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ABSTRACT

Despite popular and professional concerns with schools as institutions where socialization occurs, there are few empirical studies of classroom behaviour. The problem set for the study reported here was to observe classroom behaviour and to provide a theoretical description of what was observed in terms relevant to sociologists' interest in socialization. The thesis is thus a description of "normal form" behaviour in the classroom, with an analytic interest in how that relates to a useful conception of socialization. Socialization is first discussed with respect to some aspects of common culture, taken for granted by adults, but "taught" explicitly in first grade. Following that, the study reports upon the ways in which children acquire membership in the class, rule-learning associated with such membership, and the import of membership acquisition for the goal of socialization as conceived here, i.e. the production of social actors competent to handle "normal environments". It is argued that the classroom is one such environment encountered by children in early life, and that the work of the school as a "socializing agent" cannot be appreciated without some understanding of these matters.
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There are several conceptions of education extant today. B. F. Skinner\textsuperscript{1} has suggested that teaching machines will largely replace teachers and make the education of the young more efficient. His position could be seen as arguing against the necessity of having teachers. Teaching for Skinner is simply a matter of imparting technical content. In contrast, Paul Goodman argues that today's schools de-personalize people and fail to provide what is necessary for helping people to adjust to a society in which there will be increased leisure. He argues that:

\ldots it certainly makes sense to teach using the real subject-matter than to bring an abstraction of the subject-matter into the school building as "curriculum".\textsuperscript{2}

He urges further:

\ldots both outside and inside the school building, use appropriate unlicensed adults of the community--the druggist, the storekeeper, the mechanic--as the proper educators of the young into the grown-up world.\textsuperscript{3}

Joos argues similarly that today's school is not relevant for the children attending. In fact he states that:

\ldots unreality is the norm in school,\ldots the laws of the universe have been banished from the school room, so that within its walls the normal laws of cause and effect are not necessarily valid and a whole new way of thinking has to be
put on like a smock to replace the outdoors clothing taken off on entering.

John Holt writing in another context echoes Joos' remarks:

It (the school) often flatly contradicts other things they (students) have been told, and hardly ever has any relation to what they really know—-to the rough model of reality they carry around in their minds.

It would seem that the concerns of Goodman and Joos resemble those voiced by Holt, that the schools teach children failure. Children—all of them to some degree—"fail".

...they fail to develop more than a tiny part of the tremendous capacity for learning, understanding, and creating with which they were born and of which they made full use during the first two or three years of their lives.

On the one side, then, there is an argument that teaching machines will take over more and more from the teacher and make education more efficient, and on the other side there is the claim that there is no content worth teaching in the present curriculum. If suitable content were found, that is content relevant to the needs of the children, then teachers (the people) would be very important. Exponents of this view suggest that at present the schools impose on children an "unreality" that has no fit with the way the world exists for them outside the classroom. That the classroom is more than
a teaching machine situation is clearly evidenced by such popularizations as *Up the Down Staircase.* While it is clear that many things go on in the classroom other than the teaching of curriculum the documentation of what these things are is not so clear. There are many things that go on in the classroom that presumably would not (or could not) be programmed, and yet there is no sociological discussion of what constitute such features. Joos, Goodman and Holt argue that the school imposes an "unreality" on the children but they give no sociological evidence to support their contentions. Skinner argues for the unimportance of teachers but offers no supporting arguments. Participants in this controversy, then, seldom make reference to what observably goes on in the classrooms of schools. The traditional sociological literature on socialization and the classroom does not shed much light on any of the issues either. What I wish to point out then is that a general interest in "education" and the "influence" of schools is sustained in the absence of empirical data. An attempt to describe what goes on in the classroom is the aim of this thesis.

I begin the thesis with a discussion of traditional perspectives on socialization and then outline the perspective I will follow. In chapter Two I discuss aspects
of common culture in which all members of society acquire competency, both in and out of school. I then turn to a discussion of how the children come to see themselves as members of the classroom. Chapter Four deals with how the organization of the school affects the structure of the classroom. I end the thesis with a discussion of classroom routines, including comments on how the teacher controls and orders talk in the classroom, how she "trains" children to monitor each others activities and report on them to her, and how this monitoring is related to a sense of membership in the class. Appendix A is important for the thesis as a whole but as an organizational matter was placed at the end. It is a discussion of something that is rarely reported on, the problems the researcher faced in gaining access to the school and the problems encountered once there. These problems have implications in two areas: one, they provide indications as to what constitutes the normal environment of the school and two, they point to methodological problems which can not be solved by sampling or quantification. The other two appendices provide the reader with an idea of what normally went on in the class when I was present and a set of diagrams which may help in seeing how the classroom is arranged and where the events reported on took place. The latter are orientations for the reader.
Footnotes


3. Ibid., p. 33.


6. Ibid., p. xiii.

CHAPTER 1

SOCIALIZATION AS NORMAL FORM BEHAVIOR

In this chapter I would like to look at some of the traditional perspectives on socialization and move on to a consideration of the perspective to be used in this thesis.

There are various definitions of socialization and I would like to list a few for consideration here.

Child states:

Socialization refers to a problem which is old and pervasive in human life—the problem of how to rear children so that they will become adequate adult members of the society to which they belong.1

Elkin writes:

We may define socialization as the process by which someone learns the ways of a given society or social group so that he can function within it.2

With specific reference to socialization in the school Elkin states:

Manifestly, the school's socializing function is to "educate the young", that is, to transmit certain basic knowledge and skills of the culture.3

These definitions have in common that they conceptualize socialization as a process of teaching and or learning.
While this is a common way of defining socialization the empirical work in the area centers around variations in socialization in terms of age, sex, type of family, social class etc. What seems to be taken for granted is how this process of teaching/learning takes place.

It would seem that a more useful conceptualization of socialization is one given by Roger Brown. (1965)

The mature persons with whom a child interacts behave in accordance with such systems of norms or rules as are called logic, mathematics, language, morality aesthetics, political philosophy, physical theory, and so on. For the most part these systems have never been explicitly formulated by the adults whose behavior is governed by them and they will not be explicitly formulated by the child who acquires them. What seems to happen is that the child processes what he perceives of the behavior of mature adults of his society in such a way as to extract the rule systems implicit in it.

Brown is pointing to a formal process whereby children process data and abstract rules. Presumably this process happens as Pittenger has put it "out of awareness". The problem for the child in some sense is similar to the one faced by the linguist as Chomsky has outlined it.

...to determine from the data of performance the underlying system of rules that has to be mastered by the speaker-hearer and that he puts into actual performance. (Emphasis mine)

The problem with Brown and Chomsky in terms of their usefulness for sociology is that they leave out a discussion
of common culture. A consideration of common culture may be essential for as Lomax has pointed out (in another field) not taking it into account may lead to a formal system that bears no relation to the phenomenon under discussion. Lomax in a discussion of musical style writes:

Western European musical notation and thinking are not adequate for the description of folk and primitive music. Melodic ornamentation and systems of rhythm occur which make the notation of a simple primitive chant into a formidable score, from which the transcriber himself is often unable to reproduce the music.7

He writes further:

...that musical reality is three-quarters composed of such materials, (setting, gesturing of performers etc.) and it is therefore unscientific to focus our interest on formal musical patterns torn out of their context (as if music was intrinsically different from other human activities), or upon the precise measurement of particles of sound (as if musicology were a branch of physics).8

I take it that what Lomax is arguing is that an "adequate description" of an event must take into account the context in which the event is occurring and that the description must be one that allows someone else to reproduce the event as it originally happened. He is in effect arguing against the wholesale imposition of formal systems on the events of everyday life. The same argument may be made for descriptions of social structure.
I take it that this is what Garfinkel is pointing to when he argues that coding is an ad hoc activity that necessarily makes use of common sense notions to find correspondences between the data and the coding categories and that this procedure results in an account which may be argued: (here with respect to a clinic)

...to consist of a socially invented, pursuasive, and proper way of talking about the clinic since "after all" the account was produced by "scientific procedures". The account would be itself part of the actual order of the clinic's operations in much the same way that one might treat a person's report on his own activities as a feature of his activities. The actual order would remain to be described.

Lomax argues for "in context" studies as scientific. Garfinkel argues that settings are the subject matter of sociology because it is around settings that members organize their lives into typical, normal patterns. The child must learn how the culture works and he does this by abstracting from the behavior of those around him and it is reasonable to expect that this could take place in the classroom. The problem then is to develop an adequate description in a specific setting of the process of socialization. The concerns in the traditional literature have not been these. Elkin, Child etc., do not touch on these areas. The concern is with how children obtain what Schutz has called the knowledge that permits a person to live "life-as-usual". Schutz has
pointed out that members' knowledge of the world is a common-sense knowledge.

They (members) have preselected and preinterpreted this world by a series of common-sense constructs of the reality of daily life, and it is these thought objects which determine their behavior, define the goal of their action, the means available for attaining them—in brief, which help them to find their bearings within their natural and socio-cultural environment and come to terms with it.¹⁰

This common-sense knowledge which is shared creates a condition where "...the member... looks in one single glance through the normal social situations occurring to him and... he catches immediately the ready-made recipe appropriate to its solution".¹¹ The implication of this for the study of socialization is that children must then, learn what constitutes normal social situations and what the appropriate normal responses are in that situation. Socialized person produce normal form behaviour.

Socialization is a process of abstraction. What I mean by that and what I assume Brown means by it is illustrated in the following example. I make use of Schutz' notion that "The typifying medium par excellence by which socially derived knowledge is transmitted is the vocabulary and the syntax of everyday language".¹² This example is a description of the first day in school in grade one in a school in Germany.
When the children were settled, she asked them to read their names and describe the picture on the tags. One girl started to speak. "Schoenmelden" (Raise your hand first) Others caught on and hands went up.13 (Emphasis mine)

Here is an example of a teacher giving a rule on the first day of school. The rule is given without saying "when" it applies i.e. when it applies after what they are in the process of doing is finished. What I want to consider here, however, is the implications of the report that "others caught on". This points to what is in this report is referred to as the acquisition of social structure. That is the students have "acquired" a knowledge of what is proper procedure/what the rule is governing this activity/what is expected of them. They have, at least briefly, a knowledge of what is going on--what is proper--what is acceptable.

In this thesis my concerns are two. One is with how persons become normal members of the classroom and the other is with how the classroom prepares normal members of the community. These are not necessarily the same. The first may be seen as connected with what Joos has claimed is the imposition of "unreality" by the classroom situation. The second is concerned with the common culture which all members share. This includes such things as knowledge of time, orientation to the
calendar, etc. In the next chapter it is this I shall discuss. Chapter Three will be concerned with socialization directed toward becoming a normal member of the classroom.


CHAPTER 2

ASPECTS OF COMMON CULTURE

The concern of this chapter will be with an orientation to common culture. As I have mentioned before one of the criteria of being socialized is that it leads others to see a person as "normal". A socialized person can claim to be competent as a social actor where competence is to be seen as "the claim that a collectivity members is entitled to exercise that he is capable of managing his everyday affairs without interference."¹ This parallels Chomsky's notion of competence with reference to a native speaker's employment of a set of rules (unformulated) which allows him to produce utterances acceptable to other native speakers. Chomsky uses "acceptable" to mean "utterances that are perfectly natural and immediately comprehensible without paper-and-pencil analysis."² Connected with the concept of competence is the notion that the set of rules allows for the production of unique utterances. Competence is inferred from the data of performance.

"Normal" persons are expected to be able to orient themselves to time, the calendar, social location and the like. (Patients, on admission to mental hospitals, are frequently tested as to their "grip on reality" via
their "knowledge" of the day, month and year). While this sort of activity (asking the day) constitutes life-as-usual for socialized members it can not be taken for granted. For children these things may be highly problematic and their problematicness may be insisted upon by adults, in this case teachers. In the following examples the teacher is teaching them how to perform competently in their orientation to common cultural items.

CALENDRICAL ORIENTATION

The following is a routine that was carried on in one of the classrooms' every morning and it illustrates the concern to have the children be able to orient to the common cultural items of the calendar.

- Who can tell me what day it is today?
  - Billy Buchan.
- What was it yesterday?
  - Garth.
- Yes and today is Monday. What month is it?
  - Chris.
- November.
- And what date?
  - Lisa.
- Seventh.
- Yes now read everybody.

All: Monday November Seventh 1966.
- How many days have gone by, started in November?
  - Seven.
- What else could that be called?
  - Weeks.
- a...
- Seven weeks.
- Is it seven weeks?
  - Dierdre.
- One week.
- Seven days equals one week that's right.
The children were supposed to look at the calendar before coming to school so that they would be able to give the teacher the information. The teacher is reviewing the information but looking at the structure of the exchange it can be seen that the teacher is not just concerned with the children being able to reproduce what they have looked up in the morning (performance) but with the "theory" that relates days, months, weeks (competence). After having them give her the ordering of the days she repeats the ordering to make it clear. She again reviews the date for all by having them repeat it. When she tries to get them to produce information about the number of days in a week it appears that the children have not achieved mastery. She hints at the correct answer after the initial wrong answer by pointing out that the answer previous should have been given in the singular form ("a...") but the children do not recognize the cue. This tactic on the teacher's part could be seen as a locating device in that it points to the location of the error in the answer. (Such devices will be discussed further in a later chapter). What is of most interest here is the final formulation of the relation of days to weeks as given by the teacher. She repeats the answer given by the girl in the form of an equivalence with the ending that it is "right", perhaps to emphasize the relationship. This formulation is in-
teresting because it is available as a "law-like" statement to which the children can refer on subsequent occasions. Thus, material which is definitionally correct for adults may be the topic of explicit instruction and drill in grade one. The teacher, by insisting on the children knowing the date each day, has begun to teach them that this sort of information is of the type that everyone should be able to give on request.

ORIENTATION TO CLOCK TIME

Another concept which members are required to orient to is time. The following might be seen as socializing the children to an awareness, as well as a command of, the concept of time. This example occurred when the children were at the front of the class at the beginning of the morning. The teacher had just printed a sentence on the board and asks Jody to read it.

    t - Jody
    J - What time does school start?
    t - Do you know?
    J - Now.
    t - Yes, but what is the hour? Marie.
    M - Nine o'clock.

This could be seen as the teacher suggesting that the children should know the temporal boundaries of their activities in terms of clock time. Presumably children do not have in general to see that they are on time--someone does it for them. The teacher points out that it is not enough to know that something is happening
"now" but that activities have corresponding clock-time references. While she admits the answer "now", she nevertheless requires a translation into the standard form for locating points in time. An example from a grade three classroom points in more detail to what might be the concern of teachers with making sure the children understand about time. This is a discussion that took place during a reading period.

- How important are clocks?
- What is the importance of clocks?
- Glenn?
- If you can afford to talk, you can afford to answer questions.
- You have to keep it at the right time or you'll be late.
- If you're going to work you might go at two o'clock.
- How do you suppose they told time in the olden days?
- Stars.
- Yes, but, stars were more for what?
- Direction.

In this example the teacher indicates that what is to be referred to with respect to time is clock time. The answers of the children would tend to indicate that they already understood the importance of the mastery of the concept of time and its connection with being "on time" instead of "late". These concepts are important for all members of society, whether they are "dropouts" or otherwise, and while these things may be learned other than at school it appears that one of the few places that explicitly concerns itself with such matters is class-
rooms. The contents of a teaching machine would clearly have to go far beyond Skinnerian practice to encompass all that goes on in the classroom.

Another thing that everyone is responsible for is what might be termed "personal social location". This includes such items as who you are and where you live etc. The concern for this begins early. The example offered here is from a kindergarten classroom but this sort of thing may be started earlier especially in large cities. (It may take the form I observed of one four year old who carried with her when she went out to play a slip of paper with her name and telephone number written on it). The teacher asks the children if they know their birthday and when most do not, she comments:

It's getting near Easter time...now this is the kind of thing we're supposed to know now...it would be very nice around Easter time if we know all these things...when you go into grade one on that first Tuesday and the teacher asks you how old you are, where you live, what's your street number, what's your house number... she'll think you're marvellous.

It can be seen from this example that children have the ability to produce this type of information as early as or earlier than grade one. Since few of the children knew their birthdates the teacher set as an assignment that they go home and ask their mother what it was and with the help of their mothers learn it. There was to
be a review to see how they were getting along with learning it the next day. This may be seen as the teacher taking the learning of this information seriously.

GEOGRAPHICAL ORIENTATION

Another thing which "normal" members are expected to be able to orient to is geographical/political location.

- What is the name of the city?
  - Vancouver.

- What is the name of the province?
  - I don't know.
  - Jody.
  - B.C.

- What is B.C. short for?
  - The world.

(The teacher explains that B.C. is short for British Columbia which is a province in Canada)

Here the teacher is pointing to two geographical locations cities and provinces. While Jody is able to "answer" the question she is unable to explicate what she has known, thereby demonstrating that she is not "competent" in that she does not understand implicit "principles" which generate terminology. An exchange that occurred in a grade three classroom indicates a further demand—that of relating geographical units to some "larger picture" which members are responsible for possessing.

- Where's Ontario?
  - Quebec.

- It's close to Quebec.

- First what is Ontario?
  - A province.
What provinces are on each side of Quebec?
(Goes to map and points to a province and asks).

What is that province? Brian?

B - B. C.

What is this one?
f - Alaska.

That's close but it's a state.

Simon I'm going to ask you to leave if you don't keep your're mouth closed. You talk too much out of turn.

What is it?
f - B. C. no Alaska no Alberta

Right.
(Does Saskatchewan etc. without incident)

Would you like to go on with reading please.

Orientation to other common cultural items also occurs. The teacher has asked everyone to raise their right hand, a girl in the first row has her left hand up.

Is that your right hand?
(The girl switches her hands--two boys in the next row with their left hands up don't switch nor does the teacher call it to their attention.)

The teacher is starting a film strip and says:

It looks like a go sign why?

ml - Because you go from there to the end.

Yes, what else.

m2 - Because it is green.

There examples show a concern with items about knowing which hand is which and what colour in this culture signals go (green). Again, my point is not that such "trivial" items are important, but rather that their taken-for-granted status in the adult world must be seen as indicating how deeply "common-sense knowledge" is "internalized".
In this section I have tried to show that in the classroom teachers take as one of their concerns the orientation of children to items of common culture. Not only are children expected to be able to give an acceptable performance they are also being taught what the rules are that allow them to generate such items.

**ORIENTATION TO MANNERS**

I would like to discuss finally some items to which normal members must orient which fall into the realm of "manners" or "presentation". The following is illustrative of two elements:

- What do you say if you didn't hear him?
- I get your pardon.

(A knock, a student answers it, the nurse pushes a boy into the room.)
- Have you seen to the nurse William?
- Nods his head.
- Pardon?
- Yes, Miss Smith.
- Alright go hang up your coat.

The first part of the utterance is a lesson in politeness the last part in deference. "I beg your pardon" as a response to something not heard is a polite way of sustaining interaction. It is interesting to note that the teacher has only to ask and the child can produce the correct form. The teacher in her question includes the condition that is to be considered ("didn't hear him"). What the teacher seems to be doing here is reminding/reviewing the situationally appropriate behavior for the child. The second incident involving William
is for the teacher the same activity i.e. reminding the child of a condition which he must meet. William is being reminded that he must pay deference to the teacher. ("Yes, Miss Smith"). This activity (deference) is presumably one that in this case is oriented to the old maxim of respect for elders. "Alright" given by the teacher accepted the answer as correct and allows the interaction to move on. The concern with politeness is illustrated in another example. It occurred during the Show and Tell period where children are supposed to go to the front sequentially by row if they have "something to say" that morning. In this case a boy went up out of turn at the same time that the boy whose turn it properly was moved toward the front. The boy whose turn it was then sat down, permitting the other child to continue, drawing the comment:

   That was nice Robin, you know there is always another turn.

The teacher is complimenting the boy for acting properly -- politely. In recognition of this polite act as "proper" it is available for all the class to "hear" it as such and there is the possibility that others could abstract from the situation to see it as a guide to their own actions in the future. Such matters are part of the required standard knowledge in our society. What is important in these exchanges is that the teacher is call-
ing up information (reminding as a teaching activity) that has already to some extent been learned before. There is much common culture learned early in life.

I would like now to turn from a consideration of the concern with orienting children to common culture that takes place in the classroom to a consideration of the socializing process aimed at orienting the children to becoming normal members of the classroom. The first thing I would like to consider under this topic is the acquisition of membership.
Footnotes


3. The teachers concern with this type of performance is only one of the areas in which they evaluate children's productions. They are also concerned with evaluation of technical performance as the following excerpt from an ethnography of a Kwakiutl school shows.

   In support of these tests (I.Q.) they did rank children consistently and the ranking was generally consistent with the teacher's assessment of classroom performance.*

   This quote illustrates the teacher's concern with evaluating material that is giving by the school as an institution.


4. See appendix B

CHAPTER 3

ACQUIRING MEMBERSHIP

In the previous chapter I have discussed orientation to common culture as it is found in the Grade One classroom. In this chapter I wish to discuss how children come to be "normal", acceptable members of the classroom. I will look at what it means to be a member of the classroom and how this awareness of being a member of the class is brought about by the teacher. In order to do this I will look at the process of categorization. I will make use of the work of Harvey Sacks on categorization as it is developed in, *The Search For Help: No One To Turn To*. Sacks has suggested that any member of society faces the problem of classifying and being classified by other members. This is a problem because it is around categories that members structure their interaction with others. Associated with categories are sets of "rules" in the form of expectations and obligations which are the guide lines for interaction with a member of the category it is perceived the person belongs to. In Appendix A I have tried to demonstrate that interaction is problematic if no satisfactory categorization of a person is possible—that is if his apparent membership is ambiguous or not resolvable by the other. If Sacks is correct then the problem as related to sociali-
zation is how children learn what it means to be a member of a category and what expectations a member acquires about his category and its relations to other categories he encounters. In order to learn about the way membership relates him to members of other categories he must know the rules associated with that category—in the traditional literature, the "role of the other". Following Sacks I will locate the use of categories by examining utterances in order to see how persons address and refer to one another, and I shall attempt to elucidate the "underlying rules" which structure this usage—the category-bound rules of membership. Again following Sacks I assume that the use of personal pronouns is not simply a syntactical matter but is an important key to the way persons learn to locate one another via sets of categories.

I will begin this section by demonstrating some of the ways in which children have already learned to make culturally standardized references via pronouns.

1. t - Who has seen a play? Janet.
   J - We saw a play, but I forget the name of it.
   t - Did you like it?
   J - Yes.

2. f - Yesterday we went to a party my mother and father and brother and I.
3. t - When do you have breakfast John?
   J - We have it late because my parents
don't like to get up.
   t - I understand that.
   J - I have to get up and get it myself.
   t - Are you good at it?

Despite the fact that the reader may see these as quite
trivial it can be argued that they are structurally quite
complex. For example in number three I hear the first
"you" as the same "you" as in "Are you good at it" i.e.,
"When did you (John) have breakfast?" John's answer to
the first question includes a familiar we, which is inter-
teresting since it then appears that he gets his own
breakfast. It is possible that John sees breakfast as
a family activity and it remains so even if he does not
participate in it. It may be that children see some
activities as bound to the family and not as events
which they can report as having done as individuals.
However, what is important here is that in order for
John to be able to give such an answer he had to learn
culturally standardized pronominal useages which he is
able to use even when the "facts of the case" seem to
negate the import of standardized reporting. Simil-
arily in number one the "we" refers to the family. It
would seem that when a child sees an activity as a family
activity, or when he participates in the activity with
the family, it is at least possible to report "we did
it"/ "we saw it"/ "we have it" etc...Number two is ex-
plicit about who the people are that make up the who is
being referred to as "we"--the family. It may be possible then, to say that when an activity is one where parents are responsible, initiate or supervise children can report the activity as "we (the family) did it"/ "we have it" etc. even when their own participation is doubtful as in the case of John's breakfast. These examples show that children conceive of themselves as members of a family. The examples demonstrate that children can make culturally standardized use of personal pronouns. What I wish to consider now is how the use of personal pronouns as a referencing device is connected to children becoming "normal" members of the classroom.

One of the problems for the teacher, especially in Grade One, is to "program" the children so that they come to conceive of themselves as members of the class for whom class rules are relevant and for whom demeanour with respect to others is relevently related to their being members of the class. She is presumably interested in instilling in them a sense of identification with the class such that they will monitor their own (and each other's) activities. (The extent to which she succeeds in this will be discussed in the next chapter). This is connected with control in the classroom. For her, membership (as designated through the personal pronouns) is not simply a grammatical and syntactical matter even
though I am using syntactical materials as the data for my analysis. It is a matter of utmost seriousness i.e. getting the children into shape so that she can get on with the "formal" business of education. She must get them to the point where they will institute self controls and self monitoring to produce the appropriate behavior vis a vis her, vis a vis each other, and vis a vis "outsiders". All this is to be achieved by giving them both implicitly and explicitly a notion of the rights, obligations and rules that go with class membership. This may be difficult for it may be supposed that the children see it that all they have to do is "come". In fact they may feel that there really is no reason for their presence. The teacher has to destroy the notion that they are merely physically present and replace it with a notion that they are part of the class and as members of the class they have an obligation to behave in a correct, adequate and appropriate manner. I will try to demonstrate how this is done beginning with an analysis of several examples of utterances which contain the use of the personal pronouns.

4. t - Children would you stop that! (pause) Now when there is an extra person in the room what are we supposed to do?

5. t - When we put up our hand it means we've read the question and can read it.
6. Remember, when you put up your hand
it means that you have read it and
understood it and can read it out-

loud.

Examples four, five and six illustrate the teacher de-
signating a specific population ("we"; "you") for whom
rules prevail in the classroom. Example four points to
some notion of propriety when another person is present
in the class and examples five and six point out that
a hand up stands for something. A literal reading of
examples four and five would indicate that when the
teacher says "we" she binds herself with the rules she
has provided for the class but this seems in fact to be
a syntactical inclusion. I would argue that a social-
ized member would hear the "we" in example five the same
as the "you" in example six. That is the two sentences
are synonymous. It has been suggested that we's can be
seen as inclusive and exclusive. That is the speaker
can include himself in the referencing or can be speak-
ing on behalf of persons and the latter seems to be the
case here. The teacher is providing a model of mem-
ship for the children. Simply stated she is saying there
is a "we" in this room and that "we" have rules in this
room. She is included in the "we" as a contingent feat-
ure of syntax. I would like to consider in more detail
the rule-governed nature of membership.

I shall argue that in the above examples the teacher
is engaged in an activity I wish to designate as "Rule Giving". Socialization is concerned with what has been learned but these examples are of teaching. Since there is no suggestion that teaching and learning occur in one to one relation I shall try and demonstrate how the teacher proposes the rules and then discuss the implications for the children (learners). Rule giving is bound up with membership in that it provides for persons to see "appropriate" and category-bound behavior as instancing a rule. In order to demonstrate this I shall give a detailed analysis of examples five and six. In these examples the teacher is giving cues or programming in an explicit way. She is telling the children the import of their activities. She is telling them what others may legitimately infer from their actions. At the moment they may be putting up their hand "indiscriminately" or without the knowledge of what putting up a hand means. How then, are rules given?

5. t - When we put up our hand it means that we've read the question and can read it.

It should be noted that the conditions that follow the "we" are linked back to it as the specific concern of the population "we". In order to make sense out of this utterance I will make some rather simplified use of some of the ideas developed in transformational grammar. Transformationalists have pointed out that all sentences
can be seen as deriveable from a set of simple sentences which they call "kernal". I don't want to make use of this as a technical matter but rather to see the above utterance as deriveable from some set of simpler sentences. One set might be:

We put up our hands.
We have read the question.
We can read it.

These sentences, however, do not convey the same meaning as the teacher's utterance. The words omitted from the simplified set of sentences (when, it means, that) seem to make the difference in meaning. These words are what transformationalists call "structural words" the function of which are to "form words together in a meaningful sequence". What differences do these words make?

"When" is usually indicative of a temporal reference ("John, when do you have breakfast?"). In this case that is not its function. Here "when" denotes an occasion marked by having a hand up. "It means" can be seen as the link between the two nominal clauses that make up the utterance. "It means" may be seen as (taken by the children to indicate) a clue that what is going on here is an "explanation" of something. SOMETHING means SOMETHING. "That" is linked to "it means" to specify the condition that goes with the instance of "when" which is appropriate to the population "we". As I have pointed
out above what is going on here is that the teacher is telling the children that if a condition (hand up) is met, then others can correctly infer the state of affairs (have read it and can read it). That is so will be demonstrated shortly. This instance is one of the teacher proposing a rule—"rule giving". I would now like to look at example six which as I have indicated above would be heard as synonymous with example five.

- Remember, when you put up your hand it means you have read it and understood it and can read it out loud.

What is distinctive about this utterance is that it contains "remember" which points to another activity. "Remember" can be seen as indicating that a rule has been promulgated but that it is improperly learned. The teacher is getting students "programmed" so that they can recall matters for themselves and bring their behavior under control of the rules, with the consequence that these matters will no longer have to be made explicit and in some sense use up time which—at least in later grades—should be reserved for the more "technical" aspects of school. "Remember" also serves to cue students as to their responsibility for retaining and operating with the rules.

I would like, now to look at the correlative situation where the teacher engages in sanctioning behavior which can be seen as being based on the rule having been
proposed and repeated before this occasion and where she
does not address the class but individuals by name.

    t - Who knows it? Darin?
    D - (Silence)
    t - Darin don't put up your hand if you
don't know it.

    t - Who can find "lived"? Annie? (Lived
    is in a sentence printed on the black-
    board)
    (Annie says nothing and does not go up to the board
    and underline the word as is expected)
    t - Can you find the word "lived"? Why was your
    hand up eh?

In both these examples the person was held responsible
as an individual and in each case the hand rule was
pointed to as being in effect. Since sanctioning is
directed towards individuals the child must learn that
rules apply to him as an individual. This process may
be understandable if it is accepted that whenever "we"
is said then "I" can be said. That is whenever the
teacher proposes "we" it can now properly be inferred
by the child that "I" have to do so and so. As I have
suggested above "we" and "you" can be synonymous in
usage, and the same argument could presumably be made
for "you". Given the fact that the teacher proposes and
reviews rules to the class and then sanctions individuals
for failure to uphold the rule it may be reasonable to
assume that the child learns that he is to infer "I"
applicability from "we" proposals. While rules are pro-
posed as "we", for any child it is deriveable that he
has to comply with it. This would indicate that at some point the teacher begins to accept the children as socialized members in that she begins to hold them responsible for following the rules she has proposed at other times.

What I have attempted to show in this chapter is that membership (in the class) is connected with rules governing the activities of any member. I have done this by showing how the teacher proposes rules (rule giving); and reviews them, relying on syntactical features (when, it means, remember) as clues to the implications of her proposals. I then tried to show the implications of this process for the learner. I proposed that the child had to learn to infer "I" applicability from rules proposed as relevant to the class "we" of which he is a member.

Above I have discussed rules for which members of the class were responsible with respect to other "usual" members of the class. I would like now to show how the same process is applicable to rules that govern interaction with "outsiders". The following are utterances in which the teacher makes reference to expected behavior on the part of the class vis à vis outsiders.

7. t - Children would you stop that.
   Now, when there is an extra person in the room what are we supposed to do, Huuh?
   m3 - (untranscribable)
   t - Right, you know do it.
   f3 - ......talking.
   t - Right.
A short time later.

8. t - I don't want to reprimand children in front of someone else do I? What do you suggest your course of action should be?

f4 - Be good.

In number 7 the teacher has formulated a question giving one part of the rule "when..." asking what goes with it. The teacher then is reviewing a rule which she has proposed on an earlier occasion. She is drawing to their attention that what ever they are doing they should consider that they are members of the class of which I am not a member and there are rules governing situations of this kind ("when..."). This reinforces the contention that there is a unit class for which there are proper forms of conduct vis a vis each other and vis a vis outsiders. In both examples the children were able to give the missing part of the rule and it is possible to see socialization as effective to the extent that rules are retrieveable with hinting. It is important to note that traditional school grammar, on normative lines, fails to note, e.g., that "we" can perform a number of distinct tasks, and that there are a number of distinct ways in which "we" can be put together. As discussed above "we" can be inclusive or exclusive. In example seven "we" is exclusive, that is the teacher is presumed not to bind herself to the rule. Her position vis a vis the rules she proposes and reviews is clear from example...
eight: I sanction your inappropriate behavior. I have demonstrated in this part that the same procedure of rule giving and review applies to rules that govern the actions of the children vis-a-vis outsiders (Not usual members of the classroom.)
Footnotes

CHAPTER 4

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTINGENCIES OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

In this chapter I wish to discuss some further aspects of the social structure of the classroom. I would like first to discuss how the nature of the school impinges on the structure of the classroom and then to discuss how certain activities are organized around these constraints.

Schools are organized in such a way that a certain amount of "material" is required to be covered each year. The teacher who gets the student for the next grade can assume that some defined body of subject matter has been covered. There is some standardization here, especially at higher levels where there are uniform examinations for the whole province. In any event the Department of Education supplies a curriculum outline which provides in some detail what is to be taught. Given these constraints, time in the classroom becomes a scarce resource. Assignments must be completed, material covered so that at the end of the year the children can read, write, spell at a certain level. The teacher sets out the work that must be completed each day. Children who do not get the work done stay in at recess, noon, or after school to finish. When they begin school, children presumably do not share with the teacher these concerns. As was
discussed in the last chapter the teacher must build into them some notion of their membership in the class, including the obligation to do assigned work, in such a way that they will by and large take it upon themselves to do it. The teacher is, however, constantly involved in reminding the children what they should be doing.

1. t - Children hurry and get your work done because it's almost recess time.

This example suggests that it is the concern of all in the class, in the exclusive "we" sense as discussed in the last chapter, to get the assigned work done. The utterance also points to the fact there is certain work to be done before "recess". Other examples make it clear that this concern with getting work done on schedule is similar to other rules of membership in the class as demonstrated in the last chapter.

2. t - Children would you please get your work done. Sandy come on.

3. t - How many airplanes have finished their sentences? (No hands go up.)
   t - Well hurry up.---Hurry up Jimmy get your sentences finished.

The rule is one that applies to all the class but it is clear from the way she reminds the children that it is the responsibility of each child to follow the rule. Here "Sandy come on" and "Hurry up Jimmy..." provide the clues to this. The "hurry up" and "come on" illustrate
the teachers concern with moving the children along, getting the work done. From this it follows that the children must keep busy.

4. t - Chris get busy!

While this points to the emphasis on keeping "busy" to get the work done, it raises a further possibility. It may be that the child learns to abstract from this and similar situations the notion of "keeping busy" as an "indicator" to the teacher of work in progress or completed, with the consequence that the child can "satisfy" the teacher while attending to his own concerns. The following utterance may indicate what the teacher uses as an index of being busy.

5. t - Nicholas I can hear your voice back here, that means your not working.

Here talking is taken as the indication of not working or not being "busy", at least talking that the teacher can hear. Abstracting from both these situations it may be that children learn to talk quietly or when the teacher can't hear them as ways of getting around the work rule.

While there is this emphasis on getting work done, there are presumably legitimate reasons for not attending to work and it is reasonable to see that the children have to learn this as well.

6. t - Is that too hard for you Brent?
   B - No.
   t - Then why aren't you getting it done?
Here the teacher's concern with getting the work done is being demonstrated but as well she is pointing to one reason for not attending to work, i.e. that it is "too hard". While Brent did not use this as an excuse, or perhaps did not see it as being so offered, it remains available for children to employ it as such and it does indicate the teacher's recognition of some reasons for not working. Giving reasons for not being at work may be another activity children become proficient at.

There are other grounds for not being occupied with work:

7. t - All finished Billy Whitty?
   B - yes.

The teacher's not pursuing this any farther may be taken to indicate that she recognizes this as a legitimate time to be doing other things i.e. after work is finished. There is usually a check to be sure that it is finished correctly. At times the teacher may insist that the child otherwise occupy himself with, for example, a library book but this may be so that he does not disturb the class by talking.

Class time for other than work matters is limited. The teacher allows some interruptions and not others. This may be in part at least be on the basis of her own concerns, "private" matters (pressures, mood, fatigue etc.) which may from the child's point of view make her
decisions somewhat inconsistent. It is also likely that children learn to recognize when the teacher is tired or irritated and not to do things that annoy her when she is so. That is, they develop sophisticated knowledge of when they can get away with what. Interruptions from the outside by the nurse or principal or parents must be allowed. Other interruptions are unexpected.

8. t - What is it Murray?
M - Maise's tooth came out.
t - Would you like to stand up and show it to the class Maise.
(Maise gets up, goes to the front and holds it up.)

The teacher recognizes this interruption as legitimate. (Note that Maise has learned the form of showing things, perhaps from her experience in show and tell). However, first-grade children do not, apparently, possess a sure sense of what may be intruded. Further, children may "copy" one another in seeking to break into the schedule. This can be seen when one child asks to go to the washroom and subsequently ten others ask the same question. This sort of situation may be too disruptive to the purposes at hand. The following examples point out this sort of thing.

9. t - Kelly-Ann how come you're telling me everything that happens today? Haven't you got enough work to do?

10. t - When it's an accident you say it's an accident. It's alright to tell important things but not every little thing is it?
Number nine points to the fact that the teacher takes it that telling "everything" is too much and that the real concern in the classroom is "work". Example ten points more specifically to the fact that it is only alright (proper) to tell about the "important things" and not "every little thing". In example ten the teacher is proposing this as a rule introduced by "when". She is trying to build into them a recognition of the correct things to bring to her attention while emphasising the fact that their first concern as normal members of the class should be with getting work done. She is pointing to the limited time available for non-work matters. The problem she has with getting them to recognize what are the proper things to bring to her attention will be discussed later in this chapter under the heading of monitoring.

I would like now to turn to a consideration of talking. This is important in the classroom because talking takes time and also without a limiting of talk nothing could be accomplished. The structure of talk in the classroom, then, is basic to the whole possibility of order in the class which would allow for the getting on with the purpose at hand—doing the work.
"Uncontrolled" talking is not to be taken as an indication of the lack of order, as is implied in the following quotation from Jules Henry:

Meanwhile, her repeated withdrawal (leaving the room) results in the intensification of the noise, which mounts toward the third level when she leaves, so that when she returns, an effort must be made to re-establish the previous noise level. Probably the reason why the social structure of the room does not disintegrate is that the teacher warms the atmosphere with "honey" and "dear" and by occasionally fondling a child; and because by saying she is "disappointed" in them she makes the children afraid of loss of love.¹ (Emphasis mine)

Henry takes it that "noise", presumably largely from talking, leads to anarchy, in fact to the disintegration of the social structure of the classroom. Henry's characterization of what is going on as noise is itself indicative of something that is out of place, interfering. I would like to argue that noise/talking is a normal part of the activities that go on in the classroom and so constitutes part of the social structure which the children have to learn. There are times when talking is permitted and other times when the teacher wishes silence. The fact that the teacher has
methods for returning the class to silence testifies to the "normal" nature of noise. Learning when talk is permissible may be complicated by e.g. the teacher's tolerance for noise varying by day, but presumably another thing the children must learn is when the teacher is tired, mad, means business etc. Children come to school without knowing what it is about but it might be assumed that they do know how to talk and, in fact, do talk as a normal course of events. The teacher must teach them that as members of the class they must only talk during those times that she designates as proper. Routines must be established with respect to talking as well as with respect to working. The problem for the child is that he must learn to give up his right to talk to anyone about anything at any time upon entering school. (It is recognized that parents limit children's right to talk, but I assume that the school situation is relatively more restrictive in these matters). The problem is to find out when he can/ has to talk; how he gets to talk and at some point how he can talk without being caught. It was observed in a grade seven class that students who wanted to talk to one another but were several rows apart, caught each others eye and knew then to go and sharpen their pencils. First one would go and sharpen his pencil and as he was returning, the other
would get up, to go sharpen his. The room was so arranged that they could go through the cloakroom to get to the sharpener and this sequencing of going to the sharpener allowed them some seconds in the cloakroom together to talk out of sight of the teacher. While the child must learn to give up his right to talk he may nevertheless find ways to talk without being sanctioned by the teacher.

Talking (not in response to an invitation by the teacher) is taken by the teacher as an indication that the proper business of the classroom is not being attended to. The ordering of talk is to facilitate getting the work done. The following example is repeated to demonstrated the tie between talking and work.

1. t - Nicholas I can hear your voice back here, that means your not doing your work.

This utterance is similar in structure to an earlier one. The "that means" in this utterance, as in the previous example, can be seen as defining a condition for the child. The child may see that "talking" can be taken, by the teacher, as standing for something else, here, not working. The child stopped talking so this remark could be seen as a sanction. As well, it may provide some basis for the child to learn how to look occupied, or escape detection by talking more quietly. This utter-
ance provides some basis for the learning of the structure in the classroom, and ways to avoid sanctioning— not letting the teacher "hear".

What I wish to show in this section is how talking is to be seen as a normal part of the structure of the classroom as indicated by the fact that the teacher has normal, routine ways of dealing with talking so that the work of the class is accomplished. The following illustrates one of the routine ways that talking is stopped.

2. t - I want to hear no noise at all— Stephanie.

Here the teacher is directing the sanction at the whole class but specifies one person. This can be seen to be related back to the discussion about the responsibility for following class rules resting upon the individual. The specification of an individual may also be a way of emphasizing that some specific person may "pay" if the rule is not followed. Other routine ways that talking is controlled are given below.

3. The teacher claps her hands and talking stops.

4. t - Who is talking out loud at the back? (Several children point to who it is) t - Please be a little more quiet.

These examples show that when the teacher wishes to, she can stop the talking in the classroom easily and effectively. Talking is part of the social structure of
the room and Henry's interpretation that it was "disintegrative" may just indicate that he is a stranger to that social situation.

I would like now to turn to the "ground rules" of communication in the classroom, including a discussion of how to get to be heard, when speaking is necessary and the sequencing of talk.

All children want to talk—They have many questions to ask, many stories to tell. One of the hardest things they must learn is to answer questions instead of asking them...

Perhaps the recognition of children having "many stories to tell" is institutionally recognized in the show and tell period where that is what children do. The problem under discussion here though, is how children learn to order their talk so that it is accepted as appropriate for the classroom. Most of the talking in the classroom revolves around the raising of hands. This a signal which indicates in most circumstances that the person whose hand is raised wishes the floor to speak. The teacher may or may not choose to recognize the child. Such control of the "right to talk" would perhaps be calculated to humiliate or anger adults. In the classroom, however, this is a feature of life as usual. In situations where the teacher is in dialogue with students in the process of doing school work, raising of hands has
a special significance. It is a recipe as Schutz has designated that word. The following examples were discussed in the previous chapter but bear repeating.

5. t - Remember, when you put up your hand it means you have read it and understood it and can read it out loud.

6. t - Who knows this word? (Hands go up)
t - Nicholas sit up.
t - Who knows it, Darin?
   (Silence)
t - Darin, don't put up your hand if you don't know it.

The teacher is pointing out that she can take a hand to indicate that the persons whose it is can read the sentence out. Example six shows that she does take it that the conditions are fulfilled and that if they are not she has the right to sanction. Further, raising a hand is the only acceptable way to "answer". It is not permitted to profess the answer directly, without recognition.

7. t - Now who can tell me what this word is?
   (Answer inaudible)
t - Now what is this one? (Several speak out)
t - Hands you know.

Here the teacher is pointing out that children should be taking into account the rule about answering questions ("Hands you know"). In this situation, unlike situations when the class is working on its own, not every hand is meant to be recognized. One correct response rules out of order the other hands. At first,
children keep their hands up right through the question and answer period. They have to learn to put them down after one question is answered and not raise them until the next question is printed on the board and they "have understood it and can read it out loud". I have shown, then that in order to be heard a hand must be raised and that in teaching situations a hand is taken to indicate not only that you wish to speak but that you are able to give the correct answer. I would like to turn now to the sequencing of talk.

As there is a proper way to signify a wish to speak (hand) so there are proper times to indicate a wish to speak. What has to be learned is when it is proper to indicate a wish to speak and when it is proper to wait. While raising your hand is the proper way to get to be heard it is not the right to be heard. A teacher may ignore a hand and this makes it a special problem for those who wish to speak out of turn. I wish first, however, to show that the teacher does not have to grant the right to speak.

8. (A girl has her hand up for about five minutes, the teacher has seen her but says nothing.)
   t - What is it Cindy?
   C - May I leave the room?
   (The teacher nods yes.)

This indicates that hands can be ignored, perhaps, as was the case here because the teacher was occupied with
a group of people at the back and felt that the child should wait until her time was free. The following example illustrates that the teacher not only can make children wait to talk but can refuse to grant them the right to talk. In this example it is just after the lunchbell, children are in their seats and several hands are up although the teacher is not yet present. When she comes in she says:

9. t - You can put your hands down with your little heads.

These situations may be ones where the teacher is busy with something else. I have established then that the teacher may chose to ignore a hand and that the raising of hands is the proper way to get to speak. This means that to speak out of sequence a child has to speak "out" —perhaps meaning "out of order". The following demonstrate what I mean.

10. (The teacher is talking to a boy at his desk)
   f5 - Miss Jones.
   t - Would you not shout out like that please.

11. (A boy says something without invitation)
    t - Do you talk out like that when I'm over here or do you wait until I come around a second time?

The next example comes from a Grade Seven class. They are doing reading and Neil has said something.
12.  t - Neil, I'm going to ask you to leave if you don't keep your mouth closed. You talk too much out of turn.

Example ten shows that it is not proper to shout out, indicating that there is a proper way to get her attention and as I have argued it is by raising a hand.

Example eleven is interesting because she has formulated a "when" rule as a question, juxtaposing his behaviour with the proper behavior. ("Talk out" or "wait").

This example introduces the notion of proper sequencing of talk, i.e. waiting your turn. Example twelve makes more explicit this notion of turn and being "out of turn". It is interesting to note the harsher sanctions for inappropriate behavior (leaving the room) in Grade Seven perhaps because it is assumed that at this point children have had sufficient time to know the rules and act accordingly. An infraction, then, may be seen as a conscious violation or flaunting of the rule. Similar violations in Grade One only cause the teacher to repeat the rule. I have tried to show then that one of the things that children must learn is how to sequence their asking for the floor. The teacher gives rules in the same form for this type of behavior as she does for other types discussed. The form of the rules consists of pointing to an instance (designated by when) that calls for a certain type of behavior each time the instance
occurs. Example eleven indicates the teacher reviewing a rule that she has proposed before.

One situation that occurs each day where the children get to talk and for which there are rules governing the sequence in which they get to talk is Show and Tell. The children are supposed to come up by row and say what they have to say. The teacher designates the row that is to start. On one occasion a boy gets up out of turn and makes it to the front before the boy whose turn it properly is. The boy whose turn it was sits down and the teacher says:

13. t - That was nice Robin, you know there is always another turn.

Here she is recognizing his right to speak but also pointing to a rule about "politeness" which he has demonstrated and for which she gives him recognition.

Not only is there a proper way to ask to speak and a proper order to speaking, there are proper things to speak about.

14. t - When it's an accident you say it's an accident. It's alright to tell important things but not every little thing is it?

While it may not be clear to the children what falls into the category "important things" it is clear that the teacher is trying to convey the notion that there are proper things to talk about during class time. This
example illustrates the instance rule designated by "when".—(Instantial When3). In this section I have tried to show the structure of talk in the classroom. Apart from the programmed order I have discussed, there is talking back and forth across the aisles etc. by the children which just seems to be part of life-as-usual, talking which the teacher doesn't seem to notice. What I have tried to emphasis is that children come to school unaware that simple things they have taken for granted like talking must now fall under some rules. The teacher must propose and get them to stick to a set of rules governing the how, when, about what of talking. This is necessitated by the structure of the school and the fact that the teacher and the children are both present to get on with the job of teaching/learning the curriculum as outlined by the Department of Education and enforced by the principal and inspectors.
Footnotes


3. I am indebted to Roy Turner for this formulation.
CHAPTER 6
CLASSROOM ROUTINES: MONITORING AND REPORTING

In this section I shall again be discussing how the teacher meets the requirements of the organization. I wish to look at this in terms of monitoring—monitoring of the children by the teacher and monitoring of children by children as a response to membership in the classroom.

TEACHERS' MONITORING

The problem the teacher faces as discussed before is now to keep things moving smoothly so that the work gets done. In order to make sure work is being done she must "keep an eye" on what is going on in the classroom. Part of what the children must respond to is the fact that their activities are always under surveillance, and open to questioning. The following examples illustrate some instances where this happened.

1. (Patricia goes over to another girl's desk)
   t - Patricia, don't you have your own crayons?
   t - 'Trich?
   t - Patricia answer me when I ask you a question. Don't you have your own crayons?
   P - Yes.
   t - Then use them please.
2. t - What number are you doing Glenn?
   t - I asked you a question, please answer me. What number are you doing?
   G - two.
   t - Well you had better hurry up.

Here the teacher is checking up on what the children are doing and reminding them that they are supposed to be attending to their own work. The questions may be seen as a form of sanctioning. The teacher perhaps supposes that they are doing something out of order and uses these questions as a way of driving that home. The answers to the questions do not point to working acceptably and having to give an answer of this nature may produce some embarrassment. The teacher's final remark is a direction for what they should be doing which reinforces the point that she makes with the question that they are out of order. It is interesting to note that the teacher works in a rule about questions and answers, "answer me when I ask you a question". At other times the teacher does not wait for an answer but points out what the child should do. This gets him back to work quickly.

3. t - What are you doing Sandy? Huummm?
   If you need rods to do these, get a small box of rods from the back. Don't ask her and don't copy. Sit in Philip's desk.

Here the teacher does not wait for the answer but points out the rule.
The children then must become aware that they are being monitored constantly to see that they are attending to the tasks the teacher has set. If they wish to engage in other activities successfully they must learn acceptable ways of looking like they are doing what they are supposed to (looking busy) or they must learn to give acceptable accounts of their actions. In the following example the child looked as though he wasn't working. The teacher asked a question that could have been turned into a sanction but instead the boy gave an answer which got him off the hook. He may not have seen the answer as going to do this, but it is apparent that children do come to understand the employment of excuses.

4. t - All finished Billy Whitty?
B - Yes.

Questions that call for factual answers are not difficult to treat but some questions call for explanations and it is in these questions and answers we should look to find how persons learn to give accounts. Since the teacher is monitoring all the time it is likely that she will frequently see instances of behavior for which she can ask for an explanation, on the grounds that it is clearly outside of the rules governing behavior in the classroom.
5. t - Are you supposed to be eating gum in school?
m3 - No.
t - Then why are you doing it?
(Silence)
t - What are you doing to do about it?
m3 - Throw it in the basket.
t - Well DO IT NOW!

6. (The teacher comes in after recess—hands are up)
t - Yes?
m3 - Philip was standing on his desk
 t - Why Philip? (Shrugs—indicating I don't know)
m4 - He also stood on John's desk.
t - Why Philip? (Shrugs)
t - Well reason things out before you act.

Here the teacher is pushing for an "explanation" for the children's behavior when at least in the first case there is presumably none possible and in both none is given. The clue to what I take it is going on here is "Well, reason things out before you act." The teacher is implicitly pointing out that every action should be "reasonable", i.e. that you shouldn't do things which you can not account for in some reasonable way. I am suggesting that a hallmark for the socialized person is actions engaged in have a corresponding rationale which can be offered to make the behavior appear "normal" and "reasonable". This then is something that children must learn to do. Here the teacher is pointing to the need to give "accounts". We may suppose that accounting for Grade One students is not part of life-as-usual.
CHILDREN AS MONITORS

Since the teacher can not watch everybody at once she sometimes needs to call on other children to monitor others behavior and report on it to her. The following two excerpts point to how this is accomplished.

1. Fraulein Wollner makes productive use of class disapproval to affect changes in the performance of children. When, for example, a pupil is called to the front to recite and has nothing to say, she sends him back to his seat and often starts the class singing the following:

   (All the people get up early
    Sleepy-head, wake up!
    Outside the sun beams!
    All the people get up early.)

   At the end of the song the whole class gleefully turns towards the pupil and points at him. Fraulein Wollner thinks it helps them to be more attentive.

2. ..."when something happens and a lot of you are involved, you must stop and work together to figure out a solution. You shouldn't always run to the teacher to tell him who did it."

   It is not the first time a teacher has cautioned pupils against tattling. Most teachers seem conscious of the tendency and express interest in keeping it at a minimum. At the same time, some of the primary disciplinary devices used, in the lower grades in particular, exploit the tendency of young children to tell on each other—and make public denouncement quite respectable. Students learn this behavior comes to be, in the later years of elementary school, unacceptable.

These illustrate that the teacher can make use of the whole class (together as in one or as individuals two)
to keep the class in order. The first quotation shows the teacher's concern for keeping everyone "with" the work, and the second points to a way in which she can keep them in line. It is interesting that Warren (the author of the ethnography from which the above quotes were taken) notes that this tattling does not work in later years. This could be the result of a change of loyalties from classroom to peer group.

Children reporting on other children's behavior involves them in having learned to re-interpret what they once saw as "normal" facts of life. Children can now see what formerly were normal activities—running, talking, etc. as inappropriate or wrong. What has enables them to do this is a recognition (knowledge) of the social structure of the classroom—that is they have acquired a sense of it's rule governed nature and can apply the rules without help from the teacher. This required a high degree of "socialized" behavior. The children now take the "moral" order of the school as their own. I would like now to consider an exchange which illustrates this activity of monitoring other children's behavior and reporting it to the teacher.

7. (Several children are absent having gone to the washroom.) (There is noise of people stomping up the stairs.)
   t - Denise who was making that noise?
D - I...I don't know.
t - Was it someone from our class?
D - No.
(A boy returns—he was clearly making
noise for he did so right up to the door.)
t - Chris how do we go?
C - On tippytoe.
t - Why do we go on tippytoe?
C - So we don't make noise.
t - Why don't we want to make noise?
Cl- Because it will jiggle the tape
    recorder.
t - (laughs) That's right but we also
don't want to disturb the other
    children, try and remember that.

The first thing I would like to note about this exchange
is that the teacher ties the incident to membership in
the class. She identifies it as a class matter "Was it
someone from our class?". The implication being that
"we" as members of the class have a responsibility to
follow the rule about not disturbing the class but also
a responsibility for seeing that others do the same.
The second thing I would like to note is that the teacher
asks the child to report on the behavior of another child.
The third thing I would like to note is that the teacher
ends by giving the rule again. That is, she is repeat-
ing the rule, "remember" pointing to the fact that at
some earlier time it had been proposed. I would argue
then that the teacher proposes rules which are to govern
appropriate behavior in the classroom and which the child
as member become responsible for following. Rules are
tied to membership.
CHILDRENS' REPORTS

At some time after the proposal of the rule the teacher begins to sanction people for not following it. Further, she may specifically ask children to report on others activities and as Warren (the author of the quoted ethnography) points out "exploit the tendency of young children to tell on each other". Given these conditions the children may start to see that indeed it is their responsibility to report on others misbehavior and begin to do so. The following are examples of instances where this occurred. It may be useful to see that these reports are also clues to what the children see the social structure of the classroom to be.

8. t - Gordon?
   G - Kelly was out of her desk.
   t - Oh, Kelly stay in your desk.
       Necee. Everyone stay in their desks and do nothing but arithmetic. HURRY!

       t - Nicholas what did I just ask everyone to do?
          (Nicholas is silent)
       t - You can sit down or go outside, take your choice.
           Nicholas sits down.

Here a student invokes a rule which the teacher recognizes as valid--i.e. she carries out a sanction as a result of the report of the contravention of the rule. As well as sanctioning the guilty party she connects the rule up with the reason for the rule--getting work done.
It is interesting that she singles out Nicholas as belonging to "everybody". This would add strength to the contention of individual responsibility for class rules. Here Gordon has shown that he sees as breaking a rule being out of your "seat" and the teacher uses his report to bring the class back to the work at hand. Other examples point to similar things.

9. f4 - Sarah Lee is getting the same sticker star as me.
   t - Is that a crime?
   f4 - She copied me.
   t - Did you copy from Kelly-Ann, Sarah? Did you copy Kelly-Ann's work?
   S - (Could not be heard)
   t - That's good. If she comes over again Kelly-Ann you cover your work up with your hand again.

The teacher responds to Kelly-Ann's statement as though it were not valid ("Is that a crime?"). Perhaps she just says the remark as an indication of selfishness on Kelly-Ann's part. Kelly-Ann immediately establishes the relevance/validity of her remark by supplying the reason for her statement. (Notice that she is able to truncate the exchange by pointing immediately to the reason without the intermediate step of answering "yes" to "Is that a crime?" and then having to answer the teacher's next question of why?—"She copied me.") In light of Kelly-Ann's explanation for reporting Sarah it may be possible to see her first remark as indica-
tive of some notion of justice (perhaps learned in class) that reward should be given to those who do their own work. Given that the reason for the report is treated as valid by the teacher, this may be seen as Kelly-Ann's having learned what constitutes an acceptable reason for interrupting the teacher and also indicates that she is aware of the "rules" of classroom activity. The teacher sanctions (negatively) Sarah—"That's good"—presumably meaning it was good that Kelly-Ann covered her work so Sarah could not copy it. (i.e.—you are not to copy). She handles Kelly-Ann's claim by establishing that it is proper to not let people copy from you. Here it would seem that Kelly-Ann took it that the act of looking over constituted the copying regardless of whether or not Sarah actually saw anything. The teacher's last statement allowed her to "reaffirm" the position taken by Kelly-Ann (covering her work) as right and proper. Sarah showed sophistication when she was able to recognize the difference between copying and attempted copying. Her account got her off the hook—in the sense that she was allowed to keep the sticker star. In the next example Kelly-Ann goes up to the teacher's desk and says:

10. K - Tony is copying my printing.
   t - No, he's looking at mine.
   (Indicates board)
K - No, he looked over at my printing.
t - Tony, don't copy Kelly-Ann's printing, if you want to look at one look at mine.

Here again "copying" is used as a legitimation for reporting. The teacher does not accept at first it's validity (No) presumably because the work is in the public domain. Kelly-Ann insists, (No, rejects the teacher's version and allows her to re-state that Sarah was copying), however, that he did copy and here makes explicit what she takes to constitute "copying"—"looking over". Since copying is wrong, the teacher sanctions Tony but weakens the impact by pointing out that there is no need to copy from another student. These examples show how the children take seriously their job of enforcing the rules of the classroom. It is possible to argue that the children have seen that it is their responsibility as being part of the class "we" to see that everyone in the class is a good and acceptable member of the class.

While the teacher can make use of this reporting, it can, at times, be to her disadvantage. Examples eight, nine and ten all involved Kelly-Ann and occurred in a short space of time one morning.

11. t - Kelly-Ann, how come you're telling me everything that happens today. Haven't you enough work to do?
While a report of copying may allow the teacher to make the point that copying is wrong, a too serious concern with reporting is only annoying. Example eleven shows that the teacher must as well establish when and how often reporting is to take place. An example later in this section will further support this.

12. (After lunch—teacher comes in the room, hands are up.)

(A) t - Yes William?
W - Mrs. Gill told us to play outside and a big boy pushed me down in the mud.

t - Are you all muddy?

t - Come and let me see.

t - You have your boots on. Is it wet all the way through?

W - No.

t - Do you know where the engineers room is?

W - Yes.

t - Where?

W - Over in the big school downstairs where they keep the furnaces.

t - Do you know where the door is up stairs?

W - Yes.

t - You take this note over to the engineer and get dried out. Go get your coat on. (Goes to get it--returns)

t - Take this note over. Take your reader with you.

(B) (Dierdre comes in late with some explanation about hearing the bell and running but still late. She was not playing on the way to school.)

t - You've been late too many times Dierdre. (Puts her name on the board.)

L - Lloyd?

L - Some big boys pushed me and I slipped on a banana peel.
t - Is it important?
L - Yes.
t - Did you hurt yourself?
L - Yes but it's not bleeding or
scraped.
t - Is that important?
L - No.
t - When it's an accident you say
it's an accident. It's alright
to tell about important things
but not every little thing,

These two exchanges (A and B) are interesting in that
they are offered accounts using similar form and yet
their disposal is quite different. In (A) the account
is "Mrs. Gill told us to play outside and a big boy
pushed me down in the mud." William establishes his
right to having been outside ("Mrs. Gill told....")
and then describes what happened. The teacher's con­
cern is with William's state ("Are you all muddy?")
and not with the punishment of the "big boys"/ "big
boys pushed me" establishes it was not his fault and so
he can't be punished/reprimanded for it. Her concern
is with getting him dried out--to do this she has to
send him to the engineers room but first has to check
to see that he knows exactly where to go ("Do you know
where the door is up the stairs?"). She does manage
to point out that he has broken one rule "You have your
boots on"--slippers are proper dress. Lloyd establishes
that something happened to him that was not his fault
"big boys". He does not legitimize his being outside
but the teacher does not follow this up as important. She reveals what constitutes a valid reason for making such a report— if you are hurt. In other words, her concern is a practical one of not having wet or bleed-children in the classroom. Lloyd does recognize the criteria of hurt, "Bleeding or scraped", and truncates the exchange by qualifying his hurt. How the teacher sees the important thing as being accident/non-accidental is hard to see, although she later makes it "important thing". Note that her statement is given in the "when" form for a statement of a general rule. It is emphasized with "Is it?". It may be possible to see Lloyd's account simply as a repetition of William's account in order to get recognition or sympathy. Examples eleven A. and B. illustrate reporting about events outside the classroom. It is interesting to note that the teacher's concern is not with sanctioning but with the practical concern of dealing with any trouble (wet clothes, bleeding etc.) One can further note that the teacher's concern over "outside" events is limited to its classroom relevance, and that she requires the child to legitimate his claim to the time it takes to deal with the problem. She must be concerned with the responsibility for the act. If it is the child's responsibility then the child may be sanctioned, hence William's assignment of responsibility
to the "big boys". But this must be seen as connected to the seriousness of the problem and hence her establishment in Lloyd's case of only when it is an accident or when it is serious (bleeding). Her non-acceptance of Lloyd's report even though he blames the big boys argues for seeing the responsibility for the act and its seriousness as going together. In this section I have shown how the teacher builds into the children some notion of responsibility for enforcement of classroom rules and how this activity of monitoring and reporting sometimes gets carried to excess or is inappropriately applies, thus requiring the teacher to make more specific the sorts of things she is concerned with having reported.

Children in class constantly monitor each other and not all of the reporting to the teacher is about things other children do that is wrong. The following examples illustrate a knowledge of the social structure of the classroom, but are not so much reports to the teacher as "helpful" reminders to other children. The teacher is reprimanding a boy for not doing his reading questions.

13. f6 - (in seat in front of Ross) He doesn't have a book.
   t - Where is your book Ross?
   R - I forgot it at home.
   t - Bring it this afternoon.

In this case the girl got Ross off the hook by providing
a legitimate excuse to the teacher for Ross. This argues the girl’s knowledge of proper excuses.

In another case the teacher had stressed to one group that when they marked their phonics papers they should only mark the items that were wrong. When the second group was marking their papers a girl says to a boy.

14. f4 - Don’t put a check mark.

These examples further strengthen the argument that the children see as part of their membership in the class a responsibility to see that things are done right. If the children only reported on infractions of rules and only to the teacher it might be argued that they engaged in this activity just to get someone in trouble, but this is not the case.

Children may police each other in the absence of the teacher. A boy has just come back into the classroom to report that another boy who was to have gone home to change some muddy clothes was still waiting outside. He was waiting for his mother to pick him up but apparently he was supposed to walk home and his mother was going to drive him back. The teacher leaves the room to go check and the class bursts into laughter.

15. f1 - Quiet!
   f2 - Shhhhhhhsh!
   (The class does quieten down somewhat.)
Here the children check on each others activities even in the absence of the teacher. This indicates that they take the responsibilities of class membership seriously and that their socialization to the class has been quite successful.

The teacher makes further use of the children in getting the work of the classroom done by enlisting their aid in what might be seen as teacher's activity. She farms out work.

CHILDREN AS TEACHERS

It might be assumed that children are merely passive recipients of knowledge in the classroom. However, early in the year they are presumed responsible for carrying out many duties, some of them teaching. It was regular practice in one room for the teacher to appoint someone each day to say hello to the class and to lead the Lord's Prayer. This assumed competence for the knowing of the Lord's Prayer. The following examples point to another of these helping positions.

16. t - Any fishes who are having trouble with their reading questions can go and see Marie because she has them all right.

... The fish can go to Jo-Ann.

t - If any airplanes are having difficulty with their questions they can go to Lida because she has them all correct.

...
Nicholas puts up his hand and wants help with his questions. The teacher tells him that is what the helpers are for; if after he has seen a helper he still doesn't understand he can come and see her, after she has finished with the group.

This example illustrates the position and also points out that it is to be taken seriously by other students. It is interesting to note that the teacher establishes the basis on which helpers are chosen—"all right"—"all correct". This introduces a notion of qualification for the position—a qualification connected with accomplishment of academic work. Correctness as a qualification. Help can be given in other ways.

17. t - Go take your boots off Billy. Don help Billy. Oh you have something to show. Who has nothing, alright Lloyd you help him.

18. A girl (Laura) who is new to the school comes at recess time of her first day and asks about where she is to play, etc. The teacher asks who will be Laura's "friend"—presumably to show her the ropes—a girl is appointed (picked) and comes up and takes her hand.

19. The teacher asks one girl to help another, She is having trouble with her minuses. They go out into the hall to do it.

The teacher has the children take over work that would be time consuming for her, that is giving individual help when she has to attend to teaching larger groups new material. This may also contribute to the childrens' sense of involvement with and responsibility for the
In this chapter I have shown how the teacher makes use of the children to help her get through the work that is imposed by the organization of the school. She draws on their responsibility as members of the class to monitor, and report on each others activities. At times, she makes use of the children who know how to do a particular thing to help someone who is having difficulty.
Footnotes


CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has attempted to describe children's acquisition of a sense of social structure. I have suggested that the teacher establishes for the children a sense of their being members of the classroom and links this through demonstrable linguistic devices with a set of rules which the children as class members, have a responsibility for following, as well as enforcing. I have suggested that while the teacher presents rules in a form which indicates that they apply to all members of the classroom the individual must learn to infer these rules as being applicable to him. That is he must see that he either follows the rules or pays the consequence in the form of sanctions from the teacher. I have presented data which indicates that the teacher is successful in this and that children not only follow and "internalize" but at times both report others for not following the rules and enforce the rules amongst themselves when the teacher is not present.

As a conclusion I would like to discuss one further implication that the attendance at school has for children. I would like to begin this by citing an example.
A boy reads a sentence the teacher has printed on the board.

m1 - Where are we?
m2 - At school. (Teacher shakes her head).
f1 - In school. (Teacher shakes her head).
f2 - We are in school.
t - Why is that the answer we are looking for?
f2 - Because it makes sense.

What I would note as curious here is that both the boy's answer "at school", and the answer of the first girl, "in school", are (a) factually correct, and (b) employ normal form speech. The teacher's question ratifies, "We are in school" as the "correct" answer. In terms of classroom concerns its correctness lies in its being "a complete sentence". To make sense of this I would like to refer back to Joos' contention that the school imposes an unreality on the child. Children come to school with the ability to speak and be understood. In this example, the teacher is making this ability problematic by questioning that ability which the child has learned to take for granted. The teacher then is in the process of changing children's conceptions of speech and grammar. The children's attempt to change their conception of grammar and speech must, at least at first, be confusing for the teacher does not insist on this form (the complete sentence form) all of the time as an
examination of many of the exchanges cited in this thesis indicate. Indeed the girl's last answer ("Because it makes sense.") is in what might be called normal conversational form. The teacher is introducing a notion of the sentence as a normative unit, which then makes grammar a matter which can be given the same right/wrong treatment as other rules in the classroom. What is especially interesting in this exchange is the girl's answer to the question "Why is that the answer we are looking for?", "Because it makes sense." This answer may be taken to indicate the depth of socialization. The girl comes to see that this preferred way of speaking is the way that "makes sense", i.e. is "right". Her membership in the classroom seems strong, i.e. she "believes" in the rules. In contrast to this could be seen a response like "We have to say things that way during language periods". This sort of response then might be seen simply as knowing what is "good for you". Perhaps this latter orientation to school comes about with the socialization to other memberships, such as peer group, which may require reformulation of daily practices into strategies to "get through".

The body of knowledge which children come to school with and which "works" for them in their everyday life is, in part, subjected to explicit "criticism", and the
teacher may propose alternate forms which the children are responsible for articulating. Such alternate forms, however, along with practices which facilitate classroom "flow", are not recommended merely on the grounds of technical efficacy. Rather, children come to learn a set of routines as morally correct, fusing the actions of "propriety" and "making sense". In classrooms, apparently, children learn to "be" and to "act like" competent members of society, where the notion of competence relates to the production of warrantable behavior. It is in this sense then, that first grade children may be seen in the process of acquiring a sense of social structure, as they learn methods for producing and sustaining a stable moral order.
APPENDIX A

THE NORMAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE SCHOOL

The concern of this thesis is with a description of the structure of the classroom situation. Erving Goffman has written:

Every institution captures something of the time and interest of its members and provides something of a world for them; in brief, every institution has encompassing tendencies.

The structure of the school as an institution determines in part the concerns and problems of the classroom. Persons like Lippitt and Gold who claim to be discussing classroom social structure, however, have failed to document how the institution shapes the social structure of the classroom. Their concerns are with such things as social power structure, affective structure, expertness structure, and coercibility structure. One of the ways that the institutions shaping of the classroom becomes evident is through the problems faced by the researcher. Therefore I propose to discuss at some length the problems I encountered in gaining entry to the classrooms because during the process I discovered some of the structure of the classroom as it is constituted by the structure of the school. I shall show how the structure of the institution impinges on the classroom—that is upon the activities of the classroom.

77
The problems that arose because of my lack of knowledge of what constituted the social structure of the school are problems that the children encounter as well. The children must discover the teachers concerns and preoccupations in order to get along in the classroom. The children are faced with the problem of "figuring out" the teacher's conception of what constitutes "normal" activity in the classroom.

It has been reported in the literature that observers are used in situations where it is important that the ongoing social situation not be disturbed. Roger W. Heyns and Ronald Lippitt state that one of the occasions for the use of observers is "when other techniques of measurement would disrupt the process of social interaction". Similar notions are recorded by Aaron Cicourel:

Schwartz and Schwartz characterize the passive participant observer as being similar to one observing behind a one way screen. The idea is to interact as little as possible under the assumption that such behaviour will interfere with the group's activities to a lesser degree and provide for a more natural observation of events.

While I realize that the above strictures are not always taken literally there is still a strong assumption that observers make little difference to the situation. There is little reporting of how observers disrupt or even change the situations and occasions that they observe,
or of the theoretical import of such "reactions". At one point during the research one of the teachers said to me: "You mean I've been putting on this show for nothing?" This made me wonder how much of an effect my presence had made in the school. This chapter is a discussion of how the social structure of the school was disrupted when I was introduced into the school and into the classrooms. My claim here, then, is that a documentation of these events reveals some of the social structure of the school and classroom that children are put in the position of having to learn in order to be successful and in that sense constitutes proper data for the study of socialization.

INITIAL ENCOUNTER

In order to add clarity to the following discussion I will first recount how entrance was gained to the particular school where the research was carried out.

Mr. Roy Turner, with whom I was studying, approached the Vancouver School Board for permission to place an observer in Grade One classrooms in one school. The person in charge of such arrangements asked for the submission of a written outline of the research objectives. After the receipt of this outline a meeting was held between Mr. Turner and the school board representative and approval was given. A school was suggested to the
representative and he said that he would contact the principal of that school and that the principal would contact Mr. Turner for further arrangements. At the initial contact a meeting was suggested to discuss arrangements. A meeting was held between the principal, Mr. Turner and myself at which the purposes of the research were discussed and practical arrangements about the number of times per week the observer would be present etc. were arranged. The principal indicated that he now had to approach the teachers and discuss it with them and would be in contact when this was done. There followed an interval of about ten days which was explained to have been necessary because one of the teachers was sick another was recovering from a period of intense emotional stress. Since the negotiations for entry into the school were carried on at the beginning of the school year perhaps the teachers did not want others present when student control was still problematic. (This same attitude may be reflected in the teachers suggestion to the observer as Christmas neared that they did not want observations to take place just before the Christmas break. At this time of year formal teaching is at a minimum and students are involved in making decorations for the room and getting prepared for the Christmas assembly. These activities are presumably not supervised as closely as activities during
formal teaching and the teachers may not want their students seen at these times.) Contact was made again and the time and date of the observers first visit arranged. I was to arrive at the school one-half hour before morning classes began (8:30) and report to the office. I complied, at which time I was cautioned about not disturbing classes and not departing from the arranged schedule. The principal indicated that any changes in my observational schedule acceptable to the teachers were alright with him. The observer was taken to the teachers and introduced as the researcher from U.B.C. who would be observing two mornings a week.

As I shall discuss later on in this chapter what seemed to me to be a normal ordinary introduction was not so to the teachers. I will make clear the significance of this later, but first I would like to outline the problems I encountered and attempt some accounting of how they came about. It is these specific problems which highlight the complex structure of the school—problems which anyone (including the children) coming to school may encounter. When these situations are no longer problematic then a person is seen as a "normal" member of that situation.

The following are some of the problems I faced and what I take to be the significance of them. The first
few times only the barest interaction took place between myself and the teachers (i.e. greetings, instructions where to sit etc.). In many respects this did not change with one of the teachers (Miss Smith). With the other teacher (Miss Jones) I developed a joking relationship as a response to her facial expressiveness of looking "sad" when I arrived and "happy" when I left. This was taken as a reflection of her feelings. An example of this relationship may be seen in the following exchange. One morning there was an interchange following her expressiveness via face (looking sad on my arrival but agreeing to let me stay) in which I said: "It is good to see passive acceptance" and Miss Jones corrected "Negative acceptance". It may be seen that the observer was not a welcome sight. The same feelings may be seen expressed in an interaction with Miss Smith. I was going to leave at recess one morning and I told the teacher this on arrival, stating "I can only stay until recess today". Miss Smith did not reply verbally, she just looked up and chuckled in such a way that the observer took it to mean "Oh that's too bad", which was to be heard as that is really good news since I am not to have you around observing anywan. In order to understand the remarks above that indicate that my presence was somewhat undesirable to the teachers I
will make use of the notion that members of society in their interaction with other members employ categorization devices and associated expectations about behaviour in order to make sense of the situation and to guide their own actions in the exchange.\(^6\) When people who do not know each other are placed in a position of interacting we might assume that they are going to try and find out what the other wants/is doing. It may be that one way of checking on who a person is and what he wants is to make use of information already at hand about people who seem to be like him. If the person does not belong to a category that the other possesses information about and he has to handle what he sees as potentially dangerous information, interaction may be both problematic and stressful. The observer is present by design to find out what is going on and the teacher may want to limit what it is he sees. The teacher may be concerned not to present information that later can be used against him.\(^7\)

If members have some doubt about the intention of another member one way of checking on his avowed purpose is to see how he talks to other people or acts towards them. The teachers could not do this with the researcher for they saw him only when he was in their classrooms. They had to accept—at least appear to accept—as fact the reasons that I have for the research. They could not
see how I talked about the research to other sociologists, the principal, members of the school board or friends.

I was in a position, however, to check one teacher's presentation with that of the other had that been my purpose, i.e. to evaluate teaching ability. It is interesting to note that one teacher has to rely on another teacher's verbal reports about how and what she teaches. There is no possibility of finding out if that is what she "really" does. Knowledge of what other teachers do appears to be of some interest judging by a conversation I had with Miss Jones (outside of school). I asked her what the date was and she replied that she did not know. I remarked, jokingly, that this was terrible since even the Grade Ones's in Miss Smith's class were required to know since they were asked every day. Miss Jones responded by asking what else Miss Smith did. I replied that I did not think this was something I should talk about. The problem was to explain why the teachers did not seem happy about my presence and I am arguing that this at least in part was due to the fact that they were not sure about the "real" purposes of the research and their problem of finding out what was the real purpose was predicated on associating me with a category of persons about whom they "knew" something. One way of solving the problem would be to see if I could be assimilated to any
of the social types who are "normally" around the school.

NORMAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE SCHOOL SETTING

I will outline categories of persons normally around the school and how the school is set up to control the entry of other than "normal" persons.

In this connection I will discuss an incident that occurred in the men's coffee room at the school. The observer was invited by the principal to have coffee on the days he was at the school. The principal introduced the observer on his first day of observing to several of the teachers. The observer was sitting in the coffee room about three weeks after the commencement of observations and a teacher who the observer had not seen before walked in. He saw the observer and remarked:

"Who's sick today?"

This may seem like a strange opening remark. (Greetings are not necessarily exchanged by those in the coffee room presumably because they are on speaking grounds that are continuous and do not require re-opening each time they come into one another's presence.) Although the remark was obviously directed to the observer (he was looking directly at the observer) the observer could not immediately figure out what the remark could mean. The evidence offered is how the author reconstructed how it was he made sense of the utterance. A normal occurrence at the school is the presence of substitute teachers. It is
therefore reasonable for a teacher who has not "heard otherwise" to take for granted that those in the coffee room are 'legitimate', 'usual' members of a category who make use of that setting--teachers. A strange face is then, a substitute teacher. Perhaps this could be formalized in the following way:

In a specific setting members who usually inhabit the setting "see" some one else who is in the setting and who has no obvious symbolic detachment from the setting as a member of the category who belongs in that setting. 9

To the question "who is sick today?" the observer answered:

"No one that I know of, I'm doing research in Grade One."  

The teacher said:

"Ohhh."  

and went on fixing his coffee and talking to the other teachers present. 10

The school is so arranged that there are built-in controls on who is permitted in the school. The control centers around the notion of there being persons who "normally" are in the school--persons who belong. Access to the school for others is restricted and certain procedures should be followed. Not acting in the proper way may lead to suspiciousness on the part of the staff and subsequently questioning as to your purpose and right to be in the school.
In general the proper procedure is to go directly to the office and state your business and the people there will make provisions for it to be carried out. Teachers and office staff when deciding who to stop and question about the legitimacy of their business in the school likely use in their typifications some notions of those usually around and such variables as dress, direction of travel, apparent assuredness of going in the right direction, intensity of travel (just looking around) etc.

I was told at a previous school that suspicious looking persons are often questioned by the principal or other male teacher why they are loitering around the school grounds or the perimeter of the school. I was told that on occasion the police are phoned to come and detain the person for questioning. I was present in the coffee room of the school when a female teacher knocked on the door and came in looking for the principal. She had seen a man come on to the school ground while she was outside with her children, look around and walk away, she said: "I didn't like the look of him." She had a description ready (almost no hair, about thirty, no topcoat (it was a cold day), no car in sight and he was walking up toward twenty-fourth) which may indicate that she expected someone to go out and check on him. She asked if she should notify the engineer and finally left to do so. Presumably the engineer is in a better position to look out for people and perhaps he
has more time. In conversation with the male teachers after the female teacher left it was heard that the three incidents that occurred in the last year happened in the basement which also may account for the notification of the engineer. Even when offenses occur it is difficult to do anything about them. The teachers told the author that in one case the girl involved (a man exposed himself to her) did not tell the teachers but her mother when she went home. When the mother phoned the school the next day it was too late to do anything. In the other case the man was caught with the girl but not "in the act". With only the little girl's word they could not prosecute. One of the teachers who was not at the school at the time remarked: "Couldn't they prosecute for trespassing if he didn't have a legitimate reason?" The others guessed not. This remark does however add to the contention that the school is seen by the teachers as definitely a place of limited access. The teachers also talked about what the signal was to inform them to come to the office when an incident had/ was happening. They couldn't remember exactly what it was. Teachers may 'see' these persons as a potential threat to the safety of the children entrusted to them.

If a parent comes to the school looking for his child it is likely that he will go to the office to find out the
location of the room that his child is in. After the location is known subsequent visits may be made directly to the classroom. The author has been present several times when mothers have come to the door of the classroom unescorted by teaching and office staff. On one occasion the author was present in the classroom when there was a knock on the fire escape door (see diagram, Appendix B). When it was opened a mother of one of the girls explained that she had brought a lunch for the girl because instead of her aunt coming to their place for lunch she was going over there and the girl would not be able to come. The teacher asked the girl to go get the lunch and the mother left. The only father seen at the school was accompanied by a teacher, but this may have been simply because it was his first visit and he did not know the location of the room. Parents may come at the invitation of the teacher but what arrangements are made for this are not known.

It is easily seen that women are likely better able to 'pass' than men in the school setting for many reasons, one of which is that the stereotype of the molester is male.

Informal checks may easily be instituted by the seemingly helpful questions of: "May I help you?" or "May I be of assistance?" A 'no' answer to these questions leaves open the possibility to ask or seek an account.
While the foregoing may seem like a tedious digression it is central to establish that schools are not public places but places where it is to be expected that only certain categories of persons will be. For persons not normally present at school there are procedures that are to be followed to gain access, and not following the procedures leads to checking procedures. Not everyone may "attend" school. The importance of the idea of normally expected persons is that teachers have expectations about their business at the school and how to handle situations in which they interact with these people. While anyone may walk into a school and by following the proper procedures transact his business it is not true that the same applies to admission to the classroom. I have discussed certain categories of persons who might be found at the school and about whom teachers might have knowledge but it seems evident that the categories of molester or parent could not be easily used to deal with me as a researcher. I will now discuss some categories of people who may be found in classrooms and show that while these may possibly be used to encompass a researcher their application in terms of guiding interaction is not satisfactory.
INTRUSIONS AND RIGHTS OF ACCESS

There are several categories of people who have the right to intrude. This is a right to the extent that the visit may be a surprise. This contingency may demand of the teachers the ability to change teaching styles quickly. One group of people who may "arrive" are inspectors who are present to evaluate the teachers teaching ability. This evaluation becomes one of the bases for future jobs and salary increases. Principals may also pay unexpected visits. I was present on one occasion when the principal just walked in in the middle of a lesson and stood and watched. He spoke to the teacher twice, once about another way to present the same material and once recalling how it used to be. He talked to one student and then walked out. Arrangements are made for student teachers to observe in classrooms. Student teachers observe teachers in action but theirs may be seen as a monitoring and not an evaluating activity. The student teacher is required to see the correspondence between what is written in the textbooks and what goes on in class. Possibly the student teacher's presence generates an "idealized" teaching presentation. A student in a second year sociology course wrote a report on The Practice Teacher. This was a recounting of her experiences as one and was
in no way connected with my own research. She wrote:

There is pressure on the teacher to give a good lesson and to keep his class well under control. Any working person naturally wishes to appear at his best in the presence of observers. The teacher is naturally going to respond in the same manner with the (sic) presence of the student teacher.

Nurses in the school make arrangements so that students can be taken out of class in order that their tasks may be accomplished. Parents and nurses conduct their business at the door during class time, others have the right to enter. Perhaps only those who are in a position to determine the course of the teacher's career are likely to be seen as a threat.

The contention that there are only two usual categories of people for a classroom—teachers and students—is evidenced by the fact that there is no provision for anyone else to sit. The Grade One desks are too small to hold an adult. What arrangements were made for me? In one classroom I was given permission to use the chair usually used by the teacher at the rod table. A disruption of normal classroom activity was caused by this for now the teacher had to lift the chair from her desk and carry it back to the rod table while carrying on the lesson. In the other classroom I could have used a chair built for grade ones but this would have resulted in such a cramped sitting position that observation could only be
carried on for a short period of time. As an alternative the teacher offered the use of the piano bench (see diagram). This was disruptive as well for when singing took place the observer often was required to stand while sheet music was obtained from the bench. There is no 'normal' (life-as-usual) provision for persons other than teachers and students to be present for extended periods of time.

In many schools the category of non-education researcher is not one available for use. K. Naegele reported that the health team of which he was a member was seen by the teachers as providing a service in the form of interpreting children's problems "scientifically". This it is argued here is because of the presence of psychiatrists on the team, attended by their highly visible and publically defined role. In other words the teachers had some basis for interaction; they had some expectations regarding psychiatrists and included sociologists in the same category. In small groups research the category of researcher is more evident. Persons see him as such and have expectations about both how to act and what he is after. In the school under discussion these sorts of conditions did not exist.

Another factor which has been noted as important to findings in research is how access is gained to the setting.
The effects of differential sponsorship (the researcher may be seen as occupying the same category as the person he is sponsored by) is shown clearly in G. Berreman's *Behind Many Masks.* Different parts of the community were opened to him when he obtained another interpreter. The new interpreter was of a different religion than the first and the inhabitants of the village held different expectations for persons of this religion. In the case under discussion I entered the school and was introduced into the classroom by the principal. The teachers had little choice in the matter. The principal told us that the three Grade One teachers were approached and one apparently refused to allow the observer into her classroom. This was accepted by the principal who explained that she was just recovering from a nervous breakdown and the observer might be too much of a burden—might re-precipitate the illness.

It was found after the observations in informal conversation with one of the teachers were over that the principal had approached the three teachers and suggested that they take student teachers or a researcher into their classes. All the teachers said flatly, no. The principal presented the researcher as doing work in "the heart of the language arts program". The language arts program includes literature, poetry and discussion. It is apparently of great concern in the field of education.
today. One of the teachers reportedly said that if he insisted she would quit. Since she was married presumably she could afford to. It is interesting to note that this is the teacher that the principal presented as having just gone through a period of intense emotional stress, and having the researcher in her class might be too much. Apparently the principal took her at her word for he dropped his demands. The principal then suggested that Miss Jones take the researcher and Miss Smith the student teacher. Both again refused. I was told by Miss Jones later that they saw his wanting both a researcher and a student teacher in the school as an attempt to gain status in the eyes of the school board. The principal at this point asked them how it would look on the report cards he issued on them at the end of the year if he put that they were unco-operative and did not want to take student teachers of persons working in "the heart of the language arts program". (It is interesting to note that at the end of the year the teachers did go down on their report cards. At the end of the year one of the teachers quit a year before retirement (the one that did not have the researcher in her room); another left teaching after many years and threatened not to return and the third was thinking of quitting and looking around for something else). The meeting was apparently terminated with the issues left open—that is the principal neither accepted
or rejected their refusal. The next thing the teachers heard about the issue was when the principal showed up one morning with me. One of the teachers later noted that this was the reason for the cool reception I might have noticed. Although the reason for not wanting a researcher around was never revealed I did find out that the reason the teachers do not like student teachers is because they "know nothing, disrupt the class and upset the children". A girl writing of her experiences as a student teacher apparently noticed this.

The apparent attitude and expressed attitude of the majority of teachers is "The student teacher is a pain in the neck and why does he have to gain experience on my time, with my class!".

The teachers decided that the way to "get back" at the principal for forcing the researcher on them was not to teach language arts when I was present. Miss Jones said that she never taught it when I was present but waited until I left. An incident involving Miss Smith indicates that they believed that that was my interest. One group of children had gone to the front to read, Miss Smith came to where I was sitting and said:

I should explain that we don't do much discussion with these stories...the pictures...the pictures are too banal...there's no challenge to them, that's why we speed through them.

Given that this indicates that they believed my interest to be in the language arts program my claim to be studying
children's reaction to the school situation may have caused some confusion.

It can be seen then that the impinging nature of the structure of the school is manifest in the fact that the teachers were in a position where they had to accept the decision of the principal about having a researcher. It is evident in that there is status to be gained for the principal by having a researcher and student teachers. Along with these facts the school situation provides a limited number of life-as-usual categories for dealing with persons. The teachers then experienced confusion because none of the available categories seemed to make sense out of what I was doing. The teachers also reacted to having to take a researcher by restructuring their programs so that none of the language arts program would be taught in my presence. While the structure of the school impinges on the classroom, it is still possible to act against it. These then were some of the disruptions of the structure of the school that my presence caused. While the children were not involved in these things in the same way they did have to deal with the structure of the school as it is revealed in these incidents. The children had to be aware of the changes in program as effected by the teachers. One problem for the children is to categorize persons in the same way as the teachers.
They must learn that a person hanging around the school grounds is somehow someone who is to be reported to the teacher as a "strange" man or whatever. In the same way they had to categorize me. Their problem was double—though for they had to make their categorization congruent with the teachers, so while the children may have been satisfied with the category man or daddy they had to learn that I was to be taken as a person toward who certain images should be fostered. An analysis of this process is in a later section but it is indicated by the example that at one point the teacher asked, "How are you supposed to behave when there is another person in the room?"

I would like now to give a more detailed analysis of a verbatim exchange between myself and one of the teachers as a way of more clearly understanding the situation.

**ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEMS**

The following exchange occurred one observation period just before the Christmas break. I made the opening remark as I stood up to leave for the day. The teacher was standing near by.

S1  O-Why are you so happy to see me leave?
S2  T-You make me so nervous.
S3  O-Why?
S4  T-Because you sit there writing down things and I wonder if we split our infinitives today.
S5  O-I told you I'm not interested in the teachers.
S6  T-You mean I've been putting on this show for nothing?
S7  O-Yes
S8  T-You just wait.
S9  O-I am just interested in the children.
S10  T-My poor child. (wraps her arms around a girl standing nearby and pats her head.)

What I wish to do here is to show how the above exchange is reasonable/understandable in light of the considerations presented above. How did the teacher come to say what she did?

S1 was produced in response to a smiling facial gesture that the teacher exhibited when I rose to leave. It was said in a joking manner so that it would not be acted toward seriously. However, the teacher acted as though it were serious. S2 indicates that my presence was bothering and S4 indicates what it was she took it I was present for. The reference to "split infinitives" can be viewed either as her seeing my presence connected with the language arts program, or as a general reference to the possibility that I was evaluating teacher performance.

It would seem that the teacher was not satisfied about my presence. S4 could be seen to mean that she did not know what I was doing there ("and I wonder"). It may be since I was introduced by the principal and associated with the school board I was categorized as "one of them". Given this interpretation it may be seen as natural for the teacher to assume that I was present to evaluate her
competence as a teacher (split infinitives). That they should see me that way was puzzling, for the principal had supposedly met with them and discussed the research (he had a written outline) and I had gone over the objectives on my first day. I explained to the teachers that the research was concerned with how children react to the imposition of institutional rules and that Grade One was chosen for study because presumably it is here that children first meet this sort of situation. Since it seemed to me that they had the correct information from the beginning I could not understand why they seemed to be looking for the "real" reason behind what was said. It is clear now that since the principal presented the research as being in the area of language arts and I talked about reaction to institutional structure there was some reason to search for the "real" answer. The previous discussion on the possibilities of checking out my story may indicate an area of frustration. They may have been having a lot of trouble making congruent the two explanations of the research. The following illustration indicates that they were suspicious of my purpose.

In February of the year the school obtained a fourth grade one teacher. This teacher took students from the other three classes. One day at noon Miss Smith introduced me to the new teacher. The new teacher asked me a number
of questions about the research. She asked about how many schools the research was going on in. Miss Smith responded with "we don't know". I would take this to mean that she was not sure that I was telling everything and that the research could be going on all over the city for all she knew. The new teacher was searching for a frame and asked if I was asking the students questions or what. I replied that I just sat and observed. Miss Smith said: "And he neve... shows us what he writes". I would take this to indicate a concern with what it was I was writing and whether or not it corresponded to what I said I was doing. S5 was my reinstatement of the purpose of the research. S6 may be seen as an indication that what was going on in the classroom while I was present was not the "usual" round of activities but some how one calculated to convey an impression ("show"). It may be that the "show" was one used when those persons who evaluate teaching performance are present. That is to say I was categorized with inspectors and principals which may not be surprising given my supposed interest in the "language arts" program. The children then had to learn to realize that there was a "show" in progress and had to learn to co-operate to foster the image that was being projected.

The question to be answered then is, given my claim
that there are different presentational activities in the classroom how does life-as-usual differ from the "show" mentioned above. The following remarks occurred over a few drinks at the end of the observational period for the fall term. I took Miss Jones for a few drinks in the hope that it would provide an opportunity to clear up misunderstandings about the nature of the research and make the situation less stressful at the school during the second term. The exact exchange is hazy but at one point Miss Jones remarked, "I don't like to spank Gregory in front of people but it is the only way to control him". In addition to this remark I would like to consider the following two exchanges. The exchanges occurred one observational period that was marked with much antagonism at the beginning of the class. (This antagonism may be accounted for by the fact that I was supposed to have come the day before but did not. I phoned the principal to let him know I would not be able to make it and to let the teachers know. I found out subsequently that he did not do this. The teachers were just left hanging--my appearance the next day could well be seen then as somewhat arbitrary and a situation in which annoyance could be seen as morally right from the teachers' point of view.) During the on-going activities
of the classroom these remarks were made to the students.

A. S11 t-Children would you please stop that. Now when there is an extra person in the room what are we supposed to do, Huuu?

m-(Not transcribable)

S12 t-Right, you know do it.

S13 f-...talking

S14 t-right.

B. S15 t-I don't want to reprimand children in front of someone else do I? What do you suggest your course of action should be? (Directed to a specific girl)

S16 f"-Be good.

The first example (spanking Gregory) would tend to indicate that one thing that was being altered from the life-as-usual form of activities was that of discipline. This seems to be an indication that the teacher does not wish to have to discipline children in front of people not usually in the classroom. In each example there is mention of a foreign element ("people"; "extra person"; "someone else"). The last two examples indicate that there is a special way of acting when someone else is present. The structure of the classroom has been changed as a result of the observer's presence and the teacher's attempt not to expose the language arts program and the children are expected to somehow maintain their part of the performance so that it comes off. The examples indicate that the children have been told about their actions
when the "extra person" is present and the teacher expects them to act accordingly ("Right, you know, do it.") The "you know" may be seen as holding them responsible for their actions in this area. This then is an example of some of the activities that Grade One children must learn in addition to commonly held notions of what goes on in the classroom (i.e. reading, writing and arithmetic).

What I have discussed above is what Garfinkel has called the "moral" character of social structure, in this case of the school. That is for the actors the "natural scenes" of everyday life have a right/wrong character, not merely a concern for "technical" correctness. The introduction of the researcher caused a disruption of the moral order. This disruption may be seen as having occurred as the result of a contravention of expectancies. The principal chose to disregard the teachers' wishes about the admission of a researcher to their rooms. The teachers' expectations that he would honor their wishes may have been made on some notion that there is some autonomy about what goes on in a teacher's classroom over which she has the right to decide. When the principal contravened their expectations the teachers felt "wronged". This situation could be seen as analogous to Garfinkel's experiment where he had
students go home and act as though they were boarders—this brought responses of rage, embarrassment etc. from parents in the same way as the principal's actions provoked these emotions in the teachers. Being "wronged" they could then feel justified in "getting back" at the principal by refusing to co-operate with the researcher by excluding "language arts" material from the observer's view. The above description has delineated some of the concerns and preoccupations of teachers with reference to the researcher as well as revealing some of the social structure of the school. The children face somewhat the same problems as did the researcher—that is, the discovery of the teachers' concerns and preoccupations—the teachers' conception of what constitutes normal activity in the classroom. Their problem is the discovery of the "moral" order given off by the teacher. Their view of the social structure at some point must match the teacher's—that is socialization will have occurred. Children's acquisition of the knowledge of social structure involves these moral concerns as well as the more formal academic requirements.

One model that could be used of schools is of a teaching machine. That is, the school situation could be seen as children learning academic things without necessarily having the aid of a teacher. The program
for learning is built into the machine and the child can learn simply by following the instructions of the machine. This process could take place in isolation. In the school in which observations took place teaching machines are not used so it is reasonable to think that some of the instructions that would have to be built into a teaching machine will have to be given by the teacher. What is of particular interest to this report are those activities which are not especially involved with the teaching activities but which are of a "moral" nature. These moral concerns constitute in part, that children must learn to be accepted as a competent member of the class. I use competence in the sense designated by Garfinkel, who states that competence is the

...claim that a collectivity member is entitled to exercise that he is capable of managing his everyday affairs without interference.

In the case of children this is never wholly achieved but it is more or less the case that the amount of interference decreases as the child learns the order of things, when I talk about the moral order of the classroom I am referring to such things as: when it is permissible to talk, how one should talk, about what, that is the rules of behavior. Perhaps at home a child speaks to whom when he wants to. At school he may learn that if he does so he is in the wrong and that he may be punished
for it. Later he may learn that by giving acceptable accounts of why, he may get off—in the sense that the teacher may accept the circumstances as such to justify the breaking of the rule.

In this section I have pointed to some of the problems I encountered in doing research in a school. I found that the classroom situation was changed from its life-as-usual form in response to my presence. The problems raised by my presence are not ones that can be solved with more extensive sampling or quantification. These problems must be seen as part of the data collected and taken into account in any analysis of the data. This sort of information so rarely reported would seem to be of central concern in determining what is being reported.
Footnotes


5. It is important to case some light on the above impression. It might be deduced that the teachers just did not like the observer and that would invalidate the argument. A much accepted maxim in field research is that if the researcher is seen as a "good guy" then no more questions will be asked about the research. In this situation (professional, possibility of discovering secrets etc.) perhaps being a good guy is not enough. It may be that here the 'hostility' is directed toward the research per se. The only evidence that can be brought forth in support of this claim is an incident that occurred when the researcher informed Miss Smith that he would not be back again until after Christmas. Upon being informed she looked happy so the researcher said: "Why do you hate me so?" She replied: "We don't hate you, it's what you're doing". This could be passed off as a proper response in the situation to keep the interaction running smoothly but other interaction with the teachers would not tend to support this. The teachers' concern may not be whether the research makes use of good methodology or theory but rather with what the disposal of the data will be. Who is going to see what has been observed and what are they going to do with the information. This may fall into the type of questioning which Aaron Cicourel has seen as asking "What are you really after?" as opposed to what you are telling me.
6. This formulation makes very loose use of Harvey Sacks formulations as found in his unpublished doctoral dissertation: *The Search for Help: No one To Turn To*, Berkeley: Department of Sociology, 1966.


8. The observer took it that the coffee room was not a place he could just walk into (have the right). It was his custom to knock and be admitted. About two weeks after the beginning of observations the teacher who opened the door remarked "I don't think you have to knock everytime." It was usually the same teacher who opened the door to the observer each time.

9. The presence of a coverall clad man might be a legitimate occasion for demanding an explanation.

10. When the researcher was present in the coffee room he was what A. Schutz has called a stranger. If he wanted to be one of them he was in a position of having to find out what the proper rules of conduct were. This is seen as different than the classroom situation where the researcher could not be concerned with becoming an accepted participant. I might be noted here that since the coffee rooms are segregated by sex there was little opportunity for the observer to interact informally with the teachers in whose rooms he was observing. If informal interaction had been possible perhaps tensions would have been less.
11. Much can be gleamed about what sorts of things have to be learned by people who are trying to look like someone they are not, from the writings of and about spies and imposters. An incident concerning Fred Demara occurs in an army camp where he is legitimately a soldier, but where he did not like to wait in the long line-ups for mess.

Demara conquered the mess line. He noted that Keesler was constantly shipping people to other bases at almost any time of the day or night. Shipping clerks were armed with little blue arm bands to identify them and almost invariably carried rolls of mimeographed shipping orders. It was quite easy to look like a shipping clerk, he found. It was equally simple, decked out as he was, to start at the tag end of the almost endless line of sufferers and shout, "Carruthers? Private Quentin Q. Carruthers? Rush shipping orders!" and in this fashion move his way up, the terrible long line until he reached the door of the mess tent, which was guarded by several military policemen, and run shouting in.


12. Even if you are present legitimately in the school you may be questioned by those that do not know of your presence. An example of this is when the observer went to the office one day to see the principal. The secretary said that he was not in so the observer said: "Oh...well then I will see him Wednesday." The secretary said: "Oh, does he know you are here?"
O="Yes."
S="Oh, can I tell him you called?"
O="Yes, just say that Mr. MacKay will see him Wednesday."
S="OK."

13. The rod table is a table on which are stored the ten different coloured and sized 'rods' which are used in the teaching of arithmetic.


The following is an attempt to outline the activities that take place during a typical morning in a grade one classroom. This is intended as an aid in understanding the following analysis of the structure of interaction in the classrooms.

Division 20

A bell rings at 8.45 which is a signal that the children are to enter the building and go to the classrooms. They take off their coats and hang them on the hooks provided. They also change from shoes to slippers before entering the classroom.

"Children please remember to put on your slippers when you first get here. If you don't we'll get wey behind."

At 9:00 there is a bell which signals the beginning of classes. At this point the children are supposed to be in their desks with their heads down indicating they are ready to begin. The teacher, or a person appointed to do so, says good morning to the children followed by the Lord's Prayer.

"Marie, would you like to say 'good morning' and lead the prayer?"

Marie goes to the front and says:
Good morning girls and boys.
All-Good morning Marie.
Marie leads the Lord's Prayer, the others join in.
t-Tell them to come to the front.
M-Come to the front.

After this the children are asked to come up to the front of the room. When the children are at the front the teacher writes words and sentences on the board. She calls on people to read the sentences out loud. If the sentences are questions she may also ask for an answer.

t-Susan?
S-Do you have something new? A hair cut.
t-I have a new hair cut.
S-I have a new hair cut.

Disciplining activities are also engaged in. During one of these times the teacher asked a question and hands went up. One boy stood with his hand up.

t-would you like to stay sitting please.

The writings usually have to do with the day and always incorporate the words that are on the board at the back which the children print later. The children are asked after it is all written to go to the board and point to words that the teacher asks for. Following this the class divides into three groups (based on
learning ability). One group goes to the back and prints the day's word. (This word is printed once under a slip of paper with the student's name; the slip of paper is in the shape of the object that designates his group—fish, airplane, butterfly). Another group stays at the front to read in a group from their reader. During the reading, after someone is finished the teacher may ask a question about the story or about a picture in the book.

The other group goes to their desks and reads their story and starts on the questions printed on the board. The order varies and is designated by the teacher. As the teacher finishes the reading with one group she calls on another group to come up for group reading and the others rotate tasks. When not otherwise occupied the student should be doing the reading questions from the board and drawing an appropriate picture to illustrate this.

When the teacher is not occupied with a specific group she walks around checking questions, writing etc. and checking to make sure that people are doing their work. If they finish this before the recess bell they should finish up any work from the day before or read a library book. At recess time the teacher has the children put on their coats and shoes and line up to go out for recess. She chooses who gets ready first some-
times in terms of individuals finished.

t-Those who have finished their picture and their work can tip-toe to the cloakroom and put on their jackets. Will you tell David to come out of the cloakroom, he has a mistake.

m-He's not in the cloakroom.

f-He's at the bathroom.

**Division 19**

The routine for coming into class is the same as for Division 20. At 9:-- Show and Tell begins (this is a time when the children can tell about something interesting that has happened to them or show the class something new or interesting). At the beginning of the year the teacher designated who was to come up but early the system was established that the teacher would just point to a row to start and that the children would just come up in succession.

*t-Well Eron?  
(Eron goes to the front)  
E-This is my magazine

t-What is it?

E-an eagle (points) This is an eagle.  
(a girl comes up as Eron sits down)

f-This is wheat we got in Saskatoon.

*t-Do you know what we use wheat for?  
Can you tell the children what you do with it?

f-Farmers.
t-Yes, what do they use it for? Garth?

G-Bread.

(This girl sits down and another comes up)

f2-This is my arithmetic I did. Ten plus ten. Karen?

K-Twenty.

f2-Ten plus one. Garth?

G-Eleven.

f2-Right.

t-Well, good, Garth.

m- This is my football for good work. etc.

After Show and Tell there was a Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer. Following this the children go up to the front. The teacher would then ask for the month, day, date and year and would print them on the board.

t-Who can tell me what day it is today? Billy Buchan?

B-Monday.

t-What was yesterday? Garth?

G-Sunday.

t-Yes and today is Monday. What month is it? Chris?

C-November.

t-And what date? Lisa?

L-Seventh.

t-Yes, now read everybody.

All-Monday, November seventh, 1966.
Next the teacher would print sentences and ask the students to read them.
The teacher prints on the board.
t-Now who can tell me what this word is?
(can't hear answer)
t-Now what is this one? (several speak at once)
t-Hands you know! (points to someone)
ml-Kim brought a new record this morning
Teacher prints again.
t-Well Eron?
E-It is Winnie the Pooh

She might ask students to go to the board and underline certain words. The story would then be read both by individuals sometimes taking parts and then by the group as a whole. After this all return to their seats to read their story and do the questions on the story from the board. The teacher would have one group (again the class was divided in three with one student's name assigned to the group). Usually after one group had finished reading there would be singing (three or four songs), then another group reading. Those not reading are supposedly doing the questions or drawing a picture illustrating the story. At recess the teacher has the students get ready to go out--row finished; individuals finished; or boys/girls. Two rows are formed at the door--one for boys and one for girls.
Alright, quietly, girls go to the cloakroom and get their coats. (They come back and put them on)

Now button up your coats.

Alright, boys.  
( several boys run—the teacher points at them and they sit down )

Button up your coat Kelly.

Come on Susan, button up your coat.

After recess the same arrival procedure is followed as above. It is now time for arithmetic. The teacher calls the groups to the back for the lesson at the rod table in rotation. The other students finish their reading questions and pictures. If all the groups have not read out loud the teacher will hear them at some point after recess (usually just after). When all is finished the students may read a library book, finish up yesterday's work or work on some art project that may be going on. At lunch the same rules for leaving apply as at recess. If the teacher lets those eating at school go down stairs before the bell they come from (out of) their lines.

The recess period is from 10:25 to 10:40 a.m. When the bell rings at 10:40 the children come back in and follow the same procedure as when they first arrive. Occasionally children are required to stay in at recess if they have not finished the morning's work. After recess there is a phonics lesson. Following this the
students print the letter of the day (A-Z--one of) in their printing books. When everyone is finished this it is time for arithmetic. Some go to (as in groups above) the rod table for the lesson and others do the questions on the board. Again the groups rotate. When all the groups have had the lesson they work on the arithmetic or finish their story drawing. If they have finished everything they may read a library book. At noon the teacher has them get ready to leave as for recess. Two lines are formed--one for those going home to eat lunch and one for those who are going to eat lunch at the school. On occasion the ones who are going to eat at school get to go down stairs (quietly) before the bell.
Footnotes

1. The activities described are ideal types. There was always variation but they serve to give the general atmosphere of what goes on. These activities may have been different in the absence of the observer. There is evidence to suggest that this is especially true with respect to the Bible reading and Lord's Prayer.

One of the teachers said that she only had the prayer when I was present. When I asked why the prayer was given for me she replied: "For the first two months I thought you were a spy and after that I wasn't sure if you were a religious nut or not."
APPENDIX C

Diagram of Room # 1
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Diagram of Room #2

- Teacher's Desk
- Blackboard
- Fire Escape
- Stairs
- Cupboards
- Rod Storage Shelves
- Library
- 6 Rows of Desks
  - 6 Desks in each Row
- Small Chairs
- Table
- Table
- Observer
- Hall Doors
- Easel
- Cloakroom
- Door
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