 'Boadiceas' within Applegate.

It was interesting to discover the nature of status amongst girls and boys and the 'qualities' that provide status. Whilst academic prowess amongst the girls in all the schools afforded high status, such prowess was treated with a certain degree of ambivalence and even scorn amongst the boys in Dock Side, Long Meadow and Lintonbray. The boys in Applegate vied for academic supremacy equally with the girls. Manifestations of overt 'masculinity' were more in tune with the boys' notion of gender-related behaviour in the other three schools: prowess in sports (football) along with a competitive and aggressive 'nature' tended to score high marks amongst the boys. It must be pointed out however that there were exceptions and contradictions to the rule - for instance Ian in Dock Side was quite well-liked even though he was not high on the 'football and cowboy and indian' stakes. Similarly in Applegate, where the notions of 'masculinity' did not necessarily include overt acts of aggressiveness. Robert managed to survive and keep an admiring entourage around him despite the fact that he deviated both from the school's norms and peer group norms of acceptable levels of 'masculinity'!

Essentially gender was a category which defined behaviour as 'appropriate' or 'inappropriate' to the members of groups, and this contributed to a pupil's acceptance or rejection by the peer group. Conformity and deviation varied within the school (or group) as it did between the schools, with social class being an important factor behind these variations.

Teachers' Problems, Differences and Perspectives

It has been shown that teachers attempt to establish their authority through an ordered set of routines and procedures which assist them in 'coping' with the large number of children in their classes. Such authority, routines and procedures are negotiated not only on the basis of the age and social class of the pupils, but also on the basis of gender, and this reflects attitudes and divisions within society as a whole.

Most of the teachers accept the 'child-centred' ideology of English primary education, and rather than perceive any 'inadequacies' (either of the school or their pupils) as being consequences of wider political implications, they laid such inadequacies at 'the door' of the parents and the 'short-comings' of the pupils' home background. This confirms both King's (1978) study and Sharp & Green's (1975).

In response to the contradictions which they face between their theoretically-derived ideals and the practical difficulties of putting them into operation, the teachers use a variety of 'coping strategies' and these have the effect of reinforcing the already-existing stratifications of gender and class. These consequences are compounded by their own expectations of the 'ideal' and 'normal' pupil (either girl or boy), of appropriate gender behaviour, and of the actual and perceived levels of achievement among the children.

The image of the 'ideal pupil' is itself influenced by conceptions of gender. In general, the 'ideal pupil' is one who conforms to the teachers' demands, and who is 'bright' and 'co-operative'. Quite clearly, in all the four schools, it was girls who better fitted this notion overall. Their ability to get on in school and to be easily integrated into the authority-

structure and routine of the school would mean that teachers tend to spend more time and energy on the boys. Despite the nonconformity of the boys (as pupils) to teachers' demands in class, the former are still high in the teachers' esteem as their behaviour 'conforms' to the ideal of 'normal' boys. In effect, what exists are two ideals of pupil conformity; one for girls and one for boys.

The expressed practices and items of the teachers are a function of the constraints, both ideological and material, with which they are faced and in no way offer any effective challenge to the gender-power relationships which constitute patriarchy. Whilst on the one hand they denied differentiating their pupils by gender, on the other they justified such practices, insisting that on many occasions the children themselves warranted such treatment i.e. in that boys were disruptive, needed more attention and were, in fact, 'more imaginative'.

The discussion of coping strategies needs to be related to the position of primary teachers as women. As such, they disproportionately occupy the base of the educational pyramid. They also have to manage the double load involved in being a wife and/or mother as well as teacher and to prove that they can perform both jobs competently. The overall pressure to be proficient in all aspects of their lives was felt by most of the teachers, who worked out 'patterns' and rigid routines in their attempts to "fit everything in" and "get everything done". They felt they had to justify themselves and offer excuses as to why they couldn't excel at being both the 'perfect' wife and the 'perfect' teacher. These pressures tend to make women more uncertain of their competence and thus reinforce their tendency to resort to coping strategies which appear, at least in

the case of gender differentiation, to stand in contradiction to their own position and interests.

The contradictions present in the position of women teachers are also present in their attitudes towards the mothers of their pupils in the working-class schools. Although female teachers and mothers of pupils have common experiences of patriarchal control, and although they share conventional notions of motherhood, this does not unite them but serves to distance and separate them in many respects. As pointed out earlier, the notion of the 'ideal mother' or/and the 'ideal family' was particularly widespread among the teachers, and in some cases they saw mothers 'falling short' of their duty in that they 'failed' to duly present their child/ren to school in a 'befitting manner' and 'well prepared' for classroom life. This impression was given in both Dock Side and Long Meadow. So failure to achieve is usually attributed to the family situation and made the responsibility of the mother, particularly if she works outside the home, is separated or having any problems. So even though many of the women teachers have the responsibility of young families (as well as husbands) to see to upon returning home in the evening, this does not make them any more sympathetic than the men towards the problems faced by the mothers who try to combine paid work and child-rearing. Such a stance may, in part, be regarded as a 'coping strategy' since they cannot allow the demands of the school to impinge too much upon their home-life and upon their 'duties' as wives and mothers and vice-versa.

In the interaction between the teacher and pupils, the gender of the teacher and the age of the pupils was an important variable. The male teachers in all the schools tended to encourage solidarity between the

boys and themselves. They interacted with the boys on the basis of shared 'masculine' understandings. This form of 'solidarity' marginalises the girls; it excludes them from sharing in what are seen as certain prestigious areas. This 'group' formation reinforces the divisions between the girls and boys that already exist. It is not that sex differences abound but that gender is made a salient feature in the mediating nature of groups and situations.

Discussion

This thesis has attempted to understand the ways in which girls are 'prepared' and coerced into the dominant/subordinate relationship of men over women, by investigating the process of gender construction within the institution of the primary school, and by exploring variations in the construction of gender identities.

The findings of this thesis confirm much existing feminist research as well as, it is hoped, extending it. Before discussing some of the general analytical issues arising out of the investigation, it is worth commenting on the continuities and discontinuities with certain specific areas of previous research. The existence of patriarchal structures within staff hierarchies has been solidly documented together with the ways in which it transmits powerful messages about male dominance (MacDonald, 1980; Spender & Sarah, 1980; Deem, 1978). MacDonald (1980) in particular, has analysed this positional imbalance in the internal organisation of schools and has shown how it replicates the broad power positions between men and women which characterise the family and work-place. However, few studies have actually asked women teachers about their own social reality of their lives. Discussing women's relative lack of powerlessness within one

institution, on a quantifiable level (i.e. Byrne, 1978; Deem, 1978) needs to be supplemented by experiential data. While this issue was only a subsidiary part of the present research, I hope that I have indicated the importance of incorporating a consideration of the perception of teachers' role within the classroom and of the effects of the double work-load into a discussion of the practices of women teachers.

The sex-specificity of certain subjects and lesson content has been well documented (Lobban, 1977, 1978; Byrne, 1978; Deem, 1978) and it has been suggested that this produces a gender fragmentation of knowledge (MacDonald, 1980; Payne, 1980) whereby explicit ideas about the 'appropriate' knowledge and skills for either girls or boys are transmitted to the pupils, as well as how they learn such knowledge and skills (Wolpe, 1977). The class relation interwoven with such a fragmentation of knowledge and how this reproduces the "sexual division of labour" has been given particular emphasis (MacDonald, 1980) in relation to both the world of work and institution of the family.

The power of men, however, cannot be understood merely in terms of separate institutions but must be seen more broadly in terms of the social relationship of patriarchy, which is exercised through particular institutional arrangements at a given time, but is not to be understood totally in terms of those arrangements.

Organisation of the school and classroom in terms of segregation by gender has been a common feature of Western education (i.e. Sadker & Frazier, 1973; Belotti, 1975; Lobban, 1975), and we have many descriptive accounts of the processes that differentiate children on the basis of gender. But

these descriptive accounts have failed to incorporate the forms of social interaction and analysis of the basis of power, and how patriarchal authority is mediated at an interpersonal level.

Previous studies of teacher-pupil interaction have shown how pupils are differentiated on the basis of class (i.e. Bernstein, 1975; Sharp & Green, 1975; Sieber, 1976), on the basis of race (Rist, 1970; McDermott, 1974) and on the basis of gender (Lobban, 1978; Byrne, 1978; Deem, 1978). But apart from the theoretical work of MacDonald (1980) and David (1980), and the studies of girls' subculture (Llewellyn, 1980; McRobbie & Garber, 1976) there has been little attempt to integrate analysis of the different forms of social division and to study the relationship between them.

The works of Eileen Byrne (1978) and Rosemary Deem (1978) though drawing together various analyses, are examples of a wider failure to come to terms with some of the major issues in the process of the formation of patriarchal structures, and thus do not really engage with the ways in which schooling transmits the gender structure of power relations through which individuals' gender identity and power positions, whether dominant or subordinate, are constructed. This study has tried to explore some (if not all) of the divergent forms of girls' education found within the primary school, particularly those associated with class and community differences.

I have tried to relate the forms of girls' education not just to women's labour within the labour market, and the patriarchal structures therein, a link explored effectively by MacDonald (1980), nor just to the position of women within the family, but to their social relationships with men in

general, viz. to patriarchy, hence the descriptive analysis of women's lives within the different catchment areas.

By trying to use a wider frame of reference than either mainstream sociology or traditional Marxism we may be able to identify the links between the differing 'worlds' of men and women, which dictate not merely the sort of jobs which women are likely to find themselves in, but their attitudes and expectations to life in general, and how the basis of the power relation between men and women is constructed, reinforced and transmitted within schools.

Within Marxism, the focus has been on women's relation to the means of production only, rather than their position and relation to patriarchy as a whole. In exploring the varying patterns of teacher-pupil relations on a gender and class basis, as well as the form and structure of the actual schools, we can, in some way, assess the differing types of educational provision for both girls and boys. Traditional Marxist theoreticians of education (i.e. Bowles & Gintis, 1976) place overt emphasis on the reproduction of the social relations of production which is realised through their presence in synonymous (equivalent) structures in the social relations of schooling. Their emphasis on the form of socialisation, rather than focussing on ideology, is one of experience of the social relations and authority structures of schooling which mirror those to be found in the occupational work structures. Whilst one would agree that the hierarchy of teacher-pupil relations in many instances typifies the authority structure of overseer/manager over worker and the forms of control in such a relation, Bowles and Gintis fail to recognise the patriarchal authority structures within such processes, as well as within pupil-pupil relations.

Most studies of gender in the educational system have focussed upon secondary schooling. This piece of research has attempted to throw more light upon the primary school. One conclusion of the study is that though the outcome of the process of gender differentiation may be similar within the secondary and primary school, the form that such processes take differs between the two institutions for a number of reasons.

An illustration of this is the fact that most primary school teachers are female and that primary schools subscribe to the ideology of 'child-centredness'. These two aspects are interconnected with each other, and the presence of so many women within a specific area of education can be seen as reflecting a 'maternal', as opposed to 'paternal' form of authority. It may also be the case, as I have suggested, that the numerical dominance of women is instrumental in the formation of working class boys' attitudes and values to school.

Another significant difference between the primary and secondary schools in the process of gender differentiation is the assumption that all children have access to, and learn exactly the same subjects in primary school (Plowden, 1967). There is recognition that within the secondary school subjects are placed in discrete categories and pupils have to make a choice of these subjects at a specific age. There is likewise recognition that in this process girls are encouraged to take particular kinds of subjects. The researcher has shown that this form of discrimination is different within the primary school and that the process is much more covert.

The work of King (1978) and Hartley (1977) has done much to increase our knowledge of the ideologies of infant education as human products. King

in particular showed how the acceptance of such ideologies constrained teachers and through them the children they taught. But King fails to explore the variations between different schools in the inculcation of gender identification and fails to link those gender inequalities, which he recorded, to society as a whole. The researcher, by attempting to understand gender as part of the social totality, is able to explain why there are different variations in the process of gender differentiation within the social class categories.

Hartley (1977), like King, failed to situated his analysis within the broader context of patriarchal relations. But he has added to our knowledge of the school by focussing on the important role of the head teachers, an insight confirmed by this study.

In existence in the primary schools that I studied was a differential interpretation of the 'competence' of females and males in relation to skills and knowledge. Such a division, which has already been explored by other feminist researchers (MacDonald, 1980; Wolpe, 1977; Payne, 1980), is reminiscent of the class schism which accords high status to 'academic' subjects and knowledge and low status to practical subjects. The researcher has argued that schooling transmits, at the ideological level, not only the mental/manual division of labour but also the gender division within knowledge which is a dimension of gender power relations.

The thesis has shown, on an empirical level, how knowledge and education are gender constructed and produced. This, it is hoped, extends the analyses of those who have 'pioneered' critical study of the control of knowledge (i.e. Young (Ed.) 1971). The exploration of how and in what

situations the phenomenon of gender, in relation to class, is constructed socially, and particularly by those who have power to impose certain labels on others, is intended to take us some way further forward in understanding the relationship between the social distribution of power and the distribution of knowledge.

Finally, there is the concept of patriarchy. The researcher has concentrated on this concept of control in an analysis of the ways in which women experience subordination. Although some writers have argued that it is not suitable to apply the concept of patriarchy to modern capitalist society (see Young & Harris. 1976; Edholm et al., 1977; Cockburn. 1981; Fox-Genovese, 1982) the researcher has called the term into play in an effort to identify the nature of political relations between males and females within a specific institution i.e. the primary school. I have taken the term literally to explore the power relationships between men and women and made it central to the analysis. This helps us to analyse the ways in which educational institutions play their part in perpetuating the dominance of men over women. Men seek to extend their claim on children through strategies of influence and control. The organisation of schooling, the practice of a certain kind of regimented authority, a curricula bestowed from above by superordinate males and the contradictions between the overwhelming presence of women in the classroom and their exclusion from leadership are all part and parcel of the patriarchal institution of the primary school.

To conceptualise the education system in terms of gender-power relationships is by no means to imply that male power is monolithic and all-powerful. For example, two of the head teachers in the sample were female and each

had a strong influence on the character of the school. Again, the girls are not 'passive creatures' who succumb to their fate blindly and without question. The notion of "correspondence" is myopic and omits the possibility of resistance (Grumet, 1981). By doing so it ignores the construction of female identities separate from their ideal expression in the bourgeois male imagination. Through the development of particular kinds of social relations girls adapt to the hostile conditions of patriarchal schooling and indeed may create forms of resistance, most commonly through the adoption of partial and indirect methods of warding off the coercive and degrading conditions which become a pattern of the later years of their schooling. Examples of active group resistance were when some girls acted together to sabotage the flow of work and to challenge particular male 'strongholds' i.e. the four 'Boadiceas' of Applegate and even Kerry in Dock Side. Individual active resistance can be seen in examples of Emma and Helen in Applegate and Long Meadow respectively. These forms of resistance are not all of equal significance, but all challenged the specific notion of what it is to be female. Other girls expressed passive resistance, and appeared to withdraw, to distance themselves from classroom events and the overt masculine challenge that came regularly from the boys.

Mainstream sociology, with its concept of 'socialisation', and the notion of passive transmission which it implies, misses the tension and uncertainties of this process. Similarly, traditional Marxism with its deterministic 'cause and effect' approach omits those essential features wherein lies struggle. It is not simply that women pass on their disadvantages timelessly and unbreakably to succeeding generations through ineluctable laws of 'socialisation'. Patriarchy does not imply thoroughly effective

domination of the subordinated class; permanent struggle exists.

The issues discussed in this thesis raise the question of how changes can be brought about and of the responsibility of teachers themselves in the perpetuation of gender-power relations. How far can teachers be expected to alter their practices without wider changes in educational structures and perhaps in wider social processes? How far are they limited by structural constraints?

Firstly I would suggest that it is important for teachers to become more self-conscious of what is taking place. They must realise the connection between their classroom practices and the perpetuation of particular sets of power relationships. They must come to see that the use of gender identity within the classroom to solve short-term problems and uncertainties leads, in the long term, to a consolidation of differentiated gender and unequal power relationships. This is particularly relevant to female teachers as the processes in question form a part of the reproduction of their own entrapment.

Before teachers can enter into any direct struggle for change, however, they must recognise more fully their own position in a wider set of power relations. On the one hand, teachers have a relatively subordinate position within the educational system (and this is particularly true for primary school teachers) and their inability to exercise any real influence over either educational policies or the wider conditions under which they work leads them to accept many parameters of the teaching situation as given.

Within the classroom, however, teachers have considerable power over the

lives of their pupils. In examining this, the interrelationship of patriarchal and class domination must be confronted. The ways in which teachers form a link in the reproduction of class inequalities has been well-established by previous research, but it is important to reiterate its significance for the reproduction of gender power-relationships. In the working class schools the treatment of girls is strongly affected by the perceptions that teachers have of the nature of working-class behaviour. In the middle-class schools the attitudes towards gender relationships is influenced by the nature of middle-class life styles which structure women's position. To say this is not to underplay the significance of patriarchy but to recognise that patriarchy does not operate in isolation from other power relationships but is intertwined with them.

In the first place, then, teachers should explore alternative methods of classroom management to those based upon gender divisions and should try to eliminate their negative responses to actions from pupils which transgress their conceptions of appropriate gender behaviour. Some progress in this direction can be made within the existing educational structures but for it to be fully effective teachers must engage with the full range of inequalities and power relations within the educational system.

Appendix

Questionnaire

1. a] Name of Interviewee
 b] Name of Interviewer
 c] Date of Interview
 d] School
2. a] Date of birth
 b] Place of birth
3. a] Do you have parents who teach?
 b] If not, what do they do?
4. a] When did you qualify as a teacher?
 b] Where did you qualify?
 c] What are your specialist subjects?
5. How did you qualify?
 a] Diploma
 b] Degree only
 c] Degree and Graduate Certificate of Education
 d] Any other
6. a] What made you decide to become a teacher?
 b] Why did you choose teaching as a profession?
 c] What other opportunities were available at the time?
 d] What was your secondary choice for a career?
7. a] Has your profession always been teaching?
 b] If not what was your occupation before then?
8. How long have you been teaching at this school?
9. If you have taught in other schools what kind of schools were they
 in comparison to the one you teach in now in relation to:

 a] size
 b] catchment area
 c] social class
10. What sort of school, in which you teach now, would you say
 you were in relation to:

 a] size
 b] catchment area
 c] social class
11. What is your marital status:
 a] married
 b] married with children
 c] single
 d] single with children
 e] divorced
 f] separated

12. Number of children
 1st child
 2nd child
 3rd child
 4th child
-
13. At what age did you marry?
14. What is your partner's occupation?
15. Are your children
 - a] at home
 - b] at school
 - c] working
16. a] Have you ever had to retire from teaching for any length of time?
 b] If so, for how long and for what reason?
17. If you have a family how does your teaching career fit in with the overall scheme of things?
18. a] Do you have much leisure time?
 b] Do you teach at night school?
 c] Do you find you have time for hobbies?
 d] What are they?
19. Would you say that you looked upon your career in teaching as a profession or vocation?
20. Do you find it difficult to meet your domestic obligations along with a full-time career?
21. What is the level of your partner's involvement with housework?
22. What kind of problems do you find exist in both being a parent and a teacher?
23. Would you prefer to teach part-time or full-time?
24. It is sometimes argued that parents make better teachers or that the experience of parenthood makes for a better teacher.
Do you
 - a] strongly agree
 - b] agree
 - c] undecided
 - d] disagree
 - e] strongly disagree
 - f] why?
25. Do you view your own child or children in the same light as you do the children you teach?
 - a] yes
 - b] no
 - c] why?
26. What do you think the schools in this country are officially expected to do
27. Do you think the aims of the Education System are the same for both girls and boys?

- a] strongly agree
- b] agree
- c] undecided
- d] disagree
- e] strongly disagree
- f] why?

28. Do you think the aims of the Education system should be the same for both girls and boys?

- a] strongly agree
- b] agree
- c] undecided
- d] disagree
- e] strongly disagree
- f] why?

29. Have you noticed many changes, very few or none at all in the way that children learn or in the way that they behave from when you first started teaching?

30. With certain changes within the education system over the past two decades i.e. abolition of the 11+, the rise of the comprehensive system, and the introduction of the sex equality act, have you noticed many changes in the way that children learn or behave?

31. What differences, if any, do you find exist among the children say for example, between girls and boys? Do they behave differently in anyway i.e. towards each other and towards certain activities?

32. Do you think there are any inborn personality differences, other than biological, between males and females?

33. Do you find yourself behaving accordingly towards your pupils in order to compensate for these differences?

34. Do you think boys and girls respond differently to your particular subject?

35. Do you enjoy teaching?

36. As a teacher of young children what do you regard as your most important function?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABERLE, David F. and NAEGELE, Kaspar D. 1952: "Middle-Class Fathers' Occupational Role and Attitudes toward children", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 22, April, pp.366-378.
- ACKER, Joan, 1973: "Women and social stratification: a case of intellectual sexism", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78, pp.936-945.
- ACKER, Sandra, 1981: "No Woman's-Land: British Sociology of Education", Sociological Review, Vol. 29, No.1, pp.77-104.
- ALTHUSSER, Louis, 1971: "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays, New Left Books, London.
- ARENSBERG, C.M. 1939: The Irish Countryman: An Anthropological Study, MacMillan, New York.
- ASHBY, M.K. 1929: The Country School: Its Practice and Problems, Oxford University Press.
- ASHER, S.R. and GOTTMAN, J.M. 1973: "Sex of Teacher and Student Reading Achievement", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 65, pp. 168-171.
- BANKS, Olive, 1971: The Sociology of Education, B.T. Batsford.
- BARRETT, Michelle, 1980: Women's Oppression Today, Verso, London.
- BARRON, R.D. & NORRIS, G.M., 1976: "Sexual Divisions and the dual labour market", Diana Leonard-Barker & Sheila Allen (Eds.) Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, Longman, London
- BARRY, K., 1979: Sexual Slavery, Avon Books, New York.
- BARSTOW, Stan, 1962: A Kind of Loving, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- BECKER, Howard, S., 1952: "Social Class Variations in Teacher-Pupil Relationships", Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 25, No. 8, pp. 451-465.
- _____, 1958: "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation", American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, pp. 652-660.

- BECKER, Howard, S. GEER, Blanche, HUGHES Everett C., & STRAUSS, Anselm L.,
1961: Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School,
University of Chicago Press.
- _____ 1971: "Problems in the publication of field studies" in Arthur J.
Vidich, Joseph Bensman and Maurice R. Stein (Eds.)
Reflections on Community Studies, Harper Torch Books, New York.
- BEECHEY, Veronica, 1979: "On Patriarchy", Feminist Review, Vol. 3, pp.66-82.
- BEEZ, W.V., 1970: "Influence of Biased Psychological Reports on Teacher
Behaviour and Pupil Performance" in M.B.Miles and W.W.Charters
(Eds.) Learning in Social Settings, Allyn & Bacon, Mass.
- BELL, Colin, 1968: Middle Class Families, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- BELL, Colin and NEWBY, Howard, (Eds.) 1974: The Sociology of the Community,
Frank Cass & Co., London.
- BELOTTI, Elena G., 1975: Little Girls, Writers and Readers Publishing
Co-operative, London.
- BENNETT, S.N. and JORDAN, J., 1975: "A Typology of Teaching Styles in
Primary Schools", British Journal of Educational Psychology,
Vol. 45, pp. 20-28.
- BENSTON, Margaret, 1969: "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation",
Monthly Review, 21 (4).
- BERG, Leila, 1968: Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School, Penguin,
Harmondsworth.
- BERLAK, H., and BERLAK, A. 1976: "Towards a political and social psychological
theory of schooling", Interchange, Vol. 6, No.3, pp. 11-22.
- _____ 1981: The Dilemmas of Schooling, Methuen, London.
- BERNBAUM, Gerald, 1977: Knowledge and Ideology in the Sociology of Education,
MacMillan, London.
- BERNSTEIN, Basil, 1961: "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory
of Social Learning" in A.H. Halsey, Jean Floud and C. Arnold

Anderson (Eds.), Education, Economy and Society, Free Press, New York.

- _____ 1964: "Elaborated and Restricted Codes", American Anthropologist, Vol. 66, No. 6, pp. 55-69.
- _____ 1971: Class, Codes and Control, Vol. I, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London
- _____ 1975: Class, Codes and Control, Vol. III, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- _____ 1975a: "Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible" in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. III, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London
- _____ 1975b: "Ritual in Education" in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. III, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- _____ 1975c: "Open Schools - Open Society?" in Class, Codes and Control, Vol. III, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- BETTS, George, Herbert, 1913: New Ideals in Rural Schools, Houghton & Mifflin, Boston, Mass.
- BILLER, H.B. & BORSTELMAN, L.J., 1967: "Masculine Development and integrative review", Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Vol. 13, pp. 253-294.
- BLACKSTONE, Tessa, 1976: "The Education of Girls Today" in Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley (Eds.), The Rights and Wrongs of Women, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- BLAND, Lucy, BRUNDSON, Charlotte, HOBSON, Dorothy and WINSHIP, Janice, 1978: "Women 'inside and outside' the relations of production" in Women's Studies Group, C.C.C.S. Women Take Issue, Hutchinson, London.
- BLOM, G.E., 1971: "Sex Differences in Reading Disability" quoted in S.G. Zimet, 1976: Print and Prejudice, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- BLYTH, W.A.L. 1965: English Primary Education, 2 vols. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

BLYTHE, Ronald, 1969: Akenfield: Portrait of an English Village, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, 1905: Reports on Children under Five Years of Age in Public Elementary Schools.

BOTT, Elizabeth, 1971: Family and Social Network, Tavistock, London.

BOURDIEU, Pierre, 1971: "Systems of Education and Systems of Thought" in Michael F.D. Young (Ed.) Knowledge and Control, MacMillan, London.

BOURDIEU, Pierre, 1977: "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction in J. Karabel & A.H. Halsey (Eds.) Power and Ideology in Education, Oxford University Press.

BOWLES, Samuel and GINTIS, Herbert, 1972: "I.Q. in the U.S. class structure", Social Policy, Vol. 3, pp. 65-96.

_____ 1976: Schooling in Capitalist America, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

BRANDIS, Walter and BERNSTEIN, Basil, 1974: Selection and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

BROPHY, J.E. and GOODE, T.L. 1970: "Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: some behavioural data", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 61 (5), pp. 365-74.

BROVERMAN, D.M., KLAIBER, E.L., KOBAYASHI, Y. and VOGEL, W., 1968: "Roles of activation and inhibition in sex differences in cognitive abilities", Psychology Review, Vol. 75, pp. 25-50.

BYRNE, Eileen, 1975: "Inequality in Education - Discriminal Resource Allocation in Schools?" Educational Review, Vol. 27, No.3, pp. 179-191.

_____ 1978: Women and Education, Tavistock, London.

CENTRAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE, 1967: Children and their Primary Schools, H.M.S.O., London.

- CHAMBERLAIN, Mary, 1975: Fenwomen: A Portrait of Women in an English Village.
Virago, London.
- CHANCE, M., 1967: "Attention Structure as the Basis of Primate Rank Orders",
Man (N.S.), Vol. 2 (4), pp. 503-518.
- CHETWYND, Jane, & HARTNETT, Oonagh (Eds.), 1978: The Sex Role System:
Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan
Paul, London.
- CHILDREN'S RIGHTS WORKSHOP, 1976: Sexism in Children's Books: Facts, Figures
and Guidelines, Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative,
London.
- CHINOY, Ely, 1955: Automobile Workers and the American Dream, Doubleday,
New York.
- CLARK, Burton, R., 1960: "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education",
American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 65, pp. 569-576.
- CLARKE, John, 1973: "The Skinheads and the study of youth culture", CCCS
Occasional Papers, No. 23, Birmingham University.
- COCKBURN, C., 1981: "The Material of Male Power", Feminist Review, No. 9,
pp. 41-58.
- COHEN, G. 1977: "Absentee husbands in spiralist families", Journal of
Marriage and the Family, Vol. 39, pp. 595-604.
- COLLINS, Randall, 1975: Conflict Sociology: Towards an Explanatory Science,
Academic Press Inc., New York.
- COLLINS, Randall, 1977: "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational
Stratification" in J. Karabel & A.H. Halsey (Eds.) Power and
Ideology in Education, Oxford University Press.
- COLVARD, Richard, 1967: "Interaction and identification in reporting field
research: A critical reconsideration of protective procedures"
in Gideon Sjoberg (Ed.) Ethics, Politics and Research,
Schenkman, Cambridge.

- CORRIGAN, Paul, 1979: Schooling the Smash Street Kids, MacMillan Press, London.
- CURTIN, Christopher, A. 1978: Family and Land in the West of Ireland, unpublished Ph.D., University of Hull.
- DALE, Roger, 1977: "The Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching" in Dennis Gleeson (Ed.), Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education, Nafferton Books.
- DALLA COSTA, Mariarosa & JAMES, Selma, 1972: The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community, Falling Wall Press.
- DAVID, Miriam, 1977: The State, Education and the Family: An Exploratory Analysis, paper given at the B.S.A., April.
- _____ 1980: The State, Family and Education, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- DAVIE, R., BUTLER, N. and GOLDSTEIN, H., 1972: From Birth to Seven (Report of the National Child Development Study), Longman, London.
- DAVIES, Lynn, 1974: The Contribution of the Secondary School to the Sex Typing of Girls, Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Birmingham.
- DAVIES, Lynn and MEIGHAN, Roland, 1975: "A Review of Schooling and Sex Roles, with Particular Reference to the Experience of Girls in Secondary Schools", Educational Review, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.165-17
- DAVIES, Lynn, 1979: "Deadlier than the Male? Girls' Conformity and Deviance in School" in Len Barton & Roland Meighan (Eds.), Schools, Pupils and Deviance, Nafferton Books.
- DAVIS, A., & HAVIGHURST, R.J., 1946: "Social class and colour differences in child rearing", American Sociological Review, Vol. 11, pp. 698-710.
- DAVIS, Fred, 1960: "Comment on Initial Interaction of Newcomers in Alcoholics Anonymous", Social Problems, Vol. 8, pp. 364-365.

- DAVIS, O.L. and SLOBODIAN, J., 1967: "Teacher Behaviour toward Boys and Girls during First Grade Reading Instruction", American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 4, May, pp. 261-269.
- DEEM, Rosemary, 1978: Women and Schooling, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- _____ (Ed.) 1980: Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London
- DELAMONT, Sara, 1976: Interaction in the Classroom, Methuen, London.
- DELAMONT, Sara & HAMILTON, David, 1976: "Classroom Research: A critique and a new approach" in Michael Stubbs and Sara Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in Classroom Observation, Wiley & Sons, London.
- DELAMONT, Sara, 1978a: "Sociology and the Classroom" in Len Barton and Roland Meighan (Eds.) Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal, Nafferton Books.
- _____ 1978b: "The Double Conformity Trap: The Contradiction in Ladies' Education" in Sara Delamont and Lorna Duffin (Eds.) The Nineteenth Century Woman, Her Cultural and Physical World, Croom Helm, London.
- _____ 1980: Sex Roles and the School, Methuen, London.
- DELPHY, Christine, 1977: The Main Enemy, Women's Research and Resources Centre, London.
- _____ 1981: "Women in stratification studies" in Helen Roberts (Ed.), Doing Feminist Research, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- DENNIS, Norman, HENRIQUES, Fernando and SLAUGHTER, Clifford, 1969: Coal is our Life, Harper and Row, New York.
- DENZIN, N.K. (Ed.), 1970: Sociological Methods: A Source Book, Butterworth, London.
- DEUTSCH, M. 1963: "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process" in A. Passow (Ed.), Education in Depressed Areas, Teachers' College Press, London.

- DEXTER, L.A., 1956: "Role Relationships and Conceptions of Neutrality in Interviewing", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXIV, pp. 153-7.
- DIXON, Bob, 1977: Catching them Young: Sex, Race and Class in Children's Fiction, 2 vols. Pluto, London.
- DOUGLAS, J.W.B., 1964: Home and the School, MacGibbon & Kee, London.
- DREEBEN, Robert, 1970: The Nature of Teaching: Schools and the Work of Teachers, Scott-Ferguson, Illinois.
- _____ 1973: "The School as a Workplace" in N.L. Gage (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Rand McNally, Chicago.
- DURANT, Ruth, 1939: Watling: A Survey of Social Life on a New Housing Estate, P.S. King & Son, London.
- DURKHEIM, Emile, 1966: Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education, translated by E.K. Wilson and H. Schnurer, Free Press, New York.
- DWORKIN, Andrea, 1981: Pornography: Men Possessing Women, The Women's Press, London.
- EDGEELL, Stephen, 1980: Middle Class Couples: A Study of Segregation, Domination and Inequality in Marriage, George Allen & Unwin, London.
- EDHOLM, F., HARRIS, O., and YOUNG, K., 1977: "Conceptualising Women", Critique of Anthropology, Vol. 3, No. 9/10.
- EGGLESTON, S.J. (Ed.), 1974: Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education, Methuen, London.
- EGGLESTON, John, 1977: The Ecology of the School, Methuen, London.
- EISENSTEIN, Zillah, 1979: "Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy" in Zillah Eisenstein (Ed.) Capitalism, Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism, Monthly Review Press, New York.

- ELIAS, N. & SCOTSON, J.L., 1974: "Cohesion, Conflict and Community Study" in Colin Bell and Howard Newby (Eds.), The Sociology of the Community, Frank Cass & Co., London.
- ELDRIDGE, E.T. (Ed.), 1971: Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality, Thos. Nelson & Sons Ltd., London.
- ELLIS, Terry, HADDOW, Brian, McWHIRTER, Jackie & McCOLGAN, Dorothy, 1976: William Tyndale: The Teachers' Story, Writers & Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
- ENTWISTLE, D., 1971: "Implications of Language, Socialisation for Reading Models and for Learning to Read", Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 111-167.
- ENTWISTLE, N.J. & NISBET, J.D., 1972: Educational Research in Action, University of London Press.
- ERBEN, Michael and GLEESON, Dennis, 1977: "Education as reproduction: A critical examination of some aspects of the work of Louis Althusser" in G. Whitty and M. Young (Eds.), Society, State and Schooling, Falmer Press, Sussex.
- ERIKSON, Kai T., 1967: "A comment on disguised interaction in Sociology", Social Problems, Vol. 14, pp. 366-373.
- EVANS, Kate, 1974: "The Spatial Organisation of Infants' Schools", Journal of Architecture, Research and Teaching, Vol. 3, pp. 26-33.
- EVANS, Terry, 1979: "Creativity, Sex-Role Socialisation and Pupil-Teacher Interactions in Early Schooling", Sociological Review, Vol. 27, pp. 139-155.
- FAGOT, B.I. and LITTMAN, J., 1975: "Stability of sex-role and play interests from pre-school to elementary school", Journal of Psychology, Vol. 89, pp. 285-292.
- FANTINI, M.D. and WEINSTEIN, G. 1968: The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education, Harper and Row, New York.

- FEINMAN, S., 1974: "Approval of Cross-sex-role behaviour", Psychology Reports, Vol. 35, pp. 643-648.
- FENNEMA, Elizabeth, 1976: "Women and Girls in Public Schools: Defeat or Liberation?" in Joan Roberts (Ed.), Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A New Reality, David McKay, New York.
- FESHBACH, N.D., 1969: "Student teacher preference for elementary school pupils varying in personality characteristics", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 126-132.
- FICHTER, Joseph H. & KOLB, William F., 1953: "Ethical Limitations on Sociological Reporting", American Sociological Review, Vol. 18, pp. 455-550.
- FIRESTONE, Shulamith, 1971: Dialectics of Sex, Jonathan Cape, London.
- FITZPATRICK, Marion G., 1917: The Rural School from Within, J.B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.
- FLETCHER, Ronald, 1966: The Family and Marriage, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- FLOUD, J.E., HALSEY, A.H. & MARTIN, F.M., 1956: Social Class and Educational Opportunity, Heinemann, London.
- FLOUD, J.E. and HALSEY, A.H., 1958: "The Sociology of Education: A Trend Report and Bibliography", Current Sociology, Vol. 7, No.3, pp. 165-253.
- FOX-GENOVESE, Elizabeth, 1982: "Placing Women's History in History", New Left Review, 133, May-June.
- FRANKENBERG, Ronald, 1957: Village on the Border, Cohen and West, London.
- _____ 1966: Communities in Britain, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- FRAZIER, N. and SADKER, Myra, 1973: Sexism in School and Society, Harper and Row, New York.
- FREIRE, Paulo, 1972: Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- FREMLIN, C. 1979: "Walking in London at night", New Society, April.

- FRIEDAN, Betty, 1963: The Feminine Mystique, Victor Gollancz, London.
- FRIEDMAN, Scarlet, 1982: The Marxist Paradigm: Radical Feminist Theorists Compared. B.S.A. Manchester, April.
- FULLER, Mary, 1980: "Black Girls in a London Comprehensive School" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.) Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- FULTON, Philip, N., 1975: "Setting of Social Contact and Status Advancement through Marriage: A Study of Rural Women", Rural Sociology, Vol. 40, No.1, pp. 45-54.
- GABRIEL, J., 1957: Emotional Problems of the Teacher in the Classroom, Cheshire, Melbourne.
- GANS, Herbert, J., 1962: The Urban Villagers, Free Press, New York.
- _____ 1968: "The Participant-observer as a human being: Observations on the personal aspects of fieldwork", in Howard S. Becker et al. (Eds.), Institutions and the Person, Aldine, New York.
- GARDINER, Jean, 1976: "Political Economy of Domestic Labour in Capitalist Society" in Diana Leonard-Barker and Sheila Allen (Eds.), Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, Longman, London.
- GARDINER, Jean, HIMMELWEIT, S., and MACKINTOSH, M., 1980: "Women's Domestic Labour" in Ellen Malos, The Politics of Housework, Allison & Busby, London.
- GARFINKEL, H., 1956: "Some Sociological Concepts and Methods for Psychiatrists" Psychiatric Research Reports, Vol. 6, pp. 181-196.
- GARNER, J., 1972: "Some aspects of behaviour in infant classrooms", Research in Education, Vol. 7, pp. 28-47.
- GAVRON, Hannah, 1966: The Captive Wife, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- GERTH, H. and WRIGHT-MILLS, C. (Eds.), 1970: From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, Oxford University Press.

- GILLESPIE, Dorothy, 1972: "Who has the Power? The Marital Struggle".
H.P. Dreitzel (Ed.), Family, Marriage and the Struggle
of the Sexes, Collier-McMillan, London.
- GLAZER, Myron, 1972: The Research Adventure: Promise and Problems of
Fieldwork, Random House, New York.
- GLUCKMAN, M., 1955: Custom and Conflict in Africa, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- GOFFMAN, Erving, 1961: Asylums, Anchor, New York.
- GOLD, Raymond, L., 1958: "Roles in Sociological Field Observations",
Social Forces, Vol. 36, pp. 217-223.
- GOLDMAN, Joan, M., 1957: The School in our Village, B.T. Batsford, London.
- GOOD, T.L., SIKES, N.J. and BROPHY, J.E., 1973: "Effects of teacher sex
and pupil sex on classroom interaction", Journal of Educational
Psychology, Vol. 65 (1), pp. 74-87.
- GOODE, W.J. & HATT, P.K., 1952: Methods in Social Research, McGraw Hill,
New York.
- GOODMAN, Paul, 1971: Compulsory Miseducation, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- GOTTLIEB, David, 1963: "Regional Differences as a Variable in Sociological
Research", Social Problems, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 251-256.
- GOULDNER, Alvin, W., 1962: "Anti-Minotaur: The Myth of a Value-Free
Sociology", Social Problems, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 199-213.
- GRACE, Gerald, 1972: Role Conflict and the Teacher, Routledge & Kegan Paul,
London.
- _____ 1978: Teachers, Ideology and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio, 1971: Selections from Prison Notebooks, Lawrence &
Wishart, London.
- GREER, GERMAINE, 1971: The Female Eunuch, Paladin, London.
- GRETTON, John and JACKSON, Mark, 1976: William Tyndale: Collapse of a school
or a System, Allen & Unwin, London.

- GRUMET, Madeleine, 1981: "Pedagogy for Patriarchy: The Feminisation of Teaching", Interchange, Vol. 12, Nos. 2/3, pp. 165-184.
- HALL, Stuart and JEFFERSON, Tony (Eds.), 1976: Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain, Hutchinson, London.
- HALSEY, A.H. (Ed.), 1961: Ability and Educational Opportunity, O.E.C.D.
- HALSEY, A.H., FLOUD, J. & ANDERSON, C.A., (Eds.), 1961: Education, Economy and Society, Free Press, New York.
- HAMMERSLEY, Michael, 1979: "Towards a model of teacher activity", John Eggleston (Ed.), Teacher Decision Making in the Classroom, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- HANNERZ, Ulf, 1979: Soulside: Inquiries into ghetto culture and community, Columbia University Press.
- HARGREAVES, Andy, 1978: "The Significance of Classroom Coping Strategies" in Len Barton & Roland Meighan (Eds.), Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal, Nafferton Books.
- HARGREAVES, David, 1967: Social Relations in a Secondary School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- HARRELL-BOND, Barbara, 1976: "Studying Elites: Some special problems" in Michael A. Rynkiewicz & James Spradley (Eds.), Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork, John Wiley, New York.
- HARTLEY, David, 1977: Some Consequences of Teachers' Definitions of Boys and Girls in Two Infant Schools, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Exeter.
- HARTLEY, Ruth E., 1959: "Sex Role Pressures and the Socialisation of the Male Child" in Psychology Reports, Vol. 5, pp. 457-468.
- HARTMANN, Heidi, 1976: "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex", Signs, Vol. I, No.3, pp. 137-169.

- HARTMANN, Heidi, 1981: "The unhappy marriage of marxism and feminism: towards a more progressive union" in L. Sargent (Ed.), The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism, Pluto Press, London.
- HEIDER, Fritz, 1944: "Social Perception and Phenomenal Causality", Psychological Review, Vol. 51, pp. 358-374.
- HENLEY, Nancy, 1977: Body Politics: Power, Sex and Nonverbal Communication, Prentice-Hall, N.J.
- HENRY, Jules, 1973: Culture against Man, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- HIMMELWEIT, S. and MOHUN, S., 1977: "Domestic Labour and Capital", Cambridge Journal of Economics, Vol. 1, pp. 15-31.
- HOGGART, Richard, 1957: The Uses of Literacy, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- HOLT, John, 1974: The Underachieving School, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- HOLTER, H., 1970: Sex Roles and the Social Structure, Universitet-Forlaget, Oslo.
- HORNER, Matina, 1974: "Towards an understanding of Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women" in J. Stacey, S. Bereand and J. Daniels (Eds.), And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education, Dell, New York.
- HOROBIN, G.W., 1957: "Community and Occupation in the Hull Fishing Industry", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 8, pp. 343-356.
- HUMPREYS, Laud, 1970: Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places, Aldine, Chicago.
- HUNT, Audrey, 1968: A Survey of Women's Employment, Government Social Survey, Vols. I & II, H.M.S.O., London.
- HURSTFIELD, J., 1978: The Part Time Trap, Low Pay Unit, London.
- HYMAN, H.H., 1954: "The Value System of Different Classes" in R. Bendix and S. Lipset (Eds.), Class, Status and Power, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

- ILLICH, Ivan, 1971: Deschooling Society, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- INGLEBY, J.D. and COOPER, E., 1974: "How Teachers perceive first year schoolchildren", Sociology, Vol. 8 (3), pp. 463-473.
- INGLIS, Kate, F., 1974: House Form, Family Structure and the Agents of House Provision: A Perspective. Unpublished B.A. dissertation, University of Hull.
- JACKSON, Brian and MARSDEN, Dennis, 1962: Education and the Working Class, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- JACKSON, Brian, 1964: Streaming: An Education System in Miniature, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- _____, 1968: Working Class Community, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- JACKSON, Phil. W. and LAHADERNE, Henriette, 1967: "Inequalities of teacher-pupil contacts", Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 4, pp. 204-211.
- JACKSON, Phil. W., 1968: Life in Classrooms, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- JACKSON, Stevi, 1982: "Femininity, Masculinity and Sexuality" in Scarlet Friedman and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), The Problem of Men, The Women's Press, London.
- JOLL, C., 1976: "Teachers' Pay", Women and Education, No. 10, pp. 8-9.
- JONES, Jean and BERNSTEIN, Basil, 1974: "The Preparation of the infant-school child" in W. Brandis and B. Bernstein, Selection and Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- JOSHI, Heather, 1978: Secondary Workers in the Cycle: Married women and older workers in employment fluctuations, Great Britain, 1961-1974, D.H.S.S. Government Economic Service Working Paper, No. 8.
- KARABEL, Jerome & HALSEY, A.H. (Eds.), 1977: Power and Ideology in Education, Oxford University Press.

- KEDDIE, Nell, 1971: "Classroom Knowledge" in Michael, F.D. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and Control, Collier-MacMillan, London.
- _____ (Ed.), 1973: Tinker, Tailor ... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- KELMAN, Herbert, G., 1972: "The rights of the subject in social research: An analysis in terms of relative power and legitimacy", American Psychologist, Vol. 27, pp. 989-1016.
- KEMP, L.C.D., 1955: "Environmental and other characteristics determining attainment in primary schools", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 67-77.
- KEMPE, J., 1949: "A pilot survey of Much Marcle", Sociological Review, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 1-35.
- KHLIEF, Bud, B., 1974: "Issues in Anthropological Fieldwork in the Schools" in George D. Spindler (Ed.) Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- KING, Ronald, 1978: All Things Bright and Beautiful? Wiley & Sons, London.
- KIRVAN, Sue and SURINGAR, Moira, 1977: Women, Work and the Family Law and Social Policy, Unpublished M.A. Thesis in Socio-Legal Studies, Sheffield University.
- KITTERINGHAM, Jennie, 1973: Country Girls in 19th Century England. History Workshop Pamphlets, No.11.
- KLEIN, Josephine, 1965: Samples from English cultures, 2 Vols., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- KOHL, Herbert, 1968: 36 Children, Gollancz, London.
- KOMAROVSKY, Mirra, 1946: "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 52 (3), pp. 184-189.
- _____ 1962: Blue Collar Marriages, Random House, New York.

LABOUR RESEARCH, 1982: Working Women in the '80's, pp. 60-71.

LA CAPRA, Dominick, 1972: Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Philosopher,
Cornell University Press.

LACEY, Colin, 1970: Hightown Grammar, Manchester University Press.

_____ 1976: "Problems of Sociological Fieldwork: a review of the method-
ology of 'Hightown Grammar'" in Martin Hammersley & Peter
Woods (Eds.), The Process of Schooling, Routledge & Kegan
Paul, London.

LEACH, Edmund, R., 1961: Rethinking Anthropology, The Athlone Press,
University of London.

LEE, Anne, 1980: "Together we learn to read and write: Sexism and Literacy"
in Dale Spender & Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose,
The Women's Press, London.

LEONARD-BARKER, Diana & ALLEN, Sheila, 1976: Dependence and Exploitation
in Work and Marriage, Longman, London.

LEONARD-BARKER, Diana, 1978: "The Regulation of Marriage: Repressive
Benevolence" in G. Littlejohn et al. (Eds.), Power and the
State, Croom Helm, London.

LEONARD, Diana, 1982: "Male Feminists and Divided Women" in Scarlet
Friedman & Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), On the Problem of Men,
The Women's Press, London.

LEVER, Janet, 1976: "Sex differences in the games children play",
Social Problems, Vol. 23(4), pp. 478-487.

_____ 1978: "Sex differences in the complexity of children's play and games"
American Sociological Review, Vol. 43, pp. 471-483.

LEVITIN, T.E. and CHANANIE, J.D., 1972: "Responses of female primary school
teachers to sex-typed behaviours in male and female children",
Child Development, Vol. 43, pp. 1309-1316.

- LITTLEJOHN, James, 1963: Westrigg: The sociology of a Cheviot Parish, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- LLEWELLYN, Mandy, 1980: "Studying girls at school: The implications of confusion", in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- LLOYD-WRIGHT, Frank, 1941: An Autobiography, Faber and Faber, London.
- LOBBAN, Glenys, 1975: "Sexism in British primary schools", Women Speaking, No. 4, pp. 10-13.
- _____ 1977: "Sexist bias in reading schemes" in M. Hoyles (Ed.) The Politics of Literacy, Writer and Readers Publishing Co-operative, London.
- _____ 1978: "The influence of the school on sex-role stereotyping" in Jane Chetwynd and Oonagh Hartnett (Eds.), The Sex Role System: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- LOO, C. & WENAR, C., 1971: "Activity level and motor inhibition: their relation to intelligence test performance in normal children", Child Development, Vol. 43, pp. 967-971.
- LOWE, G.D. & PEEK, C.W., 1974: "Location and Lifestyle: The comparative explanatory ability of urbanism and rurality", Rural Sociology, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 392-420.
- LOWN, Judy, 1983: "Not so much a factory, more a form of patriarchy: Gender and Class during Industrialisation" in Eva Gamarnikov, David Morgan, June Purvis and Daphne Taylorson (Eds.), Gender, Class and Work, Heinemann, London.
- LUKES, Steven, 1974: Power, a radical view, MacMillan, London.
- MACCOBY, E. and JACKLIN, C. 1974: The Psychology of Sex Differences, Stamford University Press.

- MACDONALD, Madeleine, 1980: "Socio-cultural reproduction and women's education" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- MACKIE, Lindsay and PATULLO, Polly, 1977: Women at Work, Tavistock, London.
- MADGE, John H., 1953: The Tools of Social Science, Longman, London.
- MARCH, L. and ABRAMS, S., 1966: The Education Shop, Advisory Centre for Education.
- MARKS, Pauline, 1976: "Femininity in the classroom: An account of changing attitudes" in Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley (Eds.), The Rights and Wrongs of Women, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- MARTIN, R., 1972: "Student sex behaviour as determinants of the type and frequency of teacher-student contacts", School Psychology, Vol. 10 (4), pp. 339-347.
- MAYER, Philip (Ed.), 1970: Introduction to Socialisation: Approach from Social Anthropology, Tavistock, London.
- MAYS, J.B., 1962: Education and the Urban Child, Liverpool University Press.
- McDERMOTT, R.O., 1974: "Achieving school failure: An anthropological approach to illiteracy and social stratification" in G.D. Spindler (Ed.), Education and Cultural Process: Toward an anthropology of education, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- McDONAUGH, R. and HARRISON, R., 1978: "Patriarchy and Relations of Production" in Annette Kuhn and Anne-Marie Wolpe (Eds.), Feminism and Materialism, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- McINTYRE, D., MORRISON, A. and SUTHERLAND, J., 1966: "Social and educational variables relating to teachers' assessment of primary school pupils", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 36, pp. 272-279.

- McROBBIE, Angela & GARBER, Jenny, 1976: "Girls and Subcultures" in Steven Hall and Tony Jefferson (Eds.), Resistance Through Rituals, Hutchinson, London.
- McROBBIE, Angela, 1978: "Jackie: An Ideology of Adolescent Femininity", Women Series in Cultural Studies, No. 53, CCCS, University of Birmingham.
- MEAD, George, H., 1934: Mind, Self and Society, University of Chicago Press.
- MEYER, W.J. and THOMPSON, G.G., 1956: "Sex differences in the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among sixth-grade children", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 47, pp.385-396
- MIDDLETON, Chris, 1974: "Sexual inequality and stratification theory" in F. Parkin (Ed.), The Social Analysis of Class Structure, Tavistock, London.
- MILLER, G., GALANTERE, E. and PRIBHAM, K., 1960: Plans and the Structure of Behaviour, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- MILLETT, Kate, 1971: Sexual Politics, Rupert-Hart Davis, London.
- MITCHELL, Juliet, 1971: Women's Estate, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- MITCHELL, Juliet, 1974: Psychoanalyses and Feminism, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- MOGEY, J.M., 1956: Family and Neighbourhood, Oxford University Press.
- MOLYNEUX, M., 1979: "Beyond the domestic labour debate", New Left Review, No. 116.
- MOON, G., 1974: Sex role stereotyping in books for young children, Unpublished Dip.Ed. Thesis, University of Bristol.
- MORRISON, A., McINTYRE, D. and SUTHERLAND, J., 1965: "Teachers' personality assessments of primary school pupils", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 306-319.
- MOSER, C.A., 1958: Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Heinemann, London.

- MUNGHAM, Geoff., 1976: "Youth in Pursuit of Itself" in Geoff Mungham and Geoff Pearson (Eds.), Working Class Youth Culture, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- MUSGROVE, F., 1961: "Parents' expectations of the junior school", Sociological Review, Vol. 9, No.2, pp. 167-180.
- MUSGROVE, F., 1963: The Migratory Elite, Heinemann, London.
- MYRDAL, Alva and KLEIN, Viola, 1956: Women's Two Roles: Home and Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- NALSON, J.S., 1968: Mobility of Farm Families, Manchester University Press.
- NASH, Roy, 1973: Classrooms Observed, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- NASH, Roy, 1976: "Pupils' Expectations of their Teachers" in Michael Stubbs and Sara Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in Classroom Observation John Wiley, London.
- NATIONAL UNION OF TEACHERS, 1964: The State of Nursery Education, N.U.T. London
- NEWSON, John & NEWSON, Elizabeth, 1965: Patterns of Infant Care, George Allen & Unwin, London.
- NEWSON, John & NEWSON, Elizabeth, 1968: Four Years Old in an Urban Community. George Allen & Unwin, London.
- _____ 1976: Seven Years Old in the Home Environment, George Allen & Unwin, London.
- _____ 1977: Perspectives on School at Seven Years Old, George Allen & Unwin, London.
- NEWSON, John & NEWSON, Elizabeth.,
- RICHARDSON, Diane and SCAIFE, Joyce, 1978: "Perspectives in Sex-role Stereotyping in adolescence and pre-adolescence" in Jane Chetwynd and Oonagh Hartnett (Eds.), The Sex-role System: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- NISBET, Robert, 1966: The Sociological Tradition, Heinemann, London.

- NORTHERN WOMEN'S EDUCATION STUDY GROUP, 1972: "Sex-role learning: a study of infant readers" in Michelene Wandor (Ed.), The Body Politic, Stage One, London.
- OAKLEY, Ann, 1974: The Sociology of Housework, Martin Robertson, London.
- OAKLEY, Ann, 1981: "Interviewing Women" in Helen Roberts (Ed.) Doing Feminist Research, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- O'BRIEN, M. 1981: The Politics of Reproduction, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- O'NEILL, Norman, 1973: Class and Social Consciousness: Variations in the Social Perspectives of Industrial Workers, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Hull.
- _____ 1982: Fascism and the Working Class, Shakti, Southall.
- OPIE, Iona and OPIE, Peter, 1959: The Lore and Language of Schoolchildren, Oxford University Press.
- PAHL, R.E., 1963: "Education and Social Class in Commuter Villages", Sociological Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 241-246.
- _____ 1965: "Class and Community in English Commuter Villages", Sociologia Ruralis, Vol. 2, pp. 5-21.
- PAHL, J.M. and PAHL, R.E., 1971: Managers and their Wives, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- PARKER, Angela, 1973: Sex Differences in Classroom Intellectual Argumentation unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Pennsylvania State University.
- PARSONS, Talcott, (Ed.), 1954: Essays in Sociological Theory, Free Press, Illinois.
- PARSONS, Talcott and BALES, Robert, F., 1956: Socialisation and the Interaction Process, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- PARSONS, Talcott, 1959: "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 29, pp. 297-318.

- PAYNE, Irene, 1980: "Sexist Ideology and Education" in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, Women's Press, London.
- PEARSON, Geoff & MUNGHAM, Geoff (Eds.), 1976: Working Class Youth Culture Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- PETERS, Richard (Ed.), 1969: Perspectives on Plowden, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- PIACENTE, B.S., DENNER, L.A., HAWKINS, H.L. and COHEN, S.L., 1974: "Evaluation of the performance of experimenters as a function of their sex and competence", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, No. 4, pp. 321-9.
- POLLARD, Andrew, 1982: "A Model of Classroom Coping Strategies", British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 19-37.
- POSTMAN, Neil, 1973: "The Politics of Reading" in Nell Keddie (Ed.), Tinker, Tailor ... The Myth of Cultural Deprivation, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- RAINWATER, Lee and PITTMAN, David J., 1967: "Ethical Problems in Studying a politically sensitive and deviant community", Social Problems Vol. 14, pp. 357-366.
- REES, Alwyn, D., 1950: Life in a Welsh Countryside, University of Wales Press, Cardiff.
- RENDEL, Margherita, 1978: "The Death of Leadership or Educating People to Lead Themselves", Women's Studies International Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 313-325.
- _____ 1980: "How many women academics 1912-1976?" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- RICH, Adrienne, 1977: Of Woman Born, Virago, London.

- RICHMOND, W. Kenneth, 1953: The Rural School: Its Problems and Prospects, Alvin Redman, London.
- RICKS, F.A. and PYKE, S.W., 1973: "Teacher Perceptions and attitudes that foster or maintain sex-role differences", Interchange, Vol. 4, pp. 26-33.
- RIST, Ray C., 1970: "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 411-451.
- ROBERTS, Helen (Ed.), 1981: Doing Feminist Research, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- ROBERTS, Robert, 1977: The Classic Slum, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- _____, 1978: A Ragged Schooling, Fontana/Collins, London.
- ROBERTSON, J.A.S. & BRIGGS, J.M., 1979: "Part-time working in Great Britain", Unit for Manpower Studies, Department of Employment Gazette, July.
- ROBINS, David & COHEN, Philip, 1978: Knuckle Sandwich: Growing up in the Working Class City, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- ROSE, Arnold, M., 1945: "A Research Note on Interviewing", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 143-144.
- ROSENTHAL, R. & JACOBSON, G., 1968: Pygmalion in the Classroom, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- ROTH, Julius, 1962: "Comments on 'Secret Observation'", Social Problems, Vol. 9, pp. 283-284.
- ROWBOTHAM, Sheila, 1973: Hidden from History, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- RUBIN, Gayle, 1975: "The Traffic in Women" in R. Reiter (Ed.), Toward an Anthropology of Women, Monthly Review Press, London.
- SANDRA, Margaret, 1979: Supermum/Superteacher, unpublished paper.
- SARAH, Elizabeth, 1980: "Teachers and students in the classroom: An examination of classroom interaction" in Dale Spender and

Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, The Women's Press, London.

SARAH, Elizabeth, SCOTT, Marion, and SPENDER, Dale, 1980: "The education of feminists: the case for Single-Sex schools" in Dale Spender & Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, The Women's Press, London.

SAVILLE, John, 1957: Rural depopulation in England and Wales 1851-1951, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

SCHOOLS COUNCIL RESEARCH STUDIES, 1975: The Aims of Primary Education: A Study of Teachers' Opinions, MacMillan Education, London.

SCOTT, Marion, 1980: "Teach her a lesson: sexist curriculum in patriarchal education" in Dale Spender & Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, The Women's Press, London.

SECCOMBE, Wally, 1974: "The housewife and her labour under capitalism", New Left Review, No. 83.

SELLECK, Richard Joseph Wheeler, 1968: The New Education: 1870-1914, Pitman, London.

SELLECK, Richard Joseph Wheeler, 1972: English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

SELLTIZ, C., JAHODA, M., DEUTSCH, M., & COOK, S.W., 1965: Research Methods in Social Relations, Methuen, London.

SERBIN, L.A., O'LEARY K.D., KENT, R.N. & TONICK, I.J., 1973: "A comparison of teacher response to the preacademic and problem behaviour of boys and girls", Child Development, Vol. 44, pp. 796-804.

SEWELL, W.H., HALLER, A.O. & STRAUS, M.A., 1957: "Social status and educational and occupational aspirations", American Sociological Review, Vol. 22, pp. 67-73.

- SEWELL, W.H. and SHAH, V.P., 1968: "Social class, parental encouragement and educational aspirations", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 73, pp. 559-572.
- SHARP, Rachel and GREEN, Anthony, 1975: Education and Social Control, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- SHARPE, Sue, 1976: Just like a Girl, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- SHAW, Jenny, 1976: "Finishing school: Some implications of sex-segregated education", in Diana Leonard-Barker and Sheila Allen (Eds.), Sexual Divisions and Society: Process and Change, Tavistock, London.
- _____ 1977a: Sexual Divisions in the Classroom, paper given Teach Girls to be Women Conference, Essex, April.
- _____ 1977b: School Attendance - some notes on a further feature of sexual division, paper presented at B.S.A.'s Sexual Divisions in Society Study Group.
- _____ 1980: "Education and the individual: schooling for girls or mixed schooling - a mixed blessing?" in Rosemary Deem (Ed.), Schooling for Women's Work, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- SIEBER, Robert, T., 1976: Schooling in the Bureaucratic Classroom: Socialisation and Social Reproduction in Chestnut Heights, Ph.D. thesis, New York University, Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
- SILLITOE, Alan, 1970: Saturday Night and Sunday Morning, Signet Books, London.
- SMITH, Dorothy, E., 1978: "A peculiar eclipsing: Women's exclusion from man's culture", Women's Studies International Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 4, pp. 281-295.
- SPAULDING, Robert, L., 1963: "Achievement, creativity and self-concept of teacher-pupil transactions in elementary schools", quoted in

P. Sears and D.H. Feldman, 1974, "Teacher interaction with boys and girls", in J. Stacey, S. Bereaud and J. Daniels (Eds.), And Jill Came Tumbling After: sexism in American Education, Dell, New York.

SPENDER, Dale & SARAH, Elizabeth, (Eds.), 1980: Learning to Lose, The Women's Press, London.

SPENDER, Dale, 1980a: "Education or indoctrination?" in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, The Women's Press, London.

_____ 1980b: "Educational institutions: where co-operation is called cheating", in Spender & Sarah (Eds.), ibid.

_____ 1980c: "Talking in Class" in Spender & Sarah (Eds.), ibid.

STACEY, Margaret, 1960: Tradition and change: A study of Banbury, Oxford University Press.

_____ 1974: "The myth of community studies" in Colin Bell & Howard Newby (Eds.), The Sociology of the Community, Frank Cass, London.

STACEY, Judith, BEREAUD, Susan and DANIELS, Joan (Eds.), 1974: And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education, Dell, New York.

STRODBECK, F.L., 1961: "Family integration values and achievement" in A.H. Halsey, J. Floud and C.A. Anderson (Eds.), Education, Economy and Society, Free Press, Illinois.

STUBBS, Michael & DELAMONT, Sara, (Eds.), 1976: Explorations in Classroom Observation, Wiley & Sons, London.

SULLEROT, Evelyn, 1971: Women, Society and Change, World University Library, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London.

THOMPSON, Flora, 1979: (First published in 1945). Lark Rise to Candleford, Oxford University Press.

THORNE, Barrie, 1978: Gender How Is It Best Conceptualised?

Paper presented at the American Sociological Association,
San Francisco, California.

_____ 1979: Claiming verbal space: Women, speech and language in college classrooms, paper presented at the Research Conference on Educational Environments and the Undergraduate Woman, Wellesley College, September.

_____ 1980: "You Still Takin' Notes?" Fieldwork and Problems of Informed Consent", Social Problems, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 284-297.

TONNIES, Ferdinand, 1955: Community and Association, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

TORODE, Brian, 1976: "Teachers' Talk and Classroom Discipline" in Michael Stubbs and Sara Delamont (Eds.), Explorations in Classroom Observation, Wiley & Sons, London.

TORRANCE, E.P., 1963: "Changing reactions of pre-adolescent girls to tasks requiring creative scientific thinking", Journal of Genetic Psychology, Vol. 102, pp. 217-223.

TROPP, Asher, 1957: The School Teachers: The Growth of the Teaching Profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day, Heinemann, London.

TROW, Martin, 1961: "The Second Transformation of American Secondary Education", International Journal of Comparative Sociology, Vol. 2, pp. 144-166.

TUNSTALL, Jeremy, 1962: The Fishermen, MacGibbon & Kee, London.

TURNER, Ralph, 1960: "The sponsored and contest mobility and the school system", American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, pp. 855-867.

VON HOFFMAN, Nicholas, IRVING, Louis Horowitz and RAINWATER, Lee, 1970: "Comment - an exchange: Sociological snoopers and journalistic moralisers", Transaction, May, pp. 4-8.

- WAINWRIGHT, Hillary, 1978: "Women and the Division of Labour" in P. Abrams (Ed.), Work, Urbanism and Inequality, Weidenfield and Nicolson, London.
- WALKER, Rob & ADELMAN, Clem, 1975: A Guide to Classroom Observation, Methuen, London.
- WARREN, R.L., 1975: "Context and isolation: the teaching experience in an elementary school", Human Organisation, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 139-148.
- WATSON, William, 1964: "Social Mobility and social class in industrial communities", M. Gluckman (Ed.), Closed Systems and Open Minds, Oliver and Boyd, London.
- WEBER, Max, 1948: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Allen & Unwin, London.
- _____ 1968: Economy and Society, Bedminster Press, New York.
- WEINREICH, Helen, 1978: "Sex-role socialisation" in Jane Chetwynd & Oonagh Hartnett (Eds.), The Sex-role System: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- WEST, Jackie, 1978: "Women, Sex and Class" in Annette Kuhn & Anne-Marie Wolpe (Eds.), Feminism and Materialism, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- WESTERGAARD, John and LITTLE, Alan, 1964: "The trend of class differentials in educational opportunity in England and Wales", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 15, pp. 301-316.
- WESTWOOD, L.J., 1967: "The role of the teacher", Educational Research, Pt. I, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 122-134, Pt. II, Vol. 10, pp. 21-37.
- WHITBREAD, Nanette, 1972: Evolution of the Nursery-Infant School, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- WHITEHEAD, Ann, 1976: "Sexual antagonism in Herefordshire" in Diana Leonard-Barker & Sheila Allen (Eds.), Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, Longman, New York.

- WHYTE, William Foote, 1951: "Observational fieldwork methods" in Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch & Stuart W. Cook (Eds.), Research Methods in Social Relations II. Dryden Press, New York.
- WHYTE, William Foote, 1955: Street Corner Society, University of Chicago Press.
- WILLIAMS, W.M. 1956: The Sociology of an English Village: Gosforth. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- _____ 1963: A West Country Village - Ashworthy, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- WILLIS, Paul, 1975: "Human Experience and material production: the culture of the shop floor", Working Series in Cultural Studies, No. 33, CCCS, University of Birmingham.
- WILLIS, Paul, 1977: Learning to Labour, Saxon House, Farnborough.
- WILLMOTT, Peter and YOUNG, Michael, 1960: Family and Class in a London Suburb, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- WILLMOTT, Peter, 1963: The Evolution of a Community, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- WILLMOTT, Phyllis, 1979: Growing up in a London Village. Peter Owen, London.
- WILSON, Brian, 1962: "The Role of the Teacher", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 15-32.
- WILSON, R., 1963: Difficult Housing Estates, Tavistock, London.
- WISE, Marjorie, 1931: English Village Schools, Hogarth Press, London.
- WOLPE, Anne-Marie, 1974: "The official ideology of education for girls", M. Flude and J. Ahier (Eds.), Educability, Schools and Ideology, Croom Helm, London.
- _____ 1977: Some Processes in Sexist Education, Women's Research and Resources Centre, London.
- _____ 1978a: "Education and sexual division of labour" in Annette Kuhn and Anne-Marie Wolpe (Eds), Feminism and Materialism, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

- _____ 1978b: "Girls and economic survival", British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 26, No. 2, June, pp. 150-162.
- WOODS Peter and HAMMERSLEY, Martin (Eds.), 1977: School Experience, Croom Helm, London.
- WOODS, Peter, 1977: "Teaching for survival", Woods & Hammersley (Eds.), ibid.
- WYLIE, R.C., 1963: "Children's estimates of their school-work ability, as a function of sex, race and socio-economic level", Journal of Personality, Vol. 31, pp. 203-224.
- YOUNG, K. and HARRIS, O., 1976: "The subordination of women in cross-cultural perspective", Papers on Patriarchy, London PDC and Women's Publishing Co-operative.
- YOUNG, Michael F.D. (Ed.), 1971: Knowledge and control: New directions for the Sociology of Education, Collier-Macmillan, London.
- YOUNG, Michael and WILLMOTT, Peter, 1957: Family and Kinship in East London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- _____ 1973: The Symmetrical Family, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.

Additional References

- KELLMER-PRINGLE, M.L., 1966: National Child Development Study, Longman, London.
- LEONARD-BARKER, Diana and ALLEN, Sheila (Eds.), 1976a: Sexual Divisions and Society: Process and Change, Tavistock, London.
- PAYNE, Irene, 1980a: "A Working-Class Girl in a Grammar School" in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (Eds.), Learning to Lose, Women's Press, London.